

AZSOMB Juvenile Guidelines and Standards Subcommittee Meeting-20261022_203135UTC-Meeting Recording

October 22, 2026,

1h 25m 45s

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.

Hey, my name is Scott Naegele. I am the chairperson for the Juvenile Subcommittee of the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board. And I'd like to call today's meeting to order and ask Major Mitchell if you could do a quick roll call.

Thank you, Chairman. The date is October 22nd. The time is 1:31. Present is Chairman Naegele.

Mister Galarneau.

Present.

Miss Opheim.

Present.

Doctor Rivera.

Present.

Judge Young.



Young, Anna 0:36

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:38

And we have had one subcommittee member submit his resignation, and that's Mr. Barney, who is no longer available to serve on that subcommittee.

That was just that we just learned that yesterday, actually. So we are in the process of trying to recruit one or two perhaps people to join us, but in names have been put forward, but there's a vetting process that has to go through. So we're going to sit with the number we have for now and do the best that we can. With the group's permission, I'm going to do things a bit out of order on the agenda. And I think start with talking about the proposed dates for next year's juvenile subcommittee meeting. In front of you, you have a hard copy of the most recent iteration of proposals we had gone through trying to move it to Wednesday. That wasn't possible because of attendance issues. Unfortunately, because we are now in a position, we have to keep it on Thursday. That in part contributed to Blake's decision, I think, to.

He just simply couldn't carve out the time that was starting to impact on practice issues, so no, no, I understand where he's coming.

So what you have in front of you are proposed dates. All of them, with the exception of the first one and the 11th one on the list, are dates early in the month. The reason the date for January 21st is being proposed is because I have to testify in court and I can't be in two places at once. So with the group's permission we going to move that to later in the month I think.

The 11th one, the October 28th date, rather than a November date, is because of the holidays and Thanksgiving and all that fun stuff. So I would ask that you all take a quick glance at your schedules, perhaps, and these dates. And then we're going to seek to ratify these dates.

Yeah, so as you'll notice on this document, you know, we can do it either in the morning from 10 to 11:30 or we can do it in the afternoon as we have been from 1:30 to 3 p.m. So I want you guys to weigh in on that as well. Whatever the rule of group is, is what we will do.

Judge Young has her hand up.

Go ahead judge Young .

YA Young, Anna 3:18

There, I don't have the most recent list. The only list I've got has the Wednesday dates on it. Can someone e-mail it to me real quick?

We will do that. 3:24

YA Young, Anna 3:26

Perfect. Thank you.

The shifting sands. 3:33

I would make a suggestion that it may be hard for everybody to say yes to all those dates, but if you can say yes to 10 of those dates, then as long as we don't have conflict.

Of A quorum on any one of those dates, I suggest that we keep these dates and roll forward with them. There might be times when we miss one or two people.

YA Young, Anna 4:14

The afternoons are easier with my calendar. I have a dedicated delinquency calendar every Thursday morning, and I also sit on another board that meets on Thursday mornings. So if there's any way that we could leave it just where we've got it right now, I think I could make just it probably about every Thursday that you've got a meeting set.

Go ahead. 4:16

I'm seeing nodding of heads largely, so it sounds like that sounds fine to do. I guess the only thing we need to decide is if the dates are okay, and then do we have to take a vote on this calendar?

I think we should adopt the dates.

Judge Young, did you get that screenshot? Did it come through?

YA Young, Anna 4:58

Yep, it just came through. I'm just opening it right now.

I'm also okay with the Thursdays. They work better than any other day and the afternoons are better as well.

So it sounds like we've decided on the afternoon time is good. We now just need to perhaps give Judge Young a moment to glance at the dates and then.

I might have missed it, but did you say that this is still going to be the Thursday before the big meeting?

Well, it will be except for a couple instances.

No, we've moved the subcommittee meetings up a couple of weeks before the larger board to allow time for any documents that you all ratify and need to pass on. Maybe not up to now, but not not.

So there, we're not meeting right after the bigger meeting. We're going to be meeting still a couple weeks before. Okay, perfect. Week and a half, I guess.

Thank you. I forgot to mention that. Yeah. That gives us at least a week and a half to get those documents flipped and ready.

We have not confirmed the meeting room location we will work on that as well. So if you have any this room versus downstairs or any there is some other venue you would like us to explore.

I think either one are fine.

What's better for the technology.

This room seems to work better for us, yeah, yeah,

then if you can access it then, obviously, we will do it here.

YA **Young, Anna** 6:45

The dates look good for me, actually.

Okay, can I get somebody to make a motion that we vote to? approve this calendar for next year.

I motion that we approve the dates provided for the next calendar year.

Second that.

Want to just do it by ayes?

All in favor of doing so, please say aye.

Aye

Aye.

Anyone opposed?

Sounds like we've made it so.

Okay, let's return to the agenda and start with the old business items.

In the materials that.

placed on the website, you can see we got a couple proposed definitions of multidisciplinary team, and I think also a problematic sexual behavior.

Sometimes its hard to track of all we got.

I think we put them together in one document for you at your request from the last meeting to help you look at those definitions together.

I think Ashlesha has, if you want to start with the MDT, she has that up on the screen. Yeah, let's do start with the MDT. So are you saying that this first document that was in our packet of materials is actually two different definitions of MDT? Is that what I want? As submitted by.

So if everyone can just kind of look at that, which is marked page 5.

The first, the more paragraph written one is the one that I submitted, and then the second one, I'm not sure who submitted that document.

Fair amount of overlap.

That's why I was confused.

So there are 3 right,

Well, as Ben's pointing out, the top one on page 5 is definitely that. And page 17

So then the definition from page 5 is all of that is one person's definition? Are those two different? Am I asking for Jenna or Ashlesha to help me answer that question?

Because if mine is on page 17, then are those two other ones on two different ones on five? Is that what I'm looking at?

Yes. Okay. So there are three of these that we're trying to make our way through.

So the two were the original from the last meeting and then Scott combined them and that's on page 17.

Okay. Yeah. Okay. So really, so really all we need to do is look at page 17. Is that accurate?

We sent out the two definitions that were received, one of which was for Scott. I don't remember who the other ones was. Yeah. Put those together, sent them to all members, and then after that, you were the only person that sent us kind of a combined one or a revised one.

That makes sense.

I get it now. So looking at the document that's on page 17, that's my document. And I created that document by trying to look at previous iterations of this, both that I had created and other parties had created.

Exactly.

So I guess I would ask people to look at what they have on page 5. and see whether or not they believe I've done justice to the task on page 17, so that we can...either seek to make other changes or take a vote on approval of this definition of MDT.

And I think the two definitions that are listed one came from you Scott and the other from Courts

From AOC perhaps.

YA Young, Anna 11:42

Yeah, I think the top one on page 5 is the one that came from the court.

And then I had a I had a question actually about using the terminology problematic sexual behavior, because we made a move years ago to move with to juveniles with sexually abusive behavior, which is the terminology that ATSA uses.

Yes, ma'am. 11:47

I had the same feedback on the definitions. Page, well, no, yeah, just the JSAB is what the AOC uses. SMB is what other agencies uses. We have probably like 4 terms I know in my world that get used. So which one do we want to adopt?

YA Young, Anna 12:24

Yeah, we used to use SMB, but now all the courts, we use JSAB and we use that in conditions of probation, disposition reports. We're using JSAB in everything now.

DCS uses SMB still. We'll call them sex offenders. So it's, I'm just saying like, DCS hasn't adopted the JSAB, so it's fine. We just know that there's three different verbiage for the same kid in our, at least in my agency.

So then the question I have to everybody is, do we seek to have one definition or do we use the one that you're suggesting, Judge Young?

YA Young, Anna 12:38
Yeah.

and then put in parentheses something to the effective, also referred to as.

YA Young, Anna 13:11
Or sometimes referred to as something like that. Yeah, I mean, if we could use, you know, juveniles with sexually abusive behavior, because that's what ATSA uses. And then maybe do some kind of parenthetical, like sometimes referred to as blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, you know, SMB, that kind of thing.

Yeah, I think I think that makes sense to do. 13:28

YA Young, Anna 13:31
Okay. Yeah, I just would like to be consistent with ATSA.

Okay, so providing we can have that in written form for Monday's meeting, the way we just talked about it.

Will there be confusion if we don't?

We've been, we've been listening to, I mean, we just, we always know what they're talking about, but we're going to be fine with the DCS not adopting that at the moment. We're going to be fine.

So we want, you don't think we'll get pushback of any kind or there'll be debates about things or this kid doesn't, this doesn't apply to that kid because blah, blah, blah. I mean, I'm just trying to. I mean, every agency puts them in their own category anyway. So they may not have the same label and it may be this may

have kids with the same problems that don't end up in the in the appropriate place, but that's not going to matter with the title.

But if we don't if we don't put it in this definition, are we going to have issues later on? with some people.

I think if we put also referred to as SMB, you'll cover all the DCS kids. And those are the two I'm worried about typically. I see it nodding your head as well, Judge Young.

YA Young, Anna 14:43

Yeah, I think that makes sense. If we could just do a parenthetical, also refer to as juveniles with sexually maladaptive behaviors, SMB, you know.

All right, so I'm looking to Jenna to give me some guidance. Can we make that relatively simple change, I think? Take out my problematic sexual behaviors, replace it with the term that Judge Young and Melanie are proposing. Which is juveniles with sexually abusive behavior.

And then in parentheses.

What's the other?

Sexually Maladaptive Behavior.

And that way.

we can take a vote in here today about whether or not we accept it with those small changes and then bring it to the larger group on Monday and also ask for a vote.

And I think what we're using these definitions for was for the terminology that's going to be used in the guiding principles. That's correct.

for the juvenile guiding principles.

Which we're going to have a discussion about here today too, because I think largely these other definitions were the only things that were keeping us from being able to approve those juvenile guiding principles, is that we recognized that we needed to spell some things out.

that were going to be referenced in that document. And to not do that was going to be problematic. That's my recollection of the order of events. Is that others remembrance?

Yes.

So do we need to talk about the definition of MDT anymore? Go ahead.

I had a couple things. I mean, and it's one big paragraph at the very beginning, but basically it says out of home placement. We had out of home placement or

outpatient. So I would just want to just

It's not just the out of home kids. So that's out of home and out of patient treatment.

I think the third line, right? The end? I'm looking at, at least I'm looking at the last document, Jenna said, there's only a two-pager. Yeah, well, just the one on page 17, the one you should be talking about. Mine's on page one. It's like the third, the end of the 4th.

There you go.

At a home, it's all blended together on mine.

It says formed following adjudication, deferred adjudication, or referral to probation, parole, or out of home placement. Could include dependent DCS involved youth, the MDT pools, specialized expertise, blah, blah, blah. So is that speaking to it?

That's not the one I have. I'm so sorry. I looked at the last one that I got from these guys, and so mine does say the out of home, but I would just say it's not just out of home.

I am.

Okay.

Sorry, I'm looking at the wrong one. That was when I got feedback on. So I'm going to have the page number. Well, if we look deeper into what was posted on the website on page 17 of the documents that were posted out of 19. Does it still not say outpatient though? That's all I'm saying is don't disclude outpatient. It does say, not just out of home.

It doesn't say.

Yeah, there's two different, I have two different categories of services, out of home and outpatient.

So we need to add, we need to add.

Outpatient, because they have teams as well. Not as, usually not as extensive as kids out of home, but you're talking about two different treatments. One if they don't live at home and one if they do.

YA Young, Anna 18:19

The suggestion.

Go ahead, Judge.

YA Young, Anna 18:23

Where I'm thinking we could put it is where it says formed following adjudication, deferred adjudication, or referral to probation, parole, outpatient services, or out of home placement. If we put outpatient services right there, right before the or out of home placement, I think that effectuates what Mel's referring to.

Thank you.

Other couple things I have is it says supervising officer, at least on the first one I saw. Yeah, you don't want to look at number page #5. Sorry, does it say supervising officer? I don't know if I can look it up that fast. I intentionally tried to correct some of that stuff in my version of the document. I just would say it's probation officer. If you say officer, either probation officer or parole officer, but when you just say supervising officer, it's not

It's not too specific.

Again, I'm sorry, I thought I looked at the last e-mail sent.

Yeah, instead of just supervising officer, it's probation or parole officers. Officers is just a lot of, it's kind of vague.

We don't, I think it was mentioned in the adult subcommittee yesterday that there is no parole in Arizona anymore. It would be just probation.

Okay, they now be just probation officers. So this is like a police officer.

There is parole in Arizona, ADJC

YA Young, Anna 19:48

Wait, who just said, who just said that? And can you repeat that a little louder?

So in yesterday's adult subcommittee,

Karolyn Kaczorowski made the statement that there is no more parole in Arizona as it relates to adults.

YA Young, Anna 20:08

Oh, there is for juvenile though. Yeah, the Department of Juvenile Corrections is, they're the ones who supervise kids on parole.

