

# SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES

Friday, November 20, 2009

## **Board Members**

Mary Baydarian  
Carl Blake  
Merve Davies  
Cheryl Davis  
Jeff Geist  
Missy Gursky  
Peggy Heil  
Bill Hildenbrand  
Kellie Hotter  
Marcie Howell  
Jeff Jenks  
Tom Kennedy  
Tom Leversee  
Rick Levenson  
Daniel Makelky  
Bill Martinez  
Kandy Moore  
Paul Prendergast  
Kari Quevli  
Chris Rowe  
Doug Stephens

## **Absent Board Members**

Meg Allen  
Dave Long  
Marianne Tims

## **Vacant Position**

Department of Education

## **Staff**

Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky  
Amy Dethlefsen  
Nancy Bullis  
Charla Phagan  
Debbie Stjernholm  
Tony Hodes

## **Visitors**

Terry Bennett  
Allison Boyd  
Marcie Brewer  
Dianna Lawyer-Brook  
Karen Vigil  
Suzanne MacKinnon  
Ted Romero  
Susan Walker  
Carla Spence  
Laurie Knight  
Jennifer Kok  
Jan Hunsaker  
Stephen Brake  
Becki Hinton  
Steve Parker  
Erin Amundson  
Wellesley Bush  
John Odenheimer  
Abigail Hansen  
Kelly Radke  
Allison Brittson  
Carolyn Turner  
Louanne Griffith  
Sara Philips

## **Board Meeting Begins:**

### **Introductions –**

**Tony Hodes** is the new Community Notification Contractor for the SOMB, replacing Debbie Stjernholm who is now the Grant Site Coordinator for the SOMB.

**Chris Rowe** will be retiring from Judicial in February 2010.

**Dianna Lawyer-Brook** announces her upcoming appointment to the Board by the Commissioner of the Department of Education.

## **Future Agenda Items**

- It was suggested that the Board review the Sunset assessment and recommendations. There was no preference as to reviewing the recommendations before or after the legislature has a bill in place.
- Youth transitioning out of care (Division of Youth Corrections (DYC)/Department of Human Services (DHS), etc.) was the focus of the NJA conference- Attendees from the conference have requested more information about this topic. Colorado is seen as a leader in this area.

## **Announcements**

- Change in agenda- Defense Bar Info Sheet presentation eliminated for today due to additional feedback received. The committee needs time to address the suggested feedback.
- Missy Gursky announced a Developmentally Delayed Committee Brown Bag presentation on December 10 focusing on use of the polygraph and sexual interest assessments. Flyers are available in the back.
- Mary Baydarian reported back about the National Governors Association meeting, which was held in Colorado. The focus of this meeting was the need for housing for adjudicated juveniles who have committed a sexual offense and who are transitioning out of DYC or DHS. Mary was surprised that the participants had very little background knowledge about this and were also not up to date on the Adam Walsh Act and its implications for lifetime registration of youth. Many states wanted to know about our Underserved Initiative program, as it is a model that provides an underlying structure that looks to keep community based providers available in order to support youth in their homes and kinship placements. Mary also spoke about the trainings the Board offers; specifically about the trainings about residency restrictions.
- Calendar of Events in packet- Take note of the Sex Offender Registration Legislation Workgroup meeting on December 4, 2009.
- SVP Risk Assessment handbook and instrument are pretty much finalized. Next step will be working on getting the information out and working towards March 1, 2010 target date for implementation.
- Adam Walsh Act Update- The multi-agency compliance committee did recommend that Colorado submit a compliance package. The Committee is now waiting for the Governor's Office's input. There are a number of states that are also submitting compliance packages with what they have. At this time, there are no plans for any legislative initiatives.
- DORA Sunset Review Update- Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky spoke with the legislative drafter about the administrative recommendations to be included in the bill. The Division is seeking to make technical changes to the statutory language for inclusion in the legislative draft. An example of this would be the way the membership of the Board is listed in the statute. This change may have to be done via an amendment to the bill. Currently there are layered listings of the make-up of the Board, and requirements of Board membership.

