



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD

P.O. Box 43124 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3124 • (360) 902-0624 • [www.sgc.wa.gov](http://www.sgc.wa.gov)

**SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD**  
**Community Notification and SCC Releases**  
**Sub-Committee Meeting**  
June 16, 2020 3:00pm-5:00pm  
Microsoft Teams Meeting

In Attendance: Leah Landon, Staff; Terrina Peterson, Chair; Jamie Weimer, WASPC; Theo Lewis, DOC; Brad Manke, WASPC, Brad Meryhew, WACDL; Brandon Duncan, DOC; Devon Gibbs, King County Department of Public Defense; Holly Coryell, SCC; Jason Murphy, Washington Voices; Jedd Pelander, DCYF-JR; OPD; Sonja Hardenbrook, Snohomish County Defenders Association; Daniel Davis, Pierce County Prosecutors Office; Joshua Choate, Office of the Attorney General; Jacob Bezanson, SCC; Shawn Candella, SCC; Lisa Copeland, DSHS; Dr. Elena Lopez, SCC; Nicole Brees, SCC; Johanna Painter, SCC; Dominic Winter, DOC, Andrew Morrison, Contract Attorney

**Meeting Notes**

**Welcome & Call to Order**

Leah Landon (staff) called the meeting to order and discussed tips for participating in the virtual meeting. Leah reminded meeting participants that the meeting was being recorded and recordings can be provided upon request. Meeting participants were asked to mute their microphones when not actively participating. Leah introduced Terrina Peterson as the sub-committee Chair, and Terrina asked other meeting participants to introduce themselves.

**MOTION 20-3-1: MOTION TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 13, 2020 AS WRITTEN.**

**Moved: Brad Meryhew**

**Seconded: Holly Coryell**

**Passed: Unanimously**

**Abstained: Joshua Choate, Elena Lopez, and Jacob Bezanson**

**MOTION 20-3-2: MOTION TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES FROM June 2, 2020 AS WRITTEN.**

**Moved: Brad Meryhew**

**Seconded: Joshua Choate**

**Passed: Unanimously**

**Abstained: Joshua Choate, Elena Lopez, and Jacob Bezanson**

**Meeting Objectives**

**Objective 1: Learn more about the victim/witness notification process.**

**Lisa Copeland**, the Victim/Witness Notification Program Manager for DSHS provided an overview of her role and program for the sub-committee.

- The Victim/Witness Notification Program is designed to help victims and witnesses of sexual assault or violent crimes track those who offended against them. In order to be part of the program, someone has to have been victimized by someone who is a resident at one of the state psychiatric hospitals, or the Special Commitment Center.
  - Those eligible for the program include: those victimized by an offender, next of a kin of a victim/witness, a parent/guardian of a victim, a witness to a crime, or have some other tie to the crime.
- At any given time, the program has about 225 offenders that they are providing notifications for, and any time an offender or resident moves from one location to another (such as a new prison, hospital, or DSHS facility), the victim/witness is notified.
- Every effort is made to provide notification within 30 days of release, but in the cases of unconditional releases, this may not happen.
- In many cases, program participants are notified by certified mail or by email.
- There are different enrollment options (online, by phone, by email, or by brochure).

**Questions:**

- **Terrina Peterson** confirmed with Lisa that she receives a notification from the SCC when a resident is releasing. Lisa said this is correct.
- **Terrina** said she heard that the AGO also does a victim notification.
  - **Josh Choate** said this is correct and that there is an internal policy with the AGO that was created by the AGO and likely is not as comprehensive. When the AGO files a case, they typically decide whether to call victims/witness to testify. The policy requires that they notify anyone they have reached out to in the past regarding a case. Typically, they go back to the last fact-finding hearing to determine who was contacted. **Josh** recognized that this is an internal process and not likely to capture everyone.
- **Terrina** asked **Lisa** if when the SCC provides notification, if they notify her of a hearing date.
  - **Lisa** said she gives the 30-day notice and she lets them know that someone is scheduled for a hearing on a certain date and may be released. If nothing changes, that person will not hear from her again.

