

## **Arizona Sex Offender Management Board Meeting Transcript**

January 16, 2026,

**AI-GENERATED, CONTENT MAY BE INCORRECT**

**Beth Goulden:**

Afternoon everyone.

Thanks for being here.

Happy New year.

**Inaudible** Thank you.

It's Friday, January 16th, 1:33 PM.

I'm going to call the meeting to order the first thing we're going to do is roll call Mr. Cook.

**Benjamin Cook:**

**Suzanne Cohen:**

**Ana Young:**

**Sheridyn Miller:**

**Jeff McClure:**

**Scott Naegele:**

**John Fanning:**

**Farah R. Lokey:**

**Brecken Blades:**

**Beth Golden:**

**Blake Barney:**

**Katie Krejci:**

**Melanie Opheimer:**

**Shane Neal:**

**Nicolas Pawlowski:**

**Jamie Balson:**

**Steven R Gray:**

**Jenna Mitchell:**

**Victoria Baldner:** Council for the board.

**Ashlesha Naik:**

**Jim Hanratty:** Polygraph examiner.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

I'd like to turn it over to Colonel Mitchell to just go over some housekeeping items,

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell, just a few housekeeping things for the room. This is the first time we've used this room.

Restrooms are out the hallway to the right, about halfway down the corridor.

We do have mics.

Please turn them on before you speak and state your name in addition to posting the audio recording on the website, we will be posting a transcript, so it's very important that you say your name before you speak or it will look like staff is talking the entire time.

We do have some signs for Chairwoman to hold up to remind you, as you're speaking instead of interrupting you and disrupting your flow.

Aye, the next working. The mics do seem to be working.

We didn't think they were going to, but they do seem to be working, so we will use them.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you, Miss Mitchell.

Can we move into call of the public?

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Right, Eric Raulfestone.

**Beth Goulden:**

Say it again. Just a reminder, everyone speaking has three minutes and there will be a timer that will go off.

Thank you so much.

**Eric Raulfestone:**

My name is Eric Raulfestone.

Members of the board.

I want to begin acknowledging the seriousness of your work. Public safety matters.

Victims matter.

Accountability matters.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

No, I just don't.

It's connected yet.

Give it just a second, please. I'm sorry.

There we go.

**Eric Raulfestone:**

Now that was great.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

OK. Please start over. Thank you.

**Eric Raulfestone:**

I want to begin by acknowledging the series of your work. Public safety matters victims manner.

Accountability matters.

Not here to dispute those principles.

I'm here because the policies you're established now, your mission statement, and founded foundational standards to shape how this board operates 40 years to come. This is a pivotal moment in public equity, but matters.

I've been on the registry for over 25 years.

It was 25 years I have made offensive free.

I've complied with all requirements under Arizona law. I've followed the rules, set my obligations.

And lived up to public member of your Community working maintain stable housing. It's part of my family. Instinct tended to my neighborhood and faith community.

I've done what the system asked of someone who's seeking rehab and stability.

Yeah, under Arizona's current framework, time is not treated as a mitigating factor.

20 plus years of lawful behavior does not mean if you change how a classification is managed. In practice, lifetime registration functions as a presumption of permanent risk, even when real evidence demonstrates otherwise.

Arizona classifies people into three levels as you know that examines items such as prior convictions and victim characteristics. While many statutory changes mean.

No longer.

You see that level, one of generally excluded from public registration, the broader inaudible.

Such as age, health, stability and decades of offense.

Free carry.

Little weight. This is not consistent with science.

Research consistently showed that sexual offenses sharply with time offense free and with age, and that after long periods such as 20-30 years.

Risk for many individuals, approaches to that of general population.

The Arizona system does not meaningfully incorporate those findings until after registration. Appearing or relief medicine.

Thank you for your time.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell and I would like to add that we have board members present that came in during that statement, Peter Moray and.

**Joseph Kelroy:**

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Joseph Kelroy

The next speaker is Joe Williams.

**Joe Williams:**

Thank you for this opportunity.

I'd like to address the current registration situation in the state when I was a juvenile in 1987, I was convicted of sexual assault that occurred during the robbery.

It's given 10 flat years in adop.

Ted, that got out for 10 months, was sent back for failure to register.

Completed that in September of 99.

Got off parole in November of 99. I've been arrest free.

Complainant free and a law abiding citizen.

In the meantime, I understand why was a Level 3 at the time given my conduct in prison, given my criminal history. Given all the issues I presented to the state. But in the intervening years I built a business, had a family, stayed out of trouble and two years Ago this Level 3 was sued a customer who did not pay.

They found out my past.

They used it to get the license revoked.

They went and told the law enforcement officials I was not abiding by my registration requirements and was living in Tucson, which is demonstrably unprovable or demonstrably, provably false.

It was used to deny me my gainful employment to shut down the business I worked for years to build after my brother was killed in Iraq fighting for this country.

And I now live month to month.

Try not to lose my home trying to stay a law abiding citizen.

And I would like to implore this board to please consider the human factor in these laws. I I have a daughter.

She's 21.

She's at university honor student, a masters program.

Doesn't drink, doesn't do drugs. I want her to be safe.

I understand all of this.

I understand, given my conduct in prison and my criminal history, where all of this came from, what I'm asking you to do is to provide a path for people like myself, who?

Demonstrate.

Proven that I have pain to change this classification slash notification because as I documented in the statement I submitted to this board online, it was used as a cudgel to retaliate against me.

We want a judgment against that customer, but I lost my job. The business was taken and she tried to get me arrested for something I didn't do.

So it asked you to please factor that in and your decisions in the future.

And however you adjust this programming to balance the needs of public safety with the balance to balance with the need to allow people like myself who committed their crimes when they were a juvenile to reenter society. For the record, I'll be 57 this year, so that was.

40 years ago. So what?

I'm asking all of you to do is.

That what I understand is natural feelings towards a person like myself aside and say, what is the greater public to appreciate your time? Thank you very much.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell and now call Kitty Harrington.

**Kitty Harrington:**

Hello, my name is Katie Harrington and thank you for being so responsible and carrying out and protecting the public and responding to the victims of crime.

I respect the role and the research and the evidence that plays, and I'm here to share a long term policy that looks like inside of a family across decades.

My husband was convicted in 1987.

He accepted responsibility.

What followed affected not only him, but my children and me.

We experienced fear.

Harassment and deep shame.

Our church chose to discipline our whole family.

I question myself constantly wondering what I did wrong, didn't I?

Why didn't I see this?

What helped us to survive that period was professional support. We had access to counseling and social services and helped us to stabilize and heal based on the understanding at that time, families in that situation like ours were encouraged to pursue treatment, accountability and stability.

With guidance, we chose to stay together and relocate as we could rebuild our lives.

That decision worked for us.

We live in a fence free in the same home since 1989.

Registration was not part of my husband's original sentence.

Over time, laws changed and new requirements were added.

We complied with every one of them.

Still, the increasing public nature of these laws brought renewed harm. Relationships changed.

Trust ended in faith communities especially.

The label that often mattered more than the decades of conduct and isolation continued. My husband is classified as a Tier 1, the lowest risk category for many years, he's lived quietly, contribute to his community, and helped others when he could. In 2024, he suffered a severe stroke after weeks of intensive care and repeated rehabilitation stays, he was left unable to walk.

With significant vision loss and neurological complications.

I now have become his full front caregiver. In June of 2025, during his routine registration, we learned that tier one information had become public.

We had not been informed of this at all.

The impact was immediate.

People stopped speaking to us.

Neighbors questioned whether my husband should live in our home, pressured to sell our house is on a constant basis.

Support has completely disappeared and our our age. This has been devastating.

We no longer have the ability to rebuild the way we once did.

I feel judged more harshly than my husband, as though I am responsible for what happened.

This disclosure also makes it extremely difficult to find long term care facilities.

May release refuse admission, leaving families like ours without any kind of support. Even the original victim has expressed concern that the public posting caused reserved harm, renewed harm.

I'm asking you to consider legislation that moves away from lifetime registration, particularly for low risk, individuals have demonstrated.

Decades of lawful behavior.

A tiered time limit duty to register for the opportunity.

Renew or remove.

We better reflect current research, aging and rehabilitation while still keeping priority of public safety.

I thank you so much for your time.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

So we've had additional board members join us.

We we now have Missy Musick here and Amanda Atkins.

And I would call on Suzanne Dodson.

**Suzanne Dodson:**

OK.

First, I want to say that I am deeply sorry for victims who have endured violent, predatory crimes.

My question today is if the state has the discernment to respond to cases that fall outside the norm. In August of 2020, I moved my 18 year old son into the ASU dorms for his freshman year of College, COVID style.

But life there was business as usual, with parties and drinking and everything that goes on in the dorms.

Weeks later, my son invited an acquaintance to his room.

That young man invited 2 girls he knew from Tiktok.

They arrived drunk after midnight on a Tuesday. The girl who pursued my son would not give him her name or any personal information, but believing she was a fellow college student, they had sex.

He admitted this to campus police because it was consensual and that was confirmed in the girls interview.

Umm.

The girls were 14.

My son was charged with negligent child abuse.

I'm gonna just go back because I paused there and they arrived after midnight on a Tuesday, but they were 14 and he had no information about her. He was charged with negligent child abuse.

He was sentenced to 10 years probation.

His true friends, his peers, have remained by his side because they know who he is.

But he's prohibited for being with them in normal settings.

He can't use his phone to communicate like 20 year olds do.