It was asked if the complaint system will be drawn up into the legislative bill as it was recommended by Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA) (meaning that the complaints will be reviewed by DORA instead of the SOMB Application Review

Committee). Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky explained that Bruce Harrelson of DORA took to heart what the Board shared as concerns about DORA handling the complaints. Bruce is looking into alternative suggestions that might be given to the legislative drafter. If anyone has ideas to suggest, please contact Bruce Harrelson. The bill will be presented to the Legislature in January.

- Lifetime Report is complete and posted on the SOMB website. There will be a presentation to the Board about the Lifetime Report at the January meeting.
- The December Board meeting will be on December 11th not the 18<sup>th</sup>. The meeting will be at DCJ in conjunction with the Domestic Violence Offender Management Board (DVOMB). There will not be a working board meeting. From 11am to 12:00pm will be a joint presentation. From 12:00pm to 1:30pm there will be a board recognition lunch. The Board was asked if there were any ideas for the presentation. It was asked to review the collaborative decision making model that the DVOMB is adopting.
- The Court of Appeals made a ruling on a case involving phone solicitation. The offender was talking to an undercover police officer. The officer led the offender to believe he was speaking with a minor. It was ruled that because the intended victim was a child the offender would be designated SVP status.
- Spotlight/Updated Events button now available on the SOMB website. This feature will show case the latest materials, trainings and announcements of the SOMB.
- Probation training- SOMB will be sponsoring 10 scholarships for this training. The SOMB is now accepting entries for the lottery; which will take place January 6, 2010. There is a flyer with the training dates available in the back.
- CBS will be airing a 5 part series on Rape in America and the series can be found on their website.
- The January Board meeting will be postponed from January 15<sup>th</sup> to January 29<sup>th</sup> due to the State furlough day. The meeting will be held at Red Rocks Community College.

### **Approval of October Minutes**

A motion to approve the October minutes was made and seconded. There was a call for any additions and/or corrections to the minutes. It was noted that the minutes did not reflect that Bill Martinez voted in opposition to the SVP Risk Assessment. Motion made to approve October Minutes with the change in the SVP vote tally. Motion was seconded. The Minutes were approved with the noted change on the SVP vote tally. There was no opposition and one abstention (Mary Baydarian).

### ***Committee Reports:***

#### **Risk Discrimination-Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky**

This committee is working on a proposed draft protocol, which will identify adult sex offenders who are deemed low risk both at the time of the original mental health offense specific evaluation and through an ongoing review/assessment process. It is hoped that once this protocol is in place, there would be a possibility for a differential intervention. This would have to be mandated either through the standards or legislatively. There is a need to test/pilot this protocol. A request was sent to Evaluators, asking for volunteers who would be willing to help test the protocol. The Committee needs to find out if the protocol is accurately identifying low risk offenders, and is in line with clinical judgment.

The SOMB staff has sent out to see if providers would be willing to help test it. If you would be willing to help with testing the protocol, please contact Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky or Cathy Rodriguez. How will offenders be identified? Chris confirmed that names and other confidential or identifying information will not be used and the SOMB will not have access to client files. The test is strictly looking for the results of the process and any significant factors leading to the results.

### **Defense Bar- Rick Levinson**

The information sheet was to be focus, but was delayed as mentioned above.

### **Adult Standards Revision-Peggy Heil**

The Committee has made good progress. They will be going over the draft of the revised Parental Risk Assessment (PRA) protocol at their next session. The next meeting will be December 18 from 10:30 to 2:30. A request was made for evaluators to attend the next meeting. The Committee is trying to address concerns brought to their attention about the PRA. For example, it is a very expensive service for the offender. To address this, a phased assessment process is being proposed. Also, in looking at factors that relate to risk the evaluators will follow the protocol while working with the community supervision team when making decisions.

### **Juvenile Standards Revision-Carl Blake**

The Committee is currently working on Section 5.0, which establishes the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT). The goal is to look at the outline roles and responsibility as a MDT and for each individual member of the team. The next meeting will be December 3rd. A request was made for representatives from the Victims Advocacy committee to attend the meeting because they had written a description of the Victim Advocate role/responsibilities (which was adopted by the Board, however it was not reflected in the Standards). The Juvenile Standards Revision committee is incorporating this into Section 5.0.

### **Application Review Committee (ARC)-Missy Gursky**

Changes have been made in complaint process due to the Sunset Review. The Complaint Form was updated and an information sheet with instructions on how to fill out the complaint form was created. The Committee has started recording the Executive Session part of the ARC meetings per the new requirements brought to the Board's attention by the Attorney General representative, who was at the last Board meeting. Staff has met with the investigator to review the Sunset review and how it relates to the nature and quality of investigations. As a result, staff is establishing a protocol for the investigative process. The Committee is taking steps to enhance and improve the process as well as addressing the Sunset concerns by the time the legislation is introduced in January.

### **Victim Advocacy-Allison Boyd**

The Victim Advocacy meetings are being well-attended. At this time, committee members are actively participating in other SOMB committee meetings to offer the victim perspective. Recently some changes were made to the victim representative role definition that was approved by the Board. These changes were made to be consistent with the other roles and responsibilities presented in the Standards. The Committee is also preparing a definition of "potential victim" for the Adult Standards Revision Committee. A presentation on

victimization research was prepared for the Board. The Committee is also following up with the roundtable participants to see about the status of victim outreach programs in Colorado. The Committee has been able to influence some Crime Victim Board policies, such as providing financial support to victims so that they can attend MDT meetings. Starting in January there will be a focus on reviewing the committee's goals & objectives. The Committee will resume work on a handout for victims in regards to treatment and supervision. It is currently in a draft format.

### **Best Practices-Tom Leverage**

This committee has been involved in the Standards revision process, particularly the Juvenile Standards. The Committee is trying to access the latest research and literature that is relevant to the subject matter to be helpful. For example, the Juvenile Standards Revision Committee is working on the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) concept. Amy Dethlefsen did a literature search on collaborative decision making in order to have research to help develop the roles and responsibilities of the MDT. The Committee also found Instruments that are available in the field that the MDT can use to help with the decision-making process. The Board asked the Committee to do research about adolescent brain development as well as brain trauma. Different members of the Committee are taking on different researchers working in the fields of brain development/trauma, and reporting back and training the Committee. The Committee wants to know implications for Standard revisions as well as implications for training in the field. It was questioned if this research is relevant to adults as well? Should the Committee broaden the approach to include adult aspects? The Committee is also in the process of performing the 2-year review of Savio's variance. Data has been requested from Savio for the Committee to review. The sub-committee working on a juvenile "No Known Cure" position paper showing its relevance/lack of relevance for juveniles continues work as well.

### **DVSO Crossover- Merve Davies**

This committee has been quiet for a couple of months. The Committee spent a lot of time putting together a survey to develop a better understanding of crossover behaviors between Domestic Violence offenders (DV) and Sex offenders (SO). It is hoped that the survey will be distributed during the summer months. It was discovered in June that the survey is required to go through the IRB process (which is a lengthy process) so distribution of the survey has been put on hold. In the meantime, the Committee has been developing trainings for future presentation. The next committee meeting will be December 2, from 9am to 10:30am at the DCJ complex.

### **Community Notification Technical Assistance Team-Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky**

This Committee is responsible for developing the Community Notification (CN) protocol used by law enforcement to conduct community notifications for Sexually Violent Predators (SVP). Recent changes have been made to the protocols to accommodate the dwindling attendance at these meetings. Law enforcement can now do notifications in other ways besides town hall meeting format. The Committee will be meeting in January to discuss if further changes are in order as well as trainings for law enforcement on the new protocols. The committee is also working in conjunction with the Colorado Springs Police Department (who received a grant from the SMART office to provide trainings) to provide two trainings

specifically for law enforcement about their responsibilities for Registration and Community Notifications in Colorado Springs and another training in the metro area. A member of the CN team is required to attend a community's first CN meetings and whenever assistance is requested. There are plans for some general training sessions to take place in the next year as well.

### **Housing Committee-Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky**

This Committee has come about as a result of a need to address the difficulty adult sex offenders are having in obtaining housing due to residence restrictions and zoning ordinances. Denver County is one of the only front-range municipalities without these sort of ordinances. Therefore, Denver is concerned about the impact of these restrictions in other municipalities on their own resources. Three sub-committees have been formed. The first sub-committee will work to produce a white paper on sex offender housing. The second sub-committee will work on defining shared living arrangements (SLAs), as well as a document on the pros and cons of SLAs. This group will also produce an educational document about SLAs. The third sub-committee will work with Community Corrections (Comm Corr) to see how their resources may be utilized for sex offenders. Comm Corr has recently sent out a Request for Proposals (RFP) to pay a higher per diem for sex offenders in community corrections, and is also working on ways to use beds in the jails as temporary transitional housing.

### **Juvenile DHS Committee-Mary Baydarian**

A concern was raised about implication of sexting for juveniles. The numbers of these cases are not as extensive as was originally thought. The next meeting will be sometime in January at which time the committee will decide on the amount of involvement this issue requires. Scott Hefty from the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office has been a leader working on this issue. The SOMB is hoping to work with Scott to produce educational pieces and training sessions on sexting.

**Grant Advisory Group**- Debbie Stjernholm has been meeting with stakeholders to get input on the implementation of this grant. Debbie is looking for ideas on how to produce a survey that will identify the gaps in service delivery within local jurisdictions. This is a good way to follow-up with the rural initiative.

### **Research Working Group: Update on Standards Outcome Study-Amy Dethlefsen**

The Research Working Group is evaluating the effectiveness of both the Adult and Juvenile Standards. There is a legislative mandate for this and it was brought up in the Sunset Review. Originally the Group was meeting as two separate groups (adult & juvenile). Since there was a large overlap of people and processes involved in both groups, the Working Group is now meeting as one group. Recidivism as an outcome will be covered in both studies. The State definition of recidivism is being used for this study.

**Adult Standard Evaluation Study**- A timeline to obtain all Parole and Probation discharge data has been established (July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2005). The Working Group will be gathering recidivism data at the 1 year and 5 year points. The Group will be looking for those who successfully discharged from Parole & Probation. It will be noted that Lifetime Supervision Offenders will not be represented in the sample group, as their discharge dates

will not have occurred in large numbers during that time frame. The sample size will be around 1200-1500 for the overall number of discharges in that time frame and a sample size of about 600 – 700 for the recidivism part of the study. It is projected that the protocol will be submitted to the IRB process in January. IRB approval usually takes 2-3 months. With that in mind, the tentative time line for the study is as follows:

April 2010- pulling discharge data from DOC and Probation.

July 2010- pulling recidivism data

December 2010- writing up the analyses of the data

Variables to be examined:

Recidivism

Demographics - ethnicity, date-of-birth

Prior felonies and incarcerations

Current convictions and sentences

Level of supervision, including SVP status

Status of Evaluation - completed or not

Oregon scoring

Any new filings or arrests

Recidivism will be broken down to show sex offenses versus non-sex offenses.

It was questioned as to why the study is only looking at offenders who have successfully completed treatment or supervision. The reason is because these offenders have gone through the procedures prescribed by the Standards.

There will be no comparison group for this study. Results will be compared to national studies and states that do not have Standards in place.

A report of the overall sample will be given, not just those deemed as successful.

It was noted that the definition of “Failed Terminations” for the study should be consistent with the definitions used by the agencies from which the data is pulled.

There was concern over the definition of “filing” as used in the definition of recidivism.

There was concern over the use of the terms “successful” and “unsuccessful”.

**Juvenile Standard Evaluation Study-** For this study, in-depth file reviews (approximately 100 files) will be conducted and will be evaluated along with a comparison group.

The study group sample will be comprised of juveniles sentenced for a sexual offense from the metro area and a rural mountain community, as well as an eastern rural community. Sentencing will have taken place between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007.

Recidivism rates and data from January 2004 will be pulled. January 2012 is the target date for the file reviews and data pulls.

The control group will be comprised of juveniles sentenced for a sexual offense from the

metro area, the same rural mountain community and the same eastern rural community. Sentencing will have taken place between the dates of July 1, 1998 and June 30, 1999.

Recidivism rates for sexual and non-sexual offenses and data from January 2004 will be pulled based on the State definition of recidivism.

Variables to be examined from the time they were sentenced:

- Demographics
- Living situation
- Income level of family
- School situation
- Employment activities
- Mental health diagnosis
- Drug/alcohol abuse

Variables to be examined after adjudication:

- Evaluation information
- Date of PSI
- Ongoing needs assessments
- Polygraphs
- Any physiological assessments
- Treatment information

January 2012 - File review and data pulls

Amy will reference the BJA Standards Implementation study and documenting other reports. It was suggested that placement and placement outcome data should be more accurate if the information was pulled directly from the paper files.

