

SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD (SOMB) MINUTES

Friday, November 18, 2016

SOMB Members

Alli Watt
Allison Boyd
Amy Fitch
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
Rick May
Tom Leversee

Visitors

Beverly Casey	Susan Walker
Carolyn Turner	Thomas Casey
Chad Sandoval	Tim Johnson
Christine Rinke	Tom Nelson
Colton McNutt	Wellesley Bush
Deb Baty	
Dena McClung	
Emily Hills	
Gabriel Garcia	
Gary Reser	
Jeff Geist	
Jeffrey Jordan	
Jennifer Leonard	
Jo Stack	
Katharina Booth	
Kimberly Kline	
Lindsay Sova	
Lisa Nelson	
Nicole Leon	
Pat Harris	
Robin Richards	

Absent SOMB Members: Brie Franklin, Norma Aguilar-Dave, Pam Bricker, and Richard Bednarski

Staff:

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky	Raechel Alderete	Michelle Geng
Kelli Reynolds	Marina Borysov	Jill Trowbridge

SOMB Meeting Begins: 9:04

INTRODUCTIONS:

Introductions were made by all members and visitors present.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Jessica Meza mentioned the need for clarity of the Young Adult Protocol and asked this protocol be included as a future agenda item.

Announcements:

Carl Blake noted some issues with the Juvenile Registration section that the Juvenile Standards Committee will address this in the January 23, 2017 committee meeting.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky announced that the December 16th SOMB Meeting will be a half-day meeting with an appreciation luncheon. He also mentioned that there will be decision items in the morning and asked board members to please plan on attending.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the SOMB staff is making plans for a new "paper" copy of the Adult and Juvenile Standards with current revisions will be released in January 2017.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that the Executive Committee schedule a follow-up discussion of the responsivity issues at the December 16th SOMB meeting.

Allison Boyd announced that the Blue Bench has been awarded a new grant program that outlines victim representation work with probation and treatment providers as a part of the Community Supervision Team (CST). She also noted that this program is being piloted after the Connecticut model.

Kelli Reynolds announced she will limit the amount of research update articles emailed to the SOMB member from six to no more than three per month.

Nancy Jackson announced her retirement from the SOMB and that this is her last meeting. She thanked the SOMB and mentioned how much she learned from this functional board. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky expressed appreciation from the SOMB and invited her back in January for a proper farewell and the transition of her replacement.

Carl Blake noted that a previous approved variance regarding an offender moving from sex offense specific treatment to trauma treatment has now ended and that the offender will now shift back to sex offense treatment.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER MINUTES:

Motion to approve the October Minutes: Carl Blake; 2nd (Question #1)

14	Approve	0	Oppose	4	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

The agenda was approved by consensus.

SVP ASSESSMENT PROCESS (Action Item) – Executive Committee - (Handout Provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky reviewed the previous discussion regarding the Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Assessment process and that the SVP committee identified ten recommendations that were included in previous years' legislative reports. He also mentioned what has not been communicated to the legislature regarding the "Relationship Criteria," which is not an evidenced based. Chris reminded all of the concern as to the recidivism criteria and noted that this is a static instrument with no provision for reconsideration. He mentioned to the SOMB that the focus today will be how to communicate to the legislature, and what other issues that need to be communicated.

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake expressed the need for open dialogue regarding the non-removal of the SVP designation.

Jeff Shay suggested submitting a letter to the Legislature and also to include this information in the Legislative Report.

Jessica Meza suggested hearing from treatment providers who have been subpoenaed on this issue.

Merve Davies responded that he has testified for both the defense and prosecution. He noted that this is treated like a static issue when it is not. Merve also mentioned that not all agree on what is a SVP and the need to clarify this to the Legislature.

Korey Elger asked what the Legislative response was to the last Legislative Report concerning the SVP designation process. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that there was some understanding however there was reluctance to make any changes at that time.

Judge Kopcow mentioned that the SOMB is in a unique position to get this information and recommendations to the Legislature to help them understand the nuances of the SVP designation.

