

**The Joint Task Force on Sex Offender Management:
Final Report**

December 19, 2005

Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Summary of SHB 1147.....	2
Overview of the Laws Governing Sex Offenders in Washington.....	3
Summary of Task Force Meetings.....	9
Recommendations.....	11
Where to Find More Information.....	14

Executive Summary

The Joint Task Force on Sex Offender Management (the "Task Force") was created by the passage of SHB 1147 during the 2005 legislative session. The legislation required the Task Force to review a number of issues in connection with sex offender placement in communities and community notification and safety. In addition, SHB 1147 required the Task Force to make recommendations to the Governor and to the Legislature regarding these matters.

During the 2005 legislative interim, the Task Force held five public meetings. This final report contains recommendations, upon which the Task Force agreed during its November 17 meeting. The report also includes background information about the legislation that formed the Task Force and the issues that were covered in each meeting. There are also sections of interest to those who want to know more about how sex offenders are sentenced in Washington, sex offender registration requirements, and the possibility of civilly committing sexually violent predators even after they have completed their sentences. Finally, the report refers to some other resources for those who are interested in becoming better informed about this particular area of law and policy.

Summary of SHB 1147

Enacted in 2005, SHB 1147 imposed living restrictions on certain "determinate-plus" offenders and created the Task Force.

I. Living Restrictions

SHB 1147 prohibits an offender sentenced for a "two-strikes" offense against a minor victim from living within a "community protection zone" for the duration of his or her term of community custody. A community protection zone is defined as the area within 880 feet (two blocks) of a public or private school.

II. The Joint Task Force on Sex Offender Management

SHB 1147 also established the Task Force to examine issues of community safety and the management of sex offenders in the community. The Task Force is required to work in collaboration with the Partnership for Community Safety and to submit recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature regarding:

- The effectiveness of community protection zones and other strategies to promote community safety, including recommendations on proactive and reactive approaches to sex offender residence locations and any statutory, constitutional, or practical limitations on the state's ability to address sex offender housing requirements;
- The standardization of the community sex offender notification process;
- The applicability of the Public Disclosure Act to sex offender information sharing;
- The training needs of law enforcement, criminal justice staff, and school personnel to increase community safety in relationship to sex offender notification and management strategies; and
- The impact and advisability of pre-notification of local government officials related to sex offender residence location.

The task force consists of the following members:

- Two members of the House of Representatives, one from each caucus, appointed by the Speaker of the House (Representative Clements and Representative Flannigan);
- Two members of the Senate, one from each caucus, appointed by the President of the Senate (Senator Regala and Senator Carrell);
- The Secretary of the Department of Corrections (Harold Clarke);
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction (Terry Bergeson)
- The Secretary of the Department of Social and Health Services (Robin Arnold-Williams)
- The Attorney General (Rob McKenna)
- The Executive Director of the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (Don Pierce)
- The Chair of the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (Jeralita Costa)
- The Chair of the End of Sentence Review Committee (Anna Aylward)

- The Executive Director of the Criminal Justice Training Commission (Dr. Michael Parsons);
- A representative of the broadcast media appointed by the Governor (Paul Aker); and
- A representative of the print media appointed by the Governor (Jill Mackie)

Senator Regala and Representative Clements served as Co-Chairs of the Task Force. Staff support to the committee was provided by Jim Morishima, Counsel to the House Criminal Justice and Corrections Committee, and Kiki Keizer, Counsel to the Senate Human Services and Corrections Committee.

III. Termination

The provisions of SHB 1147, including the living restrictions, terminate on July 1, 2006.

Laws Governing Sex Offenders in Washington

Washington has enacted a number of changes to its sentencing laws over the years that have increased incarceration time and supervision for convicted sex offenders. In fact, Washington has often led the way and served as a model for other states with respect to sex offender management. It is important to note, however, that because of the *ex post facto* clauses of the federal and state constitutions, most of the changes the Legislature has made over the years may not be applied retroactively; i.e., to offenders who committed crimes before the effective date of the applicable legislation. This means that there are a variety of sentencing systems in Washington operating simultaneously; which one applies to a given offender depends on when the offender committed his or her crime. Therefore, some offenders are not affected by some of the changes the Legislature has made, even if they are convicted or released from prison today.