## **Break**

### **Intent to Apply for Students-Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky and Missy Gursky**

At this time, all listed providers or those seeking listing are required to fill out Intent to Apply paperwork within 30 days of beginning practice. Until now, students/interns have been excluded due to the fact that they may not always choose to continue in the field. However, the students who do want to continue are not following the same set of rules applied to other applicants since they have not submitted the Intent to Apply paperwork. This has caused a sort of dual system for the Application Review Committee (ARC) and staff. Having this dual system has caused problems in review process as well as the provider listing process.

The Intent to Apply process involves submitting a supervision agreement, fingerprint card and \$39.50 for a background check.

At the last meeting there was a motion to approve the requirement for students to submit the Intent to Apply. Missy Gursky requested the motion be tabled until the Board could hear from providers who work with student interns on a regular basis. The motion was

tabled. Staff put together an online survey and sent a mass email requesting that treatment providers participate in the survey.

After reviewing the survey, ARC is recommending that students need to submit the Intent to Apply. As a student, an extended period of two years will be allowed for the applicant to meet the Associate Level requirement. It was noted that an extension is always possible for students as well as all other applicants.

**Discussion:**

- It was questioned if dual background checks are really necessary, as many providers already require a background check. Because of the system set up with CBI, the SOMB needs to submit a separate request in order to receive flags on any future activity of the applicant.
- Implementation could be confusing; will someone who does not have an Intent to Apply be allowed to do individual sessions? ARC has found it difficult to draw the line on sitting in a session versus actively participating in a session. It was decided that Offense Specific treatment should be held to the standards, therefore requiring the Intent to Apply.
- How does ARC act on the Intent to Apply in order for the student to participate? Currently, anyone who conducts offense specific treatment has to file the Intent to Apply within 30 days of starting to work with this population. The background check is then done. This is more of a notification process for the SOMB rather than an approval process. However, students have not been required to submit the Intent to Apply. Upon review of this dual system, ARC has a concern about the inconsistency with the Standards.
- It was also noted that the student who may be working with this population will not get credit for these hours because the hours used to calculate the requirements are based upon when the Intent to Apply was submitted.
- Is the Board creating a greater hoop for those who may be interested in getting into our field? This is not a field with a high recruit level anyway. Interns should not be given a great amount of responsibility to the treatment process anyway. By requiring the Intent to Apply, the SOMB is making sure the minimum criteria are met (no criminal history and supervision). It was suggested that there might be a way to compromise with the requirement for students. By predetermining the student's level of interest in working in the offense specific field, the agency and the SOMB would have a more realistic idea of what to require of the student. It was explained by Missy that ARC felt it should either be for all students or no students; too many levels/categories make it hard for ARC and Staff to keep track of. It was also suggested that the supervising agency might inform the student on the process/requirements in eventually becoming a listed provider. Can the agency and SOMB team together on the background check and share the expense and results?
- The SOMB has no purview over someone who chooses not to be listed but is

providing offense specific treatment. This would have to be referred to DORA.

- The supervising agency should also receive a notice that a regulation (student providing offense specific treatment without an Intent to Apply) is not being followed and the agency should be put on notice.
- If they did not fill out an Intent to Apply, would they be able to use the hours when moving to the next level of listing? Why doesn't the Board allow hours, as they would still need more hours to complete the intent process? Is there a way to compromise by letting them go with a certain number of hours without an Intent to Apply? It will be really hard for ARC to track.
- It was noted that not all interns are entry level as has been discussed here today. They could also be fully certified therapist working on a higher-level degree; and the Intent to Apply should also apply to them.
- If a provider moves to Colorado from another state, the Board would count their experience in the other state. Why can't the Board do this for students as well?
- Cost for students is a big issue because the agencies generally do not cover this cost.
- Is the real purpose of the Intent to Apply to get the background check? Why is the background check connected to the Intent and the supervisor agreement? The SOMB wants to know who is out there practicing and whether the student is being supervised.
- Is this an agency issue rather than an intern issue? It was noted that a lot of agencies already submit the Intent to Apply for the intern already.
- Maybe it is just the name that is intimidating - could the name of the document be changed? Why is the Intent to Apply the only way to find out who is providing offense specific treatment in the field? Shouldn't the responsibility of reporting intern information be put on the supervisor/agency?
- The following suggestions were made:
  - Can the Board rename the document to Disclosure of Supervision/Intent to Apply form?
  - Can the Board make the agency/supervisor responsible for reporting to the SOMB who is doing an internship with the agency?
  - By making these changes, risk will be managed, interns will not be able to practice for long periods of time without submitting the Intent to Apply and interns will be following the Standards.
- Will these changes require a change in the Standards?
- The Board needs to trust the supervising providers (who have been approved by the SOMB) in their supervision of the interns.

A motion was made to send this issue back to the committee. The motion was seconded. A recommendation was made to have the committee refer to appendix F for guidance. It was also suggested that the committee investigate if DCJ can submit to CBI a request for flagging of an individual whose background was submitted by another agency.

Motion with the suggested changes passes with no opposition and Two abstentions (Missy Gursky & Jeff Geist).

## **Lunch: Networking**

### **Research Corner- Victimization Information- Marcie Howell and Erin Amundson:**

This presentation was postponed, as Erin was called away for an emergency. Please look over the handout and give it some thought for the January meeting.

### **Juvenile Advisory Board Agenda: Juvenile Registration Responsibilities**

It has been brought to the attention of the Board that there are some issues surrounding the responsibility of juvenile registration in a couple of areas. One area is the youth in residential treatment facilities. The problem is two-fold, getting the youth registered and getting the youth de-registered when transitioning out of the facility. The other area is with youth that are committed through the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) or through a county placement and placed in treatment facility. In both cases there is confusion as to who should actually be taking the juvenile for registration as well as paying the registration fee. The Police Department is most concerned that the actual registration or de-registration take place. In Aurora, the fee has been waived in such cases. In referencing the statute, the responsibility seems to be defined in the cases where the youth is committed, but the statute is less clear in the case of residential placement.

A goal of today's discussion is to get the perspective of residential treatment provider facilities and how they handle this situation. Provider perspective - it is the parent's responsibility for registration and deregistration if parental rights are intact. At a facility, an employee usually takes a bunch of kids to register and has been questioned by parents as to the right of the employee to register the juveniles. Mary Baydarian offered that in Park County, when a juvenile is placed in residential treatment, there is an order of parental rights that assigns the agency the parental right/responsibilities. Carla Spence offered that at the Griffith Center for Children in Douglas County, the agency has a transport driver that takes a van full of youth to be registered twice a week. For deregistration, she fills out the basic information and faxes it to the Sheriff's Office. Ted Romero offered that in Denver County the agency of placement has been responsible for taking the kids in for registration.

Who is responsible, the parents or the agencies? If a treatment program is accepting kids, shouldn't that be the agency be responsibility? It was suggested that the SOMB should suggest that who ever has physical custody of the juvenile be responsible for registering and deregistering. What does the statute say? Note that each county process will differ.

It was asked of Doug Stephens (Denver Police) if Denver is having problems with this?

Doug will check and report back. In Denver, all are registered, even those who cannot pay. They just focus on registration compliance.

If there is a hardship, monies from the county may be used to pay for the fees. There are limits within Human Services as to what can be paid for with the funds. Who pays the sex offender surcharge? It is the responsibility of the parents or the youth to pay the surcharge. Monies collected from the Sex Offender Surcharge go to pay for evaluations. Can surcharge funds be used for juvenile registration fees? At this point the fund is running at a deficit.

What is happening with deregistration? Juveniles are not deregistering and the agencies do not always take responsibility for deregistration, especially in cases where the exit from the treatment facility abruptly. Agencies can do this via phone or fax with many police departments. Carla said that at Griffith, deregistration is built into their discharge process. This should be part of the protocol to close a file. What are reasons for abrupt exits from residential treatment? Supervising (Probation) agent is responsible for informing the legal guardian about registration as well as verifying registration and de-registration. The problem usually lies in the lack of deregistration and the juvenile can end up being registered in multiple jurisdictions.

How can the SOMB facilitate this? It was suggested that Judy Kinyon at CBI be contacted to see if there is a way trigger a flag in the system when a juvenile is registered in multiple places. Is this a training issue or a documentation issue? When dealing with parents or agencies about the registration process, make sure that the deregistration process is kept in the forefront of all in the Multi-Disciplinary Team's mind.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded. Motion passed with out opposition.

## **Meeting Adjourned**