

**SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SOMB  
MINUTES**

**Friday, March 18, 2016**

**SOMB Members**

Alli Watt  
Allison Boyd  
Amy Fitch  
Angel Weant  
Bill Hildenbrand  
Carl Blake  
Jeff Geist  
Jeff Shay  
Jessica Curtis  
Jessica Meza  
John Odenheimer  
Leonard Woodson III  
Kim English  
Korey Elger  
Marcelo Kopcow  
Mary Baydarian  
Merve Davies  
Mimi Scheuermann  
Missy Gursky  
Nancy Jackson  
Richard Bednarski  
Tom Leversee

**Visitors**

Antony R. Mathias  
Bob Ardia  
Bobbie Ponis  
Caleb Frazier  
Carolyn Turner  
Chris Renda Ph.D.  
Christine Tyler  
Colton McNutt  
Dean Berry  
Debbie Baty  
Dianna Lawyer-Brook  
Gary Reser  
Ingrid Barrier  
Jeanne Smith  
Jeff Carpenter  
Jen Leonard  
Jenna Mathews  
Laurie Kepros  
Mable Banks  
Michelle Spradling  
Mona Murch  
Pat Harris  
Rob Huss  
Steven H. Parker  
Susan Walker  
Valerie Estrada  
Wayne Bethurum

**Absent SOMB Members**     Brie Akins, Jeff Jenks, Kandy Moore, Pam Bricker and Rick May

**Staff**

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky  
Marina Borysov

Raechel Alderete  
Jesse Hansen

Michelle Geng  
Jill Trowbridge

**9:44 am**

**SOMB Meeting Begins:**

**Introductions:** Jeff Geist announced that this is his last meeting as a member of the Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) and introduced Lenny Woodson III as the Department of Corrections (DOC) representative replacement.

**Future Agenda Items:**

Tom Leversee mentioned that he and Magistrate Curtis have had discussions revolving around the Sex Offender Statute and juvenile sex offense treatment language (C.R.S. 16-11.7-105) and that there may be confusion among judges regarding which treatment program the juvenile needs, specifically sex offense specific therapy or general therapy. He mentioned that this issue is something that the SOMB may want to discuss.

Missy Gursky mentioned that the Application Review Committee (ARC) would like to have a discussion regarding variances around the Burns Case.

**Announcements:**

Raechel Alderete announced that the SOMB has received numerous proposals for the SOMB 2016 Conference. She is currently working on these proposals and notifying the presenters of acceptance. She further announced that registration for the Conference will begin in Mid-April.

Jesse Hansen announced that the Colorado Youth Project has received Institutional Board Review approval with a launch date of April 4, 2016 to begin collecting data from approximately 300 youth who have committed sex offenses. He stated that field personnel should notify their Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs) about this project. Letters and emails will be going out next week to providers to recruit them for this project.

Carl Blake updated that the Department of Corrections (DOC) polygraph variance will continue until the Best Practice Committee and Adult Standards Revision Committee complete the polygraph revisions per the most recent decision of the SOMB regarding this variance.

Allison Boyd announced that April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month (SAAM) and the week of April 11 – April 15 is National Crime Victims' Rights Week. She stated that there will be a presentation at the April 15<sup>th</sup> SOMB meeting and also mentioned that the kickoff for Sexual Assault Awareness Month will be Tuesday, April 5<sup>th</sup> at noon at the Capitol.

Mimi Scheuermann also noted that April is Child Abuse Prevention Month. April 1<sup>st</sup> at 11:00 am is the kickoff on the west steps of the Capitol.

Laurie Kepros stated that today (March 18<sup>th</sup>) is National Public Defender Day and that in the last fiscal year, the Colorado Office of the Public Defenders has closed 125,000 cases.

Jeff Geist announced that the Lifetime Supervision Criteria modifications have been officially approved as there were no additional comments during the public comment period.

Jeff Geist also encouraged SOMB Committee participation from SOMB members and members of the public. He stated that there will be a standardized language attachment to the committee and SOMB agendas as follows:

*"Welcome, before we get started I am going to go over some meeting rules and expectations. Public participation is invited in all SOMB meetings and sub-committee meetings and in order to keep the meeting running smoothly, we request you raise your hand and wait your turn to be called upon. The focus of this meeting is to discuss broad statewide policy development and decision items. Personal cases or experiences should only be shared if they are relevant to the issue being discussed. This is not the proper forum to obtain a remedy for an individual case. Also the members who attend these meetings are here to address these broad policy issues, not to deal with individual cases or compliances. If you want to contact a member of an individual case, please do so at the member's*

office where they can access the necessary information to assist you. Thank you in advance for respecting the need to keep the discussion focused and for your courtesy and recognizing that members should be contacted at their own offices about matters outside the SOMB meeting agenda.”

### **Approval of February Minutes:**

There was a word revision on page 4 of the February minutes from Parole SOMB to Parole Board.

### **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY MINUTES:**

Motion to approve as amended: Jeff Shay; Mimi Scheuermann 2<sup>nd</sup>

**14 Approve**

**0 Oppose**

**1 Abstain**

**Motion Passes**

### **APPROVE AGENDA:**

Jeff Geist announced that the Variance Request agenda item has been postponed to the April 15<sup>th</sup> SOMB meeting due to the fact that Kandy Moore could not attend.

Jeff Geist also noted that in the Open Forum section, Judge Denis Maes was unable to attend today, so this item will also be deleted from the agenda.

Jeff Geist stated that the SOMB Board will go into Executive Session (12:45-1:15) right after lunch and that non-board members and the public will be dismissed from this portion of the meeting.

The revised agenda was approved by Consensus

### **Contact With Own Child Document (Decision Item)** - (Handout provided)

Angel Weant stated that this document is on the agenda for the SOMB to approve today. She mentioned that this document will be used as a guide for evaluators that would include specific information when evaluating in the event they have a Burns Case where an individual would have a Constitutional right to parent their own child. The Adult Standards Revisions committee will be addressing this issue in the Standards, and this document will serve as guidance in the interim. She stated that as it is currently written, evaluators are not required to make a recommendation concerning contact with an offender’s own child, but they are to indicate risk factors regarding such contact.

Missy Gursky stated that she would like to remove the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet on page 2 (risk level for sexual recidivism) and the last bullet point on this page (sexual offense responsibility) as they are already addressed in other parts of the evaluation process.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that it was consensus of the Committee creating this document to keep these two bullets.

Allison Boyd wanted the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point on page 2 to read, “The Nature.....”

Angel Weant noted that evaluators have been directed to include the “template language” in the Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) only in those cases where the Burns case applies, but some jurisdictions/judges would like it in all PSI’s for sex offenders. Angel also stated Probation is waiting to hear from her office as to when to start putting this language in PSI’s. Angel mentioned that she would like to be notified when the evaluators start using this so she can notify her stakeholders.

Merve Davies pointed out the bullet point (on page 3) regarding psychopathy and psychopathology are two different concepts and should not be included in the same bullet point.

Mimi Scheuermann suggested changing this bullet point to psychopathy and/or psychopathology. Merve Davies agreed to this change.

Judge Kopcow asked Angel how many issues have arisen statewide that involve the Burns case. Angel stated that she receives numerous calls and emails regarding cases where the judge has ordered contact. She stated that as far as she knows, this is happening statewide and in every jurisdiction.

To date, there have been approximately 10 statewide variances through Application Review Committee (ARC) in regard to the Burns case.

Gary Reser asked why the ROSAC is not included in this document. Missy Gursky responded that the Committee elected not to require the use of the instrument, and it does not preclude a therapist from using ROSAC.

Mimi Scheuermann stated that this does not mean that contact with own child isn't "supervised"; it means that you cannot preclude contact, but that there can be parameters around that contact based on risk.

Angel mentioned that her office has been advising probation officers and CST's that there is no barrier to take someone back to court if there are risk factors that would suggest that there would be harm to an own child.

Laurie Kepros indicated that the case law speaks to whether or not the individual is in a "parental role" or whether or not the child is their legal biological child and would like this document to be inclusive of these relationships.

Judge Kopcow reiterated Burns case law applies to a biological, a "parent like" relationship or an adoptive child.

Mimi Scheuermann stated the need to look at the whole relationship between the parental/guardian role and the possible trauma of child by not having that relationship.

Angel Weant mentioned that they have advised CST's that the Burns ruling would apply if an individual is in a parental or guardian role.

Missy Gursky stated that the SOMB Standards 5.710 defines own minor child which states that "a minor child with whom the offender has a parental role, including but not limited to, biological, adoptive and step-child(ren)".

Kim English & Mary Baydarian both agreed with the suggestion to footnote "with his or her own child" with the definition from the SOMB Adult Standards 5.710 and to notate the United States vs. White case. There was consensus to add this footnote.

Laurie Kepros mentioned confusion with therapists and some lawyers who think the Burns case is the only circumstance under which the courts would order contact with minors. She stated that this is not true and mentioned there is case law back to 2004 which is specific to contact with an own child.

There were general discussions revolving around the actual wording of this document and the bullet points.

Carl Blake noted that this document is giving basic information to the evaluators where guidance is needed and is not all-inclusive.

Merve Davies and others suggested adding "Protective factors are important and should be considered", to

the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph on page 2.

Jessica Meza emailed some revisions and/or issues to the document. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the changes she recommended and the SOMB endorsed the following changes based on Jessica's feedback along with group discussion:

- Page 1 – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – changed: "three conditions" to "**two conditions**"
- Page 1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph – first sentence: changed (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2015) to **(10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014)**
- Page 1 – Added Footnote – <sup>1</sup> **Per Section 5.710 of the Standards and Guidelines, an own minor child is defined as "a minor child with whom the offender has a parental role, including but not limited to, biological, adoptive, and step-child(ren)." In addition, per the United States vs. White, 782 F.3d 1118 (10<sup>th</sup> Circuit 2015), an emphasis is given to those who have a "custodial" relationship with their own child.**
- Page 2 – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – added third sentence: "**Protective factors are important and should be considered.**"
- Page 2 – Bullet Points – Revised bullet #4 to: "**The nature of the relationship.....**"
- Page 3 – Bullet Points – Revised bullet to: "**Psychopathy or psychopathology**"

Motion to approve Contact with Own Child as amended: Mimi Scheuermann; 2<sup>nd</sup> Tom Leversee/Angel Weant

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

### **SOMB Open Forum (Action Item):**

Open forum is a way for individuals to present some current ideas that are available in the field.

#### **Provider Information Management – Wendy Beismeier, Reliatrax:** (Handout provided)

ReliaTrax is a fully-featured EHR Program which includes tools for clinical documents, reminders, attendance tracking, and on-line referrals. It also includes tools for collaborative care such as referrals, reports, document approval, assessing real-time compliance information, SOTIPS and VASOR-2, polygraph tracking and financial reporting. Also included is the ability to track success rates such as weeks in treatment, number of absences and discharge reason.

A guest asked if the success rates can show what treatment has been completed across all treatment providers. Wendy Beismeier replied yes, but this information would have to be uploaded by the individual agencies.

John Odenheimer questioned who pays for this service and what the costs are. Wendy Beismeier replied that they contract with the treatment agencies at a cost of \$2.00/mo. per active client and a small charge for discharge records.

Jeanne Smith asked if there is any data cleaning or quality assurance from Reliatrax. Wendy Beismeier replied no, however they provide trainings that will give the users the best possible start and that whatever the treatment components are is up to the treatment agencies.

Angel Weant asked if Reliatrax trains treatment providers with regard to inputting comprehensive client information that would be useful and beneficial. Wendy Beismeier responded that it is up to the treatment providers to input comprehensively and that they only provide the training and tool.

Carl Blake asked if Discharge Reason and the Discharge Comments are from a drop down list. Wendy Beismeier replied that the Discharge Reason is from a drop down list and the Discharge Comments is an open field.

**Registration Relief Legal Clinics – Maureen Cain, Colorado Criminal Defense Institute:** (Handout provided)

The Colorado Criminal Defense Institute (CCDI) is a 501C3 non-profit organization that is primarily involved with defense work and work on different areas of policy changes. Initially, CCDI was developed to provide pro bono clinics for people to help with relief with collateral consequences from a conviction but they have expanded their assistance to provide legal assistance to have records sealed and to assist with sex offender de-registration. CCDI has received funding through a JAG Grant, the Denver Foundation and private donations. The start-up was in September, 2015. CCDI provides walk-in legal clinics on Saturdays and have had over 1,000 clients since start-up. They have assessed over 500 clients, 140 of those whom are related to the removal from the sex offender registry, and of which 25% is for juvenile removal. Twenty-five of the cases are from the 1980's-1990's when the removal time lines were different. They do accept clients with out-of-state convictions and have received referrals from many organizations. CCDI has applied for additional funding to continue this program.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky asked if there is overlap with the work of the Colorado Juvenile Defender Center (CJDC). Maureen Cain replied that they are currently working in conjunction with CJDC and that sometimes they run their legal clinics together.

Angel Weant asked about the client assessment criteria. Maureen Cain replied that the prescreening at the clinics is for statutory eligibility. After as much information as possible is given, the client is assigned to a lawyer who will work to help the client. Angel Weant also asked if most of the clients seen have completed probation. Maureen replied that for the most part the client has completed the sentence. If an individual comes in who has not completed their sentence, they do not proceed in the process.

Susan Walker asked how long it takes to successfully complete the process. Maureen Cain stated that sex offender registry removal cases are not assigned to unqualified attorneys and may take up to 90 days to find an attorney to take the case. This entire process could possibly take up to 9 months.

In response to a question, Maureen Cain stated that the last clinic in the Denver metro area (Aurora) is on April 23<sup>rd</sup>.

**Sex Offender Housing – Susan Walker, CSOR:** (Handout provided)

Susan Walker described receiving 30-40 requests a month for sex offender housing assistance. CSOR also has had hospice housing referrals. Susan reiterated the need for offenders to be persistent when calling the housing facilities and not to give up. She has a list of housing sources and mentioned a few of the organizations that may be able to assist with housing and/or first month's rent.

Angel Weant mentioned that it would be helpful to see a housing list and other assistance points on a document that could be shared with all.

Amy Fitch stated that sex offenders do better as do the communities when the housing is adequate.

Nancy Jackson mentioned that the SOMB needs to be aware that people who have a house or home, are less likely to reoffend, be on public assistance, etc. She also stated that there needs to be more low-income housing.

**Legislative/Sunset Review Update:** (Handout provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky mentioned that each SOMB Board member has a list of current bills in their packet. The Sunset Review is currently scheduled for March 29<sup>th</sup> but may be rescheduled.

**LUNCH 12:05 – 12:46**

**Executive Session Regarding Denver District Court Case # - Rob Huss and Ingrid Barrier:**

**Entered into Executive Session at 12:06 pm**

Motion to enter into Executive Session: Carl Blake; 2<sup>nd</sup> Missy Gursky, Merve Davies

**19 Approve                      0 Oppose                      0 Abstain                      Motion Passes**

**Ended Executive Session at 1:30 pm**

Motion to end Executive Session: Carl Blake; Consensus vote

**0 Approve                      0 Oppose                      0 Abstain                      Motion Passes**

**Adult Standard Guiding Principles (Decision Item) – Missy Gursky and Jeff Geist:**

Judge Kopcow mentioned that the SOMB needs to finalize Guiding Principle #15, 9 and 4 if possible.

**Guiding Principle #15** – Missy Gursky gave the Adult Revisions Standards Committee update and results. The Committee voted unanimously (13-0) to approve the amended language; however, there was much discussion regarding “treatment should not be punishment”.

**Revised Principle to Read:** (No Descriptive Paragraph)

***Sex offense-specific assessment, evaluation, treatment, behavioral monitoring and supervision should be humane, non-discriminatory and bound by the rules of ethics and law.***

Motion to amend Guiding Principle #15 – Amy Fitch

**19 Approve                      0 Oppose                      0 Abstain                      Motion Passes**

**Guiding Principle #9** - Missy Gursky mentioned that the SOMB did not approve this Guiding Principle previously and therefore this Guiding Principle went back to the Victim Advocacy Committee (VAC) for language revisions.

Allison Boyd summarized the VAC revisions made to the narrative paragraphs of this guiding principle.

John Odenheimer suggested using the word “encourage” rather than “empowered” in the last sentence.

Tom Leverage stated his concern about the words “affording the victim representation”, “victim input” and “victims are empowered”. Tom also mentioned that this might be confusing to MDTs and the victims’ role.

Judge Kopcow approved of the word “empowered” and read the actual description of empowered.

