

ITEM 7
PROPOSED STATEMENT OF DECISION
AND
PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES

Penal Code Sections 290.05, 290.06, 290.07, 1202.8, 1203, 1203c, and 1203e
Statutes 2006, Chapter 336 (SB 1178); Statutes 2006, Chapter 337 (SB 1128); Statutes 2006,
Chapter 886 (AB 1849); Statutes 2007, Chapter 579 (SB 172)
California Department of Mental Health's Executive Order, State Authorized Risk Assessment
Tool for Sex Offenders Review Committee Notification, issued on February 1, 2008
State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)

08-TC-03

County of Los Angeles, Claimant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exhibit A	
Test Claim Statement of Decision, adopted January 24, 2014	2
Exhibit B	
Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines, issued February 3, 2014.....	48
Exhibit C	
Controller's Comments on Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines, dated February 14, 2014	66
Exhibit X	
Supporting Documentation	75
SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008	
2011 SARATSO Review Committee Notification Regarding Violence Risk Assessment	
2011 SARATSO Review Committee Notification Regarding Dynamic Risk Assessment	
2013 SARATSO Review Committee Notification Regarding Dynamic Risk Assessment	
SARATSO.org Description and Calendar of Trainings, visited February 25, 2014	

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
 PHONE: (916) 323-3562
 FAX: (916) 445-0278
 E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



February 3, 2014

Ms. Wendy Watanabe
 County of Los Angeles
 Auditor-Controller
 500 W. Temple Street, Room 525
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Hasmik Yaghobyan
 County of Los Angeles
 Auditor-Controller's Office
 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

And Parties, Interested Parties, and Interested Persons (See Mailing List)

Re: **Adopted Statement of Decision, Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines, and Notice of Hearing**

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03
 Penal Code Sections 290.3 et al.
 County of Los Angeles, Claimant

Dear Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Yaghobyan:

On January 24, 2014, the Commission on State Mandates adopted the statement of decision partially approving the above-entitled matter. State law provides that reimbursement, if any, is subject to Commission approval of parameters and guidelines for reimbursement of the mandated program, approval of a statewide cost estimate, a specific legislative appropriation for such purpose, a timely-filed claim for reimbursement, and subsequent review of the claim by the State Controller's Office.

Following is a description of the responsibilities of all parties and of the Commission during the parameters and guidelines phase.

- **Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines.** Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.12, the Commission staff is expediting the parameters and guidelines process by enclosing draft parameters and guidelines to assist the claimant. The proposed reimbursable activities are limited to those approved in the statement of decision by the Commission.
- **Claimant's Review of Draft Parameters and Guidelines.** Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 1183.12(b) and (c), the successful test claimant may file modifications and comments on the proposal with Commission staff by **February 24, 2014**. The claimant may also propose a reasonable reimbursement methodology pursuant to Government Code section 17518.5 and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.13.

State Agencies and Interested Parties Comments. State agencies and interested parties may submit recommendations and comments by **February 17, 2014**. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.11(d).) State agencies and interested parties may also submit recommendations and comments within 15 days of service of the claimant's modifications and comments. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.12(d).)

Claimant Rebuttals to State Agency and Interested Party Comments. The claimant and other interested parties may submit written rebuttals within 15 days of service of state agency and interested party modifications and comments. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.11(f).)

- **Adoption of Parameters and Guidelines.** After review of the draft expedited parameters and guidelines and all proposed modifications and comments, Commission staff will prepare the proposed parameters and guidelines and statement of decision and recommend adoption by the Commission.

Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs

- **Test Claimant and Department of Finance Submission of Letter of Intent.** Within 30 days of the Commission's adoption of a statement of decision on a test claim, the test claimant(s) and the Department of Finance may notify the executive director of the Commission in writing of their intent to follow the process described in Government Code sections 17557.1–17557.2 and section 1183.30 of the Commission's regulations to develop a *reasonable reimbursement methodology* and *statewide estimate of costs* for the initial claiming period and budget year for reimbursement of costs mandated by the state. The letter of intent shall include the date on which the test claimant and the Department of Finance will submit a plan to ensure that costs from a representative sample of eligible claimants are considered in the development of a reasonable reimbursement methodology.
- **Test Claimant and Department of Finance Submission of Draft Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs.** Pursuant to the plan, the test claimant and the Department of Finance shall submit the *Draft Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs* to the Commission. See Government Code section 17557.1 for guidance in preparing and filing a timely submission.
- **Review of Proposed Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs.** Upon receipt of the jointly developed proposals, Commission staff shall notify all recipients that they shall have the opportunity to review and provide written comments or recommendations concerning the draft reasonable reimbursement methodology and proposed statewide estimate of costs within fifteen (15) days of service. The test claimant and Department of Finance may submit written rebuttals to Commission staff.
- **Adoption of Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs.** At least ten days prior to the next hearing, Commission staff shall issue review comments and a staff recommendation on whether the Commission should approve the draft reasonable reimbursement methodology and adopt the proposed statewide estimate of costs pursuant to Government Code section 17557.2.

You are advised that comments filed with the Commission are required to be simultaneously served on the other interested parties on the mailing list, and to be accompanied by a proof of service. However, this requirement may also be satisfied by electronically filing your documents. Please see <http://www.csm.ca.gov/dropbox.shtml> on the Commission's website for

Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Yaghobyan

February 3, 2014


Page 3

instructions on electronic filing. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.) If you would like to request an extension of time to file comments, please refer to section 1183.01(c)(1) of the Commission's regulations.

The parameters and guidelines for this matter are tentatively set for hearing on **March 28, 2014**.

Please contact Jason Hone at (916) 323-3562 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather Halsey", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Heather Halsey
Executive Director

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE TEST CLAIM ON:

Statutes 2006, Chapter 336 (SB 1178), amending Section 1202.8, and adding Sections 290.04, 290.05, and 290.06 of the Penal Code; Statutes 2006, Chapter 337 (SB 1128), amending Sections 290, 290.3, 290.46, 1203, 1203c, 1203.6, 1203.075, and adding Sections 290.03, 290.04, 290.05, 290.06, 290.07, 290.08, 1203e, 1203f of the Penal Code; Statutes 2006, Chapter 886 (SB 1849), amending Sections, 290.46, 1202.8, repealing Sections 290.04, 290.05, and 290.06 of the Penal Code; Statutes 2007, Chapter 579 (SB 172) amending Sections 290.04, 290.05, 290.3, and 1202.7, adding Sections 290.011, 290.012, and repealing and adding Section 290 to the Penal Code; and California Department of Mental Health's Executive Order, SARATSO (State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders) Review Committee Notification, issued on February 1, 2008

Filed on January 22, 2009

By County of Los Angeles, Claimant.

Case No.: 08-TC-03

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)

STATEMENT OF DECISION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 17500 ET SEQ.; CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7.

(Adopted January 24, 2014)

(Served February 3, 2014)

STATEMENT OF DECISION

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) heard and decided this test claim during a regularly scheduled hearing on January 24, 2014. Hasmik Yaghobyan appeared for the County of Los Angeles. Michael Byrne and Susan Geanacou appeared for the Department of Finance.

The law applicable to the Commission's determination of a reimbursable state-mandated program is article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, Government Code sections 17500 et seq., and related case law.

The Commission adopted the proposed statement of decision to partially approve the test claim at the hearing by a vote of 7 to 0.

Summary of the Findings

This test claim alleges reimbursable state-mandated increased costs resulting from additions and amendments made to the Penal Code by the Sex Offender Punishment, Control, and Containment Act of 2006¹ and the Sex Offender Registration Act.^{2,3} In addition, the test claim alleges that the SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008, imposes a reimbursable state mandate.

The test claim statutes generally provide for the establishment of a statewide system of risk assessment to be applied to convicted sex offenders. The statutes provide for a committee to select an appropriate risk assessment tool for each population (adult males, adult females, juvenile males, and juvenile females), which will be known as the State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders, or SARATSO. The test claim statutes require a statewide committee to develop a training program for those who will administer the SARATSO assessments, and require those persons in turn to be trained at least every two years. Then, when a person is convicted of an offense requiring registration as a sex offender, the SARATSO is utilized to assess the risk of that person committing future sex crimes, so that the higher-risk offenders can be more adequately supervised while on probation or parole. The test claim statutes provide for electronic monitoring of the highest-risk offenders, as well as “intensive and specialized probation supervision.” And finally, the test claim statutes require probation departments to report to statewide authorities regarding the effectiveness of continuous monitoring, and the costs of monitoring weighed against the results in reducing recidivism, and require all relevant agencies to grant reciprocal access to records and information pertaining to a sex offender subject to SARATSO assessment.

The test claim was filed on January 22, 2009, alleging reimbursable state-mandated increased costs for statutes enacted as early as September 20, 2006. Normally, a statute with an effective date of September 20, 2006 would fall outside the period of reimbursement for a January 2009 test claim filing, pursuant to Government Code section 17551 and, thus, outside of the Commission’s jurisdiction. Some of the mandated activities, however, were not required to be performed until July 1, 2008, and certain others, primarily those related to training, could not have been performed until issuance of the alleged executive order on February 1, 2008. In addition, the claimant declares under penalty of perjury that the Los Angeles County *probation department* first incurred reimbursable state-mandated increased costs for State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) related activities in February 2008. No such declaration was made on behalf of local law enforcement agencies or district attorneys, which are also affected by the test claim statutes. Therefore, the Commission may exercise jurisdiction over the 2006 test claim statutes, but jurisdiction is limited to consideration only of activities imposed on county probation departments, and those activities that could not have been

¹ Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), and amendments made by Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849).

² Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172).

³ Statutes 2006, chapter 336 (SB 1178) is also pled, but three of the code sections addressed in that statute were repealed prior to this test claim being filed, and the other two were subsequently amended. Therefore, the requirements of Statutes 2006, chapter 336 (SB 1178) are addressed as amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172).

performed by other local agencies prior to issuance of the executive order. Section 290.08, as added, is denied on this ground, and jurisdiction over section 290.07 is limited to activities required of county probation departments, based on the claimant's declaration, as discussed.

In addition, many of the alleged requirements of the test claim statutes are imposed on state-level agencies and entities, such as the creation of the SARATSO Review Committee and the SARATSO Training Committee; these requirements do not impose any mandated activities or costs on local agencies. Other alleged requirements of the test claim statutes are not mandated by the plain language, such as the Legislature's expression of its "intent" that probation departments make efforts to engage transient persons who are required to register as sex offenders in treatment. And finally, some of the activities required of local agencies are excluded from reimbursement by operation of article XIII B, section 6(a)(2) and Government Code section 17556(g), which prohibits a finding of costs mandated by the state for statutes that create or eliminate a crime or infraction, or change the penalty for a crime or infraction.

Based on the analysis herein, the Commission finds that the test claim statutes and executive order impose a partially reimbursable state-mandated new program or higher level of service on local agencies within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution for the following activities:

For county probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies, beginning February 1, 2008, to:

1. Designate key persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations;⁴ and,
2. Ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less frequently than every two years.⁵

For county probation departments to:

1. Assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person for whom the department prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203 and every eligible person under the department's supervision who was not assessed pursuant to a presentencing report, prior to the termination of probation but no later than January 1, 2010.⁶
2. Include the results of the SARATSO assessment administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06 in the presentencing report made to the court pursuant to section 1203, if the person was convicted of an offense that

⁴ Penal Code section 290.05 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008).

⁵ Penal Code section 290.05 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008).

⁶ Penal Code section 290.06 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); 290.04 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected as set forth in 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

requires him or her to register as a sex offender, or if the probation report recommends that registration be ordered at sentencing.⁷

Preparing the presentencing report under section 1203 is not a new activity and, thus, not eligible for reimbursement.

3. Include in the report prepared for the department pursuant to section 1203c the results of the SARATSO, administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, if applicable, whenever a person is committed to the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for a conviction of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender.⁸

Preparing the report under section 1203c is not a new activity and, thus, not eligible for reimbursement.

4. Beginning January 1, 2010:
 - (a) Compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender and who is referred to the department pursuant to section 1203;
 - (b) Include in the Facts of Offense Sheet all of the information specified in section 1203e, including the results of the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, if required;
 - (c) Include the Facts of Offense Sheet in the probation officer's report to the court made pursuant to section 1203; and
 - (d) Send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's sex offense conviction.

Obtaining information required to complete the presentencing report pursuant to section 1203, as amended by Statutes 1996, chapter 719 (AB 893), or the report to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation under section 1203c if applicable, as amended by Statutes 1963, chapter 1785 is not new or reimbursable under this activity.⁹

5. Beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, report to the Corrections Standards Authority all relevant statistics and relevant information regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of sex offenders, including the costs of monitoring and recidivism rates of those persons who have been monitored.¹⁰

⁷ Penal Code section 1203 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

⁸ Penal Code section 1203c (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

⁹ Penal Code section 1203e (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

¹⁰ Penal Code section 1202.8 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

6. Grant access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender to any person authorized by statute to administer the SARATSO.¹¹

This activity is limited to granting access to records exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act (Government Code § 6250, et seq.).

COMMISSION FINDINGS

I. Chronology

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 01/22/2009 | Claimant, County of Los Angeles (County), filed test claim <i>State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)</i> (08-TC-03) with the Commission on State Mandates (Commission). ¹² |
| 02/19/2009 | Commission staff issued a completeness review letter for the test claim and requested comments from state agencies. |
| 03/25/2009 | Department of Finance (Finance) submitted comments on the test claim. ¹³ |
| 06/01/2009 | The County submitted comments in rebuttal to Finance's comments. ¹⁴ |
| 10/11/2013 | Commission staff issued a draft staff analysis and proposed statement of decision on the test claim. ¹⁵ |
| 10/25/2013 | The County requested an extension of time to file comments and postponement of the hearing, which was granted for good cause. |
| 12/02/2013 | The Department of Finance submitted comments on the draft staff analysis. ¹⁶ |

II. Introduction

This test claim alleges reimbursable state-mandated increased costs resulting from additions and amendments made to the Penal Code by the Sex Offender Punishment, Control, and Containment Act of 2006 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849); and the Sex Offender Registration Act (Penal Code §§ 290 to 290.023, inclusive, as added by Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)). In addition, the test claim alleges a reimbursable state mandate imposed by the SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008, via the Department of Mental Health (DMH) website.

The test claim statutes provide that every person who is required to register as a sex offender, based on conviction for one of several enumerated offenses, shall be subject to an assessment of the person's risk of recidivism using the State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders, or SARATSO. The statutes require the creation of a Review Committee to select an

¹¹ Penal Code section 290.07 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

¹² Exhibits A-D, Test Claim, Volumes I-IV.

¹³ Exhibit E, Department of Finance Comments on Test Claim.

¹⁴ Exhibit F, County of Los Angeles Rebuttal Comments.

¹⁵ Exhibit G, Draft Staff Analysis.

¹⁶ Exhibit H, Department of Finance Comments on Draft Staff Analysis.

appropriate SARATSO for each population of offenders (adults, juveniles, males, females), and provide that if a SARATSO is not selected for a given population by the Review Committee, “no duty to administer the SARATSO elsewhere in this code shall apply with respect to that population.”¹⁷ The statutes provide for a SARATSO Training Committee to develop a training program for persons authorized to administer the SARATSO, and require any person who administers the SARATSO to receive training no less frequently than every two years.¹⁸ The statutes require DMH, CDCR, and local probation departments to administer the SARATSO to persons under their charge, as specified.¹⁹ In addition, the statutes require that probation officers:

1. Include the results of the SARATSO evaluation in the presentencing report required pursuant to section 1203, and the report made to CDCR pursuant to section 1203c, if applicable,²⁰ and,
2. Compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of a registerable sex offense, and include that document in the presentencing report.²¹

The statutes provide that any person authorized by statute to administer the SARATSO shall be granted access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender, and that a district attorney shall retain records relating to a person convicted of a registerable offense for 75 years.²² The statutes require probation departments to place probationers at high risk of recidivism on intensive and specialized probation, including more frequent reporting to designated officers,²³ and to provide for continuous electronic monitoring of those high risk probationers.²⁴ In addition, the statutes require each probation department to report to the Corrections Standard Authority all relevant statistics regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring.²⁵ And, the statutes provide that it is the Legislature’s intent that probation departments make efforts to engage in treatment transient persons who are required to register under section 290.²⁶ Finally, the alleged executive order notifies the relevant departments of the SARATSO Review Committee’s selection of an appropriate risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males, and thereby triggers the requirement to conduct assessments. The executive order also invites the relevant agencies and departments to designate persons to attend training-

¹⁷ Penal Code section 290.04 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); amended, Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)).

¹⁸ Penal Code section 290.05 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); amended, Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)).

¹⁹ Penal Code section 290.06 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

²⁰ Penal Code sections 290.06; 1203; 1203c (added or amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

²¹ Penal Code section 1203e (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

²² Penal Code sections 290.07; 290.08 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

²³ Penal Code section 1203f (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

²⁴ Penal Code section 1202.8 (amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Penal Code section 1202.7 (amended, Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)).

for-trainers in winter or spring of 2008, so that they may train the necessary personnel in their respective agencies.

III. Positions of the Parties

Claimant's Position

The County alleges that the test claim statutes and SARATSO Review Committee Notification constitute a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution. The County is seeking reimbursement for the following activities:

- Training to administer the SARATSO in accordance with section 290.05.
- Administering the SARATSO in accordance with section 290.06.
- Including the SARATSO in presentencing reports and reports to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation pursuant to sections 1203 and 1203c.
- Compiling a Facts of Offense Sheet, including the results of the SARATSO evaluation.
- Continuously electronically monitoring high risk sex offenders, as determined by the SARATSO, pursuant to section 1202.8.
- Providing access to relevant records to any person authorized to administer the SARATSO pursuant to section 290.07.
- Retaining records of all convictions for registerable sex offenses for 75 years pursuant to section 290.08.
- Engaging transient sex offenders in treatment pursuant to section 1202.7.²⁷

The County alleges that their costs “for Los Angeles County’s SARATSO program...are far in excess of \$1,000 per annum.”²⁸ Specifically, the County alleges a “total cost for initial training” of \$80,884 for the County and \$635,926 statewide.²⁹ In addition, the County alleges total costs for investigation and researching records of \$80,974 for the County and \$304,239 statewide.³⁰ The County also alleges the total cost for performing SARATSO assessments of \$213,039 for the County and \$361,302 statewide.³¹ The County further alleges total costs for supervision (including intensive and specialized probation supervision and continuous electronic monitoring) of \$842,582 for the County and \$4,124,906 statewide.³² Finally, the County alleges that “[c]ounty probation officers began incurring SARATSO costs during February 2008 and, so this test claim, filed on January 9, 2009, within one year of the date the County began incurring such costs is timely filed in accordance with Government Code Section 17553.”³³

²⁷ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at pp. 11; 13; 23-24; 26-27; and 30-32.

²⁸ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 43.

²⁹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 34.

³⁰ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 35.

³¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 36.

³² Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 38.

³³ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 42.

Department of Finance Position

Finance states that the statutes and the executive order “could result in a reimbursable state mandate; however, the reimbursement may be limited based on the statutory exception specified in subdivision (g) of Government Code Section 17556 and pending litigation.”³⁴ Finance contends that the results of the SARATSO evaluation are “required for the court to make a determination on the probation conditions of a convicted sex offender,” and therefore “the results affect the sex offender’s penalty after he/she has been convicted of the crime,” and, thus, this activity is not eligible for reimbursement under Government Code section 17556(g).³⁵ Finance further contends that “prior law required county probation offices to perform investigative duties to complete reporting requirements under the Penal Code Section 1203,” and that therefore these activities are not new.³⁶ In addition, Finance argues that engaging transient sex offenders in treatment is not a new activity imposed on the county probation offices.³⁷ Finance concludes that “the Act and the executive order may have resulted in a partial reimbursable state mandate for some of the activities identified by the claimant.”³⁸

In comments on the draft staff analysis, Finance concurs with the draft staff analysis recommending partial approval of the test claim.³⁹

IV. Discussion

Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution provides in relevant part the following:

Whenever the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the state shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse such local government for the costs of such programs or increased level of service, except that the Legislature *may, but need not*, provide a subvention of funds for the following mandates:

- (1) Legislative mandates requested by the local agency affected.
- (2) Legislation defining a new crime or changing an existing definition of a crime.
- (3) Legislative mandates enacted prior to January 1, 1975, or executive orders or regulations initially implementing legislation enacted prior to January 1, 1975.⁴⁰

The purpose of article XIII B, section 6 is to “preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local governments, which are ‘ill

³⁴ Exhibit E, Department of Finance Comments, at p. 1.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Id.*, at p. 2.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Exhibit H, Department of Finance Comments on Draft Staff Analysis.

⁴⁰ California Constitution, article XIII B, section 6 (adopted November 4, 1979).

equipped' to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose."⁴¹ Thus, the subvention requirement of section 6 is "directed to state-mandated increases in the services provided by [local government] ..."⁴² Reimbursement under article XIII B, section 6 is required when the following elements are met:

1. A state statute or executive order requires or "mandates" local agencies or school districts to perform an activity.⁴³
2. The mandated activity either:
 - a. Carries out the governmental function of providing a service to the public; or
 - b. Imposes unique requirements on local agencies or school districts and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.⁴⁴
3. The mandated activity is new when compared with the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim statute or executive order and it increases the level of service provided to the public.⁴⁵
4. The mandated activity results in the local agency or school district incurring increased costs, within the meaning of section 17514. Increased costs, however, are not reimbursable if an exception identified in Government Code section 17556 applies to the activity.⁴⁶

The determination whether a statute or executive order imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program is a question of law.⁴⁷ The Commission is vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.⁴⁸ In making its decisions, the Commission must strictly construe article XIII B, section 6, and not apply it as an "equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities."⁴⁹

⁴¹ *County of San Diego v. State of California* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

⁴² *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.

⁴³ *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates (San Diego Unified School Dist.)* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 874.

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 874-875 (reaffirming the test set out in *County of Los Angeles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.)

⁴⁵ *San Diego Unified School Dist., supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 874-875, 878; *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

⁴⁶ *County of Fresno v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (Cal. Ct. App. 1st Dist. 2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1284; Government Code sections 17514 and 17556.

⁴⁷ *County of San Diego, supra*, 15 Cal.4th 68, 109.

⁴⁸ *Kinlaw v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487.

⁴⁹ *County of Sonoma, supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1280 [citing *City of San Jose, supra*].

A. The Commission Has Jurisdiction Over the 2006 Test Claim Statutes, as Specified, Because Claimant First Incurred Costs In February 2008.

Government Code section 17551(c) establishes the statute of limitations for the filing of test claims as follows:

Local agency and school district test claims shall be filed not later than 12 months following the effective date of a statute or executive order, or within 12 months of incurring increased costs as a result of a statute or executive order, whichever is later.

Section 1183(c) of the Commission's regulations provides, accordingly, that "'within 12 months' means by June 30 of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which increased costs were first incurred by the test claimant."⁵⁰

The effective date of Statutes 2006, chapter 336 (SB 1178), and Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), both enacted as urgency measures, is September 20, 2006. Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849) was enacted as urgency legislation September 30, 2006. Therefore, "within 12 months," as defined in the Commission's regulations would be by June 30, 2008. This test claim was filed on January 22, 2009, several months beyond the statute of limitations provided in section 17551 and section 1183 of the Commission's regulations, based on the effective date of the test claim statutes.

However, some activities required by the test claim statutes, including conducting SARATSO assessments, were not required to be performed until July 1, 2008, and the claimant has, accordingly, declared under penalty of perjury that "[c]ounty probation officers began incurring SARATSO costs during February 2008 and, [sic] so this test claim, filed on January 9, 2009, within one year of the date the County began incurring such costs is timely filed in accordance with Government Code Section 17553."⁵¹ There is no evidence in the record to rebut the County's declaration with regard to costs first incurred by the probation department in February 2008.

Moreover, training activities, and any activities that rely on being first trained, could not have been performed by any local agency prior to February 1, 2008, when the alleged executive order was issued. The SARATSO Review Committee Notification identified the SARATSO for certain populations and invited local agencies to designate personnel to receive training and begin to train others to meet the July 1, 2008 implementation date. The plain language of the statutes requires that local agency personnel administering the SARATSO receive training to administer the SARATSO, and the plain language of the alleged executive order makes clear that probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies were expected to begin training activities on or after February 1, 2008. Therefore, the statute of limitations is satisfied as to activities imposed by the test claim statutes on probation departments, and for the training activities of probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies that could not have been performed prior to the issuance of the executive order inviting the local agencies to attend training on the identified SARATSO. Section 290.08, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337, does not impose any requirements on probation departments, and does not rely on the

⁵⁰ Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183 (Register 2003, No. 17).

⁵¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 42.

issuance of the alleged executive order, and therefore the Commission declines to take jurisdiction. Section 290.07 is addressed below only with respect to probation departments.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission does not have jurisdiction over Statutes 2006, chapters 336, 337, and 886 (SB 1178; SB 1128; AB 1849), except those activities required of county probation departments, and those activities that could not be performed prior to the issuance of the alleged executive order on February 1, 2008.

B. Some of the Test Claim Statutes, Triggered by the Executive Order, Impose New Required Activities on Local Agencies.

The alleged executive order, and each code section alleged in the test claim, as added or amended by Statutes 2006, chapters 336, 337, and 886; and Statutes 2007, chapter 579, is addressed in turn, below.

1. Penal Code sections 290.3, 290.46, 1203.6, and 1203.075 do not impose any requirements on local agencies.

Penal Code sections 290.3, 290.46, 1203.6, and 1203.075 are included in the caption in Box 4 of the test claim form, but are not addressed in the claimant's narrative. Moreover, the plain language of these sections does not impose any new activities on local government, and therefore these sections, as amended, are denied.

2. Penal Code section 290.03, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) is a statement of legislative intent, and does not impose any state-mandated activities on local agencies.

Section 290.03 was added to the Penal Code by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), and provides the Legislature's findings and declarations regarding the SARATSO program. The County asserts, however, that section 290.03 provides for the duties of county probation officers to "identify, assess, monitor and contain known sex offenders."⁵² Section 290.03 states the following:

- (a) The Legislature finds and declares that a comprehensive system of risk assessment, supervision, monitoring and containment for registered sex offenders residing in California communities is necessary to enhance public safety and reduce the risk of recidivism posed by these offenders. The Legislature further affirms and incorporates the following findings and declarations, previously reflected in its enactment of "Megan's Law":

¶...¶

- (b) In enacting the Sex Offender Punishment, Control, and Containment Act of 2006, the Legislature hereby creates a standardized, statewide system to identify, assess, monitor and contain known sex offenders for the purpose of reducing the risk of recidivism posed by these offenders, thereby protecting victims and potential victims from future harm.⁵³

⁵² Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 13.

⁵³ Statutes 2006, chapter 337, section 12.

The plain language of section 290.03 does not impose any requirements on local agencies; it merely expresses the Legislature’s findings and intent. There is nothing in section 290.03 that expressly directs or requires local agencies to perform any activities. Moreover, the County acknowledges that the activities required are “explicitly defined under other penal code sections included herein as the test claim legislation.”⁵⁴

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that section 290.03 does not impose any state-mandated activities on local agencies.

3. Penal Code section 290.04, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), and amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172) establishes the SARATSO Review Committee, and identifies the default SARATSO to be used for adult males, but does not impose any state-mandated activities on local agencies.

