

# AZSOMB Juvenile Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20260319\_133257-Meeting Recording

March 19, 2026,

## AI-generated content may be incorrect

My name is Scott Naegele. I'm the chair of the Juvenile Subcommittee and I'd like to ask for a motion to commence the meeting. Peter Morey, second motion or propose we start the meeting.

Yes, second. Ben Galarneau, second. Thank you. OK. Hi. I believe this is our third gathering of meetings that we've had so far. When we met last time, we were in the process of trying to come and talk about.

Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. Yeah. Let me back up and do roll call. Jenna, can you assist us with that? Yes. All right. So Chairman Naegele is present. Excused is Mr. Barney. Mr. Galarneau.

Present. Doctor Morey, present.

Miss Opheim. Present. Yep. Yep. I'm sorry. I'm going to work on it.

So you have a quorum. Thank you.

All right, returning to the old business, we were talking about other states standards and processes as related to the pre-sentence part of the process.

I don't know if we have more that we needed to talk to you about other stuff. I did, like I said I would, and I reached out to a colleague in Canada to try to garner a little bit of information about their processes with respect to both adults and juveniles.

I made a brief report about the what he had to say regarding the adults in the adult court system yesterday in the adult committee. If it's OK with the group assembled, I'd like to just read a brief paragraph that Doctor James Whirling sent me.

Regarding Uh.

The processes for juveniles in Canada. So I'm gonna do that and then we can perhaps have a discussion about that.

For youth, the age of responsibility in Canada is 12, so our youth system is applied to those who offended when they were between the ages of 12 and 17 inclusive. As with adults, we don't have any national rules or regulations regarding who does assessments.

How they conduct them or how interventions are delivered. In the most populous province, Ontario, where I live and work, we also don't have any provincial standards, rules or guidelines regarding the assessment or treatment of youth who have offended sexually. As well as you can imagine, it is highly variable.

What happens for a team who is committing a sexual offence in Canada? I think what he's trying to say is, is probably each province, maybe even smaller than that cities and municipalities in those provinces.

Are probably doing things in very different ways, some of which is probably anchored in good science, as I know it would be with respect to Jim in Ontario. Not sure I could comment on.

Whether that's being done qualitatively in other places to the extent that I know Jim and his colleagues in Ontario are doing that, but it is a marked contrast to what probably already exists here in Arizona and in the States broadly.

And something that you know the very existence of this board, I think highlights maybe some of the differences between our state and

Canada in general can't help but wonder if not doing it on some level in Canada is concerned about things becoming over prescriptive and those kinds of things.

Jim did opine here in his e-mail to me and I'd also like to read that just because I think it's important for us to consider all alternatives and all perspectives as we move forward in trying to do.

Justice to this cause. So I'm going to read what he said, and perhaps this stimulates some discussion as well.

He said from an outsider, it often seems like the US tends to see those who commit sexual crimes as highly unique and somewhat homogeneous. For example, I have heard of several states with sex offender management boards, but I have never heard of such an organization for people who murder other people.

Or who set fires. I also never hear about youth having to take a polygraph unless they have offended sexually. I'm not saying that there aren't unique issues related to the assessment and treatment of those who commit sexual crimes, but it does feel like sexual crimes are treated very differently in your land versus my land.

This is perhaps what? This is perhaps why we don't have specific guidelines, management boards, etcetera.

It it, it does raise some interesting issues, right? I mean, we certainly have lots of people who cause harm to other people and we collectively seem to have made some decisions as systems.

To intervene or to respond to or to implement interventions with this group of clients in a very different way than we have probably everybody else.

Not sure what people's thoughts are about that.

Ben Galarneau. Did he have any thoughts about more dialogues? I don't know that I went back to him and had further dialogue with him. This was just an e-mail correspondence, certainly something that I intend to go back and have more dialogue with him about.

I mean, I have a good sense of some of his responses because we know each other pretty well and I've known him for 30 years and used him as a resource to help me with difficult situations across time. So I, you know, I think, I think he says a lot in the last sentence of his paragraph.

You know.

and and trying to be thoughtful. Maybe.

Shouldn't do the sex offenders board or maybe should be the both. I think that that those are both reasonable questions, you know, I mean, why we do it differently with sex offenders is philosophically an interesting question. So, Peter Morey, I'm.

Trying so hard not to laugh out loud right now because we are trapped by Puritans, guys. I mean, we're.

It's just who we are. We're so sex negative in this country that anything deal with sex is so purulent and scandalous and money-making that, you know, it's blown out of proportion for entertainment or.

Character suicide or character assassination and all of that. And so European standards, Australian standards, Canadian standards don't apply in our own system. I really think it's funny to have a murder management board.

But I also hate to suggest that because I the lawyer part of me is saying that's just opening the door to way too much governmental overreach. So I think in my part on.

The.

I guess the point I'm trying to make is that I think in this and what I liked about the guiding principles of juveniles is that we assume they're going to get better through treatments and I think we need to carry on that same attitude with.

Adults because sex offenders in America are a really easy political football. I mean politicians and gaining so much mileage from a really easy target and we're creating a marginalized burden. And yeah, what they do is terrible. Do they need treatment? Absolutely. Do they need some sort of management?

Trying to cohesive system to help people through that, absolutely. But I think that we shouldn't throw a person out for one.

That thing would happen. I mean, if they, if it's a serial thing that keeps happening, they don't progress through treatment and they don't progress through probation, absolutely. They're making their own bed there. But we need to have some system that a person is not going to be defined by this one act or even some extra one period.

Of their life. We don't do that to murderers. We don't do that to arsonists. We don't do that to even drunk drivers who maybe commit heinous crimes that affect families for years, if not generations. So I think we need to look at this rationally from a humanistic perspective of, OK, how do we?

Respect the victim, take care of them, respect their rights, not retraumatize them by, you know, if there was a suggestion yesterday, the adult meeting of having the victims recontact a different person is going to maybe get off the .

Registration and so forth. Well, for persons 1520 years past this and have a light, do you really want to retraumatize them by bringing back to their perpetrator? You know, we need to think about all of those things in a holistic fashion and.

Work both sides of the fence here, which is the tough balancing act that we have. So there's my soapbox. Yeah, no, I, you know, I I think a lot of what you're saying is kind of what Jim's probably getting at like.

Like, you know, some of the statements that he's making, the questions that he's raising. But I've said before in our prior meetings that I want us, I want something meaningful to come out of this, obviously, but I don't want us to rush so much that we end up.

Coming up with things that are more problematic than what we already have. I want us to be thoughtful about this. I want us to be thorough about this. I want us to, I want us to create it enough of an environment both in this room and the larger committee.

That we can talk about some difficult things and and to and to truly have those vetted and for enough dialogue to take place that we that we're a largely informed body making largely informed decisions.

Peter Morey. I I completely agree with that. I also think that we need to come up with something that's realistic so that we don't create the easy necessarily the easy way, but we create a continuum that will actually work across the system because I think a lot that.

We have in place.