Allison Boyd asked if there is a SVP registration list available. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that there are approximately 100-150 offenders on that list and that CBI can give you more up-to date information.

Jeff Shay stated that in Pueblo, there are 526 registered sex offenders with 14 designated as SVP. He mentioned that the SVP designation "freaks out" the community and noted that the Legislature needs to know about community reactions.

Kim English mentioned the fact that the SVP designation is permanent and that it is in conflict with the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) legislative mandate.

Judge Kopcow noted that to his knowledge, there have not been any reversals of the SVP designation under Statute 35B. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky also mentioned a case he testified at for SVP designation reconsideration and that the judge ruled it could not be changed.

Tom Leversee noted the Legislature's frustration with the SOMB as to why it is taking so long to update the Standards and the need to reiterate to the Legislature that the statutes themselves are challenging the inability to create a risk assessment tool with evidenced based criteria.

Judge Kopcow mentioned that after discussion there was consensus to communicate to the Legislature via a letter that the Executive Committee should create. Korey Elger suggested including all the assessment resources currently used in this letter.

Allison Boyd mentioned the need to rely on the expertise and recommendations of the Executive committee.

Judge Kopcow stated the need to have this issue reported back to the SOMB in December as to how to advise the Legislature.

Michelle Geng gave the SOMB statistics that stated that as of 10/18/2016 there were 18,215 registered adult sex offenders, of that 198 were designated as SVP, and about one half of those were in the Department of Corrections (DOC).

Audience Discussion:

Jo Stack aired her concerns that the Legislature does not understand the impact of the SVP designation. She stated that this is a political issue and that the letter needs to reiterate all the collateral consequences. Kim English responded to Jo Stack that the statistics and collateral consequences need to be included in this letter.

Susan Walker noted that her work with RSOL indicates the need to be consistent between all jurisdictions.

Board Discussion:

Jessica Curtis mentioned that the SOMB is charged to make this SVP policy change recommendation.

ADULT STANDARDS REVISIONS REGARDING BURNS CASE (Review Public Comment) – Michelle Geng and the Executive Committee - (Handout Provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky noted that there were two public comments; with the first one suggesting more affirmative language; and, the second one that the Burns exception covers the court or parole board order should change to "court/parole board order".

Board Discussion:

Amy Fitch mentioned, that after speaking with various stakeholders, to use the more affirmative language Tim Johnson suggested. She went on to state rulings from two Colorado Supreme Court cases and reiterated the fact that it is the SOMB's responsibility to include concise language in the Standards that meet statutory requirements regarding contact with his/her own child(ren). Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that if approved, this language will have to be tailored and included throughout all the appropriate sections of the Standards.

Jessica Meza noted the confusion if Colorado courts should follow Burns or not. She suggested having legal counsel advise the SOMB on this issue due to indecisiveness

Carl Blake suggested using "unless ordered by the Court" be inserted after 5.740 and noted that using too much legal language opens the door to be grieved. He also suggested that if the Standards are not bound by case law, then to cite the legal references.

John Odenheimer proposed deferring any definitive direction on this due to State Judicial work with judges and prosecutors related to the Burns issues and that the Standards need to be in complete compliance. He also noted that any revisions should be on hold until Judicial makes their determinations of the Burns ruling.

Judge Kopcow suggested that the SOMB needs to look at the words "with their own children" and who the parent might be.

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded to Carl Blake that there needs to be more specific language due to the entry clause which indicates "no contact with minor children". He also responded to John Odenheimers' proposal for deferment until the Colorado Judicial decisions are made as the "restriction" language has already been approved and is in place. Chris noted that the proposal from public comment is to shift the restrictive language to affirmative language and that today's action is to leave in the "expressly allowed"

language until the judicial language is finalized. He stated that after that determination, then the “affirmative” language could be revisited.

Audience Discussion:

Tim Johnson noted that Appendix C of the Standards concerning restricted contact with children indicated that the SOMB’s evidence based research is contraindicated to waiting for the judicial decision and does not agree that deferring is the right answer. He also indicated that there needs to be an express statement that clarifies “their own child”.

Board Discussion:

Carl Blake stated that treatment providers need clear cut language as they are bound by the Standards and by law. He also stated his agreement to defer this new language until clear direction is available.

Judge Kopcow noted that what Judicial decides will be evidenced based and that the SOMB should defer the affirmative language until their decision is made. He suggested putting this issue on the January SOMB meeting agenda.

Allison Boyd agreed to defer but suggested adopting the public comment language at this meeting.

Judge Kopcow stated that the SOMB Standards are inconsistent with Sex Offender Intensive Supervision Program (SOISP) and that the SOMB should defer.

Jessica Curtis made a motion to defer affirmative language; 2nd by Missy Gursky.

Motion to approve the Motion to table affirmative language: Jessica Curtis ; Missy Gursky^{2nd} (Question #2)

17 Approve 2 Oppose 0 Abstain Motion Passes

Lenny Woodson made a motion to add the parole board where court is indicated language.

Motion to add parole board where court is indicated: Lenny Woodson; (Question #4)

18 Approve 2 Oppose 0 Abstain Motion Passes

Amy Fitch asked if Ingrid Barrier could be present at the January meeting. Judge Kopcow indicated that this will be discussed at the Executive meeting.

BREAK: 10:37 – 10:58

ADULT SEX OFFENSE HISTORY STANDARDS REVISION (Decision Item) – SOMB Executive Committee – (Handout Provided)

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky framed the Adult Sex offense History Standard revisions and indicated that Allison Boyd has created a discussion point that has been revised. He also noted that there are two new proposed language suggestions and that a decision as to how to proceed with this additional clarification language needs to be made today.

Board Discussion:

Suggestion #1:

Carl Blake reviewed his proposed changes with the SOMB and indicated these changes are in “yellow” on the handout. He also condensed the Discussion Point to be less legal in nature and added the last sentence highlighted in “yellow”.

Tom Leversee suggested changing index offense to “offense patterns” in the 2nd paragraph of the discussion point. Carl Blake responded that he agrees to this change.

Merve Davies questioned the use of “shall not” in this language. Carl Blake explained the differences of the two statements. After clarification of these 2 statements, Merve Davies responded that this use of “shall not” will untie the hands of the treatment providers. Carl Blake mentioned the Standards that reference polygraph will be modified and that the Adult Standards Revisions 3.000 modifications can be cross-referenced in this language. Carl stated that his language empowers the team.

John Odenheimer gave his approval to Suggestion #1 to modify “offender’s index offense” to “offense patterns. He also mentioned numerous reasons why the 2nd suggestion is not appropriate for treatment providers and that it is too legally focused.

Jeff Jenks stated that what is missing in Suggestion #1 is that there are agencies that are not referring sex offenders for sex history polygraphs, and that polygraph examiners ask each and every question whether a sex offender pleads the 5th Amendment.

Suggestion #2:

#2 – Christine Rinke reviewed suggestion #2 and that it specifically refers to 6.012 (polygraph), 6.012 E (unresponsive polygraph and resolution), and 6.012 F (exceptions for the treatment provider).

Allison Boyd noted that suggestion #2 gives the treatment providers more guidance and that both suggestions are very similar.

Missy Gursky noted that Section 3.000 is being revamped and may look different than now, and that today's suggestions need to give direction for the committee to make revisions.

Jeff Jenks pointed out redundancy in suggestion #2. He also did not agree with the "deceptive" polygraph language. Christine Rinke responded that this language is from the current Standards. Jeff suggested having different wording that the 3.000 Adult Standards Revisions committee can work with.

Amy Fitch expressed her concerns about the use of unresolved deceptive polygraph as she feels this is more like a punishment. She noted that the CST's do work together regarding these cases and try to assess an offender's risk. Amy asked for language to address how the CST should handle an offenders' risk, for community safety, and offender rehabilitation. She agreed that the CST would be able to go back to the courts after an unresolved deceptive polygraph. Christine Rinke responded to Amy Fitch regarding her concerns that unresolved deceptive polygraphs are a punishment is subjective, that there are still sanctions that can be made, and the Standards need to provide consistent and concise guidance. She also mentioned that the CST does not want to take away from those who do consent to take a polygraph.

Tom Leverage stated that the CSTs in the past have encouraged open disclosure without self-incrimination and there is still accountability for the client.

Jessica Meza mentioned that there are individuals that are not capable to take polygraphs and that there are other means to tease out some of the risk patterns. She mentioned that we need to look at the research when revising the Standards regarding refusing to take a polygraph.

Allison Boyd gave her support of Suggestion #2 with Christine Rinke's modifications that clarify unresolved polygraphs. She suggested rewriting this language one more time before a vote is made.

Carl Blake presented a motion to approve Suggested #1 with suggested revisions; Mary Baydarian 2nd

Amy Fitch asked Carl Blake to amend his motion to include the following language in the last paragraph of the Discussion Point: *"This provision does not prevent a CST from considering whether further restrictions or conditions are necessary to ensure community safety."* Carl responded that it is not necessary to amend his motion as this language will be incorporated in upcoming revisions.

Jessica Meza reiterated that when someone pleads the 5th Amendment will not make them guilty or are a higher risk. Christine Rinke addressed Jessica's Meza's concerns.

Christine Rinke asked Carl Blake for direction as to what revisions are being addressed in the 3.000 and/or 6.000 revisions and questioned if there should be a vote today.

Motion to approve Suggestion #1 as amended: Carl Blake ; Mary Baydarian 2nd (Question #5)

13 Approve 3 Oppose 0 Abstain Motion Passes

Christine Rinke stated that Suggestion #2 addresses the maintenance phase which is not addressed in suggestion #1. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested the SOMB will take this under advisement

LUNCH: 12:06 – 12:58

VARIANCE REQUEST for HH (Decision Item) – Application Review Committee and Gayle Christensen – (Handout Provided)

Carl Blake reviewed the variance and stated this variance is to allow Gayle Christensen to treat this client while the case is under appeal.

Board Discussion:

Allison Boyd asked if the prosecution has granted immunity regarding any statements that this offender may make while in treatment. Gayle Christensen responded 'no' to Allison's question.

Motion to Approve Variance on H.H.: Jessica Curtis; Merve Davies 2nd (Question #6)

15	Approve	2	Oppose	1	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

VARIANCE REQUEST for DC (Decision Item) – Application Review Committee and Gayle Christensen – (Handout Provided)

Gayle Christensen mentioned that this client is in drug and alcohol abuse treatment and behavioral treatment.

Board Discussion:

Allison Boyd voiced her concerns with the 3rd paragraph from the end about no victim input. Gayle responded that it was his determination that the victim would have no negative impact of proceeding with limited client treatment during the appeal process.

Motion to Approve DC Variance: Jessica Curtis ; Tom Leversee 2nd (Question #7)

16	Approve	1	Oppose	1	Abstain	Motion Passes
-----------	----------------	----------	---------------	----------	----------------	----------------------

COSA UPDATE (Presentation) – Jim Kettering - (Handout Provided)

Jim Kettering gave a presentation outlining Colorado Circles of Support & Accountability (COSA) program which started about 8 yrs. ago in Colorado. He also mentioned that this is an evidence based program that initially started 22 years ago in Canada. He went on to state that COSA supports any convicted sex offenders which helps them to reconnect with their community, monitor public protection, makes them accountable, and lowers recidivism rates.

Board Discussion:

Kim English asked if they still have a Federal grant or if they are continuing to raise funds. Jim Kettering responded that they have not received any additional grants and that they receive support from probation and parole on a year to year basis. He also mentioned that the program is at risk regarding the lack of future funding.

Rick May asked if the clients they work with are from the DOC or probation. Jim Kettering responded that they work with both.

Audience Discussion:

Carl Blake asked if COSA would be a good program for youth coming of age. Jim responded that right now they are focusing on those coming directly from parole or probation but would like to include this population in a prevention program through the schools.

UPDATE ON LIFETIME SUPERVISION REPORT AND SOMB LEGISLATIVE REPORT (Presentation) – Kelli Reynolds

Kelli Reynolds reviewed and outlined the major changes and revisions to the Lifetime Supervision report and the SOMB Legislative report. She noted that the amount of treatment providers increased as a result of the competency based model.

Kelli noted that the SOMB Legislative report is a culmination of the yearly changes, research, recommendations and some of the Sunset Mandates as requested by the Legislature. She mentioned that there will be a change to the organization of the report and she indicated the 4 major sections. Kelli also noted that the final draft language will be available for review at the December SOMB meeting and that Section 2 (Policy Analysis and Recommendations) will be available for review at the December meeting also. She indicated a draft copy will be sent out about one week before the December SOMB meeting for board members to review.

Kelli highlighted this year's changes.

VARIANCE REQUEST for RD (Decision Item) – Application Review Committee and Brenna Tindell – (Handout Provided)

Rick May and Kim English recused themselves from voting on this variance due to conflicts.

Michelle Geng contacted Brenna Tindell and David Wemmerus and team via a teleconference call.

Carl Blake summarized the variance request from the provider to have the client complete a Child Contact Assessment (CCA) and that per the Standards, the client cannot complete the CCA because the victim is his own child. He also noted that ARC does not have a unanimous recommendation for the SOMB due to some concerns.

Brenna Tindell, David Wemmerus and team explained the details of the case.

Board Discussion:

Korey Elger asked if they would give an update on the therapy to date. The response from Dave Wemmerus' team was that all parties concerned are actively participating in therapy and that the mother is a good support source.

Allison Boyd asked if he had a prior sex offense and if he was charged with incest. The team responded "no". She also asked if the facts of the original case are the same as those outlined in the Variance letter. Dave Wemmerus responded that no and that they are not the same as additional information came forward during treatment.

Angel Weant noted that judges are struggling with the Burns decision determinations and that they do not have enough or complete information to make these rulings.

Allison Boyd asked that victim names not be included in variances in the future. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky responded that the victim names will be removed from future variances.

Carl Blake questioned if allowing this variance will open the door for future uses of the CCA. In response to Carl's concerns, Amy Fitch asked if there is another way to get this information to the courts. Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky also responded that the SOMB will have to address the CCA issue in the standards revisions.

Motion to Approve Variance: Tom Leversee; Amy Fitch 2nd (Question #8)

13 Approve	1 Oppose	3 Abstain	Motion Passes
-------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------

JUVENILE STANDARDS REVISIONS – APPENDICES CROSS-WALK (Decision Item) – Carl Blake and Raechel Alderete

(Handout Provided)

Carl Blake reviewed the revisions made to the Juvenile Standards which incorporate the new SOMB approved protocols and systems.

Board Discussion:

Tom Leversee mentioned that Visual Reaction Time (VRT) should be replaced with "Viewing Time". He also noted his concerns with the use of the Penile Plethysmograph (PPG) on juveniles younger than 14 in this cross-reference. Carl Blake responded that this was what was already in the existing standards and that this language can be revised. Tom Leversee agreed to submit revised PPG language.

Carl Blake noted that much of this language was inserted from other approved sections of the Standards and mentioned that if changes are requested, that it might be appropriate elsewhere.

BREAK: 2:50 – 3:00

JUVENILE STANDARDS REVISIONS – DEFINITIONS (Decision Item) - (Handout provided)

Carl Blake reviewed the suggested changes to the Juvenile Standards Revisions Definitions. Carl asked the SOMB what specific information should be included in the DD/ID definition section from these suggested revisions.

Raechel indicated that if this is voted on that Missy Gursky and DeeAnn Major would like to comment during the 20 day comment period. She also mentioned that stakeholders are confused and are asking for this specific direction.

Board Discussion:

Amy Fitch indicated that she does not feel the Adult Standards definitions need to be inserted, but noted the discussion point might give the needed direction.

There was general discussion as to the term Mental Retardation vs. Developmentally/Intellectually Disabled and it was noted that the Mental Retardation terminology is no longer used in the Colorado Department of Human Services Developmental Disabilities Services Rules and Regulations.

Tom Lerversee suggested keeping a broader definition. Carl Blake responded that he would like have to the definition to be more specific so that this will clarify what specific treatment provider designations or credentials are required.

John Odenheimer asked the SOMB for direction to the question of inserting a "broad" or "specific" definition.

Tom Lerversee asked if it would be better for a smaller group to clarify this definition and its' intent.

Rick May agrees a narrow definition with discussion points makes sense for the treatment providers at to what expertise is needed to treat a client.

There was general discussion to reference this definition in Section 3.000 with a more narrow definition.

John Odenheimer suggested voting for a narrow definition with it being open for 20 day public content and to ratify next month.

Amy Fitch proposed a motion to approve the definition as is with modification to the "Mental Retardation" language and with input from Missy Gursky and DeeAnn Major.

After further general discussion, Amy Fitch withdrew her motion to vote on this definition document due to non-consensus of the definition language and suggested language from Korey Elger.

Carl Blake asked if the SOMB would send out this information for public comment. Raechel Alderete replied that it will be sent out for public comment.

ADULT POLYGRAPH STANDARDS REVISION (Action Item) – Jeff Jenks and Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky suggested postponing this item until next month's meeting.

SOMB Meeting Adjourned: 3:31

Session Name

New Session 11-18-2016 10-35 AM

Date Created

11/18/2016 8:46:58 AM

Active Participants

20

Total Participants

24

Average Score

0.00%

Questions

8

Results by Question**1. Motion to Approve the October Minutes (Multiple Choice)**

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	77.78%	14
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	22.22%	4
Totals	100%	18

2. Motion to table affirmative language (Multiple Choice)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	89.47%	17
No	10.53%	2
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	19

3. Motion to add parole board where court is indicated (Multiple Choice)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	4
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	4

4. Motion to add parole board where court is indicated (Multiple Choice)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	18
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	18

5. Motion to approve suggestion 1 as amended (Multiple Choice)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	81.25%	13
No	18.75%	3
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	16

6. Motion to approve variance on H.H. (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	83.33%	15
No	11.11%	2
Abstain	5.56%	1
Totals	100%	18

7. Motion to approve variance on D.C. (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	88.89%	16
No	5.56%	1
Abstain	5.56%	1
Totals	100%	18

8. Motion to approve the variance (Multiple Choice)

Responses		
	Percent	Count
Yes	76.47%	13
No	5.88%	1
Abstain	17.65%	3
Totals	100%	17

Session Name

New Session 11-18-2016 10:35 AM

Date Created

11/18/2016 8:46:58 AM

Active Participants

20

Total Participants

24

Average Score

0.00%

Questions

8

Results Detail

Last Name	First Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Total Points
Answer Key		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00
Baydarian	Mary	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Blake	Carl	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	2	0.00
Boyd	Allison	1	2	-	1	2	2	2	1	0.00
Curtis	Jessica	3	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Davies	Merve	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Elger	Korey	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	0.00
English	Kim	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Fitch	Amy	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Gursky	Missy	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00
Jackson	Nancy	3	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	0.00
Jenks	Jeff	1	1	-	1	2	1	1	1	0.00
Leversee	Tom	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
May	Rick	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	3	0.00
Meza	Jessica	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Moore	Kandy	3	1	-	1	1	1	1	3	0.00
Odenheimer	John	1	1	-	1	1	3	3	3	0.00
Shay	Jeff	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	0.00
Watt	Alli	3	1	-	1	2	2	1	1	0.00
Weant	Angel	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	0.00
Woodson III	Lenny	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	0.00
Participant List Averages		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00