

**SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB)  
MINUTES**

**Friday, June 17, 2016**

**SOMB Members**

Alli Watt  
Allison Boyd  
Angel Weant  
Carl Blake  
Jeff Jenks  
Jeff Shay  
Jessica Curtis  
Jessica Meza  
John Odenheimer  
Kandy Moore  
Kim English  
Korey Elger  
Leonard Woodson III  
Marcelo Kopcow  
Mary Baydarian  
Merve Davies  
Missy Gursky  
Nancy Jackson  
Norma Aguilar-Dave  
Pam Bricker  
Rick May  
Tom Leversee

**Visitors**

Annie L. Sepulveda  
Colton McNutt  
Dean Berry  
Dean McClung  
DeAnn Major  
Deb Baty  
Emily Jofte Nestaval  
Gabriel Barcia  
James Lenzini  
Jamie Gibbs  
Jenna Mathews  
Jennifer Leonard  
Jo Stack  
Jodie M. Gother  
Karmen Carter  
Kelli Scherer  
Laura Borrego-Gibbs  
Laurie Kepros  
Matt Smith  
Mona Murch  
Pat Harris  
Roberta Ponis  
Roger Kincade  
Steve Parker  
Susan Walker  
Valerie Estrada  
Yvette Cousin

**Absent SOMB Members**     Amy Fitch, Brie Akins and Richard Bednarski

**Staff**

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky  
Marina Borysov

Raechel Alderete  
Jesse Hansen

Michelle Geng  
Jill Trowbridge

**9:04 am**

**SOMB Meeting Begins:**

**Introductions:**

Judge Kopcow introduced John Odenheimer as the new Vice-Chair of the Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB). Judge Kopcow also introduced new SOMB member Norma Aguilar-Dave. Introductions were made by all members and visitors present.

**Future Agenda Items:** None

**Announcements:**

Carl Blake discussed an anonymous letter sent to the Application Review Committee (ARC) that outlined various complaints. Carl explained and clarified Standards questions that were raised in various sections of the letter. Carl indicated that the letter outlined accusations towards a specific agency, however, the ARC will not be investigating the complaint based on not taking anonymous complaints.

Lenny Woodson responded to questions that were raised at the last SOMB meeting during his Lifetime Supervision Report presentation.

Allison Boyd commented and briefly reviewed the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention handout and asked all to please review the information.

Carl Blake mentioned the Stanford court case and how victims are impacted by sexual offense crimes.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that this is Jesse Hansen’s last meeting today and that he has accepted a position as the Program Coordinator for the Domestic Violence Management Board. Chris also mentioned that Jesse recently received the Division of Criminal Justice “Employee of the Year” award. Chris also announced that he will now manage both the Domestic Violence and Sex Offender Management Boards going forward.

Judge Kopcow thanked Jesse for his hard work on the SOMB. There were additional thank yous from many SOMB members to Jesse for his great research work and integrity.

Raechel Alderete announced that the 2016 SOMB Conference is at capacity. She also mentioned that there are still exhibit table space and sponsorship opportunities available.

Marina Borysov reminded all to attend the SOMB meeting at the conference and to make session selections as soon as possible.

Tom Leverage asked if there can be a change of venue in the future to expand the capacity of the conference. Raechel responded that the SOMB staff is discussing this for future conferences.

**Approval of April Minutes: Q1**

**Motion to approve the April Minutes:** Rick May

**18 Approve                      0 Oppose                      3 Abstain                      Motion Passes**

**Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved by consensus.

**SOMB Polygraph Research and Best Practice Committee Recommendations (Presentation) – Jesse Hansen and Tom Leverage, Chair, Best Practices Committee**

Handouts Provided.

Tom Leverage presented a brief overview of the Best Practices Committee charge from the SOMB Adult Standards Revisions Committee that focus on polygraph. Jesse Hansen gave a presentation of the research and evidence related to the use of polygraph. Tom Leverage then reviewed the Use of Polygraph document that outlines the recommendations for revisions to the polygraph sections of the Adult Standards.

**BREAK: 10:31-10:51**

**Section 4.000 Proposed Revisions (Action Item) – Carl Blake, Juvenile Standards Revisions Committee**

Handout provided

Carl Blake mentioned that the Juvenile Standards Committee worked on the 4.000 Section of the Standards and noted that both the Juvenile and Adult Standards have the same content in this section. He noted the revisions include the components related to the already implemented competency based model, the new supervisor status, and the moving of the administrative policies related to provider qualification into Section 4.000 from the Administrative Policy section of the Standards.

