

COLORADO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

October 10, 2025

CDPS is committed to the full inclusion of all individuals, and we are continually making changes to improve accessibility and usability of our services. As part of this commitment, CDPS is prepared to offer reasonable accommodations for those who have difficulty engaging with our content. As an example, documents can be produced in an alternative file format upon request. To request this and other accommodations, or to discuss your needs further, please contact me at 720-520-9817 or via email at ellen.creecy@state.co.us.

ATTENDANCE:

Domestic Violence Board Members Present:

Yolanda Arredondo, Andrea Bradbury, Erin Gazelka, Jessica Fann, Lori Griffith, Tally Zuckerman, Tracey Martinez, Jeanette Barich, Hon. Kolony Fields, Michelle Hunter, Roshan Kalantar, Raechel Alderete, Karen Morgenthaler, Karen Crabb, Jennifer Parker, Chris Chino, Sandra Campanella

Domestic Violence Board Members Absent:

Nil Buckley, Sara Carty

Staff Present:

Jesse Hansen, Caroleena Frane, Reggin Palmitesso-Martinez, Brittinie Sandoval, Rachael Collie, Yuanting Zhang, Ellen Creecy, Taylor Kriesel, Paige Brown, Chris Lobanov-Rostovsky

Guests:

Philippe Marquis, Aims Babich, Mary Gupton-Johnson, Danielle de Boer, Kaye Knaub, Catalina Jaramillo, Kristina Carrera, Lesly Castillo, Pam Mancini, Sade Lee, Miranda Encina, Ashley Mendez Ruiz, Kevin Velez Negron, David Karnes

INTRODUCTIONS:

The meeting convened at 9:04 AM.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) introduced herself and welcomed the Board and guests.

Caroleena Frane (ODVSOM Program Manager) introduced herself and welcomed the Board and guests. She indicated that quorum was present and noted that the meeting was being recorded. She indicated to contact Taylor Kriesel if anyone is experiencing technical issues, and asked that Board members and guests sign in.

The in-person DVOMB members introduced themselves.

Taylor Kriesel introduced the online DVOMB members.

The ODVSOM staff introduced themselves.

Taylor Kriesel introduced the online guests.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) asked if there was consensus to approve the agenda. There was consensus.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) then moved to the next agenda item related to reviewing the September Minutes.



REVIEW AND VOTE ON SEPTEMBER 2025 MEETING MINUTES: (Attachment #1)

Tally Zuckerman (DVOMB Member) made a motion to approve the September 2025 Minutes as presented. Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

Session ID: 907822

Question #1

The motion passed with 14 votes to approve the September 2025 meeting minutes, 0 votes to object, and 2 votes to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	87.50%	14
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	12.50%	2
Totals	100.00%	16

**Karen Morgenthaler and Chris Chino voted yes in the chat.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Staff Announcements:

Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Program Coordinator):

- October is Domestic Violence Awareness month and there will be a special presentation and activity during today's meeting.
- Both Karen Morgenthaler and Jennifer Parker are nearing the end of their second term as Board members, with their terms ending in January. Applications for their Board positions will be opened and distributed this month.
- Following today's Board meeting, there will be a reception for the DVOMB's 25th anniversary.

Taylor Krisel (ODVSOM Staff):

- She asked that members of the public please do not stop the meeting recording as the meetings must be recorded for public record. If a member of the public does stop the recording they will receive one warning before being removed from the meeting.
- ODVSOM Conference:
 - The conference recordings have been uploaded and were made available for those registered on August 1, 2025. The recordings will close on November 1, 2025.
- 2-Day LGBTQ+ training will be held on October 14 and 15, and is open to Providers, Treatment Victim Advocates (TVAs), and other professionals in the field.
- Training Events:
 - DV102: October 20
 - DV103: November 3
- The DV Summit will be held on October 29 and 30, registration is closed.
- The Office of Community Corrections is hosting a conference on October 21 and 22, registration closes on October 10.

Reggin Palmitesso-Martinez (ODVSOM Staff)

- She asked that members of the community please reach out to her if they would like to request a virtual community roundtable to be held in 2026.



Brittinie Sandoval (ODVSOM Staff)

- The deadline for the Application Review Committee (ARC) to review submitted materials at the November meeting is November 3.

Board Announcements:

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) announced that Parole began using the eOMIS system recently and there have been issues with implementation. She asked for people to reach out to her directly if they are having difficulties with eOMIS and she will pass that information along.

Future Agenda Items:

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) announced that the ARC would like to discuss the possibility of adding a period of compliance option for ARC decisions regarding Providers as issues arise. Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Program Coordinator) explained that a period of compliance would serve as a less intrusive option compared to a compliance action plan when issues are noted by ARC.

Sandie Campanella (DVOMB Member) noted that ARC discussed when there are Standards Compliance Reviews (SCRs) and deficits are found, there are limited options when the Provider is Not Currently Practicing (NCP), and the ARC would appreciate more guidance on how to handle these situations. Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Program Coordinator) clarified that NCP Providers are removed from random selection for SCRs, but sometimes providers will not have been practicing for several months without moving to the NCP status. ARC requires documents from the last six months when reviewing SCRs. Caroleena noted that having documented procedures for how to handle these cases would be beneficial to the SCR process to ensure compliance.

Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member) shared that NCP Providers are still under the purview of the Board and she has experienced similar issues with the SOMB. She noted that she would share whatever procedures and processes the DVOMB creates with the SOMB to remain consistent across Boards.

Public Announcements:

None.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SECTIONS 5.03, 5.04, 5.05, 5.06, 5.07, AND 5.08 (PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW and VOTE): (Attachment #2) - Erin Gazelka, DVOMB Vice Chair, Jesse Hansen, ODVSOM Program Manager

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) introduced this as a public comment review and voting item and referred to Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Vice Chair). Erin discussed that at previous Board meetings, Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Program Manager) has presented and provided context on the revisions to Section 5. The revisions were sent out for public comment last month and the Standards Revision Committee has reviewed the public comments that were submitted. Erin noted there was a lot of support for the revisions and some criticisms, and there appeared to be some confusion around language that was already in the Standards. There were also some comments about redundancy and Erin explained that it was important to preserve the parts of Section 5 that were working in addition to making revisions. Jesse shared that the public comment was largely supportive, with one no response. Based on one of the public comments, there was a minor revision to Section 5.08 to reference the second contact frequency table for clarity.

There was Board discussion about sentencing lengths not aligning with minimum time frames for clients to complete treatment based on their risk level after completing a post-sentence evaluation. In these situations, it is likely that an extension would be needed and that would have to be communicated between the Provider and supervising officer.

Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Program Coordinator) shared in her experience, one year sentences are typically not enough time to complete treatment. A Board member discussed that in their legal practice, they are always negotiating sentences with the District Attorney, and District Attorneys often agree to one year sentences.



A Board member discussed that they frequently request extensions because the client's treatment level is not known until the post-sentence evaluation is completed. It was discussed by another Board member that this is useful information to pass along to defense attorneys when they are advising clients.

Jesse noted that some judicial districts might choose to use the CASCADE risk assessment, where supervising officers can score the static risk level which will help give an indication of supervision level. The Board discussed the necessity to also have these discussions with clients so they can be as successful as possible in treatment. A question was asked if there was information to share with stakeholders about risk level and treatment needs to better communicate with clients. Caroleena noted that a client's risk level is not always initially apparent.

Jesse shared there was public comment about the financial impact of some of the revisions to Section 5. He discussed that there is flexibility and Provider autonomy in these revisions to support clients who want to work harder in treatment in order to successfully discharge sooner. Erin noted that there are always financial concerns, particularly with forensic clients. She noted that revisions to Section 5 allow for more leeway to better incentivize clients.

Erin noted there were some concerns from Providers regarding if the optional first phase of treatment would be required. Erin discussed that she regularly sees clients in denial and is comfortable starting the treatment process with clients in denial, but other programs might be formatted differently and the first phase allows for those interventions as needed. Jesse discussed that the optional first phase of treatment is not just about addressing issues of denial, but can be used to offer services to clients with higher static risk scores and barriers to treatment as soon as possible instead of waiting for treatment.

Board Discussion:

None.

Audience Discussion:

None.

VOTE TO APPROVE REVISIONS TO SECTION 5.03, 5.04, 5.05, 5.06, 5.07, 5.08:

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) made a motion to approve the revisions to Section 5 as presented. Sandie Campanella (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

Session ID: 907822

Question #2

The motion passed with 16 votes to approve the revisions to Section 5 for public comment, 0 votes to object, and 1 vote to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	94.12%	16
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	5.88%	1
Totals	100.00%	17

**Yolanda Arredondo voted yes in the chat. Chris Chino abstained in the chat.*



Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Program Manager) noted that the implementation date of revisions to Section 5 is targeted for August 2027. Caroleena (DVOMB Program Coordinator) shared that there will be ample training and support from staff to support these changes.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SECTION 7.06(I)(E) (PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT): (Attachment #3) - Jesse Hansen, ODVSOM Program Manager, Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Program Coordinator), Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member)

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) introduced this as a presentation, discussion, and voting item and referred to Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member). Jessica explained that proposed revisions to Section 7.06 were made in response to changes in mandatory reporter laws for community victim advocates. Community victim advocates used to be mandatory reporters of suspected child abuse or neglect. The new law, effective September 1, 2025, states that community victim advocates are no longer mandated to report child abuse or neglect. Treatment victim advocates are considered community advocates. Paige Brown (ODVSOM Staff) clarified that the Victim Advocacy Committee wanted the entire sentence of the statute in Section 7.06, and the discussion point was added that while TVAs are considered community advocates, Providers may still carry the label of mandatory reporter.

Board Discussion:

None.

Audience Discussion:

None.

VOTE TO APPROVE REVISIONS TO SECTION 7.06(I)(E) CORRECTION TO TELETHERAPY CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

Tracey Martinez (DVOMB Member) made a motion to approve the revisions to Section 7.06 as presented for public comment.

Andrea Bradbury (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

Session ID: 907822

Question #3

The motion passed with 16 votes to approve the revisions to Section 7.06 for public comment, 0 votes to object, and 1 vote to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	16
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	1
Totals	100.00%	17

**Yolanda Arredondo voted yes in the chat. Chris Chino abstained in the chat.*

Break: 10:10 am - 10:40 am



PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SECTION 6.0 CORRECTING TELETHERAPY CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS (PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW AND VOTE): (Attachment #4) - Jesse Hansen, ODVSOM Program Manager

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) introduced this as a public comment review and voting item and referred to Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Program Manager). Jesse explained that there was language in Section 6.0 regarding teletherapy that could be misconstrued by Providers and clients. The previous language stated that clients agreed to not have anyone else in the session unless approved by the MTT, and the proposed new language states that clients agree to uphold all confidentiality requirements (i.e., of the group and with their Provider) and not violate the integrity of the treatment process. The revisions went out for public comment and were unanimously supported.

Board Discussion:

None.

Audience Discussion:

None.

VOTE TO APPROVE REVISIONS TO SECTION 6.0 CORRECTION TO TELETHERAPY CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS:

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) made a motion to approve the revisions to Section 6.0 as presented.

Erin Gazelka (DVOMB Vice Chair) 2nd the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

Session ID: 907822

Question #4

The motion passed with 14 votes to approve the revisions to Section 7.06 for public comment, 0 votes to object, and 1 vote to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	93.33%	14
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	6.67%	1
Totals	100.00%	15

**Yolanda Arredondo voted yes in the chat. Chris Chino abstained in the chat.*

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SECTION 4.03 REGARDING DIVERSION (PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW AND VOTE): (Attachment #5) - Caroleena Frane, DVOMB Program Coordinator

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) introduced this as a public comment review and voting item and referred to Caroleena Frane (DVOMB Program Coordinator). Caroleena explained that there was ambiguity in the Standards regarding diversion and that the DVOMB does not always have purview over diversion cases. A discussion point was added to provide more guidance regarding prosecutors being allowed to request domestic violence treatment and evaluation to be performed by an Approved Provider, but there is no specific language around treatment. Providers may consider using the Standards as a best practice guide, but not all diversion cases fall under the DVOMB's purview for evaluation and treatment. Section 6.0 previously stated that pre-sentence evaluators had to be the ones conducting evaluations for diversion, but that has been changed as well. The public comment received mixed responses both in favor and against the revisions. The Standards Revision Committee reviewed these comments and did not change the language. Jesse Hansen (ODVSOM Program



Manager) noted that the public comments not in support of the revisions seem to articulate some confusion around purview, and the Standards Revision Committee discussed that a training to discuss these concerns and confusion would be useful.

Board Discussion:

None.

Audience Discussion:

None.

VOTE TO APPROVE REVISIONS TO SECTION 4.03 REGARDING DIVERSION:

Jessica Fann (DVOMB Member) made a motion to approve the revisions to Section 4.03 as presented. Raechel Alderete (DVOMB Member) 2nd the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

Michelle Hunter (DVOMB Chair) asked staff to prepare the vote.

Session ID: 907822

Question #5

The motion passed with 17 votes to approve the revisions to Section 4.03 for public comment, 0 votes to object, and 0 votes to abstain.

Responses	Percent	Count
Yes	100.00%	17
No	0.00%	0
Abstain	0.00%	0
Totals	100.00%	17

****Chris Chino and Yolanda Arredondo voted yes in the chat.***

SCREENING OF THE LAST DROP

Board and Audience Discussion:

Paige Brown (ODVSOM Staff) acknowledged that while there is not overt physical violence in this film, it is still very difficult to watch. She offered her support for anyone that needs to debrief or discuss their feelings after watching the film. Paige asked Board members for their initial thoughts or takeaways from the film. A Board member discussed that the film highlights how a relationship can slide into domestic violence, through incremental exertions of power and stripping the victim of their agency. The film also shows the cycle of violence, and how domestic violence does not have to involve physical abuse. The Board discussed that there is a public misunderstanding of domestic violence, and domestic violence can include acts that are not necessarily illegal. There were also discussions that mental or emotional abuse can take a long time for victims to recover. A Board member shared that they appreciated the depiction of how victims can be isolated from people in their lives, and how victims can be very sensitive to the world around them.

An audience member shared that they were conceptualizing how they would treat the offender depicted in the film and how they would score them using the DVRNA. They noted that they would focus on entitlement within treatment, and that it would likely take a long time to get the offender to understand why their behavior was problematic.



A Board member appreciated that the film depicted how victims can doubt their feelings when those in their lives are supportive of their relationship and view the offender's behavior as positive or loving. Another Board member shared that presenting this material to juveniles is very important and educational to teach about the nuances of relationship dynamics.

VIOLENCE FREE COLORADO PRESENTATION ON LGBTQ+ SURVIVORS

Miranda Encina, Ashley Mendez Ruiz, Kevin Velez Negrón, David Karnes, Violence Free Colorado

The presentation is summarized below:

- Violence Free Colorado includes collective action, advocacy and policy, social change, and tailored support.
- Domestic violence is a pattern of coercive behavior, rather than an isolated incident, used by one person to gain power and control over another in an intimate or formerly intimate relationship.
- Domestic violence, intimate partner violence; victim and survivor; offender, abuser, and person who causes harm are all terms used in this field.
- 2SLGBTQIA+
 - Two-spirit
 - Lesbian
 - Gay
 - Bisexual
 - Trans
 - Questioning
 - Intersex
 - Asexual
 - Plus
- Common pronouns: she, he, they. Ze/zir are neo pronouns with no gender. Some people may use multiple pronouns or no pronouns (name only).
- Misgendering is referring to someone using incorrect pronouns or names.
- If you use the wrong pronoun: notice when it happened, acknowledge and apologize, and verbally correct yourself and move on.
- What is identity abuse?
 - Threatening to out
 - Intentional misgendering
 - Denying access to health
 - Minimizing experiences
 - Using derogatory names or slurs
 - Power and control tactics
 - Threats of system interventions
 - Nonconsensual language or touch of someone's body
- Power and Control in 2SLGBTQ+ partnerships:
 - Using coercion and threats
 - Digital abuse
 - Using emotional abuse
 - Using privilege
 - Intimidation
 - Using children
 - Identity and cultural abuse
 - Denying and minimizing
 - Using isolation
- There are biases and assumptions in our understanding of domestic violence and our understanding of 2SLGBTQ+ communities.
- There are financial impacts for survivors of intimate partner violence over a lifetime.



