

# SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Friday, May 20, 2022

**THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN PERSON AND VIA AUDIO/VIDEO  
CONFERENCING**

## SOMB Members

Carl Blake  
Casey Ballinger  
Gary Kramer  
Glenn Knipscheer  
Gregg Kildow  
Ivonne Sierra  
Jeff Shay  
Jesse Hansen  
Jessica Dotter  
Joshua Nowak  
Kathy Heffron  
Katie Abeyta  
Kent Vance  
Lisa Mayer  
Nicole Feltz  
Scott James  
Sharon Holbrook  
Taber Powers  
Theresa Weiss  
Tony Carochi

## SOMB Guests

Alan Donald	Kayla Riley
Ali Brady	Kayla Wildeman
Alison Talley	Lauren Rivas
Alyssa Glaser	Laurie Kepros
Amanda Retting	Lolita Sanchez
Amira Minazzi	Marsha Brewer
Angel Weant	Melissa Gursky
Becca Mickelson	Melissa Parkowski- Helmer
Brian Tobias	Nina Campaniello
Carrie Cerreta-Kessie	Pat Harris
Glen Batista	Rick Ostring
Grand Godfrey	Roger Kincade
Ingrid Barrier	Sarah Marlow
Jacob Mathews	Sera Bennett
Jessica Bartels	Tami Floyd
Jessica Meza	Tanya Ahamed
Jessica Peters	Wellesley Bush
Joanne Liu	
Jordyn Schneider	
Karen Morgenthaler	

**Absent SOMB Members:** Christina Ortiz-Marquez, Kimberly Kline, Michelle Simmons, and Norma Aguilar-Dave

**Staff:** Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky, Erin Austin, Raechel Alderete, Rachael Collie, Yuanting Zhang, Taylor Redding, and Jill Trowbridge

**SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:03am**

This meeting was recorded.

**ORIENTATION TO THE MEETING:**

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Vice-Chair) introduced herself, indicated that she will be chairing the meeting, and welcomed the SOMB members in attendance along with the members of the public.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) introduced himself.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) introduced herself, reviewed the various aspects of this WebEx meeting, and indicated how the meeting will be conducted. Erin Austin noted she will be the contact for technical support, and mentioned that she will monitor any questions or comments in the chat and in the question and answer functions.

**INTRODUCTIONS/ATTENDANCE:**

The SOMB members in person introduced themselves individually.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) asked Ivonne Sierra to introduce herself as the new Department of Education Representative on the SOMB. Ivonne Sierra gave a brief overview of her background.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) introduced the online SOMB members that were attending virtually.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) introduced Taylor Redding as the new Office of Sex Offender Violence and Sex Offender Management (ODVSOM) Training and Special Projects Coordinator. Taylor Redding gave a brief overview of her background.

SOMB Staff introduced themselves.

The in-person guests introduced themselves.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) introduced the online guests attending virtually.

**NEW FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS:**

**Board Members:**

None

**Audience:**

None

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**Staff Announcements:**

Taylor Redding (SOMB Staff) announced the following training information:

- Training:
  - 5/12/22 – Lunch and Learn training on polygraph usage
  - 5/18/22 – Training on Evaluating individuals charged with child sexual exploitation material possession
  - 6/02/22 – Lunch & Learn training on the data collection system for both Juvenile & Adult providers only
  - 6/17/22 – Lunch & Learn training on the Adult and Juvenile Standards Booster

Conference Updates:

- Taylor Redding indicated that as of this date, there are 225 registrants for the ODVSOM Conference, and indicated that the Early Bird discount deadline will end on 5/31. She mentioned that general registration will end on June 30, 2022.
- She announced the three awards being given at the conference, and noted that the deadline for these nominations is 5/27/22:
  - Denise Fransua Domestic Violence Offender Management Leadership Award
  - Gary Bergen Sex Offender Managements Treatment Leadership Award
  - Senator Norma Anderson Excellence in Victim Advocacy Award
- Taylor Redding noted that there is a JotForm for the purpose of applying for a scholarship to the conference which is due by June 1, 2022.
- She indicated that vendor tables are available at the conference, and noted that these can be reserved through the on-line conference registration form.
- Taylor Redding indicated that sponsorship opportunities are available for the conference, or a part of the conference, a session, a presentation, or a keynote speaker. She asked for potential sponsors to contact Jesse Hansen at jesse.hansen@state.co.us to submit your sponsorship.
- She indicated that the SOMB is holding the lodging rooms, but mentioned that each person must call Beaver Run to make the reservation.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) announced the following:

- Erin Austin indicated that the SOMB paperwork is now available on a special google drive for Board members for the appeal process. She asked SOMB members to set up a "business" Gmail account if they don't currently have one, and asked that all SOMB members who have one to send their Gmail email accounts so she can share the Appeals Drive with those accounts.

Rachael Alderete (SOMB Staff) announced the following:

- Rachael Alderete announced that May is Mental Health Awareness Month. She encouraged all to spread the word of the stigma of mental health, and the importance of reaching out to those in need of mental health services. Rachael Alderete gave a brief PowerPoint presentation regarding the mental health needs as of 2020, and reiterated the importance of self-care.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) announced the following:

- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky indicated that the Colorado Legislative sessions have ended for this year, and noted that the list of updated Legislative Bills were sent to the SOMB Members.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the DVOMB Board has been renewed through the Sunset process, and indicated the bill has passed both the House and Senate which is awaiting the Governor's signature.
- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that he will be more sensitive to individuals and stakeholders when presenting the fun facts of some of the practices and policies of the SOMB in the past 30 years.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) reviewed some fun facts of the SOMB during the past 30 years. He noted that there will be a 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary bingo game at the ODVSOM Conference in July. He gave some facts about the events that occurred in 1992 when the SOMB first began.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) indicated that Angel Weant, a former SOMB member, is celebrating her 30th wedding anniversary in 2022.

Gary Reser (Audience Member) noted that his wedding anniversary is on February 29<sup>th</sup>, and indicated that he has only had seven anniversaries.

**Board Announcements:**

None

**Audience Announcements:**

Laurie Kepros (Audience Member) thanked Raechel Alderete for her presentation regarding mental health, and noted that it is also Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Month. She noted the need to recognize the difficulty of interfacing with the criminal justice system when coming from different cultures. Laurie Kepros also noted that May is also Older American’s month, and pointed out that prison sentences of those serving more than ten years has tripled in the past twenty years, along with lengthy Probation terms. She reminded all that competency issues should be recognized by the courts and the criminal justice system. Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) also noted that the Adult Standards Review Committee has been working on “interpreter” standards, and indicated to contact Erin Austin or Raechel Alderete if they want to attend either the Adult Standards or Best Practices committees to review this language.

Brian Tobias (Colorado Office of the State Auditors) thanked all for cooperating and working with him during his Sunset Review process, and tolerating his presence. He indicated that the process and stakeholder outreach is almost completed. He indicated that if anyone would like to give him more information, to please reach out to him to set up a meeting. Brian Tobias reviewed that the report will come out on October 14<sup>th</sup>, the bill will be drafted, and will start with an initial review in the Senate when the Legislative sessions begin in January 2023. He indicated that the President of the Senate will decide which committee will review the Sunset report. Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) placed Brian Tobias’ email address in the Chat.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) asked the phone-in individual to email Jill Trowbridge if they want to be included in the meeting attendance record.

**APPROVAL OF April MINUTES (Decision Item) – (Attachment #1)**

***Jeff Shay (SOMB Member) moved to approve the March Minutes as presented.  
Carl Blake (SOMB Member) 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.***

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) reviewed the voting process for those SOMB members in person and those attending virtually.

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Vice-Chair) reminded the audience to not participate in the vote, and asked the SOMB members to click “submit” to ensure their vote is recorded.

***Joshua Nowak (SOMB Member) joined the meeting at 9:42 am.***

**Motion to approve the April Minutes as presented: Jeff Shay; Carl Blake 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #1)**

**16 Approve      0 Oppose      1 Abstain      Motion Passes**

- 8 Yes in person
- 1 Abstain in person
- 8 Yes online
- 0 Abstain online

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) indicated that Kathy Heffron will be leaving the Public Defender’s Office and will be leaving the SOMB. He acknowledged Kathy Heffron’s dedicated service on the SOMB, and noted her continued work and dedication in this field. He mentioned that she was a goal keeper in soccer while in college, which says a lot about her character and her willingness to stand alone as the last line of defense. Kathy Heffron (SOMB Member) expressed her pride of being a public defender, and the ability to represent the Public Defender’s

office. She acknowledged all who sit on the SOMB, how working in this field is tiresome, how difficult it is for victims, and how well the recent changes have improved the lives of all involved. Kathy Heffron acknowledged the cooperation and collaboration of the SOMB members and the work that is being done. Katie Abeyta (SOMB Vice-Chair) indicated that Kathy Heffron will be greatly missed.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) expressed appreciation for Kathy Heffron's dedication, and noted she will be missed.

Carl Blake (SOMB Member) also thanked Kathy Heffron in her ability to keep the Board moving forward.

Joshua Nowak (SOMB Member) also gave kudos to Kathy Heffron, and mentioned that she gives 110% in all that she does. He expressed his excitement to see what she does next.

Taylor Redding (SOMB Staff) read the comments in the chat from Angel Weant and Missy Gursky.

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

The Agenda was then approved by consensus.

#### **BREAK: 9:54 – 10:00**

**Casey Ballinger arrived at 10:10 am**

#### **PROVIDER APPEAL HEARING (Decision Item) – (No Attachment) – Carl Blake, ARC Chair, and Dr. Brenna Tindall, Approved Provider**

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Vice-Chair) reviewed the appeal process and policies.

In-person SOMB members introduced themselves to Dr. Brenna Tindall, the Appellant. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) introduced the online SOMB members. The SOMB staff introduced themselves.

Kari Hershey (Appellant's Attorney) described the various aspects of the ensuing discussion which included:

- Purpose of the SOMB
- SOMB Statutory Charge
- Targeting of Dr. Tindall
- Flaws in the Review Process

Kari Hershey (Attorney) then introduced herself and Dr. Brenna Tindall (Appellant.) She gave a brief overview of her past experience, and reviewed the following background information regarding the appeal:

- She reviewed the purpose and membership of the Application Review Committee (ARC);
- Noted that there was a financial conflict of interest between Dr. Tindall and Dr. Rick May of Treatment and Evaluation Services (TES) while she was employed by them;
- She indicated that Dr. Tindall received a call from Erin Austin (SOMB Adult Standards Coordinator) indicating she was being targeted;
- She noted concerns expressed by the ARC on 10/19/2019 where there were stakeholder concerns about Dr. Tindall, and the need to start an official review of the conflict between Treatment and Evaluation Services (TES) and Dr. Rick May;

- She noted that Dr. May did not recuse himself from this discussion when ARC was reviewing the conflict of interest;
- Dr. Tindall was not informed of these ARC concerns for nearly 2 years, and was not notified of the actual stakeholder concerns;
- She indicated that Dr. Tindall was notified and selected for a Standards Compliance Review by the ARC on 11/19/2019 pursuant to a policy (but no specific policy was indicated or attached);
- She noted that the review notice does not indicate this was a “for cause” review;
- She indicated that the targeting of this review on Dr. Tindall was neither fair or consistent with SOMB policy;
- She indicated that at that time a 2014 policy was in effect, and noted it was not given to Dr. Tindall to review or follow;
- She mentioned that a 2018 appendix does reference these reviews along with a 2021 policy, but neither were specifically stated when notifying Dr. Tindall;
- She noted that Dr. Tindall did respond to the notice and supplied all required evaluations, some of which were not under the purview of the SOMB;
- She asked that the ARC not consider the evaluations not under the purview of the SOMB (adult evaluations 3 and 5, and juvenile evaluations 1 and 6);
- She noted for the record, that there were some violations of the Open Meetings Law by the ARC;
- She noted that the ARC review is inflammatory and unprofessional;
- She asked that the SOMB reject the findings.