Section 290.04 was added to the Penal Code by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), and amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172).⁵⁵ Section 290.04 provides that the “sex offender risk assessment tools authorized by this section...shall be known, with respect to each population, as the State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO).”⁵⁶ The section provides that “[i]f a SARATSO has not been selected for a given population pursuant to this section, *no duty to administer the SARATSO elsewhere in this code shall apply with respect to that population.*”⁵⁷ The section further provides that every person required to register as a sex offender “shall be subject to assessment with the SARATSO.” The section provides that a SARATSO Review Committee shall be established to ensure that the SARATSO for each population reflects reliable, objective and well-established protocols for predicting risk of recidivism. The SARATSO Review Committee, pursuant to section 290.04, shall be comprised of a representative of DMH, “in consultation with a representative of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and a representative of the Attorney General’s office.” The section provides that “[c]ommencing January 1, 2007, the SARATSO for adult males required to register as sex offenders shall be the STATIC-99 risk assessment scale,” and that “[o]n or before January 1, 2008, the SARATSO Review Committee shall determine whether the STATIC-99 should be supplemented with an actuarial instrument...or whether the STATIC-99 should be replaced as the SARATSO with a different risk assessment tool [for adult male sex offenders].” The section further provides that the Review Committee shall research risk assessment tools for adult females, and for male and female juveniles, to determine if there is an appropriate risk assessment tool available. And finally, the section provides that the Review Committee “shall periodically evaluate the SARATSO for each specified population,” and may change the selected tool by unanimous agreement.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ An alternate version of sections 290.04 through 290.06 was added to the Penal Code by Statutes 2006, chapter 336 (SB 1178), and repealed by Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849); the version added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) therefore prevails.

⁵⁶ Penal Code section 290.04 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337, § 13 (SB 1128)).

⁵⁷ *Ibid* [emphasis added].

⁵⁸ Penal Code section 290.04 (as added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); amended, Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)).

The plain language of this section establishes the SARATSO Review Committee, and then defines the SARATSO for adult males, and directs the SARATSO Review Committee to examine whether a SARATSO can be adopted for other populations. The section states that persons required to register “shall be subject to” assessment, but does not impose an express requirement on local agencies to perform those assessments. Importantly, the section provides that if a SARATSO has not been selected for a given population under this section, no duty to administer the SARATSO elsewhere in the code shall apply with respect to that population.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that Penal Code section 290.04, as added and amended in 2006 and 2007, does not impose any state-mandated activities on local agencies.

4. Penal Code section 290.05, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) and amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172) imposes new training requirements for probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies required to conduct SARATSO evaluations.

Section 290.05 provides as follows:

(a) The SARATSO Training Committee shall be comprised of a representative of the State Department of Mental Health, a representative of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, a representative of the Attorney General’s Office, and a representative of the Chief Probation Officers of California.

(b) On or before January 1, 2008, the SARATSO Training Committee, in consultation with the Corrections Standards Authority and the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, shall develop a training program for persons authorized by this code to administer the SARATSO, as set forth in Section 290.04.

¶...¶

(d) The training shall be conducted by experts in the field of risk assessment and the use of actuarial instruments in predicting sex offender risk. Subject to requirements established by the committee, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the State Department of Mental Health, probation departments, and authorized local law enforcement agencies shall designate key persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations designated to perform risk assessments as required or authorized by law. Any person who administers the SARATSO shall receive training no less frequently than every two years.

(e) The SARATSO may be performed for purposes authorized by statute only by persons trained pursuant to this section.⁵⁹

This section primarily addresses responsibilities of state-level agencies to participate in the SARATSO Training Committee and develop a training program and standards for training of probation and law enforcement personnel. But in addition, activities required of county probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies include designating

⁵⁹ Penal Code section 290.05 (as added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337, section 14; amended, Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)).

persons to attend training and to train others within the organization, and ensuring that all persons administering the SARATSO within the organization receive training no less frequently than every two years in accordance with section 290.05.

The alleged executive order, the SARATSO Review Committee Notification, *issued February 1, 2008*, provides, in pertinent part:

Implementation and Training:

On July 1, 2008, the Static-99 is mandated for use by the DMH, CDCR Parole and County Probation. Training-for-Trainers sessions will take place in Winter/Spring of 2008.

This training shall be conducted by experts in the field of risk assessment and the use of actuarial instruments in predicting sex offender risk. Subject to requirements established by the committee, CDCR, DMH, County Probation Departments, and authorized local law enforcement agencies shall designate the appropriate persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations. Any person who administers the SARATSO shall receive training no less frequently than every two years.

The time factor is immediate. All agencies need to be fully trained for the July 1, 2008 implementation date.⁶⁰

These activities are new, with respect to prior law: because no SARATSO previously existed, there was no need to train to administer the SARATSO. Moreover, training activities could not be implemented prior to 2008 because the training program was not prepared until that time.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that Penal Code section 290.05, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) and amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172) requires probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies, beginning February 1, 2008 to (1) designate key persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations; and (2) ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less frequently than every two years.

5. Penal Code sections 290.06 and 1203, as added or amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), and triggered by the alleged Executive Order, SARATSO Review Committee Notification, February 1, 2008, impose new required activities on local agencies to administer the SARATSO, as set forth under 290.04, and to include the results in presentencing reports, as specified.

Section 290.06 provides that, “[e]ffective on or before July 1, 2008, the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, shall be administered as follows:”

- (a) (1) The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation shall assess every eligible person who is incarcerated in state prison. Whenever possible, the assessment shall take place at least four months, but no sooner than 10 months, prior to release from incarceration.

⁶⁰ Exhibit D, Test Claim, Volume IV, at pp. 839-840.

(2) The department shall assess every eligible person who is on parole. Whenever possible, the assessment shall take place at least four months, but no sooner than 10 months, prior to termination of parole.

(3) The Department of Mental Health shall assess every eligible person who is committed to that department. Whenever possible, the assessment shall take place at least four months, but no sooner than 10 months, prior to release from commitment.

(4) Each probation department shall assess every eligible person for whom it prepares a report pursuant to Section 1203.

(5) Each probation department shall assess every eligible person under its supervision who was not assessed pursuant to paragraph (4). The assessment shall take place prior to the termination of probation, but no later than January 1, 2010.

(b) If a person required to be assessed pursuant to subdivision (a) was assessed pursuant to that subdivision within the previous five years, a reassessment is permissible but not required.

(c) The SARATSO Review Committee established pursuant to Section 290.04, in consultation with local law enforcement agencies, shall establish a plan and a schedule for assessing eligible persons not assessed pursuant to subdivision (a). The plan shall provide for adult males to be assessed on or before January 1, 2012, and for females and juveniles to be assessed on or before January 1, 2013, and it shall give priority to assessing those persons most recently convicted of an offense requiring registration as a sex offender. On or before January 15, 2008, the committee shall introduce legislation to implement the plan.

(d) On or before January 1, 2008, the SARATSO Review Committee shall research the appropriateness and feasibility of providing a means by which an eligible person subject to assessment may, at his or her own expense, be assessed with the SARATSO by a governmental entity prior to his or her scheduled assessment. If the committee unanimously agrees that such a process is appropriate and feasible, it shall advise the Governor and the Legislature of the selected tool, and it shall post its decision on the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Internet Web site. Sixty days after the decision is posted, the established process shall become effective.

(e) For purposes of this section, "eligible person" means a person who was convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender pursuant to Section 290 and who has not been assessed with the SARATSO within the previous five years.

The alleged executive order, the SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008, identifies the appropriate SARATSO for adult male offenders and juvenile male offenders only, as follows:

For adults, the Committee has selected the Static-99 designed and cross-validated by Dr. Karl Hanson and Dr. David Thornton. This instrument is currently in use by CDCR as a tool to designate a parolee as a High Risk Sex

Offender (HRSO). This instrument will become the only statewide risk assessment tool for adult males, which is mandated to be used by CDCR to assess every eligible inmate prior to parole and every eligible inmate on parole. This tool is further mandated for use by DMH to assess every eligible individual prior to release and by Probation for every eligible individual for whom there is a probation report. (Pen. Code, § 290.06)

For juveniles the Committee has selected the J-SORAT II [*sic*] designed and cross-validated by Dr. Douglas Epperson. This instrument will become the only state-authorized risk assessment tool for juveniles, which is mandated to be used by probation; when assessing a juvenile sex offender at adjudication, and by CDCR/DJJ both prior to release from DJJ and while on supervision. (Pen. Code, §290.06.)

For female offenders the Committee has found that there currently is no risk assessment tool for this population that has been scientifically researched and validated. Therefore, the Committee does not have a recommendation.⁶¹

The Commission notes that section 290.04, as discussed above, provides that “[i]f a SARATSO has not been selected for a given population pursuant to this section, *no duty to administer the SARATSO elsewhere in this code shall apply* with respect to that population.”⁶² Therefore, because the SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 does not identify an appropriate risk assessment tool for adult female sex offenders or juvenile female sex offenders, the duty to administer the SARATSO arising from section 290.06 and the alleged executive order is limited to adult male offenders and juvenile male offenders. Consequently, all other requirements of reporting the SARATSO results, as described below (e.g., section 1203 presentencing reports) are *limited to* adult male offenders and juvenile male offenders, until or unless a SARATSO risk assessment device is identified by the SARATSO Review Committee pursuant to section 290.04.

In addition, as discussed above, section 290.04 provides that the Review Committee “shall periodically review the SARATSO,” and may change its selection of the tool for a given population. Accordingly, the Review Committee has, since February 1, 2008, revised its findings regarding the appropriate risk assessment tool at least twice: in spring 2011 the Committee added two additional dynamic assessment tools to be used in conjunction with the STATIC-99; and in September 2013 the Committee adopted a new dynamic assessment tool, “the Stable-2007/Acute-2007.”⁶³ Therefore, all requirements of administering SARATSO evaluations and reporting results describe the SARATSO, “as set forth in Section 290.04,” which necessarily includes any later action of the SARATSO Review Committee to add to or change the risk assessment tools selected for a given population.

⁶¹ Exhibit D, Test Claim Volume IV, at p. 839.

⁶² Penal Code section 290.04 (added by Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); amended by Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [emphasis added].

⁶³ Exhibit X, SARATSO Review and Training Committees Official Publication, “Sex Offender Risk Assessment in California.” See also, Exhibit X, SARATSO Review and Training Committees’ website main page: <http://www.saratso.org/>.

Section 1203, referenced in section 290.06, above, requires that the results of the SARATSO evaluation be included in the report made to the court under section 1203. *Prior to the amendments made by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), section 1203(b)(1) provided:*

Except as provided in subdivision (j), if a person is convicted of a felony and is eligible for probation, before judgment is pronounced, the court shall immediately refer the matter to a probation officer to *investigate and report to the court, at a specified time, upon the circumstances surrounding the crime and the prior history and record of the person,* which may be considered either in aggravation or mitigation of the punishment.⁶⁴

Prior law further provided that once the matter is referred to a probation officer, that officer is required to “immediately investigate and make a written report to the court of his or her findings and recommendations, including his or her recommendations as to the granting or denying of probation and the conditions of probation, if granted.”⁶⁵ Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) *added to section 1203 the following:*

If the person was convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender pursuant to Section 290, the probation officer’s report *shall include the results of the State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) administered pursuant to Sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive,* if applicable.⁶⁶

Section 290.06, above, thus provides that each probation department shall assess every eligible person for whom it prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203, and every eligible person under its supervision prior to the termination of probation.⁶⁷ Section 1203, in turn, provides that the results of that assessment shall be included in the presentencing report prepared for the court. And the SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008, coupled with the statement in section 290.04 that no duty to administer the SARATSO elsewhere in the code shall apply unless a SARATSO is selected as set forth in section 290.04, limits the requirement to assess to adult male and juvenile male offenders only.

The County argues that identification of the STATIC-99 and the J-SORRAT II as the appropriate risk assessment tools for adult male and juvenile male populations, respectively, triggers certain investigative requirements necessary to score the SARATSO and thereby assess risk. The specific information necessary to complete the SARATSO is not found in any of the statutes pled, or the executive order; the information necessary to complete and score the SARATSO can only be determined by reference to the SARATSO risk assessment tool selected for a given population by the Review Committee. In addition, a new or alternative SARATSO may be selected by the Review Committee when, in its discretion, the Committee finds it appropriate to do so, and therefore the scope of investigation necessary may change as the selected risk assessment tool changes. Moreover, some investigative activities that might be required to

⁶⁴ Penal Code section 1203(b)(1) (as amended, Stats. 1996, ch. 719 (AB 893)) [emphasis added].

⁶⁵ Penal Code section 1203(b)(2) (as amended, Stats. 1996, ch. 719 (AB 893)).

⁶⁶ Penal Code section 1203(b)(2)(C) (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)) [emphasis added].

⁶⁷ Statutes 2006, chapter 337, section 15 (SB 1128).

prepare a SARATSO are not new: section 1203 previously required a presentencing report for all felony convictions, and some of the same information is required to score the SARATSO. For example, the activities required under prior law in section 1203 to “investigate and report to the court, at a specified time, upon the circumstances surrounding the crime and the prior history and record of the person” are not new, and the prior history and record of the person comes into play in scoring the SARATSO.⁶⁸

The County, however, cites to the SARATSO training manual, published by DMH, at page 714 of the test claim, to demonstrate that some of the information required to score the STATIC-99 would not be immediately available to law enforcement, and possibly not available to the courts and, thus, an investigation is necessary to complete the assessment. To illustrate: the Manual states that one of the items required to score the STATIC-99 is whether the individual ever lived with an intimate partner “continuously, for at least two years.” In addition, the manual suggests that “self-reporting” may be sufficient for some of the information required, which presumes that an interview with the defendant is expected, prior to or in lieu of an exhaustive search of law enforcement and court records. The requirement in statute is that the probation departments assess eligible individuals using the SARATSO and report the results in a pre-sentencing report to the court, and those required activities are new. The plain language of the statute does not require probation departments to conduct an investigation to complete the assessment.

