

AZSOMB May Meeting-20260518_203037UTC-Meeting Recording

May 18, 2026,

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to call this meeting to order. The date is May 18th, 2026, and the time is 1:34. This is the regular meeting of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. At this time, I'll ask Major Mitchell to call the roll.

Chairman Goulden is present. Miss Adkins.

Present.

Miss Balson.



Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney

Present.

Mister Barney.

Present.

Doctor Blades.

Present.

Miss Breed.

Present.

Miss Chapman.

Detective Cook.

Present.

Supervisor Fanning.

Present.

Doctor Gray.

Present.

Major Griego.

Present.

Mr. Hanratty.

Ms. Kaczorowski.

Mister Kelroy.

Present.

Miss Krejci. Present.

Doctor Lokey. Present.

Supervisor McClure.

Doctor Miller.

Present.

Miss Musick.

Present.
Mister Naegele. Present.
Mister Neil. Present.
Miss Opheim. Present.
Mr. Pawlowski.

 **Pawlowski, Nicolas**
Present.

Miss Panas.
Present.
Representative Powell.
Dr. Rivera.
Present.
Madam Chair, you do have a quorum. We do have excused Miss Chapman, Judge Cohen,
Mr. Galarneau, and Judge Young.

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

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

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

Major Mitchell.

First up today is Gary Hardy, followed by Suzanne Dodson, and then Kim Drogas.

Madam Chairman, members of the board.

My name is Dr. Gary Hardy with the Collaborative Justice Institute. We are currently at a critical juncture. While this board correctly identified the SB 1709 and SB 1092 prioritize offense-based mandates over risk-based data, the legislative reality is that these policies are moving forward.

With SB 1092 now law, the system faces a future of mandatory, long-term supervision that removes judicial discretion.

This makes the work of the new working groups more than a procedural step. They are now

our primary clinical safety net.

because when statutory discretion is removed, clinical precision must fill the void. To prevent our probation and treatment systems from being overwhelmed with these new mandates, we must ensure that supervision is dedicated to actual risk reduction rather than just marking time. The human impact

of administrative limbo is significant. When individuals get stuck in extended treatment cycles due to a lack of clear exit criteria rather than actual risk, we drain resources and destabilize the very protective factors like steady employment, family support, and residency, That prevent recidivism.

Therefore, I urge the working groups to prioritize 3 specific deliverables. Statewide consistency, eliminating what we have right now a patchwork of variant provider requirements. Standardized benchmarks, defining exactly what success looks like in a treatment module. Measurable progression criteria,

Ensuring that transitions are based on clinical data and not administrative timelines.

And a review of the assessment process.

True public safety is not found in the length of a sentence, but in the stability of the individual.

By replacing administrative uncertainty with a rigorous, standardized system of measurement, this board can ensure that Arizona remains safe, even as our legal toolkit of discretion shrinks. Thank you.

Thank you.

Suzanne Dodson.

Hi, Susie Dodson, Suzanne Dodson. You've met my son, who at 18 years old, unknowingly committed a crime. He's now 24 and he's grown up under the supervision of the state in a private business. He was tested for drugs and alcohol and was found to have no problems, but he's not allowed to sit in a sports bar with his friends, even if he doesn't drink.

The state determined that he is not a sex offender. A licensed therapist specializing in assessing and treating sex offenders found that he did not have any sex offender tendencies, yet he was ordered into a sex offender treatment program. That therapy is not a state program, it's a private practice. And it's court ordered. Over the past five years, years he has spent, he has paid that private business \$25,000. That's college tuition. It's almost a house payment. Despite his attendance, compliance, and payment, the therapy provider will not give him his evaluations, his test results, measurable goals, or benchmark. They won't explain what success looks like. He learned that there is a test that's given halfway through treatment.

He hasn't been given that test yet. He's 5 years in. And even though the state said his maximum probation is 10 years, he's been told he can't get out of probation until the therapist says he's done with treatment.

He's required to sit every week in the room.

with people who have committed horrific, disgusting crimes, and he's treated as if he belongs in that category, even though state of Arizona said that he does not. I've already shared how this is affecting his mental health. Today, I'm asking you to consider what is the purpose of this therapy?

Treating a person for something that they don't have, is it rehabilitation or is it revenue?

Keeping a person in therapy indefinitely doesn't feel like treatment.

It feels like a system with no oversight.

If the state mandates a private program, the state, in my opinion, has a responsibility to ensure that that program is accountable, that it has standards. Chase has been responsible, and he's paid. He's paid emotionally, socially, and he's paid financially. Five years later, he's still being treated for something that leading authority, Dr. Simpson, and the state of Arizona declared that he is not.

I ask this board to please review how court ordered private treatment is monitored and how progress is measured. Because if a person under these circumstances can do everything required of him for five years and still not know where he stands, then this is not treatment. It's indefinite punishment with a price tag.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Next is Kim Drogas, followed by Eric Meaux, and then Darren Stanley.

Hi, I'm Kim Drogas. Good afternoon, Chair and members of the board. I respectfully ask the board to examine how Arizona identifies, evaluates, supervises, and treats individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other neurodevelopmental disabilities, particularly in the internet-related offenses. After attending legislative hearings and speaking with impacted families, treatment providers, attorneys, and individuals involved in the system, system. I've become increasingly concerned that Arizona's current one-size-fits-all approach to sentencing, supervision, and treatment is failing to distinguish between truly dangerous predatory offenders and individuals whose conduct may be significantly influenced by developmental disabilities, cognitive impairments, social immaturity, and compulsive internet behavior.

We all share the same goal, to reduce risk, improve outcomes, and protect public safety. But when it comes to individuals with lifelong developmental disabilities, such as autism spectrum disorder, traditional supervision and treatment models are often ineffective because they fail to account for language processing deficits, social communication impairments, learning differences, impulse control challenges, and vulnerability to online manipulation. Arizona is increasingly facing the intersection of the internet, criminal justice system, and neurodevelopmental disabilities. Yet many neurodivergent individuals are still being

processed under rigid statutory framework originally designed for violent and predatory offenders without meaningful individualized review.

This concern becomes even more serious with laws such as SB 1092, which this board opposed and was signed into law by the governor. This is where legislative overreach begins crossing into the balance of the three equal branches of government. While these laws are often presented as necessary to protect victims, strengthen public safety, and the reality is that they also cast an extremely wide net, one that increasingly captures young individuals with autism and other developmental disabilities along with their families. By removing judicial discretion, loses the ability to evaluate the full context of a case, including cognitive functioning, developmental impairment, actual risk level, and individualized circumstances. Far too often, the prosecutor's office may argue that an individual is legally competent while failing to fully understand the broad spectrum of cognitive functioning and developmental impairment that can exist with autism and other developmental disabilities. Competency in the legal sense is a very narrow standard. It does not necessarily measure effective functioning

deficits, social comprehension, adaptive functioning, limited limitations, impulse control challenges, emotionally mature, and susceptible to manipulation. This is also important under the American with Disabilities Acts. Courts, probation systems, and correctional institutes are required to provide meaningful access to non-discriminatory treatment, to qualified individuals with disabilities. Families across Arizona are deeply concerned that neurodivergent individuals are being placed into treatment tracks and supervision models that were never designed for them. Thank you. Thank you.

Eric Meaux.

Hello, my name is Eric Meaux. I'm the Juvenile Probation Chief for Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department. Chair Goulden, members of the board, I want to thank you for your opportunity to speak today. Today you will be considering proposed guidelines intended to guide and inform the board's future decision making. You recently received new guidelines this morning, from my understanding.

that include a separate distinction between juvenile and adults, and I thank you for that. Although in reviewing this draft that was recently provided, these distinctions do not sufficiently recognize the fundamental differences between adult and juvenile populations, and perhaps more importantly, the systems in which they operate. Separate principles provide greater clarity, improve consistency and application, and appropriately acknowledge the significant legal

legal, developmental, clinical, and rehabilitative differences between these two populations. Arizona law already recognizes these distinctions through separate statutory frameworks, case law, court procedures, approaches to evaluation and treatment, probation practices, and judicial oversight. Effective juvenile systems are developmentally informed and structured around rehabilitation, family engagement, accountability, long-term positive

outcomes in ways that differ meaningfully ways from adults. At Thursday's juvenile committee meeting, the committee reached agreement that juvenile guiding principles should be separate and distinct, and I applaud the committee for that. That meeting also included presentations and discussion involving representatives from the juvenile court, the County Attorney's Office, and Defense Counsel. I believe that presentation and discussion demonstrated through broad recognition that juvenile matters involve unique legal considerations, multidisciplinary practices, and court processes that support the need for independent juvenile guidelines. So I thank you for that.

As far as getting greater input into these principles, I want to make one point. What you will review later today is item 8 under the guiding principles proposed that talks about multidisciplinary teams. The juvenile court is the essential partner within the multidisciplinary framework and contributes to coordinated treatment supervision, accountability, and rehabilitative efforts through judicial oversight and decision-making authority established by Arizona law. In Arizona, juvenile courts may utilize specialty court models and oversight practices that support treatment engagement, family involvement, community safety, and positive long-term outcomes for juveniles. I applaud you in moving forward distinct juvenile principles, but I think my point coming here today is to let you know that I think we can go a little bit further. And I think if you allow some time for this to be discussed further and get greater input from the system, I think you'll have principles that will guide us not just in the years to come, but down the road.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

Next is Darren Stanley, followed by Lauren Whitaker.

Good afternoon, Madam Chairperson and board members. Darren Stanley, registered citizen and former inmate of 12 years. Last month, 3 new board members were introduced, 2 new ones and one replacement, yet no new member that remotely represents my demographic, as I have talked about before.

Kind of disappointing. As a person of Jewish descent who has been fortunate enough to meet with and spend time with actual Holocaust survivors, I feel our legislators are on shaky ground. They continue to pass and support bills that eliminate judicial review. This is not only prejudicial,

It borders on targeted hate crimes of a specific, isolated group of people.

not to mention unconstitutional. Nothing seems to unite people more than hate, unfortunately. We have gotten so far away of the theory of a do your time, pay your debt to society, and move on and be a productive human being. It's absurd.

When I saw the construction project in the center of the Capitol, my first crazy thought was they're building a gallows to publicly execute violators of DCAC probation. Even I was

shocked at that thought, although it seems that would be the direction we are heading. SB 1709 should not be supported for any reason.

It's just as unconstitutional as SB 1092, which the board voted against and our governor signed. SB 2870 should not be supported for any reason.

Do we not have enough homeless in this city already? If you have six guys living at the same location, aren't multiple surveillance officers going to be stopping in whenever they feel like stopping in?

SB 2966 and HB 1829 are very similar to the already passed SB 1092 that should not be supported.

SB 1240, again, we have another bill isolating DCAC and should not be supported. SB 1239, there is no reason to make failure to register any more difficult than it already is. If I'm correct, the prosecutor's office has seven years to file and can ask for an additional seven years after that.

If I understand it correctly, I am not a lawyer.

HB 2767, I strongly support, and it could use some positive help. Representative Powell would be glad to have your support, I'm sure. Let's stop wasting taxpayer funds on things that have proven not to be effective. As always, I say I am available to speak to any of you or a committee.

If you have my information on record, thank you.

Thank you.

Next, Lauren Whitaker.

Chair Goulden, members of the board, thank you for your time. My name is Lauren Whitaker and I'm a member of the public. I want to begin by acknowledging last month's agenda, which included Chairwoman Goulden's statement on Sexual Assault Awareness Month and Crime Victims Rights Week and Ms. Musick's presentation on survivors. I'm genuinely grateful for that.

My perspective is that is exactly the kind of content that belongs in these deliberations. Last month, I stood here and shared something I had been tracking that every public comment submitted to this board across the meetings. 85 and a half percent advocate for interests of registrants and their families. Roughly 13% address procedural matters, and the number of comments from crime victims, from family members of victims, or from advocates who represent them was just one, my own. Why does that matter? What does it mean when voices being heard in these deliberations are primarily advocating for offenders? It means that the people the system was built to protect are not in this room.

They are not here because surviving sexual violence is extraordinarily hard. And organizing to lobby a state board is not something most survivors are in a position to do. The board's enabling statutes require that victims' advocates hold seats on this board as structural requirement. The legislature made clear that victim perspectives are not optional input.

They are foundational to how this board is supposed to work. That same statute requires that board's methods prioritize the physical and psychological safety of victims and potential victims. Those obligations matter even more because victims aren't here to give public comment. Last month, I asked this board to actively reach out to crime victims and victim advocates to take steps to bring those voices into the record. I'm here today simply to ask, has anything happened since then? Because without the perspectives of victims in the board's deliberations, the solutions this board develops may not fulfill the mandate the legislature gave it. Thank you.

Thank you.

Next on the agenda, some updates. The status of the letters sent on behalf of the board to the governor and the legislature. These were sent on April 22nd, 2026, and are included in the background material.

Um...

Next update.

is creating the RTS account on behalf of the board. Staff has set up this account for the board to use during the next legislative session. Just for clarification purposes, once committee is closed, it is too late to weigh in on RTS. So that will be used for next session.

Number 3 on the agenda is an update on bylaws. So there is a draft of the bylaws version 5 dated May 13th, 2026, which was included with the background material. Ms. Balder prepared this version based on feedback from the previous reviews.

Opening up to any feedback.

from board members and whether or not we believe the bylaws are ready for approval.

And if there is no further discussion, I will entertain a motion for the board to adopt the bylaws.

Amanda Adkins motion to put the put them into the bylaws into action.

Frank Griego , second.

It has been moved and seconded that the board adopt the bylaws. Is there any further discussion?

not, then we will proceed to a vote.

Major Mitchell.

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

 **Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney**

Yes.

Mister Barney. Yes.

Doctor Blades. Yes.

Miss Breed. Yes. Detective Cook. Yes.
Supervisor Fanning. Yes. Doctor Gray. Yes. Major Griego. Yes.
Ms. Kaczorowski.

KK **Karolyn Kaczorowski**
Yes.

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

JM **Jeff McClure**
Yes.

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

PN **Pawlowski, Nicolas**
Yes.

Miss Panas. Yes.
Doctor Rivera. Yes.
Madam Chair, the motion carries with 23 yes, no, and no abstentions.
Thank you. Moving on to the status of legislation that we have weighed in on. Currently, HB 2870 is being held in Senate rules, being scheduled for rules, and then held is not a great sign for this bill, but it is possible to still move through the process. HB 2966 is also, it's waiting for Senate rules. It could move at any time if it is scheduled through rules, but does have some work to do before any potential passage. SB 1829 did not get heard in House Judiciary and is not moving forward.
SB 1240 is waiting for House third read and then may go to the governor's desk if passed. SB 1239 is waiting for House third read and then can go to the governor's desk if passed. And lastly, SB 1709 is waiting for House third read and then may go to the governor's desk if passed.
For an update on working groups, staff, is there an update for the board on the establishment of working groups?

Jenna Mitchell with DPS, Madam Chair and Board. We reviewed the recommendations we made last month to create 5 working groups. And after additional consideration, we felt that it would be best to conduct those working group meetings in an open environment where members of the public were allowed to.

not participate, but be present during those discussions. Having limited staff, we don't have the ability to do 8 board meetings a month or 8 meetings a month. We currently do the full board, the juvenile subcommittee and the adult subcommittee, three meetings per month. So what we are recommending is that

board members be identified to be responsible for each of those five working groups and do their research and bring information back to the board. It would be on the agenda, would be discussed, and then that board member could be directed to do further research or additional, bring additional materials to the board.

So Chairwoman Goulden has designated Major Griego to be the board member assigned for the sex offender community notification risk assessment. Dr. Miller for the supervision treatment standards of adult sex offenders who have developmental disabilities or who are sexually violent persons.

and Dr. Miller for the services and release conditions at ACPTC. And then Miss Colette Chapman for the school educational materials. So those

Four of those working groups will consist of just the board member. The sex offender community notification risk assessment, Major Griego, we will work with him to form another advisory group or subcommittee that will be comprised of additional board members. And we will do agendas for that group.

have open meeting laws followed, whether it's a virtual or in-person subcommittee that meets. And we'll be doing that probably over the summer. We'll do those preparations and be prepared to hold those meetings starting in late July or early August.

Any questions?

All right, thank you.

Thank you.

Item number six, discussion of call to the public when they are not respectful of their time limits. This was an issue raised by County Attorney

Carolyn, I'm going to turn it over to you.

County attorneys on the line, right? Yes, OK.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Yeah, and it's Kaczorowski.

Thank you.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

No worries. I think we need a procedure. Today went very well. However, in the past, we have had people not respect the time frame. Perhaps we shut off the mic or do something such as that. But we did have one meeting in which multiple people went over their time and were not respectful of that.

I am just suggesting some sort of action take place that limits that time. And perhaps prevents

them from speaking in the future, perhaps a one or three meeting prohibition on their ability to speak at calls to the public.

Discussion on that. Miss Baldner is not here today, but we can get her on the line. That is that is something we'd have to get legal advice on. Does anybody else have thoughts before we call Miss Baldner? Yes.

Frank Griego, I think it would help if we were to give some kind of time warning. like a 30 second or 20 second so that people know to finish up. Because it could be in the middle of a thought, of a sentence. These are emotional sometimes, and they want to get those emotions out and get through it. They might not actually hear the timer go off or not want to finish. So if they know that the time is coming to an end with some kind of notice, I think that'll help alleviate some of that going over time or not being respectful of the time stuff. Or an actual timer clock that's visible for people to see that their time is coming up. I think that would be very, very helpful instead of just talking until you hear a buzzer. Thank you.

KK Karolyn Kaczorowski

Karolyn Kaczorowski. I do believe that would be helpful and effective. However, in the situations I was talking about, chairwoman actually told them their time was up and they spoke over her and continued to speak.

Yes, we're going to wait for Victoria also to join the conversation. Yes, go ahead. Thank you. I like the... Oh, please state your name. I'm so sorry.

Joe Kelroy, I like the idea of the clock so they can visually see it. I would suggest maybe a warning if, and the...

and maybe the speaker shut off from yourself, letting them know. And then if they have a warning, they come back, it happens again, then possibly the recommendation where you suspend them at a meeting from speaking at the next meeting. But I agree, these are emotional. And I don't think purposely

They're being rude; they're just the emotions, I think, carry them beyond the three minutes, so...

This is Katie Krejci. Do we know from staff, do we have the ability to either get a visual timer that maybe has like a or some sort of warning and or do we have the ability to shut off the speaker? Like I know those are two proposed options. We even have those abilities, but I agree with the recommendation of some sort of warning would be helpful so people can wrap up their thoughts. I know what in the meetings I've attended, I have missed one meeting. I haven't really seen people abuse the three-minute timeline, so I don't know. That's just been

my perspective.

Okay.

Victoria, can you hear me?

BV Baldner, Victoria

I sure can.

Hi.

BV Baldner, Victoria

Hello!

Hi, Victoria, we're having a discussion on call to the public. Ms. Kaczorowski, we've just been discussing whether or not we can cut off microphones.

If there's a timer, someone gives some, you know, the speakers 20 seconds to wrap up. And then also before us is options if anyone from the public continues to disregard the time limits, what potential

I guess consequences there could be for that, whether it be...

BV Baldner, Victoria

Okay, are we in executive session?

No.

BV Baldner, Victoria

Okay, I needed to know that. Okay, go ahead.

So, or what potential consequences there could be for someone continuing to not abide by the three minutes, whether it be they don't, they're not permitted to speak for a month or two or whatnot. So these are some of the things we were discussing right now.

BV Baldner, Victoria

Okay, I think I, I think I heard three or four questions.

We don't have the capability of shutting off microphones.

If we did, we could do that.

But I, it from a, you know, it's just the nature of the microphones that we have.

Um...

As far as...

Someone who continues.

To abuse.

Their time.

What I do know is that...

You know, we can't remove people from meetings.

for going over by a few seconds.

But you are free to remind the public they have 3 minutes. We ask that they respect the process and stop talking when they hear the timer go off.

Um...

You know the the.

Being able to eject someone from a meeting is a very slippery slope. We're talking about a disorderly conduct standard and...

We need to be careful about overreacting.

As far as someone who continues to ignore.

the timing issue. I should let you all know that calls to the public are not mandatory.

Most public bodies.

Begin.

with them, meaning we chose to add these to the agenda because it is a common policy.

However...

If the board is so inclined to discuss whether they want.

Calls to the public removed from the agenda, that's a possibility.

So in other words, if you have call to the public agendized, you must do the call to the public.

If you take it off of your agendas, there is no call to the public. Does that make sense?

It does. Thank you.

BV Baldner, Victoria

You're welcome. What did I miss? I feel like I missed one of your...
Questions.

KK Karolyn Kaczorowski

Ms. Baldner, this is Karolyn Kaczorowski. Hi, we're not talking about removing people from the meeting. It would be restricting them from speaking at calls to the public as a consequence of violating the time limit. And it's not for a few seconds. It's for the people that are disrespectful of the chairwoman notifying them that their time is up.

BV Baldner, Victoria

Hello!

KK Karolyn Kaczorowski

That would be my first point. And secondly,

BV Baldner, Victoria
Okay.

KK Karolyn Kaczorowski
This isn't.

I do not advocate eliminating calls to the public. I think it's very important for this board to hear from the public. I do emphasize the victim advocate who spoke today that, you know, they are primarily in support of offenders, but they are members of the public and I don't advocate removing that. Entirely.

BV Baldner, Victoria
So...

I think you would run into an open meeting law problem if you put a blanket. And. Rule on an individual that they can never speak again. That's actually something that the Republican leaders in the Senate are being sued for right now.

KK Karolyn Kaczorowski
Miss Baldner again, Karolyn Kaczorowski. No, I suggested a one to three meeting abstention, not never.

BV Baldner, Victoria
Okay, okay.

Okay, that's that seems a little more reasonable to me. So definitely no blanket, but you know, I think maybe the safest would be one. I would like to, if you all would permit me to run that by.

Yeah.

BV Baldner, Victoria
the open meeting law enforcement team. I can do that before the next meeting on June 15th.

Thank you, Victoria.

BV Baldner, Victoria
You're welcome.

And I'm hearing if the board is comfortable, I think what I'm hearing is perhaps we can either see if we can get a timer or verbally give the public 20 seconds to.

Um...

Ohh, yes, go ahead.

Well, sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. Brecken Blades. I was gonna say, what about like one of these? Do you know what I mean? I don't know if they're not looking down, but they're looking down. I'm thinking if even if someone just says 20 seconds, you know, like, or you know, to give a...

And.

Again, revisit this if it becomes an issue.

JM Jeff McClure

Madam Chair, McClure here. I just sent someone at the board their speaker timer, just a large digital clock with a remote control that's all of \$39.99 on Amazon with large LED numbers where you can simply do it from right where you're sitting

JM Jeff McClure

And they can see it from the podium.

So I sent it to wherever our emails go to go to the somb board there, it's there right now.

Okay.

Perfect. We are solving problems today. I love it. Thank you.

JM Jeff McClure

There you go.

Okay, okay. So I think moving forward for next meeting, we will perhaps we have the timer clock and potential 20 seconds warning to wrap up. So unless there's anything else, we'll move on from this topic. Is that good? Okay.

Victoria, thank you so much for your time if you wanted to. hop off the call, you can of course do that.

BV Baldner, Victoria

I, Madam Chair, I don't know where you are in the agenda. Do you think you might need me for something else?

No, I don't think so. I think Major Mitchell said no as well. I think we're okay.

BV **Baldner, Victoria**

Okay, I'll go ahead and drop off the call and if something does come up, Major Mitchell can shoot me a text again.

Perfect. Thank you very much.

BV **Baldner, Victoria**

You're welcome.

Okay, item number 7, draft adult guiding principles dated May 18th, 2026 were included with a background material and are being distributed by staff. This version has the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board header. This version was prepared, updated version based on feedback from the previous

reviews by the board and the adult guidelines and standards subcommittee. I will ask Dr. Blades to, I guess, let us know you guys to go over these in the subcommittees. And if you could give us an update on the thoughts from the subcommittees as well, if you don't mind. Yeah, we did. We did review them and

In our discussion of them, we felt that they were well supported by research and we didn't have any further revisions. That was the consensus.

I have a question, this is Farah Lokey. As I was looking through these both, I noticed that as if you in the juvenile section under number 12, 11, 12, they do talk about disability and daily functioning, which makes sense for juvenile, but I don't see it in the adult guiding principles because we would want to focus on

that as well, disability and developmental functioning for those in the IDD community. So I would feel that that should be in the guiding principles for the adults too, but I, maybe I missed it, but I don't see that in the same areas. I see in number 14 talks about humane and non-discriminatory, which kind of

It's the same thing in the juvenile, but in the juvenile one, it includes disability daily functioning.

Or maybe you would call it functional limitations or something like that.

Thoughts, discussion.

This is Katie Krejci. I agree with Miss Lokey's or Dr. Lokey's suggestion that we also include that in the adults guiding principles. The other thing I noted about the juvenile guiding principles is #5 talks about delinquent behavior for which they're adjudicated. Sometimes what we have is we have these crossovers, we have juveniles who maybe there's a delay in the disclosure, so their offense happened when they were a juvenile.

but there wasn't, it wasn't disclosed until they were over 18 or for some reason or another, they were charged as an adult. And so they're in the adult system. And so it's unclear to me often that kind of like that population that crosses over which one they would follow on fall under. And so, you know, I'm assuming it'd be based on the time of their offense and the time of their offending behavior. And so maybe for #5, we should also include not only for which they were adjudicated, but potentially also for which they were convicted.

Scott Naegele, just a comment about that item number 5 under the juvenile guidelines. I think what that item is getting at is for those of us that work with kids and families who present with sexually abusive behaviors, is a reminder for us that we shouldn't focus exclusively and only on the treatment issues that involve the sexual misbehavior, but rather also any other problematic behaviors, because what we know from recidivism studies, longer term recidivism studies, is that kids with these problems tend to recidivate in non in non-sexual ways at a two to three times rate that they recidivate in sexual ways. So I think that's what this is trying to speak to, but I very clearly, Miss Krejci, hear what you're saying. So my proposal at this time, because I don't want to assume to write these like in right now, my proposal is we adopt as is a next month. If there's one or two that you all want us to consider to add, that would be my recommendation.

Because I, I don't, I want, I want a statement that we can, you know what I mean, unless there's a statement or something you want to bring over, but...

I don't want to rewrite them right now. So what, unless there's a line you want to add in, that's my, those are my thoughts.

Farah Lokey, I don't know about adopting them without considering what to add in and then adopt it, like do the edit first. I hear what you're saying, but shouldn't we kind of edit it and add it and then.

adopt it next time. Are you looking at, is there something specific that you're looking to add that's verbatim that we could add in right now? Like the, like a line, are you saying from juvenile?

If we want to look at.

Let me look at it real quick here.

It seems like in the juvenile, it's just a number 11 is extended with more of that information about, so race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and then it adds disability, socioeconomic status. And then number 12 talks about functioning. So that almost could be verbatim, just stretched in number

Ah.

So.

I think it's number 14.

in the adult and the 15. Yeah, 15 in the adult. I mean, we could just add functional limitations

and...

disability and socioeconomic status. That's a thought. And since I'm talking, I'm going to add another thing I noticed is in after 19, we do talk about understanding and treating juveniles, you know, when we're interviewing them and things like that in the context of their Of.

family context. We don't list anything about trauma-informed care. I don't know if we want to list anything about focusing on how we interview and deal with treatment and actually use the words trauma-informed.

Yeah, I don't see that anywhere in the principles; that's my only other thing.

This is Brecken Blades. In terms of the adult guidelines, there are several places, item 6, 14, 15, where it speaks to individualized and evidence-based. And so I think, I think those would be the places if we want to, if you want to

say, you know, even right now, if you're a few specifiers to elaborate on what individualized means, but in terms of our sort of understanding of that, or my understanding of that would be that individualized would mean take into consideration their abilities. Are they neurodivergent? Do they have mental health? You know, it needs to be individualized to that person, whatever those needs are. And so rather than giving a list that maybe is not exhaustive, we use terms like individualized. Under number 14, we have the same terms, as you pointed out on number 11 for the juveniles. We don't have the paragraph underneath that elaborates on it, but it does.

Number 11 of the juvenile guidelines says non-discriminatory and humane, and that is what it says. Number 14 for the adults, the 11 under juveniles just.

elaborates on what, on you know, which criteria there should not be discrimination, but they both do have non-discriminatory 15 adults says individualization of evaluations, assessment and treatment. So I think from our, from the adult standpoint at least, we took that individualized term to encompass some of those other things.

This is Farah Lokey. I understand what you're saying in terms of how you recognize the, but the wording I feel in the IDD community, we really want that explicitly said about making sure that we understand that we are looking at their functioning and disabilities and having that explicitly said is

for me better than assuming that it's part individualized therapy because that's just an assumption that you, the person doing it knows that. So it'd be nice to have that listed explicitly.

Do you have some, like what are the terms that you would like it to say? Is it the statement that's in the juvenile one? Is that sufficient? Or because I think where we're, what's happened is that we've gone through these a few times and in the subcommittee and this has come to this board and

We haven't had such specific suggestions, you know what I mean, until now. And so it would be helpful to have, if individualized is not sufficient, then what would be the terms that are sufficient so that we can augment this with that? Well, I mean, in #11 in the juvenile, you know, goes must discriminate based on.

not discriminating, based on race, religion, gender, sexual disability, and socioeconomics. You could say that verbatim in the adult. And then in number 12, it talks about relevant changes in their daily functioning. We usually tend to discuss in terms of recognizing functional limitations.

functional or communication limitations, something like that.

So you're asking that we add in an item like number 12, juvenile into the adult, or you're saying also add functional limitations to include in the non-discriminatory piece? Like are those two separate that you're saying or? Not 2 separate. You could say not to discriminate, like where is it race number? I keep missing 15.

I think this is social, cultural, religious.

written differently, right? So social, cultural, religious, you could put race, disability, socioeconomic status, and...

I know if you want to write your dis, don't want to discriminate against functional limitations, that doesn't make a lot of sense there. But adding that you take that into account somewhere, like number.

12.

This is this is the

J **Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney**

This is, this is Jamie Balson. Oh, I'm sorry, tell me when I'm good to go.

Go ahead. Go ahead, Jamie.

J **Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney**

I prefer leaving it as is. I find that the more wordy things get, the more confusing they get.

We want lay people to be able to look at this as well as ourselves and be able to understand what's being said and what ideas are being

being put out there. I do like the use of that. And this is not verbatim, but that it will be

individualized. I think that's very clear and concise and does not confuse things. So I would vote to move forward on it now if

that vote was in front of us without kind of adding what sounds like is going to be a lot more language that's going to just confuse it.

Ask a question, Shane Neil, so feel free to, you know, let me if it's gonna confuse the issue

even further, but the is there a reason why it's not just one document instead of two?
The juvenile subcommittee voted to separate them. So we re-separated them. Because I feel like it's, I mean, overall, I'm an overall person, but it's fairly similar. There are some differences that, I mean, could be outlined specific to juveniles in there, but the scenario that Katie's describing is a little bit different.

If you talk, because I was thinking of it as people involved in the juvenile court system versus adult court system. But if you're defining juvenile and youthful offender and what is that line, it's very gray. So I don't know where those people fall.

Scott Naegele, just to comment on our.

J **Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney**

Mr. McClure, you're unmuted.

Yeah. Yeah. Good to go. Scott Naegele again. And I just wanted to comment on why the decision was made and why we took a vote which was unanimous to separate them and not have them be one set of guidelines. Historically, there's been enough confusion and enough problems that have arisen out of

us thinking of juveniles as just small examples of adults who engage in these behaviors. And we didn't want to further add to that historical problem. We felt it was important that there needed to be two sets of guidelines to draw distinctions between the two populations.

Because while the behaviors might be very much the same, the ideology and what drives those behaviors is very different in many cases. That's the first part. The second part was, is there were some things that, because we did, there was a proposal for a merged set of guidelines, that there were some things that we felt were left that were important things that would

were being left out of that if it were to go that direction, that were specific to juveniles and their families. So that's the reason why we moved in the way that we moved as the juvenile subcommittee and voted to adopt the Colorado standards as they are.

Now, please also understand that the other part of it was for us to look at other states and guidelines that they had and had created to try to determine whether we needed to pull things from those things and add them to the Colorado standards. But what we ultimately found, I think, and others in my subcommittee can chime in, is that really those the other people's standards had already called the Colorado standards and had used the Colorado standards as their model for writing their own guidelines. So there was a lot of redundancy and a lot of repetition there. But that's some context for why we opted to move in the way that we moved.

I'll certainly field questions if there are any.

Can't there be a subsection specific to juveniles if in one document?

Because in the example Katie gave, where do those people fall?

Yeah.

Okay, well, if we're talking juvenile court, I see this is juvenile court. Why as those who are in, why as those who are 17 in adult court with fallen days, these are guiding principles.

These are not our mandates of what our standards are or the

what's in legislation and the things that we're supposed to be creating out of these.

So like the statute specifically talks about the populations that you're speaking of, and we're developing guidelines for juvenile populations. There's YSO laws and statutes, and these are the standards we're developing. These are just core principles. We're separating adult and juvenile.

So sticking to adult.

Discussion on.

Ms. Breed. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Did you say this was the first time this was brought to the big group? No. Okay, thank you.

You know, late to the ship. That's okay.

And then just on the adult side, there are some areas that include just probation instead of also community supervision. So maybe we can combine the two to community supervision or include both.

And then one other thought I have when I'm reading this is that not all sex offenders who have to register are on probation. And I think we're missing an area for the board to have our guiding principles around looking at the community risk.

level and notification to the community. I think that's missing from here for those folks who aren't on probation or community supervision, unless I missed it. So, but those are in our mandates from the legislation to look at the community notification assessment and things.

Again, and yes, and so these are just the core principles on which we are basing our recommendations for the standards on which we are developing, if that makes sense. Yes, we're supposed to modify that or review it, right? But is it in here? Am I missing it? It's in our, it's in the statute and that's the working group that is probably our top priority.

OK, that does it need to be part of our guiding principles?

I'm opening this up to you guys, so...

Um...

You guys tell me, because otherwise in my mind, we're restating what's in statute. If we're going through to, does that make sense? We're kind of putting what's in statute and what we've decided our tasks are, we're putting that back in our guiding principles.

Brecken Blades. If you look on page one of the adult guiding principles and that very first paragraph, it talks about what you said, Chairwoman, that they're establishing core foundational principles. Basically what it, how I read it, it says it's created, they're created to provide guidance in the absence of a specific standard or guideline. So I think

As we're creating our standards and guidelines, our practices, we would go back to these and

say, okay, they need to be individualized. They need to be non-discriminatory. These are the principles that need to guide us as we make different recommendations and set up different standards for, you know, practice and treatment and evaluation and for juveniles and adults. but that these are not necessarily those standards themselves. These are just the principles that are the values, so to speak, that are to guide us as we create those. So I...

So I'm not sure that all of the specific examples, that we don't have to have them in here, perhaps. These are, you know, a reference point.

Thank you, Shanda Breed. That makes more sense.

Thank you. Or just to state it differently, this is the framework and the structure and the ideals and principles that are going to guide our more in-depth processes, yes?

So this is where those details are going to be most germane, I don't think.

Can I speak? Please, Miss. Krejci.

Chairwoman. So this is Katie Krejci. So if I recall correctly, I believe this is the first time these principles have been returned to us since they were considered by the subcommittees. Is that right?

I'd have to go back and look if we've gotten them a couple of times. They've been proposed, they went to the subcommittees, now they're back before the large group. Okay, because I still see some things like, for example, in the adult guiding principles under the first footnote, it references the Colorado revised statutes. So I think we should just make sure that like, you know, have a chance that the bigger board now has them, that we should have an opportunity to make.

Any like edits or suggestions to them that was removed already? Yeah, so you, I think you may have printed an older version. I apologize, but we did, we did go through and May 18th.

Miss. Krejci, Jenna Mitchell, DPS. We provided a handout at your seat when you came in and it has Arizona Sex Offender Management Board a header on it. So some of those things were caught and updated today. Oh, okay. Yeah. Okay. So given that as well, some things are edited and modified today. If we could have an opportunity of the board to maybe like the greater board now that the subcommittees have

sort of made that decision that we should have two separate sets of principles, that we should, you know, just have that opportunity. If there's any suggested edits, like Dr. Lokey had some suggested edits that we'd be able to put them and then review all of the proposed edits and perhaps vote on them next time.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Yeah.

This is Karolyn Kaczorowski. I would definitely agree with that because the revised and edits, while they may have been placed at people's places, were not sent out electronically. So

I have been looking at the one that was sent out with the agenda. So if there are changes to it, I would ask that we be provided copies of that, and then we can discuss it at the next meeting.

Jenna Mitchell with DPS. So when there's materials that are updated after the agenda goes out, just for everyone's understanding, those are posted on the website. We have that pulled up here now to show you where those are under the Sex Offender Management Board.

There's a link under the

original meeting agenda where additional attachments are posted. And this is under meeting attachments, updated draft guiding principles dated 5-18-26. So as materials are added, once the agenda is set out, those are posted here as well. And because it was such a short time frame. That is why we provided the printouts for those in the room.

Please. Blake Barney. So I think for me, like I'm just sitting here kind of listening to all these comments and.

I see this as a blueprint. It's not something that is set in stone. It's not something that we have to stick to for the next 10 years. There will be opportunities to...

fix things, edit, make it a little bit more individualized as necessary.

At this time, I feel like it's a good blueprint. It gives us a really good idea of what it is that we are focusing on as a board. And if we go through and look at every little tiny piece, we're going to find issues with it. But that's not really the point of it. It's more of a blueprint.

give us a good idea of what it is we're attempting to create, and then we make adjustments as necessary. So that's my thought on it, and I would be more than happy to adopt it today if the vote was to be that.

Frank Griego, was there?

something that we have available that can tell us what was changed from last week to today on this, because I really don't think it's reasonable to get presented this today and then expect us to be able to speak intelligently on everything, even though a lot of people have, but to be able to.

look at it, research it and see what it says, and then still vote on it on the same day it's presented to us. I think my ask with that, we postpone a decision on this until the next meeting to give everyone on the board an opportunity to review it and to see what has changed over time.

I'm entertaining motions.

So, what is what does the board want to do?

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Karolyn, I make the motion that we be provided the amount of time needed to review this and table this for next month.

Frank Griego, I'll second that.

If I may add a comment, like all and any edits need to be in, I would say as soon as possible. So staff has a chance to go through and review some of them. So we cannot continue to kick this can down the road. So, and again, to Blake's point, these, they don't have to be perfect. There's always, anybody can bring up changes and edits. So there's a motion on the floor. We have a...

KK **Karolyn Kaczorowski**
It.

Motion, we have a second. Major Mitchell.

Just do a voice, I guess. Or do you want to do roll call? Yeah, go ahead. Okay. All right.
Chairwoman Goulden.

No.

Miss Adkins.

For clarification, we're saying no, we're not voting today. Motion to go next week. The motion on the floor is to table this for next month. Right?

That's what the motion was. My apologies. Yes. To table for next month. Yes, I proposed to table it till next month. Miss Balson.

J **Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney**
No.

Mr. Barney.

No.

Doctor Blades. No.

Miss Breed.

Yes.

Detective Cook? Yes.

Supervisor Fanning? Yes.

Doctor Gray? Yes.

Major Griego. Yes.

Ms. Kaczorowski.

KK **Karolyn Kaczorowski**
Yes.

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



Jeff McClure

Yes.

Doctor Miller.

Yes, Miss Musick. No.

Mr. Naegele.

No, Mister Neil.

No. Miss Opheim. No. Mr. Pawlowski.



Pawlowski, Nicolas

Yes.

Miss Panas. No.

Dr. Rivera.

No.

Madam Chair, the motion passes with 13 yes, 10 no, and 0 abstentions. Thank you. When is the deadline staff would like any feedback for consideration for next meeting?

June 3rd. So June 3rd, any feedback needs to be to staff. Thank you. Moving on to.

Where are we at?

The juvenile guiding principles dated May 18th, 2026 were included in the background material and being distributed. This version has the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board header. The updated version based on feedback from the previous reviews by the board and the juvenile guidelines and standards committee. I know, Scott, you already kind of commented a little bit on this. If there's anything else to add.

And this time, I'll open it up for discussion for the board.



Karolyn Kaczorowski

Karoline Kaczorowski, were there modifications made to this one as well?

If I recall correctly, they were very minor edits taking out Colorado, changing some things to Arizona.

To my recollection, nothing, Major. Scott, did you have anything to add? No, I mean, the vote that we took in our juvenile subcommittee was to adopt Colorado standards as they were written, to not change any of the categories, to not change any of the language. Again, reiterating what Mr. Barney said,

This is a launch pad. It's not not forever, but very well done and I think speaks to many of the needs that we that we need to have spoken to.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Karoline Kaczorowski. So when we removed the references to the Colorado statutes, was there an edit to the Colorado standards as well?

No.

At this time, I will entertain a motion for the board to adopt the juvenile guiding principles. Blake Barney and I make a motion.

J

Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney

Jamie Balson.

Go ahead. I think I have a first and a second, but go ahead. Perhaps. Jamie?

Blake Barney I make the proposed motion for us to adopt the juvenile guidelines as they are set in front of us today.

J

Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney

Jamie Balson, I second it.

There's a motion before us to adopt the juvenile guiding principles. Major Mitchell, will you please proceed?

Do we have to? Is there any further discussion on the motion? Please.

So in the original vote with adult principles, would there be a similar consideration for additions, subtractions to the principles of adoption today for juvenile?

Do you mean moving forward, if we adopt them today, are there additional? Would there still be an opportunity for input by that same date that was presented in the adult principles? I think anytime a board member has any potential edits or to anything that we adopt, I believe that that is, we can always do that.

Anything else?

Major Mitchell.

Miss Goulden. Yes, Miss Adkins.

Yes, Miss Balson.

J

Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney

Yes.

Mister Barney. Yes. Doctor Blades. Yes. Miss Breed. Yes.

Detective Cook? Yes.

Supervisor Fanning. Yes. Doctor Gray. Yes. Major Griego. Yes.

Miss Kaczorowski?

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Yes.

Mister Kelroy. Yes, Miss Krejci.

No.

Doctor Lokey.

Abstain.

Supervisor McClure.

JM

Jeff McClure

Yes.

Doctor Miller? Yes.

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

PN

Pawlowski, Nicolas

Yes.

Miss Panas, yes.

Doctor Rivera. Yes.

Madam Chair, the motion passes with 21 yes, one no, and one abstention. Thank you, Major Mitchell. We have adopted the juvenile guiding principles. Thank you all in the subcommittee work for this as well. Thank you. We will now hear subcommittee reports.

Let's begin with Dr. Blades and the adult guidelines and the Standards Committee.

We are continuing to meet once a month and do some research and work in between those meetings. We have another agenda item coming up next. So today we have submitted and we're prepared to discuss a recommendation regarding evaluation. So as that's being discussed by the larger board as a subcommittee,

We've begun researching and discussing what are best practices, what's evidence-based that should comprise an evaluation, what assessments, what does it consist of, what are the desired outcomes, what do we want to get out of it? So that's what we are working on discussing. And then

We will take into consideration and make any revisions as suggested regarding our proposal. That's a separate agenda item.

Thank you, Scott.

So we in the juvenile subcommittee are attempting to address the same issues that Dr. Blades just talked about with respect to what constitutes A psychosexual evaluation. Having said

that, we've also taken on the task of having the various entities that play key parts in the supervision and treatment of juveniles come in and give us presentations, which is consuming a fair amount of our time. Just so I can outline those, we initially had the folks from DCS come in and speak to us. Just this last week, we had the folks from the court system, predominantly Maricopa County, but some

Some folks that were also playing roles in different counties came and gave a panel presentation to us. In our next meeting, the June meeting, we're going to have the folks from the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections come and give us the same presentation. What we're seeking to do is trying to get our arms around, our brains around kind of how things are being done in those 3 distinct places so that we can begin to formulate some recommendations about the assessment side of things first, and then move to the treatment side of things.

thereafter. So steady progress. In some ways, perhaps some different moving parts in the juvenile world than exist in the adult world. And an emphasis being placed on the importance of making sure that we've taken the time to

to have discussions and allow for question and answers to take place so that when we start pounding out some protocol that we've done it in this informed of way as we possibly can. Thank you, Scott.

Next on the agenda is the discussion and potential adoption of the proposal for implementation of standardized pre-sentence investigation and sex offender specific evaluation protocol.

I'm going to ask Dr. Blades to go over what the adult subcommittee came up with related to this topic.

Brecken Blades, our proposal was posted online, so available for review. Essentially, our recommendation is that a sex offense specific evaluation or a psychosexual evaluation or shortened here to a PSE

be included in the pre-sentence investigation process in order to create a baseline assessment of risk and protective factors. You can see there we have listed the purpose, some of sort of just the more broad purposes of the evaluation. As I said previously, we will be

We're sort of working out the details of what each of those purposes might look like and put into practice. So establishing a baseline of risk and protective factors, determining A person's need for treatment, what that might look like, and then what would be appropriate types of intervention.

assessing amenability and responsivity to treatment. So working in with the kind of R&R model that we've talked about. If there are other behavioral health, criminogenic, other needs that the person has, that those would be taken into consideration. Recommendations about community supervision and what pieces that might include.

that would keep the community safe and the person safe and successful. And then also addressing if there are issues with regard to reunification, if that's appropriate for the case, that that could be addressed also. We've got some information here in terms of the process of

the evaluation, what the evaluator would need to be provided with their documentation. So essentially, specifically in terms of the timeline, what we discussed is that this would, this evaluation would occur post-conviction, but pre-sentence. So there is a finding of guilt in some way.

but that it is pre-sentence determination that would allow the judge time to also have the benefit of this information.

Mm-hmm.

If the subcommittee, if the subcommittee members also want to add anything or clarify anything further that I didn't bring up, or we're happy to take questions if anyone has them already or, you know, discuss things further.

J **Jamie Balson, Victims' Attorney**

This is Jamie Balson. Would this document that is prepared be included in the pre-sentence report?

Yes.

Quick question Farah Lokey.

I don't know the whole aspect of a full psychosexual evaluation, but do these evaluations also include psychoeducational assessments like IQ, learning disabilities, speech and language, and social functioning? Would that also be part of that evaluation? So that is recognized before the sentence? Okay.

KK **Karolyn Kaczorowski**

Okay.

Yes, Brecken Blades. They can, and I think to what degree would depend a little bit on the person's needs and what information you get about their history. It always, an evaluation always starts with at least a screening of the person's abilities, and then you can kind of build from there depending on the person's presentation specifically. But yes, absolutely, that would be taken into account. Okay, great. Thanks.

I have some questions.

KK **Karolyn Kaczorowski**

Karoline.

Karolyn Kaczorowski. I appreciate the subcommittee's work on this and it looks very comprehensive. I do have concerns, however. I noticed that in the scope of application, there was a recognition of longer sentences.

Typically, what happens in my county is if there is a long sentence, the probation department prefers to defer the psychosexual until after the sentence. As this committee knows, there are many

dangerous crimes against children, as well as sexual assault that have mandatory prison sentences. And the position that's been taken is that the needs of the offender will change throughout their incarceration. Therefore, to undergo a psychosexual prior to Sentencing is.

kind of redundant or it isn't as helpful. Now I can see the argument that perhaps a mitigated sentence or something like that can be impacted by a psychosexual. However, I do want to raise concerns for the victims in this case.

As you know, the victim's rights has a provision for a speedy resolution. That provision often takes a backseat to the constitutional rights of the defendant. However, adding a psychosexual pre-sentencing, especially if there is a lengthy prison sentence,

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

extends the time significantly between conviction and sentencing and thus drawing out any type of closure for the victim. It can take upwards of four or five months for these evaluations to actually be completed, and that's if the defendant is cooperative. If the defendant has been convicted at trial,

and is still maintaining his or her innocence, they tend not to cooperate with these evaluations anyway. So...

My concern at this point is the scope of application and if probation is not a possible sentence, the length of time to conclusion for the victims.

Brecken Blades. Yeah, you know what, you raised excellent points and those are discussions that we had in the subcommittee. And so I'm glad that you raised them here.

Okay, so what we looked at, so I guess to address a couple of things that it seems like came up.

When we...

On these, it looked like across the board, the typical recommendation or the expectation is that these are completed within 90 days. So we didn't have that time frame in here, but that is a piece of discussion is sort of logistically, what does the time frame look like? And 90 days was a consistent piece that we found. The other piece that we found is that some Some states were doing both because we had that discussion about longer sentences and their needs change and what is the utility of those. Ultimately, other states, and Colorado being one of them, does do the PSE as part of the pre-sentence investigation, even in the instance of a longer sentence.

and then they provide or they undergo an updated one at the end. But that is a piece also, you know, for discussion in terms of, you know, legal perspectives and sort of what we what we feel is best for Arizona. But that is that is a piece that we found other states are doing it.

Missy Musick, if I can add to that, the pre-sentence, the PSE being completed prior to even longer sentences is also on the expectation that SOETP would be done while in prison.

Madam Chair, please. Hi, Shanda Breed.

On.

Two main things before I...

Been to all of this. One.

I think at the end of this, I'd like to make a motion to continue this, to put it on the next month's agenda for approval, if that's where we're going with this. Just to provide more time, I really need to go back to our team.

To review all of this, this really impacts the court system.

criminal rules and procedure timelines. It impacts our work.

because we will have to pay for this up front or the jail will or court administration will, someone will have to pay for this up front. So there's some things going on there. I'd like more time just to debrief and provide some feedback and a response if we may. And then two, you know, I don't want to delay this whole process because

I want this board to provide great work.

I want to provide great recommendations for those gaps where we need to strengthen policy, to create policy, and that sort of thing. So as we make recommendations,

I think I would like to see the recommendations be more general, high level, and flexible so that the agencies that these impact, we can find a way to do this. You know, we can take care of the how. Like, let's give a recommendation of the what is needed.

based on the why. And then we can say, okay, now who's going to do this? Well, part of this needs to be done by probation because they impact maybe, you know, we just helped revise the booking paperwork. So we have impact of arrest, we have impact of pretrial, we have impact of pre-sentence evaluations.

to be recommended or, you know, hopefully ordered some time in between all of that. And then post-conviction. So there's lots of areas for intervention and areas that need to be taken into consideration, especially in regards to manpower or womanpower.

So I guess two things. I'm hoping our recommendations can be more generalized, but I would like to be able to provide some feedback to make sure that it can be.

pointed but yet allow the agency to come up with the how.

Thank you.

Brecken Blades, just to respond to that, I would say as a subcommittee, we did not take this lightly. We recognize that making a recommendation like this is a huge change for Arizona. And we did this in with also the recognition and knowledge that we're not experts in all of the systems and that we

want that feedback. We don't, we had discussions about sort of operationalizing things and who pays and we realized that we don't have all of those answers and we need the feedback of people who have those answers and know more intimately how the systems work. And so the proposal or this protocol and being presented is not necessarily to, with the expectation that it's given sort of a blessing right out of the gate, but that

we start a discussion of what does this maybe look like in Arizona and working in

conjunction then with the other agencies, probation, the court, and people who know those systems better and, you know, maybe make modifications or come back and say, you know, whatever it is. And we're expecting as a subcommittee that there will be comments and changes.

Madam Chairwoman, please. This is Katie Krejci. So maybe if you could explain a little bit more, Dr. Blades, kind of, so it sounds like that a psychosexual evaluation is something important to have. Why did the committee determine like this place? Because one issue I recognize as, at least in what happens in Maricopa County, is sometimes plea offers, like the acceptance is delayed till the time of sentencing. So your date of conviction and your date of sentencing.

are going to be the same day. And so I just don't think it's going to be feasible to do that evaluation. We also have an issue with the rules of procedure as they are now, is typically there's a right to sentencing within 30 days, right, for the victims and for the defendants. There's the ability of the state to ask for an aggravation hearing and the defense asks for a mitigation hearing, but would it be feasible to do that?

these evaluations within that 30-day time frame, especially given that I see one of the documents that the evaluators want is the victim impact statements. I often see those gathered as part of the pre-sentence report kind of writing process, so they're not necessarily gathered in advance of that.

So...

And when someone's pre-sentencing, the other concern is that they still have like the right to counsel, the right, I think Ms. Kaczorowski talked about kind of if they went to trial and they lost, they're not necessarily going to participate. They still have the right to remain silent, right, right to counsel. And so would evaluators be able to do these with the attorney present, which is what happens for a pre-sentence interview?

just kind of why this place in the process.

Can I address that? So I want to talk about a few things right now. And we've been doing things in Arizona.

And I said this in the adult subcommittee. We play games right now at the pre-sentence level. In the 90s, we had specialized pre-sentence writers with the adult probation department that wrote very long, lengthy

The judges got really good information. And the chief of Maricopa County took that away. She took specialized writers away for cases such as sex crimes. And we get paragraphs and two pages. And then

and Mr. Neil can probably speak to this too. There's a lot of...

Gamesmanships, right? We're going to take a plea, and then we're going to come to probation and we're going to ask for more. We're going to at sentencing, say, but I took a plea. I don't really like the sex offender conditions. I haven't even started them. I haven't even gotten my testing done. I want contact with my kids. I want to go to work.

I want to compute, I want, want, want. Without any psychosexual evaluations, without any

assessments, nothing. These are specialized cases.

And the way it's done in Arizona right now is bad for victims, and it's even bad for those that begin probation.

Because what the current system does now is set individuals on probation back two, three, four years, because they're allowed to play these games at the pre-sentence level. The better information a judge has, the better a pre-sentence report is, is better for all of them. And if they waive things, then they shouldn't be asking for all these extras.

That's my opinion, of course.

But day one, when many people would come to probation after no jail, no prison.

I'm not doing this, I'm not doing that, but right back in court.

So, I think...

We must do better in Arizona for victims.

We also should do better for those that begin probation and not set them back years by.

Being dishonest with them.

About what they're facing, so...

The current system in Arizona is not working. And when I read pre-sentence reports today, back, and Dr. Gray used to make comments in these reports, you know what I'm talking about. They were actual psychological input.

And now I see victim bashing, victim blaming in PSIs because the writers have no idea what they're talking about. They've never worked a sex offender case in their life. And that's a disservice to the entire state, to victims and to those that are going to begin probation. So those are my Thoughts on that.

Madam Chair, please, respectfully, just to make sure that the whole state is at the table with my voice, I just hope to share with you all. I think that that is an opinion that's very Maricopa-based.

And, you know, the training from every county is different. And I think that these are things that we do need to strengthen are the policies and the training for these pre-sentence writers. But offhand, and I have a long list of notes and concerns and challenges that I see with this, Although I'm very thankful we're taking a stab at trying to make sure there's some type of an evaluation, I would also say maybe a screening evaluation at that moment. I feel like this is providing a blanket instead of individualizing. If someone needs a psyche eval or psychosexual evaluation because they have a sex offense. So there's a lot just around that first sentence that I don't want to speak before the state. You know, we're trying to get away from cookie cutter, the terms and conditions.

We're looking at individual needs, right? There should be some type of screening evaluation, may not have to be a psych eval. And so that's just the tip of what I want to dive into on our response for feedback.

But I do want to say that, you know, I don't know exactly how it works in Maricopa County exactly. Although I have great contacts and connects and information from them currently. But the rest of the state too, all doesn't function just like that. So we just need to be open to

making sure that the state is all reflected and can benefit from our recommendations. Thank you.

Madam Chair. Frank Griego.

I'm sorry. Okay. More of a procedure question on this. So I did see that there was nothing mentioned in the recommendations about implementation recommendation or process. So this board says, yeah, we're behind this. If we do, then what's next? Do we?

I mean, does it go through the Supreme Court for rulemaking? Does it go to statute for statute? Does it? I think that's valuable to include in the recommendations. Because if we just say we support this or the or the subcommittee says they support it and there's no method of implementation or no next step proposed, then we're kind of spinning our wheels. So I would like to see that included in proposals that we make, including this one that we're speaking on here. And that might be when we speak about potential revisions to 3828, giving it the legislative, putting that in legislation. Correct. So right now, anything we adopt is a recommendation, but nobody does have to do anything with it. So.

Yeah.

So, Mr. Barney?

Yeah, just to speak to Blake Barney, just to speak to Dr. Blade's point, this is a proposal. We're fully aware that there's a lot of agency systems that have to be put in place that have to be adjusted. And to speak to your point, Ms. Breed, it might be more of a Maricopa type of feeling here, but this is for the entire state. And we are trying to make sure that things are making sense for the entire state. So if they don't make sense for Maricopa County, but they make sense for Pinal County, it doesn't work because we need to be unified across the whole state. And to speak to Chairwoman Goulden, why do we not have specialized PSI writers anymore?

It's a budget issue. It's we don't want to pay somebody to do this. We don't want to have all these extra things. We are a board right now because it doesn't work in Arizona. We are a broken system in Arizona, whether that be Maricopa County or the entire state, we are to represent the entire state. So everything that we're doing is for the benefit of the entire state. This is for victims, this is for offenders, this for court system this for probation. This is for everybody to benefit and so we as subcommittee take this very serious both Juvenile and Adult because we understand how important it is to improve Arizona and make it a better place across the board. And ultimately, we want no more victims. Our system right now is broken, and there are plenty of victims who are...

you know, continuing to be victimized because our system is broken. And unfortunately, the state is victimizing offenders' families. Their families are not victims of the state until the state makes them victims through processes and broken systems. So with everything that we are proposing,

Doesn't mean it's going to happen, but it is a proposal. This is with that information all understood by us as a subcommittee.

There's a lot of things that have to be improved. There's a lot of things that need to be removed and some things added. And we understand that there's budget issues and everything else.

We know there's a lot of work to be done. This is simply our proposal that everybody is taking serious all of the working parts that are going to be necessary. To your point, Major Griego, it's one of those, we don't know all of the processes as a subcommittee, so we don't know what to put in our proposal.

This is the next steps. That's why we bring it to the large board to get that information so that we can better understand it.

So, that's my two cents. Madam Chair, please.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Karolyn Kaczorowski. I appreciate that and I appreciate Dr. Blades mentioning that this is a starting point. And I believe that this is a great starting point and the discussion should continue prior to this proposal being adopted.

It's a great proposal from the perspective of a treatment provider, but there's no input. There's no mention of the victims. There's no mention of the court. There's no mention of the impact on probation. And I think there does need to be considerations for other counties. I fully applaud the 90 day time frame.

But in Yuma, that's just not realistic. There's not a lot of providers for this throughout the state and our incarcerated defendants either need to be transported or the doctor needs to come to Yuma. So I think this is a great beginning.

But I don't think this is a proposal that should be adopted as written.

Madam Chair, this is Dr. Miller. I have a few things listening to discussion. I think the discussion is very valuable and which is necessary, which is why it was brought before the board for this discussion and input. I really want to appreciate what Ms. Breed stated regarding agency funding.

and organization, this is something that's going to come up as we discuss the desired changes the board wants to see in the state of Arizona.

I put this.

Funding is an issue. It's going to continue being an issue most likely, but to see the changes we want to see, we will need to address those funding difficulties, headcount caps, difficulty hiring, and all these things to make Arizona the program that we want to see for sex offender management.

I think back to the adult subcommittee's proposal for a PSC pre-sentence, we've discussed and hear a lot of offense-based legislation and are introducing some more risk-based decision making to that process.

which would be the PSC prior to sentencing.

So this is our ideal scenario, as we discussed in the subcommittee. We did discuss logistically how that would work, and you have to choose. Do we want to present an ideal scenario to the board to discuss or a more logistically feasible approach?

for the state to adopt. So I think all of this discussion is really necessary, very valuable, and will likely continue on for some time.

Shane Neil.

My thoughts, I mean, as an expert on supervision, I mean, my job started basically at the time of sentencing on. So the more information I had up front, the better. That's not what historically happened, I mean, in recent history. We would get information, we would get bits and pieces of information that's filtered either through a defense lens or a prosecution lens.

But I can't really use either one of those. I mean, I can't, I can, I need all the information. So all that information from a third party, especially a recommendation from a subcommittee of experts, I mean, I trust, I trust their opinion, honestly. And so

Psychosexuals like this are commonly done already. It's just, you know, the more information, because day one, especially as a supervisor, people would bring me questions every day, all day long to make decisions that were not just important today, but were important long-term, whether we're talking community safety, or in regards to their progress or even victims, secondary victims, things like that, day one, can they live with their family?

I don't know. I mean, it really depends what information I'm being provided. I mean, there are conditions of probation say no. I mean, unless I say so. So, and realistically, I mean, yeah, coming out of PSI, PSI writers are not specialized. And even if they were specialized, you can get brand new officers.

in a specialized caseload that don't know the information. So, I mean, you can literally get somebody that worked at Buffalo Wild Wings at their last job, and now they're making decisions on this important stuff. And so.

I would much rather have the opinion of trusted experts that have outlined some legitimate guidelines. And, you know, I mean, we don't have to use all of it. It's just guidelines, but the more information the better from a third party. Yeah, I can appreciate AOC's budget concerns for sure. And yeah, I mean, large county, that's also my experience, but at the same time, small counties. I mean, the officers I interacted with from the small counties with intercounty transfers and whatnot, they would they kill for the resources we had here. So they would they, you know, they would say like, we don't have anything here. You know, we don't have specialized case loads. We don't have anywhere to even see people. So I

I kind of do defer to the larger counties because we do have more resources and more, you know, more stuff, more, more cases, frankly. I mean, we have more, we see more faces, we see more volume. And so I don't know. I mean, I defer to the experts and that information. as a probation officer and the supervisor and all the way up the chain. That's how we make

those decisions. So and that day one really kind of dictates whether they're going to be successful on probation or not. I can say no to everything and lock them down and tell them no, but that's not that's not really in their best interest, you know, but I need information to be able to say yes. And I don't have, a lot of times, if their attorney told them to say no to everything, then it's probably no for me too.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Well, Karolyn Kaczorowski, I think we need to understand how this proposal may be used further down the line.

Yeah.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

If this is the standardized protocol, what you're going to get in courts are challenges to not complying with this. So we need to at least recognize the realities and the idea that we're moving towards something

Better.

But it needs to, I love the idea of an idealized system, but it needs to be couched in that way. Because what you're going to get is you're going to get probationers who say, oh, well, our probation department doesn't follow this standard.

And...

we are going to have individual judges who are like, okay, well, if you can't meet the standards, then they get released or they get to live with their family. And that's not individualized either. So

I like the idealized standard, but we also have to take all of it into consideration. And again, this is for treatment providers. This is, you know, maybe probation departments, but we're not considering the impact on the courts, on the victims, on the timeframes, on the rules of criminal procedure.

And so if we are going to adopt something that as the governor's board on sex offender management, I think it needs to be more comprehensive.

Okay. Madam Chair, this is Katie Krejci again. You know, I agree that there's a good pieces in here. I think having like a pre-sentence investigator who's specially trained in sex offender management would be helpful. Also, when it's the PSI writer who's determining whether or not like the pre-plea evaluation is incomplete or compliant, it would also be helpful for them to like be required to attend ADSA and know whether or not it's compliant, right? To know what goes into the evaluation, which isn't always happening with probation officers. I know it did in the past, but it's really the unfortunate reality is a lot of them aren't getting the specific sex offender training anymore. And so maybe

if, you know, kind of with this feedback, if we could have some sort of revised proposal that kind of considers some of the logistical concerns. Also, I know one of the things about having the people who go to prison take the assessment was so they could do treatment in prison. I think we have someone on the board that provides treatment in prison. I don't know if it's necessarily offered to everyone or if there's a way to determine whether or not

You know, that's something that would even be considered versus someone who's going to get an effective life sentence. It's probably not a good use of resources if they're going to be in prison forever. And then

Yes, and I forgot my last thought. Thank you.

Amanda Adkins. So one of the questions that came up, especially regarding the long sentencing for, you know, the scope of application, excluding those of the long sentence, is part of this is to inform sentencing. So if you're going to say they don't need an assessment to see if they...

be that additional time or different, they're amenable to treatment, this kind of thing. I mean, we saw states that their pre-sentence investigation was literally after conviction and sentencing, is not pre-sentence. And so the same thing here. If someone gets charged, then this evaluation is supposed to impact how much time they may or may not get. even those with long sentences should probably be evaluated, which is not a popular opinion, but.

There we go.

Madam Chair, this is Doctor Miller.

I mean, I think, you know, this proposal is the jumping off point for a lot of future discussions that we're going to have, and it's not an isolated proposal. So when you're looking at considering a pre-sentence psychosexual evaluation, you know, in an ideal world, right, if we're talking about idealistics, that individual's risk would be assessed prior to their incarceration. And then those criminogenic factors would be addressed in treatment in prison so that they can begin getting the help that they need to reduce their risk prior to release. And in an ideal world,

maybe that treatment progress that they made in prison would carry over to probation if everything is standardized and expectations are cohesive and evidence-based and practitioners are doing what's expected of them across the state. So this is just a jumping off point, I think, for

What we would want to see for Arizonans now is that logistical, that's a whole separate issue that I think us as a board is going to have to contend with, how to make that a reality, or if that's possible to make that a reality. But I think best practice, you would have a pre-sentence psychosexual evaluation to inform sentencing.

to inform treatment needs and begin that treatment as soon as possible.

Okay, I thought of the last thing. This is Katie Krejci again. Just as like a point, since a lot of the people on the subcommittee were treatment providers, in my experience, it's a lot of times

what happens is by the time we get to sentencing, the judge doesn't have a lot of discretion. So the judge, all those, there are instances where the judge is choosing between prison or probation, or is open to modifying some of the terms of probation. Many of the plea agreements require all of the terms of the sex offender terms of probation, or they mandate a certain term of prison. And so a lot of times, although it may be helpful in some cases where the judge has some discretion, a lot of that negotiation happens prior to you know, even taking a plea. So that's where a lot of the psychosexuals that are done kind of pre-plea occur because that's where a lot of the negotiation happens. And there's just not, by the time we get to sentencing, there's not a lot of choices for the judge.

KK

Karolyn Kaczorowski

Karolyn Kaczorowski. And going back to this idea that it's not cookie cutter, that we're trying to meet people with their individual needs and based upon what they need, perhaps the scope of application section needs to be expanded to take all of that into consideration.

You know, is this offender who went through the plea agreement process? Is this someone who's even eligible for probation? Is this someone who will be serving a lengthy sentence? Is this someone where the judge can choose between probation and prison?

Is this being for mitigation purposes for the sentence?

I think that's the area where I would like to see this expanded. And again, if we're presenting an idealized one, it's not necessarily logistical to say, hey, in the idealized world, we need specialized PSI writers and here's the treatment we, or excuse me, here's the training we suggest.

and what the purposes of that are and where we're at now and where we want to be in say 10 years.

Um, but...

So, I suggest that we take a look at those factors as well.

So Blake Barney again. I just want to make sure because I know it is mostly treatment providers in the subcommittees. I'm in both.

We're not, you know, coming up with this stuff out of thin air. We've done a lot of research. Colorado may not necessarily be the gold standard, but they've been, they've had a sex offender management board longer than any other state in the US. We have with the adult subcommittee, I think, eight different states that we were researching.

And there's no way to believe that of all those states, the counties are all the exact same size, and this works perfectly in every court system and everything else. No, but it has been able to be implemented in each of those states. Sure, there's growing pains, there's all kinds of issues, and proposals have to be made. But

to say Arizona doesn't have the ability to do this, or it's going to be, you know, incredibly difficult for Arizona to do these things. Are we just saying that other states are better at

implementing things that are good for their state than Arizona? I don't believe so. I think we're more than capable of doing so, but people have to be comfortable being uncomfortable for a little while. And there's going to have to be a lot of budget changes. And we understand as a board that that's what we've got to do is make proposals that are going to be significantly different from what we're doing now, because what we're doing now, as I stated, is broken. So I just wanted to add that as well.

Thank you, Blake, for that. I do agree with you. What's really expensive is when we have re-offending going on. So re-offending is expensive. Historically, again, I will say We'd never routinely did psychosexual evaluations. Most of them were defense commissioned now.

to try to wiggle out of a sentence. We did mitigation reports, looking at different factors. And we did very thorough in-depth pre-sentence reports that worked really well.

I'll bet there's only a handful of us in this room that if we gave you a psychosexual report or evaluation, you would know if that report was being manipulated by a defense attorney or someone they hired. I can, I think Shane can, and some of our therapists in this room can.

That is not a fair practice for victims.

in our system, and again, even for offenders who will start probation. So those are things we need to fix.

The.

the funding issue, like it's, they're going to have to figure it out because then I'm happy to continue this conversation. Maricopa County was in the 90s and 2000s considered the gold standard in many ways across the country. There was a whole training for new officers. There were specialized writers.

The chiefs of probation in Maricopa County chose to get rid of those things. Those are not expensive to implement. So we can get better information to judges, to victims, to prosecutors.

to families of those on probation.

We can get back to that. It'd be very simple to do. So right now, what I see is judges getting really bad information and making serious decisions with uninformed, unintelligent information.

At this time, I am willing to entertain a motion, any motion, if we want to table this for everyone to review for another.

month, bring back feedback.

Happy to entertain a motion at this time.

or adopt if that's what you all want to do, whatever is.

Madam Chair, I would like to make a motion to continue this to next month's agenda for review and possibly adoption. Is that a good one?

Amanda Adkins second.

Can I do and all those in favor? Everybody's, I bet there's a motion on the floor right now to

table this for next month. All those in favor?

Say aye.

Aye.



Karolyn Kaczorowski

Aye.



Pawlowski, Nicolas

Aye.

Opposed.

Any abstaining?

So the motion carries. We'll move forward with this discussion next month. Staff, is there a deadline for comments you would like to let everybody know maybe a date? Let's use the June 3rd date, June 3rd. If anybody with additional comments or feedback could just get that to staff by June 3rd and we will.

Continue this discussion next month.

Okay, thanks. I'm just going to power through some of this and then I think we'll get out of here. I think we're almost done. So the discussion of potential revisions to ARS 133828. I'd like to give the board an opportunity to review our current statute. So 3828.

and get staff any suggestion suggested revisions to the statute. Did we say by August or end of July with the deadline of

August 3rd.

So that would be the sex offender management board statute that I'm referring to. For example, I know during one of our first meetings, we wanted to reduce the number of providers and subcommittees, I think down to 60 or 65. If you guys could just get me those in preparation for the next

legislative session. Things to consider, ways to fund the board. Again, many states have adopted one-time fees and fines assessed at sentencing. And I again want to reiterate that the modifications for those that can afford fines and fees are always possible.

But please consider ways to fund the board that doesn't perhaps get passed on to taxpayers and, you know, cross out the general fund. So if you guys could all go through this and get any feedback ready to be discussed in one of our August

sessions, please, or on meetings, please, please do that. Any questions on that?

Okay. Please. That's pretty much a global request, right? Anything that we think will improve the quality of what we're able to do with this board? Correct. So even like Frank suggested, like giving the teeth, there's some of that language that we're going to add. And so anything as we're having some of these discussions that we think would strengthen our, you know, our work and or make the legislation better, please provide that.

to us. This would be in preparation for the next legislative session, which, you know, I would

propose perhaps to the lawmakers by fall. You know, we need to be prepared for that.
Okay, so lastly, at this time, I will call for any future agenda items.
This is Katie Krejci. I don't know if we already have it on the agenda because we kind of discussed giving staff edits on the adult and juvenile principals, if we could have those on the agenda for next time. Oh, for just, okay, for both of them. For both, in case we receive edits on. Yes, we will put that on the agenda.
Any other requests at this time? If not, the deadline to submit those will be June 8th at noon.
Oh, one other thing. So I know you gave us an update on the pending legislation. I saw one of the public kind of comments was, I know we kind of changed the format of our letters based on like the first legislation we considered and then later legislation.
if we want to consider maybe next agenda, whether we want to update the letters and provide more of an explanation at all about our positions, or if it may be too late to do that, those bills may already be like done or not done. Also, it's in June, so the legislative session might be over.
Yeah, do you want to talk about like letters being moving forward? It's probably too late.
Yeah, the first, yeah.
Yes, we did agree to put reasons in moving forward. That was just kind of our first time doing, right? Yeah, so not retro, but moving forward, we did agree to put the reasonings in.
Okay. Yeah. But we're not going to, we're not able to revisit the 1st letters and add reasons? Did we submit the we submitted the recording in the letters, but what are your thoughts on it?
I.
Are you proposing you want us to do that?
You want the agenda discussed. OK, so, but if the legislative session is over, then OK, so we can put on the agenda, and if it's over, then we don't need to discuss it, so OK.
Okay. Let's see. Let's, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn at this time.
Brecken Blades, I will motion to adjourn.
I'll second. This is Katie Krejci.
All those in favor? Aye. Aye. Meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.
Thanks.

● stopped transcription