**Appellant Testimony**

Dr. Brenna Tindall (Appellant) then testified on her own behalf. She indicated that she was not disputing the feedback from the SOMB or the mistakes she has made, but was disputing the compliance review process and the lack of professionalism and consistency. She noted she felt she was being targeted and did not fully understand the process.

***Joshua Nowak (SOMB Member) moved to give Dr. Tindall an additional 10 minutes to continue with her defense testimony***  
***Kathy Heffron 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion***

Carl Blake (SOMB Member) noted that ARC members can vote for this extension.

**Motion to extend Dr. Tindall’s Testimony timeframe 10 additional minutes: Joshua Nowak; Kathy Heffron 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #2)**

<b>14</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

- 6 – Yes (In Person)
- 4 – No (In Person)
- 1 – Abstention (In Person)
- 7 – Yes (On Line)
- 1 – Yes (Verbally on line))
- 0 – Abstentions (On Line)
- 0 – No (On Line)

Dr. Tindall (Appellant) continued her testimony as follows:

- She noted that she is not disputing feedback, and has taken measures to increase her ability to receive feedback;
- She indicated that the review process made her feel she was targeted personally;
- She mentioned that there was a conflict of interest with Dr. May regarding this review;

Kari Hershey (Appellant Attorney) reminded the SOMB that there were unprofessional conflicts of interest, and noted that policies were not followed. She indicated that the allegations appear to be extreme based on Dr. Tindall's response to the complaint.

### **ARC Testimony**

Dr. Carl Blake (ARC Chair) reviewed the names of the current and previous ARC representatives during the review of Dr. Tindall, and noted that ARC members would abstain from voting on a decision at this meeting. He responded to the conflicts of interest in the review process given by Kari Hershey, and noted that two ARC members abstained (Dr. Rick May and Missy Gursky) from the ARC decision in the review of Dr. Tindall. Carl Blake then indicated that the ARC believes there is no justification for this appeal based on the following:

- There is no formal complaint against Dr. Tindall, and noted that this is a Standards Compliance Review which is not covered by the SOMB's appeal process;
- ARC did not deny placement or status on the approved provider list, and noted that ARC approved Dr. Tindall's reapplication for treatment provider renewal status;
- Dr. Tindall was offered a compliance action plan in lieu of any status change;
- Dr. Tindall rejected the compliance action plan, and therefore chose a reduction in status;
- Due to Dr. Tindall's choice to reject the action plan and subsequent reduction in status, this appeal does not fall into the appeals options outlined in the administrative policies.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) then read the ARC policies, the review of the complaint, and the formal appeal process and noted the following:

- All materials considered and reviewed by ARC have been shared with SOMB members;
- ARC has not considered any materials not shared with SOMB members;
- Please remember that there is personal and confidential information in the materials supplied;
- Some information is graphic in nature.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) then gave the following synopsis of the appeal as follows:

- In response to materials given on 5/15 and 5/20 by Dr. Tindall and her attorney, Kari Hershey, that the submitted materials violate the administrative policy outlined in Appendix A. The materials were not submitted within 30 days prior to the appeal as required by policy; the materials were not limited to 10 pages as per the administrative policies; it is unclear as to what materials to respond to for the standards compliance review, and what to consider for the complaint; ARC did not find any of this submitted material to be relevant to the Standard Compliance Review; per the Administrative Policies, Section E 3, the SOMB will only consider information specific to the findings outlined by the ARC in the Compliance Finding letter.
- The submitted materials were not considered or available at the time of the ARC findings or in the timeframe indicated in the Administrative Policies; therefore, they were not specific to the findings made by ARC.
- The "for cause" compliance review was initiated on 11/19/2019 based on concerns expressed by stakeholders including Probation, treatment providers, evaluators, and professionals who have reviewed evaluations made by Dr. Tindall. These complaints were made over a period of time, and the ARC determined a Standards Compliance Review was the best course of action to determine the scope and validity of the concerns.
- Dr. Tindall was notified in writing and asked to supply 5 adult evaluations and 5 juvenile evaluations within the past year (Section 1 of the Appeal folder.)
- Dr. Tindall submitted 6 adult and 6 juvenile evaluations (Section 2 of the Appeal folder.)
- ARC reviewed each of the evaluations and compared them to the SOMB Standards for compliance.
- ARC enlisted the assistance of outside consultants with specific expertise in Sex Offense specific evaluations under the SOMB Standards and Guidelines.

- Since no “formal” complaint was filed, there was no response required from Dr. Tindall.
- After review of the submitted evaluations, the ARC found general concerns within the evaluations as well as direct violations of the SOMB Standards and Guidelines.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) went through the process that was followed and outlined the specifics of the violations in the evaluations submitted for the compliance review.

- He reviewed ARC’s response of the inaccuracies of the evaluations submitted by Dr. Tindall.
- He indicated that the inaccuracies of the evaluations caused mis-matching of supervision, treatment services needed, and the validity of the evaluation.
- Materials were not submitted at the requested timeframe; therefore, many of the Appellant responses are available now for review.
- Based on the evaluations submitted and reviewed by ARC, Dr. Tindall was offered a compliance action plan.
- Dr. Tindall responded by rejecting the plan, which caused a change in status to Associate level.
- Dr. Tindall and her attorney requested an alternate supervising solution, at which time ARC re-offered the compliance action plan to Dr. Tindall (which would allow Dr. Tindall to continue at a full-operating level.)
- Dr. Tindall again rejected this plan, and she and her attorney requested a subsequent review of her evaluations by an individual both Dr. Tindall and ARC agreed to.
- ARC agreed to this path and asked Dr. Tindall to supply names of evaluators that she would prefer to perform the subsequent evaluation reviews.
- Dr. Tindall submitted four names of individuals, and ARC agreed to use one of those evaluators as a possible option.
- ARC submitted the one individual’s name to Dr. Tindall along with two other proposed individuals.
- ARC also submitted a list of questions the reviewers would be asked if they chose to do the review.
- Dr. Tindall requested that “new” evaluations be reviewed and not the ones previously review by ARC.
- ARC did not agree to this change in evaluations as they may not indicate the concerns brought up from the original evaluations.
- Dr. Tindall and her attorney were notified of the evaluators chosen to re-review the original evaluations submitted, and if she would accept the Compliance Action Plan, agree to the reviewer names submitted, and agree to the subsequent review of the original evaluations.
- Dr. Tindall and her attorney declined to accept this resolution.
- Due to Dr. Tindall’s rejection of all alternate resolutions offered, ARC determined that the original sanction would stand, and indicated that Dr. Tindall was found in violation of the SOMB Standards and Guidelines.