Some of the significant changes that have been made over time to sex offender sentencing include:

- Indeterminate sentencing
- Determinate sentencing
- Mandatory terms of supervision in the community
- Life sentences for "persistent offenders"
- "Determinate-plus" sentencing
- The Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative
- Civil restrictions

I. Indeterminate Sentencing

Prior to 1984, courts were required to impose indeterminate sentences upon persons convicted of sex offenses. Under this system, the court would set a minimum term and a maximum term. The offender would then be evaluated by the parole board (now called the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board, or ISRB) near the expiration of his or her minimum term. If the ISRB chose not

to parole the offender, it would assign the offender a new minimum term after which the offender would be reevaluated by the ISRB. All persons convicted of sex offenses committed prior to July 1, 1984, are sentenced to indeterminate sentences (regardless of the date of conviction).

Stakeholders began to consider changes to indeterminate sentencing due to concerns regarding truth in sentencing, equal treatment among offenders, and fiscal uncertainty. The result of these concerns was the Sentencing Reform Act of 1981 (SRA).

II. Determinate Sentencing

Enacted in 1981, the SRA imposed determinate sentencing upon offenders convicted of crimes committed on or after July 1, 1984. Determinate sentencing is the foundation upon which all the subsequent sentencing changes for sex offenders are built.

Under determinate sentencing, a court must sentence an offender to a specific term of confinement within a "standard range." The standard range is determined using a grid with the offender's criminal history (known as the offender's "offender score") on the horizontal axis and the severity of the crime (known as the "seriousness level" of the crime¹) on the vertical axis.²

Determinate sentencing applies to the following crimes today:

- Child Molestation in the 2nd degree (first two offenses)
- Child Molestation in the 3rd degree
- Communication with a Minor for Immoral Purposes
- Custodial Sexual Misconduct in the 1st degree
- Dealing in Depictions of a Minor Engaged in Sexually Explicit Conduct
- Failure to Register as a Sex Offender
- Incest in the 1st degree (first two offenses)
- Incest in the 2nd degree (first two offenses)
- Indecent Liberties (without forcible compulsion)
- Patronizing a Juvenile Prostitute
- Rape in the 3rd degree (first two offenses)
- Rape of a child (statutory rape) in the 3rd degree
- Sending or Bringing into the State Depictions of a Minor Engaged in Sexually Explicit Conduct
- Sexual Exploitation of a Minor (first two offenses)

¹ Some felonies do not have seriousness levels assigned to them. These felonies are known as "unranked" felonies. A person convicted of an unranked felony is subject to a jail term of 0-12 months, regardless of his or her criminal history.

² Regardless of the standard range, an offender's sentence may not exceed the "statutory maximum sentence" for the crime: Life for class A felonies, 10 years for class B felonies, and five years for class C felonies.

- Sexual Misconduct with a Minor in the 1st degree
- Sexually Violating Human Remains
- Voyeurism

III. Supervision in the Community

A sentencing court is required to impose a mandatory period of "community custody" upon a convicted sex offender. Community custody³ refers to the time in which the sex offender is to be supervised in the community. The term of community custody is in addition to the offender's term of confinement.

Under today's law, a court must sentence a sex offender whose term of confinement is greater than one year to a term of community custody between 36-48 months.⁴ A court is authorized to sentence a sex offender whose term of confinement is one year or less to a term of community custody of up to 12 months.

For an offender whose term of confinement is greater than one year, a court is required to impose conditions of community custody, including obtaining residence approval from the Department of Corrections (DOC), reporting to a community corrections officer, and refraining from possessing or using controlled substances. Additionally, the court is authorized to impose conditions of community custody, including remaining within or outside of a specified geographic boundary, refraining from having contact with the victim, and refraining from consuming alcohol.

The DOC is required to supervise sex offenders on community custody and may impose conditions of community custody that do not contravene conditions that were set by the sentencing court. The DOC is prohibited from approving the residence of a sex offender on community custody if the residence: (1) includes a minor victim or a child or similar age or circumstance who may be placed at substantial risk of harm or (2) is within close proximity of the current residence of a minor victim, unless the residence of the victim cannot be determined or unless the residence restriction would interfere with family reunification efforts. The DOC is also authorized to reject a residence location near schools, child care centers, playgrounds, or other facilities where children of similar age or circumstance to the victim are present who may

³ Prior to the Offender Accountability Act of 1999, supervision in the community went by several different names; e.g., community custody, postrelease supervision, community supervision. Different entities were responsible for the offender during these different types of supervision. In 1999, the Legislature re-named all of the types of supervision in the community "community custody" and placed the supervisory authority for all of the different types of supervision within the DOC.