In that, in that, and that's I was agreeing with that, but there still is. So, but we can we can flesh that out by putting supervised supervising officers, probation, or parole. Yeah, just the officer just sounds like it could be police and we don't necessarily want a police officer on it, you know? Would it be helpful if we switched to me sharing the screen and I pulled up the Word document and

YA Young, Anna 20:18

Okay. All right.

If we can do that, that would be helpful. Ashlesha, so I'm going to take control of sharing the screen, and that way Judge Young can see it as well, and I apologize for the confusion. We can not know how to eliminate that in the future. Because that's.

YA Young, Anna 20:55

I was actually looking at the, I could actually see the screen before I was seeing the document you guys were looking at.

Jenna Mitchell 21:02

It was the Adobe version, though, versus the current version that I can change for.

YA Young, Anna 21:04

Oh.

Perfect. Okay.

Jenna Mitchell 21:10

just a second. I think I'm starting to share my screen, just to get the right document up for you. Okay, there we go.

All right, so we are in MDT now, and I did make the change. So you were just speaking about probation officers, and now are you saying you do want to say probation slash parole? Probation slash parole. Okay, thank you.

And you already got the outpatient, right? You got that. I did not get that. Where did that go? That's going in right before the outpatient or out of home placement. It's on the 4th line, end of the 4th line. Thank you.

And it will be, or...

Outpatient services, outpatient services.

The next item I saw was it says DHS case record. You're looking at the old one. OK, OK, so it's just DCS now. Perfect. In the in the ones on page 17, I changed that to DCS.

YA Young, Anna 22:02

Actually, the or should be moved between outpatient services and out-of-home placement.

Yeah, I was trying to make the screen a little bigger, so maybe it'll be easier for them to see it. Yes, thank you. I'll grab that in just a second.

Okay, and then the last thing I thought of, well, I saw therapeutic providers in there twice, but now I can't see it up there, but it's all good. Just like that was a little redundant, but maybe it's already been changed. There is a very specific to our cases when we have a DSP or an access basically a network.

case manager is a high needs case manager and HNCM. So we will have a DCSCM and a HNCM high needs case manager.

That's a behavioral health case.

It is, but they're definitely part of the team. So as long as the behavioral health aid wasn't in the version I saw, but you don't want those guys out because they're the ones that have to call the CFT.

Okay, so we should put that probably right after where the DCS case would be. Yep. I do think we need to spell out DCS.

Maybe Nicholas can help me. If it's not a high needs case manager, they just call them case managers, right? With the networks.

I think so.

It's very confusing because we may have two case.

YA Young, Anna 23:36

Safety, it's not services. It's Department of Child Safety, not services.

Jenna Mitchell 23:41

I just deleted it.

No, you're still there. Yeah, I need to. Yeah, deleted, yeah. Department of Child safety. Thank you.

It's just, because most of the time we have a high needs case manager because they have the SMB or the JSAB issues, but once in a while they don't have the high needs part of it, and it's just a case manager, but it's a behavioral health case manager. That would probably cover both.

but most of the times it's a HNCM with a DCSCM as well. I would just put that after the, after where you spelled out DCS caseworkers over, just put Department of Behavioral Health caseworkers. No, it's not Department of Behavioral Health. Well, it's, it's, yeah, but there, yeah.

Just all the.

YA **Young, Anna** 24:25

I would just put behavioral health provider.

Department, they don't, they just behavioral health case manager is fine, and then they'll get all open access plans.

I've been out of the loop for a while, but still Title 19, right? Yeah, but they don't ever use Department of Behavioral Health. That's more like my licensing people.

It's a behavioral health home. Case manager, yeah, there's specialty providers, they've got your JSCS, they've got your La Fronteras, but they're all behavioral health homes. So if you put behavioral health case manager, you should be fine. It just implies there's another person from the RIVA involved as well as the DCS case manager.

I think that was it that I had on the MDT definition as far as these teams. Schools are not always involved. We don't always want, we have a school, just yesterday I heard about a school that wanted to be involved, that we don't want them to know everything about the kid, but if they need to be for educational purposes, we include them in their own team.

Any other additions, changes?

Judge Young.

Just for the MDT one.

YA Young, Anna 25:42

Not that I can think of, no.

For the MDT is all we're talking about right now. All right, so.

Let's formalize this and get somebody to make a motion to approve these with the changes that we've just discussed and made in the document. Can somebody make a motion to do that, please?

I motion that we approve the MDT revised definition.

Second.

All in favor, say please.

Aye,

YA Young, Anna 26:12

Aye.

Anyone opposed?

No one opposed.

Excellent

Alright, we're gonna move to discussing.

the.

updated definition of problematic sexual behavior. And that starts on page 14 of the handouts that were posted online.

That is the that is the version that I submitted and combined.

all of the information from our previous discussion about that.

Yeah, I just want to pull it from the right source so that I start with the document to share with.

And just so people can hear me say this, embedded in this definition are...

is a paragraph regarding the 12 and under kids and a paragraph regarding the kids ages 13 to 17. So what we attempted to do here was to turn this into one document and have it speak to all of the multiple things that we're trying to speak to.

My only question on that, and again, I might have the wrong version, so I'm just looking at my notes and not which page or paragraph, but you have age 13 and you have age 12, but my kids that come to the group home, my kids come to outpatient at age 12. So I wonder if it needs to be 12 and up and 11 and under. Does that make sense? If they're 12, they can already be probation that can already be in the system. I mean, maybe the judge would know better, but I, when you say 13, I'm missing, I have a 12 year old right now in my group home. And it's not.

YA Young, Anna 28:13

I think the distinction was made because that's the distinction that ATSA draws. ATSA talks about 12 and under, and then 13 to 17. And that's what Scott put in there, yeah.

Yeah, that's exactly.

The 18, you know.

And that's so if I'm talking about Arizona, it's 12 to 18 because now I have extended jurisdiction kids that stay till they're 19, you know. So I've had to increase here, but I've always been 12 and up and anything under is the, and I mean I put in here just the sexually, I mean we typically use the 12 and under, we use the words boundaries, sexually reactive.

sexually, you know, maladaptive. It might include the 12 and younger. So I get it. I like the distinctions between them, but.

That's not the one that I'm looking for.

And if we have to stick with the ATSA portion, that's fine. I just know that my kids are 12 is my cutoff, not 13.

YA Young, Anna 29:06

Yeah, I mean, and there's nothing that prevents you from continuing to treat those kids' mouths based on this. It's just this is the distinction that Atsa draws.

