AZSOMB Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20261021_200042UTC-Meeting Recording

October 21, 2026,

1h 36m 41s

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.

Brecken Blades 0:06

So I will go ahead and call the meeting to order. This is the the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board Adult Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee meeting. It's 1 o'clock on October 21st, 2026, and we are going to begin the meeting. Major Mitchell, would you start with a roll call, please?

Jenna Mitchell 0:22

Yeah, we have Chairwoman Blades present. Miss Adkins.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 0:26

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:27

Mr. Barney.

Blake 0:29

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:31

Mister Hanratty.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 0:32

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:34

Ms. Kaczorowski.
Is not present, Doctor Miller.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 0:44
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:45
Thank you. And Chairwoman, just for your information, Dr. Miller has to leave at 2 P.m. today. Miss Musick.

BB **Brecken Blades** 0:51
Okay.

MM **Missy Musick** 0:53
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:55
Mr. Naegele.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 0:57
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:59
Miss Panas.
is not present. Chairwoman, you do have a quorum.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:06
Okay. Great. Thank you. Okay. Hi, everyone.
We have several things that we have to get to today. I might go a little bit out of order. Jim, if we pick up where we left off with you, are you kind of ready to roll into that or do you need a few minutes to get going?
You're muted, I think, still.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:36
Oops, sorry about that.

Brecken Blades 1:37
There you go.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:41
Let's see. Yes, would you would you like to start with a risk-relevant behavior definition?

Brecken Blades 1:48
Yeah, let me, I guess let me see if this one is quick. Is it, I just wanted, did anybody get a chance to look at the dates? That's the only one I wanted to.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:51
Or do you want to do that when we?

Brecken Blades 2:01
for the proposed dates for the subcommittee meetings for 2027.

SCOTT NAEGELE 2:07
I did. I want to bring it to everybody's attention that the April date listed as four or five is a Monday and not a Wednesday.

Brecken Blades 2:20
Okay.

SCOTT NAEGELE 2:25
Not sure if that was intentional or an oversight.

Brecken Blades 2:25
Okay.
I would guess it was maybe just a typo, I think. I mean, unless there's something I don't know, but I think the intent is for them to continue on the same day. But the time shifted. Did everyone see that? So it's 11 to 12. And I think it looks like Major Mitchell that we're going to do a one-hour meeting instead.

Jenna Mitchell 2:46

That was what we were proposing. We were proposing to have the subcommittees meet on the same day. It does not look like that is probably feasible. So if...
you would prefer to keep it on Wednesday afternoons at the hour and a half, we can accommodate that.
It's really your preference.

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 3:05

Sorry.
I didn't see the proposed. I saw the proposed dates for the bigger meeting, I think, but not the.
subcommittee. If it is proposed to be a Wednesday at 11, I am always unavailable at that time on those days.

BB **Brecken Blades** 3:31

Okay. Well, I guess let me ask this, Major Mitchell, would it be help maybe if everybody emailed their...
availability or just there saying, you know, yes, thumbs up to it instead of having, I mean, every, I, you know, instead of having a discussion about it, would that work or how do you want to proceed with us doing those? Collect feedback and then, and then maybe I can speak with you and we can just come up with the calendar.

Jenna Mitchell 3:59

That would be great. And thank you, Scott, for pointing out that mistake on the April date. You're correct. It is a typo.

BB **Brecken Blades** 4:07

Okay, great. Okay, so thanks everyone. So then, yeah, Jim, let's just roll right into yours. If I thought that one might be quick, but I'd love to just, yeah, pick up where you left off. The risk relevant is great or wherever you, wherever you want to start for us.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 4:20

Okay.
So, can everybody see this?

Brecken Blades 4:27
Yes.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 4:28
All right. This was a real basic definition. I just want to make it clear that we're not really like changing anything about PCSOT, you know, polygraph testing with convicted individuals. I just wanted to be clear that there's a distinction between just garden variety admissions that we get and things that are more germane to risk. So Risk relevant behaviors are actions or patterns of conduct by a person convicted of a sexual offense that reflect dynamic risks or factors associated with sexual reoffending and help identifying needs for treatment, supervision, and ongoing risk management. Their relevance is evaluated within 4 domains, and these are those domains that Thornton talks about, sexual interest, distorted attitudes, socio-affective functioning or dysfunctioning, depending upon your outlook, and self-management. So all the questions that we ask in polygraph can be fitted into those domains, as long as we understand that this is about dynamic risk when we're doing ongoing testing, as opposed to sexual histories, which are more static.
and historic.
So the note that I have here is for PCSOT purposes, the practical distinction is that a behavior's risk relevance depends on its connection to those domains and the individual's offending pattern. A rule violation alone does not establish increased sexual re-offense risk, and a behavior can warrant assessment even when it does not constitute a new crime.
PCSOT disclosures can inform that assessment. They do not independently establish a risk level. So again, polygraphs should be used in conjunction with those bigger, more empirically proven dynamic risks and static risk.
instruments. Does that make sense?

Brecken Blades 6:20
Yes.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 6:21
So if you like it, that's what I came up with. Hopefully that answers Scott Naegle's question about what I mean by risk relevant. It's behavioral. It's not fantasies. It's not perceptions. It's not, you know, beliefs. It's behaviors that tie to actual identified risk.

Brecken Blades 6:42
Okay, thank you.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 6:43
Any discussion about that? Any questions?

Brecken Blades 6:49
Looks like Katie, Miss Krejci is here and has a question.
Or comment.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 7:00
Okay.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 7:01
about it means it's like behaviors and not fantasies or beliefs. Like I think this makes sense to treatment providers that are familiar with dynamic risk factors, but if this is a definition we're providing to the court that may not be an otherwise like educated on whether or not like a certain thing is a risk relevant behavior, I just, I don't know if this.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 7:07
Right.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 7:23
fully conveys to the court what would or would not be. And a lot of times this comes up in like polygraphs that are done when someone's already discharged from treatment. And so there's no treatment provider input of whether or not it's risk relevant. So if there could be like just kind of that.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 7:37
Mhm.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 7:41
That definition you just gave of like, this is behaviors, this is not fantasies, to help give the court more information, that might be helpful just from that perspective.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 7:52
So let me see if I understand you correctly. You think we need to nail down the fact that it has nothing to do with fantasies, beliefs, and perceptions, and it has to be more behavioral? Did I get that right?

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 8:01
Yes, yes, if that's what if that's what it is. And then also like keeping in that it's it depends on the person's own kind of offending pattern. I think that's helpful as well.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 8:17
You don't think that definite?

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 8:18
Right, because I think the goal is like, if for certain people, we don't really care. I think the example was in the larger group meeting, if they walk their dog through a park, but other people that may matter. And how, like, who's making the determine if it's a risk determination if it's risk relevant? Is this like a probation officer? Or ultimately, is this the court right? And like just giving them additional guidance on.
These aren't treatment providers, what is or is not risk relevant behaviors.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 8:48
Okay, like a shopping list of what behaviors would be and what wouldn't be?

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 8:53
Examples would be helpful.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 8:56
OK.
Well, we can go, we can get into that. Would you like me to augment it with examples?

Brecken Blades 9:03
Well, I don't know that specific examples would be...
helpful or appropriate so much as people might get stuck on those things. I mean, as we continue to discuss, each person is different and what is risk relevant for one is

not risk relevant for another. So if we need to modify or continue to specify what we mean by behavior versus, you know, fantasies or something else, that's one thing, but I...

I would suggest that we stay away from giving concrete examples, because I think people will get actually stuck on those.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 9:35

That makes sense. Also, the judges are pretty smart. I think they can figure out if somebody is not in treatment anymore. And if an officer asks for a polygraph for ongoing adherence to the rules, I think the judges can figure out exactly what is being recommended by the by their subject matter experts. That's what courts are for, and judges are pretty smart in that regard. I'm not sure they need to be held by the hand as far as exact examples, but your input and your feedback is greatly appreciated.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 10:13

And I think I agree now that Dr. Blade said that like people might get stuck in examples. Right now I'm seeing that like if there's any disclosures made that the court is finding that those are like they're all risk relevant. It's not clear in the polygraph reports or the summaries we're getting whether or not these things were already known or not known to probation.

just from that perspective. So like any disclosure of anything is being determined to be a risk relevant behavior, but maybe that's only things you're asking about are risk relevant behaviors. And so maybe anything should appropriately be used. But right now, if there's any disclosure,

BB **Brecken Blades** 10:38

Yeah.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 10:53

that's a problem and the person's not getting early terminated.

BB **Brecken Blades** 10:59

Yeah.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 11:03

Well, I guess I can make a comment about the walking in the park with the dog. Now, would that be a risk factor? If the person had a history of, you know, opportunistic offenses at the park or had a history in their in their probation that they were going to areas where children congregate. And that was violations of being not where they're supposed to be historically. And then all of a sudden now they're not in treatment. They're going to the park and trying to live that life, that pro-social life, normalizing. Is that a risk? Is that not a risk? I don't know. I'm not a treatment provider.