Therefore, the scope of investigation necessary to complete and score the SARATSO, as addressed in the training manual, may be considered reasonably necessary to comply with the mandated activity to complete the assessment and provide a report to the court.⁶⁹ That argument, however, may be made when adopting parameters and guidelines and will necessitate substantial evidence in the record demonstrating that the information required to complete the SARATSO is not readily available to the probation officer in other, previously required reports. Eligible claimants will be required to establish that the alleged activities are “reasonably necessary for the performance of the state-mandated program,” within the meaning of section 17557, based on substantial evidence in the record, to have them included as reasonably necessary activities in the parameters and guidelines.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the Commission finds that sections 290.06 and 1203, and the SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 impose new required activities on probation departments to (1) assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person for whom the department prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203; (2) assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person under the department’s supervision who was not assessed pursuant to a presentencing report prior to the termination of probation but no later than January 1, 2010; and (3) if the person was convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender, or if the probation report recommends that registration be ordered at sentencing, include the results of the SARATSO assessment in the presentencing report made to the court.⁷⁰ The activity of preparing the presentencing report under section 1203 is not new or reimbursable; only the *incremental*

⁶⁸ See Exhibit D, Test Claim, Vol. IV at pp. 709-714.

⁶⁹ See Exhibit D, Test Claim, Vol. IV at pp. 709-714.

⁷⁰ Penal Code section 1203 (as amended by Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

increase in service to include the results of the SARATSO in the presentencing report required under section 1203 is new.

6. Penal Code section 1203c, as amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) imposes new required activities on county probation departments to include the results of the SARATSO, if applicable, in the report required pursuant to section 1203c.

Prior section 1203c provided that “whenever a person is committed to an institution under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections, whether probation has been applied for or not, or granted and revoked,” a probation officer of the county in which the person was convicted is required to send to the Department of Corrections [and Rehabilitation] a report on the “circumstances surrounding the offense and the prior record and history of the defendant.”⁷¹ As amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), section 1203c now also requires:

If the person is being committed to the jurisdiction of the department for a conviction of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender pursuant to Section 290, the probation officer shall include in the report the results of the State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) administered pursuant to Sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, if applicable.⁷²

The plain language of section 1203c thus requires that the results of the SARATSO evaluation be included in the report made for CDCR at the time the person is committed to the jurisdiction of the department. The report was required under prior law, as explained above, but inclusion of the SARATSO evaluation is a new mandated activity. However, as discussed above, section 290.04 provides that if a SARATSO has not been selected by the Review Committee for a given population, “no duty to administer the SARATSO elsewhere in this code shall apply with respect to that population.” Therefore, because the SARATSO Review Committee Notification did not identify a SARATSO for female offenders, the requirements of section 1203c are limited to adult male and juvenile male offenders.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that section 1203c imposes a new required activity on local probation departments, whenever a person is committed to the jurisdiction of CDCR for a conviction of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender, to include in the report prepared for the department pursuant to section 1203c the results of the SARATSO, administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, if applicable.⁷³ This activity does not include preparing the report under section 1203c.

7. Penal Code section 1203e, added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), imposes new required activities on local agencies to compile a Facts of Offense Sheet, to be included in the presentencing report, for every person convicted of an offense requiring registration under Penal Code section 290, and to include the results of the SARATSO in the Facts of Offense Sheet.

Section 1203e was added to the Penal Code by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), and provides as follows:

⁷¹ Penal Code section 1203c (as amended by Statutes 1963, chapter 1785).

⁷² Penal Code section 1203c (as amended by Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

⁷³ Penal Code section 1203c (as amended by Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

(a) Commencing June 1, 2010, the probation department shall compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender pursuant to Section 290 who is referred to the department pursuant to Section 1203. The Facts of Offense Sheet shall contain the following information concerning the offender: name; CII number; criminal history, including all arrests and convictions for any registerable sex offenses or any violent offense; circumstances of the offense for which registration is required, including, but not limited to, weapons used and victim pattern; and results of the State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), as set forth in Section 290.04, if required. The Facts of Offense Sheet shall be included in the probation officer's report.

(b) The defendant may move the court to correct the Facts of Offense Sheet. Any corrections to that sheet shall be made consistent with procedures set forth in Section 1204.

(c) The probation officer shall send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's sex offense conviction, and it shall be made part of the registered sex offender's file maintained by the Sex Offender Tracking Program. The Facts of Offense Sheet shall thereafter be made available to law enforcement by the Department of Justice, which shall post it with the offender's record on the Department of Justice Internet Web site maintained pursuant to Section 290.46, and shall be accessible only to law enforcement.

(d) If the registered sex offender is sentenced to a period of incarceration, at either the state prison or a county jail, the Facts of Offense Sheet shall be sent by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation or the county sheriff to the registering law enforcement agency in the jurisdiction where the registered sex offender will be paroled or will live on release, within three days of the person's release. If the registered sex offender is committed to the Department of Mental Health, the Facts of Offense Sheet shall be sent by the Department of Mental Health to the registering law enforcement agency in the jurisdiction where the person will live on release, within three days of release.⁷⁴

Section 1203e is new: the requirement to "compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender...who is referred to the department pursuant to Section 1203" was not found in prior law. However, some of the information required to complete the Facts of Offense Sheet would have been required to complete the reports required under sections 1203 and 1203c. For example, the name and criminal history of the individual are items required by sections 1203 and 1203c, and would not be an item of information that a probation officer would be required to independently investigate for purposes of section 1203e. Therefore the new activity of compiling the Facts of Offense Sheet is limited to completing the form, which the statute refers to as compiling the document, and gathering only information not collected pursuant to section 1203 or 1203c (i.e., information not required to be collected under prior law). Finally, the plain language of section 1203e also

⁷⁴ Penal Code section 1203e (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337, § 40 (SB 1128)).

requires a probation department to send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's conviction.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that section 1203e, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) imposes new required activities on probation departments, beginning January 1, 2010, to (1) compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender who is referred to the department pursuant to section 1203; (2) include in the Facts of Offense Sheet all of the information specified in section 1203e, including the results of the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, if required; (3) include the Facts of Offense Sheet in the probation officer's report to the court made pursuant to section 1203; and (4) send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's sex offense conviction. Obtaining information that is already required to complete the presentencing report pursuant to section 1203, as amended by Statutes 1996, chapter 719 (AB 893), or the report to CDCR under section 1203c if applicable, as amended by Statutes 1963, chapter 1785 is not part of this new activity.⁷⁵

8. Penal Code section 1203f, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), imposes new required activities on local probation departments to ensure that high risk sex offenders are placed on intensive and specialized supervision.

Section 1203f was added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337, to provide:

Every probation department shall ensure that all probationers under active supervision who are deemed to pose a high risk to the public of committing sex crimes, as determined by the State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders, as set forth in Sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, are placed on intensive and specialized probation supervision and are required to report frequently to designated probation officers. The probation department may place any other probationer convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender who is on active supervision to be placed on intensive and specialized supervision and require him or her to report frequently to designated probation officers.⁷⁶

This section is new, and the requirement to place high risk offenders on intensive and specialized probation is not found in prior law; prior law stated that “[p]ersons placed on probation by a court shall be under the supervision of the county probation officer who *shall determine both the level and type of supervision* consistent with the court-ordered conditions of probation.”⁷⁷ The added section requires an additional “level and type of supervision,” and does not permit the local probation officer to exercise the discretion available under prior law in the case of sex offenders who are determined to pose a high risk of recidivism.

⁷⁵ Penal Code section 1203e (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); 290.04 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

⁷⁶ Penal Code section 1203f (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337, § 41 (SB 1128)).

⁷⁷ Penal Code section 1202.8 (as amended by Stats. 1996, ch. 629 (SB 1685)).

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that section 1203f, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128) imposes a new required activity on local probation departments to ensure that all probationers under active supervision who are deemed to pose a high risk to the public of committing sex crimes, as determined by the SARATSO, as set forth in Sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, are placed on intensive and specialized probation supervision and are required to report frequently to designated probation officers.

9. Penal Code section 1202.8, as amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849), imposes a new required activity on local agencies to continuously electronically monitor high risk sex offenders, as determined by the SARATSO.

Prior section 1202.8, as amended by Statutes 1996, chapter 6299 (SB 1685) provided that “[p]ersons placed on probation by a court shall be under the supervision of the county probation officer who shall determine both the level and type of supervision consistent with the court-ordered conditions of probation.” As amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849), section 1202.8 now provides as follows:

(b) Commencing January 1, 2009, every person who has been assessed with the State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) pursuant to Sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, and who has a SARATSO risk level of high shall be continuously electronically monitored while on probation, unless the court determines that such monitoring is unnecessary for a particular person...

¶...¶

(d) Beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, each probation department shall report to the Corrections Standards Authority all relevant statistics and relevant information regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of offenders pursuant to subdivision (b). The report shall include the costs of monitoring and the recidivism rates of those persons who have been monitored. The Corrections Standards Authority shall compile the reports and submit a single report to the Legislature and the Governor every two years through 2017.

Both continuously electronically monitoring high risk sex offenders, and reporting to the Corrections Standards Authority on the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring, are new activities, not required under prior law. The prior law left the level and type of supervision to the probation officer’s discretion, while amended section 1202.8 does not.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that section 1202.8, as amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849), imposes new required activities on probation departments to (1) continuously electronically monitored while on probation, every person who has been assessed with the SARATSO pursuant to Sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, and who has a SARATSO risk level of high; and (2) beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, report to the Corrections Standards Authority all relevant statistics and relevant information regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of offenders, including the costs of monitoring and the recidivism rates of those persons who have been monitored.

10. Penal Code sections 290, 290.011, 290.012 and 1202.7, as added or amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172), do not impose mandated activities on local agencies.

The County alleges that sections 290, 290.011, 290.012, and 1202.7 impose a reimbursable state mandate for probation departments to engage sex offenders who are identified as transient in specialized treatment. The Commission disagrees.

Penal Code section 290 requires every person who “since July 1, 1944 has been or is hereafter convicted in any court in this state or in any federal or military court of a violation of [specified sex crimes and violent sexual offenses]” to register with the chief of police or the sheriff of the county in which he or she is residing. Section 290.011 requires a person required to register pursuant to section 290 who is living as a transient to register within five days of release from incarceration, placement or commitment, and to re-register every thirty days thereafter. The section also provides that a transient who moves to a residence shall have five working days to register at that address, and a person registered at a residence who becomes transient shall have five working days within which to register as a transient. Section 290.012 requires a person to register annually beginning on his or her first birthday following registration or change of address. Section 290.012 also requires a person adjudicated to be a sexually violent predator to update his or her registration every 90 days, and a person subject to registration living as a transient to update his or her registration every 30 days. In addition, section 290.012 provides that no person shall be made to pay a fee to register or update his or her registration, and the agency shall submit registrations, including updates, directly to the Department of Justice Violent Crime Information Network (VCIN).

The test claimant alleges that these sections, in conjunction with section 1202.7, require local agencies to engage in efforts to treat transient sex offenders. Specifically, section 1202.7 provides that “[i]t is the intent of the Legislature that efforts be made with respect to persons who are subject to Section 290.011 who are on probation to engage them in treatment.”⁷⁸

However, a statement of Legislative intent does not constitute a mandate, within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6. Moreover, the amendments made to section 1202.7 are made only to ensure that the section is consistent with the amendments made to section 290 et seq, and are not new. The substance of section 290.011, addressing transient sex offenders on probation who are required to register and update their registration with local officials, was previously found in section 290(a)(1)(C). And, accordingly, the prior version of section 1202.7 provided that “[i]t is the intent of the Legislature that efforts be made with respect to persons who are subject to subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of section 290 who are on probation to engage them in treatment.”⁷⁹ Section 290 was repealed and added by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172), and the substantive provisions of section 290 were restructured in the Penal Code as sections 290-290.023; section 1202.7 was amended to ensure consistency with the enumeration of the repealed and added language, and did not impose any new requirements.

Therefore, the requirement alleged by the test claimant, to make efforts to provide treatment for transient sex offenders, is not mandated by the state and is not new. The Commission finds that sections 290.011, 290.012, and 1202.7, as added or amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172), do not impose any state-mandated activities on local agencies.

⁷⁸ Penal Code section 1202.7 (as amended by Statutes 2007, chapter 579 (SB 172)).

⁷⁹ Penal Code section 1202.7 (as amended, Stats. 2001, ch. 485 (AB 1004)).

11. Penal Code section 290.07, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), imposes new required activities on local agencies to provide access to all relevant records pertaining to a sex offender to persons authorized to administer the SARATSO.

Section 290.07, as added, provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, *any person authorized by statute to administer the State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders and trained pursuant to Section 290.06 shall be granted access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender*, including, but not limited to, criminal histories, sex offender registration records, police reports, probation and presentencing reports, judicial records and case files, juvenile records, psychological evaluations and psychiatric hospital reports, sexually violent predator treatment program reports, and records that have been sealed by the courts or the Department of Justice. Records and information obtained under this section shall not be subject to the California Public Records Act, Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 6250) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code.⁸⁰

Prior to the enactment of section 290.07, the CPRA provided for access to the public generally to some of the categories of records named above. Government Code section 6253 provides that “[p]ublic records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as hereafter provided.”⁸¹ And specifically, section 6254 provides that “state and local law enforcement agencies shall make public” the names and occupations of persons arrested, including physical description and the factual circumstances surrounding the arrest.⁸² And since every person convicted of a registerable sex offense must first be arrested, the name and occupation of each person eventually assessed under sections 290.04 to 290.06, as well as the factual circumstances surrounding their arrest, must be made public under CPRA.

Therefore, some of the records that a probation department “shall be granted access to” under section 290.07 to complete a SARATSO evaluation are already accessible under CPRA. However, section 290.07 provides for broader access than the CPRA: the court in *Wescott v. County of Yuba* held that the CPRA “is considered to be general legislation and is consequently subordinate to specific legislation on the same subject.”⁸³ The court concluded that “Section 827 of the Welfare and Institutions Code expressly covers the confidentiality of juvenile court records and their release to third parties, and is controlling over the Public Records Act to the extent of any conflict.”⁸⁴ But section 290.07 expressly states: “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law, any person authorized by statute to administer the [SARATSO] shall be granted

⁸⁰ Statutes 2006, chapter 337, section 16 (SB 1128) [emphasis added].