***Josh Nowak moved to extend Dr. Blake’s testimony an additional 5 minutes  
Sharon Holbrook 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion***

**Motion to extend Dr. Blake’s testimony for an additional 5 minutes: Joshua Nowak; Sharon Holbrook 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #3)**

<b>17</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

- 9 – Yes (In Person)
- 0 – No (In Person)
- 1 – Abstention (In Person)
- 7 – Yes (On Line)
- 1 – Yes (Verbally on line)
- 0 – No (On Line)
- 0 – Abstentions (On Line)



Carl Blake (ARC Chair) continued his testimony and indicated that due to the frequency and severity of the violations found, that the SOMB recommends upholding the findings of ARC. He noted that regarding the sanction, due to comments made by Dr. Tindall, her lack of cooperation with the ARC, her unwillingness to acknowledge the severity of the violations, and the apparent disregard for the authority of the ARC, that the ARC upholds the sanction requested by ARC. Carl Blake mentioned that the dismissal of the violations by Dr. Tindall as viewed by ARC indicate the lack of awareness of her substandard practice and an unwillingness to address the problem areas. He mentioned that Dr. Tindall's practice being unsupervised puts the wellbeing of the clients and the victims of these offenses at risk. Carl Blake noted that Dr. Tindall has been a long-standing, well recognized professional in the field, and indicated that ARC does not make these findings lightly. He noted that not all Dr. Tindall's work is substandard, but mentioned that six of the twelve evaluations submitted by Dr. Tindall indicated violations.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) noted that he is available for questions. He clarified the ARC process when individuals with a conflict of interest are in the room at the time this case was discussed. Carl Blake noted that there has been a change in procedure in the minutes regarding documenting when individuals leave the room or are not part of a discussion. He indicated that this change was made after the minutes were referenced by Kari Hershey in her testimony.

### **Board Discussion**

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) indicated that there will be 20 minutes designated for SOMB discussion.

Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) noted concerns with Dr. Tindall's reporting errors on her evaluations (these do not appear to be at a professional level of her best work), and noted she questioned Dr. Tindall's skills. Dr. Tindall responded and clarified Lisa Mayer's concern regarding the level of her reporting, and noted she asked other evaluators to review these before submission to the ARC. She indicated that some of these errors were regarding age and race, where she was told to de-identify the client where possible. Dr. Tindall also indicated that the level of denial was chosen along with Probation's recommendation. There was continued discussion regarding the discrepancies found in the reports.

Kathy Heffron (SOMB Member) asked Carl Blake (ARC Chair) if Dr. Tindall was given guidance when submitting pre-plea evaluations versus offense-specific evaluations. She expressed concern that the stakeholder complaints were not given to Dr. Tindall sooner. Dr. Blake responded that ARC did not specifically clarify which type of work product to submit, and noted that it was assumed that the requested product submitted would be under the purview of ARC's scope. He noted that the work product submitted by Dr. Tindall did not negate the concerns that were sent to the ARC.

Jessica Dotter (SOMB Member) asked for confirmation that Appendix U gives the SOMB and ARC purview over pre-plea sexual evaluations. She mentioned that this appendix also states that the evaluation would have to follow the SOMB Standards and Guidelines unless duly noted in the evaluation. Dr. Carl Blake responded that Jessica Dotter was correct in understanding that the ARC does have purview unless it is indicated that an evaluation was not done under the purview of the SOMB Standards and Guidelines.

Jessica Dotter (SOMB Member) asked Carl Blake if Dr. Tindall has access to the policies and process when the ARC receives a specific complaint, the process for a "for cause" complaint, and the process for when a Standards Compliance Review would be initiated. She then asked Carl Blake to specify the possible outcomes in those three situations. Carl Blake (ARC Chair) explained the administrative policies that were in effect at that time of the initial complaints for those three circumstances. He noted that the ARC had purview over the Standards complaint process, and indicated the compliance review a result of the complaints submitted. Carl Blake clarified that some

complaints are not submitted as a “formal” complaint, and reviewed the processes ARC uses regarding complaints and formal complaints. He indicated that when a formal complaint is sent to the ARC, then this complaint is also forwarded to the Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA). Carl Blake also clarified the “random” Standards Compliance review process, and noted that this is not a compliance review triggered by a formal complaint. He indicated that all the processes for these situations were in effect on November 2019 in the Administrative Policies along with the possible outcomes.

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) indicated that the 20-minute discussion period was over. She asked for a motion to extend the discussion.

