



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Insurance Building, PO Box 43113 □ Olympia, Washington 98504-3113 □ (360) 902-0555

SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD

November 20, 2014 1pm – 3pm
Criminal Justice Training Commission
19010 1st Avenue South Room C-101
Burien, WA 98148

Members Present:

Kecia Rongen
Anmarie Aylward
Bev Emery
Brad Meryhew
Jeff Patnode (Kecia Rongen proxy)
Michael O’Connell (Maureen Saylor proxy)
James McMahan (Dawn Larsen proxy)
Andrea Piper-Wentland (Bev Emery proxy)

Members Absent:

Jonathan Meyer
Dan Yanisch
Hon. Laura G Middaugh
Holly Coryell
Julie Door

Staff:

Keri-Anne Jetzer

Guests: Keith Barnes, Pierce County Prosecutor’s Office; Brittany Jarnot, Doug Levy’s Office; Theo Lewis, DOC; Rick Torrance, Dept of Commerce/OCVA; Alex Soldano Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Kecia Rongen called the meeting to order. She asked that everyone introduce themselves.

II. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 16, 2014

MOTION #14-4:

MOTION TO APPROVE OCTOBER 16, 2014 MEETING MINUTES

MOVED:

Bev Emery

SECONDED:

Brad Meryhew

PASSED:

Unanimously

III. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR POSITION

MOTION #14-5: MOTION TO ELECT JEFF PATNODE AS SOPB VICE-CHAIR
MOVED: Brad Meryhew
SECONDED: Anmarie Aylward
PASSED: Unanimously

Discussion: Keri-Anne did not catch that a non-voting member made the motion to elect the Vice-Chair position during the October 16, 2014, meeting making the motion invalid. Jeff Patnode indicated that he is still interested in the position of Vice-Chair.

IV. SEX OFFENDER HOUSING REPORT

Anmarie Aylward presented the draft report from the Sex Offender Housing workgroup. She commented that if the Board could come to agreement on the bigger issues, she can work on the smaller report details later.

Brittany Jarnot talked about the Kent ordinance. Because the ordinance related to group homes but not sex offender homes specifically, there is question as to whether it is applicable to the report. Kecia inquired if the Kent ordinance impacted sex offender housing? It was determined that it did and should be included in the report. Brittany offered to provide a write-up on the Kent ordinance to be included in the report.

Dawn Larsen questioned who owns the responsibility for the recommendations happen? Bev Emery commented that, in prior reports, the Board did not always specify the ‘who’ so if legislators turned the recommendations into proposals, the best ‘who’ could be determined at that time. Anmarie added that during the conversations held, she felt it was meant to be more of a collaborative effort among different entities. She asked if the idea was to note under the recommendations that there is not specific ownership should any of them move forward. There was agreement on that idea.

Brad Meryhew thought that the recommendations should be responsive to the questions asked of the Board, thus, he suggested flipping the order of the recommendations so the big question is located first. There was agreement on that idea.

Bev posited that perhaps there is only one recommendation and the others are more findings and conclusions or subsections of a single recommendation. Theo Lewis added that he thought there were two recommendations: 1) define and improve the communication roles and responsibilities ((a) law enforcement, best practices, etc.; (b) between DOC and law enforcement; (c) between law enforcement and local government), and 2) no new residency regulations. Theo also commented that the email from Briahna Taylor of the Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs that was received by Keri-Anne that morning seems to hint at new legislation. Brad added that the ‘fair share’ idea works for offenders under the jurisdiction of the court or DOC, but otherwise constitutionally we can’t cap where people live and no other vehicle was suggested in how to complete it.

Brad noted that the recommendations focus on DOC processes, on moving from prison into the communities and on the communication between the municipalities and DOC. He added that those involve about one-third of sex offenders in the community and that there isn't an acknowledgement that there is a limited ability to affect the issue through the DOC. Two-thirds of the offenders in the community and occupying the group homes who are of concern to the municipalities are not under DOC jurisdiction. Anmarie added that her intent was to make a connection for collaboration and thinks it may fit under the recommendation for no expansion under the restrictions. Brad inquired if the suggestion was to recommend the appeal of the grandfathering and move to a uniform, statewide system? That would seem the best policy to avoiding the ringing issues. There was agreement that that would be a larger issue than what the Board has been asked to deal with. It was agreed to provide data on the sex offender population and on the voucher population.

Chair Rongen asked for clarification on whether there were four or two recommendations. Dawn said she liked two, one related to housing and one related to communication paths. Theo added that he thought recommendation #4 should be the first one and the other three would make up recommendation #2 (a-public awareness, b-development of notification process and c-educate communities).

Chair Rongen discussed comment #4 on Councilmember Door's email from that morning to make an additional recommendation for ***“Placement of a sex offender in a residential neighborhood decreases the property value of surrounding residential properties and such decrease is most pronounced when four or more sex offenders live within the same housing unit.”*** Anmarie said that she didn't really see it as a recommendation plus the data suggested that there were many reasons besides sex offenders that decrease property values. She added that the same report also went on to say that offenders live where they can afford and have access to, which are usually less viable neighborhoods. Bev commented that she felt the issue was thoroughly discussed in the report and made all of those points. Dawn reminded members that Briahna included in her email that ***“If sex offenders are housed in all communities, then the concentration of 4+ sex offenders is less likely, and property values are not impacted.”*** Keith Barnes provided background to the 'fair-share' concept. There was interest to learn what the Association of Washington Cities would think about removing the current residency restrictions. Dawn noted that, when she looked at the number of sex offenders in each county compared to the county population, she found the smaller counties take on more than their 'fair-share' than the larger counties.

Anmarie offered the notion of adding, if appropriate, wording that best practice might indicate a repeal of restrictions and a more consistent policy might offer better 'fair-share' and community safety. This would not be part of the 'no new restrictions' recommendation but as part of a discussion that follows it in case the legislature chose to address that issue themselves.

Brittany noted that she is not Councilmember Door's proxy so she does not feel comfortable voting and she is unsure how the Association of Cities will feel about

removing current residency restrictions. She suggested contacting Candice Bock on that subject. Anmarie agreed. Chair Rongen added that prior reports have noted when others have not agreed with a comment or recommendation made by the Board and that could certainly be done here if need be.

MOTION #14-6: MOTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS AS REVISED:

**RECOMMENDATION #1 – NO NEW RESIDENCY
RESTRICTIONS**

**RECOMMENDATION #2
A – PUBLIC AWARENESS
B – STANDARDIZATION
C - INTERAGENCY COMMUNICATION**

MOVED: Bev Emery
SECONDED: Brad Meryhew
PASSED: Unanimously

Discussion: all the subtext under the three other recommendations would be moved under Recommendation #2 so there is no new information in that recommendation.

The Board reviewed some of the other content suggestions made by members.

**MOTION #14-7: MOTION TO ADOPT THE REPORT AS REVISED IN THIS
MEETING**

MOVED: Bev Emery
SECONDED: Maureen Saylor
PASSED: Unanimously

Anmarie said her intent was to pull things together and send it back out to the Board and workgroup members for additional comment before Wednesday. It was agreed that a final input is needed before submission.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Rongen asked the members if they had any legislative agendas that they would like to share.

Dawn Larsen said that WASPC would be submitting a clean-up bill on the sex offender bill.

Anmarie said that DOC is looking to submit a proposal related to life-time supervision.

There was discussion about the Board testifying on legislative bills during session.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD

/ s /

Chair Kecia Rongen

Date