Judge Kopcow requested that participants take these revisions back to stakeholder groups for review, and the SOMB will make a decision on these proposed revisions at the August meeting.

Judge Kopcow mentioned that any questions related to the Adult Standards 4.000 be directed to Michelle Geng.

**New Continuity of Care Standards Section (Action Item) – Carl Blake, Continuity of Care Committee**

Handout provided

Carl Blake gave a brief overview of the Continuity of Care and Information Sharing Section 9.000. He stated that the current Continuity of Care section is directed more toward the Department of Corrections (DOC). The new language and revisions include the MDT/CST (Multi-Disciplinary Team/Community Supervision Team) members including treatment providers. Carl stated that the Committee is interested in suggestions for areas that need to be included in this section. He also noted that the final draft will be an action item at the August SOMB meeting and input before that time would be appreciated.

Michelle Geng mentioned that any topics or suggested additions to this document should be emailed to her.

**Public Comments:**

Bobbi Ponis asked how long sex offender treatment information kept and where the discharge information should go. Carl Blake responded that record keeping is based on DORA standards, that the treatment records requirement is 7 years, and treatment information is available to offenders. Carl also mentioned that as a discharge provider, the appropriate documentation should be sent to the next provider and that the incoming provider has the responsibility to make sure they have all the documentation from the previous provider. He also stated that sometimes agencies do not pass this information along due to "release" issues.

Susan Walker stated in 9.030 (a. & b.) that many times providers are not accepting previous treatment records. Carl Blake responded that 9.030 (a. & b.) is new to the standards, not previously included and could be why this is not happening yet.

Jim Lenzini asked if a client can hand over their prior treatment documentation to treatment providers. Carl Blake responded to Jim that treatment providers should accept a client's documents and that this might be a training issue of the treatment providers.

**Board Comments:**

Tom Leverage stated that this is a strong area of need and good clinical practice to include these conditions in the Standards.

Judge Kopcow questioned in 9.100 (b. 4 & 5) the use of Shall and Should. Carl Blake responded that this is currently in the existing Standards and that the Committee will be looking at that. Judge Kopcow also noted that there should be language to change DOC to "providers employed by DOC" so that the SOMB has purview.

John Odenheimer suggested substituting Sex Offender Treatment and Management Program (SOTMP) in place of DOC. Lenny Woodson agreed that SOTMP might be more appropriate.

Judge Kopcow encouraged all in attendance to follow-up with stakeholders for any additional comments and to communicate these to Carl Blake. Judge Kopcow stated that this section will be brought before the SOMB in August for a vote.

**New Victim-Centeredness Standards Section (Action Item) – Allison Boyd, victim Advocacy Committee**

Handout provided

Allison Boyd gave a brief overview of this document and the necessity to include a Victim Impact and A Victim Centered Approach section that deals with what is a victim centered approach in the Juvenile and Adult Standards. She noted that this document is still a draft document with more revisions forthcoming and to send any feedback to Allison and the Victim Advocacy Committee.

Carl Blake added that Standards 1.0 and 0.0 will be identified as Standards rather than the section containing only descriptive information.

**Public Comments:**

None

**Board Comments:**

Jessica Meza stated this information will be helpful for attorneys and suggested adding information around the resiliency of victims and positive outcomes.

Tom Leverage questioned what the percentage is of victims who want to be involved or not involved. Kandi Moore responded that there is no statistics showing victim involvement at this time, and that it is an individual choice. Allison Boyd also responded that many of the victims at some time in their life may want information regarding their case. Kandi Moore stated that the providers keep clarification information and will supply it when victims ask.

Angel Weant stated that the judicial system does keep this information and that interested parties can check with her office. She stated that victim involvement numbers have increased in the last 3 years.

Judge Kopcow questioned if it is optimistic to make a decision on this document in August. Allison Boyd replied yes but is unsure if this needs to go before the Adult Standards Revision Committee first. Judge Kopcow suggested bringing this document back to the SOMB for a decision.

There was continued discussion from the SOMB members regarding the readiness of this document for a decision in August and if it should be sent through the Adult/Juvenile Revisions Standards Committees first.

Due to time constraints, Judge Kopcow stated that this issue will be brought to the Executive Committee and that the Victim Advocacy Committee will continue with the revisions.