***Taber Powers (SOMB Member) moved to extend Board discussion for an additional 20 minutes  
Jeff Shay (SOMB Member) 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion***

**Motion to extend SOMB discussion by 20 minutes: Taber Powers; Jeff Shay 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #4)**

<b>18 Approve</b>	<b>1 Oppose</b>	<b>0 Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------

- 10 – Yes (In Person)
- 0 – No (In Person)
- 0 – Abstentions (In Person)
- 8 – Yes (On Line)
- 1 – No (On Line)
- 0 – Abstentions (On Line)

Jessica Dotter (SOMB Member) asked Carl Blake for clarification regarding the complaint process and the compliance review process. Carl Blake (ARC Chair) responded that when receiving a complaint, the ARC determines if this is a provider they have purview over, if this is a client they have purview over, and if the complaint alleges a specific Standards violation. He noted that the Standards Compliance review will not necessarily indicate a specific Standards violation, but there must be a concern that ARC would have the ability to review (i.e., quality of work product, exams completed, etc.) He noted that it depends upon the nature of the complaint, and noted that the ARC has offered technical assistance at times for those who may need help with provider/client relationships. Carl Blake mentioned that in Dr. Tindall’s case, complaints came in over time about the quality of her evaluations, so the ARC asked for copies of her evaluations (not treatment records, notes, or treatment plans) so ARC could assess the quality and tone of her evaluations.

Jessica Dotter (SOMB Member) asked Dr. Tindall about the difference of the evaluations done pre-plea versus the evaluations done postconviction. Kari Hershey (Appellant Attorney) responded that Statutes dictate that the SOMB does not have purview over pre-disposition matters, only those “convicted” of a sexual assault. She indicated that pre-disposition evaluations should be notated that they would have to be updated when the client is convicted of a sexual offense. Dr. Tindall responded that a statement is included in pre-plea evaluations that states that “the evaluation is pre-plea and appears to be compliant with the SOMB Standards, but that it needs to be updated upon post-disposition.” Dr. Tindall responded that she does not conduct the pre-plea and post-conviction evaluations any differently, and indicated that she uses evidence-based research in her reports. She stated that she believed the pre-plea evaluations did have the statement that they were pre-plea and were to be updated upon post-conviction, and that her work product was adequate for the review.

Jesse Hansen (SOMB Member) clarified that the SOMB initiates Standards Compliance reviews at a regular rate (4-5 per year), both “for cause” and randomly. He mentioned that the purpose of these reviews is to keep tabs on what is happening in the field, and to ensure that the field understands the Standards. Jesse Hansen noted that another reason for these reviews is to confidentially remediate when issues first occur before administrative action needs to be taken against a provider’s listing status. He noted that Erin Austin was not employed by the

SOMB on September 19, 2019 when Dr. Tindall indicated she received a phone call from (on page 3 of the Dr. Tindall's packet) her regarding her being targeted by the SOMB.

Taber Powers (SOMB Member) agreed with Carl Blake that there is no mechanism to appeal the Standards Compliance review. He asked when Dr. Tindall would be able to move up in status again if the Board upholds the ARC decision. Carl Blake (ARC Chair) responded that it will be decided by the supervisor when that individual has adequately addressed the concerns and is able to move up in status, and that there is no specific time-frame (it depends upon the individual.) He noted at that time, an application, new work product, and a written recommendation from the supervisor would be required to move the individual up in listing status. Taber Powers asked if any newer work product has been received by Dr. Tindall. Carl Blake responded that the ARC has not received or reviewed any newer work product since 2019.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) commented that the Juvenile Standards, in Section 2.210 talks about pre-plea evaluations and states: "The evaluator shall comply with these standards at each phase. It is not the role of the evaluator to establish innocence or guilt or make a legal disposition." He noted that the findings reference this section as to whether or not the individual has committed sexual abuse. Carl Blake indicated that ARC's responsibility was to review the Standards to see if they were followed, and the evaluator "complied" with these standards without indicating innocence or guilt of the client. He noted that in the work product reviewed, that this Standard was clearly violated.

Kathy Heffron (SOMB Member) questioned why "sexually reactive behavior" is an assertion of innocence versus abusive. Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) limited the responses to 30 seconds. Carl Blake (ARC Chair) clarified that the statement that "the individual's behavior does not seem to be sexually abusive" is one that does not seem to be not sexually abusive. He noted that sexual reactivity may be an underlying factor or element of sexual abuse, but it does not negate the fact that there is sexual abuse. Dr. Tindall responded that the statement was not justification, but that she used evidence-based research when available, and it was not an intentional deception. The statement was to clarify those areas that need to be worked on in treatment. She noted that the ARC declined the offer to have any independent evaluator review all the work product submitted.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) clarified that the SOMB options are to accept the finding, reject the finding, or accept the finding and modify the sanction.

Kari Hershey (Appellant Attorney) objected to the findings of the ARC.

***Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) moved to accept the findings of the ARC and to modify the sanction to a minimum of one year operating at the Associate level.***

***Taber Powers 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion***

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) reminded all that members of the ARC will abstain from voting.

Erin Austin (SOMB Staff) clarified that this sanction only applies to Dr. Tindall's evaluator status and not her full treatment provider level status. She reviewed the procedure to move to full operating level, and the application process, work product, and competency process as indicated in the Standards.

**Motion to accept the findings of the ARC and to modify the sanction to a minimum of one year operating at the Associate level: Lisa Mayer; Taber Powers 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #5)**

<b>10</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

5 – Yes (In Person)

1 – Yes (Verbally in person)

- 0 – No (In Person)
- 4 – Abstentions (In Person)
- 4 – Yes (On Line)
- 3 – No (On Line)
- 2 – Abstentions (On Line)

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) indicated that Commissioner Scott James did not vote for the above, and left the meeting before the vote. The electronic version did indicate that he voted before leaving the meeting. His vote is included in the results above.

**BREAK: 12:03 – 12:32**

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) reviewed the appeal process.

