



STATE OF WASHINGTON

**OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

*Insurance Building, PO Box 43113 □ Olympia, Washington 98504-3113 □ (360) 902-0555*

**SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD**

August 27, 2015 9:00am – 12:00pm

Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs  
3060 Willamette Dr NE  
Lacey, WA 98516

Members Present:

Kecia Rongen  
Andrea Piper-Wentland  
Brad Meryhew  
Dan Yanisch  
Hon. James E Rogers  
Jonathan Meyer  
Keri Waterland  
James McMahan  
Richard Torrance  
Michael O'Connell (phone)

Members Absent:

Holly Coryell  
Julie Door  
Jeff Patnode

Staff:

Keri-Anne Jetzer

Guests: Jamie Yoder, WASPC; Lindsay Erickson, Senate Committee Services; Brittany Jarnot (phone).

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Kecia Rongen called the meeting to order and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION #15-2: MOTION TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES FROM JULY 30, 2015**

**MOVED:** Dan Yanisch  
**SECONDED:** Brad Meryhew  
**PASSED:** Unanimously

### **III. SOPB CONTRACT POSITION**

#### **A. Update – Keri-Anne Jetzer**

Keri-Anne announced that Shannon Hinchcliffe has agreed to take on the contract position. In addition to the experience and the knowledge, she has worked with the Board before so it would be difficult to find someone with similar qualifications for the position. She noted that the contract and the sole source announcement are being prepared now. Keri-Anne invited members to send any research articles to her. DOC offered to host a secure webpage for posting the articles and links again. Chair Rongen asked members for their thoughts or concerns about Shannon working on the contract work for the Board. Brad Meryhew said he has worked with Shannon before and strongly endorses her for the position.

#### **B. Determine fact sheet topics.**

Keri-Anne mentioned that one of the tasks assigned to the contractor is the creation of a 1 or 2 page fact sheet that boils down a topic to its essence. She asked members to provide the four topics that they would like to have in a fact sheet format. Chair Rongen asked where the fact sheets would be housed. Keri-Anne said they would likely be posted on the SOPB website and would be made available to anyone who wanted to post them on their own website. Chair Rongen suggested the members think about how to market the fact sheets when they have been completed.

Jamie Yoder informed members that WASPC's webpage includes documents on Sex Offender Registration Requirements which is derived from their model policy and State Sex Offender Registry Requirements which provides contacts for all the state's registry systems.

There was concern about why the contractor is being tasked with these fact sheets as they seemed to be outside the scope of what the Board has been asked to do and that it may impact her work for the legislative assignment. Keri-Anne explained that the priority of the contractor was the work related to the legislative assignment and that these duties would come after that work has been completed. A member asked if there might be budget to print copies of the fact sheets for distribution. Keri-Anne said she would look into that. An inquiry was also made into the possibility of having the contractor update the system map that was created a while back. Keri-Anne replied that the statement of work has already been submitted and bid upon.

While Judge Rogers said he does not have a position on whether the contractor should complete the fact sheets, he did suggest a fact sheet topic on basic registration requirements, such as length of time for registration and what do to when they move (more for couch-surfers than homeless) if the Board decided to have the contractor complete them.

Brad suggested tabling the topic for now while seeking out input from legislative leaders and other stakeholders to see if there is an actual objection to the Board completing the fact sheets. Chair Rongen said she would have a conversation with the

Governor's Office about it and get back to the Board. Then the topics could be decided via email.

**IV. REVIEW OF RESEARCH RELATE TO SEX/KIDNAPPING OFFENDER REGISTRIES**

Brad Meryhew provided and discussed some research findings related to community notification and registration laws.

**V. REVIEW OF ASSIGNED RISK LEVEL AND RELIEF OF REGISRATION**

James McMahan provided information to the members on the counties that provided documentation on their risk level classification change process.

Chair Rongen asked member to think about what the purpose of community notification and assigning risk levels are. There was discussion about how the End of Sentence Review Committee may score sex offenders.

Jamie Yoder asked if it was possible to get information on cases where the offender's risk level was increased simply because of a Failure to Register (FTR) offense. Keri-Anne said she had the Caseload Forecast Council conviction data and could send a list of offenders who received an FTR. Brad Meryhew suggested the Departure Notices that is sent to DOC. Michael O'Connell concurred that that data would be interesting to review. Brad also mentioned data from WSP that broke out the number of offenders by risk level by county. James McMahan said he believes that WASPC might be able to provide that data.

Members discussed some of the requirements found on the risk level classification change forms provided by counties. Jonathon Meyer asked if WASPC has considered creating a uniform model. James replied that they have not.

Chair Rongen passed around the criteria in the current statute regarding relief of duty to register that the court is supposed to consider. She noted that several of the counties included the same criteria in their forms to petition a risk level classification change. She believes that relief of duty to register is different than requesting a risk level classification reduction. Many members agreed.

Chair Rongen asked members if they believe there should be a uniformed process regarding having local jurisdictions looking at reducing an assigned risk level. It was suggested that perhaps law enforcement might be open to a recommendation from the Board of a form, process or criteria for offenders who request a reclassification. James said it could be distributed to his members for consideration. When asked if it would be considered a model policy, James replied that it would not; it would be considered a recommendation and a resource that could be included along with the model policy. Brad commented that what is on it would depend on what is supported by the research which could also be used to support use of the resource.

When asked if the contractor could provide this work, Keri-Anne noted that it was not included in the statement of work and that the timeline to complete the work for this assignment is already very tight. Brad suggested creating a subcommittee to create a form as an appendices to the report. James stated that he sees the report including answers to the legislative questions and then a recommendation to sheriffs about how the Board thinks it should be done. Chair Rongen suggests including the recommendation form in the report to the legislature. Andrea Piper-Wentland agreed that the legislature would probably want to see what the recommendations look like.

**MOTION #15-3: MOTION TO FORM A SUBCOMMITTEE TO CREATE AN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT FOR LEVEL REDUCTION FORM**

**MOVED:** Andrea Piper-Wentland

**SECONDED:** Keri Waterland

**PASSED:** Unanimously

**Discussion:** James clarified that this form would be the Board's recommendation to law enforcement as he would not be supportive of the Board saying that this is a mandatory form that all shall use. He would be supportive of the Board saying after looking at the issue and the research, this is what the Board suggests to law enforcement to use.

Richard Torrance inquired if it would be appropriate to include criteria that are problematic that are in current forms so that counties that are using such factors will know that they may be creating the opposite effect expected or not tell them anything about risk. Members agreed.

Chair Rongen asked if WASPC would be able to have this form vetted or approved by their members in time to include it in the report to the legislature. James said that there is a sex offender coordinator meeting at the beginning of October where they could present it.

Andrea suggested that the subcommittee might consider looking to see if other states who use look at risk to reoffend may have created a tool already. Brad said he has a copy of similar work that Shannon Hinchcliffe completed several years back.

Subcommittee members:

Michael O'Connell

James McMahan/Jamie Yoder

Jeff Patnode

Brad Meryhew

Jonathan Meyer

DOC representative (Keri will provide contact)

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

James wanted to confirm that the Board is satisfied with the status of the availability of the model policy per last meeting's discussion. Chair Rongen said she would check with the Governor's Office if there was anything else related to that issue that the Board is supposed to look at.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE SEX OFFENDER POLICY BOARD**

/ s /

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Kecia Rongen

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date