



STATE OF WASHINGTON
SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD

P.O. Box 43124 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3124 • www.ofm.wa.gov/sgc/sopb • (360) 995-3847

SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD

August 15, 2024, 1:00pm-3:00pm
Zoom Meeting

Members Present:

Brad Meryhew
Jamie Weimer
Sonja Hardenbrook
Jimmy Hung
Michael O’Connell
Julia Sather
Angie Pacheco
Jedd Pelander
Terrina Peterson
Shawn Sant
Trisha Smith

Members Absent:

Gunner Fulmer
Hon. Nelson Lee
Donald Redfield

Members Represented by Proxy:

Tabitha Yockey for Keith Devos
Corey McNally for Jill Getty
Dr. Dante Harper for Mac Pevey

Staff:

Whitney Hunt, OFM

IMPORTANT NOTE: The recording for this meeting is available on request.

Welcome & Call to Order

Meeting Objectives

Approval of Meeting Minutes

MOTION #24-18 MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 18, 2024, MEETING MINUTES

- **MOVED:** Brad Meryhew
- **SECONDED:** Michael O’Connell
- **ABSTAINED:** None
- **RESULT:** Passed

Research Update: Dr. Lauren Knoth Peterson

Dr. Lauren Knoth-Peterson presented the research findings from her review to the SOPB. Please see the recording [here](#) for the full presentation here.

- **Jedd** asked if the recidivism rates shown for desistance markers were for only for sexual recidivism, or any recidivism?
 - **Dr. Knoth-Peterson** stated the desistance markers are tied to non-sexual recidivism and sexual recidivism depending on which table is examined.

- **Corey McNally** asked **Dr. Knoth-Peterson** to confirm if time-free affects were stronger than that of age?
 - **Dr. Lauren** confirmed yes, they are.
- **Shawn Sant** asked if there are any studies in jurisdictions where supervision ends after 5 or 10 years (as compared to recidivism rates in jurisdictions with active supervision)?
 - **Dr. Lauren** stated she can look for any head-to-head studies and share out.
- **Trisha Smith** asked if this research was considered in the previous recommendations for HB 2178?
 - **Brad** stated yes, this research was looked at in the previous recommendation and was expanded to include additional research since the prior review.

Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative (SSOSA) Discussion Re: Lifetime Supervision: Brad Mervhew

- **Brad** shared an overview of SSSA including its history and purpose. Please see the recording and previous SOPB reports for further information on SSOSA.

Break

HB2178 Discussion

Brad opened the conversation about finding a path off of lifetime supervision and asked the board to share their thoughts about the question: Should the SOPB recommend a path off of lifetime supervision for individuals that qualify? The board worked through general questions to consider and had open dialogue as it relates to the SOPB’s prior 2022 recommendations and HB2178:

- In 2022, the SOPB’s recommendation on HB 2178 was “Yes” (10-2) to creating a pathway off of lifetime supervision.
 - For clarity, **Dr. O’Connell** shared historical context as to how and why the SOPB was assigned to provide recommendations surrounding this question and the civil commitment process.
- **Brad** asked the SOPB to consider how much time should pass before a person is eligible for consideration of relief?
 - The 2022 SOPB Report and HB 2178 recommends:
 - Level 1—5 years in the community.
 - Level 2—10 years in the community.
 - Level 3—15 years in the community.
 - Question to consider: should the recommendation be broken down into these three categories (i.e. Level 1, Level 2, Level 3)?
 - **Shawn Sant** stated that the arbitrary assignment of years is the concern for WAPA when looking at an individualized risk assessment.
 - **Trisha Smith** shared that there is a request within the victim service communities about a pathway to step down from level 3 to level 1.

- **Jamie Weimer** added that the board needs to be careful not to confuse risk level for the purpose of community notification with that of supervision or registration, as these are different things.
- **Dr. O’Connell** shared that, provided the ESRC continues to use validated risk assessment tools, risk levels make a difference, adding that notification level is a way of determining this and a reasonable place to start.
- **Terrina Peterson** added that law enforcement does not have the resources to do dynamic risk assessments.
- **Sonja Hardenbrook** shared that research does not link time-free reductions and risk with any dynamic risk factor (DRF) assessments.
- **Brad** directed the discussion to the question for consideration: What eligibility criteria should be used to determine if a person qualifies?
 - Criteria suggestions:
 - A period of time without any “major” violations.
 - What is a “major” violation?
 - Completion of recommended treatment.
 - Empirically validated risk assessment at time of relief request.
 - Who would administer this?
 - **Jamie** shared that, in 2022, WASPC’s concern was that there was no mechanism in place for victim input or law enforcement input in the bill.
 - **Brad** asked if there was a procedure WASPC would like to see put in place.
 - **Jamie** replied that a possible procedure would be to have the ISRB reach out to the victim and the registering agency for their input.
 - **Dr. O’Connell** stated that notification and input from victims is a complicated issue and shared examples of his experiences working with victims.
- **Whitney** offered to have the PSPRC identify language regarding how other states include victim input in their lifetime supervision relief processes and share those findings with the board for next meeting.
 - **Brad** stated that would be helpful.

Next Steps

- The next full board meeting is scheduled for September 19, 2024, at 1:00 PM.

For the Good of the Order

- **Brad** approved the meeting transition to public comment. Public comments were received. For more information, please see the meeting recording [here](#).

Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned at 4:08 PM

