

**California Sex Offender Management Board
December 20, 2007 Meeting, 8:00 AM
Sacramento State University**

Minutes:

Introduction/Updates

- Members of the Board check in:
 - A quorum is present.
 - Suzanne Brown-McBride
 - Tom Tobin
 - Gerry Blasingame
 - Catherine Duggan
 - Brenda Epperly-Ellis
 - Judge Peter Espinoza
 - Janet Gaard
 - Michael Johnson
 - Pam King
 - Nancy O'Malley
 - Shirley Poe
 - Jerry Powers
 - Dave Runnels
 - Diane Webb
- Absent members
 - Sophia McBeth-Childs
- Minutes
 - Corrections made
 - Motion made to approve minutes; motion seconded and approved
- Updates
 - The day following last month's meeting, CDCR announced one of the most massive expansions of sex offender treatment in Californian history.
 - Bids have been put out to provide treatment to more than 2700 high risk sex offenders.
 - This decision came out of recommendations from last year's government HRSO Task Force report.
 - Recently, there was a murder of a sex offender that may have been related to the sex offender being listed in the sex offender registry.
 - The transient figures this week dropped for the first time since July.
 -

Public Hearings

- Proposal to invite local representatives of related constituencies and stakeholders to the upcoming public hearings, in order to address various relevant points and perspectives
- The hearings will also include a public comment period
- We aim to have five or more board members present at each hearing

Website

- Discussion about whether to have a feedback section added to website
- There are concerns about whether the public can locate the website easily. It does not appear as a search result when "CASOMB" is typed into a search engine and the committee is working to remedy the problem.

Senator Runner

- District 17
- Speaks to the Board
 - Opening perspective
 - Reminds the Boards that of the 30 sections of Jessica’s Law, the debates centers on only three of them (the ones that refer to residency and GPS).
 - Recognizes the arguments about implementation; he does not agree with how Corrections has implemented some parts of Jessica’s law.
 - Admits the initiative process is “a fairly blunt instrument”; therefore, there will always be arguments over details and he does not find it unusual to have the various policy and implementation debates over Jessica’s law that we are having.
 - GPS Issues:
 - Believes GPS can be a valuable tool—an extension of the registration process.
 - Recognizes the extent to which organization and resources are involved in GPS implementation of such magnitude, stating that he does not expect it to happen immediately, but argues that system should not be abandoned simply to make things easier.
 - Cost
 - Hears the cost issue mentioned frequently, but says cost should not prevent the implementation of legislation that voters want.
 - Believes its funding is a state obligation.
 - Specifics
 - Does not believe the precise distance or 2000 feet was the central issue as much as ensuring distance between sex offenders and children. There is no reason specific distance requirements could not be tweaked when appropriate.
- Board feedback
 - Concerns exist about:
 - Sex offenders being managed collectively, as though they all present the same risk level when they do not.
 - Such a broad application of GPS.
 - Senator Runner argues that sex offenders might like GPS since it can help clear them from suspicion whenever a nearby sex offense occurs.
 - Lack of designated financial responsibility for GPS funding in bill.
 - Senator Runner says if he could write the legislation again he would have written funding more specifically into the bill.
 - Jessica’s Law applied to rapists of adults as well as children
 - Senator Runner says he believes public wouldn’t want rapists living next to children either
 - He personally believes he wouldn’t want this only to apply to perpetrators of crimes against children
 - Argument that we should pay attention to what is known—the results of studies, etc
 - Senator Runner argues that this is irrelevant because we are supposed to implement what the public/voters asked for (unless the board wishes to run an initiative to repeal the residency requirements).

- Expression of interest in continuing this conversation.

Board Collectively Provides Feedback to Suzanne Brown-McBride's Written Response to Secretary Tilton

- Tilton has recently clarified that it was never his intent to say post-supervision GPS and its associated funding was responsibility of local law enforcement.
- Discussion over whether our role is to simply figure out how to implement what the voters wanted or whether it is to make recommendations on best practices based on best available data.
- Members generally agree with position paper, apart from some commas and conclusions on the final page.

Committee Reports

- The different report committees sit at various tables and compile editing suggestions.
- Board is expected to turn in a report to legislature with seven sections. Three will be taken care of by Sacramento State.
- The Board, must submit the following report sections:
 - Supervision
 - Treatment
 - Victims and Community Education
 - Housing
- There are also committees that are not required to turn in a report:
 - Registration/post-supervision
 - Investigation/adjudication
- Committee chairs give ten-minute reports:
 - Supervision (Diane Webb)
 - Purpose was to describe goals of supervision, what kind of supervision exists and who provides it.
 - Emphasis on fact that 75% of all registered sex offenders in California are not under any type of formal supervision.
 - Areas of concern follow closely those of the former task force.
 - Treatment (Gerry Blasingame)
 - Advocates use of the containment model as the best practice supported nationally from current research.
 - Identifies goals of treatment.
 - Describes three counties who have created a standard for sex offender treatment providers, a huge gap in our current system.
 - We know treatment is not available in all areas of the state and that it varies considerably from county to county.
 - Strengths and weaknesses of the system.
 - Biggest gap in treatment is probably the lack of standardization and certification.
 - Housing/Re-entry (Dave Runnels)
 - Took the High-Risk Sex Offender/Sexually Violent Predator Task Force data and put it in the context of current housing compliance rules.
 - Identified strengths and gaps.
 - Discusses the transient population problem.
 - Victims & community education (Catherine Duggan)
 - Did not have much to draw upon in previous reports.

- Tried to achieve balance in report by describing how traumatic these events are for victims.
- Would like data comparing victims who have and have not received victim services.
- Registration, Notification, Post-supervision (Janet Gaard)
 - This section is not obligated to go into the January report.
 - Tried to avoid specific recommendations in order to provide the flexibility to incorporate new laws and information.
- Investigation, Adjudication, and Prosecution (Nancy O'Malley)
 - Focuses on training, specialized units, and the state of funding
 - Describes:
 - How cases develop and the guidelines of law enforcement agencies.
 - Specialized sex assault units in the police department.
 - How state funding for training of prosecutors has been cut to a huge extent

Remainder of meeting is spent revising and approving the Board's Response to Secretary Tilton.

Next Meeting will take place 9:00 A.M., Thursday, January 24, 2008.