- **Jamie Weimer** mentioned the timing of the notification for victims and witnesses and that the group had discussed this. **Jamie** asked **Lisa** if she had run into any issues with the timing for when she receives notification to when she is able to provide that to victims/witnesses.
  - **Lisa** said sometimes there are issues but it is uncommon. By law they have to provide 30-days' notice to the victim/witness and if they cannot do that Lisa, has informed the court and they may delay the release to allow for the notice.
- **Sonja Hardenbrook** mentioned that defense attorneys had recently heard a rumor that in one instance a victim was given notice with such specificity that they knew the date/time of when the resident would be at the dock, and that the defense attorney was picking them up. In this case, the defense attorney was contacted directly by the victim. This has led to defense attorneys being concerned by the amount of information and specificity that may be provided to the victims/witnesses.
  - **Lisa** said that this is not information she provided. She has a template that says that the person will release on or after a specific date to a specific city. No other dates or specific information is provided.
  - **Andrew Morrison** said that this is not a rumor, it happened to him with a recent case. Andrew spoke to Deborah Woodard at the SCC and this information is sent from the SCC to an email list.
    - **Lisa** reiterated that this would not have come from her.
    - **Deborah Woodard** said that the email she prepares goes out to key personnel at the SCC, DSHS Victim/Witness Program, DOC Civil Commitment, Shoshana at OPD, King County Prosecutors Office and the AGO. This information is not given out to anyone outside of the distribution list and the SCC has no contact with victim/witness.
    - **Dr. Lopez** asked if this information could be publically disclosed through the public records act.
    - **Nicole Brees** said this type of information could be publically disclosed but once the request is submitted, it could take 30-45 days for the requestor to receive. **Nicole** also mentioned that she has not received any requests based on this type of information.
- **Terrina Peterson** asked the group if the timing of victim/witness notification was still a sticking point now that the group had heard from Lisa.
  - **Jedd Pelander** asked Lisa if with the unconditional releases, or after a hearing, a notification may not go out until 24 hours before the release. **Lisa** said this may happen and in that case they prepare a letter to the victim/witness saying they anticipate that a person will go to court on a certain date and they anticipate that they may be unconditionally released.
  - **Terrina** asked if the group wanted to add any recommendations or leave the item as is.
    - **Jedd** asked if it was in policy that a preliminary letter notifying victims/witnesses of a potential unconditional release is in policy, or if it is just the way things have been done.
    - **Lisa** said it is the way it has been done and she is not sure what pushback would happen.

- **Leah Landon** asked **Lisa** if when she provides a preliminary notification in these cases, if she is able to say where the person will be releasing to or if it was more broad, and if they find out later where the person will be releasing to, if a follow-up is initiated.
  - **Lisa** said she will include where their intent to release to is included if she has that information, and that no follow-up is provided.
- **Jamie Weimer** said that WASPC is responsible for the public sex offender registry website. **Jamie** asked **Lisa** if in their notification documents, they provide any information that would allow the victim/witness to access that information or find it more easily.
  - **Lisa** said currently they do not, and it is not that she is not willing, she is happy to add wording around that. **Jamie** and **Lisa** will talk about this more offline.
  - **Jamie** said she thinks this may be a way to give people a way to have additional control over additional notification.
- **Terrina** asked what happens when it is an unconditional release and it is not known where they are going, but then they show up in the same community as the victim/witness.
  - **Lisa** said she does not do anything with this.
- **Terrina** asked the group again if they wanted to include any suggestions on this item, such as recommending that the notification to victims/witnesses include a link to the SOR website.
  - **Leah Landon** said the addition of the link sounded like a great idea, as this allows someone who wants additional information can easily find it without increasing the workload for Lisa and her team, nor would it require a statutory change.

