



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**  
**SCTF Siting and LRA Placements**  
**Sub-Committee Meeting**

July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2020 2020

3:00pm-5:00pm

Microsoft Teams

In Attendance: Leah Landon, Staff; Terrina Peterson, WASPC; Jamie Weimer, WASPC; Devon Gibbs, King County Office of Public Defense; Lowell Porter, SCC; Alex Mayo, Washington Voices; Daniel Yanisch, SCC; Linda Farmer, AWC; Shoshana Kehoe-Ehlers, OPD; Dan Davis, Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney's Office

**Meeting Notes**

**Welcome & Call to Order**

Leah Landon (staff) called the meeting to order and discussed tips for participating in the virtual meeting. Meeting participants were asked to mute their microphones when not actively participating. The meeting was recorded and can be provided upon request. Leah informed members that Lowell Porter would be Acting Sub-Committee Chair for the meeting as Dave Flynn is on vacation.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Meeting participants were asked to review the meeting minutes from July 15, 2020. Leah asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

**MOTION 20-2-8: MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 15, 2020 MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN:**

**MOVED: Dan Yanisch**

**SECOND: Alex Mayo**

**Passed: Unanimously**

**Abstained: None**

## Meeting Objectives

### Objective 1: Review of Siting Matrix Updates

- **Lowell Porter** provided sub-committee members with an overview of the changes that had been made based on member feedback to the SCTF Siting Matrix.
  - **Lowell** said the question came up regarding where the 72 bed estimate came from. **Lowell** reiterated that this was based on forecasting projections gathered in 2018 for those who may be transitioning to SCTFs in the future. This was compared to the current bed capacity, and it was clear that there was insufficient capacity to meet the demand.
    - The Pierce County SCTF was used as a model for how much land, etc. would be needed.
  - **Lowell** added that there is concern that the SCC is intending on building that many beds so they can do away with the community LRA option and send everyone to the SCTF. While there has been discussion on this, there is nothing formal in the works.
  - The availability of SOTPs and the availability of LRA housing have been moved to a more prominent spot in the matrix.
  - The slides on risk-related considerations were changed to only include the items required by RCW 71.09.020.
  - There were suggestions for additional stakeholders that should be added to the matrix. These included past clients/residents, advocacy groups, LRA housing providers. These have been added to the matrix.
  - There were suggestions on stakeholders that should be removed such as the PTA, this was removed and the availability of fire services was moved to the portion of the matrix with EMS services.

### Objective 2: Q&A with Lowell Porter

- Members were given additional time to ask Lowell any final questions before voting.
- **Andrew Morrison** expressed concern that what needs to be recommended be good policy, and some of the things on the matrix are not good policy. Some of the things required by the RCW are not necessarily good policy.
  - **Lowell** also clarified that some elements are included because they would be beneficial to the client, not because the client should not have access to them.
  - **Lowell** explained that they have to include and consider what is required by statute. The SOPB can recommend a change to the statute, but as is it needs to be considered.
- **Terrina Peterson** asked if the elements in the matrix were weighted.
  - **Lowell** said it is just a factor, but not weighted.
- **Andrew Morrison** said he thought there was another process the group could go through that would shorten the list and tie it to a research base.
- **Linda Farmer** said context will go a long way, and recommended that items required by the RCW be noted as such.
  - **Linda** asked if there was a scoring rubric for the matrix.
  - **Lowell** clarified that there is not, it is just the scale and list built into the matrix.

- **Terrina Peterson** asked if within the matrix, things could be identified by statute, possibly in a weighting process. So those items required by statute would have a higher weight.
  - **Leah Landon** asked if it had to be weighted or if it could just identify what is required by statute.
  - **Terrina** said it could be done either way.
  - **Lowell** said a crosswalk could be created that would relate the RCWs to the required elements.
  - **Terrina** asked Andrew what type of research-based things he wanted to add to the matrix.
    - **Andrew** said he did not want to add anything, rather things needed to be removed, he had in mind that the elements should be based in research as well as the experience of DOC.
    - **Lowell** added that when creating the matrix he worked with DOC and incorporated their feedback into the matrix.
    - **Andrew** said he thought a group could offer something better than this for the matrix, and the SOPB could still recommend statutory changes instead of taking it as a given.
    - **Andrew** added that risk-related factors based on an individual's history would be based useful, but that this is done on an individual basis.
    - **Lowell** said that in working with DOC and others at the SCC, when the investigations are done, these factors are considered.
  - **Terrina** asked Andrew if he felt anything was missing from the matrix.
    - **Andrew** said nothing has been left out, there is just a lot in the matrix that is not supported and would lessen the number of options for no reason. Andrew said he felt the implementation of the matrix should be done by people in the region being considered. Andrew recommends trimming the matrix down to make it workable by those who will be applying it in the community.
    - **Lowell** added that what Andrew just said, is the intent of the SCC.

### **Objective 3: Vote on the SCTF Siting Matrix**

#### **MOTION 20-2-9: MOTION TO ADOPT THE SCC'S SCTF SITING MATRIX:**

**MOVED: Linda Farmer**

**SECOND: Lowell Porter**

**Passed: Unanimously**

**Abstained: Stephanie Sacks, Andrew Morrison (abstained as the Devon Gibbs voted on behalf of the defense)**

The defense added that they would still like to see the process for SCTF Siting become more streamlined, as the comprehensiveness of this matrix may drag the process out.

The SCC will continue to accept edits and feedback throughout the process.