⁸¹ Government Code section 6253 (Stats. 1998, ch. 620 (SB 143); Stats. 1999, ch. 83 (SB 966); Stats. 2000, ch. 982 (AB 2799); Stats. 2001, ch. 355 (AB 1014)).

⁸² Government Code section 6254(f) (as amended, Stats. 2005, ch. 620 (SB 922)).

⁸³ (Cal. Ct. App. 3d Dist. 1980) 104 Cal.App.3d 103, at p. 106 [citations omitted].

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender, including, but not limited to...juvenile records.”⁸⁵ Therefore, as in *Wescott, supra*, the more specific provision controls,⁸⁶ and section 290.07 imposes a higher level of service on local agencies to provide access to relevant records, including juvenile records, for which disclosure is not otherwise required.

The plain language of section 290.07 does not limit itself to *probation departments* granting access to other agencies and persons, but this test claim must be so limited. As discussed above, the Commission does not have jurisdiction, based on the filing date of this test claim, over activities required by statutes effective prior to July 1, 2007, unless there is evidence that the claimant first incurred costs under a particular statute at a later time. Here, section 290.07, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), has an effective date of September 20, 2006, and while the County stated in the test claim that the probation department began incurring SARATSO costs in February 2008, there is no such assertion made with respect to any other local agencies. There is no evidence to rebut the County’s declaration, made under penalty of perjury, and therefore costs incurred by probation departments, but not any other local agency, are within the Commission’s jurisdiction for this test claim.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that section 290.07 imposes a higher level of service on county probation departments to grant access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender to any person authorized by statute to administer the SARATSO. This activity is restricted to providing access to records that are exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act (Government Code § 6250, et seq.).

C. Some of the Newly Required Activities Impose a Reimbursable State-Mandated New Program or Higher Level of Service Within the Meaning of Article XIII B, Section 6 and Government Code Section 17514.

The requirements imposed on county probation departments are reimbursable only if all elements of article XIII B, section 6 and Government Code section 17514 are satisfied; the requirements must be mandated by the state, must impose a new program or higher level of service within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6, and must impose costs mandated by the state. Government Code section 17514 provides that “[c]osts mandated by the state’ means any increased costs which a local agency or school district is required to incur after July 1, 1980, as a result of any statute enacted on or after January 1, 1975, or any executive order implementing any statute enacted on or after January 1, 1975, which mandates a new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.” In this respect, Government Code section 17564 provides that “[n]o claim shall be made pursuant to Sections 17551, 17561, or 17573, nor shall any payment be made on claims submitted pursuant to Sections 17551, or 17561, or pursuant to a legislative determination under Section 17573, unless these claims exceed one thousand dollars.” The County alleges that the activities alleged in this test claim related to the SARATSO program result in state-mandated increased costs “far in excess of [one thousand dollars] per annum,” and that those costs are not subject to any “funding disclaimers” specified in section 17556.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Penal Code section 290.07 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

⁸⁶ 104 Cal.App.3d at p. 106.

⁸⁷ Exhibit A, Test Claim, at p. 43.

Finance argues, however, that “the activities related to completing the SARATSO are subject to subdivision (g) of Government Code section 17556,” and therefore barred from reimbursement. Specifically, Finance argues that “[t]he results of the SARATSO are required for the court to make a determination on the probation conditions of a convicted sex offender,” and that therefore the SARATSO evaluation necessarily affects “the sex offender’s penalty after he/she has been convicted of the crime.”⁸⁸

The County responds, in rebuttal comments, that “[c]hapter 337, Statutes of 2006, mandates SARATSO on every registered sex offender who is required to register as a sex offender [sic].” The County argues that persons subject to the SARATSO “do not have to be on probation and SARATSO is not a part of the offender’s sentencing.” The County argues that “SARATSO is a device to eliminate future victimization” and therefore not subject to the “disclaimer” of section 17556(g).⁸⁹

Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution that states that the Legislature “may, but need not, provide a subvention of funds for...[l]egislation defining a new crime or changing an existing definition of a crime.” Government Code section 17556 provides, in pertinent part, that the Commission “shall not find costs mandated by the state,” if the test claim statute “created a new crime or infraction, eliminated a crime or infraction, or changed the penalty for a crime or infraction, but only for that portion of the statute relating directly to the enforcement of the crime or infraction.”⁹⁰ The inclusion of subdivision (g) within the statutory exclusions (sometimes called “disclaimers”) of section 17556 constitutes the “exercise of the Legislative discretion authorized by article XIII B, section 6” whether to provide a subvention of funds for statutes that create, eliminate, or change the penalty for a crime or infraction.⁹¹

Section 17556(g) prohibits reimbursement for test claim statutes that create or eliminate a crime, or change the penalty for a crime, “*but only* for that portion of the statute *relating directly to the enforcement of the crime or infraction.*” Probation is “the suspension of the imposition or execution of a sentence and the order of conditional and revocable release in the community under the supervision of a probation officer.”⁹² In addition, Penal Code section 1202.7 includes punishment as one of the primary considerations in granting probation:

⁸⁸ Exhibit E, Department of Finance Comments, at p. 1.

⁸⁹ Exhibit F, County of Los Angeles Rebuttal Comments, at p. 3.

⁹⁰ Government Code section 17556(g) (Stats. 2010, ch. 719 (SB 856)).

⁹¹ See *County of Contra Costa v. State of California* (Cal. Ct. App. 3d Dist. 1986) 177 Cal.App.3d 62, at p. 67, Fn 1 [“After the adoption of article XIII B, section 6, the Legislature in 1980 amended Revenue and Taxation Code sections 2207 and 2231, and expanded the definition of ‘costs mandated by the State’ by including certain specified statutes enacted after January 1, 1973. (Stats. 1980, ch. 1256, § 5, p. 4248.) In *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 568, 573, the court concluded that ‘this reaffirmance constituted the exercise of the Legislative discretion authorized by article XIII B, section 6, subdivision (c), of the California Constitution [to provide subvention of funds for mandates enacted prior to January 1, 1975].’”].

⁹² Penal Code section 1203(a) (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

“The Legislature finds and declares that the provision of probation services is an essential element in administration of criminal justice. The safety of the public, which shall be a primary goal through enforcement of court-ordered conditions of probation; the nature of the offense, the interests of justice, *including punishment*, reintegration of the offender into the community, and enforcement of conditions of probation; the loss to the victim; and the needs of the defendant shall be the primary considerations in the granting of probation.” (Emphasis added.)

Furthermore, the successful completion of probation is required before the unconditional release of the defendant. If the convicted defendant does not successfully complete probation, the defendant is subject to further sentencing and incarceration.⁹³ Finally, *County of Orange v. State Board of Control* concluded that “probation is an *alternative sentencing device imposed after conviction*,” unlike the pretrial diversion program added by statute, which the court held did not change the penalty for a crime.⁹⁴

Therefore the implication of *County of Orange*, and the logical conclusion from the plain language of section 17556(g) is that probation is a penalty for the conviction of certain sex offenses and that changes to the duration or conditions of probation that result in increased costs to local agencies are subject to the exclusion from reimbursement stated in Government Code section 17556(g). Changes to the administrative activities *leading up to probation*, or additional functions resulting in increased costs *not directly related to the duration or conditions of punishment* and that are *administrative* in nature generally are not subject to exclusion from reimbursement under Government Code section 17556(g), because they are not directly related to the definition of or the penalty for a crime.

The following analysis addresses the required new activities identified in the test claim statutes and executive order, and determines whether any or all are barred from reimbursement by section 17556(g).

1. Training requirements under section 290.05; reporting to Corrections Standards Authority under section 1202.8; and granting access to relevant records under section 290.07 are administrative functions performed by local agencies pursuant to the test claim statute, and are not directly related to the creation, expansion, or elimination of crimes or penalties for crimes, and therefore are not barred from reimbursement by Government Code section 17556(g).

⁹³ Penal Code section 1203.2 provides authority to revoke probation and impose further sentencing, including incarceration, if the defendant violates *any* term of probation. [“At any time during the probationary period...if any probation officer or peace officer has probable cause to believe that the probationer is violating any term or condition of his or her probation or conditional sentence, the officer may, without warrant or other process and at any time until the final disposition of the case, rearrest the person and bring him or her before the court or the court may, in its discretion, issue a warrant for his or her rearrest. Upon such rearrest, or upon the issuance of a warrant for rearrest the court may revoke and terminate such probation if the interests of justice so require and the court, in its judgment, has reason to believe from the report of the probation officer or otherwise that the person has violated any of the conditions of his or her probation...”].

⁹⁴ (Cal. Ct. App. 4th Dist. 1985) 167 Cal.App.3d 660, at p. 667.

The plain language of section 17556(g) does not bar a finding of costs mandated by the state for training, reporting, granting access to other agencies and personnel, and record keeping activities under sections 290.05, 1202.8, 290.07, and 290.08. These activities are not related to the expansion or elimination of crime, or the enhancement or elimination of punishment.

Specifically, section 290.05 requires county probation departments and authorized law enforcement agencies to designate personnel to attend training and to train others within the organization, and to ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less frequently than every two years. These training activities are not related to the expansion of crime or the execution of punishments for crime.

Likewise, section 1202.8 requires a county probation department to report, beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, to the Corrections Standards Authority “all relevant statistics and relevant information” regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of offenders required to register pursuant to section 290, including the costs of the program and recidivism rates of those monitored. While electronic monitoring itself is incident to the punishment and a condition of probation, and therefore not reimbursable in itself under section 17556(g), as discussed below, this reporting requirement is administrative in nature, and does not relate directly to the punishment or enforcement of crime. Section 17556(g) states that the Commission shall not find costs mandated by the state when a statute changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, “but only for that portion of the statute relating directly to the enforcement of the crime or infraction.” This activity does not relate directly to enforcement, and is therefore not barred from a finding of costs mandated by the state.

In addition, granting access to relevant records pertaining to a person required to register as a sex offender to any person authorized to administer the SARATSO, as required by section 290.07, is an administrative function, and has little relation to the enforcement of the underlying crimes that trigger the duty of county probation departments to provide access. Therefore these activities and costs are not barred from reimbursement by section 17556(g).

These requirements constitute new programs or higher levels of service that are administrative in nature and not related to the punishment for or enforcement of crime, and that result in local agencies incurring increased costs mandated by the state.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that the following activities constitute reimbursable state-mandated new programs or higher levels of service:

For county probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies:

1. Designate key persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, train others within their organizations.⁹⁵
2. Ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less frequently than every two years.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ Penal Code section 290.05 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008).

⁹⁶ Penal Code section 290.05 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008).

For county probation departments:

1. Beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, report to the Corrections Standards Authority all relevant statistics and relevant information regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of sex offenders, including the costs of monitoring and recidivism rates of those persons who have been monitored.⁹⁷
2. Grant access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender to any person authorized by statute to administer the SARATSO.

This activity is not new to the extent of records required to be disclosed under the California Public Records Act (Government Code § 6250, et seq.).⁹⁸

2. Administering SARATSO assessments under section 290.06; including the results of the SARATSO assessments in presentencing reports prepared under section 1203; including the results of the SARATSO assessments in reports submitted to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation under section 1203c; and compiling a Facts of Offense Sheet including the results of the SARATSO assessment, where applicable, and including the Facts of Offense Sheet in the presentencing report required by section 1203 impose a reimbursable new program or higher level of service on county probation departments.

The activities related to administering the SARATSO under section 290.06, and including the SARATSO results in presentencing reports, reports made to CDCR, and in the Facts of Offense Sheet included in a presentencing report, are all *administrative functions* whose costs *do not result* from a statute altering the duration or conditions of the penalty. Although the activities related to administering the SARATSO may result in an augmented or mitigated punishment (which may entail increased costs), and may result in changed conditions of probation, as discussed below, the activities for which reimbursement is sought relating to administering the SARATSO are not directly related to these changed penalties.

Specifically, section 290.06(a)(4), as discussed above, requires a probation department to assess, using the SARATSO, the risk of reoffending for every sex offender “for whom it prepares a report pursuant to Section 1203.” Section 290.06(a)(5) requires a probation department to also assess every “eligible person,” meaning every sex offender required to register under section 290, currently under supervision and prior to the termination of probation. Section 1203, as discussed above, requires a report to the court, after conviction but before sentencing, “which may be considered either in aggravation or mitigation of the punishment.” Therefore the SARATSO administered pursuant to section 290.06(a)(4) may have an impact on the duration or conditions of probation, based on the plain language of sections 290.06 and 1203. However, the activity for which reimbursement is sought is the assessment itself; this activity is administrative in nature, and is not a penalty in itself, even though it may lead to an increased penalty imposed by the court.

Likewise, section 1203 requires a probation officer to include the results of the SARATSO evaluation in the presentencing report, and requires preparation of a presentencing report for all

⁹⁷ Penal Code section 1202.8 (Stats. 2006, ch. 336 (SB 1178); Stats. 2006, ch. 886 (AB 1849)).

⁹⁸ Penal Code section 290.07 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

sex offenses that require a person to register as a sex offender under section 290. The report, when received by the court, may have an effect on the punishment imposed for the underlying crime, but the requirement to prepare the report, and the requirement to include the SARATSO evaluation in the report are administrative functions that are not alleged to result in costs related to the penalty for the underlying offense. As discussed above, the changed penalty is not the subject of reimbursement; the required activity for which reimbursement is sought is preparing the report and ensuring that a SARATSO evaluation, where applicable, is included in the report.

In addition, section 1203c requires a probation officer to include the results of the SARATSO evaluation in the report prepared for CDCR, if applicable. This is an administrative reporting requirement and is not directly related to law enforcement or the penalty for a crime.

