



Washington State Sex Offender Policy Board History, Projects and Recommendations

The Sex Offender Policy Board (SOPB) duties are as follows:

- Undertake projects to assist policymakers in making informed judgments about issues related to sex offender policy, in response to specific requests from a legislative committee of jurisdiction of the Governor.
- Conduct case reviews on sex offenses as needed to understand performance of the sex offender prevention and response system, or as requested by the governor or the legislative committee of jurisdiction. Reviews shall be conducted in a manner which protects the right to a fair trial.

This document is a brief overview of previous SOPB recommendations, projects, and reports. While every effort is made to keep this document up to date, specific questions or concerns about its contents should be sent to the Board directly.

2007

Following the death of Zina Linnik, Gov. Gregoire appointed a task force to review Washington's approach to sex offender management. The task force included seven recommendations in its [final report](#), including a recommendation that the Sentencing Guidelines Commission (SGC) continue their discussion around the most appropriate framework for the sentencing and community supervision of sex offenders. This task force also recommended the creation of the Sex Offender Policy Board.

Outcomes: SSB 6596 was later passed, which created the Sex Offender Policy Board and originally housed the Board within the SGC.

2008

In 2008 Gov. Gregoire signed [SSB 6596](#), which created the [Washington State Sex Offender Policy Board \(SOPB\)](#) and assigned administrative responsibility to the SGC. The intent of the Board was to promote a coordinated and integrated response to sex offender management and create an entity to respond to issues that may arise.

An area of interest was the pending implementation of Title I of the Adam Walsh Act, the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act. Implementation of this act would require the integration of federal and state laws, further reinforcing the need to move forward in a way that enhances the state's interest in protecting the community, with an emphasis on public safety.

Later in 2008, the SOPB delivered its [Annual Report](#) which discussed its work plan and the deliberations of its [Benchmarks, Sex Offenders in the Community, and Registration and Notification committees](#).

Outcomes: Following the release of the annual report, the legislature passed [2SHB 2714](#) which directed the SOPB to review Washington state's sex and kidnapping offender registration and notification system. The SOPB directed the Registration and Notification Committee to review research surrounding this topic, and the SOPB created three additional workgroups to manage the various bill components: Community Notification, Failure to Register/Registration/Risk Assessment, and a Juvenile workgroup.

2009

In 2009 [ESHB 2035](#) directed the SOPB to review whether registered sex and kidnapping offenders should be required to submit information on any email addresses, as well as websites, they create or operate.

- In response to ESHB 2035, the SOPB created several proposals that represented strong support, though not unanimity, within the group:
 - The Board recommended that no legislative action is needed for the collection of online identifier information;
 - Education and prevention efforts should be focused on vulnerable populations who are subject to grooming and exploitation through the Internet; and
 - The state should continue to look at the requirement for sex offenders to report online identifiers (email address, chat room information, etc.) where there is a direct link between Internet usage and the commission of a sexual offense.

In 2009 the SOPB hosted the first Sex Offender Management System Forum to discuss issues related to sex offender management and learn about the S.T.A.R. (Successful Transition & Reentry) program. The SOPB also facilitated a forum for interagency discussion and collaboration in Everett, Washington.

At the end of 2009, the SOPB delivered its [Annual Report](#) which articulated findings in response to assignments enumerated in 2SHB 2714. Key findings are summarized below:

- The SOPB argued that the key to ensuring public safety is to make well-informed decisions based on the best available research.

- The SOPB identified practical obstacles to implementation of registration and notification laws through stakeholder input, recent court cases, and an in-depth review of the Sex Offender Management System.
- Ongoing coordinated and collaborative efforts are necessary in order to remain appraised of best practices and ensure an efficient and evidence-based system for sex offender management.
- Washington was the first state to enact a sex offender community notification law, the 1990 Community Protection Act. Washington's current system supports public safety by setting community notification standards through the use of a risk-based analysis instead of an offense-based method.
- Finally, the Board noted that empirically validated risk tools (such as the STATIC-99R) are one of the most effective ways to determine an offender's risk to re-offend. The use of standardized dynamic factors can also be helpful in risk level assignment.

The Board also made several recommendations regarding juvenile sex offenders. Youth who have sexually offended are different from adults who commit sex offenses, in part, because of ongoing brain and neurological development. Therefore, sex and kidnapping offender laws regarding juveniles and public policy should reflect their unique amenability to treatment and vulnerability to collateral consequences due to their ongoing development.

The recommendations were:

- Create separate juvenile and adult registry and community notifications statutes.
- Fund the creation of a validated juvenile risk assessment tool and the corresponding training.
- Repeal 90-day registration check-in for juveniles.
- Change statute so juvenile sex offenders' first failure to register offense will not bar them from petitioning for relief from registration.
- Enact relief from registration and automatic termination for adjudicated juveniles.
- Community notification of juvenile offenders should be based on risk level.

Recommendations regarding adult sex and kidnapping offenders were as follows:

- The use of an empirically validated tool for risk assessment and risk level assignment should continue into the future.
- Statutory criteria for relief from registration for registered sex and kidnapping offenders should be considered and created.
- Repeal 90-day in person reporting requirement and continue with the law enforcement address verification program for adults.

- Tier the class of felony for Failure to Register as a Sex Offender.
- The state should enact a community custody range for first failure to register conviction.
- Finally, the state should provide incentives to offenders by allowing all to petition for relief from registration.

Outcomes: [SSB 6414](#) was introduced during the 2010 legislative session and focused on improving the administration and efficiency of sex and kidnapping offender registration. Recommendations from the 2009 SOPB report were used for this bill. Additionally, [SSB 5204](#) was passed in 2011. This bill focused on juveniles who have been adjudicated of a sex offense. Additionally, SSB 5204 asserts that all juveniles should be assigned a risk level by a multi-disciplinary body of experts.

2010

The 2010 legislative session introduced and enacted a bill representing the 2009 consensus recommendations of the SOPB — [ESSB 6414](#) – Aiming to improve the administration and efficiency of sex and kidnapping offender registration.

Sen. Jim Hargrove, chair of the Senate Human Services and Corrections Committee, and Sen. Rosemary McAuliffe, chair of the Senate Early Learning & K-12 Education Committee, requested that the SOPB study laws on juvenile sex offenders and school notification, and make recommendations for consideration during the 2011 legislative session. The results of this study, including relevant recommendations, are included in [the Reyes Case Review](#) and are noted below:

- When a juvenile court orders 24/7 supervision as a condition of a Special Sex Offender Disposition Alternative, the court should enter findings about this condition.
- When funding is received, the Washington Association of Sheriffs & Police Chiefs (WASPC) should create a standard form to be used by law enforcement for notification purposes.
- School districts and principals should be notified by law enforcement of a student who is a juvenile offender.
- Law enforcement should provide notice to the school when a student who is a juvenile offender moves or transfers to a new school within the district; when a student changes schools but maintains the same residence; and when law enforcement changes the risk level.
- Parents, the public, and school staff should contact their local law enforcement agency for information related to a particular juvenile adjudicated of a registrable sex offense.

- All schools should be statutorily required to have policies and procedures in place for students who have been adjudicated or convicted of a registrable sex offense and the provision of a safe learning environment for all students.

Legislators also requested that the SOPB research issues including “sexting”; posting sex offender supervision conditions on the public registry website; registration fees for sex offenders and the collection of online identifiers. On these issues, the SOPB recommended the following:

Sexting

- The state should develop an educational campaign for parents and teens on the dangers of distributing sexually explicit images through electronic means. The SOPB does not recommend any modification to statutes to specifically address sexting.
- The state should utilize current means, such as sexual motivation enhancement, to address sexting behavior if it is determined to be related to sexual offending. Issues to consider when determining what qualifies as potential offending behavior are a history of sexual offenses, whether charged or uncharged; use of force, threats, coercion or illicit substances to obtain photos; age and power differences between the parties involved.

Posting sex offender conditions online

- The SOPB recommended including on the public registry website whether the registered sex offender is on supervision.

Registration fees for sex offenders

- The SOPB asked that the state not enact legislation that imposes a fee on sex offenders required to register.