*Casey Ballinger (SOMB) introduced herself, as she arrived after the initial SOMB introductions were made. Gregg Kildow (SOMB Member) arrived to the meeting virtually at 11:15 am, and introduced himself to the audience.*

**PROVIDER COMPLAINT APPEAL HEARING (Decision Item) – (No Attachment) – Carl Blake, ARC Chair; Appellant, Brenna Tindall, Approved Provider; and Grant Godfrey, Complainant**

Kari Hershey (Appellant Attorney) reviewed the situation regarding this complaint, which involves the mandatory requirement of reporting abuse of a minor. She noted that all involved agreed that the abuse needed to be reported except the treating therapist, and the owner of the group home where the juvenile lived. Kari Hershey indicated that Dr. Tindall supplied the sexual abuse report as legally mandated. She did not supply a SOMB evaluation or any conclusions of the evaluation to the courts. Kari Hershey indicated the juvenile was removed from the group home and placed in foster care. She noted that the group home owner then filed a formal complaint with the ARC indicating numerous Standards violations on the part of Dr. Tindall, due to no evaluation being done. Kari Hershey noted that this complaint was sent to DORA and dismissed by them. She continued to discuss further details of this complaint and the lack of documentation sent to the ARC.

Dr. Brenna Tindall (Appellant) defended her position in reporting the abuse as mandated by law, and followed the process of conferring with the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) and the group home. She noted that DORA dismissed this complaint.

Dr. Blake (ARC Chair) clarified that he, Carl Blake, Christina Ortiz-Marquez, Michelle Simmons, Glenn Knipscheer, Theresa Weiss, Melissa Parkowski-Helmer, Jesse Hansen (for tie breaking), Nicole Feltz, and Dr. Rick May will not vote on this decision.

Dr. Blake (ARC Chair) reviewed the details of the complaint, the alleged sixteen Standards violations, and the process taken. He indicated that after reviewing the complaint and documentation, it was indicated that the SOMB has purview over this complaint. Dr. Blake indicated that the complaint indicated that an evaluation had already been done at the time of the complaint submission to ARC. He continued to give details of the complaint and indicated that Dr. Tindall and her attorney did not submit the clarification documentation and evaluation as requested by the ARC. Carl Blake indicated that due to this, the ARC finds for the complainant on four of the sixteen Standards violations. Dr. Tindall did not include collateral context information as requested, and the ARC issued the following sanctions:

- Dr. Tindall is to complete training on treatment of Section 2 (have this completed within 3 months of the final resolution of the complaint)
- Submit to ARC a summary of how she complies with the requirements of Section 2 including collaboration with MDT and Community Supervision Team (CST) members.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) recommended that the SOMB uphold the findings of ARC in issue of the Standards violations. He noted that with regard to the sanction, ARC recommends the SOMB at a minimum uphold the sanction imposed by ARC.

### **Complainant Discussion – 20 minutes**

Mr. Grant Godfrey (Complainant) was given 20 minutes to give his testimony of the complaint. He noted that Dr. Tindall was hired to complete a risk assessment on a client. Mr. Godfrey indicated that Dr. Tindall only made recommendations and did not do the evaluation as requested by the entire MDT. He indicated that she only gave these recommendations to one member of the MDT. Mr. Godfrey also noted that the client had previously disclosed the sexual abuse to a baby-sitter years before, and that the disclosure made to Dr. Tindall was not a new one. He went on to note that the therapist working with the juvenile also did not agree to report this disclosure, but asked for a risk evaluation to be done by Dr. Tindall. Mr. Godfrey noted that there was no regard to using a victim-centered approach or working with the entire MDT by Dr. Tindall.

### **Board Discussion – 20 minutes**

Jeff Shay (SOMB Member) asked Mr. Godfrey if he is the group home manager. Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) responded that is correct.

Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) asked Mr. Godfrey for clarification of the pre-evaluation recommendation #4, "disclosures he has made, are made up and evaluator unaware they were validated by victims." Mr. Godfrey responded that there was minimal information from the client to the therapist and noted the need for more work to be done regarding that disclosure.

Taber Powers (SOMB Member) asked Mr. Godfrey if Dr. Tindall was hired for the evaluation and asked if he paid for that evaluation. Mr. Godfrey responded that Probation requested the offense-specific evaluation as recommended by the MDT. Taber Powers asked Dr. Tindall if she received payment for the evaluation for this client. Dr. Tindall responded that she was paid when the evaluation was completed in June, but not paid for the recommendations she made to the court prior to the evaluation completion. Dr. Tindall noted that the alleged abuse was reported in February, and she notified the court of the abuse before the evaluation was completed.

Taber Powers (SOMB Member) noted that releasing the evaluation report to the ARC would have given them information needed to make an informed decision. Kari Hershey (Appellant Attorney) indicated that the complaint was not a lack of the evaluation, the complaint is on the mandatory abuse reporting.

Dr. Tindall clarified that the sexual abuse was reported, then the recommendation letter went to the court to update the juvenile's case, and then later the risk assessment and evaluation were done. She noted that she had various conversations with the Guardian Ad Litem, the therapist, the MDT, and Mr. Godfrey regarding this disclosure. Taber Powers (SOMB Member) asked for a copy of the letter sent to the court.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) clarified that ARC's purview is not regarding Dr. Tindall's mandatory requirement to report child sexual abuse. He noted that ARC's purview was to review the complaint, which listed a number of Standards violations. Carl Blake indicated that ARC did not pursue whether Dr. Tindall did or did not report the sexual abuse, which was not part of the complaint. He indicated that the complaint was regarding violations in Section 2 of the Juvenile Standards, in that the evaluation did not consider information from collateral sources. Carl Blake noted that ARC asked for responses specifically related to those allegations, and did not ask Dr. Tindall if she reported the mandatory sexual abuse disclosure. He noted that ARC asked Dr. Tindall if her evaluation complied with Standards and if she included those components in the evaluation. Carl Blake indicated that Dr.

Tindall's September 20<sup>th</sup> response indicated that this client was evaluated by her, and she indicated this complaint was filed in retaliation for making a report. He noted that this response did not address what ARC asked of her.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) then indicated that in the May 16<sup>th</sup> response indicated the evaluation was completed, and that it does comply with the Standards and outlines the answer to those questions, but he noted that the ARC still does not have a copy of that evaluation that would prove that the required sections were included in the evaluation. Carl Blake reiterated that Dr. Tindall and her attorney opted to not submit the evaluation as requested, and based on the information received, concluded that it does not have the required sections completed. He mentioned that the logical reason to not provide that evaluation is that it was not done. Carl Blake noted that the ARC based their finding on Dr. Tindall's unwillingness to supply the evaluation.

Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) asked Mr. Godfrey if the complaint includes the reporting by Dr. Tindall of the juvenile disclosure of abuse. She asked Mr. Godfrey if the Standards in the complaint were not followed by Dr. Tindall. Mr. Godfrey responded that Dr. Tindall made recommendations to the courts before the evaluation was completed.

***Gary Kramer (SOMB Member) moved to extend the Board discussion an additional 10 minutes. Taber Powers 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.***

**Motion to extend the Board discussion by 10 minutes: Gary Kramer; Taber Powers 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #6)**

<b>18</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

- 9 – Yes (In Person)
- 1 – Yes (Verbally in person)
- 0 – No (In Person)
- 0 – Abstentions (In Person)
- 7 – Yes (On Line)
- 1 – Yes (Verbally via phone)
- 0 – No (On Line)
- 0 – Abstentions (On Line)

Kari Hershey (Attorney) objected that Dr. Tindall was not given additional time to complete her testimony and respond to questions.

Carl Blake (ARC Chair) noted that the complaint was filed which implies that an evaluation was completed and does not comply with the Standards. He noted that Dr. Tindall indicated that the evaluation was not completed before the complaint was filed, and mentioned that this is the first time that the ARC is hearing that the evaluation was not completed before the complaint was filed. Carl Blake asked Mr. Godfrey to clarify that the evaluator made recommendations (opinions) to the court without having an evaluation completed, and that the complaint was filed before the evaluation was actually completed. Carl Blake noted that based on this new information, then the ARC does not have purview over this complaint. Mr. Godfrey (Complainant) clarified that he assumed the evaluation was not completed, and that the evaluator made recommendations to the Court without the evaluation being done. Carl Blake reiterated that the complaint was based on an evaluation that was in violation with the Standards, and noted that if the evaluation was not completed before the complaint was filed, then this would not be under the purview of the SOMB or the ARC.

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) noted that due to this new information, that this should be referred back to ARC for further review. Lisa Mayer (SOMB Member) indicated that this complaint appears to be outside the scope of the ARC, and possibly be filed with DORA.

Katie Abeyta (SOMB Chair) noted that in light of this information, the SOMB has the option to make a motion to reject the findings of ARC.

***Taber Powers (SOMB Member) moved to reject the findings of the ARC due to the complaint being outside of the purview of the ARC.***

***Lisa Mayer 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion.***

ARC members abstained from this vote.

**Motion to reject the findings of the ARC due to the complaint being outside the purview of the ARC:  
Taber Powers; Lisa Mayer 2<sup>nd</sup> (Question #7)**

<b>13</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

5 – Yes (In Person)

1 – Yes (Verbally in person)

0 – No (In Person)

5 – Abstentions (In Person)

5 – Yes (On Line)

1 – Yes (Verbally via phone)

0 – No (On Line)

1 – Abstentions (On Line)

**BREAK: 1:35 – 1:46**

**PRESENTATION IN RECOGNITION OF ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICANS MONTH (Presentation) –  
Yuanting Zhang, DCJ; and Joanne Liu, Co-founder and Chief Executive Officer, Asian Girls Ignite**

Yuanting Zhang gave some historical background information regarding the Chinese community in Colorado, and indicated that 142 years ago, Denver had a China Town. She read a letter from Denver Mayor Hancock who just recently acknowledged the destruction of China Town on October 31, 1880 and apologized for this disrespect and destruction. Yuanting Zhang indicated that most Chinese came during the gold rush in California which represented 30,000 of the miners in California. She also noted that 90% of the workers laying the western portion of the Continental Railway were Chinese immigrants even though most pictures taken did not show them. Yuanting Zhang indicated that there were numerous riots throughout the U.S. due to the mis-conception of Chinese taking away jobs, and bringing opium to the country. She mentioned that in 1880 there was a Federal law enacted the banned Chinese immigrants from coming to the United States, which lasted for over 60 years. She indicated that in WWII the Chinese immigrants fought alongside other Americans against the Japanese, and were starting to be recognized and included in the American society. Yuanting Zhang mentioned that even today, Chinese are considered the invisible minority group, and noted the recent uptick of Asian hate crimes due to COVID. She mentioned that these hate crimes are especially against Chinese women.

Yuanting Zhang introduced Joanne Liu (Co-founder and CEO of Asian Girls Ignite), and gave a brief background of her education and accomplishments.

Joanne Liu (Presenter) indicated that she is highly involved in various endeavors to remember the Chinese community that existed in the lower downtown area of Denver in the 1800's. Joanne Liu gave a presentation regarding the Asian Americans and Pacific Islander Americans (AAPI), and the problems they face as follows:

- I forget that you're Asian – undermines the Asian culture
- Mis-conceptions that all Asians are highly educated and doing well
- Loneliness, isolation due to small numbers of Asians in the U.S.

- Stereotypes of being invisible, subservient, sexual objects, erased identities and minimized lived experiences
- Asian Girls Ignite (AGI) is committed to lifting the limits on the ways AAPI girls are seen, heard, united, and empowered
- Asian Girls Ignite’s Mission: Is to build a strong community of Asian American and Pacific Islander girls and women to celebrate their individual and collective power. AGI serves Colorado AAPI students in grades 6-12 who identify as a girl, queer, or gender-expansive.
- Their Values Include: Courage, Compassion, Curiosity
- What Makes AGI Unique
- AGI’s programs are based on social-emotional learning components including positive identity, resilience self-awareness, self-efficacy, connection, and centered around storytelling
- The Future of AGI:
  - Spring 2023 – Mentorships to begin;
  - Fall 2023 - After-School programs to begin;
  - Fall 2024 – Rural connection programs to begin
- Their Team: Joanne Liu and 4 additional volunteers which include Meghan Yen, Esther Song, Doen Lee, Reese Sun
- Contact Information: Instagram: @asiangirlsignite  
 Facebook: @asiangirlsignite  
 Subscribe: [asiangirlsignite.org](http://asiangirlsignite.org)  
 Contact: [hello@asiangirlsignite.org](mailto:hello@asiangirlsignite.org)  
 Volunteer: [volunteer@asiangirlsignite.org](mailto:volunteer@asiangirlsignite.org)

**Board Discussion:**

Raechel Alderete (SOMB Staff) thanked Joanne Liu for her great presentation, and noted the need to recognize this community and to empower Asian girls.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky (SOMB Staff) noted an article and interview with Michelle Yoeh (Bond Girl) and the sexualization in the James Bond movie she was in. Joanne Liu was not familiar with the article, but she indicated that Michelle Yoeh most likely embraced her Asian beauty and her role in this movie.

Jess McBrayer (SOMB Intern) asked Joanne Liu if she has reached out to other states to see if they are doing the same programs or would like to help start a national movement. Joanne Liu indicated that she will first reach out to a state that is similar to Colorado to make a connection that could help encourage each other and their Asian communities.

**Audience Discussion:**

Laurie Kepros (Audience Member) thanked Joanne Liu and for her presentation, thanked her for the programs that are helping young Asian girls, and for making cross-cultural connections and mentors.


**Meeting Adjourned: 2:29 pm**



Respectfully,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jill Trowbridge  
Program Assistant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Katie Abeyta  
Chair of the SOMB

9/13/22  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Event Start Date	Event Start Time	FirstName	LastName	Join Time	Leave Time	Approve the April 2022 minutes.(9:43 am / 9:44 am)	Approve additional 10 minutes time to Dr Tindall.(10:29 am / 10:29 am)	Approve additional 5 minutes time to Dr Blake.(11:01 am / 11:02 am)
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Katie	Abeyta	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	No - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Casey	Ballinger	10:00 AM	1:49 pm D		Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Carl	Blake	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Tony	Carochi	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Jessica	Dotter	8:39 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Nicole	Feltz	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Jesse	Hansen	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Abstain - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Kathryn	Heffron	9:34 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes - Verbally
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Sharon	Holbrook	8:56 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Scott	James	9:04 am D	12:02 pm	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Gregg	Kildow	11:15 am	2:30 pm D	N/A	N/A	N/A
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Glenn	Knipscheer	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D		Abstain - In Person	
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Gary	Kramer	8:59 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Lisa	Mayer	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	No - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Joshua	Nowak	9:42 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Taber	Powers	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	No - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Jeff	Shay	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	No - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Ivonne	Sierra	9:01 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Kent	Vance	8:58 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes - Verbally	Yes
May 20, 2022	[9:00 am Denver Time]	Theresa	Weiss	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
						<b>16 Yes</b>	<b>14 Yes</b>	<b>17 Yes</b>
						<b>0 No</b>	<b>4 No</b>	<b>0 No</b>
						<b>1 Abstain</b>	<b>1 Abstain</b>	<b>1 Abstain</b>
<i>Gregg Kildow arrived to the meeting at 11:15 am</i>								
<i>Kathy Keffron left the meeting at 12:07 pm</i>								
<i>Kathy Heffron returned to the meeting at 12:39 pm</i>								
<i>Kathy Heffron left the meeting at 1:43 pm</i>								
<i>Kathy Heffron returned to the meeting at 2:06 pm</i>								
<i>Scott James left the meeting at 12:02 pm</i>								
<i>Casey Ballinger left the meeting at 1:49 pm</i>								

Event Start Date	Event Start Time	FirstName	LastName	Join Time	Leave Time	Approve additional 20 minutes time for questions.(11:28 am / 11:29 am)	Accept the finding of the ARC and modify the sanction to be a minimum of one-year at the Associate Level.(11:55 am / 11:58 am)	Approve motion to extend discussion by 10 minutes.(1:22 pm / 1:23 pm)	Reject the ARC decision.(1:33 pm / 1:34 pm)
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Katie	Abeyta	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Casey	Ballinger	10:00 AM	1:49 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Carl	Blake	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Tony	Carochi	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - Verbally	Yes - Verbally	Yes - Verbally
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Jessica	Dotter	8:39 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes - Via Phone	Yes - Via Phone
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Nicole	Feltz	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Jesse	Hansen	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Kathryn	Heffron	9:34 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Sharon	Holbrook	8:56 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Scott	James	9:04 am D	12:02 pm	No	Yes	N/A	N/A
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Gregg	Kildow	11:15 am	2:30 pm D	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Glenn	Knipscheer	8:57 am D	2:30 pm Denver Time				Abstain - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Gary	Kramer	8:59 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Lisa	Mayer	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Joshua	Nowak	9:42 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Taber	Powers	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Jeff	Shay	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person	Yes - In Person
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Ivonne	Sierra	9:01 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Kent	Vance	8:58 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes
May 20, 2022	9:00 am Denver Time	Theresa	Weiss	8:57 am D	2:30 pm D	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person	Yes - In Person	Abstain - In Person
						<b>18 Yes</b>	<b>10 Yes</b>	<b>18 Yes</b>	<b>14 Yes</b>
						<b>1 No</b>	<b>3 No</b>	<b>0 No</b>	<b>0 No</b>
						<b>0 Abstain</b>	<b>6 Abstain</b>	<b>0 Abstain</b>	<b>6 Abstain</b>
<i>Gregg Kildow arrived to the meeting at 11:15 am</i>									
<i>Kathy Keffron left the meeting at 12:07 pm</i>									
<i>Kathy Heffron returned to the meeting at 12:39 pm</i>									
<i>Kathy Heffron left the meeting at 1:43 pm</i>									
<i>Kathy Heffron returned to the meeting at 2:06 pm</i>									
<i>Scott James left the meeting at 12:02 pm</i>									
<i>Casey Ballinger left the meeting at 1:49 pm</i>									