And finally, section 1203e requires a county probation department, beginning January 1, 2010, to prepare a Facts of Offense Sheet for inclusion in the presentencing report prepared pursuant to section 1203, and also to be sent to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of conviction. The Facts of Offense Sheet is also required, for all offenses requiring registration under section 290, to include the results of the SARATSO evaluation, if applicable. Like sections 290.06 and 1203, above, the requirements of section 1203e are administrative in nature, and do not of themselves change the penalty for the underlying crime.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that the following activities are not barred from reimbursement by section 17556(g), and therefore constitute reimbursable state-mandated new programs or higher levels of service:

For county probation departments to:

1. Assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person for whom the department prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203 and every eligible person under the department's supervision who was not assessed pursuant to a presentencing report, prior to the termination of probation but no later than January 1, 2010.⁹⁹
2. Include the results of the SARATSO assessment administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06 in the presentencing report made to the court pursuant to section 1203, if the person was convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender, or if the probation report recommends that registration be ordered at sentencing.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ Penal Code section 290.06 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); 290.04 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

¹⁰⁰ Penal Code section 1203 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); 290.04 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

Preparing the presentencing report under section 1203 is not a new activity and, thus, is not eligible for reimbursement.

3. Include in the report prepared for the department pursuant to section 1203c the results of the SARATSO, administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, if applicable, whenever a person is committed to the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for a conviction of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender.¹⁰¹

Preparing the report under section 1203c is not a new activity and, thus, is not eligible for reimbursement.

¹⁰¹ Penal Code section 1203c (as amended by Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)). See also Penal Code section 290.0404 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

4. Beginning January 1, 2010:
 - (a) Compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender and who is referred to the department pursuant to section 1203;
 - (b) Include in the Facts of Offense Sheet all of the information specified in section 1203e, including the results of the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, if required;
 - (c) Include the Facts of Offense Sheet in the probation officer's report to the court made pursuant to section 1203; and
 - (d) Send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's sex offense conviction.

*Obtaining information that is already required to complete the presentencing report pursuant to section 1203, as amended by Statutes 1996, chapter 719 (AB 893), or the report to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation under section 1203c, as amended by Statutes 1963, chapter 1785 is not new or subject to reimbursement under this activity.*¹⁰²

3. Continuously electronically monitoring high risk sex offenders under section 1202.8, and ensuring that high risk sex offenders are placed under intensive and specialized supervision under section 1203f, are activities directly related to the penalty for the sex crime, and are not reimbursable under section 17556(g).

As discussed above, the plain language of article XIII B, section 6(a)(2) and section 17556(g), along with the statutory and case law determinations that probation is a form of criminal punishment, and a sentencing device,¹⁰³ results in a working rule and analysis that required changes to the duration or conditions of probation that result in increased costs to local agencies are subject to the exclusion in Government Code section 17556(g), and therefore not reimbursable.

Here, section 1202.8 requires county probation departments, beginning January 1, 2009, to continuously electronically monitor sex offenders while on probation who assess at a high risk level under the SARATSO. Electronic monitoring is thus a condition of probation that facially constitutes a greater deprivation of liberty, and therefore constitutes a change in the penalty for the underlying crimes. Based on the plain language of section 17556(g), the costs of electronic monitoring under section 1202.8 are not costs mandated by the state, within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

¹⁰² Penal Code section 1203e (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); 290.04 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

¹⁰³ *County of Orange, supra*, 167 Cal.App.3d 660, at p. 667.

Likewise, section 1203f requires county probation departments to place sex offenders who are on probation and who assess at a high risk level under the SARATSO on “intensive and specialized probation,” and to require such probationers “to report frequently to designated probation officers.” These requirements are conditions of probation placed on a subset of probationers, as specified, and therefore constitute a change in the penalty for the underlying crimes. Based on the plain language of section 17556(g), the costs of providing “intensive and specialized probation” services are not costs mandated by the state, within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

Based on the foregoing, section 1202.8, as amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 336 (SB 1178), and Statutes 2006, chapter 886 (AB 1849), and section 1203f, as added by Statutes 2006, chapter 337 (SB 1128), are denied.

V. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that the test claim statutes and executive order constitute a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514 for the following activities only:

For county probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies to:

1. Designate key persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations;¹⁰⁴ and,
2. Ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less frequently than every two years.¹⁰⁵

For county probation departments to:

1. Assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person for whom the department prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203 and every eligible person under the department’s supervision who was not assessed pursuant to a presentencing report, prior to the termination of probation but no later than January 1, 2010.¹⁰⁶
2. Include the results of the SARATSO assessment administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06 in the presentencing report made to the court

¹⁰⁴ Penal Code section 290.05 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008).

¹⁰⁵ Penal Code section 290.05 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008).

¹⁰⁶ Penal Code section 290.06 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)); 290.04 (Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04]; SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

pursuant to section 1203, if the person was convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender, or if the probation report recommends that registration be ordered at sentencing.¹⁰⁷

Preparing the presentencing report under section 1203 is not a new activity and, thus, not eligible for reimbursement.

3. Include in the report prepared for the department pursuant to section 1203c the results of the SARATSO, administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, if applicable, whenever a person is committed to the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for a conviction of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender.¹⁰⁸

Preparing the report under section 1203c is not a new activity and, thus, not eligible for reimbursement.

4. Beginning January 1, 2010:
 - (a) Compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender and who is referred to the department pursuant to section 1203;
 - (b) Include in the Facts of Offense Sheet all of the information specified in section 1203e, including the results of the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, if required;
 - (c) Include the Facts of Offense Sheet in the probation officer's report to the court made pursuant to section 1203; and
 - (d) Send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's sex offense conviction.

Obtaining information required to complete the presentencing report pursuant to section 1203, as amended by Statutes 1996, chapter 719 (AB 893), or the report to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation under section 1203c if applicable, as amended by Statutes 1963, chapter 1785 is not new or reimbursable under this activity.¹⁰⁹

5. Beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, report to the Corrections Standards Authority all relevant statistics and relevant information regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of sex offenders, including the costs of monitoring and recidivism rates of those persons who have been monitored.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Penal Code section 1203 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

¹⁰⁸ Penal Code section 1203c (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

¹⁰⁹ Penal Code section 1203e (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

¹¹⁰ Penal Code section 1202.8 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

6. Grant access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender to any person authorized by statute to administer the SARATSO.¹¹¹

This activity is limited to granting access to records exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act (Government Code § 6250, et seq.).

All other statutes, regulations, and activities pled in this test claim do not constitute reimbursable state-mandated programs subject to article XIIB, section 6 of the California Constitution and are, therefore, denied.

¹¹¹ Penal Code section 290.07 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES


980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 323-3562
FAX: (916) 445-0278
E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



RE: Adopted Statement of Decision

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03
Penal Code Sections 290.3 et al.
County of Los Angeles, Claimant

On January 24, 2014, the foregoing statement of decision of the Commission on State Mandates was adopted in the above-entitled matter.



Heather Halsey, Executive Director

Dated: February 3, 2014

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Yolo and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On February 3, 2014, I served the:

**Adopted Statement of Decision, Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines,
and Notice of Hearing**

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03
Penal Code Sections 290.3 et al.
County of Los Angeles, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on February 3, 2014 at Sacramento, California.



Jason Hone
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 1/16/14

Claim Number: 08-TC-03

Matter: State Authorized Risk of Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)

Claimant: County of Los Angeles

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-7522

SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Harmeet Barkschat, *Mandate Resource Services, LLC*

5325 Elkhorn Blvd. #307, Sacramento, CA 95842

Phone: (916) 727-1350

harmeet@calsdrc.com

Lacey Baysinger, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

lbaysinger@sco.ca.gov

Allan Burdick,

7525 Myrtle Vista Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95831

Phone: (916) 203-3608

allanburdick@gmail.com

J. Bradley Burgess, *MGT of America*

895 La Sierra Drive, Sacramento, CA 95864

Phone: (916) 595-2646

Bburgess@mgtamer.com

Michael Byrne, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-3274
michael.byrne@dof.ca.gov

Gwendolyn Carlos, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
gcarlos@sco.ca.gov

Annette Chinn, *Cost Recovery Systems, Inc.*

705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 939-7901
achinnrcs@aol.com

Alan Deal, *Peace Officer Standards and Training*

Standards & Development Division, 1601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95816-7083
Phone: (916) 227-2807
alan.deal@post.ca.gov

Marieta Delfin, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
mdelfin@sco.ca.gov

Tom Dyer, *Department of Finance (A-15)*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
tom.dyer@dof.ca.gov

Susan Geanacou, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
susan.geanacou@dof.ca.gov

Dorothy Holzem, *California Special Districts Association*

1112 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 442-7887
dorothyh@csda.net

Kathleen Howard, *Corrections Standards Authority*

600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA
Phone: (916) 445-5073
kathleen.howard@bscc.ca.gov

Mark Ibele, *Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee*

California State Senate, State Capitol Room 5019, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 651-4103
Mark.Ibele@sen.ca.gov

Susan Jensen, *SARATSO Review and Training Committee*

1515 S Street, Room 212-N, Sacramento, CA
Phone: (916) 327-5413
DAPOCASOMB@cdcr.ca.gov

Edward Jewik, *County of Los Angeles*

Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8564
ejewik@auditor.lacounty.gov

Matt Jones, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
matt.jones@csm.ca.gov

Ferlyn Junio, *Nimbus Consulting Group, LLC*
2386 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Suite 104, Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: (916) 480-9444
fjunio@nimbusconsultinggroup.com

Jill Kanemasu, *State Controller's Office*
Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-9891
jkanemasu@sco.ca.gov

Anita Kerezi, *AK & Company*
3531 Kersey Lane, Sacramento, CA 95864
Phone: (916) 972-1666
akcompany@um.att.com

Jean Kinney Hurst, Senior Legislative Representative, Revenue & Taxation, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814-3941
Phone: (916) 327-7500
jhurst@counties.org

Jay Lal, *State Controller's Office (B-08)*
Division of Accounting & Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0256
JLal@sco.ca.gov

Amber Lozano, *Department of Justice BCIA (D-08)*
Criminal Justice Statistics Center, P.O. Box 903427, , CA
Phone: (916) 227-3282
amber.lozano@doj.ca.gov

Kathleen Lynch, *Department of Finance (A-15)*
915 L Street, Suite 1280, 17th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
kathleen.lynch@dof.ca.gov

Hortensia Mato, *City of Newport Beach*
100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660
Phone: (949) 644-3000
hmato@newportbeachca.gov

Michelle Mendoza, *MAXIMUS*
17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340, Irvine, CA 95403
Phone: (949) 440-0845
michellemendoza@maximus.com

Howard Moseley, *Department of Corrections*

Board of Parole Hearings, P.O. Box 4036, Sacramento, CA 95812
Phone: (916) 323-1643
howard.moseley@cdcr.ca.gov

Geoffrey Neill, Senior Legislative Analyst, Revenue & Taxation, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 327-7500
gneill@counties.org

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*
1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Marianne O'Malley, *Legislative Analyst's Office (B-29)*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8315
marianne.O'malley@lao.ca.gov

Christian Osmena, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
christian.osmena@dof.ca.gov

Karen Pank, *Chief Probation Officers of California*
1415 L Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 447-2762
Karen@warnerandpank.com

Alice Park-Renzie, *County of Alameda*
CAO, 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: (510) 272-3873
Alice.Park@acgov.org

Anita Peden, *County of Sacramento*
711 G Street, Room 405, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-8441
apeden@sacsheriff.com

Keith Petersen, *SixTen & Associates*
P.O. Box 340430, Sacramento, CA 95834-0430
Phone: (916) 419-7093
kbsixten@aol.com

Jai Prasad, *County of San Bernardino*
Office of Auditor-Controller, 222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018
Phone: (909) 386-8854
jai.prasad@atc.sbcounty.gov

Mark Rewolinski, *MAXIMUS*
625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (949) 440-0845

markrewolinski@maximus.com

Kathy Rios, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-5919

krios@sco.ca.gov

Cynthia Rodriguez, *Department of State Hospitals*

1600 9th Street, Room 443, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 654-2319

cynthia.rodriguez@dmh.ca.gov

Matthew Schuneman, *MAXIMUS*

900 Skokie Boulevard, Suite 265, Northbrook, IL 60062

Phone: (847) 513-5504

matthewschuneman@maximus.com

Stephanie Scofield, *Assistant Executive Director, Peace Officer Standards and Training*

Administrative Services Division, 1601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95816-7083

Phone: (916) 227-2803

stephanie.scofield@post.ca.gov

Lee Scott, *Department of Finance*

15 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-3274

lee.scott@dof.ca.gov

David Scribner, *Max8550*

2200 Sunrise Boulevard, Suite 240, Gold River, CA 95670

Phone: (916) 852-8970

dscribner@max8550.com

Jennifer Shaffer, *Department of Corrections*

Board of Parole Hearings, P.O. Box 4036, Sacramento, CA 95812

Phone: (916) 445-7950

jennifer.shaffer@cdcr.ca.gov

Jim Spano, *Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 323-5849

jspano@sco.ca.gov

Dennis Speciale, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

DSpeciale@sco.ca.gov

Meg Svoboda, *Senate Office of Research*

1020 N Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA

Phone: (916) 651-1500

meg.svoboda@sen.ca.gov

Jolene Tollenaar, *MGT of America*

2001 P Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95811

Phone: (916) 443-9136

jolene_tollenaar@mgtamer.com

Kemiko Tolon, *SARATSO Review and Training Committee*

1515 S Street, Room 212-N, Sacramento, CA

Phone: (916) 327-1841

kemiko.tolon@cdcr.ca.gov

Evelyn Tseng, *City of Newport Beach*

100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660

Phone: (949) 644-3127

etseng@newportbeachca.gov

Brian Uhler, *Legislative Analyst's Office*

925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 319-8328

brian.uhler@lao.ca.gov

Wendy Watanabe, *County of Los Angeles*

500 West Temple Street, Room 525, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8301

wwatanabe@auditor.lacounty.gov

David Wellhouse, *David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.*

3609 Bradshaw Road, Suite 121, Sacramento, CA 95927

Phone: (916) 368-9244

dwa-david@surewest.net

Hasmik Yaghobyan, *County of Los Angeles*

Claimant Representative

Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-9653

hyaghobyan@auditor.lacounty.gov

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
 PHONE: (916) 323-3562
 FAX: (916) 445-0278
 E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



February 3, 2014

Ms. Wendy Watanabe
 County of Los Angeles
 Auditor-Controller
 500 W. Temple Street, Room 525
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Hasmik Yaghobyan
 County of Los Angeles
 Auditor-Controller's Office
 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

And Parties, Interested Parties, and Interested Persons (See Mailing List)

Re: **Adopted Statement of Decision, Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines, and Notice of Hearing**

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03
 Penal Code Sections 290.3 et al.
 County of Los Angeles, Claimant

Dear Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Yaghobyan:

On January 24, 2014, the Commission on State Mandates adopted the statement of decision partially approving the above-entitled matter. State law provides that reimbursement, if any, is subject to Commission approval of parameters and guidelines for reimbursement of the mandated program, approval of a statewide cost estimate, a specific legislative appropriation for such purpose, a timely-filed claim for reimbursement, and subsequent review of the claim by the State Controller's Office.

Following is a description of the responsibilities of all parties and of the Commission during the parameters and guidelines phase.

- **Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines.** Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.12, the Commission staff is expediting the parameters and guidelines process by enclosing draft parameters and guidelines to assist the claimant. The proposed reimbursable activities are limited to those approved in the statement of decision by the Commission.
- **Claimant's Review of Draft Parameters and Guidelines.** Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 1183.12(b) and (c), the successful test claimant may file modifications and comments on the proposal with Commission staff by **February 24, 2014**. The claimant may also propose a reasonable reimbursement methodology pursuant to Government Code section 17518.5 and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.13.

State Agencies and Interested Parties Comments. State agencies and interested parties may submit recommendations and comments by **February 17, 2014**. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.11(d).) State agencies and interested parties may also submit recommendations and comments within 15 days of service of the claimant's modifications and comments. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.12(d).)

Claimant Rebuttals to State Agency and Interested Party Comments. The claimant and other interested parties may submit written rebuttals within 15 days of service of state agency and interested party modifications and comments. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.11(f).)

- **Adoption of Parameters and Guidelines.** After review of the draft expedited parameters and guidelines and all proposed modifications and comments, Commission staff will prepare the proposed parameters and guidelines and statement of decision and recommend adoption by the Commission.

Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs

- **Test Claimant and Department of Finance Submission of Letter of Intent.** Within 30 days of the Commission's adoption of a statement of decision on a test claim, the test claimant(s) and the Department of Finance may notify the executive director of the Commission in writing of their intent to follow the process described in Government Code sections 17557.1–17557.2 and section 1183.30 of the Commission's regulations to develop a *reasonable reimbursement methodology* and *statewide estimate of costs* for the initial claiming period and budget year for reimbursement of costs mandated by the state. The letter of intent shall include the date on which the test claimant and the Department of Finance will submit a plan to ensure that costs from a representative sample of eligible claimants are considered in the development of a reasonable reimbursement methodology.
- **Test Claimant and Department of Finance Submission of Draft Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs.** Pursuant to the plan, the test claimant and the Department of Finance shall submit the *Draft Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs* to the Commission. See Government Code section 17557.1 for guidance in preparing and filing a timely submission.
- **Review of Proposed Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs.** Upon receipt of the jointly developed proposals, Commission staff shall notify all recipients that they shall have the opportunity to review and provide written comments or recommendations concerning the draft reasonable reimbursement methodology and proposed statewide estimate of costs within fifteen (15) days of service. The test claimant and Department of Finance may submit written rebuttals to Commission staff.
- **Adoption of Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology and Statewide Estimate of Costs.** At least ten days prior to the next hearing, Commission staff shall issue review comments and a staff recommendation on whether the Commission should approve the draft reasonable reimbursement methodology and adopt the proposed statewide estimate of costs pursuant to Government Code section 17557.2.

You are advised that comments filed with the Commission are required to be simultaneously served on the other interested parties on the mailing list, and to be accompanied by a proof of service. However, this requirement may also be satisfied by electronically filing your documents. Please see <http://www.csm.ca.gov/dropbox.shtml> on the Commission's website for

Ms. Watanabe and Ms. Yaghobyan

February 3, 2014

Page 3

instructions on electronic filing. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.) If you would like to request an extension of time to file comments, please refer to section 1183.01(c)(1) of the Commission's regulations.

The parameters and guidelines for this matter are tentatively set for hearing on **March 28, 2014**.

Please contact Jason Hone at (916) 323-3562 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather Halsey", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Heather Halsey
Executive Director

DRAFT EXPEDITED PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES

Penal Code Sections 290.05, 290.06, 290.07, 1202.8, 1203, 1203c, and 1203e

Statutes 2006, Chapter 336 (SB 1178); Statutes 2006, Chapter 337 (SB 1128); Statutes 2006, Chapter 886 (AB 1849); Statutes 2007, Chapter 579 (SB 172)

California Department of Mental Health's Executive Order, State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders Review Committee Notification, issued on February 1, 2008

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)

08-TC-03

Period of reimbursement begins July 1, 2007, or later for specified activities added by subsequent statutes or executive order.

I. SUMMARY OF MANDATE

These parameters and guidelines address activities performed by counties and cities relating to the statutory requirement that registered sex offenders shall be subject to an assessment of the offender's risk of recidivism using the *State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders*, or SARATSO.

On January 24, 2014, the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopted a statement of decision on the *State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)* test claim (08-TC-03) finding that the test claim statutes and executive order impose a reimbursable state mandated program for county probation departments and authorized local law enforcement agencies to perform the following activities: (1) designate persons within their organization to attend SARATSO training, and to train others within their organization, as specified; and (2) ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less than every two years. In addition the Commission found that county probation departments shall perform SARATSO evaluations and include the results of those evaluations in presentencing reports, as specified; compile a Facts of Offense Sheet, inclusive of the SARATSO results, and send the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of a person's sex offense conviction; report to the Corrections Standards Authority on the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring at every two years; and grant access to all relevant records pertaining to a sex offender to any person authorized to administer the SARATSO, as specified.

II. ELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS

Any county, city, or city and county that incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate is eligible to claim reimbursement.

III. PERIOD OF REIMBURSEMENT

Government Code section 17557(e), states that a test claim shall be submitted on or before June 30 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that fiscal year. The County of Los Angeles filed the test claim on January 22, 2009, establishing eligibility for reimbursement

for the 2007-2008 fiscal year. Therefore, costs incurred are reimbursable on or after July 1, 2007, or later periods as specified in section IV, Reimbursable Activities, for statutes or executive orders effective after July 1, 2007.

Reimbursement for state-mandated costs may be claimed as follows:

1. Actual costs for one fiscal year shall be included in each claim.
2. Pursuant to Government Code section 17561(d)(1)(A), all claims for reimbursement of initial fiscal year costs shall be submitted to the State Controller (Controller) within 120 days of the issuance date for the claiming instructions.
3. Pursuant to Government Code section 17560(a), a local agency may, by February 15 following the fiscal year in which costs were incurred, file an annual reimbursement claim that details the costs actually incurred for that fiscal year.
4. If revised claiming instructions are issued by the Controller pursuant to Government Code section 17558(c), between November 15 and February 15, a local agency filing an annual reimbursement claim shall have 120 days following the issuance date of the revised claiming instructions to file a claim. (Gov. Code §17560(b)).
5. If the total costs for a given fiscal year do not exceed \$1,000, no reimbursement shall be allowed except as otherwise allowed by Government Code section 17564(a).
6. There shall be no reimbursement for any period in which the Legislature has suspended the operation of a mandate pursuant to state law.

IV. REIMBURSABLE ACTIVITIES

To be eligible for mandated cost reimbursement for any fiscal year, only actual costs may be claimed. Actual costs are those costs actually incurred to implement the mandated activities.

Actual costs must be traceable and supported by source documents that show the validity of such costs, when they were incurred, and their relationship to the reimbursable activities. A source document is a document created at or near the same time the actual cost was incurred for the event or activity in question. Source documents may include, but are not limited to, employee time records or time logs, sign-in sheets, invoices, and receipts.

Evidence corroborating the source documents may include, but is not limited to, worksheets, cost allocation reports (system generated), purchase orders, contracts, agendas, training packets, and declarations. Declarations must include a certification or declaration stating, "I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct," and must further comply with the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 2015.5. Evidence corroborating the source documents may include data relevant to the reimbursable activities otherwise in compliance with local, state, and federal government requirements. However, corroborating documents cannot be substituted for source documents.

The claimant is only allowed to claim and be reimbursed for increased costs for reimbursable activities identified below. Increased cost is limited to the cost of an activity that the claimant is required to incur as a result of the mandate.

For each eligible claimant that incurs increased costs, the following *ongoing* activities are reimbursable:

A. For county, city, and city and county beginning February 1, 2008 to:

1. Designate key persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations;¹ and
2. Ensure that persons administering the SARATSO receive training no less frequently than every two years.²

B. For county probation departments only to:

1. Assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person for whom the department prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203 and every eligible person under the department's supervision who was not assessed pursuant to a presentencing report, prior to the termination of probation but no later than January 1, 2010.³
2. Include the results of the SARATSO assessment administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06 in the presentencing report made to the court pursuant to section 1203, if the person was convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender, or if the probation report recommends that registration be ordered at sentencing.⁴

Preparing the presentencing report under section 1203 is not a new activity and, thus, not eligible for reimbursement.

3. Include in the report prepared for the department pursuant to section 1203c the results of the SARATSO, administered pursuant to sections 290.04 to 290.06, inclusive, if applicable, whenever a person is committed to the jurisdiction of

¹ Penal Code section 290.05 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128); as amended, Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)); and SARATSO Review Committee Notification, issued February 1, 2008.

² Ibid.

³ Penal Code section 290.06 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)). This requirement is limited by section 290.04 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128) Stats. 2007, ch. 579 (SB 172)) [limiting duty to administer SARATSO to populations for whom an appropriate tool has been selected pursuant to section 290.04] and SARATSO Review Committee Notification issued February 1, 2008 [selecting a SARATSO risk assessment tool for adult males and juvenile males only].

⁴ Penal Code section 1203 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for a conviction of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender.⁵

Preparing the report under section 1203c is not a new activity and, thus, not eligible for reimbursement.

4. Beginning January 1, 2010:
 - (a) Compile a Facts of Offense Sheet for every person convicted of an offense that requires him or her to register as a sex offender and who is referred to the department pursuant to section 1203;
 - (b) Include in the Facts of Offense Sheet all of the information specified in section 1203e, including the results of the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, if required;
 - (c) Include the Facts of Offense Sheet in the probation officer's report to the court made pursuant to section 1203; and
 - (d) Send a copy of the Facts of Offense Sheet to the Department of Justice Sex Offender Tracking Program within 30 days of the person's sex offense conviction.

*Obtaining information required to complete the presentencing report pursuant to section 1203, as amended by Statutes 1996, chapter 719 (AB 893), or the report to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation under section 1203c if applicable, as amended by Statutes 1963, chapter 1785 is not new or reimbursable under this activity.*⁶

5. Beginning January 1, 2009, and every two years thereafter, report to the Corrections Standards Authority all relevant statistics and relevant information regarding the effectiveness of continuous electronic monitoring of sex offenders, including the costs of monitoring and recidivism rates of those persons who have been monitored.⁷
6. Grant access to all relevant records pertaining to a registered sex offender to any person authorized by statute to administer the SARATSO.⁸

This activity is limited to granting access to records exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act. (Gov. Code § 6250, et seq.).

⁵ Penal Code section 1203c (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

⁶ Penal Code section 1203e (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

⁷ Penal Code section 1202.8 (as amended, Stats. 2006, ch. 336 (SB 1178); Stats. 2006, ch. 886 (AB 1849)).

⁸ Penal Code section 290.07 (added, Stats. 2006, ch. 337 (SB 1128)).

V. CLAIM PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION

Each of the following cost elements must be identified for each reimbursable activity identified in section IV, Reimbursable Activities, of this document. Each claimed reimbursable cost must be supported by source documentation as described in section IV. Additionally, each reimbursement claim must be filed in a timely manner.

A. Direct Cost Reporting

Direct costs are those costs incurred specifically for the reimbursable activities. The following direct costs are eligible for reimbursement.

1. Salaries and Benefits

Report each employee implementing the reimbursable activities by name, job classification, and productive hourly rate (total wages and related benefits divided by productive hours). Describe the specific reimbursable activities performed and the hours devoted to each reimbursable activity performed.

2. Materials and Supplies

Report the cost of materials and supplies that have been consumed or expended for the purpose of the reimbursable activities. Purchases shall be claimed at the actual price after deducting discounts, rebates, and allowances received by the claimant. Supplies that are withdrawn from inventory shall be charged on an appropriate and recognized method of costing, consistently applied.

3. Contracted Services

Report the name of the contractor and services performed to implement the reimbursable activities. If the contractor bills for time and materials, report the number of hours spent on the activities and all costs charged. If the contract is a fixed price, report the services that were performed during the period covered by the reimbursement claim. If the contract services are also used for purposes other than the reimbursable activities, only the pro-rata portion of the services used to implement the reimbursable activities can be claimed. Submit contract consultant and attorney invoices with the claim and a description of the contract scope of services.

4. Fixed Assets

Report the purchase price paid for fixed assets (including computers) necessary to implement the reimbursable activities. The purchase price includes taxes, delivery costs, and installation costs. If the fixed asset is also used for purposes other than the reimbursable activities, only the pro-rata portion of the purchase price used to implement the reimbursable activities can be claimed.

5. Travel

Report the name of the employee traveling for the purpose of the reimbursable activities. Include the date of travel, destination, the specific reimbursable activity requiring travel, and related travel expenses reimbursed to the employee in compliance with the rules of

the local jurisdiction. Report employee travel time according to the rules of cost element A.1., Salaries and Benefits, for each applicable reimbursable activity.

6. Training

Report the cost of training an employee to perform the reimbursable activities, as specified in Section IV of this document. Report the name and job classification of each employee preparing for, attending, and/or conducting training necessary to implement the reimbursable activities. Provide the title, subject, and purpose (related to the mandate of the training session), dates attended, and location. If the training encompasses subjects broader than the reimbursable activities, only the pro-rata portion can be claimed. Report employee training time for each applicable reimbursable activity according to the rules of cost element A.1., Salaries and Benefits, and A.2., Materials and Supplies. Report the cost of consultants who conduct the training according to the rules of cost element A.3., Contracted Services.