⁴ The term of community custody is different for determinate-plus offenders (see section V *infra*).

be placed at substantial risk of harm.

IV. Persistent Offenders

There are two main persistent offender laws in Washington: three-strikes and two-strikes.

A. Three-Strikes

In 1993, the voters passed Initiative 593, otherwise known as the "three-strikes" law, which imposed a life sentence upon certain repeat offenders. Under the initiative, an offender convicted of a third "strike" (known as a "most serious offense") must be sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of release.

Sex offenses that are strikes under the three-strikes law include:

- Child Molestation in the 2nd degree
- Incest in the 1st degree
- Incest in the 2nd degree
- Indecent Liberties (without forcible compulsion)
- Rape in the 3rd degree
- Sexual Exploitation of a Minor

B. Two-Strikes

In 1996, the Legislature passed SHB 2320, otherwise known as the "two-strikes" law, which imposed a life sentence upon certain repeat sex offenders. Under SHB 2320, an offender convicted of a second "two-strikes" offense must be sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of release.

Offenses that are strikes under the two-strikes law include:

- Child Molestation in the 1st degree
- Indecent liberties (with forcible compulsion)
- Rape in the 1st degree
- Rape in the 2nd degree
- Rape of a Child (statutory rape) in the 1st degree
- Rape of a Child (statutory rape) in the 2nd degree
- Any of the following crimes if committed with sexual motivation:
 - Assault in the 1st degree
 - Assault in the 2nd degree
 - Assault of a Child in the 1st degree
 - Burglary in the 1st degree
 - Homicide by Abuse
 - Kidnapping in the 1st degree
 - Kidnapping in the 2nd degree

- Murder in the 1st degree
- Murder in the 2nd degree

V. Determinate-Plus Sentencing

In 2001, the Legislature passed 3ESSB 6151, which created a type of sentencing that has come to be known as "determinate-plus" sentencing. In brief, determinate-plus sentencing allows longer sentences and greater supervision for offenders convicted of serious sex offenses.

Determinate-plus sentencing applies to two groups of offenders: (1) offenders convicted of a first two-strikes sex offense and (2) offenders who have a prior two-strikes offense in their criminal histories who are convicted of a subsequent sex offense that is not a two-strikes offense.

A court must sentence a determinate-plus offender to a minimum term and a maximum term. The minimum term is generally⁵ equal to the standard range sentence. The maximum term is equal to the statutory maximum for the offense: life for class A felonies, 10 years for class B felonies, and five years for class C felonies.

The ISRB must evaluate the offender prior to the expiration of the minimum term. The ISRB must order the release of the offender upon expiration of the minimum term unless the offender is likelier than not to commit a sex offense if released. If the ISRB does not release the offender, it must re-evaluate the offender at least once every two years up to the offenders maximum term. If the ISRB releases the offender, the offender will be on community custody status for the remainder of his or her maximum term.

For an offender sentenced to a determinate-plus sentence for any two-strikes offense (which are all class A felonies), this means that the offender may be incarcerated for life if he or she continues to fail his or her ISRB evaluations. If the offender is ever released, he or she will be on community custody for life.

An offender sentenced to a determinate-plus sentence for a two-strikes offense committed against a minor victim is prohibited from living within a "community protection zone" for the duration of his or her term of community custody. A community protection zone is the area within two blocks of a public or private school. The legislation creating these living restrictions terminates on July 1, 2006.

VI. The Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative

In 1984, the Legislature passed SHB 1247, which put in place the Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative (SSOSA). A SSOSA sentence consists of a suspended standard range

⁵ The minimum term may also be outside the standard range pursuant to the process for imposing "exceptional sentences" under the SRA.

sentence, incarceration for up to 12 months, treatment for up to five years, and a term of community custody. In 2004, the Legislature made a variety of changes with respect to SSOSA, including narrowing the eligibility criteria, adding to the factors a court must consider when granting a SSOSA, adding requirements for a SSOSA sentence, and changing the manner in which SSOSA offenders are supervised. The 2004 changes went into effect on July 1, 2005.

An offender is eligible for a SSOSA sentence if: (1) he or she is convicted of a sex offense that is not a serious violent offense or Rape in the 2nd degree, (2) he or she has no prior felony sex offenses, (3) he or she has no prior adult violent offenses within five years of the current offense, (4) the current offense did not cause substantial bodily harm to the victim, (5) he or she has an established relationship or connection to the victim, and (6) his or her standard sentence range includes the possibility of incarceration for less than 11 years.

