

# AZSOMB Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20260318\_133903-Meeting Recording

March 18, 2026,

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Good afternoon. Can everyone hear me?

OK, this is Jenna Mitchell with DPS. And before we get started, I just need to identify we have an external that's anonymous. Is that a member of the public or a board member?

A

**anonymous**

This is Doctor Miller. I had to call in and it's showing as anonymous.

Can they unmute if they're a member of the public? I do think we have some members of the public. We have two members of public. OK, so I think that's the anonymous.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

No.

A

**anonymous**

Are you guys able to hear me? This is Doctor Miller. I had to call in and it's showing as anonymous. It wouldn't let me write my name.

OK.

All right.

Madam Chairwoman, if you'd like to start the meeting, we can do a roll call and just make sure that we have enough board members present. OK. Yeah, thank you. So it's.

1:40 PM Thank everyone for your flexibility and I'm going to go ahead and call the meeting to order. Let's get started. Major Mitchell, will you start with roll call, please? Yes, ma'am. So we'll start. Doctor Blades is present.

Miss Adkins.

AA

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

Present.

And we can't hear you, so just want to make sure you can unmute.

AA

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

Yeah, present, yes.

We're not able to hear you. We're still not hearing you. I think we may have some problems. Can anyone else hear her?

**AA** Amanda Adkins - ADCRR  
Huh.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

They're shaking, yes, and they can hear us, but we can't hear them.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**AA** Amanda Adkins - ADCRR  
I'm present.

Is the speaker plugged in?

**AA** Amanda Adkins - ADCRR  
If they could hear Doctor Miller, is it just me they can't hear, or is it everybody they can't hear?  
Scott, you wanna try or Missy?

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Uh, I I can hear you, Amanda.  
And I could hear Doctor Miller as well.

**MM** Missy Musick  
I know sometimes my computer switches over to an audio that stops me from hearing everyone, so I'm wondering if that's happening on their end.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
For what it's worth, Missy, I can hear you as well, so.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Yeah, I I can hear everyone. Although what's her name? The woman that runs the meeting that was talking, her voice was really low. I had to turn my my audio clear up.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Jenna, yeah.

Yeah, I mean, I can see several people's icons there, but I don't see people and their their mics are turned off. There's several people that appear to be present, but their mics are turned off.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Yeah, so I see Sheridyn, Garrett, Ash, Ashlesha. Oh, that's a pretty name.  
And Anthony.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
Missy, can you hear me?

**MM** Missy Musick  
Yes.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
OK. OK. Do you want to turn yours off then? Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**MM** Missy Musick  
I'm not sure who was talking.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
OK, this is Jenna Mitchell with DPS. We're going to start roll call again. Doctor Blades is present. Miss Adkins.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Oh.

**AA** Amanda Adkins - ADCRR  
Present.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
Thank you, Mr. Hanratty. Present, Doctor Miller.  
Mr. Morey.

**A** anonymous  
OK. Present

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
Miss Musick.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Present.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
And Mr. Naegele.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Present.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
And excused are Mr. Barney and Doctor Gray. So, Madam Chair, you have a quorum. We have seven members present.

First agenda item is old business. Major Mitchell, would you want to do that first one are you talking about the date change? Yes. So I sent out information to all the board members. It was brought to our attention that the originally scheduled meeting on November 11th falls on the state holiday.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
Veteran's Day. So we have rescheduled that meeting to November 4th and that's been updated on the website and I think I sent out a new list of meeting dates for 2026 for all of the subcommittee members.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Hey, Jenna, just so you can hear me, I can hear you very clearly and I think others can as well, but I don't think we can hear hear Brecken.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
OK. We will see what we can do to change that. Give us just a minute.  
OK.  
Can you hear me?

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes, with feedback.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
OK, so we're testing. Can this is Jenna Mitchell, DPS. Can you hear me?

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
OK. And Doctor Blake is going to speak, so we'll see.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Mm.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
You got to mute it and turn off. OK, all right. So you have to turn your you have to mute it and turn your speaker off.  
Otherwise, we're going to get that feedback.  
OK.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
It.  
All right, so we will have Doctor Blade's test one more time and see if you guys can hear.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
All right, so we will have Doctor Blade's test one more time and see if you guys can hear.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
OK, can can anyone hear me?

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Still a little bit of feedback though.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
OK, so a little bit of feedback though.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

Do you want to just individually have them talk whenever it's on their computer, so on your computer?

Major Mitchell, do you want to speak to have them talk whenever it is there? So I need a computer.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**  
The feedback was for Jenna this time instead of Doctor Blades or Miss Blades.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
That looks .

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
That looks like that's taken care of it.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
OK, I'm also logged into teams.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
OK.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
So do you want to turn your mic on? Speak for a minute. OK, I'm let me see.  
I'm not muted, but my volume is all the way down, which should take care of the feedback I think, so they should be able to hear me.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Mic off.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Yes.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
'Cause I think this will probably pick up this.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
OK.  
OK. Can anyone hear me now better? This is Brecken.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah, you can. OK. I have no pictures. That's good. Um, OK.

OK. The next item on the agenda is the continued discussion on standards and research from other States and entities. I just wanted to close up any discussion that we had from our last meeting. I know we had presentations from a few states I think I briefly touched on.

Colorado, although we didn't go through it in depth, I wanted to ask one, was there, were there any other jurisdictions or agencies or anywhere else that we needed to discuss? I can share a little bit about Colorado, but I was hoping to shift the discussion into kind of some of the next agenda items, which are what's going on.

In Arizona currently. And then how can we start to take some of the knowledge that we've gathered from other places and start to implement recommendations for our own state? But I wanted to 1st, like I said, kind of close out or continue any discussion on the standards if anyone has anything.

Seems like no.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yeah.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Oh, OK. I'm sorry. I there it's not.

No one's. I don't have pictures on mine. I just have people's initials, so I'll have to kind of. So if you could help me, if someone has their hand up, that would be great. OK, OK, go ahead, please. Scott. Yes.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
It's not showing the visuals, huh?

Yeah, I am. I took time as as I indicated I would to reach out to a colleague.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Do you want me to turn my speaker on?

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Are we good?

**BB** Brecken Blades

Is he still talking like we should? Oh, OK. I wasn't sure if you had paused or if I wasn't picking it up. OK, we have you now. Yes.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

No, I stopped because you started talking. I wasn't sure what to do.

No, no. Can you hear me?

OK, so I reached out to a colleague, Doctor James Werling in Canada, to try to get some structural information about their system and about assessment and treatment, both as it relates to adults and juveniles.

So if it's OK, I just want to read the the paragraph that he that he sent to me regarding the adult system. Is that OK if I do that?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Yes.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

OK, so here it is. Our adult system starts at age 18 and if you are actually charged, convicted and sentenced to two years or more, the process is handled by our federal, I E national government.

If you receive an adult sentence that is anything less than two years, then each province in Canada manages that process. We don't have anything like you folks have in several United States, such as sex offender management boards or sex offense specific standards.

As such, I have never seen any document outlining specifically who can or cannot conduct assessments or deliver interventions. As you can imagine, there's a lot of variability in how people are assessed and treated.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Ok.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

It was helpful to me. It was helpful to me because I always wondered who in their system ended up in the federal system and who ended up in the provincial system. And I didn't have any clue how those two systems interfaced or how decisions were made that that that really cleared things up that way for me.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

That was helpful. Thank you.

Yes, Jim,

Jim Hanratty, just a question about that statement you made. When you say sentence, does that include community supervision or sentencing like to corrections?

**SN** Scott Naegele

Yeah, I I, I I don't want to, I don't want to stand on this statement, Jim, but I think it's possible that that everybody who gets sentenced in the in Canada is sentenced to some period of incarceration.

So I think that when Jim uses this term sentenced, I think he's meaning that literally, though I will go back and I will check that that out again with him. But I I think it also explains, if I'm accurate with regard to that, it also explains why things like.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Huh.

**SN** Scott Naegele

You know the age item and some other variables on some of the actuarial risk assessments in terms of the operational definitions begin to make more sense to me where we over here on this side of the border have to be really careful to make sure that we read the manuals and such to make sure.

that we're interpreting things in a manner that's consistent with the definitions of these items, but a long-winded answer is I I think I think sentenced means to incarceration.

Thank you.

**BB** Brecken Blades

OK.

Thank you for reaching out and getting that information. That was helpful and interesting. I can kind of do a a quick summary of what I found from the Colorado guidelines essentially. They say that each sex offender shall be the subject of a pre-sentence investigation or PSI, which shall include a sex offense specific evaluation. This report should be prepared in all cases where it has been ordered by the court. So it sounds like.

To me that happens pretty early. The pre-sentence investigation is just as it sounds pre-sentence so, but in keeping with some of the other states, I believe it was Idaho and was it Utah that also have.

Sex event specific evaluations early on in the process, if I'm remembering the patterns correctly.

That's correct. I know it's mandatory for adults and it's discretionary. Not really discretionary, but it's a case-by-case basis for juvenile, yeah.

OK. Doing evaluations, yes. Or sentencing and evaluation at the same time. OK. So the courts solicitate that and make sure that's done.

Yeah, yeah, right. Utah's the one that had, they had just the range, right. And then the evaluation. Yeah. OK. Well, OK. So let me ask this. Does anyone have any? Additional items in terms of the review of the states, we've done any, any further discussion on standards and research from other States and the entities as we've heard it thus far? No. OK, OK. So the next oh, go ahead.



**Anthony Davis**

Hey, quick, will the research and things that folks conducted, the executive briefs, will that be available if folks want to go back or take a look at that?



**Brecken Blades**

I believe all of them were sent to Major Mitchell or to the board.

This is Major Mitchell. Yes, they're posted. Those that we have received are posted on the DPS website on background material.



**Anthony Davis**

OK, phenomenal. Great.

I don't think.



**Scott Naegele**

Scott Naegele here. I haven't sent anything in because I wanted to make sure I had a chance to report it here at this meeting before I did that. So I will make sure to send the paragraph in that I just wrote. I just read.



**Brecken Blades**

OK. OK. OK. Thank you. OK. OK. So then moving to the next agenda item would be discussion of Arizona's initial evaluation practices for adults. And I wanted to just pause here, I think.

More than likely everyone is at least has a cursory familiarity with what is going on. But since also we have Chairwoman Goulden with us, we can get your perspective on it a little bit from a probation standpoint if you want to chime in, but essentially.

The way that I see it as a treatment provider is that our pre-sentence investigation does not include a sex offense evaluation of any kind. We don't really do that for everyone. What happens is someone gets on probation, sentenced to probation, and then once they're on probation.

And they receive a referral to one of the agencies that's contracted. So I guess this is also just Maricopa County that I'm speaking for. I couldn't speak to many of the outlying counties, but essentially instead of a full evaluation, the individual once they're placed on probation, the adult.

Goes through a series of sort of intake interviews and testing with the treatment agency combined with some of the risk assessments that are done by probation and then they're placed into a group and recommendations are made from there regarding treatment and and. Probation. Does anyone else understand it differently than that?

**SN** Scott Naegele

Scott, Scott Naegele here, Brecken and I don't, I mean I don't know if this is different except for to say that and and I don't know the percentage because I'm only me. Others might be able to comment as well, but obviously a fair number of pre-sentence risk assessments are being done either.

Through the public defender's office, making referrals to to people to do those, or private attorneys being hired by defendants and then private attorneys making contact with with with persons such as myself and others.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mm-hmm,

**SN** Scott Naegele

To do pre sentence risk assessments. So um.

I'm not, you know, it's like I think there's there's two levels of this going on and obviously not for everybody who's who's being charged with something.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Right. You're right. And so, yeah, thank you for bringing that up. So there is, there are, there are a fair amount of pre-sentence risk assessments being done, but those are not typically ordered by anyone in the sense of the the court system is my understanding those are undertaken kind of privately, so to speak, at the request of an attorney, so.

Mhm.

**SN** Scott Naegele

I think that's absolutely true statement as it relates to Maricopa County but I think in some outlying counties because of the smaller scale of the process there times where the judge have actually ordered people to do that

With with consultation and consent of both the County Attorney in those cases and the client's defense attorney. So I think there are some, there's some outlying counties for sure that it's it is directed by the court.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
OK, OK.

I have a question.

Yes, Jim,

Jim Hanratty, that's pre pre-conviction and usually for mitigation if it's oriented by the defendant.

And it's his Rep or her representation. So that would be something that may or may not be necessarily accepted by probation, correct me if I'm wrong, as a gold standard of how they're going to be assessed.

Correct me if I'm wrong on that.

No, you're not wrong. I would say that's one of the one of the issues with it is that there are varying degrees of of probations, acceptance and treatment agencies sort of acceptance, so to speak, of the validity of the testing and whether that will substitute for the testing that's typically ordered by probation.

The other piece I think in terms of that timeline that's a complication is that if it's pre-sentence or pre-conviction even, say, and someone is then, you know, sentenced to 10 years, 20 years in prison and then they come out, how relevant is that?

The risk assessment that was done pre-sentence, you know, and then what do we do in that instance?

But I think it's good information to know that. So some what you're saying, Scott, is that some of the some counties outside of Maricopa are are having the evaluations ordered by the court, but in Maricopa largely they're privately.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yeah, that that's.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Done.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yep, in in post sentences is what you're saying.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Well, and it's not even in terms of, yes, the pre pre-sentence, but what's done by probation in Maricopa County or what's sort of sanctioned by them is not a full evaluation for every person. It's really just the ABLE and the MSI.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

Yeah, right.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Done, you know, to get kind of a snapshot and then like I said, some intake interviews and probation has assessments and then kind of people kind of go on their way through the process. So I think part of why I wanted to pause here and talk about what's being done in in Arizona is because I think our next sort of task here is to take this information and talk about. About, you know, kind of now what do we do with it and what we can have that discussion today in terms of what do we, what are some suggestions or how do we merge what we know from other states plus what we have going on and start to recommend how to go forward. I think the other option would be to do work groups or kind of divide that up and come back. That's kind of, I think, but I that's what I see as our next kind of task. But I'm open to feedback or if you have thoughts on it, Beth, about where you see this going next.

Yes, um, Beth Goulden, I'll add, I think you know.

What's There's no rhyme or reason to kind of what we do in the state, right? Which is why we're here. What often concerns me is the amount of money people on probation spend on doing assessments and reassessments because.

You know, say they do something pre-sentence, but then the state doesn't accept it or the defense attorney doesn't want to give it up because it doesn't look favorably, but it would say \$4500 and then they go to probation and there's a lot of.

Thousands and thousands of dollars, I feel like that gets spent. And then probation says, well, you might have one probation officer say, Nope, we're not gonna even take that one. Really. It should be turned over to the provider to put, you know, to analyze that information. So. I think it's very costly when not done right, if you will. And I guess the conversation to me when I look at other states, information is not necessarily held against clients for taking these assessments where I think in Arizona.

The concept is that I'm going to be punished for honesty, which, as we all know, we want honesty and the faster we can be honest or, you know, have an offender be honest.

The quicker hopefully they can receive treatment and so how and I don't know if this is a question for today, but there's there needs to be this shift I think in Arizona.

Of we need good quality assessments as soon as possible to then determine what treatment and supervision is effective for this individual.

Are kind of my initial thoughts on what I see. And I just, as you all know, sometimes someone takes an able like 6 times or like why? You know why, why and the amount of. So those are some of my initial thoughts on that.

No, I think it does. I think, I think our system when I was thinking about this and going through our system at least in Maricopa County because of the way it's kind of it's not uniform in what you were speaking to is it puts us in a position of being.

Reactive instead of instead of proactive about this. So instead of proactively understanding someone's risk and needs, we are just reactive as the information comes in, which often creates confusion. Perhaps they're spending additional time and money doing something. Maybe we retest them. It doesn't.

This will be more making a recommendation about implementing some kind of evaluation sort of protocol early on will be more work and and comes with a lot of logistical challenges up front.

But it potentially saves a lot of confusion and effort and money in in the process overall.

Yes, Beth Goulden. Even when someone may want to apply for a modification or early termination, often attorneys are like do redo a full psychosexual evaluation, which.

When someone's been on probation for 15/20/30 or more years, there should be, there should be. And I'm not saying every county because I think every county has limited resources, especially regarding treatment, right? But how do we get those counties the resources that? That they need to do proper assessments, but we should just, I think we're over assessing if you will, if if we have a right, the right formula or standards in place, we should. I hope that would be the goal to kind of get it right, if that makes sense. Yeah, no, I agree. So oh, go ahead.

**SN** Scott Naegele

Right.

Yeah, I think, I think a piece of this that's emerging from this discussion today is, is, is, is, is perhaps a need for defining what are the components of a psychosexual evaluation.

And what are the thing, what are the pieces of that that that that there's consensus on that that are musts as part of those evaluations and and then the secondary piece of that is, is is trying to.

To get some clarity and perhaps define with with clear, with clear purpose, you know what who are the people that can do these kinds of evaluations and what kinds of training and education and.

Professional competencies have they developed to to meet a a set of standard standards so that they that that that they can be approved to to do to do this kind of evaluation. So I think for me it it it seems to me that.

You know, piece of it is defining what is a psychosexual evaluation and what must that include. And the second step is who who can do it and what do they need to bring to the table in order to be deemed appropriate for doing it.

That's just, that's just me as I listen to the emerging discussion both from you, Brecken and from from you, Beth.

Jim Hanratty. Also, shouldn't we have guidelines as to whether or not the courts are going to mandate it or not in the 1st place? So where's the authority to do it? Is it going to be optional? It's going to be up to the offender and his resources, and if they can't afford it, then what? Is it only from the rich offenders, so to speak?

Well, I think that's the problem with what starts to happen now is that because in Maricopa County they're done privately, there's not a lot of, I guess unless you're indigent, there's different, you know, funding options. But otherwise a lot of times it is largely up to someone who's able to afford it. And so I think in some ways this would be an effort to.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
But.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Minimize the disparities in that, you know, make those type of resources and that type of assessment available more broadly.

So can we agree at some point we're going to make a decision as to if it's being mandated or not? Well, I think to roll it backwards even further because I agree with you, Scott, I think those are some of the questions that will come up. I think the first question.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Hi.  
I, I, I, I.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Based on the research that we all looked at is do we, do we as a committee recommend that that Arizona should implement some kind of evaluation early on in the process? I mean, that's the first thing is that's what a lot of the other states were doing. Do we think that would be helpful here? That's step one. And if we're all in agreement, then we can go from there. But you know, let's hear from.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Well, I...  
And and and and I think I I don't mean to be to be getting stuck in the in the, in the, in the in the tall grass here, but but what is what is early on in the process? Do you know what I mean? I mean I think some of these other states are in fact doing an evaluative process which they've defined for themselves.

**BB** Brecken Blades

From everyone.  
Right. Yes.

**SN** Scott Naegele

In the pre-sentence phase of the process. So I think we have to make a decision about when we use the term early on, what what are we talking about?

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

Yeah, I agree with you. And in my mind that's question two. So the first one is, are we in agreement about a recommendation about an eval? That's why I was diffuse about it, you know? And so I guess the first step is, do we think that would be a useful addition or change? To the Arizona sort of process right now. And then if we do think that an evaluation, a risk assessment as kind of a standard operating procedure would be helpful when the next question I think is when is that given, is that part of the pre-sentence process or is it sort of in place of the ABLE?

MSI intake, you know, kind of a portion of someone's probation that's being done now. They're two really different.

You know, fewer people are going to get it on probation because not everyone who's sentenced gets probation. So it's a little bit about what is the purpose of the evaluation, right at the probation level it that would be about informing treatment and supervision needs at the. Pre-sentence level that could potentially be more about inform informing the person's sentencing at that point. And then we would have to look at would it need to be redone, say they're released many, many years later, then what do we do for those people? But first. Does anyone have thoughts on whether do we even like this idea of an evaluation being included?

**SN** Scott Naegele

So.

Peter Morey, Yes.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yes. OK. OK. Yes.

Jim Hanratty. Yes.

Beth Goulden, yes. OK.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yeah, aye.

**AA** Amanda Adkins - ADCRR  
Amanda Adkins, yes, I think there should be like a standard assessment, yeah.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
OK, OK.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yeah, nothing. And nothing I'm saying in terms of making this more complicated should should be, should be heard to imply that I don't agree that there should be something. I just want us to make sure that we factor in all of the things that need to be factored into what we're talking about. And Brecken, I can tell you from 30 plus years.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
That I suspect that there are a lot more people going through pre-sentence risk assessments than than you might realize and some other people might realize. And now whether or not, whether or not those get turned into formal reports that that that have the potential to see the light of day again, that's another discussion.  
But there are lots and lots of people. I don't know what the percentage is. Perhaps we could figure out how to try to figure that out. But there are lots of people that are going through pre-sentence evaluations and not just people who have deep pockets that can pay for it.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.

Well, yes, I agree with you. I mean I will say out of out of our office, we do a a good number of those. So I am aware that that's going on and I am aware that there's funding for those. I think what I'm speaking to in some degree and I I do hear you saying that you're in agreement to the concept of an evaluation.

**SN** Scott Naegele  
Yes.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
So I, you know, I don't want to imply that, but I think what I'm speaking to is a more

structured, formalized, ordered process, so to speak, versus what I think is happening now as I understand it is a bit more informal and perhaps not in outlying counties, but at least in Maricopa County.

It's not. It may be informally a formal part of the process, but it's not on paper anywhere. And to speak to some of the things you brought up, there's no consistency in terms of what's required in an in an evaluation, what kind of recommendations should it be giving, who is giving them, you know, any of those things. None of that's.

Laid out anywhere, you know,

**SN** Scott Naegele

Right.

Peter Morey and I think. Trying to split the baby between the two of you, 'cause I think you're both right. Um, something that's we agree, agree upon is standardized. And as Brecken was just saying, something that has, uh, its uniformity throughout the state as to what it specifically we're looking for.

To Scott's point, who it's by, who's qualified to do it, and sort of a well, not sort of a standardized test that I agree with Brecken should be given more than once, at least at maybe presentence, maybe.

Um, you know, certainly before treatment, but also.

Five years, 10 years down the road, so we know where the person is if we're talking about getting termination of their registration and notification. So right now, from my understanding, we don't have anything to track people over time and I think that's something that we desperately need.

And I think we need to put that out right at the beginning as well that this is a time expected time limited thing for some people.

Probation uses the MSI. So we give an MSI initially sort of like a pre-treatment MSI to get a baseline and then we usually give an end of treatment.

MSI, but it's not, it's not a full evaluation, right. That's the point. And that's, you know, that's that's the piece of it. And that doesn't take into consideration, you know, the MSI is at a 7th grade, I think reading level and there are a lot of people who cannot take that. I mean that's, you know, what is the average?

reading levels, like second grade or something. I mean, that's really advanced wording. Um So,

Peter, Morey, again, to your point, it's it's pretty broad test, you know, isn't necessarily capturing our concerns of the individual after treatment.

So, well, it's not a risk assessment. You know

Really good measure of treatment progress, but in and of itself it's not a risk assessment. So it

depends on it depends on the information you want to get out of it. You know what we're looking for, which is I again what I think we need to define at the beginning when we're going in. So to both your points, yeah, yeah.

**SN** Scott Naegele

And it.

And and and if I'm and if I might humbly add, the MSI is a better fit for for some offenders than it is for others. So while it's true, that's the one that's the standard that we've been using it it it definitely fits some some cases I think.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

**SN** Scott Naegele

In terms of its theoretical background, much better than it does some other cases. You know the the other instrument out there, and I know that some people in Maricopa County are using it at this point. And when I had some free time, I was going to start using it myself from an assessment standpoint is the MDSA.

And I think that it it might be worth you know examining what the MDSA could tell us in terms of a pre intermittent and post test kind of scenario and what that might bring to to our our process as well.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah, no, I agree with you. I think, you know, we consider all the options and that's part of what this board and you know, this subcommittee is for. I think what I'm trying to do by by keeping our questions and our tasks small at first is to just like take it one step at a time because I think we're going to get, I just don't.

I don't want us to get lost in the topic of which tests and what who does it and are now are we certifying providers and who you know what happens because those are huge, potentially huge issues and we we're going to have to get to them. But first in my mind I guess first is it sounds like everybody is in agreement. We like the idea of implementing.

An evaluation for adults. So then I think the next question is when do we do that? Does it happen at the pre-sentence stage? Does it happen, you know, post conviction and and on probation or some other time that we haven't thought of yet or heard of?

Peter Morey, very naive question.

Is post conviction always going to have probation? No. And that is the. So I think in a pre-sentence investigation scenario, more individuals will be evaluated, right? Because they won't all have a probation tail,

But is there? A. Can we make it post-conviction and take probation and pre-sentence out of that? Meaning if you get the conviction, you have the evaluation. Because what I'm thinking here, putting on my lawyer hat, is you're going to get a lot of pushback probably from defense attorneys on the risk assessments pre-sentence. I agree.

Not everybody's going to probation, so that would disqualify a certain population. But if it's tagged onto the conviction, then we kind of have a division there of knowing what the risk of each individual is.

Not sure where I'm going with that thought completely, so I'm not sure how we would mandate them to do treatment or not, but at least we would know for registration and notification going forward.

So Beth Goulden, if I can chime in, I feel like if there's not some sort of standard for pre-sentence and evaluations being done. You're still the what has happened over the years in Arizona is it seems to be we have not separated. You committed a sex crime. What should your consequence be versus I'm going to use a psychosexual to get myself out of trouble and the process. OK, get just.

Take a polygraph. If you had any hands-on victims, I kind of want to address those problems that we're having. So psychosexual or any evaluations pre-sentence is not used as a potential way to manipulate the prosecutors, the court to have someone come to probation and say. Look, I passed a polygraph, but we know the polygraph is not valid because the right questions aren't asked or the right examiner wasn't used. So I feel like they're not that. I think we need to address what if someone wants or or what should happen at a pre-sentence level because there's too much manipulation of.

And too much disparities going on in different cases um at at the pre sentence level and that that's those are that's my opinion on that not to.

I have concerns about how it's currently being used and.



### **Missy Musick**

I agree with you, Beth. I I I know when I was working with sex offenders, I would get very frustrated that the lawyers had so much control over these evaluations to the point they wouldn't even give them to their clients.

And if an evaluation was done, as I I think you said, Scott, they don't like the outcomes of that. That's not handed over to the courts. And as our first goal is supposed to be public safety, that should not be allowed and and I support.

All pre-sentence evaluations being mandated. I I really don't care if the defense attorneys are are concerned about that.

I Peter Morey, I don't disagree with you, but yeah, good luck with that. So that's that's and for a practical purpose that's just not going to happen.

I understand Beth Goulden, but I understand that. But you also have people that are before the court for sex crimes, but they're then asking for I want.

**A** anonymous

This is.

This is a.

Computer permissions. I want contact with minors. So you cannot have it both ways because in order for the court, a prosecutor, probation, treatment, how we all should be making those decisions, we need all the information. So I get they have a right. They they can they bypass probation assessments often.

**SN** Scott Naegele

Yes.

Yeah.

**A** anonymous

It.

**SN** Scott Naegele

OK.

**BB** Brecken Blades

But then they go to court and they ask for a whole bunch of information that could potentially put additional victims at risk. So I guess my my concern is you can't have it both ways.

**A** anonymous

Yeah.

It.

**SN** Scott Naegele

I I I.

**A** anonymous

This is.

**SN** Scott Naegele

I I I still think we're having a discussion about what the definition of pre-sentence is. I I, you know, I'm not a lawyer, Peter, I'll let Peter chime in on on those things but but but but but if we're talking about making decisions that involve interactions.

With the community, especially children, then my sense is, is that we can pretty, pretty succinctly come up with a protocol here that structures what that needs to look like once somebody's been sentenced.

**A** anonymous

Yeah.

**SN** Scott Naegele

And probably get buy-in from, if not all parties involved, pretty much all parties involved. But when you start having a discussion about it being pre-sentenced, literally pre-sentenced with potential implications flowing from that, I I don't want to play lawyer. I'll let Peter chime in. I just think that.

I think that's a bite that's going to be a very difficult one to chew and swallow at some point.

**A** anonymous

OK.

Yeah, Peter Morey, I agree with you, Scott, and that's why I was asking that question to Brecken is, is there something that is, you know, not pre-sentence but also not pre-probation but tied to their conviction?

You know, post sentencing. So kind of in that Gray area that you're trying to identify there, Scott, I'm I'm struggling to identify it as well. I'm so did you.

**SN** Scott Naegele

Yeah.

Yeah, I I think, I think, I mean, for me, I think we're having a discussion about after the person knows what their consequences are for their conduct, because then then they've been sentenced, a legal decision has been made. They've either been sent to prison or they've been placed on probation or they've been sent to prison with a tail of probation.

At at that juncture the their legal rights have been have been addressed in terms of the sentencing process and and then if we want, if we want to structure things in a way that's meaningful for everybody, which is what I hear Beth I think accurately arguing for.

Then then I think we're really having a discussion at of it coming, you know, after the person's been formally sentenced.

I know Amanda has her heads up, but really quick, Beth Goulden, I we need to address the pre-sentence issue because what's going to happen or continue to happen is I want contact with my children. I want to continue at my job. I want, I want, which is fine. You asked for that, but the court and probation.

At the pre-sentence level needs accurate information. If a judge is going to make those

recommendations, I don't think we should ignore the fact that those requests are going to go away and the question will be why is why? What are the recommendations of the board with regard to and I know other states have this laid out.

Because I want to get away from using a psychosexual evaluation to either get what they want or because at sentence, but it's not. Then you come to probation. It doesn't do them any favors. If the assessments are bad, the evaluations are bad and they have to be redone and. Then you're like, no, wait a minute, you should not have been approved to have contact with your children or you should. And there's a lot of stuff that then has to be undone when someone comes to probation, when they were given a lot of misinformation to the court and to everybody. So that's my position on that. And Amanda, I think you have your hands up. Yeah, go ahead, Amanda.

AA

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

Thank you. Excuse me. For me, we have to look at the purpose of the assessment. Are we doing it to assess whether they should, if they're guilty or not? Are we doing it to assess like their risk levels? Are we doing it?

Yeah, you know, the MSI kind of gives us a baseline and then later a follow-up. And I just want to mention that the last time we went over some of the states, we kind of laughed at one of the the the states that had post sentencing pre-sentence reports completed or biopsychosocial after. So I just, I thought I'd throw back.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

AA

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

Like that back out there.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah, well, I agree with you. I think doing it at a pre-sentence stage has different implications for the use of the information than doing it post. I think one of the benefits of doing it post is that there's the statute that protects sort of the statements that are made.

Do you want me to say something? No. OK, in the context of mandated treatment. So that potentially helps the the honesty. But a lot of states do it, do it at that pre-sentence stage. But then I think in that in those instances the judges then rely heavily on it.

Or sentencing, which is what you're saying should happen, right?

There's a Beth Goulden, there's a lot of questions sometimes that or permissions that they're trying to get, you know, before their, you know, sentencing. And so how is that? How are we going to address that? I'm not saying I have the answers to this, but it doesn't necessarily mean to.

Don't have to do a sex history prior to. Is that part of the evaluation? I would say probably not, right. I, you know, I that would be the, yeah, it's not a pre-sentence, but it would be post, correct. I think if we take out, if we if we look at what's currently being done and we just. We sort of drop in a more full evaluation instead of the current ABLE MSI intake process. That is probably logistically the easiest because it's the most similar to what we're doing, whether or not that addresses all of the issues that we're trying to address. Don't know for sure. Somebody have their hand up. OK, Sheridan.

**A** anonymous

Hi, can you guys hear me? Sorry, I have two different things I need to unmute. I I back to the pre-sentence. I think it would also assist in balancing the severity of some sentences or make recommendations for post sentence treatment in that.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yes.

**A** anonymous

You know, offenders with low risk are sometimes made examples of and are given harsher sentences than maybe we think are necessary because of the nature of their crime and their risk level is low, but they are given these lengthy sentences and lengthy probation terms. I think a pre sentence evaluation would get the opportunity to. Comment on that low risk for those offenders.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

OK. I think my question is if we do it and maybe maybe this is where we then shift into, you know, some distribution of work and circle back to this at our next meeting. If we're thinking about doing it pre-sentence, I would be curious because for example, that's what Colorado does.

So then what do they do for someone who's then incarcerated for a long period of time? Do you have any idea? Like, do they just update?

I think there's guidelines for like who. So if someone's going to prison for 300 years, I think there's like a we can skip A and you go to, you know what I mean? There's like guidelines for who gets one. So that's the other question.

Is when are the evaluations done, but who is eligible or who is required to do one of the evaluations?

Is a whole another question. I don't know that we have to have the answer for that. Maybe we do the board probably. But that gets into, you know, I think right legal, you know, depending on the statute corresponding to their charges, I don't know. Yes, Jim,

Jim Hanratty in Idaho.

They actually aren't allowed to be in treatment and probation at the presentence stage. They're required to do the evaluation. There's four dedicated individuals in the whole state that are allowed to do it because they went through their SOMB requirements and guidelines. They got the seal of approval.

And the offenders have to actually travel to those individuals. They're mandated to do that. Even if it's all the way from the band handle all the way down, they got to go and do the assessment and that is actually mandatory for adult adults that are convicted of.

Sex crimes based on their statutes.

Post conviction they do it or this is part of their pre-sentence.

This is part of their pre-sentence where they're assigned to do so and they're not even eligible for that probation until they do it. Sorry, there's a rouge fly flying down. It's.

Did you start to say something, Scott, or was that someone else?

**SN** Scott Naegele

That's.

I was simply gonna ask the same question you did. It sounds like what although Jim said post conviction, I think what he was talking about was pre sentence.

Yes. Did I say? Yes. Pre-sentence. Yeah, they do it in pre-sentence stage and that makes them eligible to be in post-conviction in the post-conviction guidelines once they are done now assuming that they're gonna go to prison.

**SN** Scott Naegele

And yeah.

Or not go to prison. That starts when they get out.

**SN** Scott Naegele

Yeah, I I'm gonna, I mean I'm just kind of sitting and chewing on stuff that that's being articulated and and and I apologize for for perhaps making this more complicated than than it is. But at the same time I think I think we're wise to take the time to do it because then we will have thought through a bunch of things that we're later gonna.

We can get pushback on if if we had taken the time. Now we won't. I'm struggling a little bit, not with the concept of doing a pre-sentence risk assessment and doing it in a uniformed way. I'm just trying to get my brain around what that consists of and how that actually gives us the information we need to be able to answer some really important question about risk. I mean

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mm-hmm.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

I think, I I I think we're going to have a hard time trying to include a polygraph with that. I'm not, I'm not saying any I heard anybody say they're arguing for that. Yet at the same time in the absence of polygraph information, I I think, I think your capacity to to to to make a a true decision about somebody's risk is is is is.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

Diminished. So like outside of the the ABLE, which is gonna, if it's a valid ABLE, is gonna tell us something about somebody's sexual interests. I mean, are we really talking about making a decision based on an MSI and an ABLE hear?

I'm struggling. Just somebody help me please.

Oh, hey, Scott. Sorry, Peter. Morey, I'm.

Kind of with you out there, Scott. I'm not meaning to make things more complicated and I'm kind of admittedly overhearing my little world spinning through possibilities. But I I think Missy brought it up and I agree with her and I my comment was a little bit flipped, but you can't trust lawyers, which is where my comment was coming.

From So I'm wondering, is this something that we can mandate as a judicial package presentence so?

If we mandate a a pre sentence judicial package where an evaluation is assigned by the court similar to what?

Mr. Hanratty was saying about, you know, we have special evaluators who are trained along with the sex offender management report guidelines. Yeah, in what Brecken was talking about and we include a polygraph in that and that's kind of kept in camera and.

Maybe released simultaneously to the team's pre-sentence, then we wouldn't necessarily have all the gamesmanship time or ability from the attorneys and the judge would get the information on risk and treatment at the time of sentencing so that he could go forward from there and that would give all the treatment providers and probation.

The information they need to go forward to try to take some of the kinks out of the system.

But I don't. That's just a brainstorming idea.

MM

**Missy Musick**

And and Missy Musick, I mean we we still have those more static evaluations to add into the the pre sentence evaluations. It's not like it would be just an MSI and a.

ABLE.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

If we have good history, Missy, if we have, if we have good information about about their histories, especially their sexual history, we we do. I mean the the scores somebody gets on a static 99 or a static 2002 are or a SOREG are only as good as the information that's brought to the equation.

MM

**Missy Musick**

Yeah.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

I mean, if we don't have complete information, everybody's going to be being scored lower than they probably actually are.

MM

**Missy Musick**

You're right, yeah.

Yeah. And to Scott's point, that's that was part of my Peter Morey. Sorry. Um, that was part of my concern of the pre sentence evaluation too, is that you're gonna have your defense attorneys advising their clients to minimize and you're gonna have prosecutors maximizing. So mm-hmm, that's why I'm suggesting we have something that's from a an SOMB approved.

Assigned by the judge reviewed in camera with the results simultaneously distributed to defense and prosecution.

Jim Hanratty, just give you some insight as to Florida. For example, Florida does it a little differently. I know that Florida wasn't on our check was to do.

But Florida actually waits until after the sentencing. So there's not the pre-conviction concerns legally and all the other loopholes that are there or concerns that are there, legitimate and otherwise. But once the person is assigned to a treatment provider, whether it's in the prison system or in community supervision.

Treatment provider who is approved by their board then facilitates the evaluation, chooses their individuals that are going to subcontract out for say example polygraph and.

Once those folks are approved, the treatment folks that are approved to do the actual treatment and assessment.

They kind of facilitate that whole process for the future of that individual while they're in community supervision or in a treatment facility or treatment program in prison, which incidentally is a little bit different than Idaho because the evaluators that do the risk assessment that are approved.

In Idaho do not do treatment and the people that do the treatment, ongoing treatment, don't do the evaluations. I'm not sure why they did it that way, but maybe there was a conflict of

interest or the, you know, the optics of it or whatever it was and they decided not to do that, so.

A lot of states do it a little differently, but I think we've come to a consensus here that we have to do it one way or the other, whether we do it pre-conviction mandated by the courts to make them eligible for probation and treatment or whether a treatment provider does it. Right now, probation's kind of slinging it.

So you know, when a person is on community supervision, a probation officer or probation division will make a call on whether or not they're going to accept whatever information they're getting from whoever's giving it.

From a treatment perspective or polygraph perspective as to whether or not these these individuals are getting certain privileges or getting certain conditions placed on them that that are kind of, well, Willy nilly, if you don't mind me saying there's no real standardization in it. It's kind of a crapshoot. I don't think that's right. Anyway, slice it. But I think we've all agreed that there's got to be some guidelines that we're all going to adhere to. We need to cross the bridge as to whether or not it's going to be an adjudication as part of that package, that judicial package that you refer to.

I think it's a good way to put it. Or are we going to wait till after their sentence then let you know probation continue to do that and guideline probation standards to do that or a treatment provider so.

We're still talking about and I think we're still in the stage of pre pre-conviction.

Yeah, I Peter Morey, I agree with you, Jim. My only and I'm just my only pushback on everything you just said is that not everybody goes to probation and I think that we still need that risk information even if.

They're not going to probation.

So what would be the what would you want it for, I guess? What would you want the risk information for? Say they're not going to probation, they may still have to register, correct. So for registration, right. So we need to keep it in mind for registration. Where are they going to be placed on registration? What are the risks?

I know, except that. And then now we get into the the thing we heard about last week at the meeting, right? The registry like that's supposed to be right. And that's the assessment used for whether or not someone or for the registration notification levels. And so you're talking about using the psychosexual to determine.

Whether or not they even need to register at all. Yeah, partly do they need to register at all? What level of registration and you know we have to tackle and I'm getting far ahead of us here, but we're going to have to tackle that eventually anywhere is registration and notification and all that. So kind of a preview to that is if we have all this information.

Information up front and they're going to have to register and say they don't have probation. This risk assessment is going to help, you know, what level of registration do they even need

to register, you know, and one of the things that we kind of talked about today with the. The luncheon presentation and all that is OK, that's an interesting thing for identifying people who may not have to register, but they have this history. So would we even have to publicly notify if we had something that could identify somebody being in the wrong place? You know, that's a little big brotherish, but it also has interesting implications for not having to put somebody's public information out there if they're already such a low offender and not make a victim out of the.

Offender and would also be a force multiplier multiplier for the resources we already have. But registration isn't a treatment issue, really. But you can't separate the two. I think you can. How statute?

**SN** Scott Naegele

Well, there's there's lots to be said about registration in the whole phenomena of registration. But but I but I think you know the the more I participate in this discussion today and the more I listened to other people from their vantage points talk I I.

I I can, I can respect the hell out of the fact that I want to get something going here for sure. But but I'm also mindful of the fact that that unless we think about this in some sort of integrated way, we're we're we're going to be asking for for for for more trouble than we probably want.

I guess what I'm trying to figure out is are we still talking about the pre-conviction protocol that we agreed on three months ago that we're going to tackle that first. We're going to tackle that section first. And

Jim, yes, yes, we are. And I as I.

**SN** Scott Naegele

I mean.

Tried to stay in there that I probably didn't put very well. I'm getting way ahead of where we need to go. So yes, we need to reel it back in. I was getting into the weeds, but yes, we're still talking about that.

Yeah, I think pre conviction in the sense that it doesn't. Our recommendation for Arizona doesn't have to be pre conviction, but just.

That we're we're looking at what happens sort of across the board at that stage. But if we don't think which it it may be the way that I'm understanding the discussion to be going is that we're not leaning necessarily towards a pre-sentence risk assessment evaluation. It seems like that's where maybe the consensus is, but I think.

I think this is, I think this is, you know, to your point, Scott, can be a, it is a big discussion.

It's a larger discussion. There's a lot of ramifications for it in terms of people's, you know, the legal rights, the logistics, the sentencing, who pays for it. I mean, there's all kinds of different pieces of this and so.

I think shifting a little bit into the next agenda item in terms of distribution of work, I think we will be able to discuss it to some extent in here, but some of it will probably be us again kind of looking at what comes next in other areas or what do we think is best in bringing back.

Information to continue this discussion about it, you know, informed. I mean, I'm curious I guess if in the states that do, did I say this maybe, but in the states like Colorado or the other ones like I think it's Utah that do the evaluation at a pre-sentence stage.

You then what happens, right? I mean what I know that in their in their guidelines they have what what constitutes an evaluation and what those different pieces of it. But I would need to look back more closely to see kind of the process of it, what happens.

Do they recalculate risk? Do they do a portion of it again? All of it again? How do they, how do they go forward with it from there? Assign something and look at those individual states? Yeah, I think we should. That's great idea. Go ahead, Missy. Yeah.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Yeah, I'm.

And this is Missy Musick. Um. And and I haven't looked at those Colorado. Oh my gosh, probably 15 years. But it was very structured like they broke everything down.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah.

**MM** Missy Musick  
On on times and who did what? It was extremely structured.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah, yeah, I'm sure that information exists, you know, for us. So I think we we took the first piece of it and we looked at what are people doing kind of at these early stages. OK, a lot of states are doing an evaluation either pre sentence investigation, maybe post conviction depending on their.

You know, jurisdiction. So I think our task is then to say, OK, with that information we like the idea of evaluation. How does that fit here in Arizona and suit our needs? So, but we can we maybe need to look at what what is you know the next step for other states. So I think the states that are doing that are Colorado, Idaho.

And Utah of the ones we looked at. Is that accurate? Did I miss any?

I can research others and see if there's are others. Do you want to see? OK, yeah, that would be great. So you'll take the whole rest of the US is Jim. I I just happen to have the Idaho ones

handy all.

You know, so you'll do Idaho pages of it.

So I mean, I'll be happy to do Idaho to clarify that for sure. OK, but I'll cursory. Just take a look. I know I was, you know, about the rest of the US. OK,

I'm not going to Hawaii though. Not for that.

OK, does anyone? So the other states that we had already looked at were Colorado and Utah.

Does anyone want to volunteer to take a look at kind of how they translate the evaluation into practice?

What do they take from it? The next steps?

**A** **anonymous**

This is this is Sheridyn. I'm happy to continue with Utah.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

OK.

Great. Thank you. Does anyone want to take Colorado?

If not, I can do it.

**MM** **Missy Musick**

I very hesitantly just because of time, but I I can see if I can get an updated thing of Colorado cause I I still have the very old one.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

You you, you can. You can easily get it Missy. It's online. Be prepared for the fact. Be prepared for the fact that it's in excess of probably 400 pages, but but it's there and it's downloadable and it's printable. So it's it's there.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

**MM** **Missy Musick**

Yeah, I I know I have the old one and it was probably close to 400. So yeah, I can just review that that first section.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

They do have a good kind of their table of contents and how they lay everything out. You know, it should be like you were saying. It's very structured. It's very matter-of-fact in terms of how they do it. So, OK, OK, that's great. Thank you. Well, Missy, I'm happy to help with that also. So if you get to a point where you're stuck or you don't have time, you know, let me know.

Like we can work on it together. Is there anywhere else that anyone wants to look at in terms of?

Of information in that regard, kind of for Florida might be interesting just because they do it. Their treatment providers do it. They they do it. Yeah, that's interesting there. Yeah, there's potential conflicts there. So I'd be curious how they.

**SN**

**Scott Naegele**

2.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Avoid that, OK.

**AA**

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

This is Amanda Adkins. I previously did Illinois. I can follow up on that one, or if people have other recommendations that are more appealing, I'm open to researching.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

So is there like?

**AA**

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

I'm also curious what ATSA would say about it.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Oh, yeah. OK, well, do would you be willing to get us some information at least on ATSA? Because Illinois didn't do an evaluation, is that right?

**AA**

**Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

Uh, to be honest, I don't remember my apologies.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

OK. No, that's OK. I think that they didn't. Um, but ATSA that, that would be great. Yeah. And then we can kind of continue this discussion.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins - ADCRR**

And to clarify what they are using the risk, not not risk assessments, but the assessments for how that translates into practice, just so I'm clear.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Yeah, I think so. Or if if other people have, you know, opinions on what they think would be helpful in terms of the next stage of information, I think where I see our discussion having landed today is that we all agree that the concept of an evaluation early on in the process is, is important for Arizona. It could be helpful, but we're not.

We haven't landed on what exactly what timeline that may be, if it's pre-sentence, if it's post-conviction. And then so I think we're maybe looking at other states and if they do it pre-sentence, how does that translate into, you know, the folks that are on probation and kind of what it, yeah, So what do people do?

Sort of practically, I guess with the evaluations next, I think that's how I'm seeing it, but again, I'm open to, you know, feedback if other people see the discussion having gone a different way.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

I think the only thing that I would add Brecken is is perhaps and and I'm and I'm open to doing this with with you Brecken and anybody else like what what do we think that that should include what what what is the baseline set of testing that we think will give give us the most meaningful.

Information.

To make some of these decisions and to inform the court about, you know, things that people are asking for permissions for and so on and so forth. I'm, I'm trying to wrap my hand, my head around it as I sit here with it and perhaps some more dialogue around that, you know, outside of the actual committee meeting.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

Mhm.

**SN** **Scott Naegele**

We'll we'll flesh some of that out.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Yeah. No, I agree with you. I think that's going to be a huge piece of this. I think. I think most helpful will be that there's potentially, you know, standards for what's recommended. The test, you know, I think that structured is going to be helpful so that there's consistency, I know.

Only cause I looked at Colorado's, I know that they have outlined very specifically what they want. I would imagine other states that do the evaluations also have similar standards for what's included and you know what what they deem to be an acceptable reliable test versus what's not and all those things. Yeah, I think that's a really.

Gonna be a crucial part of this? Absolutely so.

**A** **anonymous**

This is this is Sheridyn. I have a maybe it's a legal question, but are there not? Is there not such a thing as a post-conviction but pre-sentence period for, you know, for a pre-sentence evaluation that would avoid that legal realm?

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
And.

I'm sorry, say that. Say that one more time, Sheridyn.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

I'm sorry, post conviction, but pre sentence.

**A** **anonymous**

No.

There is a post conviction pre sentence period. Um the.

But there's a lot of gamesmanship that goes into that time, which is what we're talking about.

And I made the flip comment earlier about not trusting lawyers because there's a lot of evaluations that go on there that never see the light of day or.

**A** **anonymous**

Yeah.

Something like that. And I that's kind of the period that I was alluding to when I was talking about having a judge's packet that instead of having the room, that wiggle room in there for, you know, sort of a mitigation phase versus.

Aggravation phase that each attorney side is playing to have something that the judge mandates they do uniformly, and then that evaluation is what they judge their sentencing on. So a judicially mandated here's what I need for a risk and evaluation.

Information to make my decision and then that would be published afterwards to evaluator's probation.

Registration, notification, that kind of thing. So easy answer is yes, with caveats.

Which is totally unhelpful. Clear as mud. Clear as mud. Exactly.

**BB Brecken Blades**

OK, we only have 9 minutes left. We have to have a hard stop time at 3:00 today. So the last. So let's.

I guess stop there in terms of the distribution of work to be completed outside and then there's always room I think to e-mail agenda items and different things if needed. The last agenda items I believe so discussion of guiding principles.

So discussion of guiding principles, discussion, prioritization of duties and responsibilities, discussion of the current community notification assessment. I think those are things that need to be kind of on our radar. I think we'll be asked to take a look at the guiding principles in kind of as a subcommittee in a smaller group and make sure we're.

Kind of aligned in terms in terms of how those should look going forward and potentially making recommendations or presenting our position on that to the larger board. And I believe Major Mitchell sent those out again, right.

So yes, Jenna Mitchell, yes, those have been sent out and we can do it however you want if board members or subcommittee.

Members want to send in their thoughts, revision, suggestions, we can compile those and then the committee can discuss them. Or if you want to just take some time, review them and then have the discussion at the next meeting, that's an option as well.

I'll put it on the agenda I think for next time, but I think if folks are able to take a look at it outside, that would.

Save us time from having to sort of read it word for word together. But I do think we can discuss it. Someone have their hand up. OK, Scott. Sorry. Yeah.

**SN Scott Naegele**

I do. I do, yeah. So those guiding principles, are those Colorado's guiding principles?

**BB Brecken Blades**

Yes, the ones that we started with, yeah, I think, I think what what was proposed initially were Colorado's is what we started with. Yeah, that's where they came from.

**SN Scott Naegele**

Oh, OK. I just want, I just wanted to verify that I thought they probably were. They looked like what I had read in the Colorado standards, but I didn't know the point of of reference.

**BB Brecken Blades**

Mm-hmm.

Yes, I think it's Colorado, but I admittedly haven't done a deep dive into the guiding principles of other state boards and I'm sure that they exist. And so I think the point here is

that it what works for Colorado doesn't necessarily work for us, but it's it's at least a starting point, you know, and we can kind of go from there.

The discussion and prioritization of duties and responsibilities, I don't know for sure what I need to be discussing about that one. I'd ask to put that on there. Instead of doing it with the larger board, she felt that the subcommittees could give advice and guidelines to the larger board.

Well, you know we've kind of taken our taken the statute and started to look at things kind of chronologically and and in the order that the statute tells us to do. But I do know and this probably goes into the the last agenda item discussion of the current community notification assessment I think.

As we're all aware, a more hot button issue is notification and and registration. So I don't know if I don't know to be honest with you exactly how to integrate that into what we're doing or if we want to tackle that in some way. I know that's that's what I mean like it's that's. Little, but I do think, yeah, it's massive. And so well,

If if I may recognize this, Peter, I think my comment earlier to Jim about, you know it's something we have to consider is because.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

It's massive.

Regardless of the risk notification, or I'm sorry, risk assessments, treatment advice or treatment recommendations we have, we have to keep those in mind because it's going to affect how people do treatment, how they're perceived, the stigma that goes with them. And all of that. So and that's that's simply what I mean by it's not black and white, Jim, is that it's going to realistically impact people and realistically impact victims, whichever way we go. So it's necessarily going to have to be in the background with everything we decide. Where we tackle and how we tackle it, I'm not sure yet.

I think you're really actually right on. And I think we should get the input of every victim before they get off registration. I think we got to incorporate that in the guidelines somehow. So they have their saying because they're like the silent victim in all this, their, their, their registration as a victim doesn't end anytime.

In their lifetime. True. Yeah. So, you know, maybe we should be contacting the victims and requiring that victims have their their say and their input for a person actually.

SN

**Scott Naegele**

They, they, they actually, they actually do have that and that's built into the existing existing system, especially when changes in status from probation to non probation take place there, there, there, there's a mechanism in the judicial process.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

It's for probation release, not registration release.

**SN**

**Scott Naegele**

We're, you know, yeah.

But.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

OK. Well, I think even though they are intertwined, yeah, we would probably have to in some ways table or pause our discussion about evaluations and then and then change our efforts into the community notification just because they're so they both require so much.

Research and focus and so much time. We don't have hours and hours to be here all together.

So I would say for now let's continue on with our evaluation piece and then I can do a little more research and you know, work with Major Mitchell in terms of if there's, if there's some kind of sort of a need for us to shift in a way to put something else first, you know.

Find that out and let the committee know. Otherwise, let's kind of carry on. Agreeing with you, just let's get to a place where we're comfortable with this. Then we can shift focus and then figure out how to put them together. Yeah. And when? Yeah, I mean, do we need to stop this right now and like move or do you know? But so for now, let's just.

Let's just carry on. Carry on. OK, All right. I am going to move to adjourn the meeting.

Would someone like to 2nd the motion?

It's Peter Morey. I second.

OK, all in favor.

**SN**

**Scott Naegele**

Aye.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

Aye.

**A**

**anonymous**

Aye.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Any opposed?

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

OK. OK. The motion carries. The meeting is over. Thank you.

Thank everyone for your patience with our technical difficulties. Yeah. And the timing.  
Thank you. Thank you all.

- **Ashlesha Naik** stopped transcription