Amy Fitch and Alli Watt were in agreement to use the word “empowered”.

Allison Boyd explained that this summary gives the victims the opportunity to let them choose their own level of participation or involvement.

Angel Weant stated from the judicial side that this sentence is applicable in the legal arena.

Michelle Geng reiterated the fact that the more the victim is believed, the faster they heal.

Susan Walker suggested alternate language that “victims can choose how they want to be involved”.

There was Consensus to vote on amended wording of Guiding Principle #9

**Revised Principle to Read:**

***Victims have the right to safety, to be informed and to provide input to the community supervision team.***

*Physical and psychological safety is a necessary condition for victims to begin recovery related to sexual abuse. Victims experience additional trauma when they are blamed or not believed, which may be more damaging than the abuse itself. Victim impact is substantially reduced when victims are believed, protected and adequately supported.*

*The community supervision team can assist the victim in this by providing information and affording the victim representation in the supervision and management of the offender. Victim input and knowledge of the offender are valuable information for the supervision team. Victims are empowered to determine their level of participation.*

Motion to vote on Guiding Principle #9 as amended: Kim English; 2<sup>nd</sup> Amy Fitch

<b>19</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

**Guiding Principle #4** – Missy Gursky stated that this Guiding Principle has been the most controversial to date. The SOMB Board sent this back to the Adult Standards Revision Committee for revision. The Committee voted 12-1 for the original language, but has submitted alternate language at the SOMB Board’s request.

Carl Blake stated that he is not in favor of the new options and prefers the original language.

Tom Leverage agrees to reconsider the original language as an option.

Amy Fitch mentioned that option #1 and option #3 are the best choices as they address risk reduction.

Merve Davies explained that offenders are capable of change and that treatment providers do not get to pick which changes a client will make; therefore, he would like to use the original language.

Allison Boyd feels that offenders “will be” capable of change rather than “are capable of change” and would prefer Option 2. Allison brought a “new guiding principle” that was suggested to the Adult Standards Revision Committee. It read: “All Sex Offending behavior is the sole responsibility of the offender” which is part of the DVOMB Standards.

Mimi Scheuermann stated that we are trying to guide providers and based on Merve’s input suggested the word “often” capable of change.

Michelle Geng stated that while training on the Introduction to the Standards Guiding Principle #4 (that the SOMB has not passed), a number of treatment providers expressed their frustration that if “offenders are not capable of change”, then why is there treatment.

Susan Walker feels strongly that the original language is clear and concise and the responsibility for change rests with the offender.

Steve Parker is on the Adult Standards Revisions Committee and stated that as a therapist, he is mandated to view his clients as being capable of change. Steve reiterated that therapists see change as an affirmation of hope and reduces the risk of re-offending.

Carl Blake expressed the need to look at the purpose of Guiding Principle #4 is to provide guidance in the absence of a standard. Carl also mentioned his concerns with Option 3 as it focuses only on behaviors and does not include psychological or emotional change.

Final Comments: Tom Lerversee mentioned that this is a foundational condition of therapy and prefers the original language.  
Amy Fitch clarified her previous statement and continues to support Option #1.  
Jenna Matthews stated that Option #1 addresses community safety and the risk to reoffend.  
Chris Renda Ph.D. stated her support of the original language as the other options use the word "can enhance responsivity" means "maybe" vs. "predictive and important facet" indicates a research backed cause and effect relationship.

**Proposed Principle to Read:** (Original Language)

***Offenders are capable of change.***

*Responsibility for change ultimately rests with the offender. Individuals are responsible for their attitudes and behaviors and are capable of eliminating abusive behavior through personal ownership of a change process. While responsibility for change is the offender's, the therapeutic alliance between the offender and the therapist is a predictive and important facet of responsivity leading to behavioral change. An empathic therapeutic approach contributes to an offender's motivation to change, as does the supervising officer's positive working alliance with the offender.*

Motion to approve Guiding Principle #4 as proposed: Car Blake; 2nd Angel Weant

<b>16</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Motion Passes</b>
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

Missy Gursky stated that there is one more Guiding Principle to be reviewed at a later date.

**SOMB Open Forum (continued – Action Item):**

**Victim-Centeredness – Michelle Spradling, Denver Sexual Assault Interagency Council:**

Michelle described the long process that happens when a victim comes forward after a sexual assault and the additional trauma due to this process. She indicated that victims look to the SOMB for the Guiding Principles and Standards to advocate for the victims. She stated her fears that the Guiding Principles and Standards are not currently victim centered and expressed her concerns as to the direction the SOMB is going.

Tom Lerversee and John Odenheimer thanked Michelle for her comments and concerns.

**Sexual History Polygraph Question Labelling – Mona Murch:**

Polygraph examiner – Handout provided.

Mona suggested clarification of some of the current SOMB polygraph question labelling and that they fall in line with actual polygraph examination protocols that would indicate what is mandatory and non-mandatory. She also suggested the possibility of adding an additional "Part" that would encompass internet activity (optional) questions.

Carl Blake stated that the Best Practices Committee is already looking at aligning other content areas and this will be brought to their attention.

Mona mentioned that she is willing to put together some information for the 2016 Conference.

**Program Evaluation – Roberta Ponis:**

Roberta discussed the issues of the SOMB's evaluation of therapists as mandated by the legislature. She stated the SOMB's Standards and Guidelines that encourage treatment providers to run group therapies in

each of the content areas without regard to an individual offender's needs. Roberta challenges the SOMB to develop an instrument as part of the evaluation mandate to reflect individualized treatment, flexibility, and innovation. Another concern she has is the issue of the data collection of quality assurance mandate of the treatment providers. She stated that this will create a burden on the providers and drive them from the field. Roberta also discussed the disparity within the treatment provider field regarding recruiting therapists, keeping therapists and the inequality of pay within agencies and private practice. She challenged the SOMB to develop a marketing/recruitment plan that would entice passionate treatment providers to work with this population of offenders.

Carl stated that this is worth ongoing discussion. He explained the costs from the therapist side and that it is more cost effective for the individual to use group therapy vs. individual treatment. The SOMB will continue discussions to explore ways to deal with group therapy vs. individual treatment.

Susan Walker encourages the SOMB to be more cognizant of all forms of therapy given the resources available.

Chris Renda, Ph.D. discussed success outcomes, how to define success and the need for measures to meet the increasing needs of clients coming out of prison or going on probation.

### **Recognition of Jeff Geist and Mimi Scheuermann – SOMB**

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky discussed that Jeff Geist and Mimi Scheuermann are leaving the SOMB Board. Chris announced that any SOMB Board members that have nominations to serve as Chairman of the SOMB Board, please give requests/nominations to Carl Blake. Judge Kopcow will continue on as Vice Chair until a replacement has been elected.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:59**

Device ID	Remote No.	First Name	Last Name	1) Motion to Approve February Minutes	2) Motion to Approve Contact with Own Children Document as amended	3) Motion to go into executive session	4) Motion to Amend GP #15	5) Motion to GP #9 as amended	6) Motion to approve GP #4 as proposed
2B201	1	Pam	Bricker	-	-	-	-	-	-
2B212	2	Mary	Baydarian	3	1	1	1	1	-
2B213	3	Richard	Bednarski	-	-	1	1	1	1
2B216	4	Carl	Blake III	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B226	5	Allison	Boyd	1	1	1	1	1	2
2B22D	6	Jessica	Curtis	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B237	7	Merve	Davies	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B23B	8	Kim	English	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B246	9	Amy	Fitch	-	1	1	1	1	2
2B25B	10	Jeff	Geist	-	-	-	-	-	-
2B261	11	Missy	Gursky	1	2	1	1	1	1
5EE64	12	Rick	May	-	-	-	-	-	-
2B26A	13	Bill	Hildenbrand	-	-	1	1	1	1
2B26E	14	Nancy	Jackson	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B281	15	Jeff	Jenks	-	-	-	-	-	-
2B291	16	Marcelo	Kopcow	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B295	17	Allison	Watt	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B2A8	18	Tom	Leversee	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B2D6	19	Jessica	Meza	-	-	1	1	1	1
2B2F5	20	Kandy	Moore	-	-	-	-	-	-
2B2FF	21	John	Odenheimer	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B302	22	Mimi	Scheuermann	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B32A	23	Jeff	Shay	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B32C	24	Angel	Weant	1	1	1	1	1	1
2B32F	25	Brie	Akins	-	-	-	-	-	-