Before granting a SSOSA sentence, the court must consider: (1) an examination provided by a treatment provider, (2) the opinion of the victim, (3) whether the offender and the community will benefit from the SSOSA sentence, (4) whether the offender had multiple victims, (5) whether the offender is amenable to treatment, (6) the risk posed by the offender, and (7) whether the SSOSA sentence is too lenient in light of the circumstances.

The DOC is required to supervise an offender who has been granted a SSOSA sentence. The DOC may sanction certain violations of a SSOSA sentence, but must send certain violations back to the sentencing court along with a recommendation that the sentence be revoked. In addition, the sentencing court is required to conduct annual hearings on the offender's progress in treatment in which the victim must be given the opportunity to be heard. The sentencing court is also required to conduct a treatment termination hearing near the end of the offender's term of treatment in which the victim must be given the opportunity to be heard.

VII. Civil Restrictions

There are two main types of civil (non-criminal) restrictions on sex offenders in Washington: registration and civil commitment.

A. Registration

In 1990, the Legislature enacted the Community Protection Act, which created one of the first sex offender registration laws in the country. A person convicted of a sex or kidnapping offense must register with the county sheriff of the county in which he or she resides. An offender must provide a variety of information when registering including his or her name, address, date and place of birth, place of employment, crime of conviction, date and place of conviction, aliases, social security number, photograph, and fingerprints. The offender must also notify the county sheriff if he or she is enrolled in a public or private school or in an institution of higher education. Failure to meet the registration requirements is an unranked class C felony.

Law enforcement agencies are authorized to release information regarding registered sex offenders based on the offenders' risk level.⁶ For example, for risk level I offenders (evaluated as the lowest level of risk within the larger community), a law enforcement agency may only disclose information about the offenders to specified persons and entities; e.g., schools, victims, witnesses. In contrast, for risk level III offenders (evaluated as the most risky to the community), a law enforcement agency may disclose information about the offenders to the public at large.

B. Civil Commitment

Another program to be put in place by the Community Protection Act of 1990 was civil commitment for sexually violent predators, which was one of the first programs of its kind and has served as a model for similar programs in other states. This program allows a sexually violent predator to be civilly committed after the completion of his or her criminal sentence. A sexually violent predator is a person who: (1) has been convicted of, found not guilty by reason of insanity of, or found to be incompetent to stand trial for, a crime of sexual violence and (2) suffers from a mental abnormality or personality disorder that makes the person likely to engage in predatory acts of sexual violence if not confined to a secure facility.

Sexually violent predators are committed to the custody of the Department of Social and Health Services for control, care, and individualized treatment. Most sexually violent predators are confined in the Special Commitment Center on McNeil Island. However, some have progressed in their treatment to the point where a court has ordered them moved to a less restrictive alternative; e.g., the secure community transition facility on McNeil Island.

Task Force Meetings

The Task Force held five public meetings on the Capitol Campus in Olympia, Washington during the legislative interim of 2005. Interested persons may listen to audio recordings of those meetings for free by accessing the web site for TVW, Washington's public service cable television station. The web address for TVW is www.tvw.org, and, as of the date of this report, the recordings may be found in the audio and video archives section of that web site. The dates that the Task Force met are:

- August 30, 2005
- September 26, 2005
- October 17, 2005
- November 7, 2005

⁶ Risk level is initially determined by the End of Sentence Review Committee (ESRC), which is part of the DOC. The ESRC places each offender into one of three risk levels, based upon the offender's level of risk to the larger community, with level I being the lowest level of risk. Local law enforcement agencies may override the ESRC's initial determination, but must notify the ESRC of the departures and the reasons therefor.

- November 21, 2005

The Task Force's inquiry began on August 30 with briefings on how the state's laws controlling sex offenders have developed since the 1980's. The Task Force also heard a presentation that day by the Department of Corrections on how an offender's risk of re-offense is assessed prior to release from prison. Local law enforcement officials and victims' advocates spoke about how community members are notified when offenders move to a particular area.

At its August 30 meeting, the Task Force heard about how repeat offenders have been subject to two-strikes and three-strikes sentencing since the 1990s. The briefings also included information about determinate-plus sentencing, approved by the legislature in 2001, which requires a longer term of supervision and, potentially, longer sentences for those convicted of serious sex offenders. Information was provided on sex offender registration requirements and laws creating a way to civilly commit sexually violent predators, which have been in place since the passage of Washington's Community Protection Act in 1990. The Task Force also considered how offenders are currently supervised in the community.