Online identifiers

- The Board recommended that the state provide internet safety and sexual violence prevention information to parents and children in lieu of collecting online identifying information from registered sex offenders.

In 2010 the SOPB also developed [maps of the adult and juvenile sex offender management system](#), both pre- and post-conviction, in an effort to provide a visual aid for those researching the process.

2011

In 2011 the SOPB established the [Sex Offender Policy Board Case Review Procedure](#). This procedure was put in place to ensure a fair and effective case review process for the future. Additionally, [ESSB 5891](#) was enacted and moved the SGC and the SOPB to the Office of Financial Management.

2012

In 2012 the SOPB amended its [Bylaws and Policies](#) to reflect changes in duties as well as articulate updated policies and procedures.

It was later requested by Senators Hargrove and Stevens, of the Human Services & Corrections committee, that the SOPB conduct a [case review of Jeremiah Thompson](#), a registered sex offender in Clark County. That case review included the following recommendations:

1. Risk to the community and the need for services, not just the crime of conviction, should be taken into consideration for determining when parole should be imposed.
2. Under best practices and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) model policy on release of information concerning student sexual and kidnapping offenders, the principal maintains responsibility for the management of sex offenders and the safety of all students in attendance. It is appropriate for the principal to share information with applicable parties when necessary to ensure safety.
3. With the state's ongoing efforts to establish and maintain consistent practice, training for school personnel on juvenile sex offenders, including the sex offender management system, risk and offender levels, should be developed and offered.
4. School districts should be required to adopt a sex offender management policy based on the OSPI model policy and then post the policy on the OSPI website by a specific date.
5. Further research should be conducted on the effectiveness of sex offender notification and registration for juveniles who have committed sex offenses.

In 2012 the SOPB was also asked by Senators Hargrove and Stevens of the Senate Human Services & Corrections Committee to [review Washington's policy on sex offense statute of limitations in the context of best practice and effectiveness](#). Several questions were presented, with responses from the Board. While some of the questions were left unanswered due to the lack of available literature, the SOPB did determine that Washington was using many of the best practices identified by the Center for Sex Offender Management.

Furthermore, the Board was unable to find information regarding the request for information on the state's statute of limitations in child sex offense cases (as related to successful civil action by victims). In all, the Board offered the following recommendations:

- The SOPB recommended that all statutes of limitations for victims of sexual assault, who are under 18 years of age (or age of majority), are 10 years plus the age of majority or up until the 28th birthday, whichever is longer.
- The SOPB also called for a revision to the civil statute of limitations for sexual assault crimes, based on policy alone, rather than in combination of clear and convincing research.

2013

In October 2012, Senators Hargrove, Regala, and Stevens, representing the Senate Human Services & Corrections Committee, asked the SOPB to review the Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative (SSOSA). The request looked at four core areas, including:

- Victim's input and the granting of a SSOSA despite a victim's objections
- What consistencies or inconsistencies exist between jurisdictions as they determine an offender's 'amenability to treatment'
- Results of (or how effective is) a SSOSA disposition
- Any recommendations for improvements to the SSOSA process

To answer these questions, professionals from different parts of the SSOSA system (defense attorneys, prosecutors, judges, certified treatment providers) were surveyed about their experiences with the SSOSA disposition process. A variety of governmental bodies (Department of Corrections, Victim /Witness) provided financial information related to the costs and effectiveness of the SSOSA program. The SOPB observed that in the 20+ years since SSOSA was created, the science of risk assessment and treatment provision had grown significantly. "Sex offenders granted a SSOSA continue to have very low recidivism rates and have demonstrated to be at the lowest risk for re-offense among sex offenders. The SOPB urges the legislature to consider the advances made over the past twenty years and to adopt a risk management approach in considering SSOSA for offenders."

In addition, the SOPB compared the costs of incarceration to the costs of SSOSA. The review took into account the 15% of SSOSA offenders who revoke (the vast majority are revoked for offenses other than sex crimes). The financial savings for community treatment versus years of incarceration and then treatment were significant.

In December 2013, the SOPB released a [full report](#) which concluded, in part:

Sex offenders who complete SSOSA have the lowest recidivism rate of sex offenders across sex offense categories (felony and misdemeanor). Additionally, offenders who complete a SSOSA have lower recidivism rates than otherwise SSOSA eligible incarcerated offenders. This reduced recidivism rate is demonstrated across felony, felony sex, violent felony and felony sex crime charges. The efficacy of the SSOSA program is demonstrated in reduced recidivism rates, low revocation frequency, and significant cost savings to the state.

Revocation rates of SSOSA at an average of 16 percent. A revocation of SSOSA does not indicate that an offender sexually recidivated. Rather, a SSOSA can be revoked for any violation of rules imposed, such as substance use or failure to register. In fact, data show that only 3.8 percent revoke for felony sex crime recidivism.

The report offered the following recommendations:

1. The state should reinstate Department of Corrections (DOC) supervision to the length of the suspended sentence (pre 2001), thus eliminating lifetime supervision for non-revoked participants.
2. The state should reinstate and fund the Sex Offender Treatment Advisory Committee.
3. Clarify the SSOSA statute language and/or emphasize adherence to the statutory language on known offenders.

The SOPB also provided two other concepts for consideration and possible future study: creation of a sentencing alternative similar to the Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (DOSA), and the possibility of including users of child sexual abuse images under SSOSA.

2014

In 2014 the SOPB was asked by Senators Hargrove and Darnelle, representing the Senate Human Services & Corrections Committee convened a work group to review policies related to the release and housing of sex offenders in the community. The SOPB filed a [final report](#) on the matter, which included the following recommendations:

1. The Board recommended that there be no expansion of residency restrictions for sex offenders in Washington. The SOPB's review of literature found no evidence to support the effectiveness of residency restrictions.
2. The Board also stated that stakeholders should continue to expand public awareness of and access to information on registered sex offenders in the community. It is important that education and awareness efforts are clear and factual regarding sexual victimization and sex offenders.
3. The state should continue development and standardization of notification procedures for law enforcement to ensure information is shared with city, county and municipal

officials. Clear, transparent and timely communication between DOC and law enforcement is key.

4. DOC should be responsible for educating communities through the sharing of information on processes, practices and laws related to the release and transition of sex offenders from prison to communities. Information should include the housing voucher program and release planning. Updated legislation on the release of offenders must be shared with multiple stakeholders.

2015

[Chapter 261, Laws of 2015 Section 16 \(ESSB 5154\)](#) directed the SOPB to make recommendations on the following items:

- Related to the disclosure of information which has been compiled and submitted to sex and kidnapping offender registries, to the public;
- The relationship between chapters 42.56 and 4.24.550 RCW;
- Best practices adopted or under consideration by other jurisdictions on disclosure of sex offender registry information;
- Ability for sex and kidnapping offenders to petition for review of their risk level classification whether that petition should be conducted according to a statewide uniform standard; and
- Whether and how public access to the guidelines can be improved.

The following recommendations were made by the SOPB in their [final report](#):

- Washington’s comprehensive statutory scheme controlling the release of information to the public on sex and kidnapping offenders contained in RCW 4.24.550 has worked well since its inception.
- RCW 4.24.550 should be considered an “other statute” under RCW 42.56.070. Washington’s Public Records Act requires agencies to produce public records upon request “unless the record falls within the specific exemptions of this chapter, or any other statute which exempts or prohibits disclosure of specific information or records.” See RCW 42.56.070.
- Release of Level I sex and kidnapping offender information is the equivalent to broad-based community notification, which is generally reserved for higher risk sex and kidnapping offenders. This would functionally eliminate Washington’s tiered risk-level approach to community notification which the Legislature and many other stakeholders have worked diligently for 20 years to develop, implement and improve.

- The widespread dissemination of Level I offender information would have a deleterious effect on victims who are often known or related to offenders or otherwise connected with offenders.
- This release would particularly impact the Level I offenders who have not been subject to community notification or the widespread dissemination of their sex and kidnapping offender registration information.
- The social science research reviewed by the SOPB indicates that widespread dissemination of information collected for all sexual offenders often has the unintended consequence of creating obstacles to community reentry that may actually undermine, rather than enhance, public safety.
- The widespread dissemination of Level I offender information would have even greater collateral consequences for low-risk juvenile offenders and their families. Juvenile sex offenders already have many challenges reintegrating in society and this would be another obstacle. The release of their information would likely negatively impact a variety of known risk factors, which may ultimately increase their risk for participating in criminal behavior.
- Widespread dissemination of sex and kidnapping offender registration information would undermine the legal rationale for upholding the constitutionality of sex and kidnapping offender registration and notification adopted by the Washington Supreme Court.
- The SOPB recognizes that adults and juveniles are different in countless ways. Many states acknowledge these differences in their statutes on sex offender registration and community notification and treat juveniles differently. The SOPB believes this issue warrants additional consideration by Washington policymakers.

In regards to the ability for offenders to petition for review of risk-level classification and whether the process should follow a statewide uniform standard, the SOPB recommended the following:

- The availability of a sex offender risk-level review process assists in maintaining a consistent approach to sex offender management.
- Criteria for risk-level determinations should be based on research and linked to risk in the community.
- The SOPB supports the concept of each county having an established process to review the risk-level classification level when requested by an offender registered in its jurisdiction.
- The SOPB requests that it be authorized to develop best practices for a process and criteria on a sex or kidnapping offender's request for assigned risk-level classification review.

- Each law enforcement agency should have an established process to accept and review a petition for risk level classification and use criteria to change the level which is supported by current research. In addition, the SOPB asks that WASPC amend its model policy to recommend that each law enforcement agency adopt a process; that WASPC assess which agencies have a process, what the process is, and share the results with SOPB by December 1, 2016.

Finally, the SOPB made the following recommendations as to whether or not and how public access to guidelines can be improved:

- The guidelines established under RCW 4.24.5501 are available to the public via the following online locations
 - <http://www.waspc.org/sex-offender-information>,
 - <http://www.waspc.org/model-policies>,
 - http://sheriffalerts.com/cap_safety_1.php?office=54528
 - This item is informational, and the SOPB does not request any additional action by the legislature.

Outcomes: The SOPB is still working on completing tasks assigned in reference to SSB 5154.

2016

In late 2015 the Board received a letter from the Governor tasking the Board with several items:

1. Provide summaries of Washington State's current sex offender registration and notification statutes and practices to assist policymakers in evaluating proposed legislative changes;
2. Evaluate Washington State's sex offender registration and notification statutes and the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) established under Title 1 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 to determine which requirements the state has yet to adopt;
3. Survey other states to determine how they have aligned their systems to meet the requirements of SORNA;
4. Offer recommendations as to how the state should proceed in moving further into compliance with SORNA or, if the SOPB determines that it is not in the best interest of the state to adopt a requirement of SORNA, offer an analysis as to why;
5. Offer recommendations as to other changes in sex offender registration and notification statutes that further advance the safety of the public; and
6. Offer recommendations as to other issues related to sexual offending that the SOPB determines could advance the safety of the public through further study.

The Board began much of the work on these items beginning in 2016, and this work continues as of this writing. In regards to item #1, the Board completed a survey of RSO Coordinators in the summer of 2016. This survey asked participants to respond to questions regarding the processes in

place for leveling offenders and using risk assessments within the community. The final report is available [here](#).

For item #2, the Board created a working chart which details the 14 indicators set forth by SORNA, and Washington's current compliance level with those. As this chart evolved, the Board added recommendations to it, and then created a report which addressed item #2, as well as item #4. Though the Board made attempts to research processes in other states (item #3) this was difficult as the SMART Office was unable to provide documentation of other states' practices. Final recommendations from this process are available [here](#).

Finally, items #5 and #6 were addressed by the Board in October 2016. The Board submitted a [report to the Governor](#), which had the following five recommendations for further review:

1. Research and Consider SORNA's Requirements for Juvenile Registration;
2. Exemption of Sex Offender Information from Public Disclosure;
3. Review and Update RCW 71.09 – Sexually Violent Predators;
4. Research and Consider Implementing the Risk-Need-Responsivity Model within the Department of Corrections; and
5. Examine Limited Liability Concerns and Effective Case Management.

Additionally, the Board amended their bylaws on August 19, 2016.

2017

In the summer of 2017, the Governor's Policy Advisor requested that the Board convene and develop a list of areas for improvement within sex offender management. The SOPB Coordinator worked with a LEAN Consultant from the Department of Corrections to develop a process that would allow the Board to work through each of the areas of the sex offender management system. The Board used six main areas during the relevant exercises: sentencing, supervision, treatment, juveniles, civil commitment, and registration/community notification.

After identifying major themes within each category, the Board worked through the themes to identify the areas most in need of attention. The areas for improvement are as follows:

1. Registration and Community Notification
 - a. Results from this category show that many of the issues mentioned by members surround the effectiveness of the registry. For example, an ineffective registry may be a result of lack of court discretion, inconsistent practices in leveling, and the registration of low-risk juvenile offenders. These in turn, can cause harm in the form of collateral consequences for offenders, such as limited housing and employment options. Both of these variables are shown to be correlated with recidivism. In short, results from an evaluation of the sex offender registry may shed light on the effectiveness of Washington's registry, thereby aiding in reducing recidivism as well as increasing registry accuracy.

2. Sentencing
 - a. There were several areas for consideration within the sentencing system.
 - i. Judges' discretion;
 - ii. Lifetime supervision;
 - iii. Treatment alternatives for non-contact sex offenses;
 - iv. Impacts of sentencing on supervision;
 - v. Use of crime title vs. risk in sentencing.
3. Treatment
 - a. Results from this category show that the underlying issue here may be the availability of treatment for offenders. This may be due to a lack of providers (specifically within the community), not enough space within DOC for treatment, and inconsistent treatment practices. This may lead to more expensive treatment in the community, which many offenders cannot afford, making it near impossible for them to receive the treatment necessary for compliance with their supervision.
4. Supervision
 - a. There were several areas for consideration within supervision.
 - i. Lifetime supervision;
 - ii. Lack of training for CCOs;
 - iii. DOC restrictions unrelated to risk.
5. Juveniles
 - a. Registration for low-risk juveniles who commit sex offenses is an area of large concern and consensus for SOPB members. Research has shown that oftentimes, juveniles who commit sex offenses do not recidivate sexually, and relegating these offenders to the registry may cause hardship and actually increase their risk for recidivism. A review of Washington's policies and practices surrounding juveniles who commit sex offenses registration is recommended.
 - b. In addition, public disclosure for the registration of Level 1 juveniles with sex offenses may also be considered. Per the SOPB's 2015 report, public disclosure for all Level 1 offenders may do more harm than good. This finding is pertinent when considering juvenile offenders and their brain development. In addition, the public disclosure and registration of Level 1 offenders may serve to dilute the registry, thus decreasing its effectiveness.
 - c. There are also concerns surrounding the lack of a good static/dynamic risk assessment tool for juveniles who commit sex offenses. This has been difficult to address, as the current risk assessment tools are for clinical purposes and not recommended by the authors for the registration of juveniles with sex offenses.
 - d. Finally, the mechanism by which juveniles with registerable sex offenses can petition for the relief of the duty to register should be reviewed. Currently, the process is confusing and difficult for offenders to access. A review of the current process may be of benefit for offenders, as well as the community.

6. Civil Commitment

- a. The Board determined that many of the issues identified within civil commitment could be addressed with a full review of RCW 71.09. This has been recommended previously by the Board, as well as other entities.

A full report on these results and the process used by the Board is available upon request.

2020

In March 2020 the Senate Ways and Means Committee requested that the SOPB convene to discuss several matters related to sexually violent predators. The project requested the following:

1. Conduct a review of current SVP re-entry and least restrictive alternative (LRA) policies and practices in Washington including:
 - a. The process for development of treatment plans and individualized discharge plans;
 - b. Provisions for determining conditions of release for those released to an LRA;
 - c. Factors regarding siting of secure community transition facilities;
 - d. Availability of adequate LRA placement sites and treatment providers by county;
 - e. The process by which community notification is completed within the community of the release; and
 - f. The process for considering an LRA placement's proximity to public services, including but not limited to schools and childcare facilities.
2. Review research regarding best practices for placement of SVPs in the community with a focus on enhancing public safety, including policies from other states; and
3. Make recommendations regarding placement of SVPs in community-based settings including placement in adult family homes or group homes, any restrictions on placements that may be made in the interest of public safety, public disclosure requirements that may be relevant to SVPs and LRAs, discharge planning, and any other related topics.

The full request letter can be found [here](#).

The SOPB convened in April 2020 to address the project from the Senate Ways and Means Committee and made the determination to handle the project and its various tasks by breaking into three subcommittees.

1. Treatment, Discharge Planning, and Conditions of Release Subcommittee
 - a. Chair: Michael O'Connell
2. Secure Community Transition Facilities and Less Restrictive Alternatives

- a. Chair: David Flynn
3. Community Notification of SCC Releases
 - a. Chair: Terrina Peterson

The SOPB met 8 times from April through October 2020, and the three subcommittees met a total of 25 times between May and October 2020. A final report was submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2020. In the report, the SOPB issued 35 recommendations. A brief summary of those recommendations can be found below. The full report can be found [here](#).

- **No. 1:** The SCC should incorporate a statement into each individual's treatment plan that addresses their potential release. The Legislature would need to allocate funding for this to happen.
- **No. 2:** DSHS and the SCC should explore how to develop community transition facilities. This may include community-based, state-operated living alternatives such as the current SOLA model.
- **No. 3:** The Legislature should allocate funding for SCC social worker positions. This will offer various services to an individual before their release.
- **No. 4:** The clinical pass off between the community SOTP and the last treating clinician at the SCC should occur no later than 15 days before an individual's release from the SCC.
- **No. 5:** A Memorandum of Understanding should be created between the SCC, the Office of Public Defense, and the prosecutorial agencies. This would ensure we could disseminate records/discovery as quickly as possible to minimize delays around DOC discoveries relevant to its investigation of the LRA plan.
- **No. 6:** The SCC should make changes to, or enter into, any MOU between the SCC and the Department of Licensing. This could help SCC residents obtain a state ID with their SCC ID badge and a SCC verification letter (the DOC currently allows this.)
- **No. 7:** The SCC should include an ala carte type of self-referral or opt-in for adjunct classes (such as ADLs, cooking, budgeting, etc.) that relate to more general community issues. This would be in addition to Bridging Transitions and the core group of classes that apply to all releases.
- **No. 8:** The clinical team should administer a comprehensive needs assessment before an individual's release from the SCC. This assessment helps the SCC identify skills the individual needs to help them be successful in the community.
- **No. 9:** The SCC should create a document checklist for SCC staff to use during intake.

- **No. 10:** The SCC should update Policy 202 with the procedure for their staff to follow if they receive a photo ID in the mail. This includes how to store documents and how to return the documents to the resident during their discharge.
- **No. 11:** The defense, prosecution, community SOTP, SCC clinical staff, and DOC should meet in advance of the conditions hearing and then work together to craft individualized, narrowly tailored and empirically-based conditions. These conditions will help the client more successfully transition to the community. Moving the meeting up in the process (it currently occurs after the LRA has been agreed to or ordered) could also help diminish liability concerns.
- **No. 12:** The SCC should have the primary responsibility for LRA planning. This will require funding for additional SCC staffing. Specifically, we recommend adopting the language in HB 2851, Section 3 (Page 9). The language states that the court will order the SCC to develop an LRA placement for the resident after a show cause hearing. We estimate a 90-day maximum allotment for the SCC and DOC to investigate and contract the relevant LRA components (housing, SOTP, etc.). If they do not recommend release, they can still put the proposed LRA plan together. But the SCC must note that they're submitting it because of a court order and not because of a clinical determination.
- **No. 13:** We believe that all LRAs should have an individualized case plan that lessens the resident's conditions or removes obstacles as they successfully transition into the community. The board agrees that stakeholders can develop better step-down procedures that promote community safety, are clinically sound, and are in the individual's best interest. This may include statutory revisions around SCTFs, interagency memorandums about the transition process, and removing obstacles to successful transitions.
- **No. 14:** The SOPB recognizes there is a potential issue with the availability and quality of SOTP providers as LRA numbers increase. Stakeholders noted that there are ongoing issues that need to be resolved. However, these issues were not fully developed during the subcommittee discussions and would require further data gathering and analysis before the full board could make recommendations.
- **No. 15:** The SOPB recommends the state adopts and uses the SCC's Regional Placement Model.
- **No. 16:** The SOPB recommends the state adopts and uses the SCC's SCTF Siting Matrix.
- **No. 17:** The SOPB recommends the state adopts and uses the SCC's SCTF Community Engagement Strategy.
- **No. 18:** The SOPB recommends that the SCC document and formalize a process that details when to present ESRC with cases to review

- **No. 19:** The SOPB recommends that the DOC Civil Commitment Unit add an educational component around the state sex offender public website to use during discussions with community members. The unit may consider formalizing this recommendation by adding it to their training and investigation guideline materials. The SOPB also recommends that the DOC's CCU develop a consistent approach to interviews with community members. This includes the primary factors that clearly distinguish the process from the community notification process.
- **No. 20:** The SOPB recommends that the SCC document and formalize its process for submitting cases to ESRC for review
- **No. 21:** The SOPB recommends that the King County Prosecutor's Office and the Office of the Attorney General notify the SCC of upcoming trials. This will better prepare the SCC for potential releases.
- **No. 22:** The SOPB recommends that the SCC should document and formalize various resources they may use to obtain a resident's release address (i.e., defense attorney, prosecutor, DOC, etc.) when a resident is unwilling or unable to provide this information.
- **No. 22a:** The SOPB also recommends that the SCC formalize its law enforcement notification process. This helps ensure that release information is sent to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, and other entities listed in law (RCW 71.09.140).
- **No. 23:** The SOPB again recommends that the SCC formalize its law enforcement notification process. This will ensure that the SCC releases information to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, and other entities listed in law (RCW 71.09.140).
- **No. 24:** The SOPB recommends that the AGO and the KCPAO provide notice of upcoming hearings. This will help the SCC properly prepare for potential 24-hour dismissals.
- **No. 25:** The SOPB recommends that the SCC further discuss if securing its emails is necessary, and if so, in what instances.
- **No. 26:** The SOPB recommends that the SCC include (in its written and formal law enforcement notification policy) that pre-registration should be used to provide an updated final release address to the correct law enforcement agency.
- **No. 27:** The SOPB recommends that the DSHS Victim/Witness Notification Program coordinate with WASPC to include more about how program participants can access the state sex offender public website and obtain additional information. This can best support victims and witnesses after a resident's release.
- **No. 28:** The SOPB recommends that the SCC add a line to their notification emails to request that the reader does not send the email to other people.

- **No. 29:** The SOPB recommends that WASPC reviews the existing state sex offender public website and works with their vendor to more prominently display information, facts, and FAQs on the registered sex offender population. In addition, WASPC may consider developing additional information and resources for appropriate groups so those groups can give the information to community members.
- **No. 30:** The SOPB recommends that WASPC adds information about community notification to the public website and include this information in the additional resources they may develop in response to recommendation 29.
- **No. 31:** The SOPB recommends that WASPC includes more information on the public registry website about the purpose of community notification, and in any documents they may develop in response to Recommendation 29.
- **No. 32:** The SOPB recommends that WASPC updates their model policy to reflect the need to use current photographs on the state public website, notification bulletins, flyers, and other materials intended for public information.
- **No. 33:** The SOPB recommends that WASPC adds additional information to their model policy to standardize community notification meetings. The board also recommends that WASPC continues to update their resources page for local law enforcement and adds any additional resources, such as educational flyers (if/when they are created). Finally, we recommend that WASPC considers providing additional training/discussion at SONAR meetings.
- **No. 34:** The SOPB recommends the SCC has additional involvement in LRAs. When that does happen, the SCC should use an LRA Housing Matrix to find housing for residents releasing to an LRA.

2021

In 2021 [SB 5163](#) was introduced to the legislature. This bill was based on recommendations from the SOPB's final report to the Senate Ways and Means Committee in December 2020.