Doesn't work because we don't talk to each other. In other words, the agencies don't know what each other is doing or how the system works. So we can come up with all kinds of great stuff in treatment. The probation guys are gonna be like, yeah, great, but we can't do that. So I think those are.

Things we need to be sensitive about in the subcommittees to say, OK, let's take this back so we can get meaningful input, as you were saying, to create something that actually works.

Yeah, and I think that that's part of what's behind this subcommittees.

Having people come in to talk to us and to share information regarding their particular vantage point of the larger system, we're going to, we're going to come to to that discussion as we sit here today, but we have people lined up to come.

Hopefully to the next two meetings from different state agencies to talk about their system's responsibilities and their system's way of doing things and responding to these issues with kids and families.

Who have these issues, I think, I think we all need to hear that information so that we can have more dialogue around those issues. We certainly have in this room enough capacity to to make our way through some of those.

System challenges and roadblocks and perhaps even conflicts. I don't know if we take the time to do that, but we're going to need to have buy-in from from everybody in a in a more complete way to to do justice to this task.

Ben Galarneau. And that's that's the beauty of those all of us being, right? We're going to get to do that. I think certainly think having a system in place is better than, not having a system. I am surprised to here they do not have something at minimum, it gives you a chance to compare notes. Getting data. I would agree.

I I mean my my guess is that this is Scott Naegele again. I suspect and it will be borne out or not borne out any more discussion that I have with Doctor Whirling, but I I know him well enough to know that he has something in place.

And that it's research driven and it's science driven. And that he's doing that as he interfaces

with kids and families who have these issues, whether or not there's any state or government oversight or provincial oversight that outlines things. I think that's probably what he's talking about, but I'm confident.

And in his interactions with kids and families with these issues, he he he has a system and it's a well thought out system and one that has been born to to to create less recidivism.

And he's probably one of a half a dozen people who's studied recidivism rates.

Of juveniles more than getting anybody else. And I think there's evidence that his programming is in fact working. So yes, yeah, well, Peter, Morey, and this kind of circles all the way back to where we're here with the risk means responsibility. It's that I think that.

Model was really appropriate for us to move forward with. OK, you know what happened?

What can we do to make this not happen here rather than there's your bad luck out. And so I think we definitely need a system. We definitely need the research base. We definitely need.

An individual as much as we can assessment to figure out how we're going to move people forward with the expectation of them getting better. Yeah, and back to the place where where we started this subcommittee similar to the adult subcommittee talking about.

The pre-sentence assessment piece of this assessment by its very nature should be drawing distinctions between one person and the next, making recommendations that are as individualized as they can possibly be. So anything other than that that's being called assessment.

From my humble perspective, is not is not assessment. It's cookie cutter, it's repetitive, and it does not take into account individual responsibility factors of individual kids and their families.

So.

Melony Opheim. Just the processing and and comments and and I I watching Jim as well as you for 30 years as well and and know well this work. I guess I just keep going to you know talking about the boards for other types of individuals.

And an arsonist.

You know they get caught two or three times. They're not. They're not able to to reoffend by burning more houses down. A murderer, if they're doing it more than once and they're committing homicides, they are typically shut down and not allowed to just keep trying and and.

Get treatment. But with offenders, there's a lot of, I think when it comes to sex offending, there could be a lot more victims. You know, there's a if there's a serial killer, then that's a little bit different. And yes, they they're treated like a serial killer. But yeah, there's not going to be a Board for the one guy that gets mad and kills his girlfriend, you know?

But I mean what stats that used to be one in three people was a sex offence victim. So I don't want to minimize the fact that we have a board to help our people. So I I I again don't want it to be this way and too extreme, but I don't want to be and and I know Canada, you know, I know how they and for him to say like we don't really have something, but you're right, he has something.

Yeah. Too bad everybody in Canada doesn't adopt to his thing. Yeah. But I don't want to get to where we all do something different in this county, or in two different counties. So imagine everybody already doing stuff, but if we didn't even have probation on board or we didn't have judges on board, it would be that much more chaotic. And yeah, some kids would get to chat and some kids.

Wouldn't get accountability at all, you know. So I kind of see it somewhere in the middle. But you know, saying why don't we have boards for other people? I think when it comes to sex offending, you can have a lot of damage in a lot of years. And so I don't know. I mean, the victims are.

You know, I'm just going to jump in and play devil's advocate on that really quickly. And this is from wearing the two hats, the psychiatrist and the SVP attorney. Pyromania is a mental illness, psychopathy is a mental illness. You know, we see a lot of unspecified peripheral disorder non consent, so.

We've got legitimate mental illnesses that may drive this, and yet we've got one in three because, you know, a drunk stepdad diddles his daughter. Research shows he's probably never going to do that again. You've got the guy who loses his cool and rolls somebody away in a second-degree murder.

He's probably never even do it again either, so.

I agree with you that there's going to be some distinction or some order, some mechanism to tease out who may be a one-time offender and who's going to go on and be a serial pyromaniac. But we need to build that into the system that we're talking about. It starts with the evaluation that Scott was talking about.

And that's how individualizing. I think that what we had talked about with the one-size-fits-all, absolutely I agree with you. Can't do that and can't not have a system so.

And I don't know numbers and other big stats and other numbers that may or may not be accurate, but I there's not as many pyromaniac as there are people who are sex offending. And I've I've worked with juveniles and I can say in almost 30 years that I've almost never had somebody that just had one victim and never did it again.

So I don't, I don't see those kids. Maybe it's because they the people looking to me aren't just the one time. But I think it's it's it's rare that just a kid doesn't want and gets caught and it's never about doing it again or doesn't have more victims. Ben Galarneau. And I think I don't think it was framed this way so that they were determinates way that it suggests that the board is bad thing.

Right. Yeah, I don't think.

Or it can be a good thing. We can address some of those things. Sure, we can establish laws that's treated that way instead of not having anything.

So I I think Boards could be good things. Regulation could be good I think if we doing properly. It's important. Peter Morey, I totally agree with you 100% and I think we absolutely need this Board. I think it's a really good thing.

But at the same time, Scott Naegele, but at the same time, I think it's important to ask

ourselves philosophical questions about how did we get here? Did we get here for all the right reasons and all the risk-based reasons and all the just reasons?

Where did we get here through other other forces such as you alluded to, you know in in in in the statement you made a short while ago. I I I think, I think you're correct. I think that that is a piece of of why we've gotten here and are sitting here having this discussion.

I think there is a way to balance the need for community safety, the need for justice for victims and the need for.

Well assessed risk of individual, of individual young, young people who are engaging in sexually abusive behavior. I I think we have the methodology to do that, whether or not we can convince people collectively that that makes sense.

That that that yet that's yet unanswered question in particular the the the the piece of that equation that involves the use of polygraph testing. That one from my perspective turned into something that I don't think.

Ever really existed in an operational sort of way and and and and those of us that that tend to support the use of polygraph never really got a chance to to comment about the advantages of it.

And and to counter comment some of the abuses that were being sold as commonplace when polygraphs are getting done. They just it it just it it didn't happen that way and from my perspective and and I think some of of of my colleagues perspectives.

That got that the issue of polygraph in the state of Arizona got got became a political issue and it got rammed through without any real meaningful dialogue about that and we need to have that dialogue.

As part of this process and if that means, I ask Ben here to come and give a presentation about his process with respect to juveniles as part of of of us bringing people in to to to share their their information from their perspective.

Then we need to do that too. Um.

Peter Morey, I think that would actually be good. I mean, I'm kind of where you are with polygraph with juveniles, but I think.

And I think Melanie said it correctly that we know a lot more individually than we know as as the collective right now. So more educational we get and being able to share all that information. So yeah, I think having Ben present that would be great just so we know.

So I'll admit I don't know the specifics of the polygraph and I I honestly don't know the entire controversy behind it, but I think it's part of the tool. It's absolutely should be included in both the adult and Juvenile. Yeah, and when I and when I say what I say about the use of polygraph.

That includes protecting individuals rights against self-incrimination. I mean, that includes all of that stuff. I'm not. I'm not naive to to those concerns. In fact, I was part of a subcommittee 25 years ago that wrote the current statute around those that are adjudicated having built in legal protections.

You know once they've been adjudicated about making other disclosures in the course of

their treatment. I I so I I I get that I I I think that's important too and and we need to balance those realities as part of this equation too but.

But to not have meaningful dialogue about it is a mistake. It's a it's an error.

So, if I may, Peter, Morey, where should we start today?

I could keep talking about this all day. Yeah. Well, I think we move on to the next item on the. I think we move on to the next item on the agenda, which is the discussion of the guiding principles. I'm not sure where to start that discussion other than.

I I believe that these guiding principles are the Colorado's state guiding principles as it relates to juveniles. It's like the succinct version that I read last time. I think it is.

Yeah,

well, Ben Galarneau. I don't know. Have you all looked around at at the other like boards? I've been to last and I saw some, there's about 17 states that have something that looks like a board. Not all the states are calling in boards like Texas and they don't have something guiding principle which is said we had a treat.

Sex offenders and you refer to this statute, this and this statute. So it's really possible. This and Colorado and Idaho seem to have kind of a document starting guiding principles for the whole thing, but a lot of states are doing it differently. Colorado and Idaho pretty similar.

I'm Scott Naegele. I had got verification in the adult subcommittee meeting which took place yesterday that these were in fact the the, the, the, the Colorado standards. I I raised, I raised the issue today because I think it's an important one.

That I I think we need, we need, we need something like this and I don't think that there's anything wrong with using these as points of departures. But I'm not, I'm not a lawyer, but I but I do have concerns about us.

Making making making this part of, you know, reviewable stuff on on our website without us getting.

A blessing from the people that we got the information from, Mr. Chairman, Jenna Mitchell. I did speak with Chairwoman Goulden and she did receive these directly from Colorado and they did share them freely knowing that we would be considering and or adopting their guiding principles. So I think we had an answer for you on that.

That's a good answer. I feel a lot more comfortable about us because I know that at least my sense is, is that the the Chairwoman Goulden wants to try to to move forward with some of this guiding principle stuff as quickly as possible. I I I concur with that, but I think we need to make sure that everybody's had a chance to.

Review these thoroughly and and and then we can have a discussion about what in here seems to hold true for us here in Arizona and what might need to be tweaked a bit and that needs to be perhaps dropped.

From from this I I I don't know.

So I don't know what the next step with respect to that is other than and to encourage all of us sitting at this table to to to to do that. Peter Morey, are we looking at Idaho too because I know the last meeting.

Blake gave us a pretty good summary of Idaho, what they have going on. It sounds like there was some pretty good system built up. I personally haven't read the guiding principles from Idaho. Yeah, I'm just wondering if we can put those up. Can we can we get these?

It could Ben submit this to you guys and just have you guys distribute it to all of us so that we have access to it. Absolutely. If Jenna Mitchell, are those the documents that Blake provided in the last meeting for the adults? No, I printed this off. You printed it off. OK, OK.

There's like, I think there's 20 here. Colorado is 18 a to r for Idaho.

They're pretty. I mean, they're pretty simple, right? They're saying a lot of the same stuff here. Yeah. And what what I'm kind of wondering is if we can put those up so all of us, can review before the next meeting, next meeting we can discuss any differences, think may be able to mesh between the two.

And add take out and then be done guiding principles. Point of clarification, if I if I can ask a question, when we say put them up, we're just talking about disseminating to the. Yeah.

Thank you for that point of clarification.

I think there's getting nods of heads that they can absolutely do that. So that that'll be helpful. I mean, we could also take time in a very busy schedules to try to do some more searches, but but I concur with Ben, I found approximately 17 states of some version of what we're trying to create here.

They are in varying degrees of operational, I would say, and in varying degrees have a whole lot of substance to them. There's a Colorado on one end of the continuum down to some other states that other than a.

Statement of that they have something of a of a board. I I don't see much else going on that that was my cursory review of things.

So we'll we'll we'll make that happen and we'll be prepared to have more discussion about that. We are at some point going to have to make some decisions about biting the bullet and who's going to do some writing and those kinds of things. I wish if I may ask another question.

Jenna Um.

Is there any way, cause I've been thinking this and maybe it just crystallized in my brain right here. Is there anybody that can can do could take that task on to look at those other 17 things and try to summarize what exists and doesn't exist in those other places in a?

In a more consumable manner for those of us that are part of the subcommittees and the larger committee, it's just so much. I don't know how somebody other than somebody who's dedicated to doing that's going to be able to pull that off.

Off.

Jenna Mitchell, yeah, I don't think that our current staff, it's a very small staff, has the capacity to do that for you. Certainly if you send us documents, we can distribute them to you all. We can combine them for you. We can help you put together a document, but.

Not to do the independent research and collect, you know, 17 different states guiding principles. I don't think we have the time or the staff in support of two subcommittees and the

whole Board. I suspected that that was probably the case. Yeah, happy to help. but I also then wondered in response to that.

Is that is that an oversight in the in the in the structure of our process that we don't, we don't have the ability to do that. I I'm just asking a question. I I I I had concerns.

About some of the about workload and those kinds of things as this started to unfold and and then it then it ends up landing on us a few select people who already don't have time to to to to do all that but.

Ben Galarneau. There's only under 17 states maybe we could break them up each look at 2 or 3. I would assume that most states did what we're doing now went of Colorado. I see a lot of Colorado stuff in Idaho. We're just gonna, you know, everyone's gonna do what we did and I think we're gonna find it's all pretty.

Pretty similar stuff, right? Community safety. Victim, victim's family. Treating the offender. It's all that kind of stuff. I don't think we need to reinvent the wheel. We'll some of the stuff we could probably just take straight from here about. But as far as plagiarizing goes, I don't know.

Jenna, do we have permission to actually just take the verbatim stuff from them use it or do we need to? I would. It's Jenna Mitchell, DPS. I want to verify that with Colorado, but from what Chairwoman Goulden expressed to me, she did have permission. I know she and I have both been in contact with the program manager in Colorado for resource documents, support things.

Things like that. So I don't think there will be a problem, but I would to Chairman's point want to just confirm that with them that we have permission to use it and or you know, rebrand it with Arizona's name on it. So then Scott Naegele in the spirit of doing with Mr. Galarneau suggesting here.

Perhaps I can send an e-mail to staff with the list of states that have some sort of structure that they're calling a management board and we can do it exactly what you're saying, but then take three or four of them and and spend a little bit more time.

Going into those in with with the with the permission of the group, I'll take the liberty of doling those out if that's if that's OK with everybody. Sure. OK, sounds good. Then Peter, Morey, quick I wonder if there's regional variation to these.

Like, there's New York do it differently than Washington. I guess we'll find out, right? Yeah, yeah, it'd be interesting. Ben Galarneau. Like you said, some of the stuff some of it's under DPS and some of it's under Department of Corrections.

And it wasn't just right there like these were. No, it's not easy to to to source for sure that that I found out really quickly that that's the case.

They're like going back to our original discussion. That's why we're here.

OK, so we'll do that between now and when we sit together again, we'll we'll get I'll, I'll get a list of the states that have some some form of board and we'll.

With the help of staff reach out to each of you about which states I'd like you to take the time to do a bit more research on, and I will be the same with whichever ones I for myself, so to

speaking, and we'll be prepared to come back and talk about that some more than the next time we come here.

Melony Opheim. I just. I still have Tom Leverage that's welcome. He offered several times too.

fill me in, or tell me what they did wrong, or what they did right, and so he's pretty willing and I can't who he is. I know who he is. Clarify for the group who he is. Bio, but more recently, I mean, he's been a big part of ATSA, the conference that that's Scott and I gone to for years and years, but I'm not sure he was ever on the ATSA board. He was going to be the president, but he's been kind of one of the guiding forces of a lot of the guidelines that came out of the national conference, the national guidelines for ATSA. More recently, the AOC, who I deal with, the Office of the Courts and especially the juvenile portion has used him as a reference referral trainer. I mean, I trained all the probation officers last year with him.

Coinciding. So he's definitely somebody that Arizona looks to and which kind of helps me because I don't agree with everything in Colorado. Case in point it was the is the polygraph. But the fact that the AOC already kind of buys him, that's who I do, but that's who my biggest contractor is.

My funding source. So it kind of helps me know he's already in. He's already got a well-established voice in the field. So yeah, he's he's been an integral figure in a in a committee of people from ATSA, the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers.

Who rewrote the guidelines for assessment, supervision and treatment for for juveniles that came out a couple years ago. And a piece of that is, as as Melanie said, had to do with the use of polygraph and just so I can say it on the record.

They didn't say not to use the polygraph. They essentially said only in in in specific unique cases and with input from the court and that and that piece of it feels right to me.

We could probably have a discussion about where the line gets drawn, about who, how we decide who we we do and don't polygraph, because I don't think there's ever been any discussion about that. There would be some, though we could have a lively debate in this room, I'm sure.

About whether or not we think everybody needs to be polygraphed and perhaps we need to have that discussion, whether that be now or at some other point in time, because I have, I definitely have thoughts and feelings about that. But yeah, so.

I mean, ATSA didn't say no. They they they they largely said no though. They largely said and the largely and the voice was loud enough that it influenced, it influenced state agencies to adopt judges and defense attorneys are our biggest. So I guess he says no, go ahead and do it. There's this this.

There's as many steps this this much paperwork now you have to do, but what the defense attorneys heard and what the judges kind of have been influenced on is that ATSA said it was bad. So that that's kind of the bottom line is there was an overall feel from ATSA in the guidelines that this man wrote.

That even though we can do them, it's very difficult. I mean, I've had several, several therapists that are very concerned about clients, our kids, and when requesting a polygraph like we were asked to do, they get shot down or it takes months and they still get shot down. So that's no certainly a a perception of polygraph.

Was created by the process that unfolded that has left the judicial and certainly defense attorneys with with with a lot of resistance and I I don't think justifiably so, but.

But those are those are discussions to be had.

Yeah, Ben Galarneau, I think we just need to, as I mentioned in the last meeting, redefine what polygraph is . Re explained or educate because people start this premise of that it's abusive and we go from there. You know, I was reading one of these statutes here, so if you're using a polygraph, proceed with caution.

My first question was why? Who wrote that tell me why? I bet they would be hard pressed, you know, because that's what I heard really should proceed with caution. You know, it's it's there's this, this perception on the word came from, but it's if it's done properly, it's very effective and I think the only place that you could criticize.

So it would be the post ask right after somebody fails how you handle that because the American Polygraphs Association says the interview should be objected, non biased, any opinions, no matter of fact in your interview and then you sit down in the chair for about 10 minutes and a couple of electrodes, five or six, seven questions.

And then you're done. I mean, I can see they're looking at that. Well, that's abusive. It's an interview like they have with a PO, you know, or a therapist and anybody else. And they sit down and answer some questions. So that we're part, you know, we kind of made some policy about how do we deal with.

Result and we could we could tweak that out and you know we can we can make guidelines and think how do we question how do we let them building do we let them maybe the therapist lets you know but there's there's a lot of things we could do there and that's the only part of that I can see when people have a criticism and I'm sure.

Somewhere along the line, you know there's some polygrapher who just wasn't doing a good job and maybe they were abusive and interrogated pressed too hard. We can deal with that policy and we can have board certified juvenile polygraphers who are trained that way and don't do this one in question.

You might say something. I'm not sure how you do this question. Looks like issues here. And the juveniles are pretty easy to start talking once you point out to not. Up until that point, they'll tell you no many times. If you go, you know what? Looks like you might not be doing so good on this question. I'll comment.

It's not difficult. We can deal with that. But there's a whole discussion in what you just said about the utility of the polygraph in terms of what it can facilitate. It becomes a more integral part of the kids ongoing treatment.

You know, so there's like there's there's all these cautionary things that have come up across time about the use of polygraph. But as you said, and I agree with you, Ben, give me an

example of that that you know from your own experience.

And the people who are saying those things can't give you an example of that. They can't in in in in. So there's a lot of folklore about what this is and how it's used.

And how it's caused trauma and how it's resulted in other charges being filed, none of which, none of which in 30 years am I am I cognizant of it. Melony Opheim. I I wish I could say and I'm not trying to get off the topic of polygraphs, but it is not. It is not solely polygraphs this month.

For different kids who are needing assessments and psychosocial evaluations, the teams that had said no, it will be traumatizing, no, it will be traumatic. So we're not just dealing with these guys being traumatized. Now it's gone so far as we cannot make an assessment. We have kids wrong.

Someone, sometimes DCS programs with no treatment available that my therapists are begging for an assessment before we get into the treatment and they're saying the kid doesn't want to or the team thinks it would be traumatic. So it's kind of a shift of everything, like asking a kid a question.

Is is is abusive. So it's going, it's taken from there. And then my last year of of treatment with my therapist is taking a whole new role like, OK, now everything's abusive and you know, I have therapists that don't look, but the way we deal with things is very upfront and accountability and we've been accused of.

mean to, to our kids, you know, but you know what I mean? Like it's just a whole different, there's a different lens and maybe it's just with kids because I don't deal in adult world, but that's what I'm dealing with on with daily. That was yesterday. I got a call by another team that said they would never let this kid take an assessment because it's too traumatic.

Answer questions about his offenses. So that's the bigger issue. That's what we try to tell them is we like our kids. You meet him once a month for 20 minutes and you think you're doing them a favor. But I swear to you, he's gonna, he's gonna end up in the adult system because he's not learning that he cannot do that.

These things, we're trying to help with that you know. Peter, Morey, actually Ben, the more we're sitting here talking more, I would like you to do that presentation just to clear up some of the myths we have about polygraph.

I mean, I'm I guess I'm going on record saying I'm I'm for it, but I don't totally understand how it works or what you can do. So I can see from the therapist hat, I get it yeah, I absolutely want polygraphs and find out what's going on.

Just, you know, fact check on them. The lawyer's side of me is saying, OK, hold on, but if you're doing this interview, I can also see how you could frame it where a person could be more, answer that again, so.

You know, I've got both, pulling both thoughts in my head. Like, you know, I couldn't see asking questions about intent from a therapist's point of view. Yeah, I absolutely want to know that from a medical doctor point of view. I'm like, oh crap, that's loaded because everybody's anxiety is going to go up in a basis, physiological interaction from a.

Lawyer point of view and be like, yeah, that's and and and see what happens when we end up talking about this more things. Things get articulated that are important for us to respond to. Like you wouldn't have realized that we don't test for intent, right? We only test on behaviors. But can't ask questions about intent, right. That's where that's where I think a lot of especially prosecutors are you know is OK, we want a polygraph on intent or even defense attorneys because they don't know. So I think and that's where I kind of started with so I would like that presentation so.

We have it on record of what we do know about polygraphs, so it shows how we're, you know, considering this that's taking considered view of it. I know that Jim Hanratty. Were you at the presentation where Jim? I'm just saying it would have to be different. This is people probably like we already heard about polygraphs.

So definitely gearing towards the the juvenile end of it because somebody did ask how does this relate to juveniles. It was a pretty I think it was Judge Young that might have asked that it was it was a pretty quick yeah response. Jim didn't go in to it and we were kind of out of time. So I just don't want to I don't want to have I mean I'm not saying you. Don't want to hear you talk but but.

I don't want the team to go, like didn't we already do this, you know, I was actually just talking about us. Oh, that's OK. No, I was just like, I just didn't take much to the big part. But having, but having said that, this is Scott having said that.

Nothing changes unless it goes through the full board. So we we can, I mean we're going to sit here and we're going to do the work we need to do and we're going to come up with recommendations and such, but it still has to pass muster with with the full board.

So if the full board isn't fully in the know about things that there are going to be discussions about, how how could they possibly weigh in in a meaningful sort of way? We do our job and we take it back and they need to hear from Ben an extra 15 minutes they do.

I think I think we just ask for permission to have that be part of the larger committee on once we go with our. Ben Galarneau and we could you know, we could as far as polygraphs we have attorneys involved. It's rare with the juveniles that we do.

A polygraph. Did you do something? Unless the defense attorney wants it and a lot of times we're doing them with juveniles we're doing part of a psychosexual evaluation. Somebody requested.

And with those.

We have a statute here in Arizona that provides immunity to some extent of any admissions made. On a polygraph.

Once, once you're in treatment, once you're adjudicated, you can. So in those situations, we'll make it very clear we don't want identifying information on victims. And just Basic information, but usually we're not doing a lot of pre adjudication stuff. Its typically after they adjudicated, we'll maybe evaluation you know, because there can be some problems with pre adjudication process with that. That's where you're gonna get the calls. From defense attorneys, Scott Naegele. Having said that, I will tell you that I've had a fair

amount of experience working with defense attorneys on juvenile cases and they are supportive.

Of my use of the polygraph in the evaluations and they know that we are going to attend to the concerns that they have as well as you just articulated Ben, but that we really want the information because it helps us do a more comprehensive risk assessment.

And it helps us make decisions about what the needs of this individual kid are from an intervention standpoint. You know, we have risk assessment scales that have been designed both for adults and for juveniles.

Um and the information.

Scoring somebody on a risk assessment scale is only as meaningful as the information that you have, and in the absence of lots of information, you're going to invariably under-evaluate somebody's risk, because if you're an ethical person, you're going to score them.

No, unless you have information that it's yes on certain variables on a risk assessment scale.

The problem is, is that you have people using scales as if they mean something when they don't have comprehensive information about the case that's sitting in front of them.

That's a problem. That's a that that's a problem and and they don't have much specificity then either with respect to what are the levels of concern. Is it an issue of deviancy, bonafide deviancy with this kid?

Is it an issue of antisociality with this kid? Where do substance issues play a part in this? And how do all those things coalesce together to either determine somebody to be more or less risky? Well, frankly, the developmental stage.

For sure, 13 year old, for sure. That has the psychological profile of an 8 year old in in behavior X. We know what behavior X is. We don't know whether behavior X means the same thing for the 12 year old as it does for the 16 year old.

Ben Galarnau, I'll tell you one of the things about about this business that I've seen. Some counties will require a polygraph as part of the assessment and they will require the person has the polygraph before they.

When that happens, when you're dealing with an evaluator, they will do evaluation and they will call me directly for polygraph. That's where they get the information. They can use that information for their evaluation. When you're dealing with evaluators, if you're not polygraph, they will do evaluation and say if they don't polygraph.

Lawyer, you can get me a polygraph and give it to me and then use that. So lawyer called me and said, hey, this kid's got a great evaluation, low risk, right? I'll tell you a specific example.

Kid had great evaluation. He's getting ready to go on to really good Ivy League school.

He inappropriately touched foreign exchange student one time. Prosecutor said that he gets an evaluation. I'm not going to charge, but I need a polygraph, so I just need to polygraph.

Everything else is great. Don't anticipate any problem.

Now, when that happens, a lawyer gets my report. A lawyer can do what they want to do. So this kid comes in and make a long story short, he had been sexually assaulting foreign exchange students for years, started doing what he's about 13 years old and he had raped

some girls in high school in the field with their date.

So this polygraph goes to the attorney and I get called by the attorney and starts screaming at him. He says, what did you do? You made my client look like Jeffrey Dollar. So this is very concerning and he said he threatened legal action. He said you tell the psychologist about this polygraph and the information.

You're in big trouble you shred your shred your material. I don't want to hear from you or about this again, right? OK.

So probably what happened is they probably lawyer sent him to six different places and when he got lucky and got a pass polygraph, he gave that to a psychologist and said, yeah, this is just what I thought. And the kid probably went off to school and I can assume there's more victim. So having that built in to the evaluation, you must agree with polygraph. The evaluator at least gets to see the information.

You know, and I would think if if you're a psychologist evaluation, just, you know, for for lots of reasons, you would want to at least look at the information. You don't have to use it. You don't have to build it into your assessment, but at least look at the information because that's the kind of stuff that comes up. I have probably been threatened by 30 or 40.

Attorney on juvenile test because of that process and it had just been built in we could and that kid probably never went off to the school. Peter Morey, couple thoughts and I I totally agree with you 100% about the polygraph and that's why I said the treatment side is for it, um, the lawyers side of me, I get it. I think.

Going back to the adult subcommittee yesterday, I off, Missy Musick's head about. she made a uh.

Very optimistic view of lawyers comment and I was like, yeah, no, they don't do that because we're not trained to do that and we're trained to fight fight, you know, right up until sentencing. And so the question yesterday in the adult subcommittee is.

OK, we're going through the process, you know, kind of looking at it as it goes along. When do we do the evaluation? And this is something we're going to face too. And one of the things was kicked around is OK, what if we build a judicial package that is done?

You know, pre-sentence, but post adjudication. So it goes to the lawyer for their consideration of sentencing and we include the polygraph, we include the evaluation and then, you know, deliver it to the lawyers sort of afterwards to say, OK, well here's what we've got on the client.

But the adjudication is already done, you guilty or not it just goes towards the sentencing, it goes towards the treatment. I think there's some validity to it because you know, as a lawyer can't trust lawyers, but that's what we're trained to do and we're trained to do what's best for our client, be it the state or the.

defense and things like what he just explained happened.

So I think that's one consideration of practical reality. Well, I think Scott Naegele, I think the good thing that we can be pretty confident about is though there was some some recent stuff going on that probably gets me to balk at what I'm about to say, but.

The the, the post post dismissal agreements that were happening in the juvenile court where there wasn't any evaluation going on and decisions were being made about what kind of interventions to happen. I think there's largely buy in that there needs to be some sort of evaluation at the front end of.

Of things with the vast majority of juveniles, whether we can get the individual systems that are responsible for that kid, whether that be the juvenile court or DCS to to agree that that that's the case, I mean that that's where the struggle is, but I think.

I think largely people buy into the fact that there needs to be some sort of assessment, what that assessment consists of and what the what the what the individual pieces of testing are that that that that comprise the protocol for the evaluation that that's where the discussion you know.

Nobody's going to debate the pencil and paper pieces of testing that are part of one of these evaluations, you know, because because frankly, what they are is they're standard psychological evaluations. Nobody's largely going to debate that. They're going to debate two things. They're going to debate the use of the ABLE assessment.

But not as vigorously as they're gonna debate the use of the polygraph. They're they're they're gonna those are those are the those are the two things and.

And I I personally don't know how I do an accurate risk assessment in the absence of the information that those two measurements bring to me. I I I I'm on record as saying I won't do a psychosexual evaluation.

In the absence of a polygraph and ABLE assessment, I I won't and I don't and I haven't. And thankfully, perhaps I've been able to foster relationships with defense attorneys that know my work and know that my question is to do an objective evaluation of their client and to get. Get their client the most appropriate treatment that they can, and I don't have the desire to have them thrown under the jail. Perhaps, perhaps that that, you know, that's a piece of it. But I don't have attorneys who come to me saying I'm not going to use you because you're going to do a polygraph. It doesn't. I don't have that happening.

Now we could have a long dialogue about what, why, why, why that might be. I have thoughts about that, but but I don't have that resistance. Well, but I think Peter Morey, but I think Scott part of the reason we're hearing you talking about that is it's not the lawyers who. Are coming to you we're concerned about be its the one not coming. So we're trying to trying to capture something statewide that gives us a system of uniform evaluation and uniform movement through the system.

Um, so I?

Personally, I agree with you. I don't know how you would do it. The question is how do we put it in there and when, get this mandated so we get that uniformed, get out those systems that don't use you.

Melony Opheim. I work with a lot of the systems and Scott said to the rural counties because Maricopa's the only ones that just kind of got rid of it from the defense attorneys had such a presence that it's just really hard to get a full polygraph, but he's talking about pre and the

assessment piece.

But we also needed it for the treatment piece. So it's and again it's it's you know about all the systems and I'm sitting here telling you about the assessments coming next and then it's just like what what do we have after that? You don't even have that. I understand and and and if I could, I won't be able to do justice to it because only two of us were part of the discussion. Yesterday in the adult subcommittee, but that there's a fallacy that that exists on some level out there that the pre-sentence risk assessments are not.

Informative in in the way or that they're that they they exist for a different reason other than to assess risk and to make recommendations about appropriate level of intervention and that that kind of came up indirectly in in yesterday's meeting.

And I I want to, I want to say that I don't, I don't, I don't, I don't know why that belief is true. I don't know where that's coming from and why there would be any belief that an assessment I or anybody else did in a pre-sentence scenario.

If operating from the standpoint that they that they have the training and education and the experience to do the evaluation in the 1st place would be anything other than an objective assessment of what's going on with the client. Well then, Peter Morey, I agree with you.

However, I don't think that comment was aimed at you or no, I don't think it was aimed at me at all. And then when I say you, I don't think you or ethical providers who do that. But being on the defense side and having dealt with this from the prosecution and the defense.

Well, lawyers get their fingers on a lot of things before adjudication's done. And if I won't want specific specifics, but because of my background in psychiatry and all that, I've run a couple not so good prosecutorial evaluators out of town because I just.

You know, showed how unethical they were. Same token on the defense side. I don't fish around for getting what I want, but I know other defense attorneys who will bury reports if they don't like what it says like Ben was just talking about. So I don't think that.

Like evaluations that you do and other ethical evaluators are the problem. I think it's that there's too much wiggle room in the judicial system and gamesmanship that goes on before the adjudication happens.

And that's why I'm, you know, put together the fact general, OK, look, this is what happens close to post adjudication pre-sentencing. When we get the evaluations done from the court, from the judicial perspective, here's the package that have to go in and consider for sentencing that will also be used for.

Um, possible treatment afterwards because it's not you. I'm worried about being unethical it's the nature of the adversarial system so.

And I'm I'm actually with is the judge still with us? Yes, Judge Young, I was just wondering if I could get your opinion on that from another legal perspective in the room.

**YA** Young, Anna

I.

Sure, yeah. I can tell you that the vast majority of cases I have where there is a juvenile who's

accused of have some kind of sexual offense is generally we do have the psychosexual done prior to disposition.

Very rarely do I ever have a defense attorney object to that. Sometimes I actually have the defense attorney that wants the psychosexual done prior to adjudication because then they review the report and they redact the report prior to the County Attorney seeing it. And because sometimes I have a defense attorney who thinks, hey, if my kiddo does the psychosexual.

Then the county attorney is going to give them a better offer, so.

OK.

**YA** **Young, Anna**  
Yeah.

And I don't. I don't have that many kids that go through polygraphs anymore since the code changed. Generally how that has happened is if the treatment team, you know, like I've had kids at YDI where the treatment team says, hey, we need the polygraph.

Thank you.

**YA** **Young, Anna**

They staff it with the team, including probation, and then probation will do the petition in order for the polygraph with the documentation attached to it as to why they think the polygraph is necessary. And then we have a hearing about it and you know. Sometimes the defense attorneys like, yeah, we're totally fine with that. Sometimes we battle, they battle it out and then I have to make the decision. So that's generally how it's worked in front of me since the code change.

You know you you, Judge Young, you you you you spurred something in my in my thinking that made me aware of something. I I I I'm listening loudly to to your to your comment that you don't have a lot of people.

A lot of youth being polygraphed and I I I I think my contention would be is because quite frankly treatment providers, a good number of them are concerned about being blacklisted and and and and and put on the undesirable list.

If they were to push for and ask for polygraph in more cases, and it's kept, it's kept, frankly, a good level of discussion from happening.

**YA** **Young, Anna**

And that could be. I can't obviously speak from the the treatment provider perspective. I do know, you know, I've been on the juvenile bench exclusively for 13 1/2 years. And so I was around before when I used to get polygraphs all the time. I used to get sexual history

polygraph I would get.

You know, incident offense polygraphs. I would get masturbatory polygraphs. I would get a ton of polygraphs initially when I was first assigned to juvenile. And then when the code change happened, initially there was a lot of discomfort, you know?

I think among everybody about going away from polygraphs because we were concerned that we were going to be missing things and and I think that at some point some treatment providers did step back from providing treatment.

So I don't, I don't know what the the state of the the treatment providers you know feeling about that is. I mean I know that you know I've had some kids at at U-turn where we've needed further assessment and and further help with with those kiddos and we've been able to to get those assessments done.

So I don't know if a lot of what you know Mel's talking about is is maybe certain county specific and you guys talked about the the dismissals. We don't have that at all in in Yavapai if we've got an adjudication and.

And we appreciate that.

**YA** Young, Anna

Yeah, if we got adjudication disposition, it's like we're that's the reality that we're dealing with. And you know, we have kids do treatment and sometimes kids are successful, sometimes they're not. I've got to say I I found that the treatment providers have done a really good job with getting good high quality services to my kids.

We're on probation for sexually maladaptive behavior. So I always tell parents during hearings that, you know, we've got really, really good success rates with kids who get appropriate treatment. So it's just a matter and I always encourage the the kids.

When you do your psychosexual, be super open and honest because the best services that we can get for you, the better outcome you're going to get because we want you to be a productive member of our community. So yeah, it's my two cents worth.

Yeah, and your two cents worth are very valuable. I want you to hear me say that. I think, I think that I think the people involved hearing that from you as the representative of the court sets the tone for it being a less adversarial system. And we're trying to win some contest here where somebody else has to lose.

**YA** Young, Anna

Oh, thanks.

Right. Yeah. We just want, we want kids to grow up and be successful members of our community, you know? So, yeah.

Um and and.

Thank you. Thank you so much. I I just want to echo what you just said right there. I think

that is kind of what we're looking for in our guiding principles is we want people who have committed these offenses to.

Eventually get get back in and participate again and.

Sometimes I feel like the candle in a hurricane, but I think that we can't lose sight of the offenders.

For the victim, I mean, it's probably feel like I'm going to get stoned for saying that, but I think we definitely need to not lose sight of both sides of the this issue. Yeah, I'd love nothing more than for us in the larger committee for for that matter, to get to the point where we could have honest dialogues about things with.

Without people drawing conclusions and insinuations about what it was I just said. Because the reality is, is anybody who's doing this for the right reasons and doing a good job is concerned about everybody that's involved. They're not concerned about just one side or the other. They're concerned about the larger system.

And.

If we could all get to a place where we truly believe that and function that way, we'd be we'd be rocking and rolling.



**Young, Anna**

Agreed.

Melony Opheim and and I agree and and I mean I get where you're coming from Peter, but that was one of the more offensive things and I tried not to take it personal, but having loved and cared and worked with kids for as long as we have in our agency and having good great people that do this job when they came out and said some of the things we were doing.

We were abusive or coercive. It was very offensive. We care about the victims, but we absolutely care about our kids. So I just kept thinking, you know, it was just hard to wrap our heads around. How do you know how I feel about my kids or what we are doing for kids? If anything, I'm rooting for him, but letting him off the hook and know, know this or know that or not knowing.

The five other kids at home are victims is not helping him or us or them. So it's a hard. It's a hard sell for some people that are like my kid doesn't have to talk. He doesn't have to tell you anything more. He doesn't need to take a polygraph. It gets very tricky when the kids like I want to talk, I want it. I want to take a polygraph, which is what we ran into when it first came out. I had kids who who got.

I had a defense attorneys that that got the the Bumby report, if you will, before the kids did, before we did. And they were telling the kid, you don't ever have to take a polygraph again. It just came out. I got a big report on my desk and the kid came to me crying. I want to take one. I want to. I want to feel clean. I want to feel like I've told everything. My two, my two sisters are now victims. I've told that.

As well. And it was, it was really hard. It was really hard. I mean, Ben's seen it too. When

you're sitting in a chair and a kid gets everything off their chest, there's nothing better than that. So when the powers that be kind of came along and said no, it's kind of punitive. It was, it was, I found it offensive. I was like, I guess you don't know who we are and how we operate, but.

I I beg to differ that we are ever trying to hurt our kids. Well, and I I know Peter Morey, I think that's the challenge is mental health and the legal system are by nature two different animals where and that's part of the challenge we have is blending those two together because one is.

Works best in collaborative state, the mental health in moving people forward and just our legal system is set up to be adversarial by nature. So Scott Naegele here I I I know.

John Lennon and I are Dreamers, but I'm not. I'm not. I'm not sure that it has to be that way. In fact, I know it not to be that way in some of the outlying rural counties outside of the state of Maricopa.

I know that not to be the case, and people who occupy different roles engage each other in collegial ways and trust what each other says and make some really sound decisions. So I know it's that way and I and I get how it's got that way.

I'm not sure it has to be that way, but that's going to require us, you know, you know, seeking to care about what each other in this committee has to say and in beginning to trust what each other in this committee has to say in in enough of a way that we can actually forge some.

Meaningful relationships at the front edge of this process.

Where there's where there's buy-in, I I I just think, you know, it just has to happen. And then when people see it happening, more people see it happening. I I, you know, I I don't think it's that simple. I'm not, I'm not naive.

But I don't know that it that it can't be that way. I think it can be that way. I hope and I see it can be that way. I see evidence of it being that way. So we've we've successfully managed to not follow any agenda again today, which.

Is OK and not OK, I suppose. The last thing on on this agenda was a discussion about the community notification assessment and.

I don't really know where to start that, but other than to say.

For those of us that were in the room when the presentation was given last month, I think it's evident that a lack of evolution has taken place with respect to.

The instrument that's being used to make some of these decisions and then perhaps the implement implementation of of of of of the decisions after scoring of of what whatever instrument ultimately gets used.

Done it.

That was evident to me. I'll just say that for what it's worth. I, Peter Morey, I.

Will completely agree with you with that 100%, but another thing I took from it is not only are the instruments.

Medieval at best. Yeah, Archaic Stone Age.

I think that.

And best meaning, I'm not not going to try to disparage anybody here, but I think what I said an hour ago about sex offenders are easy political points. I think that some overzealous legislation's been put in place.

That has completely overwhelmed the resources of people who have to go out and do the notifications and get the notification assessments and I think we've created the system.

Well-meaning or not, that has made it almost impossible for them to do their jobs. Well, we've we've not kept up with the evolution of sex crimes. That's one thing. I mean, there's probably 2 levels of discussion as it relates, at least from my perspective, about.

Community notification stuff is whether is whether or not one it was was was ever properly designed and built on the back of science. It wasn't. And then the second part is is whether or not the instrument that we've been using, at least as far as the state of Arizona is concerned. Has evolved enough to incorporate all of the kinds of offenses that are currently taking place, in particular the online offenses and and and and that instrument was never created for for for for that group of people, so to leave.

Sex crimes detectives in different municipalities with an instrument that's ill-equipped to do the task has been patently unfair.

Question. Ben Galarneau Did we ever get the research behind that who created it? Well, it's good question. What they were using to kind of come up with this system? is is every county in the state using the same one? I don't recall. The answer is yes, every county in the in the state uses the same.

Well, that's an iterator reliability issue right there. So and that's a problem too. Are we registering juveniles? Well, some juveniles are are having to register. I think it's juveniles charged as adults. No, it's not just juveniles charged as adults. I mean, I that's why I said what I said.

In the meeting and asked Catherine Krejci to comment that there are, there are registration hearings in the juvenile court where some kids are required to register. Now they're going to say those kids are aging out. That's why they're having those hearings.

But those are people that were juveniles when they committed their offenses and their juveniles when those questions were being asked and answered on juvenile probation. So while this is largely an issue as it relates to adult offenders we are missing the boat if we think it's not impacting some juvenile because it is. And. II so much to say

For treated juveniles and all those kinds of things, there's just so much to to talk about there. Melony Opheim on a personal level. I had. At a previous employment at YDI reach out when they found out I was in the board and there's three kids that I personally saw as a young therapist that had to register that are now getting notification, have nowhere to live and have families. So they're going to be showing up to the Monday meeting. In fact, I need to find out how to.

If it's too late for them to write in to to be speakers. But now it's into me personally, these kids that are being affected that I I've kind of lost track of over 30 years, but those were juveniles. Now they might have been tried as an adult, which did happen a lot more

frequently back in the day.

But now it really is. We have 17 year olds turning 18 that are going to registration hearings. So it will affect that. Yeah. Mr. Chairman. Yes, ma'am. Jenna Mitchell, we had asked after the last board meeting that or during the last board meeting that Miss Adkins with Department of Corrections attempt to find the validation study.

For the community notification assessment, she has been unable to locate that, but we do know that Doctor Gray was a part of the committee that developed that. So we are working through Doctor Blades to see if we can locate the study in your background material packet for the board meeting on Monday, there is a.

DOC called a frequently asked questions document that contains some information, but it is not the validation study which is what the board was looking for. I I have it somewhere. I I don't know where it is at this point because I haven't looked for it in so long, but I have.

I have, and this is people who know me will attest I don't throw anything out, so so it's out there, but I I, you know, I don't, you know.

I suspect it'll come up in in the larger board meeting to the discussion about the presentation and the instrument and all of the things that we're talking about in this room. But we we have a lot of things that that we need to do and eventually will do as part of this board. But that is definitely that is definitely one of them that that that that has.

To be attended to. Melony Opheim, I I saw that it was in the agenda and I definitely wanted to speak at how how alarming it was to to go through that training and to feel for those officers having to do that those Sheriff's office. But I also didn't know if it would end up on. I figure that is going to be a bigger tackle for the larger group if not the adult group.

I didn't know if they were going to want us to be doing something nuts and bolts with that.

You know, I mean, I'm glad it's on the agenda, but I figured we don't have to worry about that a lot. Yeah, well, my sense is, is we're still trying to figure out what we do have to be worried about in our individual spaces. This larger process, my God, it seems like a big task for everybody to handle. It is. And I, Peter Morey, I agree with Scott.

You know, getting he and I are and I think Blake are the three that are on both subcommittees. So it's turning into a wrestling match on the adult subcommittee too. But I don't want to speak for Scott, but I think personally.

That it's not something that we can ignore on either subcommittee. And I know there's some some rumblings that I've heard personally about, OK, we don't want to deal with registration or notification. That's not going to affect anybody, but it is, I mean.

From a treatment provider perspective, we all know that registration notification is always going to be in the background for treatment, and you can't do treatment without recognizing that massive elephant in the room in their life, because it comes down to housing, it comes down to employment, it comes down to all that.

So I think as a board we need to be very aware of registration notification as we construct what we're trying to construct. Melony Opheim. I totally agree with you. I just didn't know if it was for us to tackle. I feel like there's 10 agenda items that come before one out of 50 kids

that might have to register for my agencies as long as a violation.

I think we need to plant the seeds well and and I'm all, I just, I just figure I didn't think that was going to be the first thing we're going to tackle is the juvenile committee because that's huge I'm saying. It can't be first. I agree.

Scott Naegele commenting on something. I think I heard you say, Peter, but whatever rumblings are happening about, that's not going to be something that the board tackles. We either are a sex offender management board in a comprehensive way or we're not. I I mean, I I know we live in a political world. I'm painfully aware of that on a daily basis. Um, but.

I don't, I don't think we can carve out things that we say we're gonna attend to and ignore other other things. I don't, I don't know how. I don't know how we do that. I don't know how I do that in good conscience. Well, and if I can clarify that a little bit, I I meant, I mean we are going to tackle it as the big board. It's we're mandated to by the statute, but.

Specifically with the adult subcommittee, I was kind of rumbling as a subcommittee. No, I I think, I think I'm, I'm not as good as Brecken probably is at keeping keeping the herd of cats moving in a straight line.

And and we do have to do things as Mel's alluding to sooner rather than later versus other things. I just don't want us to forget to revisit the issues. That's that's all I'm speaking to.

That's all I'm speaking to and.

To to remember what I think this board was founded to do.

More to follow on that, I ask, I guess to make an announcement regarding the next couple of meetings we are in the process of and I think we have confirmed part of this for sure.

At our next meeting, we're looking to have two presentations done by probably more than one person, a small group probably from DCS talking about.

Their processes, it relates to kids with these issues and families with these issues and then also have somebody from the Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department give a similar kind of thing. Those will be 30 to 45 minutes each I think.

So we'll probably eat a good chunk of our next meeting, but that's OK. I in the interim of us talking about having those folks come, I reached out to the psychologist that has been here from the Department of Juvenile Corrections, who is in charge of the program at the Adobe Mountain School.

If he would be willing to do similarly for us, and he said he would, but we're looking to have him do that in May. So with with good fortune, we have two folks coming to speak to us next time and then.

The psychologist from AJC to do similarly at the main meeting. Melony Opheim.

I'm glad that DCS probation will be here in the same day, that they will be here in the same day, yeah.

I make a motion for adjournment of the meeting. I second the motion. Meeting is adjourned.

All in favor. All in favor. Aye. Aye. Thank you for that. Aye.

OK.

- **Ashlesha Naik** stopped transcription