The September 26 meeting covered situations in which jurisdictions have enacted laws restricting where sex offenders may reside, a developing area of law.

Both the September 26 and October 17 meetings focused on how law enforcement officials notify persons in the community when sex offenders move to a particular area. The Task Force heard briefings on the requirements of Washington law in this regard, as well as guidelines set out in the model policy on community notification published by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. Law enforcement officials representing a cross-section of urban and rural counties in Washington spoke about how community members in their communities are notified, as a practical matter. The October 17 meeting also included a discussion of the applicability of the Public Disclosure Act on information involving sex offenders and their victims.

The November 7 meeting began with a briefing on pending federal legislation on sex offender registration and community notification. Later, the Criminal Justice Training Commission made a presentation on the need for enhanced training of law enforcement, community corrections officers, school personnel, and others in order to create and implement strategies for managing sex offenders and to optimize public safety. Finally, the group discussed the pre-notification of local government officials with respect to the placement of sex offenders in their communities.

The Task Force's November 21 meeting began with a presentation by the End of Sentence Review Committee on the effectiveness and availability of sex offender treatment in Washington's prisons. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussing the Task Force's recommendations to the legislature and to the governor.

During the Task Force meetings, several important policy considerations emerged. In general,

members of the Task Force, and those members of the public who were present, gave careful consideration to protecting members of the community, using limited state resources responsibly, and balancing legal rights with public safety.

The following points reflect community protection considerations raised during the Task Force's 2005 inquiry. Before reaching its conclusions and recommendations, the Task Force considered, among other things:

- Making well-informed decisions about individuals' risk of re-offending before releasing them to the community;
- Identifying those at highest risk to re-offend;
- Taking steps to minimize risk to the community through supervision, treatment options, housing, offender registration, and enforcement mechanisms if an offender fails to meet conditions of supervision or fails to register;
- Making sure communities get information about how to minimize risk to themselves and their families (For example, receiving information about how adults and children can recognize warning signs and offender behaviors); and
- Meeting the needs of adults and children who have been harmed.

The Task Force was also mindful of fiscal realities. In that regard, it considered:

- Not posing an undue burden on law enforcement;
- Focusing limited resources on those at highest risk to re-offend;
- Taking advantage of federal funds, if available, and private dollars; and
- Possibly undertaking a pilot program to determine if a particular course of action, such as electronic monitoring of high-risk offenders, is effective before making a large investment of state capital and manpower.

Finally, the Task Force was sensitive to the need to balance legal rights with public safety. In that regard, the Task Force's recommendations reflect the need to enact measures to protect the public without violating the Constitution.

Recommendations

SHB 1147 mandated that the Joint Task Force on Sex Offender Management consider certain issues relevant to monitoring persons convicted of sex offenses who live in the state. It also required the Task Force to consider how community members are notified about persons with such convictions who move to their areas. Finally, SHB 1147 required the Task Force to make recommendations to the governor and the legislature after its review of the issues set out in SHB 1147.

In its final meeting on November 21, 2005, the Task Force reached agreement on the following matters. The Task Force recommends that the governor and the legislature consider these issues

if they undertake to re-examine Washington's existing laws controlling sex offenders.

Protection Zones

1. In order to strengthen community safety, collaborative efforts between communities, law enforcement, schools, and victims' services organizations should be strongly encouraged.
2. There is a pressing need to determine where sex offenders may live. Jurisdictions that prohibit offenders from living in certain areas should be encouraged to determine where offenders may live within their boundaries.
3. While research suggests that most sex offenses against children are committed within families, residential restrictions that limit access to school-aged children by offenders with a history of sexually abusing children may improve community safety.
4. Restricting where sex offenders may reside will not, on its own, ensure community safety and may, in fact, give community members a false sense of security.
5. There may be practical difficulties in imposing and enforcing meaningful protective zones.
6. No research has been done to demonstrate that residential restrictions reduce recidivism.
7. A statewide policy on protection zones is preferable to a patchwork of local policies.
8. In establishing a policy, care should be taken to avoid constitutional challenges.
9. Residential restrictions do not eliminate the problem of offenders returning to the community and may only move offenders to another neighborhood or community.
10. Residential restrictions may create an unintended consequence of more homeless sex offenders.
11. Community Protection Zones, which create specific boundaries on the movement and residence of sex offenders, reduce community anxiety. They should be simple to understand and enforce.

