

Sex Offender Management Board Meeting
June 25, 2007, 10:00 a.m.
DRAFT Minutes

Item #1: Opening Comments

Jack Wallace welcomed all members and representatives to this inaugural meeting. He stated they were all here because others had a vision and The Sex Offender Management Board (SOMB) existed today as a fruition of their work. Jack asked everyone to introduce themselves and state what their expectations were.

Item #2: Introduction of Members/Visitors

Members

Dave Runnels (representing James Tilton), CDCR
Honorable Peter Espinoza, Judge, California Superior Court, LA County
Shirley Poe, CDCR Parole Regional Administrator
Sophia McBeth-Childs, Sacramento County Sheriff Investigative Detective
Catherine Duggan, Director of Crime Victims Assistance Program
Brenda Epperly-Ellis (representing Department of Mental Health)
Tom Tobin, California Coalition on Sexual Offending
Pamela King, Public Defender's Association
Suzanne Brown-McBride, Director California Coalition Against Sexual Assault
Janet Gaard, Special Assistant Attorney General, California Attorney General's Office
Nancy O'Malley, Chief Assistant District Attorney
Gerry Blasingame, California Coalition on Sexual Offending

Visitors

Jan Neeley, California Attorney General's Office
Katherine Bell, Capital Advocacy

Jack Wallace spoke of SOMBs charges (CA Penal Code Section 9000-9003) as being first, to conduct an assessment of current management practices for adult sex offenders, primarily those under supervision. Areas to be reviewed shall include, but not be limited to, the number and distribution of offenders, supervision practices, treatments available and their quality, housing – important issue, recidivism patterns, safety concerns of past and future victims, cost and cost effectiveness, and shortcomings in management practices. The first report is due January 1, 2008. The second task will be to develop recommendations based on the assessment, with the goal of improving community safety. An update or progress report will be due to the Legislature and Governor by January 1, 2009. The final report is due on January 1, 2010.

Board member Mike Johnson from Solano County arrived and was introduced.

Tom Tobin gave the Board his perspective on the history of how the board came into existence.

Assemblyman Todd Spitzer arrived and was introduced. He spoke to the members of his history with sexual offender legislation. Some of the charges of this board, as he saw it, are to make recommendations and respond to inquiries; to be the expert and the clearinghouse for dealing with sex offender issues and to go in perpetuity. Some other suggestions for the SOMB to consider would be to communicate with the Legislature, maybe in the form of periodic memorandum updates. Consider sending a roster of the SOMB members to the Legislature. When arriving at a significant milestone, make the rounds in key public safety committees. Consider the media, with the possibility of arranging press conferences.

Item #3: Discussion of Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act

Janet Gaard summarized the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements which SOMB must follow. All meetings are required to be open. Adequate notice to interested parties must be made. There is a 10-day notice/agenda requirement including making the meeting locations available to the public. The public must be allowed to speak at the meetings. Email discussions and conference calls can be very complicated and have special rules. All substantive discussions must be done at the meetings.

Item #4: Fair Political Practices Form

Jack handed out the form packets to each member. They will be collected at the next meeting.

Item #5: Scope and Work Processes of SOMB

Discussion was held regarding the scope of SOMB. The group agreed to identify the following issues more clearly at subsequent meetings:

- Define the target group (adults vs. juveniles), or is the group identified as just those 'under supervision'?
- Data collection is important and will be a difficult task. Exactly what data will be necessary?
- Can the SOMB do a Public Record Act request for data collection?
- The reports from the previous task force groups will be resources for some of the data. SOMB will need to identify the gaps from those previous reports.
- Part of the assessment could be about how hard it is to collect real time data, with one of the recommendations being statewide data collection.

The following were decided upon as possible agenda items for discussion at the next meeting:

- Governance structure

- Data collection strategies
- Permanent agenda items to consider are the next agenda, the state update, scope and work processes of SOMB
- Administrative issues
- Mission and Vision
- Website
- Subcommittee structure and resources
- Communication plans and paths
- Statutory requirements

Item #6: Schedule of Future Meetings

The permanent day for future meetings will be the third Thursday of each month, with the next meeting to be held on July 19th, 2007, at a place yet to be determined.

Tom Tobin questioned the rules about sending representatives when the member cannot attend a meeting. Janet Gaard stated that she will research the rules regarding representatives being able to attend future meetings. She will report her findings at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.