AZSOMB November Board Meeting-20261116_203549UTC-Meeting Recording

November 16, 2026,

1h 46m 12s

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Notice: This transcript was generated using Microsoft Teams automatic Recording & transcription technology. 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.

Good afternoon, everybody. It's November 16th at 1:35 p.m. Thank you all for being here in person or virtually. We're going to begin the meeting. Major Mitchell, will you begin with roll call for us?

Thank you. Present is Madam Chairwoman Goulden. Miss Adkins.

Present.

Miss Balson.

JB **Jamie Balson** 0:30

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:31

Mister Barney.

BB **Blake Barney** 0:34

Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:35

Doctor Blades.

Present.

Miss Breed.

AI-GENERATED

BS **Breed, Shanda** 0:40
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:43
Judge Cohen had a hearing. She's going to join after the hearing, if she's able. Excused is Detective Cook. Supervisor Fanning.

JF **John Fanning** 0:54
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 0:56
Mister Galarneau.

Present.

Major Griego also excused, Mister Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:03
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:05
Doctor Johnson

present.

Miss Kaczorowski is also excused. Mr. Kelroy.

Present,

Miss Krejci.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:17
Present.

AI-GENERATED

Jenna Mitchell 1:19
Doctor Lokey.

F **Farah Lokey MD DDD** 1:20
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:22
Dr. Miller is running just a few minutes late. She'll be here shortly. Miss Musick.

MM **Missy Musick** 1:28
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 1:30
Mr. Naegele.

Present.

Mister Neil, he's attempting to join us virtually, so I will let you know if he joins. Miss Opheim.

Present.

Mister Pawlowski.

Present.

Miss Panas

present.

Representative Powell

here.

AI-GENERATED

Doctor Rivera.

Clinical Director 1:58
Present.

Jenna Mitchell 2:00
And Judge Young,

Present.

Madam Chairman, you do have a quorum.

Thank you, Major Mitchell. Next, we'll move into a call to the public. This is the time for the public to comment. Members of the board may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to ARS 38-431, action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter. responding to any criticism or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decisions at a later date. Major Mitchell.

All right, first up today is Gary Hardy, followed by Rachel Bretz, and then Matthew Burnash. And Mr. Hardy, if you could please just push the button before you start speaking, and the timer will begin when you start.

Madam Chair, members of the board, good afternoon. I'm Dr. Gary Hardy with the Collaborative Justice Institute. When I began my PhD studies in 2013, my advisor told me I'd learn a lot about a little and absolutely nothing about really important things. But he did advise me to keep learning, keep questioning, keep growing, keep pursuing.
But most importantly, he taught me always to continue asking why, and to examine my own prejudices, my presumptions, and my inherent biases. Therefore, I'm asking you to return the proposed early termination criteria and the court filing template to the adult subcommittee for the following reasons.
First, Section 13902A sets ordinary probation maximums for a Class 2 felony at 7 years. Item 2 of the draft uses those maximums as the minimum time served for an early termination.

AI GENERATED

Section A sets no such waiting period. What evidence justifies A seven-year threshold? The draft should preserve the court's discretion under 13901. Second, the committee noted that an unresolved polygraph finding should never decide a recommendation on its own. The court needs to know what risk continued supervision addresses.
Consider treatment progress, time offense free, and the personal circumstances. Third.
As board member Amanda Adkins has proposed, I urge you to hear from Dr. Karl Hanson before adopting these standards. In his team study, one of his many findings was that the five-year sexual reoffense rate for those assessed as high risk was 22% at release. For those in the group who spent 10 years offense-free in community, It was 4%. In addition, in your packet is a comprehensive report rethinking Arizona sex offense policy. The report traces how an unsupported risk estimate made its way into Supreme Court decisions.
Finally, Wharton Professor Adam Grant, in his book Think Again, describes four ways we think. A preacher defends a belief, a prosecutor who tries to win a case, a politician seeks support, A scientist evaluates their own assumptions, questions them, and revises them when the evidence warrants it. So my question for today is, are we thinking as preachers, prosecutors, politicians, or scientists? And what evidence would it take to change our minds?

Thank you.

Next is Rachel Bretz.
Good afternoon, Chairwoman Goulden and members of the board. My name is Rachel Bretz. First, I want to thank the board members who voted in September to preserve public comment at every meeting and maintain the three-minute speaking time. I appreciate your recognition that public input matters, especially to individuals and families directly affected by these policies.
I reviewed today's agenda materials and submitted written feedback on the proposals. I hope you will give those recommendations meaningful consideration. Today I want to emphasize 2 areas that I think warrant being high priorities for this board. First is the risk assessment tool. Following Detective Cook's presentation, I believe the limitations of the current methodology became clear.
It relies heavily on the underlying offense rather than adequately considering

AI-GENERATED

rehabilitation, treatment progress, behavior, and other factors relevant to a person's current risk. I encourage the board to create a more accurate, evidence-based assessment methodology as soon as reasonably possible. Second is the sex offender education and treatment program.

My son will have completed well over a year of this program while incarcerated, yet he will be expected to start over and pay for the same treatment upon release. I encourage the board to begin with a comprehensive presentation from those administering this program, outlining its format, curriculum, treatment objectives, participant expectations, and timelines.

For both initiatives, I encourage the board to establish working groups with clearly defined objectives and a target of making meaningful progress within six months. I would welcome the opportunity to serve on either or both working groups, bringing the perspective of an affected family member, along with my professional, organizational, and community experience.

I would be happy to provide more information about my background for your consideration. These initiatives could substantially improve fairness, rehabilitation, and public safety. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Next is Matthew Burnash, followed by Gerardo, and then Darren Stanley.

Mr. Burnash, can you hear me?

MB **Matthew Burnash** 8:08

I don't know if you can hear me. Can you hear me?

Jenna Mitchell 8:10

Yes, we can hear you.

MB **Matthew Burnash** 8:11

Okay, alright.

Dear Chairwoman Goulden and members of the board, I was 19 when my offense occurred and I'm now 36. Since then, I have taken responsibility for my actions, completed extensive treatment, established a career, become a homeowner, and built my own food business.

MB **Matthew Burnash** 8:34

AI-GENERATED

One of my proudest accomplishments is being invited to mentor other men in sex offense treatment programs, helping them understand accountability and demonstrating that meaningful rehabilitation is possible.
In June, adult probation described my treatment progress as tremendous. I also received a medium frost assessment. Despite all of this, I have worn a GPS ankle monitor for eight years, and under current Arizona law, I will be required to wear one for the rest of my life. My community notification risk remains at level 3. The current assessment relies heavily on historical offense-related factors, rather than adequately considering treatment progress, rehabilitation, compliance, or current behavior. Consequently, regardless of how much progress I make, I have no meaningful path to a lower classification under the existing systems. I understand the board recognizes these shortcomings and is working toward improving the assessment process. I appreciate those efforts, but until meaningful change occurs, people like me continue to face potentially lifelong consequences.
GPS monitoring also creates a significant daily burden, including equipment malfunctions, inaccurate reports, charging requirements, interference with employment, and complications involving medical procedures and personal privacy. I'm not asking to escape accountability. I'm asking whether accountability should mean

MB **Matthew Burnash** 10:04
lifelong restriction without any meaningful opportunity for reconsideration. I recognize that changing mandatory GPS laws requires legislative action. However, this board is uniquely positioned to educate lawmakers and recommend reforms. I respectfully ask the board to support two changes. First, a more individualized risk assessment that meaningfully considers rehabilitation current behavior and actual public safety risks. Second legislation allow individuals subject to lifelong GPS monitoring to petition a judge for reconsideration based on demonstrated rehabilitation clients and current risk. I cannot change what happened when I was 19, but I have spent 17 years demonstrating that I can change how I live my life.
If we truly believe in rehabilitation, there must be a meaningful way for that rehabilitation to matter. A person's history matters, so should the person they have become. Thank you.

AI GENERATED

Thank you, Matthew.

Jenna Mitchell 11:05
Next is Gerardo.
Next, Darren Stanley. And Darren, if you can turn the mic on when you get to it, please. Thank you.

Good afternoon, Madam Chairwoman and members of the board. Darren Stanley, registered citizen in the state of Arizona. I was happy to see on the agenda the subject of early termination of probation, something I'm very interested in and passionate about. I've spoke to this board before on this subject before. With that being said, sometimes repetition of a subject is necessary to make it sink in.
I can only talk about my experiences filing for ETOP. All entities, probation, prosecutors, and therapists should fully understand guidelines are guidelines. They are not written in stone. I'm very tired of hearing the arbitrary excuses, oh, you're not out of treatment two years. You haven't been in the community five years.
Every case should be judged on the individual, not minimum guidelines that all parties seem to think are mandatory. They are not. They are guidelines. In my case, I completed STOP in prison and outside. My outside therapy gave me 0 consideration to the work I did inside.
I am over 600 hours of group and individual therapy. That's a number mandated for maximum risk to individuals. I am a minimum risk for reoffense. No one seems to take this into account. I am also curious why no one ever does any due diligence into a victim statement when new claims are constantly being made and stories are changing.
My guess is no one cares or has the time because of caseloads. I have to take a mandatory polygraph on the annual basis. Why can't I address any of these false statements being made on that? I also, when I pay for polygraphs and testing, why does my attorney not have access to the results. She has to get a court order to receive them, and most likely it will be denied. In my case, I completed treatment in December of 2024 and was not released until almost June of 2025. During this time, I went through somewhere around 8 different therapists
two staffings, and the director of Mountain Valley losing my RPP and wanting me to

AI-GENERATED

e-mail her another copy. How did she not know I can't use the computer? I was the only person in my RPP group that couldn't and still can't. As most of you have heard before, the recidivism rate of a sex offender in this state is around 2.94%.
What are we doing here? As I always say in closing, I'm available to talk one-on-one or to a subcommittee. I'd be more than happy to talk off the record if that would help. I'm not blaming anyone here. Why is change so incredibly difficult when there is so much data available to prove my point? One more thing, I was able to attend the minds, justice, and the law, neurodivergence, and criminal legal
legal system that was held in this very room a week ago. One of the interesting subjects was profound isolation for individuals with autism. The other was a program. that teaches people on the spectrum of proper boundaries in sexual situations that often they don't really understand. By Brian Gilbert, thank you so much.
Thank you, John. Thank you.

Madam Chair, that concludes the call to the public and for the record, during call to the public, board members Dr. Miller and Mr. Neil joined. Thank you.

Okay, moving on to discussion and potential adoption of revised juvenile guiding principles. Scott, did you want to go over that with us? And I think this is all in your background packets as well. Yeah, they're

We are in the process of trying to make sure that the original footnotes that were attached to each of these items in the juvenile guidelines continue to be accurate and appropriate.
as we've gone through and made changes to some of these items. And that's going to delay us a little bit in getting it back to this board and taking a final vote on approving these guidelines. We are in the process of reaching out to parties that can help us gather the original pieces of research that serve as the points of departure for these footnotes. But there really isn't much to talk about except for I would bring to people's attention, I think it's on page, these documents have multiple pages on it, but I think it's the 7th page of the juvenile guidelines, we also did make some finalized statements regarding a variety of things that I think are germane to the guidelines. So I would just ask people to take a look at those and familiarize themselves with the different things and the different definitions that we put together and have worked on.

AI-GENERATED

pretty hard over the course of the last two or three months because we will be taking a vote on those as well when we bring this back before the board.

Okay, great, Scott. So you guys are still working on it. You'll bring it back to us monthly for updates.

That's correct.

Okay. Thank you so much.
Dr. Blades, do you want to go over our next one? I'm scrolling back. We are on discussion and potential adoption of early termination considerations for probationers with sex offender conditions.
I think there were a couple of edits made to that, is that correct?

We made a couple of edits on it. Really, the edits were as requested by this board and then discussed in the subcommittee, and then the changes were made either in the wording of the items or clarification in the footnotes. Like I said, as was requested per our prior discussion of this document. So we didn't change anything that was of substance other than what was sort of requested and agreed upon. So we as the adult subcommittee think that this document is ready to for a vote potentially or a motion to go forward given the the discussion that has happened previously.

Okay, great. Thank you. I'll open up to any discussion before I ask for a motion.
Any.
Discussion or questions on the document?

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 18:07
This is Katie Krejci. Can you hear me?
Okay. I just, I know someone in the public kind of made a comment on this and so I just wanted to address one of those things for #2.
And if someone like disagrees with me, please let me know. But my understanding in terms of the minimum terms of probation that we have in there under #2 just comes from the law because under 13902
Subsection E, it talks about when people are convicted of...
an offense included in Chapter 14 or 35.1 or some of the registration statutes, if

AI-GENERATED

probation is available, probation may continue for a term of not less than the term in subsection A, which is like the, which we refer to as the like subsection A is the minimum term. So that's where that's coming from.
If someone like disagrees that that's not like what the law requires, you know, happy to.
You know, I think we could possibly take that out, but I think that's why that's in there.

No, Katie, you're correct. That's my recollection as well. That is, it's in alignment with what statute requires.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 19:18
Okay.
Okay. And then my other question, just looking at this, like, you know, for I know we've seen this multiple times and there's the reference of the chaperone program, both for the sex offender, you know, early termination conditions and kind of what's put in that report. Is there, I know the chaperone program can be very expensive and sometimes people can't have a chaperone just because it costs them like $3,000.

Yes.
Yeah.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 19:49
to have a family or a friend go through the chaperone program. Do we know, is there any research to support that having a chaperone or having someone complete the chaperone program like actually reduces someone's risk? Or has there been any research about like the effectiveness of the chaperone program that we use?

So 2 things with that, Katie, and maybe I'll also have Dr. Blades respond, but I know that one of the things that the adult subcommittees want to look at is actually that, because not everybody needs a chaperone, to your point. So those who would be deemed paraphilic, perhaps those who want to reunify with their children and families,
I am pretty sure there's research and again that anyone else can chime in about how that does benefit the support of those. But not everybody to your point needs a

AI-GENERATED

chaperone. So in the adult subcommittees, subcommittee, we are going to be looking at defining who needs a chaperone and when, if that makes sense. And Dr. Blaze or Scott, or if you want us to chime in with the research aspect of that, please do so. Yeah. So I think that you're looking at item 13, which says the probationer has a proper chaperone and or support person if applicable. So I think we wanted to make sure that that if applicable language was in there, which means that as
As we've stated, it does not necessarily apply to everyone. I can get more specific studies or the research on the chaperone program. I think kind of loosely just off the top of my head, it would relate to if you think of maybe item, I think it's item one on the stable that refers to significant social influences and the research behind whether or not those significant social influences are positive. Are they informed? Are they, you know, that kind of thing?
it sort of fits into that, just loosely, right, fits into that category of evidence backing. And so, yeah, so that's why it's on there. And then it does have that if applicable piece as a qualifier. Does that answer that?

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 21:56
Okay, thanks. Yeah, I mean, I agree that like having significant social influences is, you know, are positive ones is supported by research, but I was just wondering if there's ever been any research that like the chaperone program, just because of the cost, like, are we saying, you know, someone potentially hearing these considerations can't get off probation because they can't
they don't have family or friends that can afford the $3,000 program, especially if there's no research to support that a chaperone versus just like an actual supportive, you know, support person or a pro-social support person.
or, you know, positive significance, social influence is really what the research supports. And they just, they have that, but they just don't have someone that's been able to pay to actually go through the program. And we're saying, you know, this person can't be considered for early termination.

Well, Katie, I think, and you know, too, that there's sometimes significant funding for those that cannot afford either sex or treatment or, you know, the family treatment. And again, it should be done on an evidence-based basis. I know that doesn't always happen right now in the current system, but I think that's what we'll be working on.

AI GENERATED

But as you know, there's a lot of funding available to support.
those who need it.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 23:12
Yeah, maybe we can address that with the chaperone program when we discussed that. I know there used to be a lot of funding and that, you know, I don't know of anyone in the recent couple of years that's been able to get funding for a chaperone. Even people who are otherwise like, like financially unable to pay for treatment are often losing vouchers now as well, just because probation says like, hey, you know, we're not like,

Right.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 23:34
here to give a handout. And so you only get one set of vouchers when you're released from DOC. We kind of don't care that your income hasn't increased or your, you know, you still don't have income. You have to figure it out. And I just want to make sure that like, you know, I don't think that's victim focused or, you know, anyone focused to like be like, oh, well, you can't do this or someone can't get through this program.
If there's no research to support the like actual chaperone program reduces someone's risk. And if there is that financial barrier, just why are we including like chaperone versus significant social, you know, positive significant social influence, which is supported by research. And then maybe we could footnote that, hey, this could be a chaperone or something if someone does complete that.

I think all those things can be looked at, but I think definitely, Katie, when you're talking about, you know, early termination, but someone has stay offended against a child, I think it's responsible for them to have some sort of classes or training if we're going to let them off probation, but also then move into a home or have full access to
to their family and children and folks like that. I think it's responsible for people in their family to know about the history.
whatever that looks like for each individual case. Does anybody else have anything to add or comments on that?

AI GENERATED

Scott Naegele. I mean, I would only comment that I think if Katie's statement is, has there been research done specifically on the chaperone program and our chaperone program and whether or not it
It reveals increased, you know, safety and recidivism. I don't know that we've studied that. There clearly are items in both the instrument, the SOTIPS and the SAPROF SO that speak to what we're talking about here with respect to the relevancy.
of having a chaperone. But those are individual items of those dynamic scales that have relevancy, I think, to this discussion. But whether or not we've studied the chaperone program and researched it, no, I think is probably the answer to that question.
Thanks, Scott. Missy.

MM **Missy Musick** 25:51
So I just did a quick search. I found a reference to several articles on this. It does need a little bit more research, but some summaries have stated that there has been shown to have a positive effect on recidivism.
I just haven't had time to pull up like the original one that they're referencing is Bartels et al. from 2019.

Okay, so perhaps we could have the adult sub community later on, maybe add some of that as well in the research. Shanda.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 26:34
Hi there, my comment's not for the chaperone piece, so I don't know if there's any further comments about the chaperone piece.

Oh, but no, go ahead.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 26:42
Okay, I just had a couple of thoughts and probably changes on these two documents. So on with the early termination consideration for probationers with sex offender conditions. So first there's
the considerations, right? And there's a couple of comments that may not be for all and for everyone that I think should be stricken out of the first paragraph. For instance, probationers deemed low risk may be placed

AI-GENERATED

on a minimum caseload. I know that's a may, but also there are.
the majority of counties in the state don't have a minimum type of caseload. And because we're talking sex offenders and our criminogenic risk needs assessment, that often falls in the low levels. And so I just don't think that comments.
It should be in this paragraph. Also, I don't think it should be in this paragraph that each circumstance or case shall be staffed case by case with probation supervisors. If this is a guide for everyone and a template for everyone, that's just what it is.
And you know, I don't wanna be using this document to tell.
each county probation department exactly what to do when there's already code that guides that. So.
you know, we're not going into, okay, if you're an offender, this is exactly what you need to do. If you're a prosecutor looking at this, this is exactly what you need to do. So I just think that that should also be omitted. And then in the second document, the template.

Shanda, can we hold for on the second document and just hold right now for what you said and then absorb that for a moment?

BS **Breed, Shanda** 28:38
Sure.
Sure.

Because Maricopa County only has the minimum caseload, I am okay with striking that. I think when I read the, I think that's the next sentence you're talking about speaks to staffing each case on an individual basis and what that case speaks to. So for example,
A case involving someone with medical issues or advanced age that doesn't fit this criteria, to me in my mind that means that doesn't prevent probation from moving forward with an early termination request from the court that it should be staffed with their superiors. That's what in my mind that reads.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 29:20
It, you know, not all.

because because that that should that's that would be the exception following this

AI GENERATED

criteria is if we can justify why something or someone may not fit. And when they when probation is filing an early termination or a response, those exceptions could and should be made.

Breed, Shanda 29:42
Understood, however, you know, when it comes to...

Breed, Shanda 29:49
probation supervisors, staffing each case by case, that sort of thing. That's in their code or their own policy. It's not statewide. And what this would be doing is creating a new policy change statewide.

Yeah.
Yes. So that's what we're here for. So Shanda, we're creating statewide standards. So because someone in, say, Yavapai County who has, you know, a medical issue, but the policy says they can't apply for early termination or probation cannot support it. That's one of the issues that's been going on in our state.

Breed, Shanda 30:08
So that.

is that folks are doing very different things. And so this document, I would hope would be a guide to all the probation departments to look at what this board of experts approved as criteria that they would look for when submitting an early termination.

Breed, Shanda 30:43
And this is a guide. Right. And so some counties don't have make sure to have supervisor approval before filing a PTR or an early termination, any petition. So those those different policies may be different in different counties.

Correct.

Breed, Shanda 31:02
And so I think removing this, it still is saying, you know, you have to, you know, look

AI-GENERATED

at these considerations.
It's not criteria. It's looking at these considerations. And then every county follows their own guidance when it comes to.
you know, whether or not medical issues, advanced age, I just feel like it's unnecessary.
When this is not just for probation staff, it's for the public, it's for offenders, it's, you know, for prosecutors, it's for judges.

Yes, to me though, this speaks to each case being managed on an individual basis. And this advises folks reading it that their case should be based on an, like their own situation.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 31:53
Individualization is key, you're right, and that's and that's for all.

I'll open it up to the floor. Yes, individualization is key, so...

BS **Breed, Shanda** 31:58
Yeah.

I'll open it up to the floor.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 32:03
We, we, this is in our code and policy anyways to individualize each case in those determinations. So I, that's why I feel like it's redundant to put it in here. And it speaks to just one, one type of Ave. of who's going to file the petition and not all as a guiding document.

Could you repeat that last, what did you just say, Shanda? I'm sorry. I missed it. The last part.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 32:27
I feel like, I feel like it pinpoints probation officers instead of anyone else that can be filing this response or petition.

AI GENERATED

So I think probation officers should be reminded that each case is staffed. This is not a, this does not fit necessarily every single case. That we know people that have medical issues, age issues. And to me, this is the board recognizing that each case should be staffed.
with whoever is submitting the petition or proving it or going over it on an individual basis.
That's the board in my mind recognizing there are differences in each case. And this is not just like when we're talking about the chaperone. Not everyone needs a chaperone. I've seen plenty of times in court where probation saying they need a chaperone, but they don't necessarily fit chaperone criteria and it's incorrect. It's not correct. So it's this is the board recognizing that each of these cases
should be looked at on their own merits, but that this is a guide that we are putting together and we approve should we adopt this, that this is the criteria that we would look at.

Breed, Shanda 33:42
Again, it's a guide and I don't want to get into the minutia of...
telling probation departments what to do. It's kind of like DPS. Like we're not getting into, okay, who exactly should be putting something into their system or, you know, it's, I know we're looking at higher level.
of things that should be done, but this is a guide. You know, when there's, that's what we do anyways. It's a case by case. If we take this out, it's not going to hurt anything. It's only going to not assume that probation officers, you know, are the only ones that can.
do this sort of response or petition. So maybe that's for more debate, but I have some other suggestions for the next document.

Could we modify the sentence to say, to just strike with probation supervisors? So it just is case by case basis to determine, does that retain maybe the intent of the sentence, but perhaps relieves a direct or kind of a directive towards what to do?

Breed, Shanda 34:51
I think it helps, but does it also, I think that helps tremendously, but does that also still say that?

AI-GENERATED

Any other cases that are like advanced age or medical issues, you know, will be staffed by somebody before they can consider early termination.

I mean, it does. I guess what I'm hearing Chairwoman Goulden say is that this document is only a guideline and it can be modified as we go forward and that rather than adapting to describe what we're currently doing, we're recommending a way forward that might be different than what's currently being done across the state, but it's because we think it will benefit the process and those affected by it. So I think it might not, I think you're right, it probably does still say that. And so I don't know if modifying the sentences may be kind of a, you know, a way to go forward that.
that fits both needs.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 36:02
You, you know, what we don't want is to eliminate.
You know, if, if, if someone that's on probation.
wants to consider, you know, filing this on their own. Do they need a case staffing by probation supervisors to be done? We don't want, you know, and this is a guideline, so it shouldn't be a criteria, right? I mean, that should be criteria maybe for probation staff and their own policy and that sort of thing. Okay, maybe.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 36:36
But that's not here on this guide for the public is what I'm saying. So I think modifying that would be helpful. And I'd like to hear ideas and thoughts from the rest of the board.

So people on probation though are encouraged to talk to their probation officer and or any supervisors to find out where they are currently at and when they may be ready. I think that's responsible for anyone to do and they should be able to get that information from their probation officers and or the supervisors that may be approving

BS **Breed, Shanda** 37:04
Agreed.

AI-GENERATED

the document or writing it. It should not be a mystery, as it often is, with people on probation about where they stand with their probation officers. And so we have to get away from that. There needs to be an open discussion. So people who apply or when

Breed, Shanda 37:11
Agreed.

a probation officer writes a response, it's not a surprise where this individual is on probation or in treatment. And far too often, people beg probation officers and their supervisors for information as to their status in treatment or on probation.

Breed, Shanda 37:44
Agreed.
Agreed, but.

So I think it's very important, and I would encourage people on probation to try to talk to their officers, and if they're ready to apply on probation, we'll, you know, put forward a motion to early terminate.

Breed, Shanda 37:59
Well, that's agreed on. You know, there's no disagreement there. I just we don't want to exclude or omit anyone that doesn't have that best relationship with their PO. Or maybe it may be in disagreement. Maybe they feel like, I mean, how often does this happen? They feel like they want to be early terminated and the PO disagrees.
So they're going to file this on their own. We need to step out of our box with just our own.
you know, agency perhaps, and look and see what's best for all angles. I mean,
I just don't want this to exclude those who are on probation from filing something on their own because they don't have.

Yeah.

Breed, Shanda 38:44

AI GENERATED

A staffing done.
You know, with the probation supervisor.

I don't think that, I don't read that. I don't see that that is what that's saying. And anybody can file anything, obviously, with the court. I don't think this is preventing that. And these are, again, just guidelines, but I don't, again, I'll open it up if anybody else has comments, but I don't read that to say that. Madam Chair, this is Sheridan Miller. I'm wondering if.
might be clarifying to add language such as the Arizona Sex Offender Management Board recommends individuals who would like to pursue early termination XYZ and kind of make it clear that this is the board's stance of where we think they should be and that they should reach out to probation and kind of go more global with the language.
Language, and that might.
Help some of these issues.

Cathy Johnson.
As somebody who was a probation supervisor for many years, I retired from the juvenile probation department after 26 and a half years. I am not quite understanding why that language that's in there is a problem.
problem. I mean, these are guidelines we're trying to standardize.
some guidelines for this type of thing. And if we're saying that on a case-by-case basis, it may be looked at.
I don't understand why it's a problem if there's a redundancy. Like this is something we already do in probation anyway. We do provide that case by case consideration. And I'm not understanding what the problem is if the language is saying the same thing in here. We're just standardizing it.
That's my understanding.
some additional clarification on what the problem is. What is the harm in leaving those sentences in there? What could happen?

Breed, Shanda 40:55
Well, if we adjusted it to may instead of will, you're right, I think that that will open it up so that a staffing doesn't have to be done each time.

AI-GENERATED

I...
Thank you. Jamie and then Shane online want to comment. Jamie.

Jamie Balson 41:15
Hi there, Jamie Balson. I just want to be careful. There was some suggestion, and I'm sorry, I can't remember who said it, that sounded very close to me, like legal advice. Like the board suggests that if a probationer does not like X, then they should do X. To me, that's legal advice, and I think we just need to be very, very careful about how we are phrasing things and what suggestions we are making. I don't think that we necessarily should
suggest if someone doesn't like X that they should do Y, because to me that can come across as legal advice. So that's just my two cents. Thank you.

Thanks, Jamie. Shane.

shane neil 42:01
Yeah, I would kind of agree with a couple comments ago. I think for, I'm not sure why on both this topic, the staffing with supervisor and also the previous conversation about chaperone, I'm not quite sure why it's considered.
a bad thing. I mean, I don't know why it's considered punitive. So I mean, with chaperones, you could also, there's another side to that coin too. I mean, there's a lot of people that have been allowed to do things that they would not have been allowed to do without a chaperone. So it has allowed plenty of people. That is, that is the.
the origin of that. It allowed people to do things that probation originally wasn't comfortable with and that was a process through treatment. So as far as staffing.
It's kind of the same thing. Normally, the supervisor is going to be much more experienced than the PO. You know, we would get POs brand new out of college that had, you know, different kinds of careers and they just didn't have the experience or the knowledge to make those kinds of decisions. So I never, I never thought of staffing things as a bad thing.
We did that all the time. We really did that all day long as far as round tabling things and bouncing ideas off of each other and coming up with suggestions. And we did that as a group even. We had roundtable discussions where there was, we would

AI-GENERATED

staff cases as a group, 10, 12 of us at one time, just staffing one case, coming up with different ideas. So I don't see it as a negative at all. And as far as it interfering with legal stuff, I mean, I don't think it interferes at all. I mean, defense attorneys can file anything at any point, regardless of what we put on paper. So again, it's just that I don't see it as a bad thing.

Thank you, Katie.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 43:51
Thanks. I also agree with Miss Shanda's recommendation to remove the sentence probationers deemed a low risk, maybe placed on a minimum caseload. I can see how that's not really necessarily relevant or, you know, for a statewide considerations if that's not a caseload that exists in every county.
In terms of the other thing about like staffing case by case, I think perhaps maybe moving some of that language to what the probate, like the directives for the probation officer might be helpful because that's really like a directive as I read it, as I understand it, for like the probation officer to be staffing the case and not just saying like, oh no, we're not going to consider your medical issues or advanced age.
So I would suggest perhaps...
doing it like where the additional factors may be taken into account, such as victims offending history and sexual paraphilia also include, you know, take out the and and include medical issues or advanced age. And then
And then moving the other language of like each circumstance case will be staffed on a case by case basis, moving that sentence and the next sentence to the kind of the part about writing the memo for the probation officers. And it looks like we already include the information of, you know, the probation officer should be, is encouraged to talk to their probation officer prior to
kind of submitting a memo that we are encouraging that communication and that conversation to happen. It looks like we have a sentence on that already as the following sentence.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 45:33
This is Shanda. I think that's a great idea. Thank you. Sorry.

Brecken Blades, ohh.

AI GENERATED

Okay, so when I read this introductory paragraph, I think there's, there are really kind of three sections of it. And perhaps if we just formatted it into 3 paragraphs, it would make more sense. So the first couple of sentences are kind of general introductory, and then there's a sentence, one, two, three, 4 lines down that starts with probation officers, which seem like a few sentences that are directed to the officers. And then The last sentence that starts with should a probationer is sort of a directive or suggestion to the probationer. So perhaps just formatting so that it's clear who each sentence is directed to and that it's not that it's not saying that someone on probation needs to staff with the probation supervisor. That's more of a suggestion for the officer.

Thank you. I think that, I think that sounds good. I think we may, oh, represent, did you have your, go ahead, representative?

Thank you, Representative Powell. I want to recognize the service and contribution of the committee under your leadership, Dr. Blades relates. But in reviewing this, I'm not so sure that we're quite ready to place a vote on this, but let me make some suggestions.

Legislation is being considered to address the issue of risk assessment. So I would hope, I'd like somebody in this committee, if possible, to give me their opinion of static 99R and also of staple 2007 risk assessment tools.

Is there someone that can do that?

Because the reason why I do this is because this addresses under number 7, #9, it's also in this paragraph above, it says risk level, and item 7, item 9, 11, 12, make reference to assessments. So I know Arizona already has an established risk assessment tool or system that they use. But again, there is legislation, a bill that's being drafted to address that. To address what specifically? The assessment tool, the type of assessment tool. Do you mean community notification assessment?

No, it's the actual assessment of the.

inclination of the probationer to re-offend. So the static 99R and the stable 2000 are risk assessment tools that have been highly recognized in the United States community. So does anyone on this committee have any specific personal experience with those tools. Okay. Yes. So would somebody please offer an opinion on that?

AI GENERATED

Do you mean an opinion or I don't want to.
get into the weeds with these two assessments. They're both. Do you, well, do Dr. Blades, can you give us a high level?
Maybe I can clarify this a little better. Because we're making reference to assessments, we're assuming that the system that we're using is the best system that we could possibly be using. What I'm suggesting is if we're making risk assessments and we're qualifying whether a probationer can be released from probation based upon the tools that we're presently using, I wonder
if pending legislation might impact this or these guidelines if we experience a change in legislation? I think we would then react then at that time. I'm unsure if maybe you could maybe you could
tell us what pending legislation is being written related to the Static 99 or stable 2007.
In what regard, I guess, is my question. It's been my experience as a legislator, and I'm not sure if the members of the committee know my also my familiarity with pastoring felons who experience this on a daily basis in their life.
There is a huge need, as I think most people know, of unsettled probationers who fight this constantly in their lives. And so there is an impetus to change lots of factors that impact
A lot of it comes from down to the risk assessment. It comes down to the language of DCAC as well. So there has been legislation submitted that will impact the language of DCAC if it also passes. So there's an effort made on the legislative side try to improve.
change some of the language and make language smart on crime rather than necessarily hard on crime. And I think that's the goal of this committee as well. So I'm just trying to gain a perspective to where we are on the assessment as it applies to these guidelines. And
I'm still learning, right? I'm not a pro in all this. I'm still learning, but I know that you guys have a lot of expertise that I don't have, so I'm just seeing.
unclear language, perhaps, as to the measurement or the type of risk assessment that basically determines whether they qualify to have probation release. Wade, can you point to me the number?
Well, it's in the language. It's in the paragraph. In the second sentence or the third sentence, probation officer will consider the suitability of the early termination on a case-by-case basis to determine if a probationer is eligible at risk level. Okay, so, and

AI-GENERATED

then 7, 9,
Some of those are not specific because sometimes new assessments or tools are brought forward that are better. So let's just say right now the static 99 is the most widely used or recognized instrument.
But tomorrow that changes. We have to go back and redo that. So that's why sometimes specific evaluations or assessments are not put in there. And each person's individual risk, risk, I will say, is based on a number of things.
It's not just one thing. And we should never just use one thing to assess someone's risk. Can I go to Jamie and Blake for a moment? Jamie?

Jamie Balson 52:41
Yes, I would like to know the legislation and who's dropping it. Can you give us the details so that we can educate ourselves on what is out there and speak probably more specifically next time we meet?

We don't have, we don't, there are fields that are interactive.

Jamie Balson 52:59
I'm so sorry. I got your mic's not picking you up. I can't. There you go. That's better.

I'm sorry. Okay. In response to your question. That's Representative Powell. Sorry, I just want to say your name for the record.
Right. A legislation has been submitted by the committees that I organize and we've been working on it for about 9 months. So this, the language of these proposed bills have come from my fair.
group, which is the Fairness, Accountability, Integrated, Responsibly Committee. And so we're trying to address these issues from the legislative position as well, working together with the board so that we can have the means to actually correct some injustices in the system. So I can't comment on the
Actual bills, because we don't have them drafted yet, so...

Jamie Balson 53:42
Got it, and you'll be running them, representative.

AI GENERATED

No, I won't be running them. Not allowed to run them because my term ends. We are trying to attract sponsors, lets just put it that way.

Yes.
Yes, we want the board to review them. Oh, okay. Yes, that's why we're trying to get them. In fact, they're being drafted now. Okay. And we hope. Perhaps you could add that to our next agenda if they're ready then for us to review those and talk about them if they're ready. I'm happy to do that in a timely fashion when we have them.
Okay.
Blake.

Blake Barney 54:21
So I just want to say at this point, I just want to speak to Representative Powell, one of the things I think, you know, when we think of assessments, we're thinking the static 99R, the stable 2007, but this is also considering in the treatment MSI, multiphase sex inventory.
Um...
other end of treatment assessments that are done, assessments through probation, the frost, all those different ones are determining that risk level. So it's not one assessment, it's not two assessments, it's multiple different assessments. And so I think that that's one of the reasons why we can't be super specific on this is because it's a
broad thing when we talk about assessments. And then to speak to the concerns of Ms. Breed, I'm kind of with Shane. I don't see issues with this because we do need to make sure that probation supervisors are involved.
Because if it's up to a probation, the probation officer.
Why do we have probation supervisors in the 1st place? Because these are all being signed off on by a probation supervisor for them to either get or deny early termination. So it should be staffed. And we had a long discussion in our adult subcommittee about this. And so
I feel like this is not set in stone. Obviously, we can adjust it, but we got to start somewhere and...
we can come up with a version two of this or a 2.0 or something at some point. But I think that one of the things that I continue to be frustrated with with the board is that we find these little things to prevent us from moving forward. And then we have

AI-GENERATED

to wait a whole another month to, you know, try again.
And I would love to see some progress on something as what seems cut and dry as these guidelines that we've now readdressed multiple times. So that's just my thoughts on all this.

Thank you, Blake. I'm going to go Katie, Jim, and then I'm going to close this out so we can move on from this topic. So Katie, Jim.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 56:49
Okay, I don't know if you want to entertain like a motion to like strike the probationers deemed a low risk, maybe place on a minimum caseload if you want us to do like that individual motion. And then
If not, the other thing I addressing or responding to what Representative Powell raised, it looks like for footnote one, which we would perhaps strike if we strike that sentence, kind of talks about what risk level is based on and it talks about like the frost, the static 99R or 2002R and or SOTIPS.
or other dynamic or protective factor assessments of eligible. So perhaps the first time we, if we are going to strike that sentence, we can just move that kind of the language of referring to the different assessments to a footnote for a risk level.

Yes, Katie. So what I would like to do with the board's, of course, approval or thought is to strike that sentence, move to motion, move to motion to adopt this document minus that, and then come back next month with the revisions with regard to the other
aspects and changing that. That's what I would like us to do. Jim, I don't want to, I want to hear from you before we do that. Is there anything you wanted to add before we?
Move on.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 58:10
Yes, Jim Hanratty, polygraph examiner. I just wanted to point out that representative said number 10 on the early termination consideration for probationers. That's about polygraph. It's not about assessment. So just wanted to clarify that.

Thank you. May I respond to that?

AI-GENERATED

Please.
The reason why I suggested that is because there seems to be a history with polygraph.
Oh, Representative Powell, if you could say your name. Sorry.

Sorry. I'm sorry. Representative Powell, there seems to be a history of polygraph. that it isn't a perfect system. So sometimes we need multiple polygraphs. So I'm just trying to suggest that polygraphs also contribute to risk factors in their measurement of a person. And sometimes polygraphs
need to be reoffered in different ways to actually improve the condition of the individual. Thank you. Jim, did you have anything else?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 59:13
No, thank you for the comment, representative. Thank you.

Okay, thank you. At this time, I'd like to entertain a motion to adopt the early termination considerations for probationers with sex conditions minus the sentence probationers deemed a low risk may be placed on a minimum caseload with the adult subcommittee revising the
the next sentence regarding the case by case and fixing some of those other issues. I know.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 59:41
I would so move.
And let me know if you need me to restate the motion, but I would so move.

Do I need to restate that? Madam Chair, Judge Young, I was just thinking that if you were sending it back to the group, it makes sense to not approve it today, but to actually just have the work group refine it, maybe based on some of the conversation today, other than actually having a motion to approve.
Yes. However, I will tell you guys, I really would like these comments before so we can get them to the subcommittees because I agree with what Blake said. And I think a lot of the frustrations folks are having is that you guys get these documents ahead of time and then no one says anything until we're here. So if we could please
start reviewing them because we're going to start moving these things along and

AI-GENERATED

then we can come back and edit because I think that's becoming a frustrating thing to many people on this board that we are just
Do you know what I'm saying? Everybody. So...
If I table this this month, it's not going to take me tabled next month. And Judge Young again, I think the problem though is to comply with open meeting law. We have to have the conversation about the meeting. No, yes, the conversation, but I'm pretty sure how many times have we had this document come to us or it's been like sent to the board. I think we've seen it now.
We've seen this document a few times now. So please review the documents and either come prepared or again, you can always e-mail comments and thoughts to staff who then bring it to the board as well. Okay.
Okay, so moving to discussion of potential adoption of template for writing sex and early termination response filings, I will open up to Dr. Brecken Blades, and then if there are any comments, I'll open up for discussion.
Okay, we had a similar process with this document in terms of modifying it based on the prior discussion that we held at the larger board meeting, and then also
Staff helped us to just make sure that the language was consistent between both of the documents. So they're sort of go hand in hand and are reflective of each other.
So we felt based on the prior discussion and the comments received that we were ready to bring this forward again for potential adoption by the board.
Shanda, did you have a comment on this document? I believe that you did.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 1:02:48
This is the this is the template for writing. Didn't hear you too well. Or was this the OK, I thought I saw for a second. It was the you had the standards and guidelines up on the on the board. Yes. So and you know, I don't mean to bottleneck anything, I promise. I feel that this is the time and place to discuss this. You know, not everyone's a member of the subcommittees.
And so.
You know, I feel like the conversation is all good. And these things aren't, you know, simple. They're very complex. And they're debating a lot of people's lives. So I think it's good that we take a lot of time and consideration for all of these. But I also feel like if these are guides,
that they should be presented as guides and not mandates. So with that, you know, that's my whole perception of looking at these things is just to make sure that they're

AI-GENERATED

generalized guides for those who are participating or who could participate in responses or filings.
Um...
So, for instance, when it says here...
Filing a response to an ET shall be.
In accordance, I think for this, you know, I think this is fine and good. I think before on this draft, we had more of the actual template.
which I don't think is appropriate. I think this is appropriate, just some guidance for a template. And so because of that, I think a template guide for writing sex offender early termination responses and filings is good.
And that's all I would say about that is a title should include template guide. Just so people understand that this is not what has to be in every single response or filing. I mean, they should be considered as the beginning.
considerations spelled out. But again, this is still a guide. This is not going into any, you know, court form policy, but this is the consideration to complete a certain form.
That's my only response. Thank you.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:05:31
This is Katie Crutchy. My question was about treatment status. It says to indicate the treatment provider's recommendation. Is that, just for my clarification, that's the treatment provider's recommendation as to early termination.
Not all we don't always have someone like if someone's been discharged for a couple of years, they like there's not necessarily a current update on like a early termination recommendation, but I just wanted to clarify what that if that was what the intent of it was to get that recommendation from treatment providers.

Doctor, please.
Yeah, I think, I think, you know, any input, any recommendation is helpful from the treatment provider, but you're right, sometimes there's a delay. And so I think that's why the next sentence is in there where it says, if there is no recommendation from the treatment provider, indicate why, and then the officer might be able to say, you know, no recommendation due to.
you know, years ago, whatever it is, the reason. So it does give that kind of caveat or qualifier in case there's not.
Does anybody else have anything on this document?

AI GENERATED

OK, do I have an enter? Do I have a motion to adopt this document at this time? I'll motion to adopt this is Brecken Blades to adopt the template for writing sex offender early termination responses slash filings document.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:07:05
Jim.
Jim Hanratty a second.

Thank you, Major Mitchell.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07:17
Chairwoman Goulden.

Yes.

Ms. Adkins?
Yes.

Ms. Balson.

Jamie Balson 1:07:31
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07:33
Mr. Barney.

Blake Barney 1:07:35
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07:36
Doctor Blades.

Yes,

Miss Breed.

AI-GENERATED

BS **Breed, Shanda** 1:07:40
No.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07:45
Supervisor Fanning.

JF **John Fanning** 1:07:47
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07:47
Yeah.
Mr. Galarneau.

Yes.

Mr. Hanratty.

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:07:52
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:07:53
Doctor Johnson.

Yes,

Mr. Kelroy.

Yes.

Miss Krejci.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:08:01
Yes.

AI-GENERATED

Jenna Mitchell 1:08:03
Doctor Lokey.
I don't see Doctor Lokey in the meeting anymore. Doctor Miller.

Yes.

Miss Musick.

MM **Missy Musick** 1:08:28
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:08:30
Mr. Naegele.

Yes,

Mr. Neil.

SN **shane neil** 1:08:34
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:08:36
Miss. Opheim

Yes,

Mr. Pawlowski.

Yes.

Miss Panas.

Yes.

AI-GENERATED

Representative Powell.
yes.
Doctor Rivera.

CD **Clinical Director** 1:08:47
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:08:49
Judge Young,

Yes,

Madam Chairwoman, the motion carries.
21 yes and one no.

Thank you, Major Mitchell. Moving on to item 4, discussion and potential adoption of standards and guidelines for the assessment, evaluation, treatment, and behavioral monitoring of adults who have committed sexual offenses. Dr. Blades.
So this is another document that we worked on as a subcommittee and based on the comments and questions that we received when it was on the agenda at our last board meeting. So we reviewed those, processed them as a committee, made some updates as appropriate. Some of our discussion was around
this kind of recognition that this is a very, very small kind of introductory piece to the evaluation standards and kind of protocols and so that some of the questions regarding conflicting evaluation results and denial and things like that are going to be better served in more detailed sort of further along sections that they weren't, that this sort of introductory couple of paragraphs isn't the place
for those, but that we do find those to be relevant and important, and we have, you know, kind of noted those as necessary as we go on. So, otherwise, this is this is our kind of proposed draft at this time for potential adoption.
Thank you, Dr. Blades and the subcommittee for putting together this document. Does anybody have any questions or comments? And thank you for making those provisions. Does anybody have any questions or comments on the document?

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:10:34

AI GENERATED

This is Katie Krejci. Thank you for putting this together and making those changes. I agree. My it looks like perhaps this is suggesting that like the board is encouraging someone to do a psychosexual pre-sentence and then immediately post-sentence, even if they've done that, they're also going to be required again to do an assessment.
And if that's the intent, right, that's the intent, you know, I would defer to the experts on that. But I just wanted to clarify if that's the intent or not. If and if not, could we clarify that like that if one had been done pretrial, who is to consider whether or not that's sufficient? And maybe so maybe I'm missing that piece.

Yeah.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:11:15
Um...

Sure, that was part of our part of our discussion on the subcommittee. So if any of the other members want to jump in and answer, you can do that. But in terms of my kind of recollection and sense of where that discussion went is that we do agree with you that that's an issue and an issue that will come up. That was one of the ones we didn't think necessarily had a place to clarify in this
brief introductory piece. I think also as we outline what what as a board we recommend the evaluation consists of and the pieces of it that that will hopefully kind of bring into focus some of what you're talking about in terms of if one was done pre-sentence, but it
It's by, you know, an evaluator who meets all of those guidelines and that perhaps then we can talk about how does that get considered. But we haven't done any of those sections yet and gotten there. So we didn't have, we didn't really have an answer or the place for it to specify it in a way that maybe makes sense into the future.
given that we haven't flushed that out yet. If that answers your question.
So perhaps you're saying in the next phase we move into treatment and providers and whatnot, that would be discussed and definitely resolved because we don't want multiple psychosexual evaluations. No, we're not in favor of that. And so I think if we get one that's consistent with kind of the standards we put forward, and we're not suggesting that people have to spend more money or more time or more, we're just

AI-GENERATED

saying we haven't sort of written that section yet.
And so that we believe this will be sufficient once we do write those sections. Or again, we can always modify these documents if we start writing the later sections and we realize, you know, hey, we need to add this to clarify, then we can absolutely do that easily. But yes, that's correct. Thank you, Blake.

Blake Barney 1:13:09
Yeah, Blake, Barney. I think one of the things that we also were discussing that may help for everybody is if we, you know, do what Colorado is doing and several other states where we actually certify the providers, then the people who are doing these assessments would be certified by the board.
and there would be no need for them to do a second psychosexual evaluation within a certain amount of time. So that was one of the conversations we had. And if we as a board move towards certifying providers, then that will resolve itself.
But just as Dr. Blades was speaking, it's something that we're going to be able to address further on, specific to the assessments themselves.

Thank you, Blake. Does anybody else have anything?
At this time.

Breed, Shanda 1:14:11
Hi, this is Shanda.

Oh, Shanda, thank you.

Breed, Shanda 1:14:15
Yes, I just want to say thank you to the subcommittee for making those adjustments in the conversation.
And the intent is here to still allow for the voluntary if needed and if there, but to only have a psychosexual evaluation post-sentencing for those who are placed on probation or required to participate in treatment.
I think that is just the best language. So thank you for making those adjustments.

Thank you.
If there's nothing else, I will entertain a motion to adopt these standards. Oh, Katie.

AI-GENERATED

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 1:15:01
Sorry, one other thing I saw also I saw there is a sentence about individuals determined to be sexually violent persons on probation should be required. So I don't know if the committee considered whether or not like it's duplicative at all to people who are determined to be sexually violent persons or already undergo like an annual evaluation.
And maybe that'll, maybe, you know, I don't know if the committee considered whether or not this like psychosexual evaluation would be duplicative at all to the annual evaluation that they're already doing. I don't think that it applies to a ton of people, but a couple of people, right?

Yeah, no, that's a great question. Thank you. And we did, we did consider that and our kind of where we landed is that the annual evaluations that are conducted are different than the PSE that we're suggesting here. And they are for a different purpose. So the annual evaluations are done according to the statute that guides them and the interview, the assessments done are used for that purpose. And the PSE that we're discussing here is more to guide treatment, supervision, those kind of things occurring in the community. So we felt also that the purpose was was different. And so we did, we did put that in there mindfully.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 1:16:25
Okay, thank you so much. And then one last thing I had was whether or not, we heard some people in the public comments talk about kind of treatment being duplicative between DOC and in the community. And I know it talks about people doing these assessments kind of once they're in their community, released into the community. And I'm sure

Yeah.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 1:16:45
kind of as we go along, we'll talk more. There may be some guideline on, or maybe there will or won't be guidelines on like timelines. Would it be at all like possible or appropriate for someone's like, say they're in DOC doing psychosexual treatment, would it be appropriate for that person to do an assessment like this since they're

AI GENERATED

already working with them?
perhaps know them, would that be an appropriate person to do an assessment so someone could have this assessment coming into the community? Or is that something like the committee maybe already considered and that wouldn't be appropriate for whatever reason?

Yeah, also, you know, good question. I think that if someone, if you're talking about maybe someone who's providing the SOETP, they, based on our ethics code, would not be able to be the evaluator. We're not able to transition from treatment provider to evaluator. So in terms of the time frame as to whether someone is still incarcerated in some way. I think we'll probably get into the weeds of that as we go further, but it would need to be an outside evaluator to do the assessments.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:17:49
Okay, thank you so much. That answered all my questions.

Okay, thank you. At this time, I will...
Entertain a motion to adopt the standards and guidelines for the assessment, evaluation, treatment, and behavioral monitoring of adults who have committed sex offenses.
Tell the motion.
Amanda Adkins, motion here for the adoption of potential standards of guidelines for the assessment, evaluation, treatment, and behavioral monitoring of adults who have committed sexual offenses. Thank you. Do I have a second?

JH **Jim Hanratty (SUP)** 1:18:31
Jim Hanratty second that.

Thank you, Major Mitchell.

Jenna Mitchell 1:18:33
Chairwoman Goulden.

Yes.

AI-GENERATED

Miss Adkins.

Yes.

Miss Balson.

JB **Jamie Balson** 1:18:44
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:18:46
Mister Barney.

BB **Blake Barney** 1:18:47
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:18:49
Doctor Blades,

Yes,

Miss Breed.

BS **Breed, Shanda** 1:18:52
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:18:57
Supervisor Fanning.

JF **John Fanning** 1:18:59
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:01
Mister Galarneau,

AI-GENERATED

yes.

Mister Hanratty.

Jim Hanratty (SUP) 1:19:05
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:07
Doctor Johnson.

Yes,

Mister Kelroy,

yes.

Ms. Krejci.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 1:19:16
Um, can I explain my vote? Is that a thing we could do?

Please.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 1:19:21
Okay. I would just say no for right now, just because the current language appears to require one. If someone does one pretrial, they would also be required to do one immediately post-sentencing. And so just because of the current language, no for right now.

Thank you, Dr. Lokey.

Farah Lokey MD DDD 1:19:40
Yes.

AI-GENERATED

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:42
Doctor Miller.

Yes.

Miss Musick.

MM **Missy Musick** 1:19:47
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:49
Mister Naegele.

Yes,

Mister Neil.

SN **shane neil** 1:19:54
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:19:56
Miss Opheim,
yes,

Mister Pawlowski.

Yes,

Miss Panas.

Yes,

Representative Powell.

AI-GENERATED

No.

Doctor Rivera.

CD **Clinical Director** 1:20:12
Yes.

Jenna Mitchell 1:20:14
Judge Young.

Yes.

Madam Chair, the motion carries 22 yes and two no's.

Thank you. Do you guys want to break now or do you want to get through a couple more things? Tell me if you guys want to break. Break or more? I'm hearing both. Okay, let's get through a couple more. I don't think these will be too long, I hope, right? And then we'll take a a short break. This brief discussion on community notification risk assessment versus offense of conviction. So after the presentation last month, and that we will be moving into a work group, is that the right word? And taking on the community notification assessment that we are tasked to do per the legislation. I really just wanted to get a feel for this group, some thoughts prior to those who are going to be in that group discussing that. So I kind of just wanted to open up to all members to get your thoughts. on this, please.

Amanda Adkins here. So you're asking the board to discuss whether we think it should be more focused on offense behavior and conviction as opposed to risk assessment of like current behavior. And I think it could be a mix of both with a heavy emphasis on how they're functioning at this time.
More dynamic assessment.

Thank you.
Anyone else at this time, Katie?

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:21:46

AI-GENERATED

This is Katie. Katie Krejci. I also agree that it should be, well, I believe it should be based heavily on risk assessment versus offense of conviction. I know the presentation talked about how there's like additional funding available if someone, because the federal kind of sore nut directs us to do it based on offense of conviction, as I understood the presentation last month.
But it doesn't sound like we're otherwise SORNA compliant. And so it doesn't sound like we would lose the funding if we moved away from offense-based assessment and went towards risk-based assessment. I think risk-based assessment is better for like victims, better for the community, better for everyone.

Thanks, Katie.
Does anybody else have thoughts or go ahead?

This is Dr. Miller. I was going to agree with the combined approach. I think Colorado is currently doing a combined approach and I don't see how Arizona would be negatively impacted by doing both.
So that would be my vote.

Okay, thank you.

I'm Scott Naegele. Can I ask a question?

Sure.
Is part of the discussion about...
If we're using a risk assessment based process, is part of the discussion about whether or not the current tool continues to be used, or we're talking about addressing a need for an upgraded tool for these purposes, or looking at using some existing tools that already exist that haven't been, I mean, is that part of this discussion as well? I think that's what the group will take on, certainly.
Miss Adkins here. I do want to note that if we are going to combine things like dynamic risk assessment, a lot of people are going to score very high being released from prison.

Yes.

AI-GENERATED

Yeah. Shanda.

Breed, Shanda 1:23:41
Thanks. I would just like to add to the conversation, depending on which way we go with this or if it's combined, as Scott was kind of leaning into, how often should we be doing this? I want to add who would be doing this and how frequent. Thanks.

Thank you.
Anything else? All good. Okay. Thank you all for that. Major Mitchell, will you talk to us about the legislative budget recommendation for the statute?

Yes. So that is in the statute in 13-38-28D6, which is the statute that forms this board, an annual requirement last year. The board was newly formed, as most of you recall, that were on the board at that time. And so letters were prepared stating that we did not have a budgetary recommendation at this point.
So knowing that that's coming up and due soon, we wanted to just put it on the agenda for the board to decide if they have recommendations at this time or if a similar letter should be prepared this year for the legislature.

Representative Powell.

Representative Powell, I'm happy to make a comment on that.
I took a position for two years, primarily voting against the formation of boards. because they all lead to money, they all lead to expense. Because our budgets were so crucial in managing the affairs of the state, we didn't want conflicts within the limited amount of monies that there were. Nor do we want to create a need for increasing revenue by placing further burdens on the citizenship of the people in Arizona. But this particular board, however, because it impacts so many lives, I am actually
Confining my opinion to just this board.
This board, I believe, if we're going to be successful, and especially as I elaborate on some of my suggestions when it comes to my intern on the committee on the agenda, that we would be better served if we actually had some staff.
Okay, so in order to have staff, we have to have monies. So we actually, I would

AI GENERATED

support a campaign.
visiting with legislators to see if we could not generate an assignment of monies, not necessarily in perpetuity, but an assignment of monies that would allow us to prove the value of this committee and the efforts of helping those who need help. So I'm in favor of that.

Thank you, Blake.

Blake Barney 1:26:46
Yeah, I uh...
would just kind of echo Representative Powell. We do need more staff. After that presentation, Colorado has 16 full-time staff. Obviously, we're not there at this point, but we got to start somewhere. And I'm afraid that the staff we do have, are being tasked with a lot of things that are potentially, you know, two or three people's jobs worth of tasks. And so I would.
highly encourage requesting for whatever the budget requires for us to have multiple full-time staff, whether that be three or four, because the way we're going to make the most progress with this group is to have full-time staff that can assist in getting a lot of these things moving forward.

Thank you, Blake. Katie.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD) 1:27:47
Correct me if I'm, so I'm hearing maybe discussion on two different things. Are we discussing under 13-38-28? I think it's D6. Like one of the directives of the board is to develop the annual recommendations to allocate monies deposited in the state general fund.
pursuant to 133821 and there's some other subsections and then recommend. Okay. So for that, I think that in order to make such recommendations, we may need to have information about how the money is currently allocated. Because that sounds like that sounds different than the money that's used to like fund the staff for this board.
And so for making recommendations to the legislature, essentially how to allocate the money that's in the general fund pursuant to that section, I think we would first need to know kind of how that money is currently allocated or who is supported by it

AI GENERATED

or who needs to be supported by it. I think we should try to, you know, comply with the different directives from the legislature.

So yes, I do think I'm hearing two things. So I will read what Major Mitchell was able to find, and then I'm also hearing the secondary issue that we would love more staff, which is the secondary, I think, budgetary request. So what Major Mitchell was able to find for us, the revenue collections from the courts appears to combine the funds pulled in from both the $250 registration and $500 failure to comply assessments, which is ARS 13-3821Q and 13-3824B. For the available fiscal years, they combined to have collected 79,324 and FY23.
68,776 in FY24 and 79,582 in FY25.
Since FY 2008, the highest amount it has ever collected was 81,235 in FY 21. It sits around 70 to $80,000 since FY 20. In the 2010s, it ranged from roughly 30,000 to 60,000.
This is the collected amount. There could be more assessed that was not collected for failure to pay.
Thank you for getting that information for us, too. Thank you.

You're welcome. And these are the statute for those that don't have it available. These are the coordination of the spending monies from the general fund, along with any monies by the Department of Corrections, Department of Public Safety, or the Judicial Department to evaluate and treat adult sex offenders and juveniles who have committed sexual offenses. So those are the recommendations that we're talking about.

No, of course, we just kind of threw this to you, and we can, I think we can send out these numbers, right, Major Mitchell, to everybody, and we could put this on the next agenda perhaps too, if there, if anybody wants to, you know, sit on it and then come back as well. Or so perhaps we could put this on the next agenda and then have another discussion about it. And then we just have to decide at the next meeting if we want to send the letters that we sent last year, or if we had any guidance or, you know, advice on what to do with this. And it is in our statute as well. Shanda.

AI-GENERATED

Breed, Shanda 1:31:28
Thank you, and how has this money been spent in the past?

It's a wonderful question.
Do we know?

Yeah, we do not have records on that Shanda.

Breed, Shanda 1:31:39
Okay, one other question, if you don't mind. And how are we, is that what we need to come up with if we're going to spend, if we want to propose to spend this money and how to spend it? Or do we already have a plan on how, sorry.

So, the...

Sorry, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I was going to read the statute for everyone's references. Develop annual recommendations to allocate monies deposited in the state general fund pursuant to 13-3821 subsection Q and subsection 3824, I'm sorry, section 13-3824 subsection B. These recommendations shall include recommendations regarding the coordination of spending monies from the state general fund with any money spent by the State Department of Corrections, the Department of Public Safety, or the Judicial Department to evaluate and treat adult sex offenders and juveniles who have committed sexual offenses. These recommendations shall be presented to the legislature before the start of each legislative session.

Madam Chairwoman, Jenna Mitchell with DPS. Just for clarification, those funds are fees and assessments that are collected by the courts that are deposited into the state's general fund that are spent with other state general fund dollars. So there's not a separate account that has a balance in it that is being spent on the treatment of juvenile or adult sex offenders. So just for
you know, education for those that aren't familiar with the state budget process and where those monies come from and go to. That's what we're talking about.

AI GENERATED

Madam Chair.

Yes, please.

So there's no spending authority.

Oh, I'll say your name. Joe Kelroy.

Joe Kelroy, sorry. There's no spending authority for this board. It's annually.
And if we're requesting money, we would need positions or job descriptions or specifics for them to consider allocation to this board. Okay. Correct.

This topic today for this agenda item was specific to the statute on recommendations the board has.
for treatment to evaluate and treat sex offenders. Not for staff or additional funding for the board, correct?

Yeah. These letters of recommendation are simply required annually. If there are programs that Department of Corrections might be in support of or
the courts or DPS, that the board would collaborate with them and make recommendations for allocation of those monies for those programs or projects.

Doctor. Madam Chair, this is Doctor Miller. I think this is the right place to bring this up. So if it's not, I apologize.
It's, I don't know, it's been brought to my attention that DOC might be underfunded in terms of screening and evaluating potentially sexually violent persons. We've noticed at ACPTC a pretty dramatic drop in pre-screenings, probably since right around COVID.
And I've heard through grapevines that it's because of a lack of funding. And I don't know if that's accurate. So I don't know if we'd be able to get that information to then make recommendations or have a discussion if that is something that we would want to look into and recommend. But the
The pre-trial rate has dramatically decreased. I do like my small census, but I want to make sure that everything is working as it was intended.

AI-GENERATED

Thank you. I can get with staff and perhaps the DOC and bring some information next month back to us if that's something that the board wanted to explore. Anything else on this, Representative?

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:35:33
This is Katie Krejci. My suggestion, right, if we're looking at like risk needs responsivity overall in the statute that we are suggesting the legislature allocate this to like the highest risk group for evaluation and treatment. And so, you know, kind of wherever that may be, if it's people on probation, like in the community, who are determined the highest risk and that we don't want people not going to treatment just because they don't have money to, you know, whether it's like some scholarship fund for people on probation or community supervision who are recently released from DOC. So we have, we're treating the highest risk people in the community would be my sort of suggestion.

KK **Kathryn Krejci (OPD)** 1:36:18
But I think we have to suggest we like collaborate with like money is being spent already with.
some other departments like the Department of Corrections, Department of Public Safety, Judicial Department. And so like, I don't know what those numbers are and what those funds might already look like.

Thanks, Katie. Shanda, would you be able to get us for next month the funding for sex and retreatment for those on probation? Those also, I know, come out of the general fund. Is that correct?

BS **Breed, Shanda** 1:36:49
I, we, yeah, we do have a fund. I can definitely provide the authority to you all to see and then how much goes to specifically sex offender funds. But we do have a couple of other funds that are an umbrella. And so they may go to, you know, someone that needs substance abuse treatment versus

BS **Breed, Shanda** 1:37:10
sex offender treatment. But yes, I can give you a breakdown of that for next time.

AI-GENERATED

Okay, great. Thank you. Representative Powell.

Thank you, Madam Chair, Representative Powell.
So, uh...
I strongly suggest that we have our own specific budget for management of the board. So we're talking about monies for helping probationers. Clearly, we need to put on the agenda. I'm making the recommendation we put on the agenda for next month. Since we have time is of the essence, since this has to be completed and actually submitted before the second week in January,
I suggest that we may even want to devote the entire meeting next month. We have to capture the budget. We have to identify where the money is going to come from. We have to make suggestions as to where the money, how to generate the money, so forth and so on, and how much money we need. So we need somebody perhaps running some numbers.
using a number of staff, three to five perhaps, if it might need, and so forth and so on, so that we can clearly have this discussion and actually conclude the discussion and make a recommendation to the legislature.

Do you like to crunch numbers?
Representative,

I love to read the crunch numbers.
Yeah, yeah, but crunching the numbers, are you suggesting the revising our statute to?

Yes, I am, because if this committee is going to be effective, if we're going to address the public's concerns, if we're going to give them results, then we have to have a way to do it. And it requires time, it requires manpower. So we don't want to be just going through the motion board, do we, for three years? We want to get something done.

No, we'd like to get things done here.
Yeah. Okay.
I suppose the Department of Public Safety has number crunches.

AI-GENERATED

Well, just remember, we have, we are, we love our staff, but they're very busy too, so we have to balance some of that. I will look myself at the our statue, which
Um...
I have potential revisions worked through that as well, so let me see, and then maybe we'll...
OK, let me think about that.
Madam Chair, I may be able to make a few phone calls to staff.
and see if I can get some numbers crunched.

Sure, that'd be great.
I think I can probably do that.
Thank you, Missy.

Missy Musick 1:39:48
So back to the budget and thank you, Representative Powell. I love that idea. Back to the original conversation. Could some of this budget go towards community education and prevention or is that money's
solely for like post-conviction and treatment.

The way statue reads is.
to evaluate and treat adult sex offenders and juveniles who have committed sexual offenses for this.
Funding, but to Representative Powell's point, if...
The suggestion may be that the umbrella falls under us. I mean, I would also...
not want to forget about victims either and the victim compensation fund and that sort of thing too. So just, I don't know if you're talking about
what exactly we're talking about revising, but.
Yes.
Shanda.

Breed, Shanda 1:41:02
Yes. Thank you. Is this the time for us to share what we think maybe the money can be utilized on? Okay, I didn't know if...

Sure. Yes. So I also, yeah, but I also want to just, well, we will bring it back next month

AI GENERATED

to have further discussion and perhaps, you know, a vote on, because we have to send letters by early January.

Breed, Shanda 1:41:15

Okay.

Sure, sure. I, it would help to know what the money's been used on in the past to see if this is...

Something that...

the money's kind of up for grabs from maybe certain agencies and they're, I don't know, maybe they're splitting it or they're saying, okay, this is your year to take it or, you know, if we take it, are we taking from something else? So that would be very helpful to know how, where this money has been going in the past and what maybe, could be impacted if it's being used on something else. And then two, some other thoughts, just from being at all the board meetings and hearing from public members and that sort of thing, and focusing on the treatment of sex offenders.

I would say, you know, there is very minimal funds for sex offender treatment. It's not covered a lot of it by Title 19, and just looking to maybe provide other treatment to folks who can't afford it, especially the psychosexual evaluations and telegraphs and that sort of thing. Another thing that's come to mind over these past meetings has been accountability.

or consistency of the treatment programs that are available. You know, what does that mean if we have a sex offender maybe at different levels? What does that mean across the board? Because that could be something very different from county to county and location to location, depending on what's accessible to them.

for sex offender treatment. There's also been loopholes that have been happening across the state. So maybe someone's been placed on probation, has to do some sort of assessment to look and see what type of sex offender treatment they need. But there's no providers. And so maybe you have a local

provider or clinician saying, well, let's just get you in on, you know, some general. things and that way we can get it paid for sort of thing. So maybe just that accountability piece, maybe who could kind of look at that or see what the program needs to be for the different ranges of offenses and behaviors.

For sex offenders, and then last thought was...

And we kind of talked about this before, but we were thinking about a maybe a

AI-GENERATED

validation of the community risk notification assessment. But we're also talking about if that's the best assessment at all. So anyhow, just those three things. Thanks.

Thank you.
Okay, at this time, we'll just do a table list for next month. Just bring your thoughts and then we'll see what other information we can get for next month. Major Mitchell, regarding D and to invite Karl Hansen here. Will you let the board know what you were able to find out?

Unless Ms. Adkins has other information, our research indicated that he does provide presentations at request, but charges.
for those, which I think is what you had alluded to last month when you suggested it as an agenda item. So perhaps if there's a topic or specific area that we, the board would like information on, maybe we could pursue how we could get that from, you know, maybe one of the universities or another resource within Arizona that doesn't include a speaker fee.

Scott. Scott Naegele. I wonder, Amanda, with...
The Arizona chapter of ATSA reforming, kind of getting its legs back again and trying to get moving again. I wonder if there might be a way.
to entice Dr. Hanson to come do a presentation for Arizona ATSA and get him to come by here and share with us some information that I think will be very important information for the board as a whole. So I wonder if reaching out to perhaps some, I think the folks at Mountain Valley are
the ones that are spearheading trying to get Arizona ATSA rolling again. I wonder if there's a way to do that.

I'm going to throw out the idea of the budget discussion next time. Thank you. Let's go ahead and take a
10 to 12 minute break. We'll be back. Thank you.

Ashlesha Naik stopped transcription

You ready?

AI GENERATED

Okay.
All right, it's 3:34.
will reconvene and with, let's see.
E on the agenda. Board member requests Representative Powell to establish a real-time response protocol process policy for responding to public comment.
Representative Powell.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm sure everybody has a copy of my recommendation in front of them. I'm simply acknowledging, I think, the request of the people who have come and spoken to us. In order for us to be effective,
We need to make sure that somehow they're being validated. So they come forward, we invite them to come forward, they bring ideas, they bring experiences, they share real issues with us. So we need to capture those. And then we need to address those. And we need to give a response. And hopefully,
we are learning and growing and providing some type of remedy or some type of peace or at least substantial
Response that tells them that we're hearing what they're saying, that we're paying attention to what they're saying.
So.
Not being able to be here for every meeting since October, and I apologize for that. But the fact of it is, is as I've listened to the speakers speak, I can go back and I know there's a record because I know it's being captured, but I don't see any efforts in addressing it.
So, I've made recommendations here.
On page.
Well, it probably says 25 if you printed the same thing I printed. Identify the visual tracking system. I really like the idea of a dashboard. Wouldn't it be nice if they could go to the AZSOMB page and all of a sudden there's a dashboard that pops up and they can click on it. They can identify the public comments and they could identify A, B, and C, or one, two, and three, all the steps that followed. And then of course, wouldn't it be nice if somebody on this board sent them some type of an e-mail or a follow-up message and said 48 hours or so afterwards, we heard you. We heard you. Thank you.
So on page 26, I've got this action-oriented agenda. So again, you have to ask, the board has to ask, is it within our jurisdiction, yes or no? If it's not within our

AI-GENERATED

jurisdiction, we send a comment back to the person who made it, because we're not making it here, and we simply follow up.
Again, we validate them, we thank them for participating in the process, and we say, sorry, we don't have jurisdiction. Okay, there's an answer. So now they're not going to be feeling ignored. Under
B, it says the standing follow-up comment agenda. I give an example there. And then I have a two-median rule. I give an example there. The study, the workshop, the action session. We have committees. We're doing that. I'm not trying to add more burden to the committees, but what I am trying to say is that I want to be more effective as a board so that people realize that this board is not just going through the motion. So if we're going to be asking for monies, if we're going to be asking for staff, then we have to be producing. So I come from the private industry where I've been self-employed my whole life. If you're not producing value, you do not stay in business.
So, because this is a public representation.
We've been asked by the legislature, this board was created, it was legislated. Now we're acting on it. Now we need to actually prove that we're producing qualified results, that we're actually helping people. And it needs to be available for people to follow so that they're part of the process and don't feel excluded. And then the direct communication, closing the loop,
Again, so I've made reference to that already. So these are just some of my recommendations. I would actually like to see if we can put together a format, a process, so that it is publicly
We involve the public and we're actually using that structure as a guideline to keep in touch and produce the answers that they're seeking.
Thank you, Madam.

Thank you, Representative Powell.
We do not have, we have to go back to what the legislature.
what our legislation, what we are mandated to do by law, right? And...
I have to say that is the best way, if we're able to do our work, to help those that are in this system, which I go back to why I worked on this legislation to be able to get bin with after 25 years of working inside that system, right? I know many of the problems and I still see it today in my private work.
It's still happening, so I'm aware, but the best way I believe we can.

AI GENERATED

help those, whether it's victims, those families, offenders on probation, is to do our work and set those guidelines and standards and treatment and supervision, and that we're all here as volunteers to do that. And as in our previous discussion, we talked about
we have staff that, you know, we have very limited staff. And I know in previous meetings, I've talked about, you know, we have to be careful vetting. It takes a lot of time to vet information that comes to us. Not every single thing that comes to us is accurate or true or
It takes a lot of time to look into a single case. It's not simple. These cases are very, very complicated and take a lot of time to look into. And what I think would be helpful Is. Writing in.
when a member of the public needs the board to know something, when it is something that we have control over, we need to know so we can see consistent themes, which I think I'm aware of the consistent themes that occur within our probation and criminal justice system. I am still in court quite often on different different cases. So I see it. It has not changed. And in some ways, it's even gotten worse since I retired. So I'm aware, I just cannot put staff in a position. We just don't have the capability to look into and vet every single case. And then of course, my fear would be we actually get off track, right, from the work that we're mandated to do. So of course, I want to hear from everybody. These are some of my initial thoughts. on that, but I can't ask staff to take that on at this time. We just talked about, we just, we just, we don't have funding to do.

Thank you, madam. I'm not asking for immediate structure to be put in place. What I'm saying is that if I were running this in a private sector industry, I would be creating that mechanism to do that.
So timing, of course, is critical and resources are critical. If we don't have the resources, then perhaps we need to submit an amendment to the definition of this board as it was defined in legislature and insert it. And if so, the question is, is that The...
The statute gives a definition. It offers clarity as to what the legislators were hoping this board would accomplish.
And it offered a lot of hope to the public. So if we need to somehow...
amend the language or redefine the language, we need to identify who's bringing us what we're supposed to be working on. Are we generating these ideas? Are we

AI-GENERATED

generating the issues ourselves? Are we bringing the issues ourselves because of our own experiences? I mean, who's bringing the issues to us that we're supposed to be addressing?
That's one. Number 2, if we're inviting the public to bring us issues, we do understand that we may not, we need to vet them. Of course, we need to vet them. So I'm not suggesting that we entertain every single idea. What I'm saying is that when one idea becomes apparently widespread, or if it becomes something that we obviously know needs to be addressed, then we need to have a process, a protocol for addressing it. So perhaps we just spend some time, if we feel that that's worthy as a board, to develop it and then implement it. Anybody on the board can bring forth issues, but I think that
Those that work in this field and have worked in this field for a very long time understand many of the issues that affect thousands of people on probation or in DOC in the state, right? So the public can comment and certainly share their individual stories, but the board is made-up of experts. So we are able to guide the discussion and create those standards, guidelines, as we're doing. And I've also, this is, it's a board, we're made with volunteers. It's not a private
if we were a private company or we were a private entity, we may have, you know, endless resources at our disposal.

So I think, Scott, did you want to say something? And then there's a couple people online as well. Scott, go ahead.

I, I guess I...
I certainly understand where Representative Powell is coming from and I support what I hear you saying. You know, what's, it's taken me a little bit to get clarity about like, you know, what our mission is here and what it's going to take to make our way through some things. And I felt a little remiss at times listening to certain members of the public come and talk about things that, you know, I, you know, without, you know, singling anyone out, there's certainly some things that I've heard
said that I can get behind and that are problematic and that we collectively, you know, need to play a part in cleaning some stuff up. But I'm mindfully aware more as time passes how we can't put the cart before the horse and, you know, we're trying to build a structure and some of the issues that are getting raised, you know, month in and month out are things that I'm not ignoring, but at the same time, I know I

AI-GENERATED

can't do anything about as I sit here right in this moment. So I think there's something to be said for trying to find a way for people to not feel like they're being ignored and that they're being heard. I think there's absolutely something to be said for that. But I think many of the issues that are being raised are perhaps higher level issues that can't be really effectively taken on until we
until we, I don't know, create a structure for ourselves that we're all buying into and we're all willing to follow. So I'm just trying to be mindful of that and receptive to the things I'm hearing. And I guess that's what I would say about that.

Shane.

SN **shane neil**
This is Shane, can you hear me?

Yes.

SN **shane neil**
Okay. I mean, I would like to address the original comments. I mean, to be honest, I mean, I feel like it's pretty disrespectful to suggest that the board is either unqualified or unwilling to do what needs to be done on this issue. I mean, most people on the group are doing it in either in their spare time
Or...
you know, on outside of work. So they're missing out on work hours they can bill or clock to, because this is an issue important to them. We've all seen the issues that are prevalent across the state in this field. So we're kind of aware of what the issues already are. So the
The as far as specific cases, I've said numerous times, we don't have the authority and it's also inappropriate to try to or attempt to retry cases that have already been through the court system. So there's a process legally, there more anybody's more than well or able and capable of filing whatever they want.
personally or with their attorney. They can go back to the sentencing judge. They can go to an appellate court. They can go to probation. They can go to probation supervisor, director, executive team, all the way up to the chief. Same thing with parole. They have a chain of command. Those are the people on supervision. There's plenty of people

AI-GENERATED

That, that, that can be, you know, addressed on a specific case. I will also say that... I personally have supervised and managed thousands of sex offenders. I have never encountered one person who did not commit a crime that somehow related to sexual deviancy. The difference is with regular crimes, other crimes,

shane neil

People own it. People will say, yes, I drank and drove. I used drugs. I assaulted somebody. I committed murder. They will just tell you. Gang members will tell you what they did. Sex offenses are not like that. They are rooted in secrecy and they are kept secret for a very, very long time until they come to light. And so when they come to probation, it does them no service to play into that denial because every single person comes to probation with some level of denial about what they did. I'm not saying there's not issues with reports or things that people said that happened that didn't happen. Overall, something criminal occurred. So that's why that's one of the first things they address is denial in treatment because...

That is taking responsibility for the offense is the best thing a person can do. And that's why there's a big difference between somebody who maybe is untreated or is early on in treatment or is doing terrible in treatment versus somebody that's treated and owns their offense. They have their realized prevention program.

plan in place and they have, they sound completely different than somebody who is untreated. So the, I can tell you the story you get in a ministry capacity is completely different than, you know, the facts of the case. And that's fine. But the, we, I.

None of us were elected to this board. We were appointed. So I don't, your job as a legislator is different. You have constituents. I don't, we don't. So I don't have an obligation to follow up with something. If it's legitimate, 100%, I listen and I will note it and we, yeah, if somebody has a suggestion on a speaker or whatever, I've heard plenty of suggestions. That's an option. That is a funding issue that was already said. So I just think that it's just not appropriate to say that we're not doing anything and we need a process so people feel heard because this whole board was born

from people that care about the topic. And to suggest that there's some other way that people can feel better heard is honestly crazy to me because it's better than what we had before. There was no sounding board for anybody. And honestly, nobody cared. So

That is my two cents, do with it what you will.

AI-GENERATED

Thank you, Katie. And then we'll go to Amanda.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD)

Okay, thank you. This is Katie Krejci. So I like the intent behind what Representative Powell has brought to the board. I think that sometimes we do hear individual complaints that are things that are kind of outside the jurisdiction of this board. And sometimes as a board member, it's frustrating to not be able to respond and say, like, you know, this is not even something the board can address.

Like we can't investigate in an individual person's situation, right? That's like not what this board does. It's not part of the, like our, when we look at our statutory, it's outside of the statute of what we're allowed to do. But also then like I have to balance that with everyone's time on the board of like, does it make sense to have a discussion to be like, we can't.

we can't investigate this or this, your individual situation. I think that like having that announcement before the public speaks is helpful in terms of like, hey, all we can really do and tell you today is say thank you. We'll direct staff to investigate an issue if it's specific, you know, if that's something needed. But

I don't even think we have staff that can investigate like an individual situation, right? Like all they can do is investigate issues at our direction that relate to our legislative kind of mandate. I don't think Victoria is there, but I do have like 2 questions about whether or not we could even do the, like, I'm kind of intrigued by the public comment follow up agenda item.

where maybe different board members, we could have a standing item. I don't know if that's specific enough to comply with public open meeting law. And then my other question, and this might also be for Victoria, so maybe we would need to table it, would be the direct communication and like closing the loop. I don't know if it would violate the public meeting laws to like send someone into, you know, send everyone who submits something in a public setting, like an individual.

response letter. Those are my two things. But like, you know, I do like to hear from the public. I think it does reaffirm. I think there's a lot of people on this board who have worked in this area. Some people more than others. Some people it's been a while. Some people, you know, are doing it more recently. Some people have less experience working with this population. I know like Shane,

for example, has direct experience working with a lot of this population. And so he

AI-GENERATED

has a lot more background than maybe someone else does. And so I think hearing from the public on these issues is important, but I don't think it's, and I kind of agree, I forget who spoke first about like, it's not something we can, maybe Mr. Naegele, we can't.
we can't address today because we're like barely starting this board. We're like about just past a year in and that we're getting to these issues. We hear them from the public. So I like the intent of like, hey, public, we hear you. We agree with a lot of these issues. We're working on getting there and trying to get some remedies for these issues you've been raising.

Thank you, Katie. And I know Victoria is not with us today, but we will, we can get with her to answer those questions that you had also to clarify. And then on our agenda, I do want to say we do cite the statute under the call of the public. That technically, I think per the statute, we're not able to
respond. I don't think Victoria's gone over that with us before that. So in the statute, we're not able to do so.
But, so thank you, Amanda.

Amanda Adkins. I really appreciate Representative Powell's desire to be transparent with the public and of things to be addressed. And while I don't think we should outline a specific timeline, I think we could maybe outline kind of a order of operations if we are planning to work on so that people can come prepared to those meetings when we start talking about terms of probation. then they bring their comments about probation at that time. And I also really like the number two, the relevant legislative tracking. So I'll leave that at that.

Thanks, Amanda. Dr. Blades.

So what I have that we kind of left off in terms of the questions to us were one about where are the issues being raised. And so for me, my perspective on it is that our statute is pretty clear in terms of what it wants us to do. And so that's what I've been going back to in these board meetings. And then in terms of
of working with the subcommittee and setting our agenda is that really this statute really outlines everything that we're supposed to do. And so I see these tasks as larger structural, maybe kind of global to the system and that we need to work on

AI-GENERATED

those in order for individual cases to be impacted.
in whatever way that may be, but we can't start with individual cases or smaller issues and then work backwards. We have to start with the whole kind of process. Like let's look at the treatment process and then that way when people come in and they say, you know, the agency's not doing this or I've been there for too long, right, whatever, we've now created a structure to kind of match that against and everything should flow to all of those cases. But I think that we, that is how to me this reads and that it's the statute, it's the legislation that have brought us the issues. It's not, I don't see in here that we are to adapt depending on what is brought to us. I hear that we can consider those things that are relevant to our agenda or give them further consideration, but that this is where the issues come from. And we, you know, especially I think in the subcommittees, we are working very hard on these things and to try to push these documents through and have them processed and then bring them back and make the, you know, changes. And that is our effort to help the individuals that are coming here in the room is that we are working
to streamline to benefit the larger system such that it creates change for people. In the community, victims and those who are convicted of offenses, all of them will benefit from a system that's consistent and streamlined.
is how I see what we're doing.
Thanks, Brecken. Anybody else?

So I appreciate Jenna's helping me turn it off my microphone. Thank you.
So, just a follow-up comment.
Thank you for the input, and I appreciate being on the board. And I recognize that there are experts on this board, and making these suggestions is simply suggestions, right? These are simply recommendations, but in no way is this being critical of anybody's effort. Of course, we're all volunteers, and so we serve because we want to help.
And it's altruistic. But it's also a use of, or years of experience of identifying where there are real issues. And I think from my perspective of the legislature, from being on the legislature, the purpose of this board is to bring back to them recommendations. So
Where do we get the recommendations? We get them from the public. Again, I'm simply saying this is an area that perhaps we need to recognizing all the expertise that we have here, that we applied that expertise and actually given the legislature

AI-GENERATED

and the public the defined expertise that brings them some type of recognition or validation or peace or approval in some way, knowing that we're working as a resource to better society.
That's what it was made for. I certainly hope that, you know, everyone knows that. I think that's why we're all here, right? And I know I've said this before, and I will continue to say it, that I know many of you are working very hard or very dedicated to this. I have asked for funding, just so you know, from the legislature. I have asked for additional stuff. It was shot down.
We obviously are moving into a new legislative session, and so maybe that will change. So, you know,
I appreciate the...
staff, certainly that we have because they are working really hard, but we are not set up to adequately or properly address anybody's individual, you know, at this time. But it doesn't mean that can't. I would like us to continue to improve and get better. And I want to remind everybody, you know, Colorado, for example, has been doing this since 1992. And we've only been here for, you know, just over 12 months. And so things like this take time. There's a lot
A lot to do, and...
We all work with many people who are in the system and victims and then all of the families that are impacted by sexual abuse. And so I just ask for some patience as we work through the things that I know we're going to accomplish here. So
Can we move on to your second?
topic on the agenda?
Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair. All right, the second suggestion that I am proposing, establishing a formal policy or guidelines or organizational structure for legislative bill traffic. Now, we did talk about this last month. Bills are coming up.
And so I'm just encouraging the board somehow, and again, this is one of the reasons I suggest that we do do some financial studies and reviews, that we do go back to the legislature, that we do ask for money so that we can actually have staff to accomplish because we're volunteers. So we're busy working. We're doing all the things that we are doing. We need staff that's dedicated to actually help this board meet some of its goals. So I'm happy to make that proposition to the legislature as well. But this this idea of creating some way to vet or review bills. So unless the board already has a organization, an inner organization to do that, I'm suggesting that we create the mechanism for doing that. Now, again, I feel bad because it adds work. I'm

AI-GENERATED

not trying to add work.
Work to the board members, we need staff, but we need...
Part of the statute requires us to respond to bills, and we're getting to that session, and we're probably going to have a number of bills. There's a completely new culture and environment at the Capitol, and it will be that way for two years. I'm communicating to you if we want to accomplish some good, this is probably one of the best windows that have been opened up to us to do that.
And the way we can do that is to make sure we have a really clear and defined way of studying bills that perhaps could help us accomplish the mandate of the statute.

So last March, we did vote on the legislative process, and then moving into this next session, we now have an RTS account. And then I know staff can send you or maybe resend the board what we adopted, but I know Major Mitchell just supplied it to me. I don't know if you guys all want me to read it to you, but we do have
We do have the procedure that we adopted as a board last March moving into the next legislative session. What I just cannot commit to is committing staff to more work at this time. I just can't do it and I can't give them firm deadlines.
What I can tell you is that I am going to be at the legislature often. And I think we do have a good policy that we adopted that we can, that I think we need to try and then adjust next session if we need to change things. But I think that we also had a number of people on this board that brought bills to us that they recommended that we look at or whatnot. So if you want, we can send you the process that we adopted again, or is it on our website also? It's on the website also. And I'm hoping the RTS account will help also as lawmakers go in there and can see in real time what what we're supporting or against or we're neutral on.
And then I do want to go to Missy. Missy.

Missy Musick
This is Missy Musick. So just out of curiosity, when it comes to funding, what is our ability to utilize interns? I'm sure there's a lot of graduate students or I don't know, maybe even undergraduate students that
are often looking for internships. Could we utilize that in any way?

I know that, I mean, that'd have to go through DPS, so we'd have to have a conversation with DPS and how and if they use, you know, interns. And if that's

AI GENERATED

something that we could explore.
What else? Anybody else at this time?

Amanda Adkins here.

Yes, Amanda.

As a board member, it'd be nice if there was a concise place to be able to review the stuff that was coming up. So the idea of like the dashboard that he had maybe mentioned before, or like a, I'm reviewing the March discussion, but you know, I do remember coming to the meeting feeling like,
Wow, what just happened? What did I just hear? And I wasn't aware of what was going on until we were in the meeting.

So just related to which topic you're saying?

Last year during the legislative season, it's like everybody came with these opinions and I didn't even see them on the agenda. I was like, what are we talking about? So a place that would be easy for all of us to see those that are up for discussion.
I guess, beyond just the meeting minutes, if there's due dates or something like that, just a thought.

Blake or Major Mitchell, did you want to say something?
Yeah. Miss Adkins, maybe get with me, Jenna Mitchell, DPS. If you can get with me after the meeting, just for a little clarification, because I'm looking back at our website for March. We have the board legislative review and voting procedure posted.
do post the agenda. I believe everything we talk about in our meetings is agendized, and we're trying to get those written materials to the board members a week before. That's been difficult with the subcommittees only meeting three days before, four days before the larger board. So I know sometimes we're posting those a little bit later, but
I just want to make sure if there's a gap where we're not getting you all what you need, that I can identify what that is and work to improve that for you. I appreciate that.

AI-GENERATED

It's probably operator error.

We'll do Blake and then Jim.

Blake Barney

Yeah, Blake Barney, I don't know. I know we can't necessarily request it, but is there a way to encourage the legislature to bring things to the board or, you know, send things to you, Madam Chair, that are specific to sex offender
changes in legislation, new bills that are being submitted that would, you know, benefit their cause by going through the board? I don't know, but it just seems like we could be...
maybe the first stop before a lot of these bills are submitted and then we're trying to either slow it or discuss the process as it's happening. So that's really me just kind of thinking out loud and then wondering what the options are there with the legislature and our board specifically.

Yes, and so I've already began to reach out to new lawmakers who...
who will be in office in January. So I've already began to do that. And to again remind folks that we are here and also introduce ourselves to new members coming in. And I just again want to keep, I think we started, you know, bills get dropped sometimes in
what, I mean, January, they drop them fast, right? And so a lot of work was already done before people even knew that we were here. And so my goal moving into this session is to start as early as I can and really spread the word that we're here and that really, if they want
me to come let them know what we do. They want to sit in our meetings. They want to review some of the work we've done. I'm happy to do so. And then again, I will be at the legislature often this year as well. So I think, again, we started late last year when I think a lot of bills were already, you know, drafted and dropped. And then we were we were just playing, I think, catch up and it really derailed our
even our own agenda and plans when the board got off the ground last session. So yes, like I do, and like I said, I've already reached out to members, the new members and newly elected as well. So hopefully we can stay on top of that. And I'll do my best. Jim.

AI-GENERATED

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Jim Hanratty, polygraph examiner. Just for my own clarification, the staff we have now are DPS employees that are assigned to the board, correct?

Correct.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
And the staff that we're proposing that we're going to get, is that going to be more of the same, that these would be folks that would be employees of DPS, or are these folks that we would employ somehow through another means with the funds that could be allocated? I'm trying to figure.

Right now is DPS. Sorry, I thought you were done. I'm sorry, Jim. Go ahead. I didn't mean to cut you off.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
No, that's fine. Go ahead.

The initial legislation, the intention we asked for.
At least, I think, three to five. And we modeled after we wanted a statistician, a program manager. There's a couple others. There were additional
staff that would be working through DPS to support the work of the board. And the other intention was to take, you know, a lot of the work off board members, since again, most of us on the board have full-time jobs and obviously to support the work that we do. So
The intention, I think, to ask for additional funding would be to, and really maybe identify the positions that would be helpful to us.
to support the stuff that we already have.
Does that make sense? Does that?

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you. Thank you for that.

We, those that did not, so that did not occur. And so we are very happy with what we

AI-GENERATED

received, because it could have been an absolute no. And then if without staff at all, we would obviously not be here. But now that we have, you know, a year, done, it would be important to, I think, let the legislature know and work with GPS to see what we could do to get additional staff to even be able to support the work that we're doing.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)

Thank you again, Madam Chair.

Thank you.
Okay, so I think we have a process. Oh, who? Who? Sorry, oh, Shanda. Thank you.

Breed, Shanda

Thank you. I do agree with Adkins to slow down when we, you know, have acknowledgement of a new bill that's being proposed to bring it to us. I love Paul's idea about having some sort of subcommittee.
or maybe even just a couple folks that are kind of keeping track of the bills and maybe...
You know, before we come to some...
vote if we wanted to support the bill or not as the larger board, maybe if they could, you know, send us the information prior to receive feedback. You know, some of our agencies are sponsoring maybe some of these bills or we may have ties to other legislators who are sponsoring the bills and may have more information about the background, or maybe we just have feedback on how the bills will be impacting different people or different agencies. And so I think it's a great idea to have some sort of, you know, small committee, you know, maybe Representative Powell can help with it just to kind of keep track and give us more information and knowledge about the bills that are moving forward.

So I want to emphasize last year, all of the board, all of the bills were put on agendas. They were there and I'm happy to, you know, help anybody. We put bill numbers for the interest of, you know, space, I guess. But I understand if
I'm trying to, did we put the actual, I have to? We attached. So yeah, and we attached the, that's what I thought, the attached draft was also in there. So please, please review your packets and please, again, but the legislative session, as many of you

AI GENERATED

know, also works really fast. It's very fast. So
Oftentimes, these bills are put and assigned to a committee and it's the next. Wednesday, right? And so, so it is fast moving. And then again, I, any, any board member that sees something that wants to bring it to the board's attention, I please, you know, encourage you to do so. But the legislative session oftentimes moves fast and people draft bills, obviously without
our input, but it's related to our expertise and what we're doing here. So it's important that I, that we weigh in.
And so again, with the process that we have put in place, this, and I believe, Major Mitchell, please correct me if I'm wrong, there's only so many subcommittees we're permitted to have. And again, it becomes a staffing issue with what, and a time commitment issue as to what we are able, you know, to do.
Doctor Rivera.

Clinical Director
Yes, thank you. So I was just wondering if it would be something easily done where we have just like a living document perhaps that we can update that holds all of the bills that we've either discussed or
Um...
are going to discuss and just the results of those, like if they're voting or whatnot.

Do you mean like on the website or is that what you're talking about? Okay, I'd have to ask staff if that, if that's possible.

Clinical Director
Yeah, yeah.

But we can, I can check with staff.
No, we want it all, so I'm going to go ask for like $2,000,000. OK, and like, just you are OK, Representative. OK, yes, Scott.

In the interest of trying to figure out how we can keep tabs on bills and things like that, I want to make people aware that there's a council of youth and children's service providers. I may not be getting it correct, but they're a group that's existed for, I don't know, 40 years.

AI-GENERATED

in there, they have membership from all the behavioral health providers around the state and they have subcommittees and one of those subcommittees monitors bills. So it might, perhaps we could get some help from them because they've dedicated somebody in their group on an ongoing basis.
to paying attention to what bills are out there and what those bills speak to and how they have implications for children and families. And perhaps we can get in contact with them and whoever they're. I mean, I used to be intimately involved in that, but I frankly don't even know who their leaders are at this point in time, but I know the entity still exists.
And they dedicate people to following these kinds of things and bringing it back to the larger group. So somebody already doing that, perhaps we can tag on them and get some information from them.

Thanks, Scott. Anything else?
Let's move on to subcommittee reports. Scott, do you want to give us a report? I'm sorry, Representative Powell, before we move on.

Just for clarity, thank you, Madam Chair, Representative Powell, for clarity, you've asked me to run numbers or get staff or somebody to run numbers for this board. So what is it that we're asking that can be defined so that I can communicate that to people who are running the numbers? Are we asking for two more?
Are they full-time, part-time, three, 4, 5? Are we asking for finances as well to support initiatives or unexpected cost? What is it that you want me to communicate? I don't know that we've discussed and decided that, but I think what we have
I think we put all the good that we need more staff, at least a couple staff, and do we want to identify what those people or folks may do? So presently we have 3 full-time DPS people on that?
No, I don't think we have 3 full-time.
Do we have anybody that's assigned specifically to the board full-time?
No.
Okay, so we don't. All right. So
Perhaps this board can make some suggestions as to what they're thinking might be. So we can put that on the next agenda item or agenda for next month. It'd be helpful to have just some thought right now because I'm going to go make this request.

AI-GENERATED

Historically, I have requested and modeled it after what Colorado started with, which I thought would be a good start for us.
We do not even have one full-time position.
So is there a resource that you can, somebody can send me that I can?
Sure, I can send you, and if anybody else has any thoughts, but I think three to four full-time would be really helpful.
positions. That's nice. That's nice. Thank you. Don't want to be too greedy initially. We have to start. Missy.

Missy Musick
Well, I put my hand down because, I mean, I was thinking, can we negotiate? Like, can we ask for, you know, more than we feel like we need right now? And then be good with, oh, well, we'll take.

Oh.
Ohh.

Missy Musick
Two instead of five, because at this point, I mean, I would take at least one full-time person, if nothing else.

Yeah.
There you go.
I'm listening carefully.
I threw out three.
So I'll just have some numbers run and we can make, I can bring back some several different options.
Okay. Thank you, Representative Powell. I appreciate it.
Scott with the juvenile subcommittee report out. Oh, I'm so sorry. Please hold again. Jim.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Hi, Jim Hanratty, the polygraph examiner. Just food for thought here. We have an adult committee, we have a juvenile committee, and we have the main board. So there's three right there. You said something about a data analysts. That's 5.

AI-GENERATED

If we include Jenna, that's five. I'm assuming Jenna is 1 on that list and her assistant who runs the show in the background doesn't get any credit, but she's awesome. So Is that a good number count?

I think it is, Jim. I think it is Representative Powell. Did we say 5 or you had six, Jim?

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Hopefully.
I'm at six if we include six, yes.

Six.
We're at 6, Representative Powell.
Right now, it's just a dream, right? Yes, we can dream.
The answer is always no, unless you ask, right?
Exactly. Yes. Thank you. Thank you.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
A couple horses would help too. That'd be great. We can get a couple horses in on there too. Thank you. Have a good day.

We'll start with six. Thank you, Jim.
I'm afraid to say Scott's name. Scott, would you like to give us a report out on the juvenile subcommittee?
You know, beyond what I said with respect to the guiding principles that we're working on and trying to get footnote issues solidified with that, we're continuing to work on the structure of the psychosexual evaluation. I think we took one more step in doing that at our last meeting.
where we had a couple providers from the AOC's contract list come in and talk with us about psychosexual evaluations. I think we had a lively discussion, especially as it pertains to the use of polygraph as part of the evaluation process. I think, you know, if I would ask my subcommittee members to just look very carefully at, you know, some of the stuff that we've already put together,
the structure, the grid, if you will, that I proposed prior to last month's meeting and how we might modify that and I guess make some final decisions about what that structure looks like. So we are moving, but as I've mentioned more than once in my

AI GENERATED

feedback,
I'm growing more patient and understanding of how there's nothing about what we're trying to do at any level that's simple. And it probably behooves us to take the time necessary in these fundamental steps to do justice to the task so that
Stuff that comes after this is built on a good foundation.

Thank you, Scott. Brecken.

Okay, well, you've already heard from me quite a bit today, so I'm just making sure. We have been working on the documents that we already discussed at the beginning of this meeting. So the subcommittee members have been working really hard to get those prepared. What we'll do going forward is take the considerations document back and make the changes that were suggested today so that that's ready for review at the next meeting. We also will continue working on the upcoming sections of the proposed standards for the evaluations and then try to work through that. We also have the CMT kind of Teams document and everyone has had a chance to review that. And so we're starting the next meeting ready to discuss that. If anyone who has made comments on that document is available to show up to provide kind of context and discussion about it, that would be great. And I will just reiterate that as we go through some of these documents, we're happy to have anyone on the board participate and either send us kind of written comments on those documents or attend the meetings to speak at that time about them also. So thank you.
Thank you. At this time, I will call for future agenda items. If anything comes up after today, the deadline is December 8th at noon to submit anything for our next meeting. So
Do we have any?
Agenda items at this time.
For next month.
At this time?

You did make note of the one that I suggested earlier. Yes, earlier, right?
Yes.
Okay, yes. And we also have the one we'll bring back next month with the financials and the recommendations. Okay.

AI-GENERATED

Thank you, everyone. Do I have a motion to...
Ohh, Jim.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Jim Hanratty, polygraph examiner. Yeah, sorry. Had technical difficulties here. The final draft of the polygraph examinations and how they contribute. Did you want me to put that together for the agenda for a vote, or do you want me to work that out with the subcommittee?

I would say start with the subcommittees. Are you on the adult? Yes, I would say bring that to the adult subcommittee. That would be great.

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Okay.
Yes.
All right, thank you.

Thank you.
Do I have a motion to adjourn?
Joe Kelroy, I make a motion to adjourn. Do I have a second?

Jim Hanratty (SUP)
Jim Hanratty second that, Jim Hanratty second.
Thank you. All those in favor.

Missy Musick 51:17
Aye.

Kathryn Krejci (OPD)
Aye.

Blake Barney
Aye.

Any opposed? No? Okay, we are adjourned at 4:26. Thank you, everyone.

AI GENERATED

Blake Barney

Thank you.

stopped transcription

AI-generated content may be incorrect

Notice: This transcript was generated using Microsoft Teams automatic Recording & transcription technology. 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.

AI-GENERATED