B. Indirect Cost Rates

Indirect costs are costs that are incurred for a common or joint purpose, benefiting more than one program, and are not directly assignable to a particular department or program without efforts disproportionate to the result achieved. Indirect costs may include both: (1) overhead costs of the unit performing the mandate; and (2) the costs of the central government services distributed to the other departments based on a systematic and rational basis through a cost allocation plan.

Compensation for indirect costs is eligible for reimbursement utilizing the procedure provided in 2 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), part 225 (Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87). Claimants have the option of using 10 percent of direct labor, excluding fringe benefits, or preparing an Indirect Cost Rate Proposal (ICRP) if the indirect cost rate claimed exceeds 10 percent.

If the claimant chooses to prepare an ICRP, both the direct costs (as defined and described in 2 CFR, part 225, appendices A and B (OMB Circular A-87 attachments A & B) and the indirect costs shall exclude capital expenditures and unallowable costs (as defined and described in 2 CFR, part 225, appendices A and B (OMB Circular A-87 attachments A & B)).

The distribution base may be: (1) total direct costs (excluding capital expenditures and other distorting items, such as pass-through funds, major subcontracts, etc.); (2) direct salaries and wages; or (3) another base which results in an equitable distribution.

In calculating an ICRP, the claimant shall have the choice of one of the following methodologies:

1. The allocation of allowable indirect costs (as defined and described in OMB Circular A-87 attachments A & B) shall be accomplished by: (1) classifying a department's total costs for the base period as either direct or indirect; and (2) dividing the total allowable indirect costs (net of applicable credits) by an equitable distribution base. The result of this process is an indirect cost rate which is used to distribute indirect

costs to mandates. The rate should be expressed as a percentage which the total amount of allowable indirect costs bears to the base selected; or

2. The allocation of allowable indirect costs (as defined and described in OMB Circular A-87 attachments A & B) shall be accomplished by: (1) separating a department into groups, such as divisions or sections, and then classifying the division's or section's total costs for the base period as either direct or indirect; and (2) dividing the total allowable indirect costs (net of applicable credits) by an equitable distribution base. The result of this process is an indirect cost rate that is used to distribute indirect costs to mandates. The rate should be expressed as a percentage which the total amount of allowable indirect costs bears to the base selected.

VI. RECORD RETENTION

Pursuant to Government Code section 17558.5(a), a reimbursement claim for actual costs filed by a local agency pursuant to this chapter is subject to the initiation of an audit by the Controller no later than three years after the date that the actual reimbursement claim is filed or last amended, whichever is later. However, if no funds are appropriated or no payment is made to a claimant for the program for the fiscal year for which the claim is filed, the time for the Controller to initiate an audit shall commence to run from the date of initial payment of the claim. In any case, an audit shall be completed not later than two years after the date that the audit is commenced. All documents used to support the reimbursable activities, as described in section IV, must be retained during the period subject to audit. If an audit has been initiated by the Controller during the period subject to audit, the retention period is extended until the ultimate resolution of any audit findings.

VII. OFFSETTING REVENUES AND REIMBURSEMENTS

Any offsetting revenue the claimant experiences in the same program as a result of the same statutes or executive orders found to contain the mandate shall be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate from any source, including but not limited to, service fees collected, federal funds, and other state funds, shall be identified and deducted from this claim.

VIII. STATE CONTROLLER'S CLAIMING INSTRUCTIONS

Pursuant to Government Code section 17558(b), the Controller shall issue claiming instructions for each mandate that requires state reimbursement not later than 90 days after receiving the adopted parameters and guidelines from the Commission, to assist local agencies in claiming costs to be reimbursed. The claiming instructions shall be derived from the test claim decision and the parameters and guidelines adopted by the Commission. Pursuant to Government Code section 17561(d)(1), issuance of the claiming instructions shall constitute a notice of the right of local agencies to file reimbursement claims, based upon parameters and guidelines adopted by the Commission.

IX. REMEDIES BEFORE THE COMMISSION

Upon request of a local agency, the Commission shall review the claiming instructions issued by the Controller or any other authorized state agency for reimbursement of mandated costs pursuant to Government Code section 17571. If the Commission determines that the claiming

instructions do not conform to the parameters and guidelines, the Commission shall direct the Controller to modify the claiming instructions and the Controller shall modify the claiming instructions to conform to the parameters and guidelines as directed by the Commission.

In addition, requests may be made to amend parameters and guidelines pursuant to Government Code section 17557(d), and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.2.

X. LEGAL AND FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES

The statements of decision adopted for the test claim and parameters and guidelines are legally binding on all parties and provide the legal and factual basis for the parameters and guidelines. The support for the legal and factual findings is found in the administrative record. The administrative record is on file with the Commission.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Yolo and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On February 3, 2014, I served the:

**Adopted Statement of Decision, Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines,
and Notice of Hearing**

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03
Penal Code Sections 290.3 et al.
County of Los Angeles, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on February 3, 2014 at Sacramento, California.



Jason Hone
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 1/16/14

Claim Number: 08-TC-03

Matter: State Authorized Risk of Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)

Claimant: County of Los Angeles

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-7522

SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Harmeet Barkschat, *Mandate Resource Services, LLC*

5325 Elkhorn Blvd. #307, Sacramento, CA 95842

Phone: (916) 727-1350

harmeet@calsdrc.com

Lacey Baysinger, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

lbaysinger@sco.ca.gov

Allan Burdick,

7525 Myrtle Vista Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95831

Phone: (916) 203-3608

allanburdick@gmail.com

J. Bradley Burgess, *MGT of America*

895 La Sierra Drive, Sacramento, CA 95864

Phone: (916) 595-2646

Bburgess@mgtamer.com

Michael Byrne, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-3274
michael.byrne@dof.ca.gov

Gwendolyn Carlos, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
gcarlos@sco.ca.gov

Annette Chinn, *Cost Recovery Systems, Inc.*

705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 939-7901
achinnrcs@aol.com

Alan Deal, *Peace Officer Standards and Training*

Standards & Development Division, 1601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95816-7083
Phone: (916) 227-2807
alan.deal@post.ca.gov

Marieta Delfin, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
mdelfin@sco.ca.gov

Tom Dyer, *Department of Finance (A-15)*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
tom.dyer@dof.ca.gov

Susan Geanacou, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
susan.geanacou@dof.ca.gov

Dorothy Holzem, *California Special Districts Association*

1112 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 442-7887
dorothyh@csda.net

Kathleen Howard, *Corrections Standards Authority*

600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA
Phone: (916) 445-5073
kathleen.howard@bscc.ca.gov

Mark Ibele, *Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee*

California State Senate, State Capitol Room 5019, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 651-4103
Mark.Ibele@sen.ca.gov

Susan Jensen, *SARATSO Review and Training Committee*

1515 S Street, Room 212-N, Sacramento, CA
Phone: (916) 327-5413
DAPOCASOMB@cdcr.ca.gov

Edward Jewik, *County of Los Angeles*

Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8564
ejewik@auditor.lacounty.gov

Matt Jones, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
matt.jones@csm.ca.gov

Ferlyn Junio, *Nimbus Consulting Group, LLC*
2386 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Suite 104, Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: (916) 480-9444
fjunio@nimbusconsultinggroup.com

Jill Kanemasu, *State Controller's Office*
Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-9891
jkanemasu@sco.ca.gov

Anita Kerezi, *AK & Company*
3531 Kersey Lane, Sacramento, CA 95864
Phone: (916) 972-1666
akcompany@um.att.com

Jean Kinney Hurst, Senior Legislative Representative, Revenue & Taxation, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814-3941
Phone: (916) 327-7500
jhurst@counties.org

Jay Lal, *State Controller's Office (B-08)*
Division of Accounting & Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0256
JLal@sco.ca.gov

Amber Lozano, *Department of Justice BCIA (D-08)*
Criminal Justice Statistics Center, P.O. Box 903427, , CA
Phone: (916) 227-3282
amber.lozano@doj.ca.gov

Kathleen Lynch, *Department of Finance (A-15)*
915 L Street, Suite 1280, 17th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
kathleen.lynch@dof.ca.gov

Hortensia Mato, *City of Newport Beach*
100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660
Phone: (949) 644-3000
hmato@newportbeachca.gov

Michelle Mendoza, *MAXIMUS*
17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340, Irvine, CA 95403
Phone: (949) 440-0845
michellemendoza@maximus.com

Howard Moseley, *Department of Corrections*

Board of Parole Hearings, P.O. Box 4036, Sacramento, CA 95812
Phone: (916) 323-1643
howard.moseley@cdcr.ca.gov

Geoffrey Neill, Senior Legislative Analyst, Revenue & Taxation, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 327-7500
gneill@counties.org

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*
1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Marianne O'Malley, *Legislative Analyst's Office (B-29)*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8315
marianne.O'malley@lao.ca.gov

Christian Osmena, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
christian.osmena@dof.ca.gov

Karen Pank, *Chief Probation Officers of California*
1415 L Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 447-2762
Karen@warnerandpank.com

Alice Park-Renzie, *County of Alameda*
CAO, 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: (510) 272-3873
Alice.Park@acgov.org

Anita Peden, *County of Sacramento*
711 G Street, Room 405, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-8441
apeden@sacsheriff.com

Keith Petersen, *SixTen & Associates*
P.O. Box 340430, Sacramento, CA 95834-0430
Phone: (916) 419-7093
kbsixten@aol.com

Jai Prasad, *County of San Bernardino*
Office of Auditor-Controller, 222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018
Phone: (909) 386-8854
jai.prasad@atc.sbcounty.gov

Mark Rewolinski, *MAXIMUS*
625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (949) 440-0845

markrewolinski@maximus.com

Kathy Rios, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-5919

krios@sco.ca.gov

Cynthia Rodriguez, *Department of State Hospitals*

1600 9th Street, Room 443, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 654-2319

cynthia.rodriguez@dmh.ca.gov

Matthew Schuneman, *MAXIMUS*

900 Skokie Boulevard, Suite 265, Northbrook, IL 60062

Phone: (847) 513-5504

matthewschuneman@maximus.com

Stephanie Scofield, *Assistant Executive Director, Peace Officer Standards and Training*

Administrative Services Division, 1601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95816-7083

Phone: (916) 227-2803

stephanie.scofield@post.ca.gov

Lee Scott, *Department of Finance*

15 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-3274

lee.scott@dof.ca.gov

David Scribner, *Max8550*

2200 Sunrise Boulevard, Suite 240, Gold River, CA 95670

Phone: (916) 852-8970

dscribner@max8550.com

Jennifer Shaffer, *Department of Corrections*

Board of Parole Hearings, P.O. Box 4036, Sacramento, CA 95812

Phone: (916) 445-7950

jennifer.shaffer@cdcr.ca.gov

Jim Spano, *Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 323-5849

jspano@sco.ca.gov

Dennis Speciale, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

DSpeciale@sco.ca.gov

Meg Svoboda, *Senate Office of Research*

1020 N Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA

Phone: (916) 651-1500

meg.svoboda@sen.ca.gov

Jolene Tollenaar, *MGT of America*

2001 P Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95811

Phone: (916) 443-9136

jolene_tollenaar@mgtamer.com

Kemiko Tolon, *SARATSO Review and Training Committee*

1515 S Street, Room 212-N, Sacramento, CA

Phone: (916) 327-1841

kemiko.tolon@cdcr.ca.gov

Evelyn Tseng, *City of Newport Beach*

100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660

Phone: (949) 644-3127

etseng@newportbeachca.gov

Brian Uhler, *Legislative Analyst's Office*

925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 319-8328

brian.uhler@lao.ca.gov

Wendy Watanabe, *County of Los Angeles*

500 West Temple Street, Room 525, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8301

wwatanabe@auditor.lacounty.gov

David Wellhouse, *David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.*

3609 Bradshaw Road, Suite 121, Sacramento, CA 95927

Phone: (916) 368-9244

dwa-david@surewest.net

Hasmik Yaghobyan, *County of Los Angeles*

Claimant Representative

Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-9653

hyaghobyan@auditor.lacounty.gov



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller
 Division of Accounting and Reporting

February 14, 2014

Ms. Heather Halsey
 Executive Director
 Commission on State Mandates
 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Adopted Statement of Decision, and Draft Expedited Parameters and Guidelines, and Notice of Hearing
State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03
Penal Code Section 290.3 et al.
County of Los Angeles, Claimant

Dear Ms. Halsey:

We have reviewed the proposed draft expedited amendment to parameters and guidelines submitted by the Commission staff. Below are our comments and recommendations. Proposed additions are underlined and deletions are indicated with strikethrough as follows:

IV. REIMBURSABLE ACTIVITIES

Page 3

B. For county probation departments only to:

1. a. Assess, using the SARATSO, as set forth in section 290.04, every eligible person for whom the department prepares a presentencing report pursuant to section 1203. (Penal Code section 290.06 (6).)
- b. Beginning July 1, 2007 until January 1, 2010: ~~and Assess~~ every eligible person under the department's supervision who was not assessed pursuant to a presentencing report, prior to termination of probation, but no later than January 1, 2010. (Penal Code section 290.06 (7).)


Ms. Heather Halsey
February 14, 2014
Page 2

COMMENT:

We recommend that the ongoing reimbursable activity B.1 be broken into two sub-activities because each activity refers to different sub-divisions of the Penal Code and has different reimbursement periods.

Should you have any questions regarding the above, please contact Tiffany Hoang at (916) 323-1127 or e-mail thoang@sco.ca.gov.

Sincerely,


JAY LAL, Manager
Local Reimbursements Section

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Sacramento and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On February 18, 2014, I served the:

State Controller's Office (SCO) Comments


State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO), 08-TC-03

Penal Code Sections 290.3 et al.

County of Los Angeles, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on February 18, 2014 at Sacramento, California.



Lorenzo R. Duran Jr.
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 1/16/14

Claim Number: