

CARR Board Meeting

2/21/23

9AM

Zoom Call

Meeting called by:	Standing Monthly Call	Type of meeting:	Monthly Board Meeting
Facilitator:	Butch Lewis	Note taker:	Kevin Fox
Timekeeper:	Butch Lewis		
Attendees:	Richard Montoya, Cali Peterson, Gonzalo Ardavin, Tonya Wheeler, Alia Andrews, Dara Keller		

Minutes

Agenda item: State of Recovery Residences report to state **Presenter:** Butch Lewis

Discussion:

372 known recovery residences operating = 3,741 beds

238 CARR certified recovery residences = 2,634 beds

Colorado is possibly 3rd unofficially behind California as 2nd and Florida 1st w/ the most recovery residences in the U.S.

CARR trying to expand to 18 rural area counties:

- These counties all have some type of specialty or drug court w/ out recovery residences.
- These counties do not have representation by Oxford House
- Of these counties, have no recovery residence at all.
- As of December 31st (72) recovery residences applied for CARR cert. in 2022 of which (69) were inspected/certified.

No revocations in 2022.

No changes to fees in 2022.

CARR Board of Directors added new members Dara Keller w/ Messner Reeves, LLP and Tonya Wheeler w/ Advocates for Recovery – Colorado

There were (19) grievances filed against recovery residence programs in 2022; of these found legitimate, the principal corrective actions were either improvements to program staff training or changes to program policies & procedures.

Conclusions:

CARR's annual State of Recovery Residences sent to BHA including overall number of recovery residences, overall number of beds and other recovery housing details. Brief highlights of CARR's rural recovery housing expansion initiative. Addition of new CARR Board of Directors. Of the (19) grievances filed with CARR in 2022 against recovery residence programs, vast majority were resolved with improved staff training and/or policy changes.

Agenda item: Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) requests **Presenter:** Butch Lewis

Discussion:

What info is CARR required to provide?

- CARR is independent of the state and our contract with the state does not include surrender of information.
 - Example: A while back, the City of Denver asked CARR to provide addresses of recovery residences (RRs) to members of the community (which later was found the intent was so members could pursue those RRs in an effort to remove). State's AG's office determined CARR was not required to release that information.
- After recent conversations with the state, CARR may be amending our policy on sharing of information, EXCEPT regarding; 1) addresses of individual RRs and 2) bed counts of individual RRs.
- Only three (3) people in the state has access to RR information; Butch Lewis (Executive Director), Kevin Fox (Administrator/Inspector) and Jon Arlanda (CARR database administrator, contractually obligated to protection of info).

- Butch – Do we (CARR) want to start providing at least # of beds at individual RRs to requests?
- Dara – What if CORA requests were for RR applications?
- Butch – CARR would provide redacted (addresses) versions of the applications.
- Cali – CARR should not provide individual addresses nor bed counts.
- Alia – If the City of Denver is changing their laws to no more than eight (8) unrelated and city requests bed counts from CARR, is CARR violating ordinance(s) in withholding bed counts?
- Cali – That info should be on the sober living (or RR) operator NOT on CARR.
- Dara – CARR is not responsible for enforcing zoning regulations of municipalities. Houses (RRs) are in charge of complying with municipal regulations.
- Butch – CARR requires houses (RRs) to comply with residential (building) codes for health/safety/maintenance.

Conclusions:

CARR may be amending the current policy on the release of RR information to CORA requests through redacted versions protecting addresses and bed counts of individual RRs.

Agenda item: Grievance against [REDACTED] **Presenter:** Butch Lewis

Discussion:

CARR received a grievance filed by female former staff, who was the house manager, stating her and the male owner/operator carried a brief, relationship in which this client was placed as the house manager. Per the grievance, the owner/operator ended the relationship and client felt obligated to voluntarily leave the residence/program.

The client states there was another incident that occurred between herself, while she was admitted to a treatment center, and this owner/operator while he was employed at the same treatment center. Because this allegedly occurred at a BHA-licensed treatment center, this incident would fall under the Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies (DORA).

Regarding the recovery residence (RR) . . .

- On Sunday, February 19th at 7PM, during the RR’s scheduled weekly house meeting, Butch Lewis, Cali Peterson and Kevin Fox arrived at the residence unannounced to interview any/all female clients and the owner/operator present investigating the grievance allegations and to assess the well-being of the clients in residence.
- Prior to the unannounced site visit, the former house manager who filed the grievance advised CARR that her phone had deleted the entire text thread between her and the male operator.
- After interviewing all the female clients individually in the residence and the male operator:
 - No substantial evidence was found of physical involvement between the former house manager and the operator.
 - Clients interviewed all indicated they were comfortable and supportive of the male owner/operator; although a few clients indicated feeling possibly a preference or favoritism exist with other clients by the operator.
- However, screen shots of text message thread provided by the male owner/operator to CARR indicate severe boundary issues.

Cali – “. . . a lot of inappropriate behavior/responses evident in text messages.” Can CARR require special training on this? Would like to sit down and talk more with operator. Distressing he does not show adequate concern over this issue.

Butch – Typically, CARR requires training as a solution, but since he is the sole owner/staff perhaps CARR requires him to attend a 3rd party training within 90 days. We could use Arapaho County or Aurora PD offices as a possible venue for follow-up conversation(s) with the operator.

Gonzalo – We (CARR) have the right to handle this matter swiftly and seriously.

Tonya – My experience with treatment centers says this would be a “guilty until proven innocent” situation.

Cali – If up to her, the owner would not be allowed to operate a recovery residence. Taking girls to meetings alone. Should have shut down the situation immediately but didn’t.

Gonzalo – At a minimum, CARR should do something serious pending the outcome with the BHA licensing director.

Butch – Recap of lengthy discussion:

- CARR requires this owner/operator to sever all ties and relationships with clients in residence.
- CARR requires the owner to allow a 3rd party operator to maintain operations of the residence for the next 90 days, as the current house leader only has three (3) weeks in residence in this position.

- CARR requires the owner to advise the 3rd party operator for the interim.
- CARR requires the owner to attend a 3rd party training.
- CARR requires the owner to revise his program's policies & procedures.
- Cali to facilitate a conversation with whoever 3rd party operator has agreed to stand in during the 90 days.

Conclusions:

Butch has a meeting scheduled with Thom Miller, Dir. Of Quality & Standards at the BHA, Tuesday 2/21/23 @ 11AM to discuss this grievance. Pending the outcome of that consultation, CARR to review recommendations of suggested actions discussed by the CARR Board of Directors here.

Other Information

Observers:

Resources:

Special notes: