

AZSOMB Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20260826_200042UTC-Meeting Recording

August 26, 2026,

1h 23m 26s

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Notice: This transcript was generated using Microsoft Teams automatic recording & transcription technology. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, the nature of automated transcription means that it may contain errors, omissions, or phonetic misinterpretations of names, technical terms, and legal citations. This document is intended as a general record of proceedings and should not be treated as a verbatim record. In the event of a discrepancy, the original audio or video recording shall serve as the definitive source. Questions concerning this content can be directed to azsomb@azdps.gov.

Jenna Mitchell 0:18

Yeah.

All right, welcome everyone. It is one little after one now and 1:01 p.m. And it looks like we do have a quorum. So if you want to kick this off, Chairwoman.

BB Brecken Blades 0:35

Okay, yeah, so I will call the meeting to order. It is 1:01 p.m. on August 26th, 2026. This is the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee meeting. And then if you would start with Roll call. Major Mitchell, please.

Jenna Mitchell 1:01

Chairwoman Blades is present. Mister Hanratty.

JH Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:06

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07

Miss Adkins.

AA Amanda Adkins 1:09

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:12

Dr. Miller.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 1:14

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:15

Miss Musick.

M Missy 1:17

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:18

Mister Naegele.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 1:20

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:21

Ms. Panas.

Ms. Panas, can you hear me?

I can see.

Miss Panas is present. Can you hear us?

JP Jenna Panas 1:50

Sorry, my speakers were not working. I am here. I apologize.

Jenna Mitchell 1:53

There you go. Thank you. No worries. Thank you.

Looks like we have absent Mr. Barney and Ms. Kazarowski. Also available, Chairwoman, just for your information, AAG Baldner is available if we need her. I have her number available and we can reach out to her if you need legal advice or executive session with her presence. And with that, you have a quorum.



Brecken Blades 2:21

Okay.

Okay, thank you. Okay, well, hi everyone. Welcome. Thanks for being here. Okay, so we just on the agenda have our two items, but they've sort of been our items for a while and there's kind of a lot of depth to each of them. But so let's start with item one, which is our ongoing discussion of the proposal for implementation of kind of the standardized evaluation. And so I think that we started to reach kind of more of a consensus on this at our last meeting, at least that's how I understood our discussion to be leading, but I just thought I would kind of recap that a little bit and then see if anyone had had any other sort of thoughts on it or revelations or anything else they wanted to share about how we move forward. So basically, what I remember as far as where we came to is that because of the *White V. Woodall* Supreme Court case. Any evaluation done in kind of the window of time that we were discussing between conviction, so post-conviction, but pre-sentence has to be in some way optional or it can't be mandated. The person has to be able to choose to not do it. And that's kind of where we landed. I know that Ms. Kaczorowski submitted some wording that was in the background material. I don't know if everyone had a chance to take a look at that. I can. read it because what she had indicated was that there was, that we already have wording in Arizona that would, oh, thanks, that would, that kind of speaks to this and so that we don't need, you know, additional legislation or something else that would kind of duplicate it. So, okay, so here's what she said. The guiding principles of the SOMB include respecting the rights, interests, and the impact of sexual offenses on victims, protecting the safety of the community, and providing evidence-based evaluation and treatment of sex offenders. So this is kind of the part, this last sentence. So Arizona law allows a trial court and a defendant to request a psychosexual evaluation prior to sentencing. It is the position of the AZSOMB that voluntary pre-sentencing evaluations should be utilized in all appropriate cases. So that kind of reflects the statements that she had made at the end of our last meeting. Did any of you have a chance to... Take a look at that. Anybody have thoughts on that?

B **Blake** 5:07
Yeah.

BB **Brecken Blades** 5:09
Questions, comments? She's not here to answer questions, but we could still discuss it.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 5:19
Quick question.

BB **Brecken Blades** 5:20
Yeah, Jim.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 5:22
So does that mean that the guidelines that we are hopefully going to provide dictate those private voluntary pre-sentence?
like criteria for who's qualified to do that.

BB **Brecken Blades** 5:44
You mean, okay, I just want to make sure I understand what you're saying. Are you, you're saying will the guidelines that we eventually produce dictate who, like what kind of provider is qualified to do the evaluations?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 5:58
Yeah, so in other words, it's up to the discretion of the court right to use these in pre-sentence, but don't you think they'd want to kind of follow the same guidelines as far as somebody who's qualified to do it?

BB **Brecken Blades** 6:03
Mhm.
Yeah, I agree with you. I mean, I do think so. So I think our step 2 or what I have on the, what's kind of discussion item 2 on the agenda is starting to put together those guidelines and standards, you know, I think in filling in the blanks of what we think that document should look like. And in some of the states, for example, I think

in Tennessee, I, it's the one I'm thinking of right now, says something along the lines of like any pre-sentence risk evaluation should follow the standards and guidelines set forth for like a post, you know, sentencing evaluation. And they don't repeat themselves, they just basically say.

This is kind of in our state, what we consider to be best practice, I think, for this type of evaluation. That's kind of how I'm taking it.

So certainly if you're doing an evaluation privately, you could do whatever you wanted, but I would imagine this would influence that. Yeah. Some of the other states have specific qualifications for the providers, or at least, you know, to some extent. And so that's something I think we'll have to consider in terms of whether we want to include that in ours, as well as, you know, what should be in an evaluation, but also who should be completing them. So, yeah.

Did that, did that answer your question? Yeah. Okay. Okay. Anybody else have thoughts on this or thoughts, I guess, on where we landed in the discussion last time?

AA **Amanda Adkins** 7:46

This is Amanda. I'm in support of Ms. Kaczorowski's language.

Jenna Mitchell 7:47

Chairwoman.

BB **Brecken Blades** 7:53

You're okay with it? Is that what you said?

AA **Amanda Adkins** 8:01

Yes.

BB **Brecken Blades** 8:02

Okay, okay, okay. Somebody else started to talk too, right? Was that you, Jenna, or someone else?

Jenna Mitchell 8:07

Yes, sorry about that. I just wanted to know for the record that Mr. Barney has joined us. So he is present now. Thank you.

BB Brecken Blades 8:11

Oh, great. Okay. Thank you.

Okay.

Okay, any, I guess so.

Blake, we were talking about this statement that's on the screen that was written by Karolyn regarding the kind of...

the wording that Arizona already kind of has on the books in terms of utilizing, you know, the court's ability to order an evaluation pre-sentence. It's not being done very often. Other states, I think, do have wording that's stronger even than this, and I think gives some

Well, I still be honest with you guys, when I read the Colorado guidelines, I do not see how it takes into account the Supreme Court ruling at all, in all honesty, but I...

You know, I'm not an attorney, so I will defer. Has anyone else read that? Do you guys have an idea of what I'm talking about?

Basically, it says...

This is the only place I can see where it kind of references to that. So it says each sex offender shall be the subject of a pre-sentence investigation, a PSI, which shall include a sex offense specific evaluation.

It does say this report should be prepared in all cases where it has been ordered by the court, but then the footnote goes on to explain that anyone basically who's committed a sex offense and who's considered for probation shall be required as part of the pre-sentence or probation investigation to submit to an evaluation.

So.

I don't know if anybody has other thoughts on that in terms of how that lines up with our discussion last time on the...

The, you know, right to not self-incriminate, the right to remain silent.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 10:18

Brecken, just to comment on that might, and again, I like you, not an attorney, but might that be speaking to

BB Brecken Blades 10:19

Yeah.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 10:27

all cases where there's some sort of plea agreement where the person's going to be initially sentenced to probation and then they're required to and may not have implications for people who aren't going directly onto probation.

BB **Brecken Blades** 10:47

I think, I mean, I think so, because I think it says it's intended for anybody who is going to be considered for probation. I guess I think what I'm saying is what I understood from our discussion last time is that even if you're being considered for probation, unless until it's an absolute that your sentence is given, you cannot be ordered to participate in something where you might incriminate yourself. And I guess I read this, the shall type language as. being in order, meaning like you shall do it, you have to do it. But yeah, I do think I go ahead.

SP **Sheridyn Miller Psy.D.** 11:26

Unless.

Unless it's similar to like the SVP evaluations where an evaluation will be completed whether or not they participate.

BB **Brecken Blades** 11:39

That's true.

Yeah, I don't know that I don't know that I saw that in here, but you're right. I mean, you are right. Obviously that in that process, they're allowed to kind of opt out, but a report still has to be completed.

Well, that's kind of an interesting idea.

We didn't talk about that last time, right, of completing a report, regardless, giving the person the option to participate, but completing it just based on the records.

What does everyone think of that?

SP **Sheridyn Miller Psy.D.** 12:17

I think, and correct me if I'm wrong, this is Sheridyn Miller. We were discussing regarding the pre-sentence evaluation, the need for a pre-sentence evaluation because the information is often so spotty once they are released.

And so we might end up in the same predicament with not having a full collateral and needed to actually do an adequate psychosexual evaluation. But I think at the heart of it, we're wanting these pre-sentence evaluations to inform the court. and to inform treatment after their sentence. So it could get at the same goal.

BB Brecken Blades 13:07

You're right, though. I mean, that is kind of right what the PSI is supposed to do. And I mean, it's not a mental health professional, but it is supposed to pull together all of the information. And so I guess the...

the interview is sort of like the crux of it. I guess that would be different mostly, unless I guess except for some of the maybe testing that's given. But if they opt out of the evaluation, then you're going to get that anyway. So, okay. Yeah, I don't know. I don't know, but I, it seemed like both Victoria and Carolyn last time were pretty firm in their understanding of the implications of the Supreme Court case. That was my take on it. I don't know if that's how everyone else took it. And so that that's kind of the reality of the situation that we need to deal with and work around. Is that how everyone else landed last time? Yeah. Okay. Okay, so.

B Blake 14:11

So, so Brecken, can I jump in real quick?

BB Brecken Blades 14:14

Yeah.

B Blake 14:15

I guess one of the things I'm thinking about, because are we really changing much in Arizona if we follow this, which if we don't change it, that's fine. But I'm just thinking, you know, for informing sentencing, that was one of the things that Karolyn was basically saying the prosecutor is going to have, you know, this, this, and this set up and it's going to be it is what it is if there's a plea deal or whatever. So.

BB Brecken Blades 14:37

Yeah.

B **Blake** 14:46

If we're trying to say we should be using it to inform sentencing. whether an extended sentence or, you know, a less sentence for whatever reason. Are we accomplishing that or giving that information to accomplish that? Because that's what these other states are doing specifically, right? So Idaho, Colorado, Tennessee, some of these different ones that are using it to inform sentencing. Are we able to do that, you know, following what Karolyn has put on here, or are we just saying Arizona is just going to kind of do the Arizona thing? where you get a free bill and it's like 10 to 18 or, you know, 15 to 25. And regardless of their testing, regardless of what it says, or we give them three and 10 is way more appropriate because of all of the additional.

BB **Brecken Blades** 15:30

OK, let me.

B **Blake** 15:48

you know, problematic sexual behaviors that are identified in testing.

BB **Brecken Blades** 15:55

Um...

Yeah, what I remember her saying is that...

future risk isn't really taken into account at the time of sentencing. And so she, her point was that, which I think is kind of what you're saying, like that even if these evaluations are completed and submitted, it might not have the effect that we are hoping it would have all of the time.

I think it's probably less for prosecutors, obviously, and more for the judge and to inform and not in all cases, but.

As I understand it, kind of the concerns would be, you know, catching the times where someone gets onto probation and somehow they've managed to have contact with minors. And what's been missed is a whole history of assaults against minors or something. And that if we had done an evaluation earlier, perhaps that would have been brought to light and it could have, you know, modified their condition. So community victims are safer, you know, like, so, and those are not, that's not every case. Those are, you know, exceptions to the general

majority, I think. Okay, so you're saying.

You're saying if this is this wording just bringing us kind of like right back to where we are currently?

B Blake 17:20

Yeah, I feel like this is...

kind of where we've been originally. Because if we're truly going to inform for sentencing, which I understand your point, there's other things that may come up through these evaluations that impact their conditions of release on probation and everything.

But that's not necessarily sentencing, right? So if they're going to be incarcerated, the sentencing factor. So I have multiple cases in my head right now I'm thinking of where.

You know, a school teacher was assaulting a child for...

Almost 2 full years and got three years in prison.

but has a history of additional victims that were not taken into account.

BB Brecken Blades 18:14

Well, I think, oh, go ahead.

B Blake 18:14

And then I, well, I was gonna say, and then I have other guys who, you know, that I can think of that had a one-time offense, hands-on offense with their victim, and they're getting 10 flat.

So it's, and the age was the exact same. So those kinds of things I feel like are, there's so many huge discrepancies in sentencing that informing sentencing makes more sense. You know, if we're able to use

BB Brecken Blades 18:30

Mhm.

B Blake 18:49

these evaluations. But in this case, both of these guys had evaluations done and it did not change what the prosecutor was saying. And then the prosecutor basically

informs the judge and most of the time the judge is going to go with what the prosecutor wants.

BB Brecken Blades 19:01

Yeah.

Yeah, well, and I see your hand, Scott. And I let me just say quickly, I think that I think we started at a place of like, okay, let's see, you know, for everybody and all sentencing. And then as we've communicated more with the attorneys and the larger board, they've provided feedback that you really that that they don't think that's feasible or reasonable or would be accepted and that it's more so, it's less about an evaluation that might inform prison time and really only for people who are being considered for probation. And that's the some of the other states too. But I think you're talking more about like discrepancies in terms of, you know, years of incarceration.

And I think where we came to with the problem with that also is that like, okay, what if we do an evaluation and then someone is incarcerated for 10 years and now they come out and they have to have another one and what, you know, so because this is more for the purposes of like community safety and supervision. I don't know, Scott, what's your, what do you have to add?

B Blake 19:48

Right.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 20:09

Well, I'm just kind of thinking and listening to both what Blake is saying and, you know, Brecken, what you've commented on now. And I guess part of what comes to my mind is, while it may well be true that given the way things are stated currently, that it has limitations on what pre-sentence risk assessments have the ability to do, that's based on what's currently in place. You know what I'm saying? And I guess, I guess at least, you know, playing devil's advocate, I mean, Maybe it goes nowhere, but if I don't say it, then I don't know. But perhaps part of what we're talking about is whether or not some of the structure of the way it is needs to be altered so that science and empiricism can play a role in and how people are and aren't getting sentenced, if I'm making any sense. I mean, I mean, it seems pretty clear what this statement says. I guess I'm asking the

question is, do we just accept that and move on? Or is it worthy of a larger discussion as it relates to that? And I don't even know what that would look like, you know?

BB Brecken Blades 21:15

Mhm.

No, I think, I think that's a great point. I think I had said last time something along the lines of like, do we, is the wording that we have currently in the state sufficient? Could we look at, you know, maybe modifying it or recommending A modification in some way? I think as I've looked at a couple of the other board

documents, their guidelines, and how they recommend or, you know, I don't know, outline these evaluations. Their wording is, well, I just read to you Colorado, so you all have that in your mind, but it's there. Their wording is stronger than this. And I think we talked about last time, Idaho,

Definitely, I think, you know, acknowledges the fact that it doesn't have to be done, but I think you have to submit your, you know, declination of participation in writing or the Colorado one just goes right ahead and says that it shall happen. I, you know, I don't know how that always plays out, but

Tennessee also has kind of has some wording around that also. And so we could we could take this statement and incorporate it into kind of a guidelines and standards document, but make it a little firmer in terms of our the like weight of our recommendations or how heavily we're

we're waiting the fact that this should happen. I don't know, is that kind of what you're saying, Scott? Like, let's like highlight it a little more, push on it a little bit.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 23:06

Yeah, I mean, this may well, this language may well be coming out of statute, and I think that that's the case. But that doesn't necessarily mean that as a group, as a subcommittee of this larger board, that we couldn't collectively take the position that encourages the participation in this and that it has, that we believe that it has implications or should have implications for the ultimate sentence of people. I mean, it doesn't mean we couldn't take that position.

and we couldn't figure out how to language that if in fact that's the consensus of this subcommittee. I'm neither advocating for or against it. I'm just simply saying, you know,

BB Brecken Blades 23:41

Mhm.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 23:55

we can acquiesce or we can try to be more comprehensive than that.

BB Brecken Blades 24:01

Mhm.

B Blake 24:05

So I can jump in with that in mind, Scott.

BB Brecken Blades 24:06

Yeah.

B Blake 24:12

I kind of feel like maybe the Idaho route is a little bit better because we are saying, you know, you should be doing this. If you want to decline, it's got to be in writing. Because, you know, this specifically just says they can request a psychosexual evaluation prior to sentencing.

from the defendant side, but...

How many times do these guys not have an attorney that says, hey, I think it would be a good idea for you to do this. So they don't even know it's an option. We could say it's something that should happen. And if you don't want it to happen, you need to decline that in writing.

BB Brecken Blades 24:55

Mhm.

Yeah, I think this also does say that the trial court, like the courts can order it, but I think what we're understanding is that that just really doesn't happen in reality. They just don't order it at this stage. So, Missy, what do you have for us?

M Missy 25:10

I like to add on to the idea that they sign something, but within that paperwork,

identify all of the pros and cons of completing the evaluation because there are actually

BB Brecken Blades 25:23

Mhm.

M Missy 25:29

potentially a lot of pros for that person specifically to do the evaluation.

BB Brecken Blades 25:39

Okay, I like that.

Um...

So kind of, I guess what it seems like everyone's saying is that even though we can't mandate it, perhaps we want our position as a board or as a subcommittee, we're going to recommend that the position is that the evaluation, that participating in the evaluation in that kind of window of time is the recommendation, is the standard, is kind of the baseline where we're starting from. And if you want to decline that, deviate from that, that is your right to do so, but that you need to sign something showing that you've been given the explanation of, you know, why to do it, or sign, I guess, to participate in it also. I mean, that would be part of, you know, kind of an informed consent piece. Is that kind of what?

What you guys are saying, like, where were?

Falling at this point with the discussion? Yeah, Sheridyn.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 26:38

I think, yeah, I think we're probably missing some lawyers on this call who might have quite a few things to say.

didn't want anyone to sign anything declining an evaluation, it would probably be shut down until it's ordered by the trial court or if you know the defense did want to do it and then the individual declined their, you know, thereafter, put that in writing. But I think we're going to get a lot of pushback.

until it's actually ordered to put anything in writing that I would imagine someone saying you would violate some right.

BB Brecken Blades 27:23

Jim.

JH Jim Hanratty (SUP) 27:25

So...

I was under the impression, based on our last conversation, that the guidelines kick in at post-conviction. So any of these volunteer things that happened prior to that are all fine and dandy, and the courts can accept them or even ask for them, and a defendant can as well. But the guidelines...

we only had juice after the conviction. Otherwise, we're intervening in a way that I thought the lawyer said we didn't have authority to do so legally.

Maybe I'm wrong, but that's kind of what I took from the last in-depth conversation with the lawyers. I'm not a lawyer, but I think we should have some here.

BB Brecken Blades 28:05

Mhm.

Yes, yes, would be helpful. No, I think you're right. I think that what we're talking about, and honestly, we're really, in terms of the time frame, we're splitting hairs a little bit, but there is a window of time after conviction.

but prior to the person being given their sentence. And we're talking about, can we get an evaluation in that window of time so they are convicted, but that we maybe provide more information to the court for the sentencing, you know, before it's finalized. Other states, do that. But what we were told last time as kind of you're referencing also is that it's the right to remain silent, you know, to not incriminate yourself is stands all the way through the sentencing phase so that we're going to run into an issue where we cannot force someone, you know, to participate in something like an evaluation. It just can't be mandated that point in time. Yeah, Sheridyn.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 29:12

I would be curious what the board, you know, what the rest of the board would think, or if they would support strengthening the language presented here, if the board would agree that it's our position that the voluntary pre-sentencing evaluations are strongly encouraged and utilized in all appropriate cases. I don't know if that last

sentence could be strengthened or if should be utilized in all appropriate cases is as strong as we can get. And really lean on the judges and the trial.

BB Brecken Blades 29:39

Mhm.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 29:48

boards to, when appropriate, that they make an order. That's at least our stance. That's where we stand. And that's what we would recommend. I don't know if that's a possibility for the board to take a stand on that.

BB Brecken Blades 30:04

Scott.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 30:06

I just want to, you said that very well, Sheridyn. I mean, I think, I mean, as I sit here reflecting on what is it we are doing and what are we as professionals attempting to do. And I think a piece of what we're attempting to do is to evolve practice, right? And to evolve and to evolve the effectiveness of our interventions to the greatest extent possible. And bringing people along and having them understand, you know, how science and evidence and those kinds of things are essential to this discussion. I think is part of is part of what I think we're about, or what I think we need to be about. So, I, you know, enough said.

BB Brecken Blades 30:58

Yeah, I think I think we're all kind of circling around the same points here and on the same page that this wording is really helpful and a good start, but that we maybe want to make it even stronger so that there's more of an emphasis or even we more clearly communicate how strongly we feel about this being, you know, an inappropriate and unhelpful time for these to be done and to call kind of call attention to the fact that this is an option and one that should be utilized more frequently. And I think that's kind of what I hear everyone saying. So I could work on kind of merging what we have here with some of the wording from the other states if everybody feels like that's kind of appropriate. And that would be. kind of the beginning of our like standards and guidelines document, you know,

would start with that and then we'll shift more into the item 2 about what is an evaluation kind of look like then, what is it composed of. Okay, thoughts on that as kind of a direction to go forward?

Good.

Okay, I will work on putting something together and then maybe have that submitted to everybody to take a look at so that we're all aligned on it and feel comfortable with it before we take it to the larger board. I won't, I know we have our meeting on.

Monday, but I don't think that it's feasible, obviously, for us to review it and discuss it and have it ready for them.

Okay, I guess anything else at this point on...

Item one on the agenda in terms of this.

pre-post-conviction, pre-sentence, risk evaluation, and...

Anything else to close it out?

Okay. Okay, great. Okay, well, I will put something together and hopefully we'll have the attorneys on the call and then they can give us the feedback on it. Okay, so let's shift into item 2. So that one is discussion of standards for the adult sex offense specific evaluation. So I would like to say this one might be easier, but I think we're just, we've got just an uphill battle in front of us every time we go on to our next agenda item. So, okay, so, oh, go ahead.

Jenna Mitchell 33:40

Madam Chair, do you want me to call Ms. Baldner? Would it be helpful for me to get Ms. Baldner on the phone or do you want to just move on to the second topic?

BB Brecken Blades 33:53

Um, to ask her about our idea of strengthening that the kind of wording and making that like a...

And I don't know, what do you guys think? Do we want an attorney's input at this stage or wait?

Jim says yes. Anyone else with the?

B Blake 34:15

So I feel like maybe coming up with the wording, you know, rewording this a bit and coming up with what we're thinking and then presenting that rather than here's what

we're thinking and then her saying, well, you know, without seeing it right in front of her, she's giving her opinion on something that we haven't really got figured out yet. So to me, it seems like it would be better to wait a little bit, get something put together, make sure we're all in line with it, and then getting her input.

BB Brecken Blades 34:42

Yeah.

B Blake 34:52

or an attorney's input of some kind.

BB Brecken Blades 34:56

Yeah.

JH Jim Hanratty (SUP) 34:57

I think the attorney's input before you're right, it would make more sense. It's like putting the cart before the horse, but that's just me.

BB Brecken Blades 35:06

Yeah, to have our way in before we get too far into it.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 35:10

My concern, though, is that they weigh in and then we stop doing what we're doing because they've weighed in. You know, I'm with Blake on this one. I think that, you know, adjusting this statement in the ways that we've been having a conversation, About, and then, and then saying, you know, tell us what your thoughts are about this. That, that, that feels like that feels like an inclusive process.

BB Brecken Blades 35:45

Okay.

Okay, let's hold off for right now on asking.

Victoria, let me, let me see what I can, let me see what I end up putting together. It may not be all that.

Vastly.

Different. Let me see what I can come up with.

Okay, thank you for offering that though, Major Mitchell.

Okay, did anyone have did you guys have a chance to take a look at the list of all the testing?

Um...

Yeah, if you would scroll down, that would be great.

Okay.

Um...

All right, so certainly not.

all of the tests on here are being used. Can you, do you have more specifics, Major Mitchell, as to who it was that filled this out? Like who responded to their inquiry? Because I know that it was Shanda, right, who helped us with this, but who did she have?

Do you know, was it probation departments or?

Jenna Mitchell 37:09

That's correct. And I would need clarification from her on who what county representative she submitted these to to fill out.

BB Brecken Blades 37:18

Okay.

Okay, so this is, this is it.

Jenna Mitchell 37:21

from the judges or from probation or a combination of both.

BB Brecken Blades 37:27

Okay, judges or probation officers or some representative of probation in some capacity.

Okay.

Okay.

Anything kind of jump out at anyone on this list initially when they're first looking at it?

So it's much shorter than, for example, the list from.

Colorado of all of the available testing that they can use in the.

In the evaluations, although there's no indication in their document of how frequently obviously those tests are used, and the biggest thing missing from here is obviously the polygraph.

Jim, so maybe let's see where the discussion goes. And then I think we need to, if you want to weigh in on the polygraph for us a little bit more next time, because we need to make sure that that's included in here.

Okay.

B **Blake** 38:40

So, so Brecken, my two cents on this.

BB **Brecken Blades** 38:41

Mhm.

B **Blake** 38:45

The main ones, you know, the MSI 2, the STABLE, the Static 99, they tend to be the ones that are being used the most. But I feel like we also have to figure out, like, what is it that we are trying to accomplish with this evaluation to know which ones are most appropriate.

BB **Brecken Blades** 39:07

Mhm.

B **Blake** 39:08

because some of these counties are not using ones that I feel like, man, everybody should be doing this one, like the MCMI. I feel like that's a really good one, the MCMI 4. And I think it's a two or maybe 3 counties are using it. So what is it that we're trying to accomplish with the evaluation?

Should help us inform what.

we want to be included in the evaluation.

BB **Brecken Blades** 39:36

Mhm, mhm.

B **Blake** 39:38

And I know we've come up with a consensus on what is it that we're attempting to accomplish.

BB Brecken Blades 39:43

Yeah, I agree. That's where we start first. Go ahead, Scott.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 39:47

Um...

The same kind of discussion is taking place on the juvenile side of this equation. And I'm trying to make a case for a couple things. One, that we identify the three or four or five, we could have a debate about that.

distinct areas that we're trying to gather information about. And we have a list of measurements that will help get us there with respect to those three or four or five areas.

And then, and we can and people and leave some people some latitude perhaps to to select from an array of things, but I think we collectively need to decide what those three or four or five areas are that we're that we think are essential to the overall assessment process.

BB Brecken Blades 40:42

Mhm.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 40:42

And that probably then also means simultaneously that we're jettisoning some of these that are just not germane to the psychosexual evaluation. They're more neuropsych kinds of things. That doesn't mean that that keeps somebody as they interact with somebody and do the psychosexual sexual assessment on them that if they see concerns of other kinds that they don't make recommendations for follow-up in that. But I just think we don't have as many here on the adult side as we do over on the juvenile side. We are making our way through.

Quite quite the list of things, but I, but I think I think we need to, we need to. identify the structure, identify the measures that could be under each of those elements that we agree on, and start to bring some clarity to what kind of an evaluation this is and what it's not, if that makes any sense.

BB Brecken Blades 41:45

No, I agree with you. I agree. And most of the states start this section of their guidelines and standards with, you know, sort of more broadly, what's the purpose? And then they kind of, you know, go down from there. So, Sheridyn, what do you have?

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 42:05

Two major things. I think, you know, as we look at the evaluation, ATSA has adult guidelines for what a comprehensive psychosexual evaluation should include. It's pretty broad regarding areas of focus, the need for collateral data, and incorporating aspects of the offender's life into their risk. And so I think that might be a good guideline to look at instead of reinventing the wheel, starting there. And then I just know looking at Utah, they had parts of an evaluation that they expect, but regarding testing, they explicitly state they expect one actuarial risk assessment and one dynamic risk assessment measure that are validated. So I know, you know, the dynamic risk is still a newer area of psychosexual treatment evaluation. So I like that they put a validated measure and not something new that might pop up in the next few years.

BB Brecken Blades 43:16

Mhm.

Yeah, yeah, no, I agree. I think that's a great place to start, and I think...

I think you guys are right. I think we need to define, you always need to know what's the purpose or what's the question that we're trying to answer. And then we can fill in with, you know, how do we answer that question? But we first need to know what is it that we're trying to get to. So, okay, well, I went over, I just mostly Colorado and Tennessee, and I'm assuming the other ones are pretty similar, but basically, Their guidelines and standards for the evaluations include these types of headings. So they start with the purpose. So more broadly, like this evaluation is to inform, you know, treatment, make whatever about risk and discuss. So it kind of explains that. They outline the time frames in terms of, you know, when a referral is made and so some of the logistics of how they expect that to go. So I don't know, that could be something that we could.

I guess my thought is if we can look at some of these topics and decide, you know,

yeah, we think we need to address that in our guidelines document, or we can say, you know, yes, but maybe later, or no, that's not relevant. So they talk about the competency of the evaluators kind of broadly.

in all of them, they have a section that's either cultural considerations and language and ethnicity that includes kind of developmental and intellectual disabilities, or those are two maybe separate sections, but those specific considerations as to how those are addressed and how those are taken into account in the evaluation process are in there. Use of interpreters, what do you do if someone's in denial? How do you submit a complaint? So again, you know, we don't maybe have to start with the complaint process, but then they all have a method or modalities type section that's kind of a broad outline where it's like, you have to maybe more so what you're saying, sharing with the ATSA guidelines where it's like, you have to consider collateral, you have to have an interview, you have to, you know, like these are the ways you're going to get there. And then there's a more specific areas of focus that would say like, okay, within the interview, you have to address.

sexual history, this, that, you know, so even they kind of start, like I said, really broad with the purpose and then they continue to go down. And then formulation and recommendations are sometimes separated out also in terms of separate from an area of focus. And they're really usually pretty specific about the questions that they expect

To the answer, so.

So I think we just have to decide, you know, where we want to go from here. I guess we could start by, you know, we probably have a couple of pathways. We could start by looking at the larger scope purpose of this evaluation and kind of start to draft and get language for that. We could start at the end with what kind of formulations and recommendations do we want to get and you know work our way backwards and fill in the gaps there.

I don't know, what do you guys think?

Start with the purpose, maybe, or...

AA Amanda Adkins 46:33

Amanda here, I kind of liked when we were walking through like the timeline of the experience of, you know, it's kind of why we started first with the pre-sentence, all that kind of stuff. So, but I'm open to whatever, if we need to move a little faster on some items, I'm also open to maybe knocking out some low-hanging fruit.

BB Brecken Blades 46:34

Yeah.

Okay, so in terms of if we're following a timeline, you would say probably the next piece would be like, what's the purpose? Why are we doing, what's the purpose of this evaluation? Just sort of broadly and then kind of go from there.

AA Amanda Adkins 47:12

And I agree with Dr. Miller. I think there's a lot to be pulled from ATSA, who's done a lot of this research and stuff already for recommendations.

BB Brecken Blades 47:19

Mm-hmm.

Yeah, no, I agree. Okay, well, I guess the question, I think, I think that all of you are right that there is, there are a lot of, you know, other states have guidelines, ATSA has guidelines. There's a lot more. We're not going to be, you know, in a loss for information, I think, in terms of suggestions as to how they should be done or what are the guidelines. I think the question to us is just how do we compile that and discuss it so that we keep moving it forward, you know, so we could look at the full documents from ATSA. and some of the other states and put those in background and make sure we're all ready to discuss them. We could jump ahead from that a little bit and maybe volunteer to take, you know, like I'll write down some things about purpose and we can discuss that or write, you know, we can sort of start to compile those on our own and come back with it. I don't, Well, I guess what makes sense to you guys, because this one's kind of a, this is kind of a big piece here to bite off. Any suggestions?

B Blake 48:38

So I guess one of the things I'm thinking about, and this isn't going to answer the question, unfortunately, but we have to get all of the counties on board. So we're not just, I mean, it's for the whole state of Arizona, right? But we got to get all these counties on board. So if you're looking at these, on the spreadsheet, so many of them are, you know, doing this one or that one, and

they're not including all these other ones on here. So unless we have the board certified evaluators like other states do,
We've got to get evaluators in these counties to be on board with, hey, here's the guidelines. This is what it's going to be. And in the smaller counties, they're limited on their resources and everything. So unfortunately, we've got to take that into account as well, is the evaluators that are going to be doing this in these smaller counties, how do we make sure that we're encompassing and recognizing the limitations that they have when it comes to the goal, the purpose, everything else? I think that's going to be the same, but identifying what evaluation or what the assessments
That would be included, or we have to think about the...
accessibility for some of these other evaluators and maybe time constraints or something like that if there's only one or two in a whole county, right? So it's just another piece of this puzzle that I'm thinking we have to consider.

BB Brecken Blades 50:08

Mhm.

No, I agree with you. And I do think that's where deciding on kind of the categories or the areas of focus in the evaluation and then allowing for some, you know, leeway in terms of what's empirically supported and that, but what's available to them. But I do think that there are going to be some things that we decide are just evidence-based and best practice and no matter what, they're non-negotiable. And so like, if you're not giving some kind of, you know, it doesn't have to be the ABLE, but if you're not giving something in that category of testing, then your evaluation is insufficient. As an example, it's, you know, I mean, that is going to be kind of the harsh reality of it to some extent. There are some options, but in order in order for us to help Arizona rise to the level of, you know, sort of the gold standard, or it's going to, it might be a stretch for some people for a while. You know, but I agree. I think we can give some options. We can give options if, you know, to make things more accessible. Sheridyn.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 51:22

Yeah, I hear what Blake's saying about a lot of the states certify their evaluators or vet them, so to speak. I don't know if the SOMB statutes as they stand lead us there yet. I think that once we create standards, we are going to have to

discuss enforcement. So these standards for evaluating exist for the SOMB, but what do we do or if nothing for people who don't follow those standards?

And maybe we do talk about certifying evaluators or having an evaluator list. I don't know if we're there yet at the current iteration of this board. I do agree that we should set standards that this is the this is the basic expectations for a psychosexual eval.

And if you don't have certain risk measures, then it's not a psychosexual evaluation. And that will have to be dealt with in court. And hopefully, you know, we have some well-versed lawyers out there that will shine a light on the inconsistencies there.

I wonder if a spreadsheet like this would be helpful to look at the different categories that the ATSA guidelines recommend for an evaluation versus other states to see if we can look at. I'm a visual person, so I like spreadsheets. I like

BB Brecken Blades 52:55

Hmm.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 53:01

graphs, I like things in line as much as possible. I don't know if that's something that we can do, because the ATSA guidelines do outline subheadings in a report, things that should be discussed, like limits of confidentiality, and maybe go from there and we could discuss, you know, for a pre-sentence evaluation, are we expecting personality measures and cognitive measures or would that be expected for pre-treatment, EPA evaluations and kind of look at all the recommendations and then pull out what we would expect for this versus that type of evaluation. I don't know if that might help organize our process.

BB Brecken Blades 53:52

So you're saying start with the ATSA guidelines and almost make like a matrix or kind of overlay that with what is being done in the other states guidelines and see where there's overlap or you're saying just let's just start with ATSA as our guideline and kind of build from there.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 54:10

I was kind of thinking, just because I haven't seen all the other states, you know, writing out the ATSA guidelines, kind of like we have here with the different scales

and measures and kind of writing out the different expectations that ATSA has, and then

BB Brecken Blades 54:14

Yeah.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 54:30

comparing states side by side to those guidelines and see where it falls. Does it line up? Does it not work that way? That's if I were tackling this by myself, that's how I would approach it, just so I can kind of organize what I'm looking at.

BB Brecken Blades 54:46

Mhm.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 54:51

I don't know if that's possible.

BB Brecken Blades 54:52

Mhm.

Um...

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 54:58

Scott here, if I can just comment real quick. I think that makes sense. I think we've got a structure here. We can use the structure that ATSA has. We can see where what we have here can plug into those various categories of the ATSA structure. I'm going to go back to, you know, Blake's concern about outlying counties and stuff and echo what I heard, I think, Sheridyn say.

Presumably, we've gathered some information from the outlying counties about what they're doing. But I can also make the presumption that we are sitting on this subcommittee and are members of the board because we bring expertise to this discussion. And I'm confident that this group can come up with a structure of what this looks like that is evidence-based, forward thinking, and others who perhaps are not as up to speed, so to speak, will have to make some decisions about getting up to speed if that's

if that's something that they want to continue to be part of. That doesn't mean I'm

not interested in what others have to say, but I think we've tried to gather that information, and that's what's represented here in this grid. At some point, we collectively are the ones that have the expertise. And we need to make, we collectively need to make decisions about what this looks like.

BB Brecken Blades 56:31

Yeah.

Yeah, I hear you. I think to some extent, you know, the evidence backs what it backs and the standards kind of are what they are. And we can, you know, do what we can to take into consideration the limitations of some of the different counties and evaluators, but ultimately, you know, we can't change the standard.

you know, if the evidence backs it, then it is what it is. So,

Okay, I guess Major Mitchell, is it something that you guys could help with to put together another spreadsheet that shows like the ATSA areas and the areas of focus, or is that, I'm not good at that stuff at all, so that could be really easy, or it could be something that's, you know, really...

complicated and I wouldn't know the difference.

Jenna Mitchell 57:25

Let me get back with you on that. Let me look at what we have and see how much work it would be to put something like that together, how time consuming it would be.

BB Brecken Blades 57:36

Okay.

I think in my mind, in some ways, it could look a lot like this spreadsheet where you have like, and maybe the, that main, the left hand side is like all of the ATSA areas and then across the top would be like Colorado, Idaho, Tennessee, and then you could still put X's like if they, right, if they have the same.

thing or not. So I don't, that's how that is how I would see it potentially, Sheridyn. Is that what you were kind of imagining?

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 58:06

Yeah, if we, yeah, I was thinking you could organize a spreadsheet based on the ATSA guideline areas and then states across and we could either beforehand if

someone has time to go through those states, that's great, or we could walk through it.

BB Brecken Blades 58:23

Yeah.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 58:25

as a committee and say, you know, for this section, does anyone state mention this? And then we could do it maybe live.

BB Brecken Blades 58:34

Yeah, that's true. We could do that.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 58:36

And so, and over time, and then we could overlay, so to speak, a different color or column about when would we expect that type of measure or that section to be addressed? Is it for all evaluations, some evaluations, not these evaluations? just to organize our process. And maybe AI could help.

BB Brecken Blades 59:04

I know, I'm wondering, I'm like, hmm, can I just put that ATSA document into AI and say, make this a spreadsheet for me?

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 59:11

Right, that's where I would start and see what happens.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 59:14

Don't encourage AI things at all. None of them.

BB Brecken Blades 59:21

Oh, it's possible I still wouldn't be able to make it work, so it's okay. Okay, well, no, I do, I like that idea of starting with ATSA as the baseline. Like I said, I kind of, I went over some of what's in.

Well, just that are not necessarily even the areas of focus of the other.

of the other states guidelines, but just their how they organize their guidelines

documents that it starts with purpose and then it goes through. So maybe what we could also do is if we put together the spreadsheet to kind of go through the areas of focus, maybe I can also see if I can put together something on some of those larger areas like what's the purpose. Truthfully, I'm just going to pull from what's kind of existing and then modify it and then we can continue to read it and edit and modify it in terms of the purpose. They all are very, very similar with sort of, you know, small nuances in their phrasing or wording.

So, yeah, Sharon.

SP **Sheridyn Miller Psy.D.** 1:00:24

Sorry, it's me again. It also sounds like just as you're speaking, I'm thinking that like a...

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:00:25

No, that's great.

SP **Sheridyn Miller Psy.D.** 1:00:35

An example outline of a report might be helpful, kind of synthesizing these expectations for an evaluation as we go through our guidelines for this area. Here's like a sample report outline of all the things that should be included.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:00:55

Mhm.

I think some of the state guidelines are so specific and detailed that they almost look like that, honestly. Like the way that they have it, they have it in an outline format and the bullet points of like, you know, you address these things. I think Colorado even has like charts on different.

risks and protective factors and I think you, I don't know if you have to put the chart in your report or incorporate them, but some of the some of them are really specific like that, but I do, I agree with you. I think that's helpful and I think.

What I hear or have heard from doing trainings and things with judges and in other areas of evaluation is that the more streamlined the information is in terms of like the consistency even just of its presentation, the easier it is for judges to consume it.

You know, and when, so I do think that it's going to be important for us to be specific and to get it to a point where it's almost like, these are the headings, this is

what you, because if some, you know, if one person's handing in one thing and somebody else's looks totally different, and then it takes judges a long time to figure out what's where.

And so that is something we can even get that, you know, specific by the end of it, I think would be helpful.

Okay, is there anything else you guys think that we can do today to kind of move this forward or are we at a place where I guess what I have so far is that we're going to kind of take another look at or I'm going to take another look at the wording in terms of the pre-sentence evaluation recommendation and then also start to kind of put together some of the general like purpose and overview type documents for the evaluation and that then we're going to, I'm going to connect with you Major Mitchell about.

the possibility of at least maybe just the kind of like the start of a spreadsheet that we could review maybe even all together.

If we do that and we review it live and kind of go through the areas of focus, would it be more helpful if everybody has reviewed like one state so that we're ready to come in or do we want to review? I just don't want us to get lost like in the, you know, discussion of it because this material is so dense.

I'm afraid if we put up the spreadsheet and then pull up just like Colorado's guidelines, it's going to take us.

Forever to get through it.

I don't know, what are your thoughts? I guess we could also...

Well, I don't know. Major Mitchell, are we allowed to like make that spreadsheet a document that we can all...

edit, you know what I mean? Like a lot, like I can get in and make my x's for whatever state or is that probably maybe not allowed.

Jenna Mitchell 1:04:01

You could put your state in it and send it to us and then we could compile them. I think that would probably be the best way to do that.



Brecken Blades 1:04:09

Okay. Okay.

Okay, that makes sense. So that might make sense to try to do before the next meeting if

if that's possible. For everybody, I know that that takes time, but...
in order to kind of keep our discussion moving. I don't know. What do you guys think about that? Or do you want to do it all together live and go through the documents together?

B Blake 1:04:44

So, so for clarification, again, are we saying specifically?

BB Brecken Blades 1:04:45

No.

B Blake 1:04:50

identifying the categories that the states are using? Or are we saying specific evaluation tools like what assessments they're using?

BB Brecken Blades 1:05:02

I think we're not at the evaluation tools yet. I think we're starting, I think we're kind of based on what Scott and Sheridyn were recommending is that we start with just identifying, you know, what area. So first we're going to say, okay, ATSA, and it seems like everybody else says we need to address dynamic risk, we need to address static risk. Okay, then how do we, what tools do we want to use to do that? And then we fill in.
with the tools after once we have all of the areas. Does that make sense?

B Blake 1:05:31

Okay. Yeah, I have all that information already for Idaho, so I can send that over to Major Mitchell.

BB Brecken Blades 1:05:36

Okay.

B Blake 1:05:40

tomorrow. And so I'll volunteer for Idaho because I already have like a whole breakdown of all of that. So.

BB Brecken Blades 1:05:47

All of it.

Okay, okay, great. Well, I think I'll talk to Major Mitchell after this. What it might look like is if they're able to just start like an Excel sheet for us and then send it, it might mean you taking the Idaho information and just like making the X's where you see them to be the same and then sending the Excel sheet back so that their staff isn't having to like weave through all of the information and interpret it into like which category means the same thing, which is probably faster for us to do really. Anyway, so, okay, thank you, Idaho. I think the other ones we've really been looking at are Colorado, Utah, and Tennessee.

Um...

So is anybody willing to take on any of those or do you want to wait and then I'll just, we can do it by e-mail volunteers.

SP Sheridyn Miller Psy.D. 1:06:40

I have Utah's evaluation outline written up already.

BB Brecken Blades 1:06:46

Okay.

Great. Okay. Anybody want Tennessee or Colorado?

You can e-mail about those ones once we get this going.

Okay.

And.

Okay.

Anything else?

M Missy 1:07:21

I just want to check in because Colorado and their standards, they very clearly state all of the categories, right? The category and then the tools.

BB Brecken Blades 1:07:29

Mhm.

M **Missy** 1:07:33

If I remember that correctly, I'll go ahead and do that and submit it.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:07:39

Okay, thanks, Missy. Yeah, they do. And so, I mean, the other option here is to just, I think what we're talking about is just doing a little bit more.

due diligence and sort of cross-referencing to see, you know, is it, I'm assuming it all is going to end up looking pretty much the same, but instead of just taking the Colorado document, which it may be what everyone has done, I don't know, but at least taking one extra step to look and see like, okay, this is.

Yes, they're all the same and then coming out with the categories. But you're right, Colorado is very, they're very specific about it. It's all outlined and listed. So.

M **Missy** 1:08:25

So just so I'm clear, so looking at all of the categories and comparing, like somehow are we going to have a document that I can look at and say, oh, Colorado is doing this and so it's right up there with Idaho and Tennessee and ATSA guidelines.
So...

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:08:49

Yeah, so I'm hoping that someone at DPS will be able to help us start an Excel spreadsheet on it. If not, honestly, I could probably figure out how to put it together. No, I will not use AI, Scott. I will not.
to put it together and then have that will be sent around. And so I think we're talking about having the ATSA guidelines as kind of like the baseline for it. And then you can look and make an X like, okay, yep, Colorado has all of these same ones or they have, you know, something else. But yeah, that would be ideally, we will get that.
center around so you have that. So it's a shorter, like more visual look at it for us.
So, yeah, Sheridyn.

SP **Sheridyn Miller Psy.D.** 1:09:33

And that is the other option, right? We just start with Colorado, since it might be

narrower instead of ATSA'S, which is much more global. Colorado might be more specific if we want to just start there and compare the other states to Colorado.

BB Brecken Blades 1:09:52

Yeah, that's an option also.

Yeah, I just, I think that doing some level of comparison, whether we're comparing everyone else to Colorado or everyone to ATSA or whatever it is, is going to help us just to make sure that we've looked at all of them, because one way or another, we either can potentially do it this way, which you suggested, I think is you know, helpful and maybe shorter and visual, or we can comb through each of the documents kind of to, you know, and discuss them to make sure that they're all the same. But that just sounds like A lot. So I do like the idea of this being kind of visual and a snapshot of us, you know, verifying that everybody's kind of in the same category.

I think that's probably a good way to move us forward on this. And then, like I said, I'll put together some writing for everybody to take a look at in terms of kind of the broader purpose and can go from there. With that, I will work on the wording for the eval. Guidelines.

see what I can come up with.

Anything else that you guys can think of for this meeting or any other comments or questions, concerns?

M Missy 1:11:23

I do have just kind of a curiosity question because I'm looking at the list of counties who responded. I mean, and I noticed there's like some of the larger counties did not provide information on this. I mean, our smallest county with a population of 9,500 people responded to this list. So I'm curious about that.

BB Brecken Blades 1:12:04

Yeah, That's why I had asked at the beginning, just to clarify who it was that we had gotten the responses from. I'm not sure. Yeah, I don't know. I don't know what the, maybe they just didn't respond in time or I'm not sure exactly, you know, what the response piece was like for this.

I know last time, I think Karolyn had kind of referenced that maybe she would be able to have some of the attorneys also kind of get information on this. And so I could

follow up with her about that, or we could follow up with her and see if that's a possibility. If we don't feel like, are you concerned?

Missy, that this is not a thorough or maybe not a representative snapshot of the testing, or you're just sort of generally kind of curious about what happened, like why didn't Pima say anything?

M **Missy** 1:12:57

Well, and so just looking at the broader picture, because I love that there's a total list of how many counties are using each one. And I mean, the consistent out of the, I think it was 10 counties,

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:13:08

Mhm.

M **Missy** 1:13:16

that responded like...

there's, we're not super consistent. And then when you look at like Pima and what was the other one that was really sticking out to me was a Yuma like

Why didn't they respond? I think we kind of need...

what they are using so we at least have a better idea from groundwork of what people are using and Trained in.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:14:03

Mhm, mhm.

B **Blake** 1:14:09

So, Missy, my thought on that is they had the opportunity to respond. They didn't. So whatever we come up with, that's what's it's going to be that. So

M **Missy** 1:14:23

And I don't disagree with that. Absolutely. I agree. Like either you respond or you're just going to have to deal with it at the same time. I think it would be beneficial if

B **Blake** 1:14:23

I guess.

M Missy 1:14:39

we try to avoid as many roadblocks as possible moving forward. Does that make sense? Because there is kind of this piece of we gave you the opportunity to talk, you didn't. And then I'm looking at rollout and all of these people coming in and saying, oh, but this isn't how we've been doing it. Does that make sense?

B Blake 1:15:05

I totally get your concern there, and I agree with you, but if we're going to create the gold standard for Arizona.

It's based off of, as Scott was saying, our expertise and what we believe is the gold standard. And everybody's got to get on board with it. So to Brecken's point earlier, if it's something they weren't doing, but they need to be doing it, it's like, hey, you got to implement this. And if not, it's not going to be considered.

A psychosexual evaluation, and it's not going to be something that's, you know, put into this whole court process.

Jenna Mitchell 1:15:43

This is Jenna. I can certainly send this back out again or get with Shanda to determine, you know, how it was sent out. I know we did get this back relatively quickly. We asked for it at our last meeting, so, you know, the end of July. So it was, you know, roughly A two-week timeframe by the time Shanda sent it out. We got responses from the counties.

JH Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:15:43

Just a quick, sorry.

Jenna Mitchell 1:16:04

So we could certainly make another attempt. And I do know that the AZSOMB chairwoman does statutorily have authority to make requests and counties, attorney general, agencies, political subdivisions in the state are required by statute to respond. We didn't do that in a very formal method of distribution. We used a very informal, quick method to distribute and get as many responses as possible. So happy to, you know, get more responses, but we did provide you with what we had to date when it was time to send this out to the subcommittee.

BB Brecken Blades 1:16:46

Yeah, yeah, I see your hand. Jim, I'm just going to make a quick comment. I think that it is helpful and interesting to see who is using what assessments and kind of where things are falling in terms of, you know, what seems to be most heavily utilized in our state. But ultimately, kind of again, to come back to like, the standards of evidence and the baseline is what it is. And so even if there's a test that no one's using, if it is, you know, found to be the best test and it's got all the evidence behind it, then we need that to be the standard and everyone's going to have to, you know, regardless of whether they're using it or not, it's our job to look at objectively.

what is the gold standard, kind of. So even if they don't respond, I don't know how much it would change our understanding of the testing that evidence supports if one of the counties is using something or not using it. If that makes sense. Like, so maybe we'll get more responses. Maybe there's still you know, someone out there, but we have time. I think next week we won't, we're not fully, you know, doing the list of testing yet. We could still have a little more time to capture some of that. So, okay, Jim first though, and then, and then Missy, go ahead, Jim.

JH Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:18:04

So, could you scroll that back down just so I could see that spreadsheet one more time?

I can kind of see why.

All the way.

Little bit more.

There you go. I can see why Navajo and Apache wouldn't be.

Kind of having a whole lot, even though they do.

You know, on the federal contracts, they certainly have.

you know, sex offenders on the federal contract. And I think that also includes part of...

Mohave on the Crit, you know, the Colorado Indian Reservation Tribes.

So obviously these guidelines are strictly statewide and not going to be bleeding over into federal, I assume, jurisdictionally.

But I just wanted to point that out. I could see why those folks probably wouldn't even participate at all, even though they do a lot of it.

BB Brecken Blades 1:19:05

Yeah.

Yeah, right. Yeah, yeah, I know. Okay, Missy.

JH Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:19:08

Anyway, just making a comment.

M Missy 1:19:14

And Jim, you're absolutely right. That does make sense because it did pop into my head. These are some of the counties with larger like reservation areas and it completely makes sense because that is under federal jurisdiction.

I would, if we could get some information from those counties, I think even though you're absolutely right, we're doing the gold standard, but I think it's also better to start now because this is going to be huge. And having an idea of how much training and coordination this is going to take would probably be very beneficial as well.

BB Brecken Blades 1:20:09

Yeah.

Yeah, I think you're right. It would certainly be interesting to know what, you know, how big of a change this will be for people. Scott.

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 1:20:19

The glaring absence here obviously is Pima County. But I mean, there could be a myriad of reasons why we didn't get information back from them. But I mean, for me, they're the ones that might have something additive to say to the discussion that's not already been represented by what we already have.

BB Brecken Blades 1:20:43

Mhm, mhm.

Yeah, could be. Okay, well, I will see about if, you know, we maybe try one more time and send it out. I don't know what the process was, you know, for getting these

answers in the 1st place or how difficult or cumbersome that was or if there's, you know, a chance that people just miss the deadline or if... this is, this is it, this is, you know, you get what you get kind of a situation. So we can, you know, kind of revisit that. and see where we land. Okay. Oh, so I think the last thing I wanted to bring up was, Jim, what is, what's obviously missing from this list of assessments is polygraph. And so we need to hear from you. I think next week, or not next week, next meeting, next month could potentially be a good time for that. If you're, was we're talking about, you know, kind of the areas of focus and what what answers what question and to kind of talk more about the polygraph, what we get from that, how you see it being used in these evaluations and what, you know, some of those things from your perspective. Does that make sense to you kind of timeline wise as a time to weigh in? Okay, is that feasible for you to, it doesn't have to be anything formal for us, obviously, but, you know, to just give you some time on the agenda to talk about that.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:22:06

Absolutely. Absolutely. And I'll take Dr. lead here and use the ATSA because I think they pointed out pretty clearly, at least for adult use.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:22:08

Okay.

Yeah. Okay, great. Thank you. Okay, well, we're a few minutes early, but if anybody, if there's nothing else or anybody else have anything else, I guess, future agenda items, if there's anything anyone wants to bring up that we haven't already talked about.

Okay. Otherwise, I will, if someone wants to motion to adjourn the meeting, we can do that.

B **Blake** 1:22:49

Blake Barney, I motion to end the meeting.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:22:51

I second Jim Hanratty.

BB Brecken Blades 1:22:54
Okay, all in favor?

SN SCOTT NAEGELE 1:22:57
Aye. Aye.

B Blake 1:22:58
Aye.

M Missy 1:22:58
Aye

AA Amanda Adkins 1:22:58
Aye

BB Brecken Blades 1:23:00
Anyone opposed?
Okay, so then 2:23 we are adjourned. Thanks everyone.

B Blake 1:23:11
Thank you.

BB Brecken Blades 1:23:12
Have a good day.

Jenna Mitchell 1:23:14
Thank you. Bye-bye.

● stopped transcription