Homeless/Transient Offenders

1. Homeless offenders are a challenge for law enforcement.
2. A better method of keeping track of homeless offenders would improve community safety.
3. Every sex offender should know that there is an officer assigned to make face-to-face contact on a regular basis.
4. Local jurisdictions should explore proactive policies related to where offenders may live.
5. Electronic monitoring has some positive potential for improving community safety. Accordingly, Washington should develop a proposal for a pilot program to explore this potential, employing federal grant money.
6. The statutory reference to a "fixed residence" may create some implementation problems, and the legislature should consider clarifying the statutory language.

Community Notification Process

1. Risk levels should be based on recognized valid assessment instruments.
2. Best practices and model policies should be developed for notifying residents when sex

- offenders move into a community.
3. There is a need for improved community education about the behaviors that sex offenders use to gain access to victims.

Sharing Information with Other States

1. The legislature should urge federal officials to require states to share records regarding the movement of sex offenders and assessments of risk posed by offenders.

Training Needs

1. The Criminal Justice Training Commission, the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, the Department of Corrections, the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration, and the state's juvenile court administrators should collaborate to develop and implement curriculum and training for local law enforcement, community corrections officers, and community members.
2. School personnel should be supported in efforts to establish and implement uniform policies and procedures regarding juvenile sex offenders.
3. Education is an important component in effective sex offender management.
4. Improved community education about the behaviors that sex offenders use to gain access to victims could help communities become partners with law enforcement in crime prevention.
5. The efforts of schools, victims' advocates, and others to better inform members of the public about identifying predatory behaviors and talking to children about identifying such behaviors should be supported.

Registration

1. The Washington Institute for Public Policy has found a correlation between failure to register and recidivism.
2. A nationwide policy on registration would improve safety.
3. The legislature should consider making possession of child pornography and child luring registerable offenses.
4. All offenders required to register in other states should be required to register in Washington.
5. The legislature should consider making the period that offenders have to register consistent for offenders who remain in Washington and those who return to Washington from out-of-state.
6. Certainty of punishment for failing to register is an important policy and an effective incentive to ensure compliance with registration requirements.
7. The penalty for failing to register as a sex offender should be increased.

Victim Services

1. The legislature should work to ensure that services to victims are adequately funded so that victims can continue to receive necessary counseling and seek redress in the criminal justice system.

Treatment

1. Sex offender treatment can be an important component in strengthening community safety and reducing the likelihood of recidivism.
2. Sufficient resources should be provided for effective treatment.

Responsible Use of State Funds

1. Many of the proposals considered by the Task Force represent additional costs to the state of Washington.
2. It is important for the legislature and other officials who manage public funds to remain mindful of the importance of using public funds as efficiently and effectively as possible while meeting goals in the public interest.
3. The state should be hesitant about imposing unfunded mandates on local governments.

Where to Find More Information

The web site for TVW, Washington's public service cable television station, has an audio and video archives section that includes audio recordings of the meetings of the Joint Task Force on Sex Offender Management. Interested persons may listen to those recordings for free by accessing the web site for TVW at www.tvw.org.

In 2004 the Washington State Legislature directed the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to conduct a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of current sex offender sentencing policies. In response to this directive, the WSIPP published a series of reports in the fall of 2005. Those reports, along with reports on sex offender registration, community notification, involuntary commitment of sexually violent predators, and related topics, are available for free through the WSIPP's web site at www.wsipp.wa.gov.

Washington law requires the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) to maintain and operate a web site, posting information about Level II and Level III sex offenders residing in the state, as well as information about all registered kidnapping offenders in the state. The WASPC's online Washington State Sex Offender Information Center may be viewed through its web site at www.waspc.org.

County sheriffs' offices and police departments, as well as the Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs, can offer helpful resources to persons who are interested organizing opportunities for community members to learn more about how perpetrators of sexual violence gain access to victims. They can offer advice to parents and others about how to talk to children and adolescents about recognizing problematic behaviors and taking appropriate precautions. Speakers from local law enforcement offices and sexual assault resource centers can be scheduled for meetings of school and parenting groups, religious and service organizations, and other community groups. The web site for the Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault

Programs, based in Olympia, is www.wesap.org.

The Center for Sex Offender Management, a project of the U.S. Department of Justice, is another source of publications, training materials, myths and facts about sex offenders, and other information that may be of interest. Their web site is www.csom.org.