He can't even go to a sports bar, even if he doesn't drink to socialize with his friends and Co workers.

Yet he can go to target and Walmart on a Friday evening where minors regularly gather, and I find that logic impossible to reconcile.

Along with probation, he must attend a weekly sex offender treatment program, even though he was not charged with sex crimes.

And he is not on the registry.

Every week he must sit with men who committed.

Did.

Admittedly ugly, violent, intentional predatory crimes. In his words, he doesn't speak of this because no one needs these details.

That's therapist only information for someone trained to deal with it. Because I'm not coping well with knowing this myself.

Says this is the population that he has repeatedly told he is the same as.

In this program, they must write a detailed defense narrative, and when he writes statements such as if I had known she wasn't a college student, this never would have happened.

He's reprimanded for failing to take responsibility and not learning his lesson.

He's currently attended more than 200 meetings.

He spent his 24th birthday on the suicide hotline.

He's isolated and lonely, and we're not dismissing the fact that he broke a law, but the severity of this punishment has changed him in ways that I can't believe the state of Arizona intended. I worry every day for his mental health and safety.



My point today is that outside of the courtroom, no one will distinguish between negligence and predation.  
What do you think?

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Kim Drogosz.

**Kim Drogosz:**

Dear Committee members, I'm speaking to you as a concerned parent and advocate for individuals with neurodevelopmental differences. My family's recent experience with the justice system has shown me first hand how urgently our laws need to evolve to recognize the realities of neurodivergent, particularly when addressing online viewing offenses.

I'm deeply grateful to Chairwoman Golden, who testified before the Senate committee in February of 2024. Highlighting that a neurodivergent individual of 20 years may function as a function with a cognitive capability of a 14 year old. Her testimony resonated profoundly with me because it reflects exactly what occurred in my son's case in 2023, my son was arrested for viewing inappropriate content online. On October 17, 2024.

His counselor strongly recommended an autism assessment.

I immediately provided this information to our attorney.

However, our attorney addressed advised us that if there were any delays, the judge and the prosecutor would have been upset as a result, on October 22nd, 2024, five days after the recommendation from a psychologist before anyone understood my son's neurodevelopmental challenges, we entered a Settlement conference.

We accepted a plea agreement that included A5 year prison sentence.

The assessment showed that my son is indeed.

Neurodivergent he scored in the 9th percentile for facial recognition and social.

Cue interpretation, though, 24 years old at the time of testing, he functioned cognitively at approximately a 17 year old level, applying that same developmental lag to the time of the 2021 offense. His functional age would have been closer to 14.

This experience has made it clear that our legal system must better distinguish between online viewing behavior and hands on offenses, particularly when neural developmental disabilities are present.

Failing to do so not only harms individuals like my son.

But it diminishes the credibility and fairness of our judicial system.

I respectfully urge you to consider legislation recommendations that requires mandatory neural developmental evaluations before settlement conferences for plea agreements or sentencing in applicable cases, distinguished clearly between online viewing offenses and hands on offenses.

Provide training for attorneys, prosecutors and judges on neurodivergent.

Ensure a sentencing guidelines account for cognitive and developmental age, just not chronological age.

Allow judges to intervene with judicial discretion in exchanges for first time online offenses to enter treatment as a as a probation instead of incarceration, and make it retroactive to lower.

Incarceration, overcrowding.

Modifications during polygraph testing, parents guardian advocate to be present during testing questions in such a way that a neurodevelopmental individual can interpret. Modifications to the Arizona sex offend assessment screening profile with regulatory community notification.

This questionnaire is difficult for a neurotypical individual, let alone a neurodivergent individual.

Thank you for your time, your service and your willingness to listen to families affected by this issue.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Now Call on Eileen Kato.

We'll come back to Eileen, Justin Colum.

**Justin Colum:**

Thank you. Members of the board.

My offense happened when I was 13 and I was charged at 14.

Always a level one involved a family member.

I live with a label that most people never take the time to understand. Being on that registry is not just a legal status, it's a lifetime shadow that follows me into every part of my existence.

It affects where I can live, where I work, or I can go and how people see me before they ever speak to me.

I can walk into a room having done nothing wrong that day and still be judged as if my past defines my entire worth as a human being.

Opportunities disappear before I'm even given a chance to explain who I am today.

Jobs I'm qualified for or denied housing becomes a major objection.

Friendships feel fragile because the disclosure can instantly change how someone treats me, and the constant fear of being exposed or misunderstood.

Bates, an anxiety that never truly turns off what people don't see, is the daily effort it takes to live responsibly.

To stay accountable, to heal, and to grow, all while carrying a stigma that offers no room for redemption.

There's no finish line, no moment where society says you've done enough for free.

This reality is impacted my mental health. My sense of safety, and my belief that I'm allowed to move forward.

Is affected my family and the people I love.

It has made simple things like feeling hopeful about the future feel incredibly happy.

And I stand here to say this.

I am more than than my worst mistake.

I'm not the sum of a label.

I'm a human being, capable of change.

Responsibility, empathy and contribution. All I ask for is what we claim to value as a society, accountability.

And compassion, safety and fairness, consequences and the possibility of redemption because growth is real, healing is real and people are more than their past. Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

And now call on Trenton Davis.

**Trenton Davis:**

Good afternoon.

I'm doctor Trenton Davis, the member of the public, and someone who has been in public touched by the system from both the survivor and offender sides.

I'm here today to express my concerns with legislation on the agenda for the current state legislative session, specifically, Senate Bill SB1092.

Given that the board is charged with advising the legislature on policy, I'm inquiring as to if and when the board will be exercising this.

Duty to advise.

I also implore the board to advise the legislature.

To oppose this bill in lieu of the significant research and debate that is needed in addition to the serious constitutional and civil liberties questions, changes to the current probation termination structure of proposed by SB1092 will impede successful rehabilitation, negatively impacting public safety. I'm sure the Board is aware I won't go into the detail I have here. You know that sexual recidivism rates are exceedingly low, especially for those with no prior criminal or sexual offence history.

And recidivism declines each year as an integral reigns defense, free in the community. Completion of treatment further reduces risk.

Early termination of probation removes barriers to employment, housing and pro social community ties, facilitating successful reintegration.

This supports public safety. We know that the probation departments and treatment providers operate under chronic staffing shortages and high caseloads, limiting their capacity to focus on higher risk individuals.

Continued supervision of low risk individuals who have demonstrated supervision and treatment compliance and sustained offense free behavior consumes limited resources without public safety benefit.

I'm confident that most good faith stakeholders agree, several of whom are board members and have in fact alluded to the these challenges in past meetings.

Finally, we know that judges are uniquely positioned to determine eligibility for early probation termination, guided by input from probation

departments and treatment providers.

This is a model that has worked in Arizona for decades, which this bill threatens to upend. In light of this, I again am inquiring.

As to the board's plans for expeditiously confronting these issues with legislators and to express their evidence based opposition, I understand that the board is still in its nascent stages, but individuals directly affected cannot tolerate delayed action because of supposed vacancy once laws are passed, it is effectively Impossible to reverse them.

I'd like to remind the board that it is comprised of experts possessing.

Are working and ready to be deployed. Knowledge that can directly shape the direction of those policies and in turn the resulting real impacts on people's lives. Thank you.

Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell, I now call Marina Fleetwood.

**Marina Fleetwood:**

I have my hearing aids up all the way and I can't hear anything.

Good afternoon, Madam Chairwoman and members of the board.

My name is Marina Fleetwood and I speak today on behalf of my husband. In 1986, my husband committed a serious crime that caused harm.

He was convicted of attempted child abuse and sentenced to 10 years of probation.

He accepts full responsibility.

He does not excuse it. Minimize it or forget it.

It remains no shameful act of his life.

He completed every requirement of his sentence, including extensive treatment and a 1996 successfully completed probation.

With a civil rights restored since then, for nearly 40 years, he has lived offense free.

He has worked, paid taxes, supported his family and contributed quietly to his community for the past 22 years, we have been married.

We were active in our church and deeply connected to family and friends.

He was classified as a Level 1 offender, the lowest risk category and for decades his information was known only to law enforcement.

That privacy allowed accountability without destroying a rehabilitation. In 2024, new legislations changed that for the first time since its conviction His name, photo and home address were made public retroactively nearly four decades later. While this is described as regulatory, the impact is clearly punitive.

It exposes not only him, but me and NSA spouse and our family to stigma, isolation and potential harassment.

Over time, registry requirements have expanded long after his sentence ended.

The result is a system where punishment never truly ends.

The rules change the goal post move the burden grows.

Closure is denied even to those who have done everything the law required.

We are not asking for sympathy. We are asking for policy based on evidence. Research consistently shows that individuals who are decades offense, free treatment compliant and assess as low risk.

No more likely to reoffend than the rest of the general public, or even members of this board.

Lifetime public registration in these cases does not prevent crime and does not improve public safety. Arizona allows second chances in most areas of law, but for people like my husband, he has denied any meaningful way to demonstrate rehabilitation.

We respectfully ask that Arizona create a clear, lawful path off the public registry for individuals who have proven through decades.

Of lawful conduct that they are no longer a threat to public safety. Public safety is not strengthened by endless punishment, but by evidence-based laws that recognize rehabilitation and allow proven low risk individuals a way to move forward.

Thank you for your time.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell, I'll call Darren Stanley.

**Darren Stanley:**

After all those, I don't know if I really have anything worthy to say.

Everyone is articulated really well today.

First, I'd like to thank the Board for moving the meeting from Monday to Friday.

Monday is my chemotherapy day each week.

I worked out perfect for me, so thank you again. As far as comments on the agenda, I would like to remind the board of what I said last time I spoke. Part of the mission statement should be to help and reduce the amount of harm caused the offender's family, spouse and children.

Also face legislation on facts not fear.

Also on the agenda, I saw the post-conviction sex offender petition or presentation. With that being said, I would like to say the 12 years I spent in prison was wasted time other than the 2 1/2 years I spent at STOP a program.

That is underfunded and not available on all sites of Fender Yards.

That's where you're willing to put if you're willing to put in the work, you will learn a lot about yourself.

And why you made the decisions you made?

When I was released, neither of the places I went to therapy considered the fact that I had completed the program in prison.

I was told by the director of one facility what I learned in prison was just baby steps.

They would teach me so much more.

That was completely a false statement. I taught people in my groups, things that were never covered as far as post conviction, there's a need and a way to be off the registry.

While on 4th Ave. Jail, I saw an elderly man brought in.

Failure to register.

It was brought in from a nursing home and clearly was in the early stages of dementia.

I wish I would have documented all the crazy stories I've seen with names and case numbers. This is one of the reasons I think someone like me, who has lived through this life should be on this board.

It doesn't have to be me, just someone who has experienced it from the other side of the fence.

No one on this board is even close to my demographic.

Thank you for the time and allowing me to speak.

I'll see you next month.

If anyone would like to speak to me in person, I would be happy to come to your office at your convenience.

Thank you so much.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell, someone left a phone at the sign in. If it's yours, let me know.

We'll call on, OK.

I'll bring it to you in just a moment.

I will call on Matthew Ellis.

**Matthew Ellis:**

Hi. Hello. My name is Mathew Ellis and I'm going to thank the board for your time today.

So I spoke a month ago, but in case you don't remember, I'm on lifetime registration for.

Hi. Sorry, can you guys hear me now, OK.

I'm at the Ellis.

Thank you for your time today.

I appreciate being here. If you don't Remember Me. I smoked last month and I'm currently on lifetime registration.

I've completed all my necessary issues with court. My time, all my fines and fees. Everything's been done.

I'm even off probation after I was successfully completed probation, I went back and sought out my therapy for myself.

Paid out of pocket.

I was diagnosed with complex PTSD.

I know everyone's different and that's kind of the problem this board has but a lot of the punitive actions the court take took, you know, some of them are very traumatic to certain people.

Not to everyone, but I think if you guys are really going to OK.

So let me step back a second.

I don't envy the task this board has in front of them.

Your guys responsibility and goal, in my opinion, is to police sexuality across different cultures, ages, races, religions.

And technology and to find some common ground with that.

I wanted to give us a little perspective here.

I I don't really need to give you my sob story, even though it's given me a lot of enlightenment when I see the problem is is you guys are trying to assess true character and growth from a past incident and I'm sure everyone here has done something terrible.

Or something.

You know, everyone's done something worse in their life.

Imagine if we judged each one of you on the worst thing you've ever done and said. Hey, because you did that. You're probably gonna do it next day, even though anyone in here is capable of so.

The risk assessments and the polygraphs and the out of pocket expenses, we need to do to find our own assessors, you know, to demonstrate our true growth and character development is very hard. I feel like the risk assessments and the polygraphs are kind of like a hammer and.

A nail when the only tool you have is to identify risk, and if they're lying or not, you know it gets a bit tricky and it seems like most of your issues here are around intent. If you dig into sexuality.

I'm not an expert, but I think it's.

Their lived experiences, the stereotypes for how a predator becomes a predator.

Typically they've been through some difficult issues and been abused themselves or seen it modeled.

What I've heard today is there's a lot of people that were not abused and have not seen bad behavior modeled that made a mistake, and it seems like this institution has a big problem figuring out what their true intent was, right?

And I'll end with this.

I just think it's a travesty. If you say somebody is worse than they are, but they're really not.

So you're, you know, and it's also a travesty if you let a guy that is risky.

Out 'cause. Then he's, you know, in a place where he can reoffends.

You have to err on the side of caution.

But when there's only three levels, if any guy messes up on those levels, it kind of muddies the waters for everybody else on that level. So sexuality is complicated. It's steep. There's many reasons until we have technology to put it on our brain and see what they were thinking in the past like minority report. I just humbly ask that this board really consider. What the metrics are you're looking for and how you get those over time? How can we see true growth? How can we find their true character? How can we figure out their true intent at the time? Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell. We'll go back and call on Eileen Kato.

Does not appear that she's present, Madam Chairwoman. That concludes the call to the public request that were received.

**Beth Goulden:**

Miss Baldner, did you want to give us an update on?

**Victoria Baldner:**

So that is on the agenda. I had envisioned running through version three and just addressing the comments in order. Thank you to board members that had something to say. There were there's some typos in miss and someone caught them. I appreciate your input there. Also some questions brought up that I think. Need to be discussed by the board. They aren't for me to decide. If anyone has. A different view of how we should tackle this. Please speak up. Necessarily, if we're going to have a valuable conversation, everyone will need a copy in front of them. We didn't provide paper to everyone.



I don't know if everyone has access on a phone. If not.  
Major Mitchell, do we have a A?  
A possibility of throwing up the version three on the monitor.

**Jenna Mitchell.** Yes, we can do that.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Does anyone need the monitor?

OK.

Give us a moment.

I don't want to get started until everyone can look at it.

Madam Chair, perhaps.

We can take agenda items out of order and we'll get this moving in the background and OK.

Thank you,

**Beth Goulden:**

I think.

The b is going to be quick.

We just wanted to give an update on the mission statement and writing principles.

The guiding principles are still under review and revision, so I'm hoping to bring that back to the board to the next slide.

So that would be.

I think C is a little bit more of a discussion.

Subcommittee reports.

I don't think that will be too long.

I want to call on our chairs of our subcommittees to maybe just give everyone a brief overview of where they're at and then.

I have some thoughts I'd like to share as well.

Mr. Naegele, do you want to start?

**Scott Naegele:**

Sure, I can do that.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

**Scott Naegele:**

Very briefly, where we have the first meeting scheduled for once a week, we haven't met yet.

As a subcommittee, we will do that next week and we'll have one report back after having had that first meeting.

**Beth Goulden:**

do you want to give us an update on adult?

**Brecken Blades:**

So we have the subcommittee meeting scheduled for Monday, February 2nd.

That's going to be virtual meeting.

So similarly, we'll have more report after that.

Scheduled.

**Beth Goulden:**

Just to share, you know my thoughts with everyone on as subcommittees are, umm, have been formed and as much of our work is going to be done on the committee level and then brought back to board as a whole.

I would like to come up with some goals for this year for the board as a whole and work with the subcommittees, and I will make every intention to make all of those meetings of the subcommittees, but I think some goals. Umm.

Would be helpful and also.

See about having a subcommittee chairs work together on top priorities and goal for each subcommittee, and I think it makes sense in my mind to tackle some of the same thing together.

So it makes sense when you're bringing things back to the board.

And perhaps even in some chronological way.

Whether we're talking starting with Presentence expectations and standards evaluations, things like that.

So those are kind of some of the initial thoughts I have, but I kind of wanted to set some goals and priorities and work with the subcommittees to make sure.

It makes more sense until our tagging tagline, some of the same things at the same time have any.  
Does any have any thoughts on that or but those are some of the thoughts I was kind of mulling over in my head.

**Scott Naegele:**

Scott Naegele, I I concur.

In fact, I was hoping that there would be some measure of discussion about that so that we don't find ourselves unintentionally.  
Misaligning with each other.

Looking at issues that are not consistent on both fronts now, obviously there will be some differences.  
But I think structurally it'll be more similarities than there will be differences.

**Brecken Blades:**

I agree. I think if we look at the same sort of general topics at the same time, it will also be more cohesive for the board. Then when we bring  
back information.

Looking at makes it fall under the same things all at once and not asking the board to consider two totally different.  
So I'm gonna.

**Beth Goulden:**

Any other thoughts on that?

Great. Thank you.

Miss Mitchell, Virtual meeting update do we have an update?

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Yes, I thought you said in our last meeting we have procured Microsoft Teams premium, which is the platform that we will be using to do virtual  
meetings.

We are still testing and we will go live with that for the adult subcommittee on February 2nd and hope to have that ready for the larger board in  
March.

To offer a virtual option.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

**Jenna Mitchell:**

You're welcome.

**Beth Goulden:**

for the bylaw discussion,

you may thank you.

**Victoria Baldner:**

All right, step through this.

It's not my best to keep everybody awake.

Start on page two at Article 1.

We're at 1.3.

I don't see any issue with.

The deletions.

And one board member did point out tiny typo that I appreciate.

That needs to be changed.

If no one has anything to say about the proposed changes, I think we can go to the next page.

Specifically at 2.3 section 2.3 on page three, yes, we need to delete the word the.

So I don't think we need to talk about that.

Page 4.

This is a really good question and unfortunately I don't think this particular board member is present but.

I I wish she was here to weigh in on.

Her comment question.

Regarding reelection, can a person be reelected after his or her term has expired?

The answer is yes. For instance, a person serves as the chair and the different persons elected as chair. After the second chair's term expires, can the first person be elected to be the chair again? Frankly, if she envisions tweaking 3.1, I'd like to have a.

Discussion with her.

I don't know that.

Or I can go ahead and just draft.

But I believe she's getting at.

I would anticipate this is going to take a few other drafts, so it's it's laborious, but we want everything to be correct.

That was my thought. If anybody has any comments please let me know.

Moving on to 3.2.

I am in.

I am in agreement with the leading E speaking to the media is a very sensitive thing and everyone needs to realize that I don't take any issue with deleting that.

But this is a DPS board and DPS has a public information officer.

Those are the people that whenever the media comes to me as an attorney or comes to someone.

Whose staff?

Or someone who's in the chain of command.

And wants to talk.

All of us are trained to send them to the PIO.

So I might suggest that he be turned into something.

Fashioned in that manner, I hope that makes sense to everyone.

Does anybody have a comment?

Go ahead.

**Joseph Kelroy:**

Joe Kelroy, Is the DPS Communications division ready to take orders and Inaudible

**Jenna Mitchell:**

Jenna Mitchell, Yes, they are prepared and are available to provide response on behalf of the board. Thank you.

**Unknown:**

I would support that.

**Victoria Baldner:**

I appreciate your comment.

I think it's a good idea to have one point of contact.

This is a very large board.

It's just the best advice I can give you.

So anyone else

**Katie Krejci:**

I had a comment

so I just want to this is Katie Krejci

I propose that we deleted it because my concern is that if we're in a situation where maybe the board isn't on a consensus on something, what message we would be giving the public if we have a certain point of contact. So if we could have to defer to.

The DPS, like public information officer, are they going to then come to the board and ask our position on something?

**Victoria Baldner:**

I would hope so.

I don't see the utility in having a PIO.

Who just says whatever they feel like, but.

I think what we can do is instead of forcing the PIO to come to a board meeting, is maybe.

Have fashion.

Some kind of communication with staff and I can I can further discuss that, but I totally understand your point.

Yes, they are not going to say whatever they feel like saying. I didn't mean it to sound like that.

No, I OK.

**Katie Krejci:**

I didn't think you were.

You intended it to be that.

Do we need to add then something in the bylaws about?

Like if we don't have a consensus on something, how we approach a package from them?

Yeah, I just don't know.

That's another word.

**Victoria Baldner:**

I mean my.

So my gut reaction is if you don't have a consensus, you don't have a consensus.

It's not really.

And the public's allowed to know that they're entitled to know that.

I suppose you know, considering how long this board is going to be running that may that may actually end up happening, but it is what it is, right?

So I think the PIO is there to just make sure that the public's informed and we really can't.  
I don't want to spend things to make them sound better than they are, so I would never direct the PIO to do that.  
Does that make sense?

**Katie Krejci:**

Yes, that makes sense.

**Victoria Baldner:** OK.

**Katie Krejci:**

It makes sense that they would just pass on the message that,

**Victoria Baldner:**

yeah, the message that's in Board would like put out to the media if that. That's the the chain of the communication, yeah.

And Miss Krejci, she looks like you added a statue.

Thank you. Yes.

And G we're on the same page still. OK. Appointment of a vice chair,. Carolyn's not here, unfortunately.

Same question as for three one above. Can a person be reelected after his or her term has expired?

For instance, a person services the vice chair, then a different person is elected after the 2nd.

Can we go back to the first?

I believe the answer was yes.

**Brecken Blades:**

I I think I have a So I I think unless I misunderstanding or misremembering, I think that the.

Larger board turns out four years maximum.

So the chair serves 2 years and then someone else selected and serves two years.

And then it says, so long as that person's they'd be re elected.

So long as their term hadn't run out, even if their term was four years, they serve the 1st 2:00, then someone else served two in their board term would have expired.

That makes sense.

**Victoria Baldner:**

I think all of you are controlled by the number you pulled out of the hat.

The first day, right?

**Brecken Blades:**

Right maximum's 4.

**Victoria Baldner:**

The maximum is 4 and you don't all have 4, right?

So what are you?

If I'm following you correctly and I'm sorry, do you you want it to be more specific as to whoever's elected chair is controlled by the 2-3 or four?

**Brecken Blades:**

No, I'm just saying. I think that's the answer for it's it's, I think that the answer to her question is embedded in what's written there is because.

If someone and I, I could be misunderstanding.

But if someone if the chairs or the vice chair serves a term of two years and then they could be reelected so long as their board term had not been expired, if someone else,

**Victoria Baldner:**

I understand, I think

**Brecken Blades:**

2 years, then even if they had four, their board terms.

Be expired?

**Victoria Baldner:**

I think I need to add a sentence.

Yes, but like makes it more clear that the the controlling number is the one that you started with when you showed up.

Correct. Yes. In there. Thank you.

That makes sense now.

**Sheridyn Miller:**

May I add to that.

I think I think an issue might arise if a board.

Oh Sheridan Miller.

I think an issue might arise if a board member serves a term of three years and is elected during their third term to serve for two years. Would they?

Maybe I missed that.



Would they only serve one year and then a new vice chair be elected?

Or would they serve?

I know that's in a different spot in the bylaw.

It's like saying that here, if that's another reelection thing, this is just.

**Beth Goulden:**

Miss Baldner, correct me, but I believe we discussed prior that they, if you initially drew a two year, you're not automatically kicked off, right?

If you discuss that and that, yeah, that nothing says that you're.

Done.

**Victoria Baldner:**

You can continue as a pleasure of the appointing authority, OK.

So all you would have to do if you would like to continue is contact whoever appointed you because you're all formally appointed by.

Someone.

And and say like my two years is up next month, I'd like to extend another two.

May I do that?

And then we can go from there that way, but.

To Miss Miller's question I if there's somebody three-year who says I'm over this, I don't do it anymore. We're going to have an issue.

But I think we're just going to have to figure it out as it comes, unless somebody has a great idea.

Right now I don't.

So I'm not. I'm not going to.

**Katie Krejci:**

This is Katie Krejci.

So I think 3.1 and 3.3 address.

Miss Miller's concern or Doctor Miller's concern about what occurs if there's a vacancy.

And so then I think if board members can actually serve longer than four years, even though they're four years at the time, then I think I would ask that the attorney do add the additional language that answers yes to Carolyn's question because it sounds like someone could.

Have a four year term. Initially serve two years as.

As a chair not be the chair, the next two years and then be a reappointed to the board for another four years and then they could then be re

elected as the chair.

So we can make it clear that it doesn't have to be consecutive terms.

**Victoria Baldner:**

OK, I can do that.

OK.

It's 1/2.

Page 5.

Oh, conflict of interest.

This is a bigger issue. Should the chair be the person to appoint an acting chair if the chair has a conflict of interest, wouldn't it be better to utilize the process enumerated in 3.6?

That is a business question for all of you and I think.

One side.

To give you a little more information on what conflict of interest really means in Arizona, I think you're all going to have to vote on that.

So we have to table or at least for right now I don't really have an answer for 3.5.

Unless everyone thinks that that's a common sense.

Solution.

**Unknown:**

I think 3.6 reduces conflict.

Or I position with people. I leave any question at the table.

So 3.6 lessens conflict by the board.

You know selecting.

A placement because the board had another director.

The chair has conflict.

I would advocate whether it's 3.6 or other language.

Because we wouldn't want to leave conflict on the table I to SharePoint.

That that would be my question.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Well, clearly this 3.5 as it's written right now, doesn't contemplate that it's an issue.

It just says sure, as the conflict sheets to make somebody else.

And I think to Carolyn's point, she's like, I don't. Maybe, you know, given the nature of conflict of interest, it makes sense to not have the person

with the conflict pick their substitute.

I mean, am I right?

Is that and I'm not.

I'm not casting dispersions on anybody.

I'm just saying from logical standpoint I Carolyn's point is well taken and so.

Why don't I refashion 3.5?

To reflect what she suggested.

OK.

Moving on to page 6, we're in Article 4. Halfway done.

We're at 4.2 because the board is only up.

I remember this one.

She's not wrong again because the board is only meeting in person at this point.

Three days notice is not sufficient for those of us who have to travel to Phoenix.

She is in Yuma.

And admittedly, I apologize, Major Mitchell.

I don't remember what you said about how soon we thought we would have hybrids, and I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but I don't want to.

I don't want to create a rule and then have to have the board amend it because it's no longer an issue, although three days versus 6 days. What's I mean, you know?

**Jenna Mitchell:** March is the time frame,

**Victoria Baldner:**

she's not here to weigh in on what she thought, and she doesn't say what she thought would be reasonable.

I mean.

If three's not enough notice, I would feel maybe a week.

I mean, it's not up to me.

Somebody help me.

**Joseph Kelroy:**

I think the challenge with three.

I'm sorry. Joe Kelroy from a courts perspective, I think it's difficult for judges with the calendar.

Typically it's a month out, but obviously we're meeting monthly, right, so I think.  
For majority of non judges it might be a week, two weeks.

**Victoria Baldner:**

But I I haven't spent a lot of time contemplating special meetings.  
They're not called for in the statute.  
I have to wonder if they'll even end up being a thing.  
I mean, what I what I can do maybe is?  
have staff.

Respond to Carolyn and just say, what do you think is is?

Appropriate for outlying counties and go from there.

I don't know how everybody feels about that.

It may be. It may soon be a moot point, so I don't want to spend a lot of time worrying about whether seven days is enough or should be 10, or it should be a month.

**Judge Cohen:**

go ahead. Go ahead.

Suzanne Cohen

And Anna Young, I'm speaking for both of us.

I think there were the two judges off judicial officers on the board even a month.

Our calendars are set out till June at this point, right?

So we need for our staff to move all of our hearings.

We need the time.

I'm and I'm. I'm here.

I'm in Maricopa County,

**Victoria Baldner:**

but the nature of a judges, the nature of a special meeting is that it's like, oh, we just need, we need to do this immediately. And so I think that the sets of urgency is I think is inherent in a special meeting and unfortunately

I can't.

I don't think we can change that, but I understand your point.

I recognize moving hearings and moving things.

Is not. It puts a lot of pressure on everybody.

Mostly my staff.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Well,

but I just thank them for fuselage, right?

**Victoria Baldner:**

I recognize the difficulty and judge young you're in.

You're in avipai, so you're far away also.

Just period.

Special meeting, can't they do a conference call or a team meeting with a little more?

Well, like I said, I think this isn't gonna end up being a moot point, and that's why I didn't.

I didn't wanna stress out about it, but absolutely not.

Special circumstances emergency. Kind of.

I think it's.

I think it's the type of meeting as far as public bodies are concerned that has to do with like an emergency in a city or a town like there's a huge problem. Funds need to be allocated.

I don't really envision a special meeting issue coming up with this board, I just don't.

So I don't want anybody who's actually ever heard of Charter.

I know for a Board of Supervisors that to our our notices 48 hours.

Yeah, that's nothing.

And so if we have a special meeting, it comes up with a 48 hour notice.

We put it out and say what's happened right and whoever can come can come. It may be and as long as you have a majority of the board there, the quorum, we're fine.

And we do it online or we do it by telephonically. If we have to, because we just can't be there and maybe a 15 minute meeting, right?

There's not going to be a full dress rehearsal like, you know, come and show up, drive in two hours, go home. You know what I mean?

It's just it's a quick thing that we need, but I I can't really foresee having special meetings in this particular instance.

That's my position, so.

I may just leave the three days.

Sure, go ahead.

**Jim Hanratty:**

Special meeting. Obviously the public's going to be involved in this.

Or is this executive?

No, this is the same public, same public. We're held to the same notice.

Correct. Those are the problems well.

Notice is 24 hours.

**Jim Hanratty:**

What I'm saying is, if you have a special meeting, could it be an executive place under an executive meeting?

Kind of circumstances.

Not unless it was open call or conference.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Executive session is laid out in statute.

There's seven specific reasons, and an emergency is not one of them.

OK.

So unfortunately, unless it falls under legal advice, which is probably the only time.

This group is going to go into executive session.

The answer is no unfortunately. OK.

Madam Chair, I think I may just leave it at 3 days because I really think it's going to be a moot point once we go to hybrid.

I agree and I think trying to set our meetings monthly and in advance well, it's a different issue, yes, but I'm resting. You should leave it as is. OK, so I don't think it'll be it. Thank you.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Comment. That's perfect. I think that's fine.  
Moving down to 4.6 additions to the agenda.  
I wholeheartedly agree.  
The last sentence needs to be deleted.  
Thank you for catching that.  
And there were two of you that noticed that will come out.  
Inaudible Quorum, page seven and Article 5.

Question on that I I don't.  
Are you saying? Leave it in that we could bring an agenda?  
No.  
OK, good.  
Delete it.  
I'm sorry, just checking.

I will delete it. I'm saying. Whoa, stop.  
Thank you.  
Thank you.

**Victoria Baldner:**

All right, back to Quorum.  
Article 5. Does the definition of a quorum include vacancies?  
Yes it does.  
This board is 32 people by statute.  
We do not have 32 appointments.  
I believe there are three vacancies.

Quorum is calculated based on the number of spots that are supposed to be filled, which is how I came to the number 17.

I think I answered that question, but Carolyn's not here so.

Comment on page.

Eight. Honestly, I'm a little confused. I believe this needs to account for absences and conflicts of interest.

I'm not sure what she meant here. If anyone wants to take the time to try and.

**Katie Krejci:**

I think she's saying because it's at the chair shall vote on all motions. If the chair has a conflict, obviously the chair shouldn't be voting on that motion, but it shall.

So that would require the chair to still vote. OK, I think she's just saying add in tweak.

Yeah, tweak our shall vote on all motions before the board.

Unless absent or has a, they have a conflict.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Got it.

Thank you.

All right, moving on.

Page 9.

So I am not.

I don't have the conflict of interest statute memorized, and I was again hoping to ask Carolyn where that language came from.

What I can tell you is it's very specific in Arizona. This may have come from the statute, but I need to double check that.

Again, conflict of interest.

Is is really.

99% of the time involving money.

And this board doesn't really deal with money. Absent that, that one.

Subsection that I coded green for money.

Regarding.

A recommendation to the legislature about money. So for me to say you're never gonna talk about money is untrue.

I would like I will go ahead and make sure the definition is accurate. From what I know.

We've got conflict of interest in Arizona.

It's a lot longer than this, but I will make sure in version four that that's taken care of.

Almost done.



Thanks.

Comment JM 24. I respectfully disagreed with his reading.

Of 8.3 the way I read it, it actually means what he's retyped, but in the interest of being.

More clear.

I'm happy to adopt that language and and Miss Krejci since you had a comment.

Do you agree with what he suggests?

Sure, take your time.

**Katie Krejci:**

Yes, I agree with that,

**Victoria Baldner:**

OK?

We'll go ahead and adopt that unless somebody has a objection.

Article 12 12.1 process to amend bylaws.

This is another business decision. You all are going to have to have a discussion among yourselves to figure out which you prefer.

And I will.

Put that language in version 4.

**Katie Krejci:**

I would propose that we just do a two third majority of the Board of the board present at the meeting. You don't have to wait for a specific number of people to be here to make the changes.

Any rebuttal?

I agree.

Madam Chair, if you could do that.

Situation where 10 people show up and four people essentially would make a decision for 32 members.

That's not a quorum.

It's not a quorum.

**Victoria Baldner:**

You always we haven't run into this before.

You can do any business. 17 people need to be in this room.

And last but certainly not least, we have a question about indemnification.

This is this is.

Way more complicated than.

It sounds my first.

Comment about indemnification is that by laws?

Are rules about procedure that a public body wants to, you know, uses no guideline.

In, in my view identification is a question of law and specifically contract and I don't think an indemnification clause belongs in bylaws.

To like.

You oversimplify it.

Indemnification in Arizona is what it is.

And no matter what's in the bylaws, what is gonna control is what the law actually is. And so.

What I want to do is direct everybody's attention to the AGO Agency handbook that went out. I think almost everybody Chapter 7. There is a portion.

It's not that long, so I just want to read it since I have everyone's attention right now.

It's section or subsection 7.13.3 civil penalties in addition to suits brought in order to require compliance with prevent violations of or determine the applicability of the open meeting law. The AG may also commence a suit against an individual member of a public body.

For a knowing violation of the open meeting law.

In such a suit, the court may impose a civil penalty not exceeding \$500.00 for a second offense and not exceeding \$2500 for a third or subsequent offenses against each person who knowingly violates open meeting law.

This penalty can also be assessed against a person who knowingly AID, agrees to aid or attempts to aid in violating the OML.

This penalty is assessed against the individual and not the public body and the public body may not pay the penalty on behalf of or otherwise reimburse the person assessed. If a person who might otherwise be liable under OML objected to the action of the public body and the.

Objection is noted on a public record. The court may choose not to impose.

A civil penalty on that person.

So.

In a nutshell, and I need, I need you all to understand I'm not an insurance defense lawyer.

My concern for all of you is making sure no one violates OML because you are personally liable for doing that. Now to your question, and I'd love your input. Were you thinking about?

Everything outside of OML, like what would happen if I'm on a way to a board meeting and I get in a car accident.

Is that what you what?

**Katie Krejci:**

Katie Krejci. So someone just suggested that in bylaws they had work, been on other boards and that in other boards and the bylaws included identification clauses. OK.

I just asked the question, but if you don't think it's necessary, it's not something we use typically.

**Victoria Baldner:**

I. the bylaws that I've seen don't include it, but I hope I'm not.

I just want you to understand that the law about identification is going to be what it is.

It's not anything to really guide you or.

You can't change it by by the language that you put in the bylaws. If you want to know more about how you're indemnified by the state of Arizona, I'm happy to either consult with an attorney from risk management or bring in somebody to like, give you a power point

Because like I said, I'm.

It's outside the area of my expertise besides what I was able to just tell you.

So you can all think about that.

We can put it on the next agenda for, you know. Are we worried about it?

Like I said, you need.

You need mostly to focus on OML.

That's where you can get into a lot of trouble, and we would like to avoid that.

Any thoughts?

**Katie Krejci:**

This is Katie.Krejci, I think you answered it by saying that the bylaws can't essentially overwrite with the law, says

**Victoria Baldner:**

they absolutely can't.

But if you if you know you, if somebody thinks of something tonight after they get home and they're like, oh, I should ask that question, please send it to staff.

I'm here to get you answers.

I'm just not always the best lawyer to give you the answer immediately, but I will do everything I can to get you the right answer.

So.

I think that's it.

**Beth Golden:**

Thank you.

Thank you so much.

**Victoria Baldner:**

You're welcome.

**Beth Golden:**

Mr. Hanratty.

Thank you so much.

**Jim Hanratty:** again.

Polygraph examiner,. I'm going to put that up on the screen too.

Or we're just going to use the handout.

OK, perfect.

Hit the slide show.

There we go.

OK.

When I use the term PCSOT, it stands for post condition, sex offender testing.

It's specific to polygraph testing the overview and the summary today that I'll discuss is really just a very basic introduction.

We will also be posting the APA.

That's the American Polygraph association.

Guidelines that were updated in 2021, updating the 2009 revision that's gonna be posted on the DPS website. It is posted now. Very good.

It is not like secret or anything like that.

It's for public know observation and comment, you know, so you can see it at the APA website.

See it on our site.

Ultimately, we're gonna try to do as much transparency as possible and.

This is just brief.

So there may be some people in this room that have never worked with convicted sex offenders.

Possibly, and certainly they may have never worked with an organization that uses polygraph in an attempt to help treatments.

So let's talk about that summary of key components and guidelines.

So evidence based practice and evidence based approach is what we try to adhere to, and that's a scientific kind of theorem.

Base valid principles are things that are assumed or intuitively correct.

They appear to be correct.

They sound right, but they're not empirically proven or studied.

So whenever the research suggests that maybe.

We need to change how we do things, particularly polygraph.

Then we should be nimble enough to be able to do that.

The APA suggests that our guidelines.

Be open for that periodic review and make amendments when necessary.

The way we do polygraph today is much different than we did 10 years ago and it was much different than 10 years before that.

So the research suggests that we need to be nimble enough to change and accept those changes.

Hopefully, evidence based practices and how we're going to put our guidelines together will adopt the research and science of not only polygraph psychophysiology but also risk assessment, risk management, behavioral and mental health treatment, and particularly those that are related to those that have been convicted of a sex Offense.

Next slide please.

So the goals of a polygraph program for post conditional sex offenders really are designed to enhance public safety and improve that risk assessment and the management and the treatment planning that's involved.

For expediting meaningful change.

It also promotes the containment model. We talked about that at a meeting before where the roles are defined.

We'll get more into that here in a second.

It does involve a multidisciplinary collaboration and we're all working on the same goal.

Core principles of the program, based on guidelines would be obviously the evidence based approach, keeping in mind what the phase valid principles are and always adhering to the EB part of it.

That that collaboration, that's absolutely necessary in maintaining confidentiality and mandatory reporting. If we have to do mandatory reporting.

In Arizona, we are not mandatory reporters as polygraph examiners, but other states are, and certainly other members of the team are as well.

So that's important.

That's something that we'll do in the heavy work in the subcommittee level when we decide if we need to address issues of confidentiality. The next slide will be a little more specific about that.

Obviously, the respect and rights of the individuals and the dignity of those individuals that are going to testing is absolutely paramount as well.

Polygraph is not a Thai foot massage.

It's a scary proposition for anybody who's had to take a polygraph so that respect and the rights and the dignity of these individuals, absolutely important.

So this next slide is AZ Revised Statute 13406610 or 12 years ago.

I can say that a lot of folks got into some contentions about this. On what Treatment disclosures are and what isn't.

I'm not so sure it's too controversial.

Now I'm hearing from colleagues that it's pretty much put to rest, but we need to understand that if.

A person is in treatment and under supervision under post conviction statements. Prior statements made prior to behaviors before the conviction really aren't intended in any way to be used against evidence court law. That doesn't mean to say that if a victim comes along two years after they're in.

Treatment, of course.

That law enforcement will do their thing.

We just don't want to cooperate corroborate statements made from treatment and try to build a case against them. That's not what post conviction sex offender testing is about. So keep that in mind.

I would also ask that if there's any lawyers in the room that have had any experience about 131466, they can chime in anytime.

That's too many difficulties they may have had about that. I know I've had a lot of colleagues.

That were lawyers that.

Had questions and comments about whether or not there were problems with that.

So for example, if a person is on.

Probation. They're not talking about their sexual history, but they make admissions about behaviors that constitute possibly violations of probation or treatment guidelines.

Is that going to be used in a court of law? That's up to the treatment team to decide.

Judges during probation violation hearings, but clearly polygraph and treatment statements aren't used as evidence against them.

That's that's not the point.

I'll make that clear.

Additional principles regarding ethics and legal compliance.

Obviously the polygraph examiners part of the treatment supervision team.

That's that containment model we talked about before.

Polygraph is never intended to interfere with ongoing investigations.

As we step away, if there is an investigation from an outside law enforcement agency that is now involved with that individual, we're not there to assist them in their investigation.

We are there for treatment and probation and to expedite.

Their the ongoing monitoring and maintenance of those individuals while they're in their community supervision.

Known versus unknown allegations.

This is really important to understand that polygraph can really fall into two categories.

There diagnostic testing and then there is screening testing. Most of the tests that are done in post conviction sex offenders are screened with a few exceptions like the instant offense or a specific issue.

So keeping in mind that when we can, we will always.

Try to test for known allegations.

Are known event specific things.

And not try to mix that in with unknown behaviors, even though it doesn't invalidate the process.

You are kind of weakening the reliability of the test results, so the APA makes it very clear that we should really separate the two and one of the slides feature on will kind of highlight that.

Ethical professional roles, obviously.

Treatment provider can't be a polygraph examiner of the individual that they're treating.

Polygraph examiners, though they may be qualified, can't do the treatment, and vice versa.

That goes also for probation staff.

They they can't do that treatment of those individuals or the polygraph.

Uh, the number and length of examinations. That's gonna be uh spelled out in the guidelines. The APA provides a model policy for that most states.

Thank every state that I know that has a sex Offender Management board has adhered to that.

So we'll do that heavy work and outline that in subcommittee level.

Examination techniques based on the validated APA.

Meta analysis study that came out in 2009.

No 2010.

Actually, I think it was 2011.

Took about a year to put that to put that holding together.

So what?

That basically did.

Was provide.

Clarification on what techniques.

Met the 80% range or better for reliability.

And on the diagnostic end, they reached the 90% or better reliability.

For diagnostic, so some techniques didn't meet the need the grade, so they threw a couple of them out and obviously.

As the research changes, even by today's standards, we're doing testing that's different as far as technique goes than we did 10 years ago and.

I definitely will go through that when we do the the line by line.

Heavy work with subcommittee level of the guidelines that we're going to not at this level though.

Operational objectives. This is really designed for the 1<sup>st</sup> inaudible. So increased disclosure deterrence of behavioral, you know, behavior issues, problems that they.

May think about for their.

Thinking about doing or possibly they could get themselves involved and they want to be careful right there.

They're gonna get off the public bus when they realize a group of school children got on the bus and sat next to them.

They may be a little bit more proactive.

They may separate themselves.

They're gonna start thinking more.

They're gonna have an enhanced demonstration of compliance of treatment and probation plans. Also the polygraph process.

Is supposed to be proactive and intervene for behavior that might potentially put them at risk.

To reoffend in the community. We don't want polygraphs to be retroactive.

We don't want it to be like, OK.

It's too late. Found out.

So sad.

Now we want to be proactive.

We always want to be where can we best intervene in helping not only the convicted person, but also for public safety.

This is probably the most important slide for the day.

It's really decisions, decision support, polygraph is best suited for that.

Polygraph represents incremental validity. It's intended to assist professionals in making decisions regarding risk and safety.

It is not to supplant or replace or supersede the professional and their expertise in judgment when making decisions for.

Community and the offender.

There are problems with screening tests and the probabilistic nature of polygraph needs to be known and should be taken into account by those professionals.

When they're making those decisions. So.

We'll discuss that more, but for example.

If somebody has been reported that they are failing their polygraph test with zero information to validate that outcome.

That's not the way to go to a probation violation hearing.

That's a way to circle the wagons, figure it out.

Do some QC on it.

Maybe we need to look at it a little bit closer before anybody attempts to use that information as incremental decision support.

Success of hurdles is known in science. When we have screening tests, it's not just for polygraph, it's for medicals, for materials testing, what have you.

You know.

We start with multiple issues and screening tests.



Just then, we should when there's issue.

Narrow it down to a single issue.

Try to piece it or parse it out.

A lot of folks are under the impression that single issue exams are diagnostic.

This needs to be clear that they're not specific.

Issue testing is diagnostic.

Not to be confused with single issue exams when you're trying to clarify problems from an earlier mixed issue.

Just we need to be very careful about that success of hurdles is adopted by the APA.

It's highly suggested to do so and it needs to be put in the guidelines so that we're making sound decisions.

Confidentiality examiners are not considered mandated reporters. As I stated, other Community supervision team members might be.

We need to keep that in mind as well.

Operational defined terms. We all got to be operating the same sheet of music.

So every every state that has a sense of Fair management board has their own ideas about what's important for operational definitions.

But it needs to be clear that.

If a person is coming in for their polygraph and the polygraph examiner is trying to explain what these things mean, then we're really putting the cart before the horse.

So hopefully in the treatment process and in terms of their conditions on probation, contact is specified, what is physical content?

What is incidental contact?

What is?

What is minor content? What's a minor?

Also, things regarding sexually stimulating material, pornography and sexually explicit material.

Those need to be defined clearly, and we can't like blur the lines too much on that, particularly when we're doing polygraph tests.

Because that really kind of weakens the effectiveness of the questions being asked on the test.

OK. So specifically regarding the examination questions, the guidelines are pretty clear.

They have to be answered with a no.

They can't be confirmatory.

They're behaviorally descriptive. They're simple.

They're direct.

Easily understood by the examinee and they should be based on the vernacular of the test subject, not the examiner or someone else. They need to be time delimited.

That means that there is a specific.

Time frame.

Involved with it. If it's the sexual history, obviously it's before the conviction.

If it's the, it's an offense. It's about the offense.

And if it's maintenance testing, which we'll talk about in a second, it needs to be defined by time.

It can't be so all-encompassing in time that it really stretching the limits of what we can do with human memory.

So.

That's important that we have time delimited.

Time frames.

We have to eliminate assumptions of guilt or accusatory type questions. We're not testing them on their.

Veracity about lying about behavior, but we're testing them on behavior needs to be free from jargon or legal terms.

And here's a big one.

Mental state or intent

Oftentimes somebody wants to treatment provider or probation officer, wants to test for whether or not the person's intent was for sexual pleasure.

Particularly with the incident offense, we really can't test for intent or motivation or complete systems or perceptions. We have to keep in realm of behavior.

So it's important to understand the limits of what we can do ethically with polygraph test.

The types of PCSOT exams we standardized have been pretty much since about 2009, publicly speaking.

There has been some changes since the 2009 adoption of the model policy. In 2021, they changed some things around based on field studies based on practicalities based on input from what was happening in the field. For example the incident offense.

Is very clear on what we do with that and what the intent of doing that polygraph is for. If a person is in denial about the behavior itself.

They can use the polygraph to help with that denial.

The incident offense investigative.

Exam is a little bit more about testing the parameters of that behavior.

How much it happened when it happened?

Maybe there was some coercion or or force that was alleged.

By the victim.

Maybe there's some victim.

Compromised has to be done or or practically. If an offender is going to be reiterated or.

Reintroduced into the family.

Or maybe they may have opportunity as time goes on to have supervised contact with family members, for example.

Maybe the treatment provider wants to know specifically if there are issues that are important to them.

Wait a second.

It's an option to do.

We're not doing a whole lot of instant offense polygraphs these days because for the most part, the person will admit to the gist of the behavior. We're kind of moving on and getting on to other issues. We're trying to expedite things and move, move the ball forward a little bit.

All the types of exams on this slide are based on the APA model, with the exception of the prior.

Allegation exam the PAE.

That I put in here because this one didn't get the votes from the executive Committee and the subcommittee members at the APA.

It was a close call.

In 2021, they decided that if an organization or state wants to use single issue or specific testing, they could do that.

And we still have that option based on procurement contract, those are in the contracts that are given out.

I'll buy those individual counties. However, I think it's worth noting that the prior allegation exam might help.

When you can't get somebody to pass that sexual history and it's held over their head, they're already moving on to maintenance exams.

And they still haven't resolved the sexual history.

They still have it hanging over their heads, so sometimes that's because a prior obligation that is known to us has actually been parched out from sexual history.

Sexual history is more of a kind of a catch all.

Is there any other victims besides the ones we know about?

A lot of agencies and polygraph examiners think that, well, we can cover those prior exams in the sexual history, but that violates the tenant of having known issues.

With unknown issues. So I would suggest that we actually talk about that a little bit more at the subcommittee level and see if it's worthy of putting that in there.

I think it is the two states that have adopted the PAE or folks that were on those committees and in their States and they they thought it was important enough to put that in there and they had the field experience to realize that folks that were having difficulty in passing, their sexual histories had a better chance of passing their sexual histories once they put the prior allegation exams to bed just before.

The sexual history exam based on the 2021 format.

Is different than the 2009 format we used to have two different types.

But the APA, in their ultimate wisdom, decided that it's probably more practical just to put it all in one or to address it as one. You can parse those out if necessary, but a sexual history exam is really one that's solicited.

By treatment and they condone the API, condone the use of a documents.

Sexual history document, which is.

Clarified by the treatment providers. It's also accepted by the probation department and what we do currently is we allow the treatment providers of the probation officers to sign off on that before they come in for their Polygraph. In the old days, they would come in for their polygraph and maybe the first time they've act.

Gone through a very thorough inventory.  
Should be moments before they take the polygraph.  
It should be something that's kind of sanctioned by treatment and known to treat them.  
So it's a treatment oriented test.

**Amanda Adkins:**

Any sorry, I had a question before we got too much further. I'm sorry. OK. I mean, you had mentioned at the beginning there was two types of the diagnostic and the second kind?

**Jim Hanratty:** Screening

**Amanda Adkins:**

screening and then the ones on the slide 11 here these fall in diagnostic or?

Screening.

**Jim Hanratty:**

Now all these are pretty much screening with the exception of the PAE and the Instant Offense

So it's a good question, by the way.

Sexual histories have commonly been believed to be specific issue or single issue.

They are single issue, but they're not specific issue testing so they don't fall into the diagnostic range because you don't have a you know you're not very specific to a event.

Like the instant events.

**Amanda Adkins:** Thank you.

**Jim Hanratty:** Maintenance exams and you'll notice this flow here.

You can see it on the screen, but there's like this flow starting to the top, serpentine to the right and then going down.

The guidelines and the time frames that are prescribed by the APA are probably things that we're gonna adhere to, or at least discuss during subcommittee level.

There has been issues with practicality of moving.

Moving folks through treatment when they don't like, for example, have their sexual history done.

Can they move into the maintenance process if their sexual history is still hanging over their head?

So the guidelines are just that.

Or guidelines you can always address what you need to a specific issue if necessary.

Maintenance exams are really fishing expeditions.

They're delineated by time.

There's issues of concern by treatment and probation staff that are discussed with the probation and treatment. They hopefully put their minds

together before they make those requests to the polygraph examiner.

And then that is what is tested.

So when a person who is doing that test might have significant responses to one or more of the questions.

The success of hurdles approach should fall into place, or we're going to do retests and parse them out.

That is what is suggested to be done, but sometimes practically and financially it's not real feasible, especially if the victim person is trying to pay for all those.

So there's pragmatic issues with that as well, but the guidelines should still adhere to the better science and that should be discussed as a treatment team decision.

The sex offense monitoring test or the monitoring test as we've come and called it in the past, we're not doing a lot of those much anymore.

But those involve a sexual re-offense where you're actually testing.

If there has been a sexual re-offense not a known allegation, but just asking and testing the veracity about that.

These can be problematic on a lot of different levels.

In the old days we would use a monitoring exam to try to clarify maintenance tests, hoping that we could all sleep better at night knowing that there is not another victim out there but but they still did not clear up their maintenance issues, so we don't do that.

Anymore. The guidelines do not suggest doing that.

That's where this successful hurdles comes in into play.

You'll see more about that when we do the the subcommittee work line by line.

OK, testing procedure guidelines.

There's three parts to a polygraph examination.

Each part has specific processes, and that's spelled out in the guidelines.

The pretest interview.

The in-test operation.

The post test review.

The test data analysis of the charge.

And.

The discussion of forms of the sexual history.

They review all that is.

All spelled out in the guidelines and we will do that in our guidelines as well.

It's highly.

Encouraged to have case background information before you do an instant offense.

You don't wing it.

You don't have a guy come in and do a polygraph on the incident events. If you don't have at least some clarification what the victim said.

Maybe there are there's a difference.

Maybe there's some subtle differences.

We don't make any assumptions. We just try to look at the facts. We look at the information that's provided to us and we formulate fair objective test questions based on the disclosure of.

Test. Keep that in mind.

Audio and visual recording is required.

That's part of the quality assurance process.

Examiner standards. Obviously we want all the folks that are going to be doing polygraph to be going through their certified APA training, which is 40 hour block of PCSOT.

There's plenty of examiners out there that may have never actually worked in the post conviction realm.

It's a little bit different and there does require some specialized training and ongoing continuing education. APA recommends 30 hours of continuing education every two years.

I think treatment providers have their own.

Category for what they they do a lot of these trainings that we do, we do with our state association.

We have one every year we try to get 24 hours in every year for our examiner. Some of them are \*\*\*\*\* \*\*. Some of them aren't.

But we try to afford enough.

Really great training to make sure that we're staying current.

Some state boards have suggested that the 40 hour block needs to be renewed every three years.

Which I think on its base was well intended but not real practical.

So I think as long as we have 30 hours of continuing education every two years and specify how many of those 30 hours are based on sex offender treatment risk assessment and what's what, what the research is now suggesting is is effective in testing offenders.

And always we have to adhere to the APA standards.

Practice for any examiner, whether they're PSCOT or not.

The APA is the premier kind of guidance for polygraph in in America.

Quality assurance. This slide here is probably the second most important.

It's close to my heart and I have to tell you, if I don't do anything else in this committee, I'm really gonna stress quality assurance.

So obviously audio and video recording of the exams is absolutely necessary.

There's no reason these days that we shouldn't be doing that data retention for a minimum of three years or maybe some contract differences for state procurement.

Obviously, the regulations have to apply for those contracts and annual peer review for examiners work.

So let's talk about that.

Annual peer review was a baby step in the right direction.

To keep polygraph examiners accountable.

I don't think it's enough.

Personally, so I think we should consider.

That if treatment and probation are gonna make a decision that's gonna impact somebody who is on probation, for example.

That they at least should have an option to ask for quality assurance on what they're seeing. Oftentimes, the adjudicator treatment provider probation officer will look at Test results.

And not really have any data to support that or any information.

And they may be inclined to make decisions about that.

Well, they should probably make sure it's good first before they really stick their neck out.

I'm really gonna have to say that that's important.

I do quality assurance all day long.

My stuff is quality assured.

It's really necessary.

It really is necessary.

OK.

Next slide, the workflow in team roles. Obviously in this multidisciplinary team, it's the containment folks, the supervision officer, whether it's probation, parole, Treatment providers.

And polygraph examiner.

It's needed to collaborative approach. You know that's what we want.

We want to enhance that risk management and treatment outcomes for the offender and it also promotes public safety.

Here's a picture of what it looks like. Next slide please.

This is the basis of why we do polygraph and the collaboration kind of the the collaboration zone is going to here next slide.

It really a shared responsibility for that risk management.

It's a regular exchange of information.

It's hopeful that there's a unified intervention strategy and obviously the safety is the top priority.

So this was just an introduction.

I could literally take an 8 hour day just on the types of polygraph exams and go into great detail on that.

And I'm sure we'll probably do a lot of that at the subcommittee level. Any questions?

**Katie Krejci:**

Katie Krejci, I just had a question we heard earlier from the public about like the Guardians being allowed to be present during polygraphs. You know, after the the guidelines talk about other people trying to follow the

**Jim Hanratty:** yeah.

That's not gonna really be effective.

No, they can view.

Possibly. I mean, even attorneys that come in that wanna do a polygraph, they can't be in the room.

The only exception to having somebody else in the room besides the examiner and the Examinee is possibly the interpreter. If they need like a language interpreter.

But to have other parties, particularly members of the family, that's really changing the dynamic of that, that, that rapport, that confidentiality, that, that build, that an examiner wants with the examinee to get to where they feel comfortable, take that risk, it's very vulnerable to take a polygraph. Nobody.

'S gonna feel feel very vulnerable about that.

So we have to take great care.

And allowing them to be able to be vulnerable.

Take that risk because we want what they want.

We want no one to.

**Anna Young:**

Have a question Anna Young I'm a juvenile judge up in Yampa County and I don't think I've seen a polygraph on a juvenile in juvenile court since probably 2018. And I hadn't heard of any courts doing polygraphs on juveniles. Or so. Everything.

You're talking about, you're talking about adult examinations, is that right?

**Jim Hanratty:**

No, these guidelines can be used for juveniles as well, and actually I think Arizona still allows for like risk assessment.

So if a judge wants to use somebody that's actually gonna do a risk assessment polygraph, that's pre conviction of course.

I think there's a little bit more.

Guidance and safety and credible professional.

Opinions about doing that because of some things that happened in the past that really caused us to stop using polygraphs as a matter of blanket.

Like polygraphs on juveniles, juveniles are different. Boring.

There's so many different things involved with juveniles and our subcommittee separated for that reason.

Ben Galarneau will be doing some work on that.

It's very.

It's important work to do, but I think there wasn't enough safety guidelines in place, in my opinion, to do it effectively and that's why we have this board.

We've got to have this board, so if we're going to do that work with juveniles, it really has to be done with care.

That's much.



I have a question.

That kind of extends from that because I was inaudible, but also both and his nails, and on in the IDD population.

Relations are there specific guidelines within the APA guideline that that carves out the extra training that needs to be there for people to?

Autograph on people ICU.

Yes, that's actually twofold.

There's not only guidelines for who is suitable to a polygraph based on those issues, but also training for those folks that are gonna be dealing with those you know, suitability for polygraph is really a team decision.

So if you have somebody who you know is, you know, whether it's a less restricted caseload or seriously mentally ill caseload or whatever or even a challenged with autism.

You really have to keep in mind that when we when we subject them to the polygraph.

Utility of that process is really to help them.

Get information that disclosure process and to keep in mind.

That the polygraph is screening.

So there are some probabilistic issues. Are we going to say that if a person has failed his test, all we can do is say that we've done it according to the industry standard, but there may be some cognitive issues that are getting in the way. So we're not.

Going to necessarily.

Call it golden.

We're just going to take it as collateral information for now.

But we may have to make some concessions and do some retesting and keep in mind that maybe not everybody is suitable to do a polygraph test.

So it's really a decision, like I said, polygraph is a decision support tool.

The guidelines that we hopefully that we're going to put together during these next several years will note that those probabilistic issues and those concerns and keep that in mind.

With cooler minds making decisions.

### **Farah R. Lokey:**

One more question. Farah R. Lokey on quality assurance.

Yearly peer review that seems very far far.

And is it innerated reliability that you're doing? And usually that's sent every 90 days or even monthly in a lot of places?

**Jim Hanratty:**

So if it's not, it's basically a way to say OK and it's really up to the probation staff.

To put that together, you know.

They ask an examiner to give an example of the reports that the report, but the charts the the work up.

They may even ask to do a review of the videotape.

But the problem is that they're probably not going to even know what they're looking at necessarily.

They're certainly not going to know what the charts are.

Their quality assurance piece is the piece that's always missing.

That's the part that I will stress more than anything else that if we're going to do this, we're going to make decisions on it, going to attempt to try to use this, that's going to be impactful to an individual that we should ensure that every step has.

Been made quality shines and that somebody is qualified and say this is what you're saying. And if it's not, you throw it out.

That's real popular with some big colleagues about that, but it's really necessary, absolutely.

I'm very used to it now.

Just one time a year.

**Farah R. Lokey:**

Farah R. Lokey, saying that the integrated reliability if you had a standardized testing where you took the case that was not a real case.

Maybe you put a case in multiple polygraphs. Take it and told that's what he's made of.

Reliability is gotcha.

You look at that.

You see that everyone's scored the same for any person who deviates more training.

Exactly. So that's what I'm so we do do.

**Jim Hanratty:**

That's the reliability of the polygraph test results.

So the validated studies did just that.

So when they say correct decision making in polygraph, it's based on.

So if you take 200 hundred examiners looking at the same charts, you know 197 of them are coming up with the same decision.

So that's a pretty high degree of reliability, right? But.

The quality assurance that I'm referring to isn't is more like a peer review as far as.

Are they doing what they're supposed to be doing?

Are they staying within the guidelines of the APA?

Are they?

Are they doing things during the interview that seem a little bit odd, or could they influence?

How a person's responding, in other words, is there interruption going on and are they? Are there mannerisms or are there behaviors or?

Their interactions with the individual causing potential pollution of the of the signal value.

On the charts so.

A lot of that is really gonna require a little more in depth.

Talk about quality assurance on what we should do.

It's really necessary in my opinion.

That, as we have a question.

Thank you.

Thank you.

**Beth Goulden:**

Right now we do a call for future agenda items or request for presentations.

**Katie Krejci:**

Katie Krejci, could we have someone talk about the registration assessment?

That's like the level 123 board knows about it.

**Beth Goulden:**

Detective Cook is going to be joining that next month for us.

Yeah. So he's gonna walk us through on that assessment.

I believe that is one of our tasks anyway on this board right to go through the communication assessment and so Detective Cook is going to present. that assessment to us next month.

Exciting.

What else?

No, not from you.

No one likes looking at you.

Any other agenda item request?

Or of course, you're gonna always, you know, e-mail staff as well.

Any other?

that comments,

**Shane Neil:** Madam Chair.

**Beth Goulden:**

Do we do items?

Yes,

**Shane Neil:**

Shane, Neil, So clarification to loop back to what you were asking earlier was the recommendation to wait for the subcommittees to meet and then establish goals for the Committee for the Year.

**Beth Goulden:**

So I am gonna share my thoughts on some goals with the subcommittee chairs at their meetings.

I think that's OK with all of them. And then I think.

In their meeting, cell meeting converges, converges, so we can present.

Calls to.

All of us, and see what our agenda for the year would look like.

So that's kinda what I think and.

Did, I miss that agenda item.

**Katie Krejci:**

Katie. Krejci, do we do?

Item C prioritize board duties and responsibilities.

**Beth Goulden:**

We did not.

Thank you.

Miss Baldner, were you gonna help us go through those today or?

**Victoria Baldner:**

I'm happy to do that if you want to, but I don't know what you had envisioned.

**Beth Goulden:**

I think we have discussed in previous meetings, I guess I prioritize the affordable kind of with them with goals, so.

Unless you want,

**Victoria Baldner:**

is it redundant?

Are you asking me?

**Beth Goulden:**

I think we kind of have touched on that. So I don't know.

Do we have thought on do we want to go through all of our board duty?

Has everyone seen that document?

I don't know.

Everyone reviewed the document that was sent on board duty then responsibilities. Yeah. And do we wanna go through that right now or table that for?

After we discuss goal and.

Things for the year? Thoughts.

Oh, OK. I think we'll just table that for now.

Discuss some goals in the subcommittees and future meetings.

**Katie Krejci:**

OK, Katie, sorry, I was trying to find the right one.

So my only concern is that we're supposed to make recommendations for monies to the and the legislative session is like already started.

So I don't know if they're they're.

Not until, like, yeah, that's information about how money they're already spent.

We haven't added yes.

Miss Baldner, please,

**Victoria Baldner:**

I'm going to refer to.

That,

**Anthony Davis:** yes, so we won't.

We won't have that.

Good afternoon guys.

This is we won't have that prepared Anthony Davis, AZDPS.

We won't have that prepared for this legislative session.

Those recommendations will go up for the next legislative session, so legislative session 27.

So this provides us this full year to do our work, understand what we need to actually make proper recommendations. We just won't have enough time to do that.

For as you indicated, we're already in this session.

**Victoria Baldner:**

Victoria Baldner. Madam Chair. May I weigh in, Mr. Davis?

Just to clarify what has been done already, could you talk about that?

**Anthony Davis:**

Yes, so the chairwoman chair Goulden, she prepared a letter notifying the house and the Senate of what we just discussed that we won't have.

We just convened and we're getting going and getting started. And so we'll be most prepared to share that information.

Next legislative session.

That letter is complete and it will be prepared for your final approval and signature later this afternoon.

And we'll get that transmitted over by next week.

**Beth Goulden:**

Thank you.

Any other items, Any other comments?

I will adjourn us at 3:31.

Thank you all so much.

Have a nice weekend.