I get it. I just don't know what, I mean, who's looking at this and yeah, it's fine. I missed this. It was just a number.

Yeah, so we're seeking to get.

a copy of my most recent draft up so that everybody can look at it. So we're all having the same discussion. So this is the version that I'm pulling from your e-mail on that.

But it's not the one that was posted on the website, because I printed this from the website.

Which part of what this accentuates is the importance of all of us finding time to get on the website and look at the documents that are there before we come to this meeting. I'm not trying to be petty or anything, but it really makes that important because then we all know we're talking about the same documents.

These were attached to the to the documents.

We have to PDF them to post them to the website. So I have to pull them from the original e-mail that came in to make sure that I'm going to the right source document. So this is the first time we've really done live editing in the meeting. So we'll get better in this.

It's all good.

I have the right screen.

Yeah, that's it.

Yep.

So, Judge Young, can you see that?

YA **Young, Anna** 31:03

I can.

No one will hurt my feelings if they have things that they want to revise. I was just seeking to try to move this along and try to make this an integrated document. and to incorporate everything that I had seen other people put forward in written form.

While we're doing that, can I make a request? Can we, is there a way to put an as of date on some of these things so that we have a way to be clear that we're all looking at the most current versions of things?

What will do is add Draft watermark with the date of that version. That would be helpful.

YA Young, Anna 33:29

Version up on the screen is the version that got sent out with the materials when we got the agenda. So this is the one I've been looking at, yeah.

Yes. 33:34

Well, the first thing is, since we made some changes to definition in the last document, we need to make some changes in this one so that it's consistent.

My very first sentence.

It needs to be amended.

I thought I was being crafty and putting several things there that would cover it no matter who we were talking about.

I don't want to lend itself to confusion either.

I was going to ask where you got the SCRI. Never heard of that. Is that is that ATSA or is that just something?

I called this from multiple places, and if I knew for sure, I'd tell you where I got it.

It's all good. I was like, oh and that's fine.

Core characteristics and Identifying factors is that needed for this or just the definition

Did everybody hear that question?

YA Young, Anna 37:04

No, can you repeat that? Sorry.

I'm just wondering if the core characteristics and identifying factors, if that is necessary for just defining problematic sexual behaviors.

YA Young, Anna 37:21

Probably not. And this is also going to be a footnote, right, to the juvenile guiding standards, guidelines and standards.

What you do after you find it, you know?

YA Young, Anna 37:31

I mean, we don't want like a two-page or three-page foot note.

Right. 37:34

So, is the suggestion that we...

Think of this as the document up to that point.

Yeah.

And have a discussion about what changes need to be made to that portion of it.

The part that ends with directly harms others?

Yes.

YA Young, Anna 38:05

Agree.

Anybody want to take a stab at wordsmithing the first sentence after problematic sexual behavior?

These are our go-tos, the JSAB and the SMB.

YA Young, Anna 38:31

I think since we used them before, I think that makes sense.

To keep it consistent. 38:35

YA Young, Anna 38:37

Yeah.

So start with problematic sexual behavior is also referred to as, and use the same language that we just used in the other document, in the MDT document.

YA Young, Anna 38:56

Wondering, sorry to be like a pain, but now I'm thinking about it. Maybe we go back all the way to the guidelines and change it to juveniles with sexually abusive behaviors. And then we don't have to.

I have to keep saying it.

Would it be helpful if I pulled out the draft guiding principles?

YA Young, Anna 39:17

Yeah, sorry.

No, no. 39:18

YA Young, Anna 39:20

I was looking for it and I couldn't find it easily.

Give me just a minute to find the most recent version.

Ashlesha, if you find it before me, let me know.

Yeah, sure.

I'm sure you're looking too.

I am.

Okay, I think I found it.

Are you guys okay with the red lines or do you want the clean copy?

That's okay, as long as I have the Word version.

I have one from the e-mail that was sent to them on May 13th. Does that seem like the most recent one?

Yeah.

OK. Sounds like that probably.

I think so too. Yeah. I think so too. I just want to.

OK, I'll start sharing my screen again.

Yeah, so the one from the August 27th meeting . That's the latest one.

YA Young, Anna 41:31

Yeah, I'm just trying to figure out where it says problematic sexual behavior because it looks like we changed it to sexually abusive behaviors.

Can you do a word search for problematic and see if it pops up?

And sexually abusive behaviors would apply because you're just leaving out the J, you know, it would be fine.

I'm not sure that that's where the discussion and the birthplace of defining what problematic sexual behavior came from, though.

I think I think that came from a more organic question that was asked in the big, in the big, perhaps by you, Nick, I'm not sure about, you know, what is the definition of problematic sexual behavior. I guess us looking for it, I guess what I'm trying to say is, we might not find it there because I'm not sure that that's the way this question came about and the need for defining this term came about.

YA Young, Anna 42:36

Yeah, I was thinking it was something in the guidelines that we needed to define. Otherwise, I don't understand really why we need to do it if it's not in the guidelines.

Yeah, it's not in the guidelines.

I think my question is the definition of sexually abusive behavior, because that wasn't in the guidelines.

YA Young, Anna 42:49

Okay.

And so, really, if we jump back to...

The updated definition, we're not really then defining problematic sexually sexual behaviors. We're really defining sexually abusive behaviors, right?

And if you look at all this information, you know, from ATSA about the age specific definitions and distinctions and terminology, that all goes towards juveniles with sexually abusive behavior. So if we just change the very top of this document that we're looking at on the big screen right now, instead of defining problematic sexual behaviors, we're defining sexually abusive behaviors.

I see .

YA Young, Anna 44:00

I think you get rid of the also referred to, I think you can get rid of that whole thing. And it, because JSAB encompasses a broad range of sexualized actions initiated by children and youth, you know, under 18.

Section.

And you do want it to be juveniles with sexually abusive behaviors. I add that juveniles. Okay.

YA Young, Anna 44:21

Yeah.

I think that fixes it. And then if we get rid of everything underneath the, everything above, sorry, everything underneath core characteristics and identifying factors, then I think we've got our definition that we need. I think that answers the question.

Which is.

YA Young, Anna 44:44

about what we're talking about in the guidelines, right?

which is that now we've defined juveniles with sexual behavior problem.
And eliminated problematic sexual behavior.

YA Young, Anna 45:016

Right, because the terminology problematic sexual behavior, if we're not using it in the guidelines, why do we need to define it? Because the conversation was when we were talking about the guidelines, that's when somebody raised this issue of what is it that we're really talking about. And I think that this document right now as drafted answers that question.

It does.

I agree.

So given that, do we need to go back and take another vote on this as it exists?

Yes.

Okay.

Yeah.

So could I ask for someone to please make a motion for approving
The juveniles with sexual behavior. Somebody say it for me because I'm not used to saying it.

Can I add something just before you guys move? I know I'm not part of the subcommittee, but.

The did you, to Mel's point, did you want to add sexually maladaptive behaviors since that's

That's what the DCS world uses. So like after JSAB. We took the SCRI out, but maybe leaving or otherwise sometimes known as SMB or otherwise known as like putting in the DCS. So right after JSAB.

Yeah, I think it's...

YA Young, Anna 46:10

Just like we did with the MDT thing, I think we could just include it as a parenthetical. Sometimes I wouldn't to otherwise, I would just put sometimes referred to as sexually maladaptive behaviors, SMB.

There you go.

YA Young, Anna 46:45

And then I would actually put SMB after sexually maladaptive behavior because a lot of times you do see it abbreviated.

Yeah, perfect.

OK, now can I get a motion for?

approving this definition as it exists.

I motion to approve the definition of juvenile sexually abusive behaviors as it exists.

Second.

All in favor, please say aye.

Aye.

YA Young, Anna 47:32

Aye.

Anyone opposed?

And we probably just saved ourselves a headache by doing that, so...

Okay.

Are you wanting to switch back to the guiding principles now? Do people want to go back and look at the guiding principles again just to make sure that there isn't some

inconsistency? But I don't think there is because we spent a heap of time on those previously. We did adopt those. And then there were.

YA **Young, Anna** 48:07

Yeah, I think they're good.

Those are haven't approved yet. That's correct. These are the revisions. So let's go back and look at it real quick and just make sure that given the discussion that's taken place in this room today, that there isn't anything that we agreed on with respect to these other two documents that we need to

We need to remedy here.

That's the clean version, and I have the version that has the mark through with the changes, if you want to see that. This one's better for me, but the other one just makes me dizzy. Which one is better for you? This one? This one, the clean version. I have the other one too.

But we need some.

They don't want to see the changes to the clean markup.

And we're a more trusting bunch. We don't need to see what can you see that sexual abuse.

Everywhere it says sexually abusive behavior, we need to change it to juvenile. It does say juveniles who engage in right before it.

Well, given that this is juvenile guiding principles, I think we should be good.

It seems clear to me that we're talking about juveniles, right? Yeah.

YA **Young, Anna** 49:44

Agreed.

Want to just scan through Jenna and see if anything jumps out?

Ashlesha, could you just scroll down for him. Thank you.

Sorry, didn't know who had it? Lost track of who had it.

We're just giving you guys a guess in some of what.

It's good for Brain function.

Yeah.

There were, when I look at the track changes, like in section 2, there's strike through violate victims, offenses violate victims. So I don't know if you want to look at those or if you're just adopting those as they were proposed, because this came from outside of the subcommittee, these proposed changes.

They came from the larger committee, you're saying?

YA Young, Anna 50:52

Yeah, they were the ones that we got from all the different counties when we sent out the guiding principles to all the counties and we got the feedback.

So, my memory all had approved it, and then the courts came back with these proposed changes. So, I don't know if you want to look at exactly everything that they're proposing to change, or if you're just wanting to.

Can somebody, I mean, I don't recall it that way, that there were more changes after.

YA Young, Anna 51:00

Is it?

I think there were more changes after, but this incorporates, I think, all of the changes that were suggested.

Yes. 51:18

Say it again, Judge, and I'm sorry.

YA Young, Anna 51:27

I think this one incorporates all of the changes that were suggested both from our subcommittee as well as the e-mail feedback we got from the various counties when Joe Kelroy and I sent it out for feedback.

That's my recollection too. We are in fact looking at the most current version that incorporates the most recent feedback.

YA Young, Anna 51:43

Yeah.

Agreed.

Correct, with things that have been removed, and I just want to make sure that you have.

Is there a way to see the version that we revised before the court and then see what?

If you want to look at the track changes, that's the best way for me to demonstrate it.

Yeah, here, I'll take control and share my screen then.

I got it.

You have it up. OK. It's right there.

So what I was pointing out is in like #2.

There's just some areas there where...

reference victims before and that's been removed. I just want to make sure you agree with removing that.

Yeah, I see no issue with, I see no issue with that, where the warning is through it, you're talking about? Yeah. Not under it, through it. Right.

Under 2, the things that have lines drawn through them, weave.

The new language is the underlying versions, correct? Yeah.

I don't see anything that I have...

Concern about.

Looks fine.

Looks fine too.

So asking for any changes to that. That means the clean version is this with all the stuff removed.

Correct.

Okay.

So it seems to me that we're in good standing there.

And the...

YA **Young, Anna** 55:25

Yeah, I think we're good to go.

I think we ought to be able to go back to the larger committee and...

Have a discussion about this, and then hopefully take a vote in that.

In that forum, too.

Kind of leave this piece alone.

This version.

Not everyone has seen this version, right? Just the subcommittee has seen this version, correct? Right.

Okay, yeah, so then I do need a motion for approval of the juvenile guiding principles as they currently exist.

A motion to approve the juvenile guiding principles as they exist.

Second.

All in favor, please say aye.

Aye.

YA **Young, Anna** 56:18

Aye.

Anyone opposed.

Good.

We will prepare those and distribute those for the November board meeting. That will give everyone time to review that.

That works for me, because then it will, yes, that makes sense. We have one more item, I think, on the agenda that we needed, and I anticipate it would be the most lively of the

most lively and fun one of the bunch, and that is discussion and framework and format for psychosexual evaluation reports.

So.

I sought to somewhere here.

Create a...

What is this?

Page 11.

Page 11, Mr. Galarneau says.

Have a good evening.

Bye. Nick.

All right, so what I sought to do here...

Um...

was to further organize.

the discussion that took place from all the data that we've collected from all of the counties.

And...

try to put this in a way that some things needed to be included and other things people could choose to do. But please understand this is just from my brain and I recognize that we all need to kind of agree upon this. So if you take a glance at the broader categories,

I, with the guidance of other people's efforts previously, put together. I also sought to do this in a way that wasn't restrictive of people using things that they thought, for whatever reason, helped them get to the tap, get to answer the questions that were being asked, whether I agree with them.

Or not.

So, the first variable I put was cognitive intellectual testing and mental status. And I wrote, must choose one of the following, Kaufman brief intelligence test, Shipley, Wechsler abbreviated, scale of intelligence. And then I put, in addition, evaluators may all choose one

may choose one or more of the following when deemed indicated on a case-by-case basis to assess intellectual functioning, academic achievement, cognitive processing, and visual motor integration.

Anybody want to comment on what I sought to do just with item number one?

YA Young, Anna 59:39

So, if I could kind of make a like a broader suggestion.

Please.

YA Young, Anna 59:46

I thought maybe it would be interesting to get a presentation from AOC about what their contract parameters are right now for psychosexual evaluations and use that as a starting point.

And maybe they could give us a presentation in the next meeting about what's included in their contract, what are their providers supposed to be including in these psychosexuals, and then build from there.

So, you...

So, you think that goes beyond what we've already?

gotten from all the outlying counties? Because that was the question that was posed to the people in all the outlying counties, all of the counties, with respect to their...

YA Young, Anna 1:00:26

Right, but we didn't get input from AOC about what their contract parameters are as far as

YA Young, Anna 1:00:35

what they're requiring their providers to put in there. And like I said, I mean, there were things on that list that we got from some of the counties where I'm like, I think that they're talking about psychological evaluations, not psychosexual evaluations. So I was just thinking it might be a good starting spot to start with what the AOC is already including in their contract.

since the vast majority of psychosexuals that are done statewide are in fact paid for through those AOC contracts.

And I might be confused. Did the AOC, they've already been out and didn't we already ask them? I think we already did ask them, but here's what I would go to.

YA Young, Anna 1:01:13

We didn't have the specifics though. They came and they presented about.

The recidivism data was the last time, the time before that, I'm drawing a blank on exactly what it was, but I don't think they've ever told us exactly, here is what the contract says and shown it to us as far as the categories go. And we haven't engaged in that conversation with them.

Really quick, Scott. I did not bring my glasses, so I'm feeling very incompetent on my on my laptop here. But why can't we just look at the specs, the contract specs? Do you have those by any chance? And if not, I have those, but you can look up on the website, the AOC specs, they tell you exactly what you have to have in their contract. your social, the services, you know, when they do their specs, I don't know that they'll tell us anything more than what they write in those online that we can get to.

YA Young, Anna 1:02:06

I think it might be worth asking the question, though. I mean, because if they're the ones who are paying for all of these, I mean, don't we want to know what they're requiring exactly?

I feel like we've been provided that documentation, but you're right when you say we've had no one come out and speak to us specifically about the structure of psychosexuals as contracted with the AOC. That's a true statement.

YA Young, Anna 1:02:28

Yeah.

I just thought that might be very interesting and informative for this for this conversation, because then we're using that as our starting point and building from that.

Obviously, Joe's not on the line today.

I think there's value in doing that, though I would tell you that what you have before you that I put together is integrative of all of the data that was culled from all of the counties with respect.

YA Young, Anna 1:03:03

Right.

the psychosexual evaluations, I just simply sought to try to categorize them in a way that lend itself to there being some structure to the process.

YA Young, Anna 1:03:09

Mhm.

Yeah, no, that makes perfect sense to me, Scott. I think it's just, you know, the feedback we got was from judges and probation. We didn't get feedback from providers. So maybe we could couple that with the AOC presentation if the AOC was willing to come and talk to us about that.

I have no opposition to that. As long as everybody recognizes that we're probably

now talking about getting something finalized with respect to this after the first of the year, just in terms of using the process up to this point to gauge, you know, what we're going to have to make our way through to do this.

No.

YA Young, Anna 1:03:52

Yeah, I mean like this item was just for discussion today. It's not even agendaized as an action item.

True.

I think it's fine. Probably feel like they've already been out and done their thing, but I have the specs right here. I mean, I don't think they're going to give us anything more than it's written down, because they're not going to vary from what they've already got in their contract.

So tell us, as you look at those broad categories, will you articulate those?

YA Young, Anna 1:04:00

Yeah.

I mean, the category service tasks. So it's going to say the requirements. It's going to give you quite of other stuff. There's A consultation. You're going to talk to the probation officer, the parent, interested parties. But when it comes down to conducting a clinical interview, assessing the strengths. So these are all the things that they want you to do, but it says it's pretty vague. Conduct psychometric psychoeducational testing under standard.

non-abbreviated assessment instruments to measure cognitive and emotional process, learning, et cetera. Conduct additional educational testing as needed. All psychometric assessments must be validated, developmentally appropriate and formed or norm to use with juveniles. So it doesn't say what. I really thought that they put on there a couple things. I thought they told us we had to use the PROFESOR, but I think that's more in their treatment.

specs, and not just their evaluations, and not so much as the psychosexual, but it doesn't. I mean, we can ask them, but I, I,

they haven't done what I'm seeking to do here is what I, what I hear you say.

The diagnostic statement, which refers to the diagnostic statement of findings, they want you to put all that in, but it does not give you specifics. They don't want to give you the specifics, which is why we have so many different barriers.

I thought we had talked about this and

They had said that they probably like getting all of that information from the providers would be very difficult. And there are some evaluators that perhaps weren't.

Yeah, and and I'm seeking to...

I don't want to use the word codify this, but to standardize this to a greater extent than it is by what I've attempted to do here. So while I don't have any issue with asking the folks at AOC to come and have a discussion with us about this, I'm not confident that we're going to get any more

Than what Melanie's reading, you know, from the specs for a psycho. Sorry, I clicked to the wrong one because of my eyes. I was on the psycho psychological, but here it does say all psychometric assessments must be validated, norm blah blah blah, with the use of this testing instruments for adults must not be utilized with juveniles. If any tests which are used to conform these guided.

These guidelines evaluation report must provide the clinical justification for the use. All evaluations must include JSOAP one, not two. If applicable, IQ cognitive testing, unless this has already been done in the last year and the results are reviewed and included in the current evaluation. As applicable, diagnostic tests inform the DSM, these must conform. So it does say the JSOAP two. That is the only thing they put in here that is specific to something you have to have.

Yeah, and I respectfully say I think that's woefully inadequate. And you said that I'm pretty sure to Joe in one meeting, talking about versus the ERASER versus the JSOAP versus the... So here's what I ask, and we can make a decision about whether we have them come speak to us again. But let me just say this.

Um...

As I did with item number one, I sought to do that with each of the different categories, so that it allowed, so that it created some standardization, but also

allowed for some flexibility on a case-by-case basis. You'll see under #2 where I put assessment of risk and protective factors, factors I put must include the following. And I put the PROFESSOR as it must include the professor. And then I said, in addition, must include at least one of the following. And I put, you know, the JSOAP, the JSORRAT and the ERASER. There's no mandate there in terms of the way I'm trying to language it, but But I think if we're going to require something, then it makes sense to have the PROFESSOR be the one that's required and the other ones be adjuncts to the process. And then I attempted to do the same thing under psychological assessment, you know, personality testing. If I'm missing something, it can be added to the list. And then I tried, but I tried to structure each of these categories in the same way that definition was lent to this and flexibility could still be added to the equation. And, and I'm not wed into these categories. This was just me trying to organize it in some meaningful sort of way. And I guess I would ask people to give me feedback on that. For discussion.

YA Young, Anna 1:08:42

I like the idea of organizing into categories. I think that's useful. I think we have to have AOC as part of this conversation though, because they're the ones who are.

Is there?

YA Young, Anna 1:08:58

They're the ones that have the contract.

Yeah, so Renee is asking the question, is there a way for us to send what we have in draft form here to the AOC? And I think that's easily done. I think she was asking the staff that are helping us with all of this to send this to the AOC to get some feedback from them.

YA Young, Anna 1:09:18

Yeah, but I'm just saying it might be good to have them at a meeting where we're

talking about the contract since it, I mean, they're the ones that are paying for these evaluations.

So then let's make this available to them and let's ask them to come and participate in the discussion that we're trying to have today to try to vet some of this stuff out.

YA Young, Anna 1:09:41

I think that's a good idea. Yeah.

It's going to get challenging is whether or not they want a visual rate, they agree with a visual reaction time being part of the standard psychosexual evaluation or not. I can make a strong argument for why I think it's relevant and I think there are others in this room that would support me on that. So that's where, that'll be the 1st place where discussion has to take place.

some sort of resolution has to come about. And then the other one, of course, is with respect to polygraph testing, which if the visual reaction time thing is a challenging discussion, the polygraph will be even more challenging.

YA Young, Anna 1:10:20

When you say the visual reaction, which one, what are you looking at, Scott?

Talking about ABLE or LOOK.

YA Young, Anna 1:10:26

Oh. Well, you know, the problem is even the look, I mean, I got on their developer website and the developer website itself says it's experimental for juveniles. And so I would be really cautious about having judges rely on something where like the developer's website itself says it's experimental for juveniles.

I think that's in part because they're still collecting data, which we would help them with their data collection and analysis if we did this. But we should remember that even though the ABLE will make statements more definitive than what clearly LOOK is doing at this point in time, we ought to be cautious in taking the results from the ABLE in making sweeping assumptions and statements about what it means for a juvenile, especially younger juveniles, not perhaps those that are 16 and 17 as much, but still, but certainly those that are, you know, 13 to 15, we

ought to be cautious about, even if there's more research supporting the use of the ABLE.

So that, so what I just spewed probably needs to find its way into this language a little bit too.

But, but I, but I, but I think I think knowing these things about our kids.

helps us tailor how we intervene and knowing in which cases we need to do some things differently than in other cases.

But you're right, Judge Young. There is no question that the amount of research that's been done on the LOOK at this point in time pales in comparison to that that's been done on the ABLE assessment.

YA Young, Anna 1:12:08

Yeah, I just, we've made such a push over the last, you know, I don't know, 14 years I've been presiding juvenile judge to just make sure that we're trying to really use evidence-based practices with regard to kids that, I mean, it makes me a little a little trepidatious about using something when the developer itself says it's experimental. Because if we have, you know, I mean, Mel's talked about before about, you know, rotation where we sometimes get judges who have not been on the bench very long. And so if they're being provided with a psychosexual evaluation that includes an assessment where the evaluator themselves says, hey, this is just experimental,

I just don't want to judge looking at that and making a decision that impacts a child and their well-being if it's not evidence-based.

I absolutely hear what you're saying and I don't want you to hear me in any way disagreeing with that. What I am saying is, is we ought to be doing the same thing with the ABLE to.

And part of the reason I put the LOOK on here was for discussion purposes and because one can get access to using the look and gathering clinical information that might be relevant to individual cases and do it a lot more cheaply than they can with the ABLE at this point in time.

The ABLE at this point in time, if you buy 50 of them at once, is going to cost you \$100 to administer. The LOOK, if you pay an annual fee for the LOOK, you can use it on as many different people during that calendar year as you paid for access to do. That's part of the reason I put it on here.

And if in the end we don't leave it as part of this discussion, I can live with that. But I think it behooves us to at least take a moment to think about what it might bring to the equation and help us bring to the equation in a less costly fashion than using the ABLE.

What is the cost because it's experimental?

I think the cost is because of the way they've structured it, to be honest with you. ABLE is charging per test, and these guys are charging an annual user's fee. And In their databases, clearly still one that's in development. It was built on the back of a previous version of viewing time assessment. It's now in its second generation from the previous one.

I would say to the judge's point, and I guess to yours too, Scott, a lot of these evaluations, it's all about the evaluator, which I know isn't fair to a new judge, but how they reference it in their report. We know it's not, I mean, I've had kids come back that say they're attracted to something and we really don't, not that we don't buy it, but they're attracted to everything.

you know, so you don't have a clear picture, you know, with the ABLE or probably the LOOK necessarily, but as an information, it's kind of like the polygraph. Don't send them off to Adobe because of a failed polygraph, but now you have more information. What they did, what they didn't, what was, you know, what didn't get passed. I don't know. I think it as a clinical tool, I get it if it's going to be an evaluation.

And maybe this is why we haven't always had it in ours. Obviously, the cost was the reason we haven't had it in ours, just included. But we usually have ABLES when we think that there might be a child arousal issue. But you're saying you think it should be on everybody, just so we know. And so I guess I can see both sides. Like, it's just kind of like, you don't want it to be used inappropriately, but that's why a good evaluator says like,

I'm just saying what this said. I'm not saying this is who they are, you know?

And I think a piece of what we're charged with doing in defining what a psychosexual is, is to speak to, you know, the cautionary things that we need to be advising people to be thoughtful about in terms of the way they're articulating things.

From my perspective, that's more important than choosing just to not use the LOOK.

But are you only picking the LOOK because it's more cost-effective? Like that's problematic too. It all goes very up to you.

No, let me go, let me go, let me go further in saying that.

The look pictures are modern, and they're not antiquated. And there are seven categories of males and females in the LOOK, as where on the ABLE, there's only four. So it's attempting to assess with more distinction on different age groups.

So, I, I mean, I, I agree with...

more relevant perhaps. But I'm concerned about if anyone were to look at the LOOKS website and see that, then how that then looks on us. There's many looks in there, but.

YA Young, Anna 1:17:06

I mean, I think we have to do things that are evidence-based. I mean, I mean, I understand, I mean, the ABLE is super outdated, you know, but...

Right.

YA Young, Anna 1:17:16

just going to the LOOK when the developer itself says, hey, this is experimental for kids at this point. And I mean, and just when you think about it in terms of, you know, a 40-year-old guy looking at this photo of this young girl and being aroused, that's very different than like a 16-year-old boy looking at the same photo and being aroused. And that's.

Judge.

YA Young, Anna 1:17:36

Like, it makes me, it makes me nervous, you know.

When you go on the ABLE website, what does ABLE say evidence-based?

YA Young, Anna 1:17:47

No, I don't see the ABLE a whole bunch. Because I mean, they're ancient photos. I mean, it's, yeah.

No.

ABLE is passed Dauber. OK, so for courts, OK, we say past Dauber, that's a pretty big deal. OK.

YA Young, Anna 1:17:59
Yeah.

So it's just obviously been around longer. It's got its, yeah, even their updated. Having said that though.

The passing Daubert, I'm not sure that it was necessarily a discussion about whether or not it passed Daubert with respect to juveniles.

YA Young, Anna 1:18:16
I think it was adults.

I'm certain it was adults, so all I'm all I'm saying is...

Might have the same concerns with both. We're going to come to, I'm confident we're going to come to a decision about this, but, and just so that I can say this clearly, I think the overall comprehensiveness of the evaluation is improved if we're only talking about doing the ABLE.

I mean, I want to be clear about that. If we don't agree to use the LOOK or the ABLE, I think you're going to find out things about your kids that you don't otherwise know without them being in treatment with you for six months and hoping that they've trusted you enough to tell you what's going on with them. And

And we should be very, I mean, and here's the other thing, and I say, and this maybe is going outside the scope of the structure of a psychosexual evaluation, but I can assure you that there are people who are administering the ABLE who are not following the testing instructions. And by not following the testing instructions and administering the test the exact same way every time they do it, they're undermining the validity of test results. So

There's pretty clear protocol for the administration of the ABLE. And while I know they're only anecdotal, if I told you how many stories I've heard from people about

how the ABLE was administered to them,
You'd be, you'd be, you'd be concerned too.

So a piece of this is making sure that people are properly trained in the administration of these, and that they're administering them with respect to the principles that are laid down by the entities that, you know, make these tests available.

Could you say that about other testing as well?

That is absolutely true.

I mean, unfortunately, I mean, my screening person, when we're, you know, when we get a referral, it's, I mean, the first thing she can say is, well, he looks good on paper, or he doesn't look good on paper, but the interview went great. I mean, the document is great. Psychosexual is awesome. But I think as the people reading it, and I mean, I'm assuming the judge kind of feels the same way. Sometimes you read between the lines, some evaluators go heavy on the more restricted environment, some don't. I mean, everybody's kind of got their style, even if you have all the same testing. You know, they're definitely more subjective than you'd probably like them to be, depending on who's administering the test and if they're doing it correctly. But I think for a lot of us reading it, we just know that. We just know going in like we're still going to give give him a shot or he looks dangerous and we can't. You know, like we're looking at it whether we're admitting a kid. And so we rely a lot on them, but we also know that there's a varying degree of quality for psychosexuals. So, the...

YA **Young, Anna** 1:21:13

I've had kids who look bad on paper and we basically begged facilities to at least interview the kid. And, you know, the kid ends up going there and doing really well. So yeah, I agree, Mel.

A lot of my clinicians out of that all the time. Like this is a, cross your fingers, but maybe it'll be okay.

So let's do the two things that we agree to. Let's make this available to the folks at the AOC, and let's invite them to come talk to us specifically, to participate in the discussion that we're having right now as the next step to moving forward with this. Does that sound reasonable to everybody?

YA **Young, Anna** 1:21:54

Sounds good to me.

Okay.

And Jenna, I don't know if you, I went and sent that link of what their specs already say. I mean, I already kind of read it, but you're welcome to send that out to the committee as well, just so they can see what they already have in place. And then we'll send them what we have and then hopefully we'll have an agreement.

You know, before we leave this, triggered by something Mel just said.

Perhaps weekend, I don't know what it looks like exactly, but...

Just because somebody has an advanced degree, and just because they might meet the requirements for doing a psychosexual, doesn't mean that they're ready to do a psychosexual, and...

I worry at times that...

Perhaps the folks at AOC might not understand that in the same way that I think some of the rest of us understand that. So maybe there's some, I don't, you know, I mean, how somebody, how somebody gets a contract to do psychosexual evaluations that set the tone for what flows from there for kids.

and they've never had any experience working with kids and families with these issues is beyond me. And I know that there are some that are doing that.

This is how I remember that we did have a conversation about the evaluations a little bit, was because I think in their presentation, they said, we've never had anybody say anybody was awful. And at that moment, I had two different county attorneys saying, there is somebody that is awful. Like it was the same verbiage saying like, no, this guy should not have a contract. This woman should not have a contract. And afterwards, I gave Joe the name. Like you need to look into some of these people that everybody's talking

talking about. County attorney said they'd already filed a complaint with the AOC, so

I agree. Like there's some people that don't deserve or have not earned the spot of writing these, you know? I guess all I'm saying is perhaps we can provide some things that might be helpful in them deciding who ends up with a contract.

That's all I would say about that. Feel like Forest Gump now.

All right, we can move on from this. We have a plan for what the next step is. I'm just trying to look at the agenda and see if we've missed anything.

Jenna, can you help me if I've skipped around so much that I can't keep track?

Yeah, future agenda items.

Last thing. All right, so unless somebody says there's something else that we need to talk about, I ask for a motion to adjourn today's meeting.

I motion to adjourn today's meeting.

Second.

All in favor say aye, please.

Aye.

Anyone opposed?

We are adjourned for today. Thank you all. Thanks, Judge Young.

YA **Young, Anna** 1:25:04

Bye. Everyone.

Before you hang up Judge Young, I'm going to send out that contract information that Melanie sent me. I'm going to also include the three documents from today with the updates. Just so you can look at them.

YA **Young, Anna** 1:25:14

Thank you.

We'll take a look at that.

YA **Young, Anna** 1:25:18

And my judicial assistant has put all the subcommittee meetings on my calendar already, so we're good for next year.

Must be nice to have an assistant.

Starbucks card for being efficient.

YA **Young, Anna** 1:25:27

Oh, my assistant's amazing and I tell her that all the time, so yep.
Thanks.

Thanks.

Thank you.

Bye.

● stopped transcription