



STATE OF WASHINGTON

Sex Offender Policy Board

PO Box 40927 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0927

(360) 407-1050 • FAX (360) 407-1043

Minutes

Sex Offender Policy Board

Registration and Community Notification Committee

Department of Corrections

Tumwater, WA 98516

October 14, 2008

Members Present:

Anmarie Aylward
Sheriff Mark Brown
Bev Emery
Brad Meryhew
Andrea Piper
Kecia Rongen
Maureen Saylor

Staff Present:

Andi May

Others Present:

Joanna Arlow, Policy Director, Washington Association of Sheriff and Police Chiefs (WASPC); Dianne Ashlock, Department of Corrections; Shani Bauer, Counsel, Senate Human Services and Corrections Committee; Leslie Burns, Mercer Island P.D.; Deborah Collinsworth, Washington State Patrol; Patty Klopp, Washington State Patrol; Lyndsey Palmer, King County Sexual Assault Resource Center; Bernard Ryan, Counsel, Senate Democratic Caucus; Carolyn Sanchez, Criminal History Records Supervisor, Washington State Patrol

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chair Kecia Rongen at 10:20 a.m.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

The board members, staff and other interested parties introduced themselves.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion #2 Approval of the Minutes

Moved: Anmarie Aylward

Seconded: Brad Meryhew

Passed: Unanimously

IV. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ON LEVELING AND NOTIFICATION OF SEXUAL OFFENDERS

Dianne Ashlock from the Department of Corrections (DOC) provided a presentation on the process of assessing sex offenders for level recommendation to law enforcement. In addition, she provided information on the process of notifying law enforcement when an offender is released.

V. LAW ENFORCEMENT PROCESS OF REGISTERING AND COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION

Sheriff Mark Brown presented information on the updated Washington Association of Sheriff's and Police Chiefs Model Policy for law enforcement. The Model Policy is available at: <http://www.waspc.org/index.php?d=169>

The Model Policy has information on who is required to register, information to be collected, examples for community notification bulletins, how to conduct a public meeting and recommendations for risk assessment tools for leveling.

There was a good discussion that resulted from the Sheriff's presentation that is captured below:

Active notification at the local level:

What does that look like? How are both urban and rural jurisdictions handling it? For example, some law enforcement agencies mail the notice home, while others go around and knock on the neighbor's door of the offender? Which is more effective? What are the limitations on jurisdictions? Staffing and places to hold the community meetings are two examples.

Departures:

When an offender's level is different than what the DOC or Department of Social and Health Services recommends, how is the offender notified?

Criteria of leveling:

What are the criteria that local law enforcement is using for classifying offenders into levels 1, 2 and 3? Is it consistent statewide?

Legislative staff informed the committee that the legislative intent was for the process to be consistent. How does that fit into local jurisdictions desire to retain control in their community?

There was a recommendation that a review be done on the process of leveling at the local level to determine how it is being done.

WASPC has recently sent out a survey to local jurisdictions that may be helpful to the committee's discussion. Joanna Arlow will bring the results at one of our upcoming meetings.

Community Notification Statute:

Currently RCW 72.09.345 indicates that the End of Sentence Review Committee should base their classification level of I, II or III based on the offender's risk to the community at large. Although closely linked to risk to reoffend it is not exactly the same and can be confusing to both professionals and the public. As the committee's discussions continue we will need to consider the statute's purpose and how ultimately it fits into public safety.

Education:

Committee members are also interested in increasing the education to the public around both prevention of sexual assault and reentry of offenders. Should we include overall public safety as our goal, rather than a sole focus of the reentry of offenders?

VI. REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF REGISTRATION AND NOTIFICATION LAWS

The committee reviewed the legislative intent of the Community Protection Act from 1990. Members agreed that legislative intent, although based on the best information available at the time paints a broad brush in regards to sexual offenders. For example, although the statement that "sex offenders pose a high risk of engaging in sex offenses even after being released from incarceration or commitment," may be appropriate in select cases, recidivism rates are not supportive of that in the majority of offenders.

VII. HIGHLIGHTS OF ARTICLES

Due to time constraints this was postponed until next meeting.

VIII. PLAN FOR REPORTING TO FULL BOARD

Kecia volunteered to present the status of our committee at the next full SOPB.

IX. SORNA SURVEY

A professor in Massachusetts is conducting a research study on States response nationwide on the implementation of the Sex Offender Registration Act of Adam Walsh. The committee decided to send it to the full Board for action, if warranted.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned, by Kecia Rongen at 4:00 p.m.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE REGISTRATION AND COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION COMMITTEE.

Kecia Rongen, Chair

Date

Jean Soliz-Conklin

Date