

**California Sex Offender Management Board**  
**March 20, 2008, 9:00 AM**  
**Prison Industries**

Minutes:

**Introduction/Updates**

- Members of the Board check in:
  - Quorum present
  - Suzanne Brown-McBride (Chair)
  - Tom Tobin (Co-chair)
  - Gerry Blasingame
  - Janet Gaard
  - Michael Johnson
  - Pamela King
  - Sophia McBeth-Childs
  - Judge Peter Espinoza
  - Diane Webb
  - Catherine Duggan
- Absent members
  - Brenda Epperly-Ellis
  - Nancy O'Malley
  - Jerry Powers
  - Dave Runnels

**Minutes**

- Corrections made to last month's minutes.
- Motion made by Tom Tobin to approve minutes as amended seconded and approved by board.

**Legislative Presentation:**

- Joyce Hayhoe details and discusses the legislative intent behind currently proposed legislation relevant to sex offender management.
- She will return next month to provide updates.

**State Updates:**

- There are 3000 transients statewide as of St. Patrick's Day, representing an increase of 80.
- Many counties, such as Long Beach, are trying to ensure they are in compliance.
- There is a discussion about whether the Board should attempt to compile a list of local ordinances regulating residency restrictions.

**Future Agenda:**

- Dashboard indicators—the proposed dashboard indicators from Sacramento State, which the members looked at earlier this week, provide a good starting point.
- The Board also plans to ask Sacramento State to write a paper on housing issues and also wants to begin setting up parameters for CSUS's original research project.
- The Board hopes to soon address residency restrictions, SARATSO, and victim notification

**Discussion Concerning Dashboard Indicators:**

- Some data is unobtainable—members want to determine what data is obtainable as well as how often obtainable information is collected, in order to maintain working indicators.
- What are the important data to collect? Members propose potential topics:
  - Number of transients
  - What are possible measurements of response to victims?
    - The number of victims accessing victim services, which is compiled yearly.

- It is important to determine the proportion of those victims accessing out of those eligible to access them
  - How many new victims every month, year, or other length of time?
    - Does the Board want the total number, or divided into categories, such as adults versus juveniles?
  - An audit of how many victims eligible for compensation (restitution) are collecting it.
  - How many victims eligible for notification are receiving it?
- Supervision—members propose that we may want to determine the:
  - Number of 290's on parole
  - Number 290's on parole per county
  - Number of High Risk Sex Offenders on parole
  - Number of 290 Parolees-at-large.
- SVP's—members are particularly interested in:
  - Number in institutions
  - Referrals out of CDCR
  - How many are living in the community under supervision.
  - Number being evaluated, cost being spent on evaluation.
- Recidivism
  - Rate of new sex crimes
  - Rate of technical violations
- Polygraph
  - Amount polygraph data is being used.
  - This provides an indication of how much the Containment Model is being used.
- Management technology
  - Currently a very critical issue
  - GPS
    - Number of active.
    - Number of passive.
    - Number of parolees that should be GPS but are not.
    - Recidivism rates of those on GPS.
  - Interagency collaborations
  - Housing
    - Transient 290's that are parolees.
    - Transient 290's that are registrants.
  - Treatment
    - Number of SVP's participating in treatment.
    - Number of sex offenders successfully completing treatment. However, the problem would be defining "successful" treatment.
  - Registration/Notification
    - Notification can be divided into passive and active notification.
- Board agrees to revisit proposed data topics at the next meeting.

**Discussion of Topics for Original research:**

- The first commissioned research may be a very political decision.
- Members propose potential topics:
  - 10-year recidivism data and possibly a "failure analysis"
  - Risk/tiering
  - Proximity its relationship with crime
  - Political/public knowledge (for example, surveys and public perceptions). Board determines not to pursue this option.

**Next meeting will take place at 9:00 AM on April 17, 2008.**