#### **LUNCH: 11:52-12:31**

#### **Burns Case Variances (Action Item) – Executive Committee**

Carl Blake discussed Application Review Committee's (ARC's) concern about approving variances when they do not fully agree with the decision. He mentioned that the Executive Committee met and discussed further the variance approval process and decided to shift it from ARC to the staff of the SOMB (Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky) for approval. He further indicated that the nature of the variances will then be tracked and presented to the full SOMB and this will allow any discussion by the SOMB.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reiterated that this will expedite the variance process review and approval process and that the needed flexibility will be addressed in the Standards.

#### **Public Comments:**

None

#### **Board Comments:**

Jessica Meza asked if the SOMB has taken a position on the definition of "own child". Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the SOMB will defer to the judges determination of "own child" for each individual variance.

Judge Kopcow mentioned the defense attorney, the prosecutor and the judge are the best people to make the decision as to whether a defendant has the right of contact with a child. It is not the purview of the SOMB to make a legal decision regarding these cases.

Angel Weant stated that she is working with the Chief Probation Officers statewide as to whether to change the forms to help the court provide more direction around the order of child contact.

Jeff Jenks asked if any of the District Attorney's offices are having distress due to the variances and if training is needed. Training needs were uncertain at this time.

Carl Blake stated that ARC has no pending variances to date and moving forward, they will submit any new variances to Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky. He also noted that when Chris reviews the variances, they will be approved in a shorter period of time and then mentioned that the only information ARC will bring to the SOMB is statistical information as to the number, etc.

Michelle Geng clarified the treatment providers' position while the variances are under review with the SOMB.

#### **SOMB Administrative Policies Proposed Revisions (Action Item) – Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky**

Handout provided

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky highlighted the changes to the Administrative Policies which will ultimately be the same in both the Juvenile and Adult Standards. Chris mentioned that the grounds for denial of placement that are in Adult Standards Section 8 will be moved to Adult Standards Section 4 and to the Administrative Policies.

**Public Comments:**

Laurie Kepros asked if it would be useful to clarify the statement "No formal actions will appear on file" in Section C. 3. (a.) Outcome. She also asked in the event a complaint is founded, D.2. (Outcome) if there is public information available as to the disposition. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that this is what information is available to the public. The unfounded complaint information is maintained by ARC for future complaint purposes but is not made public.

**Board Comments:**

Carl Blake stated that the variance screening step by the Vice Chair has been removed and ARC will review the complaints.

Allison Boyd asked if the data collection plan A 2. be included in Appendix F or elsewhere as a Standard.

Allison Boyd requested a future agenda item regarding ARC member abstention from voting during the appeals process (bylaw change). Judge Kopcow added this as a future SOMB meeting agenda item.

Carl responded to Allison Boyd's question that the data collection plan should be kept in the Appendix as the plan is not yet completed, which will allow for ease in revisions. Carl also mentioned that the SOMB and Executive Committee have had previous discussions regarding abstaining of appeal votes.

**Adult Standards Section 1.000 – Adult Standards Revisions Committee – Angel Weant**

Handout provided

Angel Weant gave an overview of the most recent revisions and changes to pre-sentence investigation (PSI) section as dictated by statute.

**Public Comment:**

None

**Board Comments:**

Rick May commented that Section 1.050 should be phrased in a more positive manner.

Angel Weant responded to Rick May and will make the requested changes.

There was general discussion as to when the sexually violent predator (SVP) evaluations should be done.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 1:30**

**Session Name**

New Session 6-17-2016 11-12 AM (1)

**Date Created**

6/17/2016 9:39:04 AM

**Active Participants**

21

**Total Participants**

24

**Average Score**

0.00%

**Questions**

1

**Results Detail**

Last Name	First Name	Q1	Total Points	Score
<b>Answer Key</b>		-	0.00	-
Aguilar-Dave	Norma	C	0.00	-
Baydarian	Mary	C	0.00	-
Blake	Carl	A	0.00	-
Boyd	Allison	A	0.00	-
Bricker	Pam	A	0.00	-
Curtis	Jessica	A	0.00	-
Davies	Merve	A	0.00	-
Elger	Korey	A	0.00	-
English	Kim	C	0.00	-
Gursky	Missy	A	0.00	-
Jackson	Nancy	A	0.00	-
Jenks	Jeff	A	0.00	-
Leversee	Tom	A	0.00	-
May	Rick	A	0.00	-
Meza	Jessica	A	0.00	-
Moore	Kandy	A	0.00	-
Odenheimer	John	A	0.00	-
Shay	Jeff	A	0.00	-
Watt	Alli	A	0.00	-
Weant	Angel	A	0.00	-
Woodson III	Lenny	A	0.00	-
<b>Participant List Averages</b>		-	0.00	-