

AZSOMB April Meeting-20260420_203403UTC-Meeting Recording

April 20, 2026,

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to call this meeting to order. The date is April 20th, 2026, and the time is 1:34. This is the regular meeting of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board.

April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month, and today begins Crime Victims Rights Week. I've asked Dr. Blades, our vice chair, to read a statement.

Good afternoon. As we observe Sexual Assault Awareness Month, the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board wants to take a moment to reaffirm a core principle. Preventing sexual violence is both a public safety priority and a collective responsibility. Research and clinical experience make clear that sexual harm does not arise from a single cause nor is it prevented by a single solution. Effective prevention requires a coordinated approach, one that integrates victim services, evidence-based treatment for individuals who have offended, informed supervision strategies, and strong community education. When these elements work together, we reduce risk, support accountability, and promote safer communities.

It is equally important to center survivors. Prevention includes ensuring access to trauma-informed care, reducing barriers to reporting, and fostering environments where individuals feel safe, heard, and supported. Listening to survivors not only aids healing, but strengthens policy and practice. As professionals, policymakers, and community members, we must remain guided by data, ethics, and compassion. This means investing in programs proven to reduce recidivism, promoting early intervention, and challenging myths that undermine prevention efforts. It also means acknowledging that meaningful change requires sustained commitment, not just in April, but year-round. Through informed policy, responsible practice, and community engagement, we can continue to move toward a future where fewer lives are impacted by harm. As a board, we take our responsibilities seriously and remain committed to carrying out our duties with integrity, diligence, and a continued focus on advancing practices that enhance public safety, and support victims across Arizona. Thank you.

Thank you, Dr. Blades. At this time, I'll ask Major Mitchell to call the roll.

Thank you, Madam Chair. A few reminders before we start. For those in the room, please state your name and speak directly into the microphone. For virtual board members, just for your information, you're designated as presenters for the meeting. This allows you to mute and unmute and turn your camera on and off. We would ask that you turn your cameras on for the meeting.

Also, I'd like you to take note of the yellow button on the right portion of your screen that says end event. When you leave the meeting, please do not use that button. As a presenter, that will end the meeting for everyone. So please use the small little red telephone that says leave to the right of that button.

Thank you. I'll now begin the roll call.

All right, Chairwoman Goulden is here. Miss Adkins.

Present. Miss Balson.

JB

Jamie Balson

Present.

Mr. Barney.

Present.

Doctor Blades. Present. Miss Breed. Present. Miss Chapman.

Present. Judge Cohen.

present?

No.

Detective Cook.

Present.

Supervisor Fanning. Present. Mr. Galarneau. Present.

Doctor Gray is excused, Major Griego.

Present.

Mr. Hanratty.

JH

Jim Hanratty (SUP)

Present.

Ms. Kaczorowski.

Mister Kelroy.

Present. Ms. Krejci. Present. Doctor Lokey. Present. Supervisor McClure.

JM **Jeff McClure**

Present.

Doctor Miller, present.

Miss Musick present.

Mr. Naegele. Present. Mr. Neil. Present.

Miss Opheim. Present. Mr. Pawlowski. Present.

Miss Panas.

JP **Jenna Panas**

Present.

Representative Powell.

Dr. Rivera.

Present.

And Judge Young. Present and Judge Cohen let me know that her internet went down, but she's back with us. She's back with us.

SC **Suzanne Cohen (SUP)**

I am present.

Thank you, ma'am.

Alright, Madam Chair, you do have a quorum.

Thank you. We will now move to the call to the public. This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the board. Comments are limited to 3 minutes per speaker. A timer will sound to help speakers manage their time. When the timer indicates that time has expired, speakers are expected to promptly conclude their remarks.

I would like to remind all speakers that public comment time limits are in place to ensure fairness and allow all individuals the opportunity to be heard. The board also accepts written public comments. Please note that in accordance with open meeting laws, the board cannot discuss or take action on items that are not specifically identified on the agenda.

Therefore, action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism or scheduling the matter for further consideration, and decision at a later date. When Major Mitchell calls you to come forward, please state your name and organization if applicable.

For the record, Major Mitchell.

Thank you, Madam Chair. First up today is Amy Stewart, followed by Gary Hardy, and then Patricia Borden.

Amy.

All right, we'll go on to Gary Hardy.

Good afternoon, Madam Chairwoman, members of the board. My name is Dr. Gary Hardy. I'm representing the Collaborative Justice Institute, a research arm of Restorative Action Alliance out of New York, and I'm a member of this community. I provided a brief handout in your material. It looks like this. It's a short paper and several summary figures.

It's a very concise and simple, highlight one key issue. We share the same goal, and that is to reduce sexual re-offense and protect the public. My question is whether our current approach is fully aligned with that goal.

As outlined in the handout, Arizona relies heavily on the containment model, particularly the use of polygraph treatment.

The concern is not with supervision itself. The concern is how polygraph is being used as an essential component of treatment rather than a limited support tool. In the research program we developed,

Polygraph may increase disclosure, but the evidence says it reduces recidivism and it improves treatment outcomes is limited and inconclusive. And that matters. Because when a tool becomes central without a clear outcome link, it can shift treatment from behavior change to compliance, from skill building to confession.

From internal motivation to external pressure. In figure one, a polygraph is only one model, only central in one model, the containment model, and it is peripheral or discouraged in other treatment models.

The handout suggests there may be a gap between what we say we are doing, which is risk, need, responsivity, and how the system is structured in practice. This is not about removing accountability. It is about ensuring that treatment functions as treatment and that supervision tools are used in ways that actually support long-term risk reduction. The brief framework we have in figure 4 outlines a path towards a better alignment.

So if the goal is public safety, then our practices should reflect what actually reduces risk, not

what simply feels rigorous. Thank you very much.

Thank you.

Next is Patricia Borden, followed by Tracy Jones, and then Charles Cole.

Good afternoon. My name is Patricia Borden, and I'm here speaking on behalf of the over 17,000 Arizonans on the Arizona Sexual Offense Registry.

and their families who love them and navigate the system every day.

I want to bring three things to the board's attention. First, Colorado Sex Offender Management Board just released their 2026 annual legislative report. Their research confirms that evidence

is based treatment on evidence-based treatment reduces sexual recidivism by 10 to 30 percent. And their data shows a sexual re-offense rate of just 1.3 percent among community treatment clients. That number tells us a very different story than the assumptions that drive policy. Yes, 1.3%. Colorado found that community-based treatment outperforms incarceration-only approaches. 95% of clients received individualized treatment plans and risk level decreased for roughly half of moderate risk clients by end of treatment. They are not just producing research, they are acting on it. This study

will be presented in July at the Colorado 2026 Summit in the Rockies.

The title of it is Navigating Collaboration and the Creativity, Enhancing Public Safety through Transformative Best Practices. Over 500 professionals are expected and registered to be there. I encourage this board to attend it as well.

Second, civil commitment here in Arizona. Individuals who have completed their sentences continue to be held indefinitely with little transparency and limited pathways to release. What is

is Arizona doing to ensure these decisions are grounded in evidence and not simply used as a mechanism, but in definite confinement. Third, this past Thursday, Rutgers University School of Law hosted a national symposium

title, no exit, challenging civil commitment and indefinite confinement of people convicted of sex crimes. Was this board aware of it? Are you tracking these things? And I'd like to encourage you to attend that because people need your help.

Thank you.

Next up is Tracy Jones, followed by Charles Cole, and then Steven Mandoka.

Tracy.

Charles Cole.

I don't have copies. I didn't know where to submit anything, but I do have what I want to show the board here.

If I could pass it around, I'm not sure. It's short. You can give that to staff after the meeting. I'll publish it for you. All right. So good afternoon. My name is Charles Cole. I am here today to provide public comment regarding my case as it relates to the sex offender management, treatment and classification.

under SOMB standards. I am currently in a year 8 of 10-year probation term. That began January 2018. Before later violations, I completed approximately 4 years of clean probation from 2019 through 2023.

During that time, I maintained compliance, I completed treatment, and made substantial progress. That history should matter. It reflects sustained rehabilitation and shows that my case should not be evaluated as though no meaningful progress occurred. I'm here today because the factual record

in my case has materially changed. The complainant witness has now provided multiple forms of corroboration, including a sworn affidavit, a written communication to the prosecutor, and statements made during my 2011 or February 11th.

2026 revocation hearing. In those statements, she confirmed that she misled me through false identification and misrepresentation of age, that I was aware of her true age, and that she supports my freedom. She has also stated that she does not view me as someone who preys on minors.

I have a copy of the audio hearing from the revocation on February 11th that the board can review directly.

This evidence is consistent, repeated, and directly relevant to how my case should be understood.

these change factors, these change factual factors directly affect how my case is being managed in terms of risk, treatment, assumptions, and classifications.

Despite this, my case continues to be managed based on the original narrative without meaningful reassessment. I also want to raise concerns about how my case is being managed overall. I feel like I am being rather set up.

then fairly evaluated on the complete and updated facts. I'm being required to restart sex offender treatment despite not committing any new sexual related offense and without any new clinical assessment or updated testing to justify the decision.

Behavioral health standards require that treatment decisions be based on current clinical evaluation and individualized needs.

We start, we starting treatment without a new risk factors or reassessment raises concern about whether accepted professional and ethical standards are being followed.

I believe this restart is not clinically driven, but instead is being done at the request of probation rather than based on an updated clinical determination.

Thank you.

Next is Stephen Mandoka, followed by Marina Fleetwood, and then Rachel Bretz.

Hello, my name is Stephen Mandoka. I've been on the registry now for 28 years. I'm here because I just want you guys to remember me, period. I shouldn't be on the registry. I took a polygraph, but probation said back over a decade ago that it wasn't admissible in court. My victims of this case wrote letters stating that it never happened. Unfortunately, I signed a plea when I was 15 years old. I ended up going to prison. I got stabbed 17 times. As you can see from my hat, my shirt, I'm really good at fighting now because of that. And I'm a coach too.

Two world champions, is that it? No. Oh, like what? You guys tricked me? All right, anyway, so yeah, I know I trained 2 world champions now because it takes less than three seconds now for me to connect with somebody's chin. And I wouldn't even know that if I didn't have to go to prison. I didn't write anything down because it makes me nervous.

Uh, but uh...

I was 11 years old in 1994. The case says I was being charged as an adult. In 1994, you know, if I was, I mean, 10 years old, I mean, there's got to be a problem in there somewhere. Maricopa County charged me as an adult, gave me a life sentence. I got stabbed 17 times. Some of you guys have placed handcuffs on me.

Mr. Pawlowski. Dr. Gray's not here. He's the one who took my polygraph that I passed, but I'm still on the registry today. I walk out the door, anybody finds out I'm a sex offender. They have a lot of this going on. They don't know what I do for a living. I don't have to work anymore. I'm retired.

But I only got here because of the situations I was put in. I wouldn't have to fight. I wouldn't have to punch people for a living or know how to punch people for a living if I didn't get charged as a sex offender. And before I wrap this up, the person who did this, commit these crimes was my co-defendant. I didn't even know the whole time. He's in the police report. If any of you want to look at it, I got the letters from the supposed victims saying this stuff never happened. I have the police report where I never committed a crime in it. But the detective said, just admit to it and you'll get out of here. I'm not 14 years old anymore. If any of these detectives want to come and talk to me now, I have no fear of that now.

So yeah, anyway, that's all I got to say. I'll send a written one. So if any of you people want to read it or even care, that would mean a lot to me because I don't know how much more time I have left on this planet, but I'm pretty sure I'm not going to get out of the registry. But if my case can help these kids that are coming up now in the system, Hopefully, it'll change something. So, yeah, that's all I gotta say.

Thank you.

Next is Marina Fleetwood, followed by Rachel Bretz, and then Darren Stanley.

Good afternoon, members of the board. My name is Marina Fleetwood. Thank you for continuing to provide evidence-based guidance to our legislators. Arizona Dangerous Crimes Against Children, DCAC law began in 1985 with the enactment of the former 13-604. It was created as a sentencing enhancement, not a separate crime and not a lifelong status. Its purpose

was to increase penalties for certain offenses committed against minors under 15. For decades, DCAC functioned exactly as intended. It was a tool used in courtrooms, not a measure of future risk and not something meant to follow a person for life. Risk assessment has always been separate. A level one classification reflects low risk based on decades of research and data.

In 2008, the 604 was renumbered to 13-705, but its purpose remained unchanged, a sentencing enhancement, not a predictor of future danger. Over time, the scope of DCAC expanded. What began as a courtroom tool is now being used to influence supervision and registry practices. In recent years, that shift has accelerated.

Legislative changes now treat DCAC as an ongoing classification using decades-old convictions to impose new retroactive consequences. Those never subject to public exposure are now placed on the public site, not due to change risk, but a reinterpreted label, turning DCAC into a lifelong status with ongoing legal and social consequences.

There's no credible research from the U.S. Department of Justice or elsewhere showing that a level one individual with a DCAC designation is more likely to re-offend. In fact, level one individuals are among the least likely to re-offend. Yet real lives are being upended. One man convicted in 1986 of an attempted offense with a DCAC enhancement accepted a plea that increased his sentence.

He completed that sentence and has already been assessed a level one, low risk. For decades, he fully complied with the law, but he had no crystal ball. Then 40 years later, his information is made public. His risk did not change, but his life did. Facing the loss of his church community and privacy, he and his wife left the state to start over. Another individual,

also level one and now disabled from a stroke, relies on his wife and supportive church community.

After being placed on the public register, he was told not to return to church. When he later needed skilled nursing care, facilities refused to accept him because of his public status. A third level one register and a father saw his status made public after more than 30 years. His children's school was notified. They now face stigma, bullying and isolation, despite no risk in their father's.

No change in the father's risk. The last example, level 1 grandfather. He and his wife are raising their grandchildren and SB 1236-1404 were passed. He moved out of the family home to avoid school notification, leaving his wife to manage alone. This decision strained finances, disrupted the stability of the children they were trying to protect. These are not abstract outcomes. These are real families experiencing real harm.

Public safety policy should be guided by evidence and individualized risk, not by labels applied decades ago. When we impose retroactive consequences on those already assumed, assessed at low risk, we are not strengthening public safety. We are undermining it. If the state's own risk assessment system identifies someone as low risk, why are laws treating them as they're not?

Thank you. Thank you.

Next, Rachel Brett, followed by Darren Stanley, and then Lauren Whitaker.

Good afternoon. Madam Chair, members of the board, thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm speaking to you today solely on my own behalf, not representing any other individuals or organization. First and foremost, I want to acknowledge the concerns about the materials that were shared with legislators.

Specifically, the flyer that appeared to be an official document from this board. And I want to let you know that I take responsibility for my part in that.

I can absolutely see how it looked like it came from the board and caused confusion. The information as it was presented was misleading and I understand how that led to serious repercussions. My goal in attending your meetings is to educate myself on the full scope of issues related to individuals on the registry

And the challenges they face, because this has a personal, this has... personally affected my family.

My son was sentenced to five years of incarceration.

and two terms of lifetime probation for the possession of illegal online material. We are devastated that he will be listed on a public registry indefinitely, not to mention the societal

shame and judgment that comes with this type of offense.

We acknowledge that while his offense did not involve physical contact, it still contributed to the harm of children and the impact on those children is serious and lasting. My goal is to contribute to conversations around online related offenses and how the easy access to illegal materials on the internet

combined with young adults who have underdeveloped decision-making skills, and in our case, mental health challenges, can lead to severe and sometimes disproportionate consequences. I also want to better understand the impacts on public safety and victims and how those outcomes can be improved.

I respect the work this board does, the perspective you all bring, and I hope to participate in a constructive and meaningful way. Thank you.

Thank you.

Next, Darren Stanley, followed by Lauren Whitaker.

Good afternoon, Madam Chairperson and board members. Darren Stanley, registered citizen, former inmate for 12 years at ADCRR, where neither rehabilitation nor re-entry was going on for sex offenders. That's a discussion for another day. First, I want to thank all board members who voted against SB 1092.

Believe me when I say I feel your frustration and empathize with you that the very governor who nominated most of you did not follow your wise recommendation not to support SB 1092, only to sign it into law. I feel it is a constitutional violation to steal a person's right to judicial review, but most of all, when you take away their hope, you create a very angry and dangerous person. Once again, another law based on fear, not fact. Yes, I myself committed a DCAC, the worst decision of my life. The powers that be continue to find new ways to punish, but not to rehabilitate or help offenders. Move on and be productive.

I feel legislators somehow perceive themselves as weak or not doing their job if they are empathetic to the real struggles living on the registry already. As you know, sex offenders are the most regulated, scrutinized, and controlled felon, even more than people who end the lives of others.

With that being said, I strongly oppose HB 2870. Isn't it smarter to know that there's two or more sex offenders living in one location rather than homeless, desperately, desperate and living under a bridge somewhere?

right now in our city.

There is an empty hotel being considered to be sex offender housing. The need is great and

the only and it's only going to get worse, mainly because the difficulty of employment with the SO tag. Please let's use some common sense here. Now that SB 1092 is passed, I'm not sure what the viability of

HB 2966 and SB 1829 are, since they are close to SB 1092, which has already passed. With that being said, I strongly oppose them as well. In closing, please stop supporting bills like 1239 that makes

more possible ways for registrants to be violated and sent back to prison. As someone who was revoked and released by the appellate court, instead, let's start supporting bills like HB 2767, a path off the registry. There is plenty of actual data that shows the registry doesn't work.

Let's use that money for rehabilitation for offenders and victims. Anyways, if any of you would like to talk to me in person or come in and talk with the subcommittee, I'll make the time to be there. Let's work together and make a difference. Thank you. Thank you.

Next is Lauren Whitaker.

Chair, members of the board, thank you for the time. My name is Lauren Whitaker and I'm a member of the public. I've attended all but one of the board's meetings. I'm here because early last year I discovered a 70-year-old man caught seeking sex with a 12-year-old child lives in my neighborhood. His offenses are attempted sexual conduct with a minor and attempted child sex trafficking.

both dangerous crimes against children under Arizona law. He was assigned as a level one offender, the lowest risk designation at his 2023 sentencing. No community notification was issued. He lives immediately next to a public high school. No one was told I found out by chance. That brought me here, and what I've observed concerns me.

I want to acknowledge that today's agenda includes a statement on Sexual Assault Awareness Month and a presentation on survivors. I am genuinely grateful to see it, and it is why today feels like the right moment to share what I've been tracking. I have tracked every public comment given to this board. Of all comments, a little over 85

percent advocate for the interests of registrants or their families. About 13 percent address neutral or procedural matters. The number of comments from actual crime victims, family members or friends of victims, or advocates for crime victims is just one, which was my own submission. I have not once heard the word victim used in a board deliberation.

to refer to the people whose suffering is the reason for the system.

Someone is sexually abused in this country every 74 seconds. Roughly one in four girls experiences sexual abuse in childhood. One in five women will be raped in their lifetime.

63% of sexual assaults are never even reported to police. Sex crime victims are not here because they are dealing with extraordinarily difficult things and may simply not be in a position to organize.

and come before this board the way others have done. This board has a statutory mandate to provide balanced evidence-based guidance on assessment, treatment, supervision, and management of sex offenders in Arizona so that victims are not harmed and public safety is protected. Right now, the voices shaping these deliberations are overwhelmingly one side. The people in the system, the people this system was built to protect, have no presence in the record at all. I am asking this board to actively seek out input from crime and victim advocates. I'm asking that the gender bias in the risk assessment instrument be treated as urgent. And I'm asking that before every vote on legislation, this board asks out loud, what does this mean for the person who was harmed?

They are not here to ask it themselves. That's exactly why this board should. Thank you. Thank you.

And I'll call one more time for Amy Stewart.

and Tracy Jones.

OK, Madam Chair, that concludes the call to the public.

Thank you. At this time, I'm pleased to introduce and welcome 3 new members to our board. First, please join me in welcoming Ms. Jenna Panas. Ms. Panas was recently appointed by Colonel Jeff Glover, Director of the Arizona Department of Public Safety. She is the Chief Executive Officer for the Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence.

Jenna, would you please give a brief introduction and share a bit about your background with the board?

JP

Jenna Panas

Good afternoon, everybody. I am really pleased to join you. My background is in victim advocacy and survivor-based services. So I have worked in both domestic violence and in rape crisis centers, serving both victims of intimate partner violence, domestic violence, sex trafficking,

and sexual assault. That's 20 years of working with victims, and I hope to provide the voice for victims that this board needs. Thank you.

Thank you, Jenna, and welcome. Next, I'm pleased to introduce Ms. Shanda Breed. Ms. Breed was recently appointed by the Honorable Katie Hobbs, Governor of the State of

Arizona. Ms. Breed is the Division Director of the Adult Probation Services at the Arizona Supreme Court. Shanda, the floor is yours. Please give a brief introduction and share a bit about your background with us.

Thank you. Shanda Breed, Director of Adult Probation Services. I've been working at the AOC Administrative Office of the Courts for the past 10 years. I've been the director for the last four years. Before that, I worked in Navajo County, juvenile and adult probation, both sides of the fence, worked with all caseloads.

I made my way up to the Chief Probation Officer in Navajo County.

I hope to bring to the table the statewide view of what's going on with the probation side of things, hoping to listen and learn from the board members, from the public more how we can guide our policies and codes

to doing the right and fair thing.

And yeah, that's about it. Thank you.

Thank you, Shanda. Dr. Renee Rivera was recently appointed by the Honorable Steve Montenegro, Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the replacement for Peter Morey. Dr. Rivera is the Clinical Director for Psychological and Consulting Services. Dr. Rivera, will you please give us a brief introduction and share a bit about yourself with us?

Thank you. Good afternoon. I've been working with the sex offender population for the last 10 or so years. I'm the clinical director. I work with the chaperones. I run the chaperone program, the maintenance programs, primary treatment for both adolescent and adult sex offenders.

And I also assist with the risk assessments that we do. Thank you.

On behalf of the board, welcome. We're excited to have all of you join us and we look forward to working with you. I would now like to turn this over. I asked board member Missy Musick to give a presentation on survivors of sexual offenses.

I thought you were going to wait till the end because I may go on forever with this presentation. That's okay. I would like you to. So Jenna, I apologize. I got this presentation to you like 45 minutes before it started.

Let me pull mine up.

So I want to share, I was asked to do this presentation, sorry, about a week and a half ago.

And if anyone knows me, once I start doing research on a presentation, I start going down the rabbit holes.

So I was throwing out information and adding information. So I tried my very best to fully represent the scope of the impact of sexual offenses on people.

Missy, before you go, can you, I know many of us know your background, but will you talk to us about the work you do with survivors and you've also worked with offenders too, so will you let everyone know the? Oh, absolutely. So my history, I guess I started, I don't know about

2004, 2005, I did my internship. I'm A licensed professional counselor. I did my internship with Family Transitions who provides treatment for people who have committed sexual offenses.

I worked there for approximately 15 years. I worked with all levels, minimal risk, medium risk, high risk. I also worked with chaperones, training family members and acquaintances to become chaperones.

with the men and women that we worked with. After I left Family Transitions, I opened my own practice. I now focus primarily on trauma. If I'm going to like throw a statistic out there, about 85% of the people that I work with are survivors of sexual abuse. I do only work with adults, so I want to throw that in there.

That good? All right.

So...

When I was asked to do this presentation, I went back and forth of what is going to... be most useful for the people of this board. We really focus on the back end of sexual violence with managing the offenders. And I was going back and forth. What's going to be most useful? And then

I was washing dishes the other day and I had a memory about my marshmallow pig.

I have been working in this field for maybe a year and a half. I remember sitting in my office and I was reading a very descriptive pre-sentence investigation. It was regarding a person I was doing an intake, getting ready to do an intake with who had been charged and convicted of viewing images of child molestation. This PSI was very descriptive. And I remember my therapist hat coming off and I kind of sat back going, really kind of questioning a lot of choices in my career. At this time, a colleague walked by my office. She works with survivors, and there was a little boy who was walking behind her. And knowing what she, the population that she worked with, I knew exactly why this little boy was there.

I don't know why she chose this moment if she saw the look on my face, but she stopped in my office and she introduced this little boy to me. He was very shy and I remember her saying, this is Missy.

She works with men like the men that hurt you so that they don't hurt any more children.

That really changed my perspective in that moment of the importance of the work that we do. They went away. I felt much better. They ended their session and he came in and he dropped a little marshmallow pig he had made.

on my desk, said thank you very quickly and ran out of my office. That marshmallow pig has gotten me through a lot of rough

days working with people who have committed sexual offenses, and now also working with people who are the survivors. That marshmallow pig is still on my desk today. And the story came up for me because I think it's important that we all remember

the reason why this board is important, why it's important to make the best decisions to reduce recidivism that we possibly can. We have a very important job. So with that said, everyone loves numbers and statistics.

So, next, next slide.

So nearly every minute someone is sexually assaulted in the United States. I want you guys to sit with that. We have been in here for almost 45 minutes. In the time that we've been sitting here 45 people have been sexually assaulted. I want you to sit with that for a moment. So every 68 seconds, these are some different statistics, some from RAINN, some from the Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence.

Both of those report that every 9 minutes that someone is a child.

more than one in every three women and nearly one in every four men have experienced sexual violence. I want to talk about this because I recall growing up, I'm not going to reveal my, well, I'll reveal my age. Back in the 80s, that statistic was one in every 4 women. So I don't know if this is sexual violence is more prolific or people are more willing to support. But that number has actually increased since I was a teenager. An estimated 443,635 people age 12 and over, experience sexual violence every year in the United States. I come from a very small town in Iowa. The entire population of my hometown is approximately 5,000 people.

Right. So when you look at those numbers, that is the entire population of my hometown times like 9.

45.1% of women, 16.9% of men in the United, the US experience some form of sexual violence in their lifetime. And if there's typos in here, like literally, I just got this all completed.

set up like an hour ago, so I apologize.

I looked up the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey from 23-24, and this is a report since they work under the CDC.

And they stated that sexual violence is a preventable public health problem in the United States. And they have released a sexual violence prevention resource for action to the communities.

This was very interesting to me because when I looked up this report, the very first thing that they stated on there is to work towards empowering survivors of sexual abuse. However, when you look at our community, we have a tendency to do the exact opposite of that. And I'm going to talk some more about that later in the presentation.

I also want to talk about child sexual abuse material. This has gone by various names. It is commonly referred to as child *****. I have seen police reports that have referred to it as kiddie ****.

And so those words are not really indicative of the damage that has done through this material that is really all over the internet. So since 1998, 195 million, million reports have been made.

The victim, the Child Victim Identification Program has reviewed more than 425 million images and videos of children being sexually abused and molested.

and more than 30,000 victims have been identified by law enforcement. I want to go back to the size of my hometown. Remember, the size of my hometown is population 5,000.

I also want to point out that this report is from 2018. That was the most recent report I could find with statistics. So that was eight years ago. I don't know what those numbers are today. I wasn't able to find them.

67% of the survivors said that the distribution of their images impacts them differently than a hands-on abuse or the actual hands-on abuse that they suffered because the re-victimization never ends. These images are downloaded. They are kept in files. They are shared among people. There is no way for these images that I'm aware of, for these images to ever be completely taken off of the internet. So these children, and there's children, there's images. I want to say the youngest identified age was 1.5 years old.

for the rest of their life. That image continues to be on the internet.

I want to talk about reporting and prosecution for every thousand sexual assaults, approximately 50 reports lead to arrest. I'm going to talk about the gap in there in a little bit. 28 cases lead to felony conviction and only 25 are sentenced to incarceration. One in three victims report to the police. 80% of female college students do not report to the police.

I have worked with several of these young women.

And this comes back to them taking on responsibility. I shouldn't have gone to the party. I

shouldn't have drank as much as I did. I shouldn't have been in that place by myself, very much taking on the responsibility that someone chose to sexually assault them.

72% of elderly victims do not report to the police. I was looking for specific numbers for the number of men who report. It was impossible. I could, or maybe some of my colleagues here could tell me how to find these numbers.

but there were no specific numbers for men. And there's a lot of reasons behind that that I'm going to come back to later. I also want to talk about false reporting because it seems like a lot of people

claim that there's a lot of false reporting. And that just absolutely is not true. We actually don't know specific numbers of the cases of false reporting because the definitions used are so vast.

across different states, even different counties.

Many of the numbers, they found that when they got their numbers, they found that a lot of the reported false reports were actually because there was not substantive

Um...

Um...

brain went blank evidence that it actually occurred. This report, if you ever have a chance, I would love everyone to pull up this report. It's a super easy read and it outlines the fact that quite often the symptoms that survivors actually experienced are used against them during the investigation. So the fact that they don't recall specific details of what happened to them, That's neurobiology. That happens to people who have experienced trauma. The fact that they waited to report that there may be some inconsistencies, all of them, all of those things have a tendency to actually be used against these survivors during police reports.

And.

This kind of goes into the false reporting are frequently inflated because of the inconsistent definitions and protocols or weak understanding of sexual assaults.

So I want to talk about why people don't report.

In 20% of the cases of women who don't report, it's because there's a fear of retaliation. The person who perpetrated against them were in a position of power, or they had threatened that person.

13% don't believe that the police would do anything to help them. 13%, because it has to do with sex, a lot of people truly believe that it's something that they just have to deal with themselves. 8% reported to a different official. This could be child protective services. It could be a social worker, different offices. 8 percent.

Yes.

believed that it was not important enough to report. I work with so many people that as we start talking about their history, they will start telling me stories and they are shocked when I identify certain events

as sexual abuse because they take on the responsibility and they were not in a space to accept that they were sexually abused. Seven percent, they don't want to get the perpetrator in trouble. This happens A lot.

in familial cases. I don't want my brother to go to jail. I don't want my dad to go to prison. I hear that a lot with many of the people that I work with.

2% believed that the police couldn't do anything. And 30% gave another reason, did not cite a reason. In some of the research that I looked at, there was very much...

this sense of, I need to take care of myself. I need to take care of my body. And absolutely, absolutely, the idea of going through court proceedings and reporting and telling the story over and over again, the forensic medical exam.

in and of itself. Like every woman here, if you've ever gone to the OB-GYN, that's not a pleasant experience. We don't sit there going, yay, I get a pap smear today. Imagine being sexually abused and one of the first things that someone wants to do with you is give you this very invasive procedure.

So one of the people that I worked with, this was a really, she has worked super, super hard. This is the report, this is the quote that she gave me. I'll always be angry at them.

and I'll always be angry at the police. So many of us have been through it. It doesn't seem like there was a lot of protection for women in the 80s, 90s, and even up to 2010. As much as I make jokes about the current generation, they have made progress.

I don't think what happened to me wasn't wrong. I have accepted it like I've accepted my CPTSD. I was in my darkest spot. It doesn't excuse them taking advantage of me. I blamed myself for a very long time. Now that I understand why I was there,

I don't have a lot of shame around it. I want to note the word A lot. I went to the emergency room and waited for four hours. I now know that is how they lose evidence. Then A sheriff came and wouldn't let me get medical treatment.

until after I had spoken to them. I was told they knew this guy and he was a violent and scary person. Then the police came to my house and took all of my stuff, meaning her clothes.

They later called and told me that because there was weed and alcohol involved,

My report was unreliable, so they wanted me to wear a wire and confront this guy who they had just told me was dangerous. It was ***** **, and I will never report anything to the

police ever again. **** the police. I have a lot more compassion for that version of myself. I want to hug that version of myself.

Why people do not report. When I talk about men specifically, there is a fear of retaliation, but a lot of it has to do with shame and embarrassment. I have read many posts and reports of young men and boys, I'm going to say boys being molested by older women. And the comments on these reports are extremely disturbing. I've read comments like, wow, I wish that woman would have molested me when I was his age.

He should be happy that that happened to him.

You go, buddy. You got some.

Saying this to a survivor who had just been molested by an older woman.

There's shame and a lot of embarrassment.

Sexual assault for men tends to hold extra.

Questioning of their masculinity, especially if that assault happened by a male.

I believe.

Majority, as far as we know, the majority of people who are sexually assaulted are females. I sincerely believe that it is much more prolific in the male population than we know because males don't want to talk about it.

And I think that a lot more research and work needs to be done around that. Oh, I skipped. There was, I must have accidentally deleted. So there was also why women don't report. report. Did I go over that? I think I did. I apologize.

I think I did. That was a me thing.

So let's talk about the long-term impact for survivors of sexual abuse. There was a pretty well-known quote from the father of Brock Turner, where in a letter to

A judge, he reported 20 minutes of action is going to destroy his full 20 years of his life so far, indicating that it's only those 20 minutes that really mattered in that moment.

That is most definitely not the case. Approximately 70% of female survivors experience moderate to severe distress.

94 women report acute distress disorder. They actually identified this as PTSD for the first two weeks afterwards. However, just as clinicians up to, I believe it's six months, that's the actual diagnosis is acute distress disorder. 30% will later meet the criteria for PTSD.

33% of female survivors contemplate suicide, and 13% actually attempt suicide. That talks a lot about the shame that survivors carry with them. This comes from a report from the Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute.

Long-term effects for survivors of sexual assaults include PTSD, depression, anxiety,

dissociative and dissociation and dissociative disorders, substance use and abuse, trust and intimacy issues.

sleep disturbances, eating disorders. I'm going to talk more about physical health consequences and re-victimization. I want to talk a little bit about the trust and intimacy issues. This is Very often, a main topic of conversation working with survivors, difficulty being in an intimate relationship and trusting that that person is safe is a topic that I spend a lot of time working with survivors on, and it's very difficult. The intimacy issues.

I have worked with women who have come in and said, hey, I do have a history of being sexually assaulted. I've worked through that. I'm good with that. I want to talk about my depression and anxiety and my trust issues.

So many of these women, we will start talking about intimacy with their partners. And they'll be like, I don't know what it is. Like I used to love when men would kiss my neck, but for the longest time, anytime he breathes on my neck,

I just want to go and take a shower. Or anytime they touch my back, or anytime they stroke my thigh. And every single time we can bring it back to the sexual assault that they were convinced that they had worked through.

Sleep disturbances, this is often part of the PTSD. And re-victimization. There is many studies that show once a person has been sexually assaulted, the chances of them being re-victimized is actually going to increase. This is from a variety of reasons. This could be because of substance abuse and putting themselves in high-risk behaviors. There is actually

that 6th sense that we often talk about, that it factor that we get. There have been some studies that have shown that once someone has experienced trauma, that person tends to not trust that 6th sense. That's actually our amygdala that receives information about four times faster than our cerebral cortex. And it's our personal bodyguard. But because that system failed us, we don't trust

That that system anymore, after we've been been traumatized.

The medical and physical impact on survivors. According to NIH and Harvard Health Publishing, survivors are at greater risk for hypertension, thyroid disorder, diabetes, cancer, cholesterol. The list goes on and on. I actually probably could have filled several pages of this. If you look at the ACEs, which is what the medical profession often use to look at risk for different medical conditions, sexual abuse is listed on there. It's just well known in the medical

profession, I work with several women who do suffer from endometriosis. And it's very

common that their OB-GYN will tell them when they're diagnosed, you've been sexually abused, haven't you? Because the chances of developing endometriosis is at a higher rate for survivors of sexual abuse.

So let's look at the financial costs because, you know, the United States and we like to bring everything to dollars and cents. So according to the Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault, they actually used a lot of research done by the CDC to come up with these numbers. It's estimated that over the lifetime cost for a rape victim, they actually spent over \$122,000 between loss of work, not being able to work for the justice system,

And then some intangible expenses. I am a therapist and I wish I could afford to work for free. However, people do pay me when they come to see me. There was one of the women that I work with as we were talking about some of the impacts of her, one of the statements she made was, I come in to talk about what you did to me every week, and I spend money on this, even though I did do anything wrong?

And that's pretty common.

for sight lifetime costs for survivors of that should say child sexual abuse. That number actually increases to over \$282,000. So according to this report, again, it was they actually took these numbers from the CDC.

In the United States, 3.1 trillion, trillion with a T, is spent in our society due to rape.

So I want to talk about just a few of the trauma factors. Look at me. I'm like actually keeping it on time. Unfortunately, this is the part I tend to really start getting into. So I want to talk about disclosure.

disaster. This is definitely a piece that plays a role in not reporting.

Both the men and women that I've worked with have shared different experiences they had when they've reported that they've been sexually abused.

I've worked with several women who they're...

Parents would accuse them.

Several parents used the word *****, referring to their child when they disclosed, because the child came to them and said, I need to go get an exam, or I need to go and get a plan B. And the parents' first reaction

is not my child has been hurt. It was that the...

Their child is a *****.

In cases of family.

Many of the people that I've worked with have talked about...

how their disclosure tears their family apart. And certain family members won't talk to them anymore. How they truly loved the person that sexually offended against them. They just wanted them to stop.

And now that person is gone. The financial impact of the primary breadwinner of the family being removed from the family so they can no longer afford rent. They can't make the car payments.

And so often the survivor will take on the responsibility of...

We can't afford to live because I reported what someone did to me.

We are definitely a society of victim blaming and shaming. A person can't even have their house broken into without being asked, well, what could you have done differently to stop this from happening? It's very prolific in the world of

survivors. I was at a party several years ago. I was talking to a psychiatrist at that time. I was working with offenders and she found out what I was doing. So she started talking. Yeah, I, you know, I have clients and it's just really unfair how they've been treated because you have these little girls walking around in these shorty shorts and these teeny tiny tops.

So I paused and I pointed out that that was definitely victim blaming and shaming when it comes to sexual abuse. The person that acts out is 100% responsible.

She didn't like that. We continued to engage in a pretty heated conversation around this.

The part that I really want to talk about was this is a party of people that I have known for decades, very educated, very intelligent, very compassionate people. The only person that stood up to the psychiatrist

to say you need to stop.

A woman can wear whatever they want. That doesn't give people permission to sexually assault them. That one person was her husband.

And there were probably, I don't know, 30, 40, 50 people. And this is a problem that our society has. We don't want to stand up. We don't want to call people out on victims shaming and blaming, even though the CDC

Their first step for prevention.

is survivor empowerment. And we need to do better around that.

I'm trying to remember. There's so many reasons that I may have put PTSD up there.

Oh, I remember. So many of the clients that I work with, they come in and they're...

They ask me, why can't I get over this?

Why is this still interrupting my life? What's wrong with me?

that I still have these things going on in my life.

kind of goes back to the victim shaming and blaming of we have this expectation that a survivor should just get over it, right? Go do your few little therapy sessions, do your crying sessions. It's been a month now. You need to get over it, right? You need to pull up your big girly pants.

What people forget.

is someone ripped off their big girly pants and it's not that easy to get over.

There's also the neurobiology. I talk about Amy and CC.

That's how I talk with, explain it to my clients. Amy is our amygdala. I mentioned earlier.

Our amygdala is kind of our own little personal bodyguards.

Sometimes the best way the amygdala knows how to protect someone is to shut them down.

They're not able to say no. They're not able to fight. They're not able to push people away because their amygdala decided the best way I can protect you right now is for you to freeze.

Because if you don't freeze, we don't know of something worse.

is going to happen.

and sometimes the amygdala.

kind of pushes those memories down. It will not give the cerebral cortex, which is CC, the information because they don't know if a person is ready to remember that. That's why sometimes it can take a person decades.

to even remember that a sexual assault happened, let alone the actual specifics of it. I talk a lot with my clients around we're not going to push you to read those specifics. However, you are going to start remembering now that your brain is telling you that it's safe to talk about this.

I could do a whole session on neurobiology because I am a neurobiology nerd. But I think I'm at my hour, so.

Thank you.

Missy, thank you so much. I've seen you do that presentation or a variation, and I really want to appreciate, I appreciate you doing that for us today. So thank you. At this time, we're going to take a 10-minute break.

● **Ashlesha Naik** stopped transcription

Welcome back, everyone.

The next item on the agenda is the status of the letter sent on behalf of the board to the governor and legislature. Major Mitchell. Thank you, ma'am. The letters were sent on March 26th and on March 30th, and those letters were included in the board's background material.

The next item on the agenda is the status of...

Pending legislation. Be next. Okay. That's okay. Currently, HB 2870 is headed to rules today. It can go to the Senate caucus after that and eventually make its way to the floor. It's still viable, but not moving quickly. HB 2966 is waiting for rules in the Senate.

It is viable, but also not moving quickly. SB 1829 was not heard in house judiciary. It is currently dead barring a suspension of rules. SB 1040 is ready for third read in the house. It's not yet been amended. And if it passes, it will go to the governor's desk. And correction, that's SB1240, 1240 - is that what? OK, I think 1240 - OK, 1240, thank you.

It likely will not move until after the bill moratorium is lifted.

SB 1239 is ready for third read in the House. It has not yet been amended, and if it passes, it will go to the governor's desk. It also will not likely move until after the bill moratorium is lifted. SB 1092 was signed by Governor Hobbs on April 9th, 2026.

The next item on the agenda, Ms. Baldner, I believe you have an update on the bylaws. I do. Thank you, Madam Chair. We're at version 5. A few people have commented, sent in questions, double check things. Thank you to everybody who took the time to do that.

I really appreciate it. My goal is to have a version for you to vote on next month.

I do want to make sure that we're not missing anything. And what I'm going to do, even though this is a very specific type of board, what I need to do is look at a couple of the sets of bylaws for the largest public bodies in Arizona, the ones who've been around for the longest, because I would imagine they've

Had the most trouble, by definition, and probably have, I think, that...

Particularly the Board of Regents and particularly the Department of Education might be illustrative of things that I want to make sure we include that we may not have thought about already. So next month is the goal.

Thank you. I appreciate all your hard work on this and the input and I look forward to version 5. Six. Six. Version 6. Version 6. The next item of old business was a request a few months ago for the validation study of the current community notification assessment. This was located and it is included in the background material for your review.

I encourage you and to review it when you have time. It's a long document, but there were recommendations made at the very end that really never got addressed. It was just kind of left

out hanging. So that is in the background packets. Ms. Baldner, can you please provide an update on the concerns raised last month with the board creating an RTS account with the Arizona legislature?

Yes. And for the new board members, I am counsel for the board. That's why I'm chiming in on things. So welcome and thank you for being here. With regard to RTS, there was a question about whether that constituted lobbying. It does not. So

It was a great question. I talked to a number of my colleagues who said it's fine for the board to create an account. Necessarily, I would think it will transmit information to the legislature more quickly. But again, it's only a yes, no, or a neutral, I believe.

So it's another tool for you. We can set up an account. It's not considered lobbying. So we don't we don't want to we don't want to.

cross over into the lobbying realm and setting up an account to say yes, no, neutral is not lobbying.

Discussion on that, or...

If, if this is something...

If this is something the board wants us to do, us being the Department of Public Safety, Madam Chair, you'll need to ask for a motion and a second and a vote. And if people don't understand what I'm talking about, please weigh in. I don't want to assume that everyone knows what I'm talking about.

The request is, go ahead. Madam Chair, I'll make a motion for the board to set up a request to speak with the Arizona legislature, account with the legislature.

JB **Jamie Balson**

This is Jamie Balson. I have a question.

It's not request to speak. Oh, I have a question. There's a question. Who's on the? Yes.

JB **Jamie Balson**

Yes. Jamie Balson, can you guys hear me okay?

Yes, Jamie. Hi, Jamie.

JB **Jamie Balson**

Hi there. If we set up an RTS account, will the board vote on which position we'll be taking on whatever respective bill we're discussing before somebody posts on there either for, against, or neutral?

My expectation would be yes, it would be we would not be weighing in a position until it's something that we vote on. And my question is, would it say Arizona Sexual Management Board? Correct? Okay. I just got it. It needs to. And just let me clarify something. I don't. The account is called RTS, request to speak, but you are not going down to the legislature to speak. I don't want anyone. It's kind of a misnomer. I don't like the title, but I didn't name it. So it's more of a request to weigh in and picking one of three positions. So yes, it is. It is RTS. Thank you, Major. And

I believe I interrupted his motion.

Can I have one more discussion, Madam Chair? Please. Sorry. Is this something where... Can I state your name really quickly? Sorry, Shanda Breed.

I believe Jamie mentioned it. Is this something to where even if we have a vote to weigh in one side or another, will there be a list of who abstained, who opposed?

And so, no, the website, and Mr. Davis, if you want to pop in and talk about the website, it's literally, do we agree with it? Do we oppose it? Do we take no position? That is correct. And Anthony Davis, DPS. So really quick notice, so similar to how we've done it in the past, where we discussed legislation here in this venue, and then everyone votes and we tally what that vote is.

that component will still happen. So whether you chose to abstain in favor or neutral, we'll still track that. However, when we go to the RTS system, all we will do is whatever the final tally was, was that we as a board or you all as a board voted to abstain from this legislation, then that's what it will say. Nothing else. You can also, I do believe, give context a little bit, but not.

a lot as to why.

So I think what you're saying, just to clarify for everybody, this is in addition to the letters, right? Right. We won't, yes, and we will still continue our process. We may not send as many letters to the legislature as we've historically done. We will still send a letter to the gov's office consistent with our current practices, but we will not likely send a bunch of letters to the legislature like we have because they're going to understand our position based on the RTS system.

And the one benefit here, or one of the many benefits here, is that it will be able to get to a

wider sloth of the legislatures rather than just the leaders of the various chambers.

And Madam Chair, if I may add, DPS did suggest this as a solution to getting your position on legislation communicated to all of the legislature when these letters were not necessarily reaching all the legislators. And my understanding is that when it's in committee, we can give brief comments in addition to our position. Once it's out of committee, it'll only show your position.

But up until then, we can include some brief comments on why you oppose or support or are neutral. So just for clarification. And one last point, Madam Chair, we will always preserve for the purposes of this board and our internal operating processes, the state the vote, the vote count, who voted for what,

what vote we took up. So all of that stuff will still take place. This is not a complete.

Thank you, I'm losing the words in my head, but we're just adding an additional component to it to make it a more effective with the Lege. Madam Chair, if you may, Shanda Breed. I'm wondering if we could add on to any motion. I like this idea. I think it'll be better so that you won't have to keep on writing letters.

to all legislation, but if it were part of the extra commentary, just to add how many approved, how many opposed, and how many abstained.

to give the clear picture for any legislator reading that, that the SOM board approved, but it means this.

Madam Chair, Frank Griego , the maker of the motion. I would oppose that. When we go forward as a board, we go forward as a board not individuals. You are within your rights as an individual outside the board to do something separate, but I do not think we should put forward things that are split or not.

Or or announce what the vote was when we when we take a vote, it's to speak, it's for you to speak for the board. And I do want to clarify, there minutes are always posted on our website and legislators, any anyone.

Sorry to interrupt you. Go ahead. We did minutes the first. Don't we do a transcript? We do a transcript. That's all I wanted. I wanted to make it clear that it's a transcript. It's not minutes any longer. So, but the information regarding voting is available for sure. So anyone who wanted to go back and listen to the transcript about who voted and discussion, it would. And to clarify, I guess that

Um...

There are reasons why we might support or oppose something that we had put in letters, but legislators certainly know to reach out if they want additional information as well. Madam

Chair. Yes. Jenna Mitchell, DPS. We have been including the vote tally the totals in the current letters. For example, we have up the letters that were in your board packet. So we do put, like, for example, with SB 1240, a vote of 12 yes, zero no, and eight abstaining. So the tally is included currently in the letters that we write. And if it is at committee, we could include that.

if the board wants us to.

I think to Frank's point, though, that we do vote as a board. So it's yes, no, or neutral in RTS.

If anyone wants additional information as to the conversation, dialogue, whatnot, the transcripts available. However, in the RTS,

say I or someone wanted to...

go down and ask just in a neutral manner, answer any questions, you certainly could do that as well to legislators in committee only.

JB **Jamie Balson**

This is Jamie Bolson. I agree with Frank's motion, and I second the motion. And I also agree with his comment that if we are voting as a board, that we submit what the decision was as a board, and that if more information is requested, we can provide it at that time.

I think it gets too confusing otherwise.

This is Scott Naegele. But that does leave unanswered the question about whether or not when we do generate a letter, whether we include that information in those letters. So no? We will continue all standard practices with letters like we have done. We are not making an adjustment to that. So when we send a letter to the Gov's office, it will look like what's both in your packet and what was displayed on the screen.

The question that we're litigating or that's up for discussion is whether do we also put that information inside of the RTS. The current statement on the floor is no, we do not. It adds additional confusion, which if that's y'all's prerogative, that's fine. Also, it's very important that the comment field on this is not expansive. It's very, very limited. So the question becomes, do we want to use our limited word count?

when we counting the vote, when they can come back and see that either by listening to the transcript or reaching out to the chair.

There's been a motion and a second right now on the table. Is that correct? Yes. Sir, would you just clarify your motion, please, for the audience?

So our motion was for the board to establish a request to speak account at the Arizona legislature for the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. Okay, if there's no further discussion, we will proceed to a vote.

Yeah, OK.

Major Mitchell, please proceed with a roll call vote. Chairwoman Goulden. Yes. Miss Adkins. Yes. Miss Balson.

JB **Jamie Balson**

Yes.

Mister Barney. Yes. Doctor Blades. Yes. Miss Breed. Yes. Miss Chapman.
Yes, Judge Cohen.

SC **Suzanne Cohen (SUP)**

Yes.

Detective Cook. Yes. Supervisor Fanning. Yes. Mr. Galarneau. Yes.
Major Griego. Yes.
Mr. Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Yes.

Mister Kelroy. Yes. Miss Krejci. Yes. Doctor Lokey. Yes. Supervisor McClure.

JM **Jeff McClure**

Yes.

Doctor Miller. Yes. Miss Musick. Yes. Mr. Naegele. Yes. Mr. Neil. Yes. Miss Opheim. Yes.
Mr. Pawlowski. Yes. Miss Panas.

JP **Jenna Panas**

Yes.

Doctor Rivera. Yes.

Judge Young.

Yes.

And.

Madam Chairwoman, the yeases pass with 26, 0 nos and 0 abstentions.

Motion passes. Thank you, Major Mitchell. Will staff please proceed with the creation of an RTS account for the board?

Thank you.

The attorney, Caroline, is not on, right? No, OK.

We're going to skip to E, pending legislation SB 1709 on the agenda.

I'll give a brief..

Background from the fact sheet for SB 1709. Madam Chair, really quick, if I may just remind the audience of process for this before you the give the introduction. So the chair will provide the introduction overview of what this bill is. We will have a timed 15 minute open

discussion. If we, after that 15 minutes up,

it will be a motion and a vote. If it does not, if the vote does not pass or doesn't get anywhere because we don't reach the sufficient numbers, then we'll go into another 15 minute session of discussion. After that, another vote will be called. If we cannot reach consensus by that point, then this will be tabled to our next meeting.

Any questions? And again, this is the policy that we've previously adopted.

Great, Madam Chair.

Thank you. The purpose of SB 1709 requires, rather than allows, the court to issue a warrant for re-arrest and revoke probation for a probationer who commits an additional offense or who violates probation conditions if the probationer is at least 18 years old and is convicted of a dangerous crime against children.

Background on this, if a person who's been convicted of an offense is eligible for probation, the court may suspend the imposition or execution of their sentence and must without delay place the person on intensive probation supervision or supervised or unsupervised probation on such terms and conditions as the law requires and the court deems appropriate.

including participation in any community punishment programs. In its discretion, the court may issue a warrant for the re-arrest of a defendant and may modify or add conditions to probation or may revoke probation if the defendant commits an additional offense or violates a condition. If the court revokes probation and the defendant is serving more than one

probationer

probationary term, concurrently, the court may sentence the person to serve the terms of imprisonment consecutively.

Miss Breed, I know that I...

Asked you, if you wouldn't mind kind of opening the discussion for us today on.

current either policy practice related to new offense behavior for those on probation.

including those to commit a new crime or violate probation, if you don't, if you don't mind leading our discussion on this. Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm just diving right in here.

But please chime in. Shane, Joe.

if I miss anything. So I was asked about my first thoughts of this and

First thought is that I'm here to just inform. So if you have any questions about probation policy or code, please let me know. When it comes to statute, there's not much of our policy involved. Our practice policy and code is under the Arizona Supreme Court.

It's administrative judicial administration code that we follow. And then each probation department has their own local policy as well.

However, when it comes to the violation or new offenses, Sanctions.

There's not much in statute with the exception of...

all the times that it does state that we need what a probation officer's role is and how they can bring defaulting probationers into court when the probation officer's judgment of the conduct of a probationer justifies revoked suspension of the sentence. Also in statute, it says other parts of the role to serve warrants, make arrests, bring persons before the court who were under

suspended sentences. Excuse me.

Um...

I just lost my place. The only other place where it mandates...

for probation revocation to occur is with intensive probation. And so you have high risk offenders on intensive probation on the adult side. There's about 2,800 of those on intensive probation, highest of the highest risk.

And statute currently says that if they violate with a new offense or condition of probation violation, then they shall be imprisoned. What we just added several years ago to that is we also wanted to incorporate that they will not go to prison unless the new offense or the probation violation are something that endangers the public.

Other than that, there's no statute stating that, unless I'm wrong, are you thinking of anything,

Shane? No other statute mandating the violation in going to prison.

when it comes to sanctions, when it comes to non-compliance, when it comes to new offenses, when it comes to probation violations.

We have in local policy, in code, we talk about, we have matrixes, we have a range, we have a continuum. We look at every case individually. We look at every circumstance uniquely, and we make the determination based on how our training states. We look at evidence-based practices to make those determinations.

And with this being in statute, it is going to be stating.

this method of imprisonment for dangerous crimes against children cases. So it doesn't not include any other violent offenders, DV, physical assaults, other dangerous offenses.

Which?

Some have already come to me about some discrimination, perhaps.

Am I missing anything?

I want to just state the facts and kind of what's in code and in statute, so you're educated more on the decision.

Any questions for me?

Madam Chair, just to please clarify, so I would say your name. Joe Kelroy. Thank you.

Um...

dangerous offense, intensive probation.

requirement or is that a court decision?

It's a court decision. And then would this language supersede?

So technically with this language, you could have somebody on standard probation with any violation or new offense of any kind, and it would be automatic.

The way it's written, that's more of a question. So. The way it's written. In this, did they amend it at all? Is it just level the threes and twos, or did they just say dangerous crimes against children altogether? I don't know if there was an added amendment, do you know? I can double check and look that up. I believe it still just says dangerous crime against children.

But I'll look it up. I have it open. Madam Chair, please. I just opened it now and it's and it still only applies to dangerous crimes against children. And the way it reads in section C of the same statute makes this discretionary in the court. And this new section, it makes it mandatory if they're on probation for DCAC and commit another crime. So I think that's where the.

or what it changes and makes it to answer your question, sir, from the way I read it.

Madam Chair, please. Anna Young. The way I read this too, it's or violates a condition of probation, which could include, you know, something as simple as leaving the county without permission for, you know, a couple hours, maybe not updating the address. And so to me, it seems overly broad because it doesn't give any discretion as to what the violation condition that probation was.

Thank you.

Madam Chair, please. This is Katie Krejci. So to kind of echo what Ms. Breed said, the statute she's referring to where there already is mandatory revocation is 13917. That if someone is already on probation and it's intensive supervised probation, so it's like the more intense probation where they're already on the schedule,

If they violate that and commit a new offense, that's a serious threat or danger to the community, the court already has to revoke the person. It looks like this statute or this bill is only doing it for dangerous crimes against children, which we have to remember just means it's not necessarily a dangerous offense. Under 13-705, that just means the victim was under the age of 15.

One of my concerns is that it just says if the defendant is at least 18 years of age, so it doesn't clarify when they were at least 18. It doesn't tell us that they had to have been 18 years of age at the time of this offense. So it could be someone who was a minor at the time of their offense. And so maybe they were 16 and their victim was 14 or 13.

which is a little closer in age than we're thinking of like a 60 year old with a 13 or 14 year old. And it also doesn't talk about, as Anna Young talked about, you know, it says for any violation, right? And so what if we have someone who has neurocognitive delays, is developmentally delayed and has issues attending appointments, has issues,

And so if they miss a meeting with their probation officer, then they could be in violation and they would have to be revoked to prison.

So I would suggest we oppose this legislation.

JB

Jamie Balson

This is Jamie Bolson, but the court would need to find that there was a violation first, correct? Mm.

Correct. If there, if someone is revoked, they would have to be found in violation at probation violation court. Correct.

JB

Jamie Balson

Right. So it's the court still will be looking at it closely. It's not an automatic.

It's not an automatic thing. There will be findings made before any of this would occur.

Is that ?

Madam Chair.

Please, and then, Mister Neil, you can go.

Go ahead. I just wanted to make the point back to the overly broad. In my world, if I were to pull an offender over and gave him a ticket for a criminal speed, that would be a criminal violation of the law and they can end up falling under this. A warrant issued for the arrest and sentenced again with 0 discretion, just the finding that they committed an offense which...

Is it just to speak to the overly broad part of it? Yes.

Madam Chair. Please. Shane Neil. So, I mean, I would agree a lot with what Shanda said in that I believe it's already captured as far as how IPS is handled. And as far as evidence-based, this is not that. I mean, DCAC is really just a sentencing enhancement.

There are plenty of people who have all kinds of stuff going on with their case that are DCAC, non-DCAC. Non-dangerous sounds less bad than dangerous, but it's simply just how they were sentenced. And so we have assessments to cover risk. And, you know, with evidence-based practices, I feel like

Accountability is a big piece of that. Accountability sometimes is going back to court, but sometimes it's not. So probation officers have a lot of discretion on how they handle violations. Sometimes when offenders violate, it is technically a violation that you could take them back to court for, but in some cases,

them bringing the information to you is actually progress. So if somebody, for instance, admits to viewing sexually stimulated material, you can absolutely violate them for that. And we did many times. But if somebody brings that to you and you know, they've seen the error of their ways and they

that's progress. They bring it to their therapist, they bring it to group, they bring it to their PO. And so in those scenarios, a lot of times we wouldn't violate them because that actually is progress and that's showing, you know, some awareness. So that would remove the probation officer's ability to do that. And, you know, and even if you do

file a PTR. I mean, I feel like the court process, it kind of ties the hands in that normally, I

mean, the PO is going to make a recommendation, which if they've committed a new crime, I mean, my personal policy was, yeah, pretty much I am going to recommend prison on the new charge with a tail on whatever they're already on probation for. But that's just my recommendation.

Defense is making a recommendation, prosecution is making, and the judge does whatever. So that, I feel like it's really going down a weird road with the any condition. If it was just a new crime, I would be on board with that. But any condition is very broad and it doesn't really capture evidence-based stuff or risk.

at all. It's just DCAC, which doesn't paint the picture.

Madam Chair, Amanda Adkins. Please. How common is it for someone to go through probation with no violations on a lifetime probation?

I mean, with probation, how common is that? It depends. There's a lot of discretion that probation officers and their supervisors have on when to take someone back to court.

And this would remove their discretion.

It, well, it would, however, I'm not sure.

Who's tracking the other piece to me, who commits an additional offense or violates probation conditions? Who knows other than probation if someone's violating the conditions of probation? So is someone auditing like files that, I mean, who's, how is that going to be enforced, number one?

Yeah, the scope of that was my question. Yeah, so, and violates probation could be not paying your fine for the month. And a lot of people, it's court ordered on the 1st. Nobody pays on the 1st. They either pay when they come in the probation office or they pay every six months or they'll get behind six months and they'll pay. That's a, that could technically be a violation of probation for some that have that.

condition of probation. To answer your question, but there is a lot of discretion on what probation officers do on their caseloads. Sure.

And then my follow up is I see that there it says no anticipated fiscal impact on the general fund. If we're incarcerating a lot more, I feel like there would be a fiscal impact on the general fund.

Yes, and you know, my additional comments on this, you know, I want to take a moment to talk about victims that I have worked with that had their offenders convicted of very serious crimes, but did not get a DCAC

enhancement. And so when we focus so much on what is simply a sentencing enhancement, which has been over the years, I mean, my college job was to go to the jails and interview

inmates pending sentencing. I've seen thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands of sex plea agreements.

in addition to my 14 to 20 years working sex crimes, thousands. And we really do a disservice to victims when we focus on

Do you have a DCAC? Did you not? I've had victims who were kidnapped across state lines and the county attorney's office gives them a class 6 custodial interference. Molested them for weeks.

But their offense is not a DCAC.

Is their offender any less, I want to say important, is their case any less important because they did not get, whenever I got a case, my officers got a case, I never looked at the plea agreement. I do not care about the plea agreement. I didn't care other than

Other than...

what's in there is related to fines or the years of probation they received or any of that. I'll wrap up. But I didn't care about a plea agreement. The plea agreement never tells the story of what the victim went through.

of what the case is. And I will also say DCACs in Arizona are still 18 year olds who have sex with 14 year olds. That is a senior and freshman in high school. And I've been saying that. They charged it and they've charged it from the 90s, 2000s. We have people who were 18 and had sex with a 14 year old.

a custodial interference for a kidnap and a rape across state lines. I can go through tons of these cases that I've had. I do not care about what a plea agreement says. And I never supervised what I, nor would I recommend anybody supervising anybody based on a plea agreement.

And with that...

Do we have a motion? No, no, I think Miss Krejci, did you say? I can make a motion. OK, Madam Chair, I would.

Trying to get all the process together. Okay. Katie Krejci, I would make a motion that we vote to oppose SB 1709 and that we oppose it because it takes away the court's discretion.

And...

It includes for a mere violation of probation, not only an additional offense, and it's offense based instead of risk based.

Amanda Adkins, I second.

It's been moved and seconded that the board.

Opposes.

SB 1709 due to a taken away judicial discretion.

Included includes minor violations.

and it's offense-based instead of risk-based.

The.

Ms. Mitchell, can you do a roll call? Madam Chair.

Yes.

Ms. Adkins.

Yes.

Miss Balson.

JB **Jamie Balson**

No.

Mr. Barney.

Yes. Doctor Blades. Yes. Miss Breed. Yes. Miss Chapman. Abstain.

Judge Cohen.

SC **Suzanne Cohen (SUP)**

Yes.

Detective Cook? No.

Supervisor Fanning. Yes.

Mister Galarneau. Yes. Mister Griego.

Yes, Mister Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Abstain.

Mister Kelroy. Yes. Miss Krejci. Yes. Doctor Lokey. Yes. Supervisor McClure.

JM **Jeff McClure**

Yes.

Doctor Miller. Yes. Miss Musick. Yes. Mr. Naegele. Yes. Mr. Neil. Abstain.

Miss. Opheim. Yes, Mr. Pawlowski. Abstain.

Miss Panas.

JP

Jenna Panas

Yes.

Dr. Rivera.

Yes, Judge Young, yes.

Madam Chair, the motion passes with 20 yes, 2 nos, and four abstain.

Thank you, Major Mitchell. Please prepare letters to the governor and legislature on behalf of the board for me to sign. Thank you.

The next item on our agenda is the formation of working groups to support the board's objectives. At this time, I will ask staff to give an overview of working groups and to present their recommendations regarding the proposed process to create these.

All right, thank you, Madam Chair. So we want to begin using working groups. I believe at the very, our very first meeting, we talked a little about this. Working groups are similar to subcommittees, but a little bit different. A working group allows not as much process. As you notice, we have to call for a motion. And this is a very process-based meeting.

The working groups will allow us to kind of mind meld and put our heads together in a different way. I do want to call out a few specifics as to what working groups are designed to do. So this is for to help prepare, not decide. So what happens in the working groups is a lot of preparation, and then we either come back to subcommittees or this venue to make an official vote.

do work early, gather information, draft language, frame options. It's also designed to help move quickly and more iterative. If you've noticed both with our these meetings and our subcommittee meetings, they move very slowly and we're only taking very small bites. And so we do need to push the ship forward a little bit faster, further.

And so that's what this is going to help us do. So those working groups, they don't have to have agendas, they don't have to have meeting minutes, and it's not considered a formal meeting in the same way that, again, these meetings or subcommittees are. How we, again, prep an agenda, we post it a few days in advance, all of that working groups don't have to participate in. Additionally, with working groups, you guys are able to leverage staff.

a little bit more and us helping and answering certain questions, pushing in a different way than if you observe in these meetings. And then again, the idea here is that you're supposed to

pressure test your ideas in a more informal way. So it allows more of that informal discussion, smaller groups. You will notice most working groups, I believe, won't be more than five or six people.

And so again, they're designed to be a bit smaller, not as big, and for you guys to iterate.

Lastly, working groups, the focus will be very narrow. And I am going to be annoyingly so, annoyingly so, ensuring that we focus on what the purpose of that working group is. It's easy for us to, you know, have

would be having a conversation about probation and then the, let's say an assessment comes up and then we get distracted by that. The idea is that this is more bite-sized so we can go further faster. Again, to reiterate, we want to move in the direction of working groups. They are different than subcommittee meetings. The purpose of this is to gather more information, draft language, and propose recommendations to the broader group.

It's for us to move quickly and more iteratively, pressure test ideas, and then get more of an ability to leverage staff.

Major Mitchell is going to talk a little bit more about what that process of starting a working group will look like. We will use a charter process. Again, this is not a free for all. It's going to be very prescribed with consultation of the board, but at the discretion of the chair. Before I pass it off to Major Mitchell, any questions with what I've shared so far?

Okay, hearing none, Major Mitchell.

Oh, sorry, Ms. Musick.

Sorry, I just wanted to clarify, since this is much more informal, we're not limited to that percentage of clinicians. Correct. Thank you so much for that question. Yes, we are not limited by a particular composition. It doesn't have to be specifically clinicians. We can make up the board or the working group how we would like.

Madam Chair, may I weigh in, please? Please. Thank you, Victoria Baldner, Council for the Board. To your question, Missy, you need to stay away from a quorum, and a quorum for this board is 17. We've

talked among ourselves, obviously it's up to you whether you want to change the number we've come up with, which is 10.

The other thing I need you all to understand.

I think the idea is to have 5. I need none of the five working groups to talk to one another.

I know it sounds really controlling, but I really need to be clear about that. No emailing, no phone calls, because you can lead to what's referred to as splintering the quorum. And I don't want you to do that, please. So stay away from 17. That's the goal. No emailing, no phone

calling.

And.

When you want to run things by other people that are not in your working group, you've got to do it here or at a subcommittee.

Thank you.

May I ask a clarifying question? So to that respect, that means that when you talk about a quorum, it's that piece that you spoke to the subcommittees about no more than, I believe it was five. So we have to make sure that there's no more than a certain amount of people on this.

that are on the same subcommittee? No, subcommittees are totally separate. I don't know off the top of my head what the quorums are for the subcommittee. Something tells me 5 and five and nine, five and seven. Just about there.

Five and three. Okay. If I understand your question, I think maybe you're conflating the tiny quorum of the subcommittees with what is going to control the work groups. Right. Does that make sense? So I maintain 10 is no more than 10 is fine because I think 17 is what controls.

The subcommittees are their own thing. And the subcommittees are held to open meeting law the same way all of you are when you're here together. But they're separate. So their quorums don't really enter the analysis about what a work group size should not exceed. Does that make sense?

Yes, it does. OK, good. Thank you. This is Katie Krejci. I have a follow-up similar question, so...

If we have a quorum of a subcommittee all in the same working group, that's not going to cause an issue for us.

I think we're avoiding that by who we're putting on the work groups, and yes, that's a good question. I think that Major Mitchell is gonna talk about is the charter process, and we've intentionally deconflicted to avoid that.

Great segue, Jenna Mitchell with DPS. So we passed out the proposed recommended procedure for the board to establish the working groups. So as been discussed, I'm not going to read it verbatim. You all have it in front of you now and we're posting it up for those that are participating virtually. But it's

The scope is to establish that standardized process to complete the work that this board needs to do. It'll assign the responsibility, address the specific issues, develop recommendations, and carry out the tasks as defined in statute. The authority still remains with the board on, as has been discussed earlier, final decision making,

or any of the recommendations of a working group would come either to the subcommittee or to the board. I think the working groups that we're recommending it would come to the board. Establishment of the working group. So any member or staff can propose a working group. The proposal would include a statement of purpose, the scope of work, expected outcomes, membership, composition, deliverables, and timelines or duration. These working groups would, the intent would be that they would be for specific tasks and that they would be formed for the short term. Approval, as Mr. Davis stated, the goal is to reach consensus within

the working groups. This board would just need a simple majority to establish the working groups. The charter, it goes into what would be included in the charter, much of what I already mentioned, the scope of work, the purpose and the objectives, the guiding principles, unless the board establishes and defines guiding principles. I know we're still working on doing that.

membership composition, the deliverables, and then the reporting requirements.

So membership and appointments would be based on subject matter expertise and may include up to 10 board members is what we're recommending, that no more than 10. That doesn't mean we have to have 10, but we wouldn't want to exceed that. Representatives of relevant agencies or external subject matter experts. The nice thing about the working group is it will allow us, like for example, with polygraphers, not to pick on the two of you, but we only

We have two of you on this board and you're already tasked with the full board, the subcommittees. So we're able to allow you to bring in someone else with that area of expertise that can assist the working group and be a part of that working group. Appointments will be determined by the chair or designee.

And then the chair will designate, the board chair will designate the working group leader for each working group. And then we'll go through the expectations for the working group. Any questions on this proposal on the formation of working groups?

And you will notice that again, it's a little bit more flexible or a lot of bit more flexible than the subcommittee meetings that we don't have to follow as many of the same processes. So that is by design to allow the working group leader and that team to come up how they want to, how they want to work, where they want to work, how, and how they want to report those things up back to the chair.

Any other discussion?

Okay, at this time, I'll entertain a motion for the board to adopt the proposed procedure for

the establishment of working groups.

Madam Chair, Frank Griego .

I'll make a motion to approve the establishment of those of the provided procedure to establish working groups.

I don't know if I said that in proper English or not, but I think it did. Yes. Do I have a second?

Brecken Blades, I'll second.

We will proceed to a vote. Do you want to do? Roll. Okay. We'll proceed to a roll call vote.

Major Mitchell. Chairwoman Goulden. Yes. Miss Adkins. Yes. Miss Balson.

JB **Jamie Balson**

Yes.

Mister Barney. Yes. Doctor Blades. Yes. Miss Breed. Yes. Miss Chapman. Yes. Judge Cohen.

SC **Suzanne Cohen (SUP)**

Yes.

Detective Cook. Yes. Supervisor Fanning. Yes.

Mister Galarneau, yes.

Major Griego. Yes, Mr. Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Yes.

Mister Kelroy. Yes. Miss Krejci. Yes. Doctor Lokey. Yes. Supervisor McClure.

JM **Jeff McClure**

Yes.

Dr. Miller? Yes.

Miss Musick. Yes. Mr. Naegele. Yes. Mr. Neil. Yes. Miss Opheim. Yes. Mr. Pawlowski.

Yes. Miss Panas.

JP Jenna Panas

Yes.

Doctor Rivera. Yes. Judge Young. Yes.

Motion passes, 26 yes, no nays, and no abstentions.

Major Mitchell, please provide an overview of the board's objectives. Wait, this is, wait, did you want to do? Okay. Along with the proposed working groups intended to support the board's efforts.

Not you, yeah.

All right, thank you, Madam Chair. Jenna Mitchell with DPS. So staff has worked to take the task that this board is statutorily required to do and break those down for you in a very summarized format. I know you have the document, the multi-page document that was color-coded, that really broke down what we need to do. So

I'm just trying to give you that thumbnail view of what the tasks are, what kind of broad category they fall within, and then whose responsibility they fall under. So we've simply labeled them with the statute number. So D1, if you go to D1 in the statute, it's going to give you all of the additional things that are required and what that needs to obtain.

all the details, but basically D1 is to establish the standard procedures to evaluate adult sex offenders. So those first four listed, D1, 2, 3, and 4, all fall under the adult subcommittee, their responsibility to achieve those tasks. D5,

is under the authority of this board to establish the adult subcommittee pursuant to D4, which you've already done.

D6 falls under the authority of this board to make the annual budget recommendations, which you've already done.

D8 and 9 also fall under the adult subcommittee.

D 10, 11, and 12, we're recommending that the committee form work, that the board form working groups. D 10 involves the supervision and treatment standards of adult sex offenders who have developmental disabilities or who are sexually violent persons.

The 11 is services and release conditions at ACTPTC.

And D12 is the living arrangements for and location of adult sex offenders and adult sex offender housing. So we would recommend working groups for those 3 tasks. D13 and 14 are under the purview of the juvenile subcommittee.

D15 established the juvenile subcommittee, and that was done by the board.

D16 also falls under the juvenile subcommittee. And D17 to develop school and educational materials. We would recommend that a working group be formed to accomplish that task. And then E is evaluate effectiveness of individuals or entities that provide services of D4. which would be done by the board at a much later date once your recommendations have been implemented and adopted. So as you can see from this thumbnail overview, we're recommending the five working groups be established and that charters be developed, that the chair would appoint a leader of that work group.

And if there's interest in joining work groups that you email staff and let us know, you or someone within your organization that might be best suited for those working groups. if you agree to adopt those working groups, but that is our recommendation.

Madam Chair, Frank Griego, are you looking for a motion? Is there any discussion before? Yes, I look for a motion. Any discussion on one working groups? This is Katie.

SC Suzanne Cohen (SUP)

I have a question. This is Judge Cohen. D7 that you didn't mention, is it both community notification and how risk assessments are done, or is that one topic, D7?

I'm sorry, D7 is sex offender community notification risk assessment. I'm sorry, I did skip that one.

SC Suzanne Cohen (SUP)

No, that's okay, but what does that look like? What?

Yeah, so that's the community notification risk assessment. If you look at the statute, the board is tasked with making recommendations on the current community notification risk assessment.

SC Suzanne Cohen (SUP)

Right, but does it, yeah, that I know, but does it, not phrasing this correctly. I'll figure it out. Never mind.

Madam Chair, Frank Griego, if I could, I think what just to clarify what she was asking, there's two different pieces is community notification and risk assessment. So I think what

she's asking is this both of them or is this just one thing of the risk assessment that only involves community notification or is it also include the risk assessment?

SC Suzanne Cohen (SUP)

Yeah, what he said.

This is the community notification assessment that is currently used to assess whether someone is a level one, two, or three. It's that assessment.

This is Katie Krejci, did...

Do you say that someone else from our organization, like these working groups, don't have to be made up of just the board members?

Correct.

Madam Chair, if I may. Please. I would also encourage, again, this came from the, by show of hands, how many folks have read the statute in detail? Okay, so y'all ready for my pop quiz? No, I'm joking. But we would encourage you guys to continue to go back to reference the statute, everything that we

done or we've delineated or distilled this down to is from the statute. So that's again where a lot of the information on what each of these working groups or subcommittees will be doing. So I'm going to keep encouraging to go back reference the statute.

And since I have it in front of me, Madam Chair, may I read D7? Please. Just to clarify Judge Cohen's question, because I find the verbiage in the chart a little confusing also. Seven says consult on and propose revisions to the legislature as necessary to the sex offender community notification risk

assessment as prescribed in Section 133825. I do not have 133825 in front of me, Judge, but I would hope.

that illuminates the answer with regard to if it's both or one or the other.

SC Suzanne Cohen (SUP)

Got it, and I haven't looked at 133835 in a while, but I will. This is Judge Cohen.

Okay. Thank you, Judge.

Amanda Adkins with a clarification question. Since the working groups are not supposed to overlap, is it possible to be part of two working groups? Is it one at a time?

The.

Except for me.

Mr. Davis, do you want to weigh in? I think it's fine, but I'm more concerned about the numbers and who the people are. I'm more concerned about the numbers and who the people on each working group are. Because also the chart makes it look like.

a couple of the working groups are only going to be people on the adult subcommittee. And I don't want people to think that because we need to mix it up. Absolutely. So thank you for that question. So yes, you can be on multiple working groups. I'm going to caution that, you know, you guys all have full-time jobs. You guys all have a lot of other stuff to do. So we want to be careful that, you know,

a singular person is not taking on a lot. If, let's say, you may be on a working group and a subcommittee and an additional working group, that could just be a lot. Although I'm not here to manage your time. That's what you, if you have the capacity to do it, we'll take it. But we of course want to be mindful.

I asked because I said to indicate which ones you're interested in. So if I just, do I put all my eggs in one basket and say, this is the one I want, or do I say, these are like top three? Yeah, please share. Please, if when you do share with staff via email your preferences, please let us know indicate, because if we see, hey, look, you, we may be full on one working group, we can place on another, we can play a little bit of musical chairs when we do the placement with the chair.

Jenna Mitchell, DPS, if I may, some of those working groups, the composition may will be based on what the requirement and the task is in statute. Like for example, on D17 on the develop the school educational materials, that needs to be done in collaboration with law enforcement across the state, victim advocacy organizations, Department of Education and Department of Public Safety. So we would ensure that the composition of that board included collaboration with those. And some of those are not lists, don't have members on the board. So that's where we want to allow for that outside input into accomplishing these objectives.

Shane, Neil, clarification. Please. To Anthony's point, it looks like, I mean, appropriately, so most of the work is going to be done either in subcommittee or the working groups. Is this larger group going to continue to meet monthly? Because I feel like the formal meeting doesn't need to be monthly if the bulk of the work's being done here.

By statute, it's required quarterly. Is that correct?

Yes, it's not in statute how often we have to meet. We'll take that question and that's going to be a conversation that the chair and the vice chair has a discussion about. We've always

talked about at some point if we need to, we can move the meetings to quarterly every other month, what have you, but that is a decision that I want the chair and the vice chair to have an opportunity to.

Yeah, this would be just, you know, affirming formal business, you know, here. Correct, and I think that is at some point the thought.

That is, I think, the thought that a lot of the work is happening in the working groups and the subcommittees, and here we're confirmed, discussed, and approved.

Madam Chair, Frank Griego, on that same point, I believe at the first meeting, we did it as a board motion and vote to do monthly meetings to start with. But I'm not sure how the rest of that motion carried out would have to go back if it's at the discretion of the chair, or if we'd have to come back to this board to change the frequency of the.

Of the meetings, but I know it was set by a motion at the first meeting.

Thank you.

Madam Chair, I would echo what was just said and I appreciate Shane bringing that up because I also had that question. So I do think that's relevant based on time management.

JB **Jamie Balson**

Jamie Balson, I think it might be prudent to schedule monthly meetings when the legislature is in session, if we're tasked with weighing in on bills that are before them, and then the rest of the year, possibly quarterly meetings or whatever the chair and your designees decide.

Really quick, Madam Chair, if I can respond to that. So this board is not obligated per statute to weigh in on legislation. That was a design choice that this board voted on as an additional, like a plus, but it was not something that's in statute required. So your recommendation is well taken that can be added into the thought.

Yes, I definitely think, Jamie, to your point, I mean, legislative session is very busy and there's a lot of potential, you know, items that may impact the work we do. So all good points and I think we'll think about that and discuss. So thank you.

At this time, I will entertain a motion for the board to establish the proposed working groups to objective D7, D10, D11, D12, and D17.

John Fanning so moved.

Frank Griego, I'll second. Thank you. Major Mitchell, can we do a roll call vote, please?

Chairwoman Goulden? Yes. Miss Adkins? Yes. Miss Balson?

JB **Jamie Balson**

Yes.

Mister Barney. Yes. Doctor Blades. Yes. Miss Breed. Yes. Miss Chapman. Yes. Judge Cohen.

SC **Suzanne Cohen (SUP)**

Yes.

Detective Cook. Yes. Supervisor Fanning. Yes. Mr. Galarneau. Yes. Major. Griego. Yes. Mr. Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Yes.

Mister Kelroy. Yes. Miss Krejci. Yes. Doctor Lokey. Yes. Supervisor McClure.

JM **Jeff McClure**

Yes.

Doctor Miller. Yes. Miss Musick. Yes. Mr. Naegele. Yes. Mr. Neil. Yes. Miss Opheim. Yes. Mr. Pawlowski. Yes. Miss Panas.

JP **Jenna Panas**

Yes.

Doctor Rivera. Yes. Judge Young. Yes.

Madam Chair, the motion carries with 26 yes, no, noes, and no abstentions. Thank you. Will staff please proceed with the establishment of the five working groups for the board, and then I would ask board members to please email staff as soon as possible if you're interested in joining.

a working group or to recommend a representative from relevant agencies or anyone you feel is a subject matter expert on any of these topics. Thank you.

Moving on to H, the next agenda item is discussion of documentation provided by board member Joseph Kelroy regarding juvenile court practices for juveniles with sexual abusive behaviors. Thank you, Madam Chair. I, attending these meetings, I just, there seemed to be a lot of

various discussions and then attending the subcommittee meetings, I felt it appropriate to share the documents that were shared with all of you. Those were the statute 8350, the code of which also the ATSA guidelines, which I think many of you have seen. The Dr. Caldwell report, which was published in 2020, and then also the service specification from the AOC that we contract with our providers for evaluation and treatment for JSOP, the juveniles with sexually abusive behavior.

I do not have a presentation today. I just wanted to make this information aware to you. And we are working on other pieces of information, data, et cetera, to share with the board and the subcommittees at the appropriate time.

for discussion. And at that point, too, I know people have said, I believe it was today, too, that, you know, this information, the essence of this work isn't singular. It's not one thing. It's a combination of many different things.

And I hope that during the subcommittee meetings and the committee meetings, we can bring in other folks in probation, the juvenile court that are working in the various aspects of juvenile justice so that this board gets a sense of what is being done.

Also, your presentation, Miss Musick, was very, very, very amazing. You know, and we hear bits and pieces and a lot of that, you know, but I think it's always good to revisit it to the essence of the work that we're doing with minor victims, with victims in general. So I appreciate your work. And hopefully we can delve into more of that, I think, with things that we're doing in other aspects of juvenile justice. So I don't have a presentation. I just wanted to preface the handouts.

By the way, so...

Thank you.

I have a question real quick, Dr. Lokey. Please. With the work groups, I was just thinking about subject matters expert that I might want to join with one of the work groups. Do we have any idea of cadence or is each work group going to be doing that cadence? So when I ask somebody this week, they're going to ask me how often do they have to meet and you know, so.

any idea of what kind of cadence we want to look at for that.

That's up to y'all. The working group leader and group, that's up for you guys. You guys can

decide to meet twice a week for 30 minutes or meet for 40, you guys can come, we don't want to prescribe that because again, depending on the outside experts, depending on who's there, they may have a different schedule. I would encourage, you know, we all know when our board meetings will be. So to try to align the work up so that you have something to present here or have something for the board to vote on.

And that's my only one recommendation, but otherwise, timing, cadence, that's to you all's discretion.

Yeah.

On the agenda, D Miss County Attorney Kou Kaczorowski.

Karolyn . Karolyn . County Attorney Karolyn . Was not able to make it today. Can I get a motion to table the discussion of call with the public for next meeting, please?

This is Joe Kelroy. I would make a motion to table D. Can I have a second, please?

Brecken Blades, I'll second that. All those in favor, please say aye.

JP

Jenna Panas

Aye.

Any opposed?

Any abstaining? Thank you. The motion passes. We will table that for the next meeting.

Lastly, today.

Well, almost lastly, we will hear subcommittee reports. If we could start with Dr. Blades with the adult guidelines.

Sure. Okay. The adult subcommittee has been working really hard and I think productively.

So thank you to all of the members of that committee for the work and time and research that you've been putting in. So at this point, we've had a few meetings and we are ready to make a recommendation to the board for the board's, you know, larger further discussion of implementing or the implementation of a sex offense risk, or you could say a psychosexual evaluation that would occur post-conviction, but pre-sentence.

with statutory protections in place that would ensure that the resulting information is used for its intended purpose. So I don't know if that needs, so one of my questions, I guess, would be in what format would I need to make that? Do we need a written format, something to the board? But essentially what arose out of our last meeting and the discussion was that we're essentially ready to kind of

make that recommendation and discuss it further, bring that to the larger board. Next, in

terms of our tasks or what we're going to be taking on will be to discuss what is included in an evaluation. So we have had some kind of preliminary ideas and a little bit of cursory research based on

what's happening in other states and with other boards in terms of the sort of procedures and the assessments that might be a part of that. But we will expand on that in our next board meeting or our subcommittee board meeting. So that's where we landed.

Can we start?

Okay. Okay. So thank you, Brecken. And what I would recommend is let's write something out for next meeting that the board can take a look at and then possibly take action on. Okay. Write something and it will be included in the. Yes. Thank you. Scott, will you please give us an update on the juvenile subcommittee? Sure. Scott Naegele.

We too have continued to meet once monthly. We're trying to do 2 things, I think, simultaneously. One, inviting the various entities that play a role in working with youth and their families in to give us presentations about kind of their system of care, if you will. and how they respond to youth with these issues. Thus far, we've had the folks from DCS who came in this past week and gave us a very good presentation and are going to try to provide some numbers for us in terms of numbers of kids in the DCS system who are in that system for these types of issues.

but are not adjudicated so that those of us on the subcommittee, myself included, can kind of get our brains around the scope of the issue. So there are obviously kids who are on probation and are dual wards. There are kids that are on probation and not in the DCS system, and there are DCS kids who have these issues who are not on probation.

So the youth system has a bit more in terms of moving parts in the equation. And what we're trying to do is get all those entities to come in. We are in the process of trying to invite some folks from Maricopa County Juvenile Court to come and give us a similar presentation.

And at our next meeting, we will have a presentation given to us by the folks at the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections regarding the kids that

to that system of care. We're also exploring and researching other states' guiding principles for the work with juveniles. And we are a stone's throw away from making a decision about whether or not we lock, stock, and barrel adopt the principles, the guiding principles, that the fine folks in Colorado have put together, or whether we modify those slightly with the addition of some information from a couple other states. So we are moving in that direction.

We have yet to have any formal discussions, though it's come up rather informally what

constitutes the evaluation process for juveniles. We have to have much more discussion about that in our pending meetings, but some good stuff happening as well.

Thank you, Scott. Before we adjourn today, are there any items any board members would like to propose for our next agenda at this time? This is Brecken, please. Can I just add one quick thing to our, we also on the adult subcommittee reviewed the adult guidelines document that was given and we didn't have any additional revisions or changes. So just to That out there, we didn't have any recommendations for changes. We were comfortable with the document version as it is. It's OK for the guiding principles. Yes, yes, guiding principles. OK, sorry, OK.

I go through the chairwoman, right? This is Katie Krejci from the chair. Just a clarify mic. Oh, sorry. This is Katie Krejci, chairwoman. This is a clarifying question. When Dr. Blades, you said you looked at the adult.

guidelines, were those the adult guidelines from Colorado or somewhere else? Guiding principles, I think, from Colorado, correct? Is that what you looked at? I believe they were based on Colorado. It was the document that I believe a version of it at least was given to the larger board initially, and then we've been asked to continue to kind of review it. So it was that document.

And.

Any suggestions for future agenda items at this time?

Okay, may I have a motion to adjourn?

Motion to adjourn. Joe Kelroy. Second. John Fanning, second. Thank you. All those in favor?

Aye. Any opposed? Any abstaining? Okay. We're adjourned at 4:18. Thank you. Did I say that?

We're adjourned at 4:18 pm.

● Ashlesha Naik stopped transcription