## Objective 2: Finish Reviewing the Final Swim Lane

- Sticking Point #11: SCC distribution list may be shared more broadly and impact the safety of the defense and their client.
  - **Sonja Hardenbrook** said that in previous meetings the group had discussed rare instances in which a resident is released and no address is provided and how this may be related to too much information being provided to the victim. Sonja said that we need to provide privacy and protections to the defense attorneys as well as to their clients. The SCC is sending out quite a bit of information to a lot of people, and if we can restrict that we might find that there is more willingness around sharing the address.
  - **Terrina Peterson** asked if **Sonja** wanted to add another sticking point to the notification part. **Sonja** said sure.
    - **Terrina** clarified that the concern is about who gets the discharge plan from the SCC. Sonja said yes as it sounds like the official victim notification does not include this, but the SCC does.
    - **Sonja** said if it is identified as a sticking point we can identify solutions such as requiring anyone on that distribution list cannot share the

information, would allow the defense to feel more comfortable sharing this information.

- **Terrina** asked **Nicole Brees** if a notice to not share the information would preclude it from public disclosure. **Nicole** said no and that there is no exemption that would preclude that information through a public disclosure/records request.
- **Sonja** said she is not worried about public disclosure because of the built in delay, and that she is worried about the people on the SCC distribution list sharing that information more widely.
- **Terrina** asked if putting a line in the SCC emails asking people to not share the information contained in the email would work, and **Sonja** said yes.
  - **Nicole** said they could do this. She also added that the SCC tried to track down how the information was released and they have not been able to identify how it got out. **Nicole** reiterated that they want to have open communication so they can continue to facilitate both law enforcement and victim/witness notifications.
- **Terrina** asked if this was the reason defense attorneys were not wanting to share release locations.
  - **Andrew Morrison** said that only the SCC had the details the victim knew, and that he has other concerns as to why he is providing the address when it is legally required, and it is not only this issue. Andrew said in his experience when he provides the address early, those clients show up on local news before they even release. Whereas for those he shares later, they do not show up in the news until they release. There is someone in the distribution list that seems to be flagging releases for the media and this make reintegration more difficult. It hurts their ability for housing, employment, etc. and Andrew is resisting the community and media blow up for as long as possible.
  - **Terrina** asked if when there are times when the media knows about the release ahead of time if it is an unconditional or and LRA. **Andrew** said unconditional and he is unsure if law enforcement notification was completed.
  - **Nicole Brees** asked if **Andrew** would be interested in getting some more attorneys together so they could review the distribution list together and talk out the issue. **Nicole** said she thinks this is the first time something like this has happened and she would like to come up with a solution so it does not happen again. **Andrew** said he would be willing to do this, though he is not sure how broad of an issue this is.
  - **Brad Meryhew** asked **Andrew** if changing the distribution list was enough. **Andrew** said he would be more comfortable if there was a written SCC policy to cover distribution, who is getting notice, and what they are releasing. **Andrew** said he is finding a lot

of information is going to legislators, commissioners, etc. and what in the past was a more informed distribution list, has grown. Then when someone asks to be added they can say yes or no depending on whether they fit the policy, which would allow for the distribution list would have more intention.

- **Brad** mentioned that access to information is common in Washington you have to be able to defend the reasoning to do so. Brad also mentioned he did not feel a verbal agreement is enough to get there.
- **Terrina** mentioned that the last time the group met they talked about the 30-day notification requirement to law enforcement, and when these notifications happen that have no information, the SCC does not know where to send the notification and they may end up sending it to the whole state. In order to make notifications more meaningful, we need to be able to share the address with law enforcement for the 30-day notification.
  - **Andrew** asked if there is a policy or reason to provide this information earlier. What policy reason is there to share this information earlier when they are not doing anything but making the client's life harder?
  - **Terrina** said that law enforcement does not send out notifications before the client comes in to register. Most agencies spoken with, they create the bulletin in advance and then they wait until the resident physically comes in and registers because they do not want to get the community riled up.
  - **Jamie Weimer** added that the purpose of community notification is not to rile people up, and doing it in advance of the person arriving is not something they want to do.
  - **Andrew** clarified that in his experience the media gets ahold of the information before the release, so it seems to be something on the SCC end, and he is not trying to say that law enforcement is performing the notifications early.
- **Jedd Pelander** pointed out that we need to be clear when we are talking about community notification, which is done by law enforcement, whereas the SCC does law enforcement notification.
- **Andrew** said he can guarantee that the SCC distribution list does not just include law enforcement and like Brad mentioned it will be hard to tell people without a written policy that they will no longer get that information. However, until there is a policy in place, it is safer to not share that information until legally required if there is no good coming from it.
- **Sheriff Manke** mentioned that the purpose of the sub-committee is community notification and for the purposes of what the sub-committee is doing, we should be working on community notification. **Sheriff Manke** mentioned that he had

been talking to colleagues and they feel they get plenty of information from DSHS, DOC, and the information provided to them is not released until the person is released AND registers in the community. He added that we may be getting too far into the weeds.

- **Brandon Duncan** seconded this and asked to end the conversation.
- Sticking Point #11: The SCC is adding a line to their notification emails asking that the information contained not be shared more broadly.
- Sticking Point #12: Community education about the public website.
  - **Terrina Peterson** said this was added as a recommendation to where law enforcement could push out more education on the sex offender registry website.
    - **Jamie Weimer** said this also goes along with what was discussed with **Lisa Copeland** earlier, regarding adding information about the registry to notification emails. **Jamie** said this may allow folks to be more responsible for the information they receive. **Jamie** reiterated that it is important to let people know where to go for more information when they need it.
    - **Terrina** asked if the recommendation should be something in the WASPC model policy to help guide law enforcement in providing the education.
      - **Jamie Weimer** said it may not be right for the model policy, but that **Terrina** in her role could work to determine different forms of education for people to use. Such as creating a brochure, that **Lisa** can include in her notifications, or for the DOC victims' services unit.
      - **Brandon Duncan** added that DOC is willing to collaborate on creating these resources.
    - **Sonja Hardenbrook** mentioned that the group had previously discussed creating a handout with empirically based information for this area of practice that law enforcement could use in community notifications and this would be great to do.
      - **Terrina Peterson** asked if she was referring to something to be used during meetings or something more generic.
      - **Sonja** said she was thinking for the community meetings because not everyone is doing them, but there is a lot of information from prior SOPB reports that would help inform this, and it could create a flyer for use at community meetings.
      - **Jamie Weimer** mentioned that this might be an opportunity for WASPC to review the information they have on the public website and make sure it is up to date and educational.
      - **Brandon Duncan** said that he would recommend a well-rounded collaborative approach with stakeholders if any sort of educational handout were to be developed. **Brandon** also mentioned it would be prudent to discuss the environment of the community meeting

itself, as this is going to be dependent on the areas and the Sheriff will know how to best approach and present. Brandon also mentioned that having something on the website seems most appropriate and that during the meeting people are directed towards that.

- **Terrina** asked about adding an FAQ on the resource page and **Brandon** said that would be helpful and that you can come to these meetings with data and evidence, but that he does not know if the goal was for there to be an educational approach. In these community meetings, we have to be careful with how much we try to give information vs allowing the jurisdiction to lead us in forming what the meeting will look like.
- Sticking Point #12 Outcome: WASPC will add additional information to their website such as an FAQ page, and Terrina will work on developing resources such as brochures for distribution with the appropriate entities.
- Sticking Point #13: Discuss treating SVPs differently than level 3s.
  - **Terrina Peterson** recalled the discussion around treating SVPs differently. Terrina added that there is no separate notification policy for SVPs and so most jurisdictions treat them like a level 3 and they try not to single the SVPs out. In some of the conversations, it sounds like people may feel they should be treated differently.
    - **Brandon Duncan** said that the Sheriff's Department is going to know what information is going to be shared or not, and the current process of notifying them and giving them all the information they need is what is important. Then they can determine the best way to present that.
    - **Brad Manke** agreed with **Brandon**, that they are level 3s and this is how law enforcement is going to treat it. **Brad** added that the opening of the SOPB was because a community was on a witch-hunt and this is tough for him to swallow. If he handles a notification poorly, that is on him and his community and there is no one way it can be dictated statewide. Brad added that he likes the WASPC model policy and a few things could be tweaked, but they need to take ownership for how they handle these cases.
    - **Sonja Hardenbrook** said she might have misarticulated what she said earlier, and the tool she was trying to talk about would be for particularly as the LRA program grows, for those jurisdictions that do not see SVPs very often. This would be a resource for law enforcement that would be short and concise and provide information on SVPs, and it would be similar to the model policy and can be altered as necessary.
    - **Brandon** offered to share the FAQ and law enforcement information DOC has with the group. This is the information DOC distributes to law enforcement as appropriate.



- **Terrina** asked if the group was okay with removing the sticking point as it seemed that this may not be an issue.
  - **Brandon** mentioned that having the option for law enforcement have resources to use if they wish would be good.
  - **Jamie Weimer** asked if local law enforcement is putting that someone is an SVP on bulletins or on the website.
    - **Terrina** said that some agencies will put that someone was committed under 71.09, but a lot of agencies do not do public comments and so it would be in a bulletin if it did happen. Terrina added that WASPC has done a lot of work on this and how law enforcement can use DOC and the SCC as a resource and now they are starting to understand the process more. Some agencies are putting it in, but some are leaving it out.
    - **Jamie** asked if WASPC should have an internal discussion on consistency of when that information should or should not be included. Jamie also asked thoughts on including this information across the board or not including it.
      - **Sheriff Manke** said he did not feel that an “across the board” anything is a good idea, due to the vast differences in the state of Washington. What is right for one jurisdiction is not necessarily right for another.
  - **Terrina** confirmed that no committee members had anything to say on whether the SVP information should be included in a bulletin or not.
    - **Josh Choate** said it is a different thing than a conviction, it is a mental health finding against someone and they have been found to not have those same symptoms anymore. Josh said it is hard to see a nice fit or overlap where protection of the community or offender is advanced by a blanket rule.
    - **Brandon Duncan** said we seem to be hearing ambivalence, and it sounds like it may be an agency issue. The people that know what an SVP is can understand it. It is hard to ride the line between education and raising alarm. **Brandon** said he is leaning towards not having an across the board policy and that jurisdictions should be able to have the discretion.
      - **Josh Choate and Sheriff Manke agreed with this.**
- Sticking Point #13 Outcome: This is no longer a sticking point for the group and will be removed from further consideration.
- Sticking Point #14: Timing of Community Notification

- **Jamie Weimer** recalled that is had to do with confusion between law enforcement notification and community notification. Knowing that community notification is happening once a resident has been released and has registered in the community and this may no longer be an issue.
  - **Jedd Pelander** said this made him think about how long it takes from the time someone registers to the time a community meeting is held. Having a meeting a month after release may be less helpful.
    - **Terrina** said from what she has heard, law enforcement does the mailers as quickly as they can. Usually, they do not hold a meeting unless there is a lot of chatter or the community requests it. In the past, there have been times where the community knew something was happening before the release and it was determined whether to hold a meeting, but the decision to hold a meeting is determined based on community feedback.
    - **Leah Landon** asked if there was no recommendation on this item or if it should be removed from the list of sticking points.
- Sticking Point #14 Outcome: this is no longer a sticking point based on clarifications that have been provided to sub-committee members.
- Sticking Point #15: Community members often have inconsistent perceptions of what community notification should look like.
  - **Terrina Peterson** asked if this was inconsistent perceptions from the group or from the community. **Leah Landon** clarified that this was from the community and that with each community doing it differently, community members do not know what to expect or what information they are entitled to.
    - **Theo Lewis** said he was part of that conversation and that the community likely has an idea of what they believe should happen, and when we do not do it the same, or when a minimum requirement is not performed, they may ask why and this may be a contributing issue to cases such as Poulsbo. Having even a basic framework may help the community trust the process more.
    - **Brandon Duncan** said in Poulsbo he was not involved in everything, but there was some inconsistency in who says what or who is involved in what, and people were mad at DSHS but happy with DOC, and this is not the way we want media press to go out. This may have had a lot to do with a lack of coordination pre-meeting, and there should be some sort of format. Brandon went on to say that, the driver behind the sub-committee and many of these questions might be what happened in Poulsbo. At the least, a pre-meeting or de-briefing may be helpful so folks know what each stakeholder is going to do.
      - **Terrina** said there are some recommendations in the WASPC model policy about the community meeting, and maybe they can

provide additional clarification and guidance, and possibly recommend a pre-meeting.

- **Brandon** said this may be helpful, and that a briefing and de-briefing should be embedded in the policy so we can learn.
- **Terrina** said this would be added to the policy.
- **Dominic Winter** added that it may be dangerous to extrapolate too much from the Poulso meetings as there was clearly an agenda from the public, and it was that they did not want to be informed. Taking some of what happened and frame our response based on that may be counterproductive. **Terrina** agreed, and said it is not necessarily a good example. **Dominic** said it was supposed to be to inform the community but it became an attempt at civil legislation. He added that we are trying to nail down how these meetings should or should not look, at that should be the focus, not necessarily what happened in Poulso.
- Sticking Point #15 Outcome: WASPC will add additional information to the model policy on meeting consistency and what community meetings should look like.
- Sticking Point #16: Standardized Community Meetings
  - **Terrina Peterson** asked the group if this could be lumped into Sticking Point #15. The group agreed.
  - Sticking Point #16 Outcome: this item will be included with Sticking Point #15.
- Sticking Point #17: Purpose of meetings is to educate/deescalate community, not provide an opportunity to stop the LRA.
  - **Terrina Peterson** said this may go into the timing of meetings and the clarification in the WASPC model policy on how to guide the meeting so the community is calmer and more understanding.
    - **Theo Lewis** said the most destructive meetings he have attended are ones where the public felt or had been led to believe that the SCC or DOC were conspiring to slip someone into their neighborhood. Coming at it from a transparent point of view, is what tends to eliminate this type of situation. Theo also said he understand the defense wanting to avoid sharing the address early, and by being transparent we can avoid people thinking the state is going behind their back. Some type of prior notice is helpful in these cases and can go a long way to reinforce credibility.
    - **Terrina** asked if Theo felt a community notification should be done prior to the resident registering.
      - **Theo** said he recognizes that this may not be the best approach, but we should try to provide as much notice as possible and as our

margin shrinks, that is where we get the anger from the public. Theo reiterated that he is not necessarily saying notification should happen sooner, but in instances where it has the public has been more receptive.

- **Brandon Duncan** pointed out that the request for the SOPB to look at this topic was driven by legislators from the district where Poulsbo resides. While there is some generalization we can make and take advantage of, how far are we going in addressing issues that are driven by this specific request. The legislation and legislator from the area behind this request, were trying to stop the LRA, and we need to remember this and the source of us being asked to do this is from one constituency.
  - **Leah Landon** clarified, and said that while Senator Rolfes is a big player in this request as a Chair of the committee, the request to the SOPB came from the Senate Ways & Means Committee and legislative staff are involved in the request as well. Many legislators are interested in hearing from the SOPB on this topic as they may be able to present information and evidence on the topic to help determine how we can do this work better.
  - **Brad Meryhew** added that it is important to remember that the task is not to assess the political viability of solutions, and we should step back and look more broadly at what are the problems. Brad added that he objected to the characterization of Andrew's concerns as being in the weeds, and he objects to attempts to narrow the scope of work for the community. Brad said he was not in agreement with tailoring this sub-committee and its work down to the politics of the moment.
  - **Brandon** said that if the explanation Leah gave was the driving force from the very beginning, that would have been helpful.
  - **Terrina Peterson** said that the items this sub-committee is talking about is cleaning up processes and policies and not necessarily talking about RCW changes. The group is getting places, and if we can get agencies to implement these changes then it is not wasted time.
    - **Brad** said he did not appreciate being told "a priori" that the group would not be making recommendations for statutory changes and that we should suspend that judgement, and not be politically weak. The group should aim to do what is best practice, and not work under the assumption that this is not going to go anywhere.
    - **Terrina** said she agreed and she was not trying to say there would not be RCW changes or

- recommendations, but that the group had yet to actually recommend any. If people feel that statute changes should be made, she is happy to put them forward. Terrina added that she feels the sub-committee is accomplishing things and it is not a waste of time.
- **Brad** said it is not a waste of time and that he thinks the group should feel free to engage.
  - **Terrina** circled back and said that the purpose of the meeting is in model policy, and is intended to deescalate.
    - **Leah Landon** said that the sticking point may not be that the purpose of the meeting is to educate or deescalate, but that the sticking point is that the community does not understand the purpose. The recommendation could be updates to the WASPC model policy.
      - **Dominic Winter** added that we need to identify a means of providing that information that would be provided in these meetings even when there is not one.
  - **Terrina** confirmed that the recommendation to add information on the purpose of the community meetings makes sense to add to the WASPC model policy. **Leah** agreed that it did.
  - **Dan Davis** said he had been listening but not weighing in because he could not remember the last time Pierce County had a community meeting, but he knows they can be tricky. Dan asked if before it gets to the point of an in person meeting, if there is a better way to put out the information about the release. Oftentimes people may not understand why the person is not releasing, and if there could be a more standardized way to churn the information out multiple times. If the education could come before the in person meeting, this may be helpful.
    - **Terrina** said that some of the information Dan mentioned is included in the bulletin and community members are hopefully reading the bulletins.
    - **Dan** said people often do not understand the legality that these people have completed a sentence or that the person is entitled to a release, and people see DOC or DSHS as “Waving a wand” to release the person.
    - **Terrina** asked if this was a recommendation to add some clarification to bulletin writing.
    - **Theo** said it sounded like the group was looping back to a standardized template for bulletins, etc. and this provides cover to law enforcement and others where they can say they did what they were supposed to.

- **Jedd Pelander** asked for clarification on bulletins. **Terrina** said she is referring to the mailers and press releases that go out, and these in some cases include brief information on the offense.
- Sticking Point #17 EDITED: Community members do not understand the purpose of community meetings.
- Sticking Point #17: Recommendation: WASPC may add additional verbiage to their model policy that clarifies the purpose of community meetings. This may include information on information that should be included in bulletins, mailers, etc., as well as guidance on how to conduct community meetings.
- Sticking Point #18: Notification is too inflammatory and sometimes may have original mugshot.
  - **Brandon Duncan** said this has not been his experience as of late, and this does not seem like a huge sticking point to him.
  - **Theo Lewis** said the WASPC model policy does include an item saying that information from OffenderWatch should be used but it may be helpful to add that a current photograph of the individual should be used.
    - **Terrina** wondered if this sticking point was about the notifications coming from SCC.
    - **Sonja Hardenbrook** said now that she understands more about the discretion at the local level, she thinks the issue may be there and not something this committee can fix, but additional guidance in the model policy may be helpful.
    - **Sonja** added that brief procedural history may be helpful to the community's understanding.
      - **Brandon Duncan** said that while Sonja may have had some experiences where this did not happen, but in his recent experiences this has all happened. This may though, be a good idea to do in general.
  - Sticking Point #18 Recommendation: WASPC may update their model policy to reflect the need for use of current photographs of clients when they release.
- Sticking Point #19: Notification meetings need common set of agreed upon facts to present either visually, or as handouts that include purpose of community meetings.
  - **Terrina Peterson** said this could be put into the model policy, and that WASPC already has resources on their website for jurisdictions to use when they have community meetings.

- Sticking Point #19 Recommendation: WASPC will continue to update their resources page for local law enforcement and will add any additional resources, such as an educational flyer, if/when they are created.

**Next Steps**

- At the next meeting the group will review the topics for the model policy, and the topics for the SCC so these can be provided to the SCC for review.
  - Once approved by the sub-committee all items will be finalized and sent to the SOPB for review and adoption.
- Next Full Board meeting on June 24, 2020 from 1:00pm-5:00pm
- Leah will send out Doodle poll to schedule next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Sub-Committee Chair  
Terrina Peterson

\_\_\_\_\_  
07/15/2020  
Date