But maybe for that individual, going to the park may not be.

a risk factor, maybe it is, but you're talking about gray areas there and really case-by-case basis stuff. I think

I'm not sure we really need to put examples.

Brecken Blades 12:03

Yeah, I think we could, I think what we're all kind of, where we're kind of landing is maybe if you, I mean, I don't think it would necessarily hurt to add another specification, I suppose, if that would make it more clear, if everybody thinks that would make it more clear that it's, you know, it's not necessarily a fantasy or that you're testing. I guess I just also want to make sure that.

that I think, you know, there are a lot of issues that were, that everybody agrees upon in this, the process of termination and with, you know, probation processes and all those things, but that we address those issues in the place where it's appropriate and so that we don't bog down

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 12:32

Oops.

Brecken Blades 12:42

something like this, like this definition with extra things that we will address somewhere in another.

document. Does that make sense? So we're just, we're defining what is risk relevant behaviors for the purposes of clarifying those two documents that we

discussed at the adult or the big board meeting. Is that right? I mean, that's what

everyone's understanding is of this that we're doing.
Because we talked about clarifying those.

Jenna Mitchell 13:22
Madam Chairwoman, this is Jenna Mitchell. I just want to let you know that Ms. Kaczorowski has joined the meeting as well.

BB **Brecken Blades** 13:29
Okay, thank you. Okay, Dr. Miller, did you have a comment?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 13:34
I did. Yeah, I was going to say I appreciate what Jim is doing by highlighting patterns of conduct in the risk relevant behaviors section, because I think, you know, it's called risk relevant behaviors. Behaviors, and then it elaborates that it's patterns of conduct or actions. And so we could clarify that behaviors and actions are not fantasies or beliefs. But I also think at the very beginning, it describes that these are more behavioral situations and not imaginary situations.

BB **Brecken Blades** 14:21
So, remind me, I guess this document is...
is for, or we're using this definition only in that document as it relates to polygraphs, is that right?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 14:34
Correct.
Per PCSOT.

BB **Brecken Blades** 14:36
Okay.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 14:39
So, when we were when we were having the discussion about risk evaluation, we wanted to, I feel like it's necessary to tie how we do polygraph and how that relates to risk, whether it's static from history or whether it's ongoing over time.

Brecken Blades 14:39
Okay.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 14:58
while they're in treatment or even after treatment. So the way to defend that or to state why we do what we do, why we test what we test on specific behaviors is relevant to that individual. And it ties to these four domains that have empirical evidence, if you will, of dynamic risk. So, and it's going to change from each person. So it's not going to be like a cookie cutter. I think a lot of times I've noticed that agencies get into this cookie cutter type testing where they're asking to be polygraphed on issues that may not even be relevant to that individual.
And I think that this is more in line with science.

Brecken Blades 15:56
Okay.
Okay, and are we saying that it needs to be...
behavioral because these are things that are tested on the polygraph and we're testing polygraphs on behaviors. Is that, am I right in understanding that? Because you also up there we have one of the domains is sexual interest and.
There are items on the dynamic risk instruments that concern sexual.
Interest.
And then, so, you know, beliefs or other things, which we don't test in polygraphs that we do consider as in terms of someone's overall dynamic risk picture.
Right? So I think now I'm like, I'm like getting lost. That's why I'm trying to make sure I understand what exactly is, like where exactly are we using this definition and what is the purpose of it? Is it specifically as it relates to what we're testing for polygraphs? And that's the only place because otherwise I would probably disagree that.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 16:42
I'm sorry.

Brecken Blades 17:00
fantasies or other beliefs are not risk relevant. I think sometimes those are risk relevant. We test them in our dynamic instruments.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 17:09

Yes, but if you don't tie it to behavior, I can't really test them. Polygraph examiners can't test on a person's belief system and perceptions. They have to, if you want to tie those fantasies or those deviant fantasies to ********** or sexually acting out or, you know, propensity behavior, you can do that because it's based on behavior. But asking them if they believe in Santa Claus,

Brecken Blades 17:13

Okay.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 17:29

is not really a good question to ask a six-year-old, because they're probably going to say yes. So beliefs and perceptions and those kinds of things are not what we can really, it's not good polygraph to test them for that. It certainly may be relevant to how they think and how they perceive the world, and that's a treatment realm, not a polygraph realm.

Brecken Blades 17:33

Yeah.

Right.

Right, right. And so I'm wondering if maybe we need to say something like risk relevant behaviors as it pertains to polygraph examinations are this and this and this. unless the term risk relevant is that the only place this term is going to come up.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 18:02

Okay.

I think the only reason that I put this risk relevant behavior on here was because Scott Naegele asked me to define it so that it could be defined for future reference. This is, again, not changing what we already do in PCSOT. It's just making it clear that when we are testing, we're not

Brecken Blades 18:22

Right.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 18:27

It's making two things clear. We're testing for things that are tied to dynamic risk, for example, in the maintenance tests. And it's also clear in the note that just because somebody makes a disclosure, it doesn't necessarily mean that that's going to raise their level of risk. It just depends on the individual.

Brecken Blades 18:45
Mhm.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 18:49
So it's trying to clarify that, you know, don't use polygraph and the outcome of the polygraph as a risk factor. You want to use the information. The information that's gathered regarding their behaviors are going to be far more important than the actual test outcome. I think a lot of people hang their hat too much on test outcomes and I don't think that's really what we should be doing.

Brecken Blades 19:13
Mhm.
No, I agree with you and I understand what you're saying. And I think I'm just making the distinction that like risk relevant as it pertains to what can be tested in a polygraph is behavioral. But if we're talking about what factors might be risk relevant, just like

Brecken Blades 19:33
in general overall, we might include fantasy or something that couldn't be tested on a polygraph. Does that make sense? I'm just wanting to make sure I understand how and where we're using this definition so that it's appropriate and that it fits anywhere that it might be included. Where I see that this has been included already is as a footnote in the updated drafts of the template for writing sex offender early termination responses and filings and the early termination considerations documents that were discussed at the last larger meeting.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 20:10
Well, this document that I have up now might make it a little more clear. I put a basic examination types with a grid so that you can kind of see. Can everybody see this?

Brecken Blades 20:21
No, but I think Ms. Krejci had a comment on what we were talking about still.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 20:24
Oh, I'm sorry.
Go ahead.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 20:29
Um, it, yeah.

Brecken Blades 20:40
I don't know if you're muted or we can't hear you.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 20:40
Can you?

Jenna Mitchell 20:46
It looks like she dropped the call for some reason. I don't know if she had bad connectivity or what's going on. Yeah.

Brecken Blades 20:51
Yeah, I see that.
Okay, thanks. Okay, Scott, then do you have a comment?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 20:58
Here she is.

SCOTT NAEGELE 20:59
I was just simply wondering if perhaps...
to make it clear that what Jim's talking about is for polygraph purposes. I almost wonder, Jim, if your little section that starts with the word note actually is the first paragraph and then the other one becomes the second paragraph. I wonder if that would lend itself to being clear about that.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 21:21
Sure, we can incorporate the two together if you'd like.

SCOTT NAEGELE 21:24
You know, I just...

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 21:24
Hopefully, the content is really what is the important thing at this point, if everybody agrees that that's making sense as to why we're using polygraph and how it ties to that dynamic risk or static risk. It's really intended to contribute to

SCOTT NAEGELE 21:28
What?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 21:44
treatment and supervision. It's not intended to be a standalone risk assessment. I think anybody that's in treatment realizes that. Unfortunately, I'm not sure the polygraph examiners do all the time, but they should. They really need to understand that this is just a tool.

Brecken Blades 21:50
Right.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 22:03
It is something that is contributing to treatment and supervision. And this, I'm not sure if you're seeing this or not. Are you seeing the basic, you're not seeing it? Okay, let me go ahead and share.

SCOTT NAEGELE 22:11
We're not.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 22:21
Standby.

Okay, let's share that. I may have to stop and then restart, so stand by.
There we go.

Brecken Blades 22:34
Okay.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 22:41
Here we go. This is what you want.
And, hopefully, you can see that now.

Brecken Blades 22:49
Yeah, yes, we can.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 22:51
OK, so on this.
Their contribute to their contribution to risk assessment, right? So, I put...
All the ones that we know, the types of exams that we know about with the exception of specific issue tests, which I probably should add to this, because a lot of jurisdictions do incorporate a specific issue, but we don't use it very often because we very rarely have a specific issue, maybe a single issue, but a specific issue would probably be limited to like the incident offense or some allegation or maybe something directly related to an event which makes it a specific issue. So that's probably a nomenclature issue that most people aren't aware of. But anyway, if you look here. On the two right columns, the treatment risk contribution and the risk assessment contribution rather, and the risk management contribution. So I've divided it into two categories, the risk assessment contribution and the risk management being on the probation side. And you can see here that
What it does, you know, helps clarify the offense behavior, for example, on the instant offense, accountability, victim characteristics, offense dynamics, treatment relevant patterns, and patterns of that denial or minimization may obscure, not necessarily cause higher risk, but it could be an impasse in treatment, but that's a treatment realm. Where the incident offense contributes to risk management may improve the understanding of victim access, walking in the park, offense circumstances, restrictions, supervising supervision planning and monitoring needs. So I've done this for each type of the test that there is. And I don't know if you want

me to read each one of these, but it should clarify a little bit maybe. Any questions of what kind of examples we would be testing or where the direction for the actual relevant targets that we're testing for in polygraph?

Brecken Blades 25:04
Mhm.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 25:04
Do you want me to read these out loud or do you just want me to submit it for disclosure to you guys?

Jenna Mitchell 25:10
And it may be helpful if you forward that to AZSOMB and we can distribute that to the subcommittee members.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 25:18
Okay, so I can get some highlights here, like for example, so sometimes the instant offense is not really, I mean, if a person will admit to the essence of the crime, they waive the instant offense and they move on, right? So for the matter of time and expense,

Brecken Blades 25:19
Yeah.
Yeah, highlights.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 25:38
But sometimes that's not really a great idea. That's really up to the treatment provider if there's an impasse in treatment. The incident offense investigator, or the IOI, that's the one where you can identify more depth of the offense behavior. So the frequency, the severity, level of force, coercion, that may help with treatment targets that are going to be identified. And if that can't be done from a treatment perspective, again, the information that we gather at the polygraph, not the test results, could be helpful for that end. It may also from a management point of view, identify behaviors. or victim access circumstances, warrant and collateral verification, further investigation or modification of supervision targets, can't walk at the park

anymore. A polygraph result alone does not establish an uncharged crime, of course. And we won't talk about the prior allegations. I'll just mention that I'm kind of an advocate for those because sometimes I've had history in the past where persons can't pass their sexual history because the examiners or the requested sexual history was trying to incorporate known with unknown things or victims. And that's not really good polygraph. So I would encourage the board to take a look at the prior allegations before we get into sexual history testing if it is advised by treatment. So especially if the person is not passing their sexual history.

The sexual history one and two, the one is more like hands-on victims, all minor victims, that kind of thing. That's static behavior history in the past. It generally is a fishing expedition. It's not based on allegations that we are aware of. So that's the unknown, right? Not the known.

Um...

Again, the frequency, victim characteristics, crossover patterns, onset, escalation of prior offending. This can materially refine baseline case information and identify treatment targets not apparent from the conviction record alone.

So I'm sure that most treatment providers who work with sex offenders realize that the sexual history is full of information that's helpful to them, getting a bigger picture of the individual they're treating.

From a risk management point of view in supervision in the community, it may reveal previous unknown victim access patterns, of course, and relevant to restrictions, collateral information, safety planning, and supervision intensity. Disclosures require appropriate legal and investigative handling, of course.

And of course, the difference between sexual history one and sexual history two, the two has to do with more paraphile behavior, sometimes referred to as nuisance crimes, where there may not be any hands-on victims per se, but there may be other behaviors, exposure, voyeurism, use of props, fetishism.

Fortaj, et cetera, et cetera.

And then, of course, we get into the maintenance, which is the ongoing dynamic stuff, right?

These are the periodic polygraphs that are done, provides information about dynamic change. So correct me if I'm wrong, treatment providers, but when you're doing case notes, you're kind of like 3 directions, right? You're either about the same as where we were at before, we're getting some improvement, they're doing more pro-social, they're starting to disclose more, it looks like it's...

being successful thus far, or there's a regression. So when we do that dynamic risk or those changes, we're trying to see and help those treatment providers to identify is there secrecy going on in this person with their partners, their behaviors, their access to materials. Or contact with minors. So it includes the concealment or non-compliance involving treatment rules and prohibited contracts or treatment guidelines. And the functions of ongoing risk management feedback may assist early detection so that we can be a little more proactive before the person goes off completely off the rails, and they're off to the races in their cycle.
So, these again, these are contributory to help treatment and probation to establish dynamic risk.
And we could talk about the sexual offense monitoring test. That's the one where at this point, we're testing on whether or not they've sexually re-offended, whether it's the adult rapist or the child molester. Those are a little bit retroactive, unfortunately. We can't do much about it if they respond. Usually it sends all kinds of red flags, a lot of chaos, a lot of alarms go off, we assume the worst. But without any actual collateral information, this can become sticky. But. You know, there's obviously going to be some significant concerns about any disclosures, if there are any. But keeping in mind that just because a person has significant responses to a single screening test, which this is, pertaining to any physical sexual contact with a minor since they've been on probation,
needs to be backed up with collateral information. And it may at least cause some concerns about their current risk. as well.
So. I don't know how much time you want me to do.

BB **Brecken Blades** 31:42
I mean, maybe another, like, you know, 5 or 10 minutes, or how long do you need to kind of to get through everything you had planned for us?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 31:47
Well, let me just go to the statement that I let me let me just go to the recommended policy statement here. I think this is hopefully

BB **Brecken Blades** 31:52
Okay.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 31:57

Going to be clear enough.

The PCSOT, and again, we're talking about post-conviction sex offender testing. That's what PCSOT means. PCSOT examinations assist risk assessment by developing and verifying behaviorally relevant information concerning offense accountability, historic sexual behavior, compliance with treatment and supervision requirements, and possible new sexual offending.

This information may enhance case formulation, treatment planning, supervision, decisions, and the identification of changing risk management needs. PCSOT information supplements and does not replace validated risk assessment instruments, clinical assessment, collateral information, behavioral observations, criminal history, supervision data, appropriate investigation, and of course, professional judgment. And that's why we rely so heavily on our treatment folks.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 32:50

And I think I'll end it there.

Brecken Blades 32:53

Okay. Okay, Katie, I see that you're back and you have your hand up. I'm assuming it's about the risk relevant definition. And so I will come back to you because we're going to have to get into that in the next documents. But Missy, if your question or comment is about this that Jim just presented, let's stay with that before we go backwards. So

Missy Musick 33:13

So there's two things. I think, Jim, the fact that even though they don't happen very often, I would encourage you to include specific issues in that. My second question, I've been out of this field for a few years.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 33:25

Absolutely.

Missy Musick 33:33

My confusion comes when you were talking about previous allegations versus sex

history, because I know those have been picked when I was doing this, previous allegations had been included in the sex history.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 33:52
Yeah.

Missy Musick 33:53
And, and so, why?
Why would we have two different polygraphs for that? Or is that just to pick up previous allegations if they're not?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 34:09
No, it's really about testing the known with the unknown. So the elephant in the room when we do a test is going to probably be those things that are known instead of the unknown. So if we're, if let's say Uncle Bob is the offender and Uncle Bob is accused and convicted of molesting the niece. Well, there was allegations that there were other nieces that were also touched, but they weren't investigated or they weren't at least charged. So what the temptation is, is that we try to put those allegations, those victims, in with the sexual history to identify all sexual minor or all sexual offending of minors. So if we were to separate the ones that we know were the family members' prior allegations from the sexual history, and then we can identify that fishing expedition that we do when we're trying to identify all the other minors. If a person is so...
their salience is going to be to the other nieces, right? And they're afraid that they're going to make disclosures and they can't make those disclosures because, you know, that could lead to, they're worried that they're going to be charged. They're going to be worried that it's how it's going to make them look in the family. It's going to affect their ongoing

Missy Musick 35:17
Mhm.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 35:32
supervision or their ability to reunify with the family down the road, that's the bigger, scarier issue for them being tested than testing them on unknown victims that they

may or may not have had. So the argument is that if we're testing unknown behaviors or unknown history with known history, then we're really kind of defeating the purpose of how we do testing. So you want to address the known issues first or the things that we know that are allegations before we go into the more exploratory have you ever.
Or is there any others?

Missy Musick 36:13
And I guess the main reason, like I like the best information we can get, I just know polygraphs are super expensive. And if you start piling on these polygraphs, that that can become very overwhelming.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 36:21
Yes. Of course. And again, I use the example of somebody who can pass a sexual history. So I'm, you know, somebody can't pass a sexual history. Is that going to be an impasse for treatment? I mean, I've seen this happen when I used to do it as well, where we would ad nauseum do these sexual histories. It's like, how many victims do we need to

Missy Musick 36:32
Yeah.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 36:45
to add up to before you say, okay, we get it. He's got a lot of victims. But if they can't, if they're going to place so much emphasis on getting a cleared sexual history, you have to kind of look at, well, did we identify the known issues before we went into this very convenient, let's put them all in one big sexual history. Let's try to identify all these historical victims and include those that we think or that have allegations against them, and we'll call it good. Well, if that works for the treatment program, fine, but don't be surprised if they can't pass their polygraph.
So, I'm just thinking that it should be an option when those exist.

Missy Musick 37:31
Okay.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 37:35
It's very effective in Idaho, by the way.

Brecken Blades 37:40
Thank you so much, Jim. Does anybody else have questions for Jim or comments? I know, Katie, am I correct in that yours is about the risk relevant, or did you have something about this document too?
Okay.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 38:01
You're correct. I don't know if you can hear me.

Brecken Blades 38:04
Okay, yeah, I heard you now. Thank you. Okay. Jim, thank you so much for putting this document together, for presenting for us. This is really helpful and informative about the different types of polygraphs and their purposes. And it's really very clear and I like the way it's organized. So thank you so much.
for doing that for us. So I really appreciate it.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 38:23
Would you like me to give this to Jenna to distribute?

Brecken Blades 38:27
Yes, please. That would be great.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 38:29
Do you want me to augment the definition of risk-relevant behaviors, or do you want to table that for now?

Brecken Blades 38:35
Well, I think we're about to go back to it, Jim.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 38:37
Oh, okay. Fair enough.

Brecken Blades 38:39
I think we're headed back. So, okay, so we're going to, thank you, Jim. And then we're going to go back to a old business item one, discussion and review of early termination of lifetime sex offender probation protocol, because I think that is where

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 38:45
Okay.

Brecken Blades 38:58
that document and then the template for writing the early termination responses or filings is where the definition of risk relevant, oh, there you go, you have it up, has been added as kind of a footnote. So, okay, go ahead, Katie. I know we lost you before, but.
I think we have you now, so...

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 39:21
Doing.

Brecken Blades 39:23
Yes.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 39:24
Okay, good. So my other comment was we used the acronym, the PCSOT that Mr. Hanratty was just explaining in the other document. I would just define that there in the early termination document. So we're not using an acronym for the first time and people don't know where it comes from.

Brecken Blades 39:44
Yeah, that's a great comment. Thank you. We can do that. Yeah, just spell it out instead of using the acronym for it.
So I think I like your suggestion, Scott, about just kind of flipping the order so that it says risk relevant behaviors, you know, for PCSOT purposes, the practical distinction, so that it's clear that in this document, risk relevant is referring to kind of polygraph specific and not like a not a global definition of what's risk relevant. I think that makes that clear because that's how it's being used here. But I don't know if this term

risk relevant might come up again later in a different document. And so I don't want to exclude or limit it to something that might be relevant later, you know, but isn't doesn't pertain as much to polygraph. Does that make sense? So.
I think that's great. And then if you have more comments on that, please, you know, speak up. Or the other piece that was added to this document was I just kind of shortened the explanation about the personal accountability piece that comes from the SOTIPS, and that was added here as a footnote.
And so this document then is just included kind of for our review before it goes back before the larger board, I believe probably at the next meeting to for them to, you know, vote on. So I don't know if anybody has any other questions or comments on that or, you know, modifications to this document while we have it.
In front of us.
No.
Okay. Okay. And so then similarly for the template for early termination responses, does anyone have any comments or edits, questions for that one?
Okay.
Okay, so I will then motion that we that we move this document forward to the larger board for their review with the discussed change that the note for the risk relevant definitions will be included at the beginning.
of the risk relevant definition in the footnote. Does anyone, do I have a second for that motion?

Jenna Mitchell 42:15
Chairwoman, this is Jenna. Before you do that, I think there was one other issue that the subcommittee may need to look at, and I think that was a question about the two years. I, yeah, thank you.

BB **Brecken Blades** 42:17
Ohh.
Oh, yeah.
You're right. Thank you for bringing that up. Okay.
Can you scroll to where that might be on this?

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 42:40
Item number 11 on the first document.

Brecken Blades 42:40
You see, I have that on 11.
No risk wellment emissions for the past two years to be able to take polygraphs.
Okay, well, let me just put it to you guys then. I mean, does anybody have questions on that or thoughts about it?
Comments.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 42:57
Can you restate the question? Sorry, I just want to make sure I'm actually responding to the question you're asking.

Brecken Blades 43:02
Yeah, yeah, well, so we are tabling the motion for now, and then we went back to on the Early termination considerations document item 11 says, has successfully passed or resolved all maintenance or specific issue polygraphs with no risk relevant admissions for the past two years if able to take polygraphs. So I think the question that kind of came up in the discussion of that was,
with regard to the two years, you know, and why, why is that there? How did we arrive at that? You know, so I don't.
So now I'm just wondering if anyone has thoughts on that. Comments, Jim, did you have something to share?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 43:46
No, I was just helping you move that up there. I wanted to, trying to see number 11.

Brecken Blades 43:50
Oh.
Yeah.
Missy.

Missy Musick 44:02
If maybe I'm remembering this incorrectly, the two years was more about is that post completion of treatment or does that include treatment time? I'm kind of remembering that that's where the conversation was more around.

Brecken Blades 44:25

Mhm.

Yeah, I know we had discussed that also in here in our subcommittee as far as kind of what the general, what is sometimes seen in practice versus what's written there. So yeah, if anybody has thoughts on any of it, anything related to the two years.

Well, you know, let's just kind of start a discussion about it. Yeah, Dr. Miller.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 44:53

So, help me.

place this document again. So this is early termination considerations for sex offenders to provide to probationers or to have the board stamp that the SOMB would support.

early termination if these issues were met.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 45:23

The second one was my understanding, so I'm glad you're asking.

Brecken Blades 45:27

Yeah, I think in some ways a combination of both a little bit. I do think what we talked about is that this is a document that I think will guide both probation officers and probationers. It could also be given to people who are on probation so that they're aware and that there's transparency in what the court and their officers are looking for to support a petition for termination.

I think in terms of our voting on it or approving, so to speak, the document would be not that we're saying in specific cases or that anybody who meets these should get it, but just that we agree that these are the factors that should be considered. These are the relevant factors in consideration for termination Does that make sense not that these are guaranteed

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 46:11

Yeah.

Brecken Blades 46:12

or even that these are the only ones. I mean, and we've talked about, you know, these can be kind of living documents in the sense that we modify them at some

point, but that at least as a starting point, you know, and reflective of kind of what is being done in practice that, because I think they're using either this document or one a lot like it kind of generally.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 46:30
Yeah.
I mean, you know, I know we talked about this at a previous meeting. I do think there's utility in someone passing polygraphs after treatment completion because they don't have that weekly accountability or check-in with a treatment provider. And so doing, you know, being successful on probation after treatment,

Brecken Blades 46:33
Currently.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 46:53
think is the cherry on top that would make their case even stronger. I think not clarifying it also allows the probationer to use this to their benefit when they've passed polygraphs for two years and everything else is met. So, you know, I know there would.
There's probably going to be a conversation about wanting to pin this down as to when the two year starts. I think it's fine the way it is because it provides latitude for all parties.

Brecken Blades 47:28
Mhm.
Yeah, I agree. And I think to some extent, that's where we landed. I think partly, I guess, so I wasn't part of the creation of this document. So I can't say with certainty why they landed on two years. I'm not aware of unless you guys are maybe, any research that specifically states that in some way two years is kind of a, you know, a hard and fast rule. But maybe somebody does. Blake, do you have a comment on it?

Blake 48:05
So I was literally just looking that up to see if there was any evidence or empirical data. And there isn't. There isn't anything that significantly demonstrates a better

outcome at two years than there is at 12 months or 18 months. I think that to Dr. Miller's point, it's

Brecken Blades 48:08
Oh, great.
Yeah.
Okay.

Blake 48:26
good to have those two past polygraphs. But when we say two years post-treatment, some of these guys are taking a polygraph a month after they finish treatment, and other people are taking them nine months after they finish treatment. So this two years may not be a very good full view for people based off of when they're scheduled to take their polygraphs, because my understanding is if you've passed a maintenance polygraph, you don't take another one for a full year, and so...

Brecken Blades 48:54
Mhm.

Blake 48:57
If you finish treatment and you take one, you know, a year after that, if it's to have two full years of post-treatment and two polygraphs, it may be more than two years for some people. And so we have to, you know, keep that in.

Brecken Blades 49:12
Right.

Blake 49:17
in the back of our minds as well, because we don't want that to be an arguing point. So it basically just says, you know, in what I just read, there's no empirical data. There's been a whole bunch of different studies on recidivism, and there's nothing that specifically states that two years is better than 12 or 18 months or three years.

Brecken Blades 49:21
Mm.

Right. The two years. Yeah.
Yeah.

Blake 49:37
So...
Maybe what we need to do, because we can't necessarily say as determined by this study, right, because we don't have that.
Maybe we take out the two years and change it to...
At least one.
past maintenance polygraph post-treatment.
Jim, you're shaking your head no. So I don't know. I'm just spit balling because I don't know for sure. But what would be the best way to get a clear view, you know, 365 days after they're not in treatment anymore, doing a polygraph to understand how they've done for that full year?

Brecken Blades 50:09
Yeah.
Mmh.
Okay, yeah, thank you. Jim, what do you want to add here?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 50:31
Well, I think the whole idea of saying two years was more about having two successful maintenance polygraphs, which shows the pattern that that was the minimum pattern. They've had two annuals in a perfect world.
maintenance polygraphs that showed no significant responses and no risk relevant behavior in their admissions. So again, it shows that trajectory of progress, or at least no regression.
So that put them on a better footing to suggest that they could ask for termination.
So I think the two years, you're right, there is nothing that says two years is the is the magic number. Maybe a more general definition of consistent, you know, using words like consistent at the discretion of the court. I don't know.
Whatever that consistency is, but two, I think, was 2 annuals was kind of what showed, you know, if you want to try to predict a tangent line, you got to have two points, right? So you have two annual tests that show that there is no issues. So that's a better footing.

Brecken Blades 51:47
Mhm.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 51:48
I think that's where it came from. I don't know where the two years came from, but I'm assuming it had to do with having two successful annual maintenance polygraphs because the idea is that those folks that aren't in treatment anymore are likely going to have to do maintenance tests annually in a perfect world.

Brecken Blades 51:52
Yeah.
Mhm.
Right, that was their, that was their suggested time frame for demonstrating sustained progress, the maintenance of that progress. And yeah, as we're saying, it's not necessarily a hard and fast number in research, but it is, you know, it does demonstrate some ability to maintain without relapsing. So yeah, Amanda.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 52:28
I would just suggest that our wording in number 9 and number 11 be similar. If we're saying there's a certain amount of time to pass the poly, maybe also a certain amount of time to have her paraphilias, right? I don't know if we want to make it both significant period or make it both two years, but I think they should probably match if we're looking for like timelines and to not be vague.

Brecken Blades 52:39
Mm.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 52:48
People are, I think the vague timeline is some of the frustration for the probationers.

Brecken Blades 52:54
Mhm, mhm.
Yeah, I see what you're saying. Go ahead.

Sheridyn Miller PsyD 53:01

I would hope so that for #9, that their paraphilic behaviors or any deviances would have been under control for more, for more time than two years, hopefully throughout the duration of their probation. Because if, yeah, if we're not managing those, we have bigger problems.

Brecken Blades 53:23
Yeah, I think that's probably the reason they don't match is that we have probably a different expectation for, you know, yeah, demonstration of their paraphilic behaviors or deviant sexual interest being under control or, you know, not acted upon versus maybe more of an allowance for if somebody feel the polygraph related to like, you know, using Instagram or something is not necessarily like we have a different standard of what's allowable for those, I think. But I see what you're saying. And it is, I think anytime you use a term like considerable or a significant period of time, it leaves it up to the discretion of whoever is.
You know reading the document and that can get murky. I totally agree with you. Okay, anybody else thoughts about this or about number 11? It seems like.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 54:18
I have a statement I'd like to make. The guidelines are just providing a minimum, right? I mean, so whenever it comes to measuring of time or content, you're either going to have to use years or you're going to use the significant period of time, whatever that means.

Brecken Blades 54:18
Oh, okay, go ahead. Yes.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 54:37
How can we make a guideline that just gives the minimum of what could be required and not really expect it to be like written in stone that it has to be this? So maybe a more general definition or suggestion or guideline might be appropriate. These are only suggested minimums, right?

Brecken Blades 55:05
Yes, yeah, minimums, I guess. I mean, these are just things that will be taken into consideration when someone is petitioning to early terminate and whether or not,

yeah, they've met, I guess you would be right, probably that these minimum criteria, although there's, I think, there's probably a case to be made where maybe someone doesn't have two years of...
polygraphs, but they're petitioning and it's still considered. And you know, so these are not, and I guess they're not necessarily minimums, they're guidelines. And somebody could go, you know, above or below them potentially. Yes, Miss Krejci.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 55:43
I just wanted to go back to, I think Mr. Blake Barney said about that there is no research to support the two years, that like research tells us really we're no different a year out versus two years out, that why would we continue to say two years then if there's not research to support that we're going to have something different

BB **Brecken Blades** 55:51
Mhm.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 56:04
two years, especially if we're looking at like, ultimately it's up to the judge that has the discretion whether or not to early terminate someone. And if these are like kind of the minimum considerations, if there's not research to support that two years, why are we continuing to include the two years?

BB **Brecken Blades** 56:24
Yeah, it's a great question and a good point. I think that's kind of what we're trying to figure out and discuss is I read this one and the intent of this item to be that we What we're hoping for or what probation is looking for is for someone to have to not like...
fail a polygraph and then petition the court the next day, because it probably does them a disservice because it more than likely maybe wouldn't be supported by their officer. And then also, I think we're hoping that someone who is ready to early terminate has demonstrated, you know, kind of some stability in their behavior. So I think if you have a suggestion about wording that that maybe kind of speaks to that sustained or that maintenance piece without using the two-year guideline.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 57:13

How about no unresolved polygraphs?
Period.
instead of limiting it to, you know, because there may be an old sexual history that was never resolved, let's say. Maybe they need to, maybe they feel necessary that that has to be resolved. So just instead of putting a two-year time limit on it, how about just changing it to, you know, instead of successfully passing, not having any unresolved?

BB **Brecken Blades** 57:19
Hmm.
Mhm.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 57:39
maintenance or specific issue polygraph.

BB **Brecken Blades** 57:42
I see. So just taking it out almost at the place where it says 4. So just now it says has successfully passed or resolved all maintenance or specific issue polygraphs with no risk relevant admissions period.
Basically, is what you're saying.
Okay.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 57:57
Correct.

BB **Brecken Blades** 57:59
Okay. I don't know who was first, Blake or Sheridyn.
Katie again. Blake, go ahead.

B **Blake** 58:09
I think Dr. Miller beat me, but I was just going to say, I think that real quick, the bigger issue here is the risk level of the person who's attempting to get off of probation, right? So if they were high risk versus low risk, how long they've been on probation, if they did maintenance treatment, all those different things,
are going to be factors. And so I agree with Jim that, you know, the two years thing is

going to be so arguable in court, likely by an attorney that would say, well, you know, yes, you've been doing really well. You're completely stable. You have a wife and kids and you have a good job and you own your own home.
but we're still going to make you do two years because that's what the guidelines are. I think that that's muddy waters, especially for us as a board. So the unresolved makes more sense because then we're looking at risk and everything else included. And I also don't know if we can, like, do a footnote and then have something in the footnote that based off of the offender's risk level, any unresolved polygraphs, that kind of stuff. If we could do that, so it's not in the body of it, but it's as a footnote.

BB **Brecken Blades** 59:28
Okay. Yeah. Go ahead, Dr. Miller. What were you going to say?

SP **Sheridyn Miller PsyD** 59:37
I mean, I know this conversation is going to be circular regarding how we want to pin this down. If, I mean, I do think there's utility again in there being polygraphs post treatment that are passed. If we want to take out the two years.
I don't know if we would want to include language about post-treatment polygraphs to make that more of a notion that post-treatment polygraphs would be more meaningful regarding assistance. And then separately, I recall there being something about the STABLE and a two-year time frame.
So I'm trying to look up that research to see if maybe that's related. It could be purely random. But something about the stable in a two-year time frame, not regarding ever lived with a lover, something separate to see if that piece might apply. Yeah, I'm in favor of post treatment polygraphs being passed. Two would be a pattern, one might be a one-off. But we can make it vague, if everyone thinks so, to make it easy on all parties.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:01:00
Okay, Katie, do you have another comment?

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:01:05
I have a sort of a question. I, you know, I think you guys know the research better than I do about whether or not there's something to support the two years. If we change the language like Mr. Hanratty suggested about just resolved all of the

polygraphs, sometimes I see where someone has like, like six years ago and unresolved maintenance and they did a monitoring instead, would that be considered?
like resolving that. Otherwise, because probation at least says, and I don't know if this is true or not, I'm not a polygrapher, probation will say like, oh, we can't go back and resolve like an old maintenance because too much time has passed. And so that's why we did a monitoring instead. Like there was a lot of issues during like COVID and.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:01:47
Yeah.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:01:47
people's polygraphs and things like that. And like whether or not there was like time to go back and resolve some things. So I don't know if that's true or not. So, especially when we're talking about something so old, but I do also really like Mr. Barney suggested of like footnoting and talking about risk level, because I don't know if that's really talked about otherwise in the consideration the considerations.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:02:10
Mhm.
Yeah, I like the footnote idea too. I think as you're saying that, I wonder if part of the two years piece was around what you're saying, like the amount of time, and you can correct me, Jim, but I think, you know, there's certainly a limited amount of time with which you can retake the same polygraph test and is it two years or is it 18 months maybe or am I totally off but maybe that's part of how they.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:02:40
No, it's really kind of a conjecture because two years based on memory studies, two years really for pulling details, memories fading after two years, and based on other studies about memory, it's that's where polygraph kind of generally says, you know, don't really go beyond two years when you're doing the maintenance.
But to Katie's statement, sometimes it's better to resolve that test by doing a monitoring test to at least clarify that there are no other victims out there and that no matter how far off the rails the person went, they didn't actually actually re-

offend.
The bottom line is if the treatment provider and the probation officer say it's resolved with that monitoring test, and so be it, it's resolved. To try to go back six years like she suggested to resolve the test, that would be really not really a great polygraph. I would not support that. That would
You can't really defend that. So I wasn't trying to suggest that having any unresolved tests would be an impasse for them to get off probation. But really, it's going to be a determining factor by treatment and probation that they're both supporting the idea of this person getting off termination, you know, terminating early, and that

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:03:41
Yeah.
I hear you.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:04:00
any unresolved polygraphs were resolved at some level, either by admissions or by additional testing. So, and if that includes monitoring, so be it. But it's really up to them. They're the ones that are going to present it to the courts. Does that make sense?

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:04:17
Yeah, it makes a lot of sense. And I, but yeah, I think I think it does. I think to her point, we want to make sure that we don't write it in such a way that that people can get.
like that everyone has your definition of what means resolved and that we don't get hung up where somebody says like, well, you took this very first polygraph and it's never been technically like resolved. So there's no chance, like we don't certainly don't want to create that situation because that's not our intent here, obviously either.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:04:42
Well, well, yes, but a person's not going to be on a maintenance program without having the sexual history resolved. Typically, I mean, there may be some obscure cases where that's not the case. I can think of a couple off the top of my head. But

generally speaking, if a person is going to be, you know, getting early termination or petitioning into court to do so, they've gone through that process.

Brecken Blades 1:04:55
Right.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:05:05
they have graduated treatment. So the treatment provider is basically said at that point, there is no unresolved issues or they just let it go, which I don't think that would happen. But I mean, that's always a possibility. So we have to assume that a maintenance, the reason why it was written this way was because these people are on the maintenance program. They're already out of treatment.

Brecken Blades 1:05:08
Mhm.
Mhm.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:05:27
And only probation is asking for these maintenance polygraphs, so...
Again, I would just emphasize that there isn't any unresolved polygraphs. I don't know if we need a time frame, but if they're not in treatment and they don't have any unresolved polygraphs, I think it should be kind of self-explanatory. It's really at that point, the only advocate they're going to have is going to be their probation officer because they're not in treatment anymore.

Brecken Blades 1:05:55
Mhm.
Yeah, just as long as everybody is in agreement with, I think less likely with the sex history, even more likely with a maintenance polygraph if, you know, the time passes or someone doesn't take it or they take specific issues or something instead. And then are we in agreement that that maintenance has been resolved by that, you know, just making sure, I don't know, Amanda.
You've been waiting.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:06:17

I just wanted to mention the research that Dr. Sheridyn was speaking about was that Dr. Carl Hansen, the high risk sex offenders may not be high risk forever. And then reductions in risk on lifetime offense free in the community, once an offender, not always an offender. And they say it's like three to five years is a steep decrease in about 50%.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:06:21
No.

AA **Amanda Adkins ADCRR** 1:06:36
Less chance at five years, but I think you mentioned to you, yeah.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:06:39
At 5 years.
Yeah.
Yeah, you're right, starts to cut in half, but I don't think we want to say five years. It just, it...

AA **Amanda Adkins ADCRR** 1:06:51
It does say that it decreases significantly every year.

B **Blake** 1:06:52
But that's not specific.

AA **Amanda Adkins ADCRR** 1:06:55
Sorry, go ahead.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:06:55
Decreases more every year. Yeah.

B **Blake** 1:06:55
So, so yes, Amanda, that that's accurate, but it doesn't say post-treatment.
Right. So if he does, if he does nine years in prison, technically his risk is decreasing over the number of years since he's been able to do anything. And then he gets into

treatment and he's in treatment for three years and then he finishes like, yes, it is absolutely a factor in reducing risk.

Brecken Blades 1:07:16
Mm.

Blake 1:07:23
But we are not saying post-treatment, five years later, their risk is significantly lower. Right, so...

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:07:31
So he does mention offense free in the community each year decreases, but you're right, it doesn't address treatment.

Brecken Blades 1:07:34
Yeah.
But time incarcerated does not count. It's offense free in the community. So it would start once someone is released on probation. And then if they're on it for those three years, like you said, that would count, you know, in their favor, but they would, we would not count the nine years of incarceration. That would change their age score on the static as the time age at release of their index offense, if that's what they were in for. And so in that sense,
would have an impact on their risk level, but it wouldn't be, it wouldn't factor into this calculation of that she's talking about the time in the community offense free. That's the thing, they have to have the, they have to have the opportunity to commit offenses and not do it.

Blake 1:08:15
Right. Yeah. Yeah. I yeah, I misspoke on the the incarceration thing, but you're right, the number of years. So we have to.

Brecken Blades 1:08:16
That's what it is, yeah.
Yeah.
Yeah, but it doesn't it doesn't have to be post-treatment to your point per se.

Blake 1:08:27
Right, so we have to look at that as an argument point as well from the legal side.

Brecken Blades 1:08:29
Yeah.
Yeah, for sure. Yeah, Scott.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:08:35
So I can't speak with absolute certainty about this because it's at least 15 years ago, perhaps more. But the first iteration of these guidelines that were created were created by a fairly small group of people, four or five, as I recall. I was one of them. John Tennant, who is now a retired probation officer, was another.
the then judge who was overseeing sex offense cases at that time, and one other person, though I can't remember who that was. The discussion around this time thing, quite frankly, might have just simply been a year's not enough. And then the discussion went to two years. This has been repeated, I think, over and over in the in the modified iterations of this that have evolved across the last, you know, however many years. But you also need to remember that way back when, when the guidelines were first created, the one I'm talking about, nobody was being released from treatment. Everybody was being kept on treatment. This release from treatment stuff only happened in more recent times.
Um, so, so...
Those things have to be recalled in terms of the historical reference points here.
Yeah, you know, I think it could be as simple as us agreeing that a year wasn't enough time for somebody to, you know, be at the maintenance level of treatment, but they needed, you know, more time than that, and we land on two years.
And then two years becomes more meaningful once somebody has been successfully discharged from treatment. It comes a slightly different discussion because, as I said, people weren't getting released from treatment at all way back when the first discussion of these criteria took place. I, you know,
From my standpoint, the stability is the issue. And that's demonstrated by consistency. And whether that means 2 maintenance polygraphs post, you know, successful discharge from treatment, I could live with that being the definition.
It certainly brings some standardization to the discussion and probably less debate,

ongoing debate about it if we were to choose to do that. But I thought those things were important. I was hesitant in talking about where I think this came from, because frankly, I think it came from a long ways back and I don't think it
was anchored in anything remotely scientific other than to say a year is not enough time that they've been at the maintenance level of treatment before they're petitioning to get off of probation.

Brecken Blades 1:11:16
Yeah, no, that's really helpful. Thank you. Okay, so kind of to, I guess, bring the discussion around or maybe to a conclusion even, I think the options before us are what we've kind of talked over are to just leave it as it is and let there be some discretion in terms of whether the two years are post-treatment or
pre-treatment graduation or, you know, and that the two years is just a suggested timeline in terms of demonstrating stability in terms of positive change. Another suggestion before us is to remove the end of the sentence and so put a period after admissions. And so it's just you know, at any point, you know, that throughout their time on probation, they've resolved in whatever manner that might be all of their polygraphs.
I think those are the main suggestions ahead of us. I think Blake also suggested, perhaps if we modify it to remove the two years that we add a footnote that then discusses maybe the person's risk or maybe says, you know, suggested would be two consecutive maintenance polygraphs or something to kind of clarify what we mean by this. So I don't know if I missed an option or if I did, let me know or also, you know, kind of let me know where everyone's landing on this so we can send it back through to the larger board with our suggestions.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:12:56
After all that discussion, I kind of like it the way it is.

Brecken Blades 1:12:59
Yeah.
Full circle.
Okay.
Any other thoughts on it?

Blake 1:13:14
I think that not making it so concrete, because if we have it right in the recommendations, it is going to be viewed by some as concrete. It is 2 years. And so I think that the footnote adding some additional information based off of risk, consistency, you know, the person's previous admissions, and it doesn't have to be that in-depth, but something that at least recognizes those things goes into the number of maintenance polygraphs that have to be passed post-treatment. And maybe that's one of the things we could add is just saying at least one maintenance polygraph, pass maintenance polygraph post-treatment.

Missy Musick 1:14:14
Not more than or not less than six, nine months after a post-treatment.
Does that make sense?

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:14:22
My vote for it is the period after admissions with Blake's footnote.

Brecken Blades 1:14:34
Seems frozen. Yeah, I think what I think what Blake is suggesting is, yeah, period after admissions and then in the footnote, I guess what I'm getting out of what he's saying or kind of what we're discussing is that then the footnote says something like, you know, that the there's successful passing or resolution of all maintenance. polygraphs at least within the past two years and suggested or recommended one of those be or one or more whatever be post-treatment graduation. And so to kind of clarify.

Blake 1:15:07
Yeah, yeah.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:15:08
Yep, that's my vote.

Brecken Blades 1:15:11
what we're saying and that those are just a suggestion and not a hard and fast.

Okay, do we feel comfortable that...
that everyone would be on the same page or in agreement by everyone, I mean probation and, you know, everyone involved that a maintenance polygraph could be resolved. Maybe that needs to go into a footnote and maybe Jim, you could help with that. But that what would be the definition of resolved, if that makes sense, so that people, someone doesn't have a...kind of like Katie was bringing up, someone doesn't have a maintenance polygraph that's kind of old, and then they change probation officers and it never gets redone, and then they pass that time frame, and so they resolve it in another way, but it's not in the obvious way of like immediately retaking it with the same examiner and the same questions. And you know what I mean? Like that we have a broader definition, I guess, of.
Resolved. so that someone doesn't get hung up by that.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:16:10
Resolved is.
gracious. It's generous, if you catch my drift. I mean, resolve really is going to be a professional judgment resolution. That's where that professional judgment comes into play. So if we're going to try to know it all and get it all and be completely square and everything closes tight,
It may not be really practical or really something we can do with polygraph with human beings on probation, but resolved really is meant to be.
open for professional judgment. And that's all I would say about that.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:16:56
Okay.
Okay, so you're saying there isn't a great definition of resolved.
Earlier you had said something like resolved.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:17:05
There isn't a great definition of resolve because resolved is if you're doing a maintenance test and you were not doing successful hurdles, you have to assume that the maintenance test that they did not pass or they had admissions to is only going to be addressed to maybe one or two things and not the other one or two things that they were tested for.
So what's unresolved? The ones that they didn't retest or the ones that they didn't

parse out of that test to do a successive hurdles more specific issue test. And that's the problem with screening tests. Just because you use three issues and one's only reactive doesn't mean that they've passed the other two. So unresolved could mean a lot of different things, but resolved to the satisfaction of treatment and probation is really kind of more probably.
Tangible.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 1:18:00
I think that's your definition, what you just said, Jim.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:18:04
Yeah.
Okay.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 1:18:08
This is Scott. That's my two cents. I think how you articulated it right there at the end is the definition of resolve, because choices were made based on knowledge of the case and importance of the issues that we addressed, the ones that we thought had the most concern.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:18:08
Does that make sense?

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 1:18:27
and the client did in fact resolve those issues.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:18:33
So help me out here. What did I just say? That was great.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:18:37
I know, you're like, I've blacked out. I don't know. Okay, so what about something like resolved to the satisfaction of the treatment provider and probation officer or probation department by or via admission or additional testing?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:18:53
That sounds good.

Brecken Blades 1:18:58
Does that work? Okay. And then we're also saying in the footnote that we're suggesting that it's, you know, for, or I guess this would also maybe take care of some of those really old ones, is that the suggestion would be that it's at least the last two years of past or resolved maintenances. And so then that way, if there's some 10 years ago, something that we've got in there that it.
You know, it's...
The last two years have passed and resolved, right? And at least one of those being post-treatment. Or am I off on that? How would you guys modify that?
It sounds fine. Yeah, okay.
Okay.
Okay, so then are we ready, I guess, for a motion to, with the edits that as we've discussed, forward this back to the larger board for their review and voting?
Yes. Okay.
Okay, can I make that motion, Jenna, or do I need to have somebody else make the motion?

Jenna Mitchell 1:20:02
I believe you can make the motion, but correct me. My recollection at the board meeting was they accepted it. It was approved with the changes, adding the definition in the footnote.
Is that not correct? Like the board already adopted this. They just wanted the subcommittee to add the footnotes for those two items or provide the definitions. And then there was a question about the two years.

Brecken Blades 1:20:26
Oh, you might be right.
Okay, so...

Jenna Mitchell 1:20:33
Whatever. I'm not sure. I don't think it would hurt for you to make a motion to adopt

the changes, the footnotes that have been added, because those are the only changes you're making, correct?

Brecken Blades 1:20:43
Right, yeah, but we don't have to.

Jenna Mitchell 1:20:43
To the original document.

Brecken Blades 1:20:48
We are saying it probably doesn't have to go through a vote again at the board meeting.

Jenna Mitchell 1:20:53
No, I think you would just, and then I think that's why it's not on the agenda as old business, because it was adopted. So I think that you would just present it in the subcommittee updates that you have added those footnotes and we can distribute it to everyone with that information in it.

Brecken Blades 1:21:06
Okay, added the footnotes and then updated that item 11, so it's more clear. Okay. Okay, well, then I guess I will, my motion will be that we, as the subcommittee, adopt this document with the changes, as we've discussed here to the footnotes and item

Jenna Mitchell 1:21:12
Yeah, yeah.

Brecken Blades 1:21:25
11 and then we would need a second.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:21:29
Scott Naegele, I second.

Missy Musick 1:21:29
I second at that motion.

Brecken Blades 1:21:33
Okay, do we need to do a roll call vote, Major Mitchell, or can we just do a all in favor?

Jenna Mitchell 1:21:42
You can do an all in favor and then if anyone opposes it, we'll just note for the record who opposed.

Brecken Blades 1:21:48
Okay. Okay. All in favor say aye.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:21:51
Aye. Aye.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:21:52
Aye.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:21:52
Aye.

Missy Musick 1:21:52
Aye.

Brecken Blades 1:21:54
Okay, any opposed?
Anyone abstaining?
Okay, so the motion carries, so we, I will make the changes to the document and then send send it back to you or actually.
Well, I'll just e-mail you, Major Mitchell, about how to get the edits made to the document. Okay.
Well, we are 7 minutes away from being done. So we did do that.
So the last two...
Well, three, two or three items. So Beth gave us a document, the CMT Teams model, which I know I think she made some comments on. And then I also saw that Karolyn,

you made some comments on as well.
I don't think we're going to have time to go all the way through that document in our last 7 minutes. And then the other documents were one that I created about the proposed definition of a sex offender and...
And then edits based on that that kind of proposal and initial guidelines for evaluations piece that we sent through the board last time.
I don't know, Major Mitchell, I guess, do you have a suggestion about what to do? Do I just motion to kind of table those until our next meeting or would I, would we send them to the larger board or, I don't know, Blake, do you have a comment?

Blake 1:23:42
Oh, I was just going to suggest that we go over the changes that you made to the document. I don't know if everybody had the opportunity to go through them since we received them last night, but that to me seems like a easier item to, you know, go through and say, it looks good. I appreciate the changes that you made.

Brecken Blades 1:23:53
Yeah.

Blake 1:24:02
which is my exact comments. And then we can move forward with it and not have three different things tabled for our next meeting because we're already at our time limit. So that's my thought.

Brecken Blades 1:24:14
Yeah. Okay. Karolyn.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:24:19
Yes, I don't have a problem either going through the suggested changes because I did have a number of them on the model or tabling that. I did want to make a quick comment on the definition of sex offender that I think people will need time to.

Brecken Blades 1:24:37
Okay.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:24:39
to think about or not. And given a choice between the two, I'd rather tackle the definition of the sex offender.

Brecken Blades 1:24:41
Mhm.
Okay.
Yeah, we can start with that. I mean, it's short. So I will, I guess, to put some background for that. This is, I am obviously not an attorney, as we know, and that is my, this is just me taking an initial stab at it. And then I put other statements, you know, on there for consideration.
given that those were included in the definitions of other states or and then at the very end is just the full definition copied on there of Colorado's definition for reference.
so that we can see what another state is doing with their definition. But also, I'm also open to, you know, if I'm totally off and as an attorney or you're like, hey, this is so wrong, then I would be glad for someone else to take a stab at doing it, honestly.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:25:36
So this is 133821A. This is the list of people who have to register as sex offenders. It's one subsection of that portion of that statute.

Brecken Blades 1:25:43
Mhm.
Right.
Mhm.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:25:55
Um...
I would suggest, if that is what this committee wants to go with, is, you know...
We consider a sex offender as a person who's required to register under the statute to go with something as simple as that. Because this statute changes regularly, and especially as new laws are added, you know, such as child sex trafficking, things like that.

Brecken Blades 1:26:10
Mhm.
Mm.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:26:25
And if we keep a definition simple like that and tie it to the registration requirement, then we don't have to update our guidelines every time the law changes. I didn't know what the intent of the subcommittee was.

Brecken Blades 1:26:36
Mhm.
Okay.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:26:45
If that's what you want to go with is it's just a person required to register that.
It is, it doesn't take into consideration probation status. It doesn't take into consideration how old the offenses were, that we're just straight up defining a sex offender as a person who has to register as a sex offender.

Brecken Blades 1:27:11
Yeah, I guess I would say that's not necessarily my intent. I think probably it has more to do with the first piece about their convictions. And so, like I said, I'm not, I'm not an attorney. And so I, as I'm going through it and I'm looking at different places where things are listed, but I don't, I didn't, I don't know for sure that this encompasses all of the appropriate sex offenses or by statute or that the subcommittee stands behind this in any way, I would really, I think this is probably the definition is a place where.
we would really benefit from some legal expertise. We can put some clinical pieces in there, but in terms of... you know, making it an appropriate legal definition. So I also, in one of the considerations for inclusion, put, you know, for the purposes of this document, sexual offenses are identified in ARS, you know, xxx instead of listing out all the offenses. So sort of like you're speaking at that, it doesn't have to be a list. That was just one of the ways that it was done as I researched it. And so I put that, but as also as just a sample. And if you're like, hey, that's not the appropriate statute,

let's use this one and this one or just this one, then we can just modify it. I just wanted to get the discussion going about it.

KK **Karolyn Kaczorowski** 1:28:20
Well...
If you guys tell me who you want our guidelines to cover, who you want to define as a sex offender for the purposes of these guidelines, I can get something to you. I can get language to you. But I just need to know who you want included.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:28:35
Yeah.
Hey, Jim.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:28:47
Karolyn, the way that this is put together, it's modeling the Colorado version, correct?

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:28:54
I put this together, Jim. She didn't. Yeah. So that's why. That's the reason it looks like it does. I think if Karolyn did it, it would probably look a lot more official and appropriate, but this is me. No, you're fine.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:28:56
Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. So you modeled Colorado. You modeled Colorado.
Sorry, sorry, my mistake, my mistake. But Dr. Blades, you'd model Colorado. I mean, this is how they do it in Colorado, right? This is how they kind of define it.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:29:17
Yeah, the other one I looked at, well, Colorado's is there for you on the bottom for reference. And then I also looked at Tennessee, and I don't know if there was others, but I looked at a few of them to see what other states had a definition. But the way that Colorado's is included in their guidelines documents is exactly there at the bottom of page two in the

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:29:22
Mhm.

Brecken Blades 1:29:39
Top of page or no page, well, the first page of it, but page two labeled.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:29:44
So, what Karolyn is suggesting is specific offenses.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:29:49
No. What I'm suggesting is you tell me who you want these guidelines to apply to. Do you want it to apply to only people convicted of sexual offenses? Do you want it to apply to people who have to register as sex offender, regardless

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:29:49
Just parse it out.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:30:09
of their probation status? Do you want it to apply to anybody who is on any type of community supervision? And oh, by the way, I want to sideline there. You guys have to take parole out of your language here. Arizona did away with parole. It is community supervision or some other type of supervision.
There is no parole in Arizona. But do you want it to apply to people who are only in treatment? You know, so just, or a combination of all those, just tell me who you want it to apply to and I will draft language for you.

Brecken Blades 1:30:46
Okay, that's really helpful. I appreciate that. My sense is that the intent is for it to apply to anyone convicted of a sexual offense. That's my understanding, but I'll let everyone else weigh in. Some are nodding. Blake, do you have your hand up?

Blake 1:31:03
Yeah, I was just going to say, if we use the ARS specific to those who have to register, then there's going to be an argument for those guys that don't have to register that they're not qualified as a sex offender, when in reality, if they're convicted of a sex offender under our definition, then it's not whether they register or not. It's if they've been convicted of a sexual offense.

Brecken Blades 1:31:14
Right.

Blake 1:31:25
So, Karolyn, to your point, I think that if we're going to be all inclusive, we have to be all inclusive for those that are on community service, for those that are registered, for those who are not registered. Because if not, there's going to be a lot of gray area that's going to be argued.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:31:45
Okay, so anyone convicted of a sexual offense regardless of registration requirement, regardless of supervision status,

Brecken Blades 1:31:46
Yeah.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:31:46
And I just want to add.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:31:56
The other thing is, is this, the proposed one specifically said an adult person, which is different than the statute, and the Colorado one did reference juveniles. Do we only want, okay, first of all, we are the adult subcommittee, so are we only making recommendations for people who are currently adults?
That's question one. Question 2 is, are we addressing people who are currently adults who are adjudicated delinquent as juveniles?

Brecken Blades 1:32:33
I don't know where the line would be, Scott. Also, you guys, I'm going to have to stop us in like 3 minutes probably. Scott, where is the line between what would be considered a juvenile? Because I know, I mean, just generally speaking, you're right, Karolyn, we're the adult subcommittee, so it's only adults in terms of adjudicated delinquent and I don't know the line there. Scott, do you have an idea about that, where that would cross into the adult system?

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:32:54
Yeah.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:32:59
Yeah, so my initial thought is that it wouldn't include those that are adjudicated delinquent and are being supervised or overseen by those in the juvenile probation systems. We could have a debate about whether or not that includes the juveniles who've been transferred to adult court. But I would want to think that through before I made any definitive statement from my perspective. But I don't think, but I feel pretty solid in saying I do not think it includes those that are adjudicated delinquent in the juvenile court system.

Brecken Blades 1:33:40
Okay.
Okay, I'm comfortable with that.

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:33:43
That is a good starting point for me. I will draft something up. I will send it to you along with possibilities for those juveniles so that you can look at it and we can discuss it next time.

Brecken Blades 1:33:55
Thank you so much, Karolyn. And I guess apologies to you and to everyone for my really poor attempt at this, but I guess it served its purpose of starting our discussion. So thank you for your help. It's much appreciated. And then, yeah, Blake, I hear you about this other draft. Thank you for making a comment on it. The reason I didn't start with that one is because there are some

Karolyn Kaczorowski 1:33:57
No worries.
No, it was a good, good attempt.

Brecken Blades 1:34:17
I made some changes and then I also just posed some of the questions that we were

asked at the last meeting. And I think those will probably, I have some thoughts on them, but I think they'll probably generate more discussion. So I think then at this point, I guess I'll have to make a motion maybe to table the.
discussion of standards and the evaluation protocol and the CMT team's model for our next meeting, or potentially the CMT meeting to the larger board meeting, if that's where that ends up going instead first. So do I need to, does that need to be a motion?
Major Mitchell or do I just need to address that kind of as the, that that's the plan?

AN **Ashlesha Naik** 1:35:04
Dr. Blades, she just stepped out, so she's not here at this minute. Yeah.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:35:06
Ohh.
Okay, well then I'll just, I can't hurt to make a motion, right? So I will just motion that we table the discussion of the proposal for implementation of standardized pre-sentence investigation and sex offense, or sex offender specific evaluation protocol, the discussions for adult sex offense specific evaluations, and the discussion and potential adoption of community management team TEAMS model that we table those three agenda items for our next meeting. Does somebody want to 2nd that?

AA **Amanda Adkins ADCRR** 1:35:44
I second that motion.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:35:46
Okay, all in favor? Thanks, Amanda.

AA **Amanda Adkins ADCRR** 1:35:47
Amanda Adkins.

SN **SCOTT NAEGELE** 1:35:49
Aye.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:35:51
Aye.

Blake 1:35:52
Aye.

Missy Musick 1:35:52
Aye.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:35:53
Aye.

Brecken Blades 1:35:53
Okay, anyone opposed?
Anyone abstaining?
Okay, does somebody want a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:36:09
I motion that we adjourn.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:36:10
I.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:36:12
motion that we adjourn the meeting.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:36:15
Amanda Adkins, I second.

Brecken Blades 1:36:17
Okay, all in favor.

SCOTT NAEGELE 1:36:20
Aye.

Amanda Adkins ADCRR 1:36:20
Aye. Aye.

B **Blake** 1:36:21

Aye.

BB **Brecken Blades** 1:36:22

Okay, is anyone opposed?

No, okay, thank you guys. Thanks for staying after. Thanks for the discussion today. Have a good day.

B **Blake** 1:36:30

Thank you. Bye-bye.

◉ stopped transcription