IN HER SHOES ACTIVITY

Board and Audience Discussion:

A Board member discussed how previously when they have done this exercise it was really highlighted that victims can feel extremely overwhelmed navigating the process of getting help and the judicial system, and it can feel easier to return to their abusive partner than continue on with the process.

Justice centers were discussed as one-stop shops for victims to receive services and include a district attorney, medical examiners, and human services. There is currently a justice center in Jefferson County, Denver, and there is one coming to Adams County. Family justice centers can give a lot of support to victims so they do not have to spend so much time trying to find the resources they need.

The Board and audience discussed that during this exercise they felt the exhaustion that victims feel having to navigate this system, and that every decision a victim makes has a price and consequences. The facilitators noted that this exercise is based on real cases and real people, and reminded Board members that every victim's choice is different and is based on survival and protection, and sometimes for victims it can be safer to stay than leave.

There was discussion about how it can be easy for those in the field to feel like they know what is best for victims, and this exercise highlights that victims are the ones that know best for their situation. Victims and survivors can come in contact with a lot of well-intentioned people that end up doing harm. Audience members discussed how they enjoyed the addition of an LGBTQ+ story within the exercise, and emphasized the importance of being victim-centered and supporting victims with what they truly need. It was also discussed that when helping survivors it is important to consider their personal concerns such as legal status and what options might be available for them.

A question was asked about the impacts of federal funding disruptions on family justice centers, and it was clarified that the family justice center in Jefferson County is open and still serving as a resource.

There was discussion about the nuanced approaches to supporting victims, and how listening to victims stories is crucial when trying to assess lethality or power and control. It was also discussed how victims can experience additional forms of violence due to overlapping identities, and there can be distrust with victim resources like family justice centers.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:59 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

Ellen Creecy, Program Assistant



Name	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Andrea Bradbury	1	1	1	1	1
Erin Gazelka	1	1	1	1	1
Jeanette Barich	1	1	1	1	1
Jennifer Parker	3	1	1	1	1
Jessica Fann	1	1	1	1	1
Karen Morgenthaler	1	1	1	NP	1
Lori Griffith	1	1	1	1	1
Michelle Hunter	1	1	1	1	1
Chris Chino	1	3	3	3	1
Nil Buckley	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Sandra Campanella	3	1	1	1	1
Sara Carty	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Tally Zuckerman	1	1	1	1	1
Yolanda Arredondo	NP	1	1	1	1
Roshan Kalantar	1	1	1	1	1
Raechel Alderete	1	1	1	1	1
Kolony Fields	1	1	1	NP	1
Tracey Martinez	1	1	1	1	1
Karen Crabb	1	1	1	1	1
Total	Yes = 14 No = 0 Abstain = 2 Total Present = 16	Yes = 16 No = 0 Abstain = 1 Total Present = 17	Yes = 16 No = 0 Abstain = 1 Total Present = 17	Yes = 14 No = 0 Abstain = 1 Total Present = 15	Yes = 17 No = 0 Abstain = 0 Total Present = 17

Q1 Motion to approve the September 2025 Minutes.

Q2 Motion to approve the revisions to Section 5.0.

Q3 Motion to approve the revisions to Section 7.06(I)(E) for public comment.

Q4 Motion to approve the revisions to Section 6.0.

Q5 Motion to approve the revisions to Section 4.03.

