

**AZSOMB Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-  
20260513\_195920UTC-Meeting Recording**

May 13, 2026,

AI-generated content may be incorrect

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

All right, Dr. Blades, you do have a quorum. I know we still have a few members that said they were joining that haven't logged in yet. So I'll leave that up to you if you want to give them a little more time or not.

**BB** Brecken Blades

And.

I know Dr. Gray was going to try to join and then we're missing, yeah, a few other people. Well, let's go ahead and get started and then they can jump in.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

Yeah.

Okay.

**BB** Brecken Blades

kind of whenever. So, okay, so it's 1.01 pm. and I am going to call the meeting to order. This is the adult subcommittee meeting of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. And I believe the first item will be Major Mitchell to go through roll call.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

Yes, ma'am. Today is May 13th and we'll start roll call. Dr. Blades is present. Miss Adkins.

**AA** Amanda Adkins

Present.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

Mr. Barney.

**BB** Blake Barney

Here. Present.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

Thank you, Dr. Gray.  
Mr. Hanratty.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Present.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Dr. Miller.

**+14\*\*\*\*\*42**  
Present.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Miss Musick.

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
Present.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Mister Naegele.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Present.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Miss Pannas.

All right, so you do have a quorum. We have seven members present.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Okay, great. Thank you.

Okay, the first item on the agenda is the discussion of the proposal for kind of implementation of the standardized pre-sentence investigation and then sex offender evaluation protocol. So everybody had it in their background material.

So based on our discussions, that is kind of just a, it's a rough draft of a proposal that I put together because I believe we need something in writing to give to the larger board to start to discuss. And so just as, you know, a reminder, oh, thanks, Ashlesha.

As a reminder and a recap, this word we're only proposing the existence of this type of evaluation. We're not talking about what it what it really entails, which is, you know, more business that we have for later in this meeting. So it's pretty brief. And

There were some feedback on it. I know that was sent in, but also please feel free to add any

other feedback. Doesn't have to stay like this. You know, you can use a critical eye and look at it. Let's make it look how we want it to look before we send it through. You will not offend me if you...

make any suggestions or changes, you really will not. So, okay, do we maybe, maybe the first thing we would do is go through some of the suggestions. I know Dr. Miller made some suggestions and Missy, you did also. Dr. Miller, do you want to talk about yours a little bit? I think you had said.

kind of some logistical operational pieces you wanted to.

Consider.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

Yes.

I'm looking for my copy so I can pull up the comments. I think it was more logistical, like you were saying about, you know, when implemented, one thing the legislature is gonna have to think about is funding and who will complete the PSIs.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

Is that probation? Is that someone else?

Oh.

just operationally speaking, it'll have to be flushed out, but that also might be down the road for us to discuss.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

No, I think it's a good thought. I think my sense of kind of our discussion and just where things stand, because this is kind of a big, not kind of it is, this would be a big change that we're proposing for the state. And so that we would, the pre-sentence investigation would continue to be

handled by the prohibition department, their division that does that. And I believe they are, or I don't think that's saying they need to be specially trained in sex offender management. I believe they are. And maybe somebody can.

Correct me if I'm wrong, maybe just hopeful, but I don't know that that imposes any kind of a different standard on them to be able to do these.

Payment for the PSE is something that we had talked about before, and I don't know if we've arrived totally at an answer. Scott, do you have some thoughts on this?

SN

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

I just wanted to go back to your.

we're talking about whether or not somebody has received specialized training in the PSI writing. I would make an assumption that that's probably accurate in Maricopa County, probably accurate, probably accurate in Pima County, perhaps accurate in Yavapai County.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mm.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE  
But after that, I wouldn't be as confident that the PSI writers have all received the kind of training that I think we would all consider important and necessary to do justice to that task. But I can't say definitively, you know, that they do or they don't, but

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE  
But I'm, but I'm less optimistic that it that extends to all the outlying counties.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
No, I think you're probably right.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE  
So, we we.  
So perhaps we need to, you know, get somebody who can answer that question for us. I'm not entirely sure who that is in the larger board, but perhaps somebody can answer that for us.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.  
Beth might know, but I would, I would, I would imagine that you're correct, Scott, that it's maybe not a different practice for Maricopa County or some of the larger counties, but that, you know, being specially trained in sex offender management is going to vary.  
when we start to get into smaller counties, I'm sure you're right.  
Okay, Doctor Miller.

**+14\*\*\*\*\*42**  
I was just going to piggyback off of what Scott was saying about, you know, the outside counties or the more rural counties. If we're looking to standardize processes across the state, some counties might need more assistance than others.

and maybe training or something written into the guidelines that we end up establishing. And then same thing for funding. As we operationalize things statewide,

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mm-hmm.

**+14\*\*\*\*\*42**  
Some counties might have more funding than other counties, which I will assure you likely has more funding than the state does. You know, all of that will need to be taken into consideration as well. But I think I'm thinking a little bit further down the line, like I said earlier.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Well, I think in terms of this piece of the proposal, we could either leave it as it is, and, you know, which would signal that we believe that even in the outlying counties, it is important that there's some training and level of familiarity with sex offender management. We could reword it if you guys think that there's a different way that it should be stated that's more appropriate or more specific. Or we could delete it if we don't find that that's critical. But I would probably lean towards personally one of the first two options because I do think there should be some...  
some level of education and training to, because these, the people doing the PSIs are now going to have to be sort of a critical consumer of a full evaluation. And even though they're not making a, you know, determination in the way that the judges, it would be helpful if they had some frame of reference for that.  
So, what are, what are other thoughts?  
Leave it as it is. OK, got it.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE  
This is Scott. I absolutely agree with you, Brecken. I think that I think that it warrants it warrants us taking some time to kind of think about the kinds of things that we need that we think those people need to bring to the table to be able to do justice to.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Okay.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE  
To to really creating a document in a way in a way that's informative.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.

Okay.

Okay, so you're saying leave this in to communicate that we think that the individuals completing the PSIs should have some level of familiarity with sex offender dynamics.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**

That would be my, that would be my hope, yeah.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Okay. Okay. Does anybody else have a differing opinion that they want to propose?

**AA** **Amanda Adkins**

This is Amanda Adkins. I was curious, does anyone know if other states require someone to be trained in that? Like I know in other states they have, you know, providers who are authorized to do counseling through their board and other places have people who are authorized to do their PSIs through the board. It sounded like

The people we spoke to, that I spoke to in Chicago, was like an officer who worked for parole, but it varies here, it sounds like, between probation and parole.

Well, it is probation and parole.

Does anyone know?

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Hi, this is Jim Hanratty. I was curious if you wanted me to chime in now because a couple of sessions ago you asked me about looking at Florida regarding their pre-sentence versus post-conviction risk assessment evaluations, not to be confused with a full-blown psycho, sexual psycho evaluation, but

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

I.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Florida doesn't have a board, but there's nothing in there.

They're titled 47, Chapter 948, which I looked at, that suggests that a risk assessment pre-sentence has to be done.

But...

If a particular justice-involved individual is convicted of a particular statute and they want special privileges like particular contact with minors, internet access, or something else special that's outside of the scope of their

terms and conditions of probation, they can incorporate a risk assessment and those folks do have to be certified through their organization. It's usually ATSA driven.

And every year they sign off on it, so they're not required to do.

They're not required to go through like an inspection or anything like that, but they do have to get a one-page checklist and it's kind of on an honor system where they have agreed to do a certain amount of CEUs and they have to submit that. So once you're in, you're in, you just have to kind of prove every year and document.

that you've actually continued your education, your continuing credits, and that you're still a member of the ATSA in Florida.

I don't know if that answers your question specifically about training, but I did want to chime in about Florida because I didn't get a chance to share that the last time because I couldn't be here.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

Yeah, no, thanks for sharing that. We're glad you're back. Okay, so it sounds like what you're saying is that in Florida, the evaluations are optional, depending on the person's sort of desires in terms of their privileges or special conditions going forward, but that if they want to do one,

they need to do it with an approved evaluator. And those evaluators approvals or certifications, so to speak, are housed within the local chapter of ATSA.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

Ohh.

Yes, and they're also listed with each particular county for adults. Juveniles are a little different. They're on a state level, and it's based on state juvenile justice services. They don't typically use polygraph, by the way, for juveniles, but they do with adults, and it's mandated if they're going to do an evaluation, that polygraph is incorporated.

**BB** Brecken Blades

OK.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

that's not accepted otherwise.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay. Okay, thanks. Okay, Blake, do you want to say something?

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

Yeah.

**BB** Blake Barney

I was going to say, from Idaho, and this is crazy to me, but my understanding is that there is 3

PSI writers for the entire state, maybe 4. And so I attempted to speak with one of the Ladies who is one of those PSI writers.

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

One.

**BB**

**Blake Barney**

She referred me to the board, basically did not answer any of my questions. She was not helpful, which is unfortunate because she's friends with my mom. So I thought that she would be more helpful. But I think that in Idaho, it's very few people that are actually PSI writers and they

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Wow.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay.

**BB**

**Blake Barney**

either cover an entire area or, you know, maybe county. So that's something we could think of. And.

The numbers I wouldn't say are anywhere comparable to Idaho. Obviously, we have a much higher population, but maybe thinking about like every county has a trained specific PSI writer for any kind of sex offender going through the judicial.

Process that that's kind of my thought to make it a little bit.

easier to digest, maybe, is having one person per county or two people per county. Some counties, the smaller counties, maybe one, and the larger counties, 2, or, you know, however many, but not having somebody from each division of probation in the east side, you know, the Mesa division, the North Phoenix, the Scottsdale. I don't know that that's necessary. So I think we could, in a sense, take a page from Idaho and how they do it and have a limited number of PSI writers that are specifically

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

But...

**BB**

**Blake Barney**

certified by the board because she is certified by the board and she basically said, I can't answer any of your questions. You have to refer back to the board. So

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mm.

Interesting. Okay. Well, thanks for trying to get in touch with her.

**BB** Blake Barney

That's, you know, that's my thought there. Yeah. I attempted. Now I need to get on somebody with the board specifically and see if they'll help me out, which I know they will. I just haven't had time. So.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

Yeah. Okay. Major Mitchell, did you want to chime in on something?

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

Yeah, I just want to thank, Missy shared some information that Colorado was coordinating some meetings with some of the program managers with other states. And so I have been successful in making contact with program managers for Colorado, Idaho, and Tennessee. So Blake, I can, I will email you the program manager's contact information.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Oh, great.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

And you can just share with her that I passed that along with you. And I think that you'll be able to get the specific answers that you need. So I apologize that happened, but we are making progress. And again, thank you, Missy, on making those contacts to make it easier for you guys to get the information that you need.

**BB** Blake Barney

That's awesome. Thank you so much, Jenna.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah, that's great. Thank you.

Scott.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE

I was just going to respond to, you know, what Blake was talking about in terms of, you know, how the workload, if you will, of the PSI process gets doled out to people at the probation levels. I mean, my sense is, is that the larger counties are going to want to identify

their own people.

And the larger counties are probably going to want however many people they need to handle the workload. In the smaller counties, they're probably also going to want to identify who they want to do that. But these duties are probably going to end up being part of the duties of a singular person.

that's a member of that of that whatever small probation department, if I'm making any sense. So I think from my perspective, the real issue is, is somebody in perhaps more than one somebody in some counties,

I think we want to kind of recommend what knowledge base they bring to the equation. And the department chiefs can decide however many people they need to identify to do that, or if these are just duties that somebody's going to take on and they're going to give up something else in there.

current duty responsibility. You know what I mean? I think, you know, to me, it makes the most sense for us to get clear about what we think this person or these persons need to bring to the table.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
Okay.  
Up.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah, yeah.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
Hello?  
Can I ask a question?

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Sure.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
Jim Hanratty.  
Forgive my ignorance to this, but typically in Arizona, we've relied on state procurement per county for vendors to do such work.  
in any kind of work, whether it's polygraph or assessment or treatment.  
And where the states have an actual board, the ones that I'm familiar with.  
Particularly, Idaho, they have set up the board to basically provide those guidelines, and

they're required to actually review the folks that are gonna do the work, whether it's polygraph or treatment, and...

To chime in on what Blake said, there's actually only four polygraph examiners in the entire state of Idaho that are actually board certified with that state to do polygraphs for post-conviction sex offenders. So the justice-involved individual has to travel. They can choose one of the four, of course.

But they may have to travel 100 miles.

to go do their process and it's out of pocket for them. I know that's terribly inconvenient, but the way it was explained to me by colleagues up in Idaho and Polygraph Field was that that was the only way that the state entirely, the state, could assign certain people, regulate, you know, operate with quality assurance and stay within the guidelines without going into state procurement where each county kind of has their own like vendors that do it. Now, that's terribly convenient to do it that way, but you're talking about oranges and apples. Either it's going to go through state procurement in the bidding process, based on qualifications, or you're going to have a state board that's basically going to say, here's the paper you're going to use, and it's up to the individual to pay for it and make arrangements to get it done. So that's the way that I see it. So are we talking about the same thing here? Or are we talking about, you know, are we talking about a board that's going to be doing this, a state board regulating it for the whole state or providing those guidelines? Or are we going to give it up to the counties

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
to say, here's the guidelines, run with it.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Well, I think we've jumped way ahead, to be honest with you. So let me let me interject a little bit, Scott, and then I see your hand in, so I'll come back to you. I just want to like route us back to this proposal. And I do think the issues of certification and approved providers and all of those different things are going to.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
OK.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
be raised at some point in the future. I just think they're beyond a little bit beyond our discussion today, where originally, I think a few minutes ago, Amanda, you had said, what do other states require in terms of their pre-sentence investigating officers and their knowledge

of sex offender.

kind of dynamics. I think it's probably from my kind of cursory, you know, review of different states. I think it varies. So Colorado does say kind of a similar, make a similar statement. Tennessee just doesn't include it at all. There's no mention in their requirement about who the officer is or what they know or don't know.

So I think I think that's why I was saying we could take something like this out and not speak to the, you know, the necessary knowledge of the officer if we don't think that that's important or we could leave it in in some form if we do think it's that any some kind of level of familiarity.

with this, a person who commits this type of offense and kind of the, you know, the dynamics thereof is important. So that's kind of just the small, really small question at hand is really just to do with this one statement in the proposal and if we're leaving it, modifying it, or deleting it.

Jenna.

**JP**

**Jenna Panas**

I just want to say I think having the requirement in there is important. And so just maintaining it in there is would be my preference.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, thank you. Okay, Scott, looping back to you.

**SN**

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

You said it, Brecken, and we were only talking about that one very specific thing. And my commentary was only about that one specific thing, not about other pieces of the larger psychosexual evaluation and what that includes. We're going to get to that, but that's not what we were having a discussion about.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

The.

Yeah. Yeah, thank you. Okay.

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Thank you for clarifying that.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, so it sounds like we're thinking to just leave this in there alone at least. And we have to remember also that this, what we end up sending in is just a proposal, our proposal to the board. And so the board may have all kinds of questions and modifications and we may be working on it again. This doesn't mean that it's going

you know, in front of the legislature, anything in any final form, there's a whole another set of, you know, checks and balances. So, okay, so we'll leave that for now. Ashlesha, can you go to the next comment Dr. Miller made and we'll just kind of work our way through. Okay, the financial piece. Yeah. So financial assistance may be provided based on demonstrated financial need.

Again, I guess we could take out the financial piece of it and let that be, you know, a discussion for a later date or by people who are more involved in that.

I would imagine the funding would probably be county because I don't know. Well, I guess if it's part of the PSA, I don't know. Let me just open it for discussion and someone with more information than I have can chime in before I start guessing.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

This is Jim Hanratty. Are you suggesting that this proposal, this PSE is going to be incorporated with the typical PSI of somebody pre-plea? Is that, is that, am I getting that correctly?

**BB** **Blake Barney**

So.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

What we decided was that it would be post-conviction so that they've already admitted guilt to something or been found guilty in some way, but pre-sentence, because in a lot of states, this is used to help inform the judges in some way or of treatment needs, conditions going forward so that it falls in kind of that very specific

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Ohh .

I see.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

timeline. But then the question is who pays for it? Go ahead.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

So they would be under the jurisdiction of, they would be under the jurisdiction of the probation department, then they would be seeing a pre-sentence investigator under the county probation to do that, correct?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Mhm, mhm.

Yeah, so you're saying maybe probation financing.

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Okay.

Well, no, I'm not saying that at all. No, I'm not going to say that at this point because I think that's a huge amount of money. What I would say is that I'm pretty sure probation does that now with folks that are on sex offender conditions or potentially going to be on sex offender conditions.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay.

Ha ha.

None.

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

and they have three main sources to do their evaluation, but that's based on risk.

based on those actuarial, those instruments that they use. I'm not skilled in them, obviously, but those folks that have to do that have to be AOC certified to do it. So they get specialized training to do it. They can't have a sex offender caseload without it, at least in Maricopa County.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

And.

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

As.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

**JH**

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

You know, we've already discussed, Naegele already kind of hit on it, in Maricopa County and the bigger populated counties, that's kind of a commonplace. So is this an augmentation or a guideline for those sex offenses where you're changing the instruments that they currently use or just

I'm trying to get a get my head wrapped around what these, what this PSE is really going to be different than what they do now.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Well, the timing of it is different. So at this point in time for adults who are on probation, once they are referred to a treatment agency, then they're given a few different assessments,

primarily the ABLE and the MSI. And those are written up into kind of a summary report, but they're not

They're not always given a personality assessment if we're thinking that's part of it. And they're not always, the treatment provider anyways is not scoring a static 99R or a risk assessment and not coming together with comprehensive recommendations in terms of their, you know, treatment needs. And they're coming up with kind of a summary of their results of those assessments. And

And, you know, using those to proceed forward and helping in some ways to inform supervision. But I think, so the timing is different. So it could inform sentencing even, or some of those kind of privileges maybe that you were referencing. I know one of the things Missy wants to bring up is reunification. And so maybe that is addressed in the evaluation. So they would be more comprehensive.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
OK.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
And it would occur earlier. So what we're talking about, so in.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Right, right.  
Prior to sentencing, correct?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Prior to sentencing. So in my mind, I guess I'm assuming that this probably means that the individual assessments given by probation kind of early on in the process are not going to be necessary anymore.

Is that what everyone else thinks also? Yeah, this will take the place of that. So that may, there's a case there to be made for there to be some interplay with probation funding because they do have a model for kind of vouchers for people similar, you know, based on need. And we theoretically will no longer be doing those assessments early on.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Understood.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
So I don't know. Okay, I think Amanda, do you still have a hand?

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
I understand. I understand. Thank you.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

No, OK, Doctor Miller. Thanks, Jim.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

I think this question that I posed about finances came from the understanding that this is post-conviction, pre-sentence. So the individual actually might not be on probation.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Right.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

So, if probation would pay or do the PSI.

If they're not on probation, who would pay?

would probation still be responsible to pick up.

you know, that responsibility anyway, just due to the likelihood that they will likely be referred to probation, but that's not a guarantee.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

I think what we talked about or what I had put earlier in the proposal is that one of that this evaluation is going to be required for somebody who does have some kind of an alternative sentence, you know, pending. And I think I said, I think I maybe did the marker of like three years because that corresponds in some ways to like SOTIPS and other.

other kind of risk instruments, but that if they're spending more than three years in prison, that we wouldn't probably be doing it. So that most people were assuming that they're headed out to probation within a rather immediate period of time. So they theoretically would either be, if they're not going to prison, or it would be quickly on under the jurisdiction of probation. Because otherwise, you know, if we're doing these on somebody who's looking at, you know, 20 years or something, it's like, what's the relevance of that by the time they get out, really.

I think is, well, that's what I thought was where we kind of landed.

AA

**Amanda Adkins**

Amanda Adkins here, I thought this was to be used for determining how long their sentence would be.

So we would know how long their sentence is going to be if we're getting the PSI before their sentence.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

AA

**Amanda Adkins**

Right. Am I missing? Did I just wrong there?

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

No, you're right. I think we would know the, we would know, we wouldn't know what they're going to be given. We would know, obviously, like the mitigated, presumptive, and aggravated terms that are corresponding to the charges to which they, you know, admitted guilt. So we would have that information.

Um...

But yeah, at the very least, we need to reword that piece that Ashlesha highlighted because it says prioritizes for individual sentenced in the past tense. And obviously, that's not accurate. They haven't been sentenced yet. So we need to change that.

Um...

I don't know. I guess, honestly, this is where I struggled with the timing of this in the 1st place, because then I guess, you know, what do you guys think? What is the solution for somebody who's facing a long prison sentence?

And then are we still making those people do the evaluation and then they have to do it again when they get out? And maybe the value for informing sentencing is such that it's worth it. I don't know, that's a question I have, I guess, for discussion. Blake, I think, and then Missy, and then Scott.

BB

**Blake Barney**

Yeah, so the way that things are currently is that

it goes through the court and the court determines if somebody is indigent. And if they are indigent and it's still determined that they should be doing the assessment, then the court covers the cost of the assessment, however that works. Basically, the provider is paid through the court.

So I'm thinking in some way, shape, or form, this would still be going through the court and it would have to be determined that the person was indigent or, you know, lacked a significant amount of the funds. So they paid like a third of the cost and the court covered the rest. In some way, the financial aspect of it has to be

Um...

worked around in a way that people who have \$100,000 in their bank account aren't having the court pay for it.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Right. Well, yeah, and I think that's why.

**BB**

**Blake Barney**

But people who have \$1,000 in their bank account do have some way to have it assisted. So that's how it is currently. I don't think we necessarily have to change that significantly, but determining how that is funded through the courts or what is determined for indigent, I don't know that aspect of it.  
not familiar enough with that part.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah, well, I think that's beyond our scope anyway. Thankfully, we don't have to understand how they do that, but you're right. And so it is, it is to be clear, what we talked about is not that everyone's evaluation would be paid for automatically, but that it would be, there would be a determination made based on need and that there is a process that exists for that within probation and within the courts currently.  
where exactly that is most appropriate. I don't know for sure and I'm not sure we have to determine that. But you're right, Blake, the courts can do it too. So, okay, Missy, what's your input? Share with us.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

So part of, Blake, what you said, I think kind of covered part of what I was going to say, because my understanding was this conversation began with where does the funding come from? And so, Blake, what I'm hearing you say is the court does have a pot of funding for these things? Okay. And that's where I think the larger board, where the people that understand the funding, because this is, if we're having this number of evaluations done, the funding available is going to definitely need to be expanding. So that's where other people I think on the board would be better able to do that because I feel like that's a legislative thing. Am I correct on that?  
Does that make sense?  
And so the second piece is the way it's done in Colorado is the PSCs are done for everyone. And anyone who spends, I want to say it's more than two to three years in prison, another evaluation is done because

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

a lot of stuff happens, including assessing for trauma from being in prison.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, so they do have a second one.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

And they...

Yes, and a part of that is SOETP is kind of mandatory in prison up there. So the treatment in prison will have that information ready for them as well.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay.

Mhm.

And then when they're released, is it the...

If they're just released.

with flat time. So they only do another one if they're going to be released with probation term also.

Because it seems like if you're just released...

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

you know, to the community straight away. There's nobody, no agency is overseeing, right, or supervising you.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

Yeah.

Correct. And so that's true because if you have flat time in prison, you are expected to hopefully complete SOETP and then they're just released straight to the community. So they're not required to do any treatment because they're not being released to probation.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay.

Right.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

Yeah, yeah.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, so just somebody who has like a probation tail, then they...

Would get a second one.

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
That's what I'm recalling. My recall's not always 100%.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Okay.  
Yeah.  
No, that's really helpful, Scott.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Well, I mean, I don't want to be the fly in the ointment. I've been doing my level best to kind of not say what I'm about to say, but we have an enormous hurdle to overcome it convincing the constituency that this is going to be after a guilty plea, but pre-sentence.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Okay, let's hear it.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Because the way the way the way it happens now, the guilty pleas are tied to whatever the contents of that plea agreement is. You know what I'm saying in terms of time incarcerated followed by lifetime probation.  
Um...  
I, you know, I don't want to stop what we're doing, obviously, because, but the big hurdle is going to be convincing all the people, all the parties that have say-so in this, i.e. defense attorneys and prosecution, to buy off on a  
You're going to agree to a, you're going to agree to guilt to something even before a risk assessment's done, and then a risk assessment's going to get done, a psychosexual risk assessment. And then that's going to have, that's going to play a part in what your ultimate sentence is.  
I, I, I think we're gonna have to figure out how to...  
What this, what all of what this evaluation entails, and then sell, sell that frankly, 'cause that's what it's gonna be to to the to to the parties ultimately that that that make decisions about how things are gonna flow.  
Yeah, I don't know where to go with that.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Mhm.  
No, I think you're right. I mean, I, in all honesty, I think an easier or maybe not easier, but I guess just more consistent with our current standards would be to implement a full PSE once someone is on probation in place of the one or two assessments

that they now get. I think in terms of...

people's understanding and the process, that's a smaller jump for us as a state, and that's probably an easier thing for people to swallow and to, you know, move forward with. From our discussions, what I understood is that we're trying to capture some information earlier on in the process, provide that to judges, provide it to the court, have that available earlier, because I think there are sometimes information would be helpful in sentencing or in recommending probation terms or different things. And so that the earlier time frame is helpful. I agree with you, Scott. I think there's probably some hurdles here that we're going to face. I think our job as a board and as a committee is to determine and discuss what we really think is the best practice and kind of the ultimate standard.

and propose that. And then whatever resistance we're met with, we'll deal with. And if we need to modify, or if it seems like this is just not going to happen right away, and we need to revisit for a different time frame where, you know, on probate, whatever it is. But if we think if we think this should be the gold standard, and this is what seems like the gold standard in other states, then I think

Our job is to go forward with it and not, you know, we can't control how people react. So just gonna, you know, but I agree with you, Scott. I do.

I do, Amanda.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins**

I just wanted to add that I like the timing of the post-conviction pre-sentence. I think that it helps inform the courts about what's going on. And I also like that we address that there's a small subset of people who are going to want probation privileges and that's addressed on here as separate and that it's going to be different because that testing is going to look different.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins**

And so that part is spot on for me. So nice work on it.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Okay. Yeah, I think that's what we had kind of collectively come to the conclusion is that there are a lot of benefits from it being in this time spot in terms of the process, but that this is a bigger leap for us as a state. You know, it is. So

Yeah, I don't know. Other thoughts on that or proposals to change it or we're we're gonna band together and go forward, do our best to explain our reasoning to the board. Okay. And you know, like I said, if we need to modify and we're met with, then we'll do that. You know,

that's no problem. So, okay, I think those were both. Dr. Miller, did we address your feedback on this or your concerns or questions?

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

Yes, no, everything was addressed. And I just want to say, I think the proposal looks great. So I think we're on good ground.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, good.

On track, OK. OK, I think Ashlesha the next person who had some comments was Missy. So, Missy, do you want to maybe kind of clarify, give us context, expand on that a little bit?

MM

**Missy Musick**

I think it's very important that not only the offender, but families get at least some kind of idea about the expectation for either unification or reunification from the very beginning to see

You know, does this look like it may even be a possibility? What are some steps that people take? Because people are released from prison and their children, they've had contact with their children this whole time. Then they're released and children and partners and families end up hating probation because they're no longer allowed to have that contact. And there's really no structure to unification or reunification in our system. It just kind of...

There's kind of like these very loose outlines to that.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

Yeah, no, I agree. I think it is important to address that right away. And that way, I think that's one of the probably the sort of pros of having it at this point in time is that it's an early kind of look at that piece of it and whether someone's risk is too high or whether, you know, and in the PSI, right, there's

there's, they get victim input, right? So that could also be a piece of, you know, does the victim, do the families, does anybody even, because it has to be victim led, right? And so do we even want this to go forward? Where are we at? And then combining some of the risk pieces, I totally agree with you. Do you think there's somewhere in the proposal that we need to say that, or are you thinking,

We need to make sure that that's one of the recommendations or outcomes that's required to be addressed in the actual evaluation.

MM

**Missy Musick**

And that's what I was thinking, the area that it talked about the intention or the purpose is to include that in there.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mm.

Okay.

**MM** Missy Musick

But...

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay, in the purpose section.

**MM** Missy Musick

Yeah.

And yeah, the bullet points of the purpose of sex offense specific evaluations, if it's just kind of clearly outlined there, you would probably have to maybe add it to the blurb.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mm.

Okay.

I see what you're saying. So add another bullet point that addresses whether reunification is appropriate, feasible.

**MM** Missy Musick

Yeah, or at least on an initial assessments of.

**BB** Brecken Blades

And how that would.

**MM** Missy Musick

possibility of reunification at some point.

So like not make it super concrete, but at least saying we have an initial idea of what the evaluation is saying about this.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay, yeah, I see that to just add it on there that it needs to be just maybe it just needs to be addressed. There doesn't have to be a finite sort of conclusion about it, but that it needs to be addressed somewhere that that's part of what this is for. Okay.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Okay.  
Maybe.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Okay.  
On.  
Okay, so let's see where it says this. Well, I guess anything else Missy on that or is that does that cover your feedback?

**MM** Missy Musick  
I mean, that's, I'm kind of guessing I'm not an evaluator, but I'm kind of guessing that the tools that we're already looking at will assess for that. But that's something for people that know evaluations better than I do.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah.  
Yeah, there are some on there that do. I mean, the ROZAC is designed to do that. The difficult thing about reunification and assessing for reunification is that there's not an instrument that gives you a really great like hard and fast answer to it. And also you would have to pull in, you know, a lot of different information, but that would be also  
Ideally, that's what you're doing in a full PSE where you have, you know, different snapshots of sexual interest and risk and all kinds of things. So, okay, I will add that. And then any other thoughts on the proposal?  
As it stands, do we feel comfortable with this going forward? Do we have other changes?  
I guess the only thing in my mind that we didn't totally close up is that the piece where on the first page under the scope, it says the proposal prioritizes implementation for individuals sentenced to three years or less of incarceration. But obviously that does not make sense.  
So.  
Any thoughts on how to modify that?

**AA** Amanda Adkins  
I think no matter what, they get it prior to incarceration because it's supposed to impact or inform the sentencing.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Okay. Okay.

**AA** Amanda Adkins

Ohh.

I'm open to any other thoughts on that, but it may not seem like a big deal to us, but if someone's looking at 3 years versus 10 years or 3 years versus 5 years, that means a lot to them, right? Like the presumption, oh, you're going to get more than 3, so we're not going to do your assessment. You know, it still has the ability to impact how much time they get.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

Okay, then I will just move ahead with kind of deleting that whole really long sentence. And it'll just say, each individual convicted of a sexual offense shall be the subject of a PSI that includes a sex offense specific evaluation when ordered by the court.

which we could take that out. Also could just say that everyone undergoes it. Individuals serving longer sentences may undergo a sex offense specific evaluation upon their release to the community to ensure accurate and updated information is acquired. And I'll just take out that middle part.

Do we think leave in that first sentence the specific evaluation when ordered by the court or just they just will undergo it period?

Yeah.

**BB** Blake Barney

I think it should be matter of fact and just undergo it because we leaving a gray area we say when ordered by the court because now we have argument from either prosecutor or defense attorney as to why it should or shouldn't be ordered. I think we just make it a standard across the board. This is what it is.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay.

Okay, each individual convicted of a sexual offense shall be the subject of a PSI that includes a sex offense specific evaluation. Also, do, is it, you guys feel okay about calling it that or should I, would we be more comfortable calling it a psychosexual evaluation and, you know, making the acronym a PSE?

Doesn't matter. Yes, Scott.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE

I was I was I was thinking that through just as you were saying that. I wonder if there's a way under the introductory purpose paragraph to kind of

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

SN

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

to flesh that out, flesh that out some more, because really, really, we're talking about two separate things, right? We're talking about a PSI and we're talking about a formal evaluation as both playing a part in influencing the course and direction that this case is going, correct?

BB

**Brecken Blades**

I think so, yeah.

SN

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

So, I, so I wonder if there's if there's merit to trying to...

flesh that out within the scope of that very first purpose paragraph.

Because it leans heavily on the PSI and then there's a sentence after that that goes into this sex offense specific evaluation. But I'm not sure that other than us who are sitting here participating in this and going through all this would come away from reading that being really clear about that.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, so I, so maybe adding.

that on that first sentence to say that includes sex offense specific evaluations to clarify that that refers to a psychosexual evaluation or a PSE.

And then you want more.

of a definition of a PSE is what you're thinking to be in there?

SN

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

Yeah, I'm wondering if that has merit. I mean, because this, to the uninformed reader of this document, it seems that the PSI is the document that really should be leaned on.

And I, and I, and I'm concerned that somebody would draw that conclusion.

That they, that they wouldn't see it as being both of those things.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, so what if we change it to say, this proposal establishes A standardized statewide protocol for pre-sentence investigations to include sex offense specific evaluations, psychosexual evaluations, or, you know, PSE, so that it's clear that this proposal is not about the PSIs themselves, but a proposal that they include the evaluation and then go on. Is that, that's maybe more clear.

SN

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

That makes sense. That makes sense to me.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Missy.

**MM** Missy Musick  
So have we decided this is all going to be one document or two separate documents? Because if they're going to be two separate documents, can you just say the PSI and a PSC?

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mm.

I think that...

I mean, physically, I don't know if they get merged into one document or if it's kind of like an addendum or an attachment to it. I think that in terms of the logistics of it, that making it as part of the PSI provides some oversight so that that PSI investigator is now tasked with kind of making sure that that's included in their investigation because I my fear would be that if it's totally separate.

I guess unless who like who's responsible for it and then does it separate it too much maybe? But I think it's not, it's not, my guess my thought of it would, that it would be kind of like an attachment to it, that they're not like, they don't get to copy and paste and like chop it up however they want, but that it would be like an attachment, you know, to the regular PSI kind of. I don't know what other folks are thinking.

**BB** Blake Barney

So my thought on this, we do what we can to keep it simple so we don't over create a lot of areas for people to overthink it. So the way that you restated that, Brecken, I think that makes the most sense in the sense of this is the PSI and it will include sex offense specific evaluations, the psychosexual evaluation, PSE, If people have additional questions or something like that, they can have those specific questions, but I think we do what we can to keep it as simple as possible. And then if people are overthinking it or overanalyzing it, then that's like an issue we address at that point. Because again, this is a proposal, so we don't even know that it's going to be this document in its finality.

**BB** Brecken Blades

It may likely may not, but this is our best, our best try at first. OK.  
Yeah, I see what you're saying. Oh, go ahead. Go ahead, Jim.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
Jim here.

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

No, you're not.

JH

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Uh, so is this gonna be...

A guideline for anybody that's charged and subsequently convicted of any sex crime, or is it strictly limited to like sexual assault and child sex crimes?

Is it going to be statutory like...

specific regarding what they're actually being charged and or pleading to.

AA

**Amanda Adkins**

My understanding was any sex offense.

JH

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Okay.

AA

**Amanda Adkins**

Yes, no?

BB

**Brecken Blades**

I mean, that's how we have it written. I think that's where I would probably defer to someone on the larger board that is like an attorney or has more legislative experience to say like, hey, you're going to get bogged down. Like, let's, you know, if someone was urinating in public or like, let's, you know, let's disclude those.

ones and keep these and but I that would not be probably my area of expertise.

AA

**Amanda Adkins**

And then this is Amanda again. I didn't know if the evaluation set for like SVP should be addressed in here. I know this is the PSI. I just wanted to throw it out there that we're saying there's some people who are getting like after their release, they would get one upon release, right? I didn't know if they would get one in preparation for SVP.

JH

**Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Okay.

AA

**Amanda Adkins**

I don't want to muddy the waters, but I don't know if we wanted to include the same evaluation for SVP, like for them to be the same as the PSI. Just throwing it out.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

No, I think that's a really good thought. And Dr. Miller, obviously, you're the expert on that. If you want to chime in, I what I would imagine is that because what we the word the wording we included was individuals serving longer sentences may undergo that potentially the screening evaluation for SVP criteria would maybe take the place of this. Instead, I don't know what you think, Doctor Miller.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

Yeah.

I mean, the SVP criteria, can you hear me?

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Yes.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

Yes, the SVP statute outlined that an individual with a sexually violent offense is supposed to get a screener. I think that's a whole separate conversation of who's getting screened that we need to discuss burning SVP. statute, but I don't think we need to separate it. That statute already exists. and I think would satisfy this. The longer sentence may get evaluated while those with sexually violent offenses will be looked at and evaluated if they meet that criteria.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah. Okay. Thanks. That's a good thought, Amanda. I like that.

+14\*\*\*\*\*42

Yes.

BB

**Brecken Blades**

Okay, any other?

Any other thoughts on anything else in the document? I guess we didn't fully come to a conclusion based on the about the. finances. And I think where I see that our discussion left off is that we would maybe defer to those who have more intimate knowledge of the financial workings of the county and the court and probation and, you know, sort of heed their advice as to who should house the funding for this. Is that Accurate.

Okay. Okay.

Um...

Okay, anything else before...

we move on to the next piece. And then I think probably Major Mitchell, would it be best if we maybe take a vote, like make a motion to provide this to the board as our proposal and then vote on that? So we have that.

Or do you think that's not necessary?

**JM** Jenna Mitchell

A motion, a second. No, I think that's appropriate. A motion, a second, and then a vote. Yep.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay, so would anyone, does anyone have a motion regarding proposing or not proposing this to the board?

**BB** Blake Barney

Blake Barney, I'd like to motion for us to present this to the larger board after the amendment is made to the first paragraph under purpose and the additional bullet point is made and get the larger boards

Uh, opinion on it.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay, thank you. Is there a second to that motion?

**AA** Amanda Adkins

Amanda Adkins, I'll second that motion.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay. All in favor, say aye.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE

Aye.

**MM** Missy Musick

Aye. Aye.

**+14\*\*\*\*\*42**

Aye.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Aye. Aye.

**JP** **Jenna Panas**  
Aye.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
OK, any opposed?  
Okay, the motion carries. So I will make those amendments. Some of it I was like working on it as we're talking. So go ahead. Yes, Major Mitchell.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Okay, and just for the record, the vote was...  
Nine yeses, no nays, and no abstentions.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Thank you.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
And can you just confirm no abstentions?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Oh, yes, any abstaining.  
Sorry about that.

**JM** **Jenna Mitchell**  
Perfect. Thank you. Motion carries. Thank you.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Do we actually have nine people on the subcommittee?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Okay.

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

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Wow, okay.

**JM**

**Jenna Mitchell**

For the adult, yes.  
Juvenile has five.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Okay. Okay. Well, thanks everyone. So that is exciting. I will send this over to Major Mitchell with our revisions and then have her, you know, provide it to the board as we do with the background information. And then I will plan to kind of start the discussion about it at the board in whatever way.

you know, that's listed on the agenda, but then we'll welcome any input, questions, further elaboration on the proposal and the ideas from anyone else on our subcommittee be happy to have you join in that discussion. So, okay, great. Thanks, everyone.

Okay, so the next piece we'll spend the next half hour or so just kind of starting to dive into is what does this evaluation look like? And I know we have some information from Colorado and from Idaho. So thank you to Blake and Missy for

getting that background information so we can kind of start. I think, Missy, yours is first in the background information. So if you would like to give us any, hit the high points or anything you wanted to point out about that, we can kind of start the discussion.

Oh, you're muted, Missy. We can't hear you. Sorry.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

Sorry, this list I really just copied and pasted all of the tools that they use.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

The polygraph is not included in this. Colorado actually has several pages that goes very specifically into how the polygraph is supposed to be completed. They also use the plethysmograph that they have a large section that they go pretty in depth on that. I know the plethysmograph is not used in all of the counties in Arizona. So they have a wide variety and they kind of leave it up to the evaluator.

of which tools to use. I did put in a note, I didn't add this.

But in Colorado, they have a specific section for female sex offender risk assessments because almost none of these tools are really validated for use on females. And apparently there's really no tools.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Mm.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

for that. And so they do have just like a list of areas to look at for both co-defendants and

primary offender risk questions.  
for females.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Okay, that's great. Yeah, I mean, you are right. There's there are far fewer choices for females and but having a section specifically about that would be helpful.

Okay, Jim, where would you suggest that we get, and I think you're not hugely in favor of the Colorado standards on polygraphs. Am I correct in recalling that?

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

No, I'm sorry if I gave you that impression. I was just trying to be open to what state boards were, nor, you know, established more recently and how they were putting together, particularly with the use of polygraph. And that's why I liked Idaho. I'm not opposed to Colorado. I mean, they have, they're the premier experts. I mean,

**BB** Brecken Blades

Oh, okay.

Oh, okay.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

you can see by their pages and pages and pages of all inclusive assessments that they accept or document. They were the trendsetters. They were the first. I just don't know how much they changed their polygraph piece since 2021 when the APA changed their model policy from the 2009.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

standard. So I know that Idaho did. I wasn't sure so much on how Colorado got up to speed on that, but I guarantee you by our next meeting, I will be well versed on that status so that I can be clear about it, but I'm not opposed to Colorado at all. I mean, they're our neighbors and I think they've been great.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

Oh, okay.

Yeah, okay, sorry. So that was my misunderstanding. I was hoping that you would be willing

then to kind of spearhead our polygraph research and recommendations for the adults. And I heard you volunteered to do that.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Yeah.

Absolutely.

or voluntold either way.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Well, yeah, exactly. Okay. Thanks, Jim. Okay, Missy, do you have more about this? Scott, I see your hand too.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

You bet.

**MM** **Missy Musick**

Well, well, Jim, I just wanted to respond because the current documentation for Colorado SOMB was updated in 2024. So they're not going off of the original.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

But okay, Scott, what are your thoughts?

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**

Um, I guess I'm wondering if, if it if it makes sense to try to have, I mean, I think that...

By and large, we we have.

a structure in some categories of measurements that are part of psychosexual here in the state of Arizona. And I wonder if there's just some merit to us talking out loud about what those categories are, and then

looking to try to create lists of instruments under those categories that are going to get us where we need to go, I guess is where my brain goes to. I mean, we've got physiological testing, which we would all agree is polygraph, ABLE, and PPG, though it's on the fringes at this point in time.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Mm-hmm.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**

We've got psychological testing, you know, which is, which we can get to in multiple ways through multiple different personality assessments. We've got psychosexual testing that we can get to in different ways. And then we have the issue of...

the necessity, in my view, of actuarial assessments to help us bring science to, you know, kind of evaluating an individual's risks. So I guess I just wonder if maybe furthering what I just threw out there so that we can have discussion about that or if there's... something that somebody thinks is missing, that we have a discussion about that too.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

Yeah, so kind of what I hear you saying is that you're in favor of there being an available list of different assessments that evaluators could choose from that we kind of go through and determine the different assessment options that would meet the needs of the report that we're, you know, that we're saying. These are the things you to speak to in the report and here are your options as far as testing to kind of provide that data. Is that right?

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE

Yeah, I guess, yeah, that is correct. But I think even before that is, is there agreement among the ranks here in this discussion about what those categories are? The definite, you know what I'm saying? I mean, I have a real clear picture in my head, and I suspect you do too, Breckon, of what they are, but

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

Mhm.

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE

I don't wanna, I don't wanna shortchange the process if somebody thinks there's something else that has been missing, you know.

**BB** Brecken Blades

No, I agree with you, especially I think, and I think other states do as well, because it seems like in all of the...

documentation from different boards that I've seen, they all start kind of, seems like they all start more broadly with the big picture of the evaluation and what does it include? What does it entail? What's the purpose? And then they go more specific. Like, what do we, what are the tests you can use? And then what are the outcomes? And what, you know, they kind of like narrow it down, but they do start by talking about.

to your point, like, what are the categories, what do we hope to get out of this? What's the information that we want here? And then they go further to be specific about how, you know, that information is going to be provided or how it's going to be given, I guess. So, Missy, this was really helpful. I think we can probably wait a little bit later. There are some

on here that I thought were interesting that are probably worthy of our discussion, but maybe discuss point, that's probably a little later, but things like the Rorschach is an interesting inclusion on their list.

And some of these, you know, like the Vermont, very Vermont specific, the Vassar, and anyways, but we can get into the kind of nitty gritty of that other times. Missy, was there anything else you wanted us to kind of see in this or point out?

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

I just wanted to point out that it looks like there's actually a test for people who are viewing images of children being molested, that it's still kind of in the research phases.

But I was very excited to see that that's finally starting to be addressed in testing.

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

You?

**SN**

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

What are you speaking of specifically, Missy?

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

Um, oh, I'm trying to remember. It's actually, oh my gosh, he used to be my professional crush. Scott, what was his name? The...

**SN**

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

Oh, Michael Seto, you're talking about the CPORT. Yeah, okay.

**MM**

**Missy Musick**

Michael Seto, yes, he's the one that did it. I'm sorry, was that inappropriate for me to say during a board meeting?

**BB**

**Brecken Blades**

Haha.

That was really funny.

**SN**

**SCOTT NAEGELE**

No, I find him to be a very handsome man too, and intellectually he's very curious to me.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Yeah.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Well, and for me, it wasn't about looks. It was just he is just very intelligent and I like the direction that he does, but he came up with a test I wish.  
I don't have my own list in front of me, but it does outline that there's still some work being done.

**+14\*\*\*\*\*42**  
That's the CPORT?

**SN** SCOTT NAEGELE  
It's the CPORT.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
The CPORT.  
child \*\*\*\*\*.  
Offender risk tool.

**AA** Amanda Adkins  
This is Amanda. I will just add, in my last discussion with Colorado, there are people who do not have hands on offense, like internet offenses only usually only get probation.  
interesting up there. Listening in here.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
You said they only get probation or they don't get probation.

**AA** Amanda Adkins  
No, they only get probation. I was bored when they talked about, when we were talking about sentencing.

**MM** Missy Musick  
That is interesting because on the research that I did for my presentation, I want to say that research showed that approximately 87% of the people that were convicted of online viewing

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Ohh.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins**  
Thank you.

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
had also engaged in hands-on offenses.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Interesting. Yeah. Okay, Scott.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
No.

I just simply was going to comment on what Missy was saying. That's anchored in a very old federal prison-based study that has been largely discredited. It's the Butner study and has been largely discredited by a whole bunch of people, including Michael Seto.

But your point, your point is well taken that there certainly is a subcategory of guys that get arrested for online offenses who also have committed what we would call category A offenses. And it's important to understand that, you know, those, they're different.

That's a, we're having a slightly different discussion. But I think to Amanda's point, part of what's going on is a recognition in the state of Colorado that sending every guy who's arrested for CSAM or CSAM offenses to prison

probably isn't the most efficient use of our dollars. So it's like, throw the baby out with a, you know, I mean, I think what they're probably speaking to there is if they've made a decision as a state to handle those cases,

in this certain way. Whether or not the state of Arizona ever functions that way, unlikely.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Mhm.

Yeah, it is interesting the differences. And I think what I was struck by when you sent this list, Missy, is how long it is and how many assessments on there don't have anything to do with sex offender risk. You know, you could give someone a full IQ test and you could, I mean, there's things that are totally unrelated. So that's interesting in the sense also that it kind of speaks back to what you were saying, Scott, about what are kind of the categories here and what are our purposes? What are we trying to get out of this? And, you know, do we need some of these assessments, which I think then, Blake, maybe that's a good segue into what you found in Idaho, because that list was a lot shorter.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
Yeah, so I kind of appreciated how short Idaho's list was because I had seen everything that

Missy had put up there previously in last month's meeting. And so pretty simple. They have the required evaluate or the required assessments as part of the evaluation, the static 99, well, static 99R the stable 2007, the acute 2007, the MSI, the MMPI, the ABLE, and the interview. Pretty similar to what I believe most of the evaluators are doing here. I don't know about the Acute. I don't think that's one that is typically in there. I don't know if the STABLE is used that often, but I can see their benefit in some ways. being able to incorporate those within our evaluation. But there is the same as with Colorado. There's opportunity to add additional tests as needed. If the MMPI has a lot of elevated areas, it's like, okay, maybe we do an MCI 4. And if the MCMI 4 comes back and there's clearly some psychopathy, you know, massive narcissistic traits showing up, whatever it is, then you could you could do the PCLR and determine if that's, you know, really where they're at. So Idaho has ones that are specific, but not, you can only do these, right? You can add additional ones as needed. And a polygraph is one of those as needed. So in most cases, they have the polygraph, but it was safer to

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mm.

**BB** Blake Barney  
put on here, like, it's a optional, it's sometimes included, right? Because it's not in every single case. So I think that's one of the things we also have to recognize is not every PSE in Idaho is accompanied with a polygraph, but post-conviction, so I would say upon release, the polygraphs are far more utilized in Idaho than they are. as a whole in the PSE process. But in Arizona, we can do whatever we feel like is most beneficial for getting the clearest picture of what's going to make sense for this guy, risk assessment wise. And also hopefully give as much information as possible to help with the sentencing, because that's kind of the process or the purpose of this process is for us to inform for sentencing as well.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)  
No.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mhm.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Idaho does mandate polygraphs in post-conviction sex offenders unless they're imprisoned.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
Correct. Correct. So that's why I'm saying in the sense of pre-sentence or pre-conviction or pre-sentence post-conviction, it's not required. It's not mandatory. So sometimes they use it. And the reason I put sometimes instead of most times is because I

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Right.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
just kind of playing it safe on making sure we're not overgeneralizing. Yeah, almost every single one of them does it. When I think in reality, almost every single PSE is accompanied by it, it's just a little safer to say sometimes.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Mhm.  
Okay, Missy, what are your thoughts?

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
And so, you know, I did fail to put in here because like Colorado does do the same thing. They are not required to hit all of these areas. It is the evaluators discrepancy to decide should there be a ship leak.  
involved? Do I suspect cognitive impairment? Do I suspect some kind of personality disorder? So those pieces are at the discretion of the evaluator. And it does also say that any approved evaluator can use tools outside of this as long as they're able to support the reason that they use those tools.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Mhm.  
Scott?

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
I guess, I guess I want to say, I think we should define the categories. And I think that we should have a discussion about whether or not we stick to those categories, always recognizing that we could add more things to it as long as we've spoken to whatever the categories are that we that we have consensus on. I don't I

personally don't think we want to leave it as undefined as some others may be believing it. But that's just me. And I want to hear what others have to say, too. Steve, what do you think?

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

Is he still here? Gone? Dr. Gray.

**BB** Blake Barney

He's muted. We see him, but he's muted.

**BB** Brecken Blades

I don't know. That's okay.

Um...

**BB** Blake Barney

So real quick, Brecken, if I can speak to that, I think that in a sense, that's kind of what Idaho has done, Scott, is created categories and they found that those assessments fit specifically into those categories. And then additional testing as determined necessary by the evaluator at the time, or maybe even at the request of

an attorney or something like that, whether that be the defense attorney. I mean, that would be the only way is if the defense attorney asked for specific evaluations. But it does seem like Idaho has identified categories, even though they don't specifically state them. They've identified categories that they have said,

This is the assessment fits this category. This is the assessment that fits this category, right?

The static, the dynamic, the ABLE, the MSI, the MMPI. So personality, sexual interests, sex inventory, the interview, all of those things are hitting specific categories in the way that I interpret it. So

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

**BB** Blake Barney

That's my two cents on it.

**JH** Jim Hanratty (SUP)

This is Jim Hanratty.

**BB** Brecken Blades

No, I think, oh, go ahead, Jim.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

I'm sorry again to interrupt. I just, you know, Colorado has the most expansive list of evaluating instruments on the planet. I think we can all agree on that. But wasn't the intent when they put that together and their subsequent meetings to augment their guidelines was to be all inclusive of anything that had publication as its use. And then it let it let it, you know, the individual treatment provider who may be skilled in those areas to use them as they see fit. Not to limit it, not to say you can only use these and shame on you if you go anywhere else, but they were just trying to be all inclusive.

So I appreciate that they were doing that because that's truly Colorado. But...

You know, I to to to Naegele's point.

Um...

Yeah, I see that you want to limit it somewhat. I think there's like, what is it?

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**

No, I'm not interested in limiting it. What I'm interested in doing is operationalizing the categories that we think are necessary for a psychosexual evaluation. And then we can have a laundry list of tools under each one of those categories if they exist.

But, but it's the categories that I think are the important part of what I'm trying to say, not so much what the what the specific instruments are.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Okay.

To see.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**

Can somebody tell me what made the grade for the list in Colorado? I mean, is it based on meta-analysis? Is it based on, you know, reliability studies that are at least 80%, you know, on their reliability? I mean, I mean, if somebody invents a new assessment and says, here, I'm going to publish this in the ASTM.

Does it meet? Does it meet the grade?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

I think that most of them, yeah, I think most of the different states have language in their board, you know, requirements that the assessments all need to be empirically validated and

peer reviewed and different. So I think they have to meet probably certain standards. I don't know if they go as far as saying like,

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Not, not a clue.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
you have to meet a DAB or whatever, but they do have language in there indicating that the test, you can't just be like, well, you know, like my brother and I created this in our garage, like here it is, and then get it added to the list. I think all of the ones on there are ones that I.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
I think I'm familiar with that. That's the grunge band test, right? Isn't that what?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Yes, it's very effective. Yes, thank you. So I think they do all have wording. I couldn't tell you exactly like the percentage or what it is, but they all are, you know, validated in some way. So, okay, to close up in the last few minutes, I think it seems like we all are in agreement that we need to maybe back up a little bit and make sure that we're clear on sort of the purpose, the categories, kind of the outcomes, almost start from the end and then fill in backwards. So like, what do we want? What do we want to get out of the psychosexual evaluation? And let's agree on that, like what comes out of it. And then we'll start to fill in with a list of testing that will give us those outcomes, right? So I think for next time, that will be probably the biggest topic of discussion is kind of what can we agree on what are our purposes? And there may be, I think I would be interested to see if across different boards, is it described in a similar way? Or are we, you know, is it just a matter of like, I use this term, you use that term, but it means the same thing? Or is there variation in what purposes they are using these for, what they want out of them? My guess is that it's similar, but I don't, you know, know for sure. So maybe we start there and take a look at get ourselves settled in what is the point of this? What do we want? What are the outcomes? What are the expected outcomes? And then how are we going to meet those outcomes? And you know, what categories do those fall into? And right, I mean, I think there's some obvious ones we all know, right? Like there's got to be an actuarial risk assessment. There's got to be, you know, some of those, but But then in terms of other ones, I know everyone will, it'll be important that we include, you know, how are we addressing diversity and how are we addressing different cognitive functioning and disabilities and needs. And so there will be some more, you know, kind of minutiae in there that we need to. Make sure we have included so.

So I think what would be helpful maybe is next time do we want to separately provide, I guess I'm trying to think like, and so I'm open to feedback here about what would make our discussion next time most kind of productive and fruitful. Do we want? Do we want to each come in with different states and what their purposes are and start comparing those? Or do we want to have already something maybe compiled that we've all reviewed and then we kind of like start the discussion on that? What are you, what do you guys think would help us the most next time?

**BB** **Blake Barney**

So, Brecken, I think for me, I'm wondering if we, again, we just kind of simplify, are we trying to determine what is the goal of the evaluation as a whole? Because we know the purpose of it, but what is the goal of the evaluation as a whole? And that's where we work backwards because we kind of know what the end result should be. And then how do we get there?

Because I can look that up for Idaho and figure out what is their goal specifically with the PSE, but I don't know if I do that. Am I going to be doing something different than what other people are looking into?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**

Yeah.

No, I get what you're saying. I can be more clear. I guess my thought, yeah, is we have a general sense of the purpose. I mean, we kind of wrote that already in our proposal and we already know what it is. So I guess I'm thinking.

that in my opinion, what would be the easiest is to look at other states and what are their expected outcomes. So whether it's like these are the recommendations we want, these are the categories that have to be addressed, these are the like, you know, you have to assess the person's risk, you have to assess their protective factors, you have to talk about reunification, you have to address their treatment needs. Like, and so we kind of start to come up with like, these are the things that are going to be expected to be addressed or spoken of in the report. And then from there, it seems like once we have those things, we can start to fill in like, okay, well, what are our options for someone's risk? Okay, it's the static, it's the 2002 R, it's the this, that, this. Okay, what are our options for, it has to include a diagnosis. So what do we like?

diagnostically? What do we like cognitive functioning wise, right? Or is that I could be totally off if you guys are thinking like something else and that's okay.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins**

I think you're in the same boat as Mr. Naegele. Just identify what is it that we want and how do we get there?

**BB** Brecken Blades

Yeah.

Yeah. Okay. Missy, what do you think?

**AA** Amanda Adkins

Alright.

**BB** Blake Barney

So we have to also, oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Missy, I mean to speak over. Go ahead.

**MM** Missy Musick

No, go ahead, Blake. Go ahead.

**BB** Blake Barney

Well, I was going to say, I think we also have to decide how much of this, because we're, in a sense, influencing sentencing. What is it from the sentencing aspect of it that we are wanting to provide as much information as possible? So identifying those categories, as Scott's saying, you know, yes, the purpose is clear.

**BB** Brecken Blades

Mhm.

**BB** Blake Barney

but the expected outcome is we're going to be able to provide.

you know, X, Y, and Z to the court in every instance, whether it's an IDD person, whether it's somebody who is cognitively functioning at a high level, whether it's somebody who's ASPD, across the board, we're going to be able to give them XYZ. Is that, is that accurate to?

**BB** Blake Barney

Have that assumption.

**BB** Brecken Blades

I think so. Yeah, I mean, purpose is probably too like diffuse of a term. I'd probably like expected outcomes is a better way to say it. And in consideration of the audience of the assessment, given that it will be the court, it'll be probation. So go ahead, Missy. What do you think?

**MM** Missy Musick

Well, well, now I'm wondering if I'm having the same conversation. There's a piece of me that's like just on this subcommittee. We have people who have been doing evaluations for decades. Do we really need to go completely to the other states to identify what are the categories that we want to, that needs to be a part of the evaluation.

**BB Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

Mhm.

No, I agree with you. I think in the interest of just being thorough and seeing kind of what's out there and how does it align or are we on some kind of an island in Arizona or are we doing things the way that everyone is? But I agree with you. There's a lot and there's been, I know that Dr. Gray wrote, has published a lot of things, but did write kind of like almost a how-to.

to do a psychosexual evaluation for Arizona AFCC, the Family Court Conciliation organization. And so there are already written documents that kind of outline what in Arizona we kind of generally consider to be best practices, because I think it's pretty similar for you, Scott. Most of us kind of align. So I agree with you, Missy. I think that's a great point. And I think that should be part of what's

discussed. And so maybe Dr. Gray would be willing to share with us his perspective on that and kind of Scott, you know, what you think goes into an evaluation and then we can look at how that aligns with, you know, some of the other states. And given kind of like you said, Blake, I think it was Amanda, that the timing of this, that it's also going to be influential in terms of the sentencing, because typically when we do them, you know, they're really speaking to sort of post-sentence treatment and supervision recommendations. And so thinking through that brings a little bit of a different element to it, I think, too.

Okay, I don't want to keep you guys late. Go ahead. Yeah.

**MM Missy Musick**

Can I just say one more thing, Brecken? I think, you know, if you reach out to Colorado, because my conversation with them was very vague around using the PSE for sentencing. So I'm guessing that they have come across some of the barriers that were mentioned earlier. And so if you reach out to them, maybe you can get a clearer vision of should this really be used for sentencing.

**BB Brecken Blades**

Mhm.

Okay.

Okay, yeah.

Yeah, I think getting perspectives from what other folks are doing that is working and not working is just going to benefit us so we can, you know, build on from there. Okay, so Blake,

you said you'll bring some information from Idaho. I know I have a document from Tennessee that I can throw in the mix. I'm also happy to do Colorado, unless Missy, you want to continue with that.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
Yeah.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Jim, you're going to get us some polygraph information. What else do we want for next time? Anything?

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Jim, do you want a comparison or do you just want me to pluck some states like Idaho and Colorado? Do you want me to do a comparison table? Do you want me to include certain states?

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Yeah.  
I think at least two states, maybe, yeah, Idaho and Colorado. I don't think it has to, you don't have to put it formally in a table, but maybe kind of like a one or two pager that's a summary or if a table is the easiest, then that's great, but just a way that we could, we could understand what you're referencing as we look at including these and how to include them in the evaluations. Are they optional or the mandatory? Are they, you know, and kind of your thoughts on that also, but then as an expert, you know, in Arizona, but also what's being done, you know, more broadly for us. I think. Okay, Missy, thanks.

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
OK, thank you.

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
So just for clarification.  
We're looking for what are the...  
required outcomes that we want from the assessment is that what we're looking for is just the bare minimum.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
I think you can start with that. I think, I think what's going to happen is, we're just talking about this, so it's theoretical, but if you, when you go into the different board statutes or documents, they have outlines. I think it's going to be, I think, and like I said, I'm happy to do Colorado also, because I think that they all have this.

**MM** Missy Musick  
Which?

**BB** Brecken Blades  
written down. And so they're like, this is the process of an evaluation. This is what it includes. This is what it addresses. You know, like they start broadly and then they're like, okay, but when we say we provide information relative to risk, like what does that mean? And then they start to operationalize it. And so I think we just, we kind of have an idea of what the broad purpose is, but we need to start operationalizing, like how does this evaluation play out. But so I can bring something from Tennessee and I'll take on Colorado if Blake you'll do Idaho and then Jim has polygraphs. And then are there any other states that we want to consider Utah or anywhere or we're good with that?

**MM** Missy Musick  
Thank you.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Good, okay, let's start there. Jenna, yes, Major Mitchell.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
I just want to offer, since we have those contacts now with those program managers, if you're talking about Idaho, Tennessee, and Colorado, I know you all have already made some contacts as well. But if it would be helpful for Ashlesha and I to send the request to them, if you tell us exactly what it is that you want us to collect, we could put that together for you.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Mm-hmm.

**JM** Jenna Mitchell  
But if it's better for you all to do it so you can ask questions and you guys know what you're looking for, that's fine. I just wanted to throw that out there to offer to help do that. Now that if you're only one in those three states and we do have established contacts, we could offer that to you.

**BB** Brecken Blades  
Okay.  
Okay. No, I think that would be great. I can more concisely state what it is that we're needing. So you can pass that along. And then maybe at least if that just gets kind of the ball rolling,

and then we can see, we can go from there to ask for more things or clarification. But to have someone that's a contact, I mean, versus just, you know, pulling it from what's available.

**SG** **Steven Gray**  
Yeah.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Is always helpful, so.  
Okay. Okay, I will, unless there's anything else, I'm going to motion to adjourn the meeting.  
Is there a second?

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
I second that motion.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Okay, thank you, Blake.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
Blake Barney. Sorry, I second.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
All in favor say aye.

**MM** **Missy Musick**  
Aye.

**SN** **SCOTT NAEGELE**  
Aye.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
Aye

**JH** **Jim Hanratty (SUP)**  
Aye.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Any opposed?  
Anyone abstaining?  
Okay, the motion carries and we are adjourned. Thank you guys. This was a great discussion today. I really appreciate everyone's input. So thank you.

**AA** **Amanda Adkins**  
Thank you.

**BB** **Blake Barney**  
Bye-bye.

**BB** **Brecken Blades**  
Bye, everyone.

⦿ stopped transcription