



BACKGROUND MATERIAL

April 20, 2026

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ashlesha Naik

From: Kim Drogosz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 8:20 PM
To: Arizona Sex Offender Management Board; Baldner, Victoria
Subject: Fw: Response To Somb Chair Regarding March 9 Folder And Board Position
Attachments: 03312026 SOMB Letter to Kim Drogosz regarding packet.pdf; highlighted packet.pdf; page 39-40 email from Champ.pdf; 03092026 SOMB letter to Gov Hobbs.pdf

Categories: Call to the Public Written Comments

Good evening, I was reviewing the agenda for the Monday, April 20th, meeting and noticed my email was not included in the public comment area. Please address this on why it was not added.

Thank you

Kim

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kim Drogosz
To: azsomb@azdps.gov <azsomb@azdps.gov>; victoria.baldner@azag.gov <victoria.baldner@azag.gov>
Cc: Hannah Johnson <hjohnson@az.gov>; Alex Uriarte <auriarte@az.gov>; ccampbell@az.gov <ccampbell@az.gov>; lpena@az.gov <lpena@az.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 at 09:42:43 AM MST
Subject: Response To Somb Chair Regarding March 9 Folder And Board Position

Dear Chairperson,

Thank you for your letter regarding the folder I distributed to members of the Arizona Senate on March 9, 2026.

Please understand there was never any intent on my part to mislead legislators or suggest that I was speaking on behalf of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. I am new to advocacy work, and my purpose in distributing the folder was to share the legal realities and experiences of impacted constituents and to begin a conversation with legislators.

The information included in the flyer was based on the Board's publicly stated positions and the official transcripts from the public hearing at which the Board voted to oppose HB2966, HB2870, and SB1829. Because those positions were made during a public meeting, I felt it was accurate from the SOMB transcripts to share that information with legislators, especially given that the Board's official correspondence had not yet been sent.

Your letter states, "We are aware of a folder you distributed..." and that "some lawmakers believed" one of the flyers was authored by the Board. In the interest of clarity, I respectfully request the following:

1. Who is included in "we are aware"? Was this concern raised by the full Board, Board counsel, or only certain individuals?

2. Which specific lawmakers believed the flyer was authored by the Board? I would appreciate the opportunity to contact those legislators directly and clarify that the flyer was not authored by the Board, but rather was created by private citizens using information from the Board's public meeting and transcripts.
3. Your letter states that such conduct "could constitute a violation of law." Please identify what specific law or statute you believe applies. I take that statement very seriously, and because no intent to mislead existed, I would appreciate understanding the legal basis for that assertion.

I also respectfully ask whether the Board had changed its position on these bills. At the February 23 public hearing, the Board opposed the legislation. The content in the flyer reflected that public position.

If the Board's position had not changed, then I am struggling to understand why concern is being directed toward citizens sharing the Board's publicly adopted position with legislators, rather than toward the fact that legislators were not informed of the Board's opposition in an expedited manner while the bills were actively moving.

Legislators needed to know that the Board had opposed these bills. Had lawmakers known sooner, that information may have been valuable to those who were also considering opposing the legislation.

I am also concerned that your letter may have the effect of discouraging or intimidating citizen advocacy. I have always acted in good faith and have attempted to accurately communicate information that was already part of the public record.

I did not intend to mislead anyone. I do not claim to speak for the Board, and I am more than willing to clarify that with any legislator who may have misunderstood the flyer.

In addition, I would appreciate clarification regarding the specific portions of the document that were highlighted in your correspondence:

- The highlighted reference to "SOMB = Sex Offender Management Board" appears simply to define the abbreviation SOMB. I do not understand how that statement could be misleading, as it is a factual description of what the acronym stands for.
- The highlighted phrase, "Why the Sex Offender Management Board Opposes It," appears to summarize the reasons the Board gave during the public hearing. My understanding was that I was accurately reflecting the Board's publicly stated position.
- With respect to the March 23 statement, I acknowledged and corrected that error. The sentence should have referred to AZRSOL, not the SOMB.
- The flyer itself clearly stated: "Source: Official SOMB Meeting Transcript, February 23, 2026" and cited the Board's public webpage at azdps.gov/sex-offender-management-board. It also stated that the document was "prepared for legislative purposes." I believed those disclosures made clear that the document was not authored by the Board itself.
- The descriptions of HB2870, HB2966, and SB1829, along with the vote counts, were taken directly from the public transcript and meeting record.
- The additional highlighted phrase, "Why the Sex Offender Management Board Opposes It," again appears to be a factual summary of the Board's public statements.
- Finally, the statement that "the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board has emphasized that supervision and management tools should be applied locally and individually rather than through broad categorical housing restrictions and voted to oppose this bill" was also taken from the public hearing discussion.

I support the Board having the opportunity to communicate its own views directly to legislators. In fact, I believe it is extremely important that the Board's positions be transmitted promptly, ideally within three business days after a public vote, so that lawmakers are aware of the Board's position while legislation is still moving.

Had the Board's official correspondence been sent more quickly, this misunderstanding may have been avoided.

As advocates for our families and for others similarly situated, the issues raised by these bills are deeply important and personal.

Kim Drogosz

Gilbert, Arizona

Footnote:

Potential retaliation against protected speech and petitioning activity under the First Amendment and Arizona's anti-SLAPP protections.

Distributing information to legislators and speaking at a public meeting are protected activities. If a government official uses their position to threaten, intimidate, or retaliate against advocates because they spoke publicly or petitioned legislators, that can potentially implicate:

- *The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (free speech and the right to petition the government)*
- *A civil rights claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for retaliation by a government official acting under color of law*
- *Arizona's anti-SLAPP statute, A.R.S. § 12-751, which protects citizens from attempts to silence or intimidate participation in government matters.*

Courts have repeatedly held that government officials may not retaliate against citizens for protected speech or political advocacy

Please note the chain of events that occurred after the informational packet was distributed only on the Senate side of the Capitol between approximately 9:30 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. on March 9, 2026.

Within just a few hours of that distribution, Senator Shamp sent an document to the Chairperson which triggered Chairperson to email AZSOMB at 1:47 p.m. on March 9, 2026. Five minutes later, at 1:52 p.m., there was an email exchange between Ryan Boyd and Jenna Mitchell. Later that afternoon, at 3:15 p.m., Ryan Boyd again emailed Jenna Mitchell.

The timing of these communications is significant. Legislators had only just begun receiving the packet that morning, and almost immediately a series of communications began among those involved.

The timeline is as follows:

- 9:30 a.m.–10:30 a.m., March 9, 2026: Informational packets distributed to members on the Senate side only.
- 1:47 p.m., March 9, 2026: Chairperson sends email to AZSOMB
- 1:52 p.m., March 9, 2026: Email exchange between Ryan Boyd and Jenna Mitchell.
- 3:15 p.m., March 9, 2026: Ryan Boyd sends an additional email to Jenna Mitchell.
- Distribution Letter to Governor Hobbs from Chairperson on SOMB position after chain of events
- Shortly, after the informational packet was delivered to the Senate, there was such a rapid and coordinated response, particularly when the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board's formal correspondence to legislative leadership and the Governor had not yet been timely communicated despite the Board already having taken positions on these bills.

The close proximity of these events suggests that the distribution of the packet directly triggered these communications.

Ashlesha Naik

From: Kim Drogosz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 8:33 PM
To: Arizona Sex Offender Management Board; Baldner, Victoria
Subject: Fw: Response To Somb Chair Regarding March 9 Folder And Board Position
Attachments: 03312026 SOMB Letter to Kim Drogosz regarding packet.pdf; highlighted packet.pdf; page 39-40 email from Champ.pdf; 03092026 SOMB letter to Gov Hobbs.pdf

Categories: Call to the Public Written Comments

My apologies - I do see it in the public comment area. I was looking at the agenda 222 pages.

Sincerely

Kim

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kim Drogosz
To: azsomb@azdps.gov <azsomb@azdps.gov>; victoria.baldner@azag.gov <victoria.baldner@azag.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 at 08:20:21 PM MST
Subject: Fw: Response To Somb Chair Regarding March 9 Folder And Board Position

Good evening, I was reviewing the agenda for the Monday, April 20th, meeting and noticed my email was not included in the public comment area. Please address this on why it was not added.

Thank you

Kim

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kim Drogosz
To: azsomb@azdps.gov <azsomb@azdps.gov>; victoria.baldner@azag.gov <victoria.baldner@azag.gov>
Cc: Hannah Johnson <hjohnson@az.gov>; Alex Uriarte <auriarte@az.gov>; ccampbell@az.gov <ccampbell@az.gov>; lpena@az.gov <lpena@az.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 at 09:42:43 AM MST
Subject: Response To Somb Chair Regarding March 9 Folder And Board Position

Dear Chairperson,

Thank you for your letter regarding the folder I distributed to members of the Arizona Senate on March 9, 2026.

Please understand there was never any intent on my part to mislead legislators or suggest that I was speaking on behalf of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. I am new to advocacy work, and my purpose in distributing the folder was to share the legal realities and experiences of impacted constituents and to begin a conversation with legislators.

The information included in the flyer was based on the Board's publicly stated positions and the official transcripts from the public hearing at which the Board voted to oppose HB2966, HB2870, and SB1829. Because those positions were made during a public meeting, I felt it was accurate from the SOMB transcripts to share that information with legislators, especially given that the Board's official correspondence had not yet been sent.

Your letter states, "We are aware of a folder you distributed..." and that "some lawmakers believed" one of the flyers was authored by the Board. In the interest of clarity, I respectfully request the following:

1. Who is included in "we are aware"? Was this concern raised by the full Board, Board counsel, or only certain individuals?
2. Which specific lawmakers believed the flyer was authored by the Board? I would appreciate the opportunity to contact those legislators directly and clarify that the flyer was not authored by the Board, but rather was created by private citizens using information from the Board's public meeting and transcripts.
3. Your letter states that such conduct "could constitute a violation of law." Please identify what specific law or statute you believe applies. I take that statement very seriously, and because no intent to mislead existed, I would appreciate understanding the legal basis for that assertion.

I also respectfully ask whether the Board had changed its position on these bills. At the February 23 public hearing, the Board opposed the legislation. The content in the flyer reflected that public position.

If the Board's position had not changed, then I am struggling to understand why concern is being directed toward citizens sharing the Board's publicly adopted position with legislators, rather than toward the fact that legislators were not informed of the Board's opposition in an expedited manner while the bills were actively moving.

Legislators needed to know that the Board had opposed these bills. Had lawmakers known sooner, that information may have been valuable to those who were also considering opposing the legislation.

I am also concerned that your letter may have the effect of discouraging or intimidating citizen advocacy. I have always acted in good faith and have attempted to accurately communicate information that was already part of the public record.

I did not intend to mislead anyone. I do not claim to speak for the Board, and I am more than willing to clarify that with any legislator who may have misunderstood the flyer.

In addition, I would appreciate clarification regarding the specific portions of the document that were highlighted in your correspondence:

- The highlighted reference to "SOMB = Sex Offender Management Board" appears simply to define the abbreviation SOMB. I do not understand how that statement could be misleading, as it is a factual description of what the acronym stands for.
- The highlighted phrase, "Why the Sex Offender Management Board Opposes It," appears to summarize the reasons the Board gave during the public hearing. My understanding was that I was accurately reflecting the Board's publicly stated position.
- With respect to the March 23 statement, I acknowledged and corrected that error. The sentence should have referred to AZRSOL, not the SOMB.

- The flyer itself clearly stated: “Source: Official SOMB Meeting Transcript, February 23, 2026” and cited the Board’s public webpage at azdps.gov/sex-offender-management-board. It also stated that the document was “prepared for legislative purposes.” I believed those disclosures made clear that the document was not authored by the Board itself.
- The descriptions of HB2870, HB2966, and SB1829, along with the vote counts, were taken directly from the public transcript and meeting record.
- The additional highlighted phrase, “Why the Sex Offender Management Board Opposes It,” again appears to be a factual summary of the Board’s public statements.
- Finally, the statement that “the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board has emphasized that supervision and management tools should be applied locally and individually rather than through broad categorical housing restrictions and voted to oppose this bill” was also taken from the public hearing discussion.

I support the Board having the opportunity to communicate its own views directly to legislators. In fact, I believe it is extremely important that the Board’s positions be transmitted promptly, ideally within three business days after a public vote, so that lawmakers are aware of the Board’s position while legislation is still moving.

Had the Board’s official correspondence been sent more quickly, this misunderstanding may have been avoided.

As advocates for our families and for others similarly situated, the issues raised by these bills are deeply important and personal.

Kim Drogosz

Gilbert, Arizona

Footnote:

Potential retaliation against protected speech and petitioning activity under the First Amendment and Arizona’s anti-SLAPP protections.

Distributing information to legislators and speaking at a public meeting are protected activities. If a government official uses their position to threaten, intimidate, or retaliate against advocates because they spoke publicly or petitioned legislators, that can potentially implicate:

- *The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (free speech and the right to petition the government)*
- *A civil rights claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for retaliation by a government official acting under color of law*
- *Arizona’s anti-SLAPP statute, A.R.S. § 12-751, which protects citizens from attempts to silence or intimidate participation in government matters.*

Courts have repeatedly held that government officials may not retaliate against citizens for protected speech or political advocacy

Please note the chain of events that occurred after the informational packet was distributed only on the Senate side of the Capitol between approximately 9:30 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. on March 9, 2026.

Within just a few hours of that distribution, Senator Shamp sent an document to the Chairperson which triggered Chairperson to email AZSOMB at 1:47 p.m. on March 9, 2026. Five minutes later, at 1:52 p.m., there was an email exchange between Ryan Boyd and Jenna Mitchell. Later that afternoon, at 3:15 p.m., Ryan Boyd again emailed Jenna Mitchell.

The timing of these communications is significant. Legislators had only just begun receiving the packet that morning, and almost immediately a series of communications began among those involved.

The timeline is as follows:

- 9:30 a.m.–10:30 a.m., March 9, 2026: Informational packets distributed to members on the Senate side only.
- 1:47 p.m., March 9, 2026: Chairperson sends email to AZSOMB
- 1:52 p.m., March 9, 2026: Email exchange between Ryan Boyd and Jenna Mitchell.
- 3:15 p.m., March 9, 2026: Ryan Boyd sends an additional email to Jenna Mitchell.
- Distribution Letter to Governor Hobbs from Chairperson on SOMB position after chain of events
- Shortly, after the informational packet was delivered to the Senate, there was such a rapid and coordinated response, particularly when the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board's formal correspondence to legislative leadership and the Governor had not yet been timely communicated despite the Board already having taken positions on these bills.

The close proximity of these events suggests that the distribution of the packet directly triggered these communications.

Webform submission from: SOMB Call to the Public - Written Public Comment

From Department of Public Safety <do_not_reply@azdps.gov>
Date Fri 4/17/2026 11:19 PM
To Arizona Sex Offender Management Board <AZSOMB@AZDPS.GOV>

Caution: The following message contains information provided by an anonymous user through an online form. Please treat the below message with caution, avoid clicking links, downloading attachments, or replying with personal information.



Arizona Department of Public Safety
2222 W. Encanto Blvd.
Phoenix, AZ 85009

Submitted on Fri, 04/17/2026 - 16:18

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Your Name

Marina

Email Address

[Redacted email address]

What part of the agenda does your written comment relate to?

An item NOT on the agenda

Please provide your written comment in the field below.

I am attaching a link to the Colorado Sex Offender Management Board Legislative Board Report.

<https://dcj.colorado.gov/sites/dcj/files/documents/2026%20SOMB%20Annual%20Legislative%20Report.pdf>

Specifically, their studies on recidivism - especially those considered "LOW RISK" - PAGE 28. Please keep in mind -- "recidivism" can mean re-incarceration for even a technical violation. They don't specify if this is a re-offense rate for a similar offense or if it is any offense, that violates a term of the registry or probation.

Table 2. Post-Treatment Recidivism Rates For Each Final (End) Risk Classification

Risk:	Total count.	Sexual Recidivism Rate.	Violent Recidivism.	Violent Rate	Any Recidivism.	Any Recidivism Rate
Low	304	1 0.3%	9 3.0%	29 9.5%	9.5%	
Low-Moderate	96	2 2.1%	7 7.3%	24 25.0%		
Moderate	115	0 0.0%	9 7.8%	26 22.6%		
Moderate-High	112	1 0.9%	6 5.4%	35 31.3%		
High	203	7 3.5%	30 14.8%	68 33.5%		
Total	830	11 1.3%	61 7.4%	182 21.9%		

I understand this notice

YES, I Understand this Notice

Arizona Department of Public Safety

2222 W. Encanto Blvd.

Phoenix, AZ 85009

(602) 223-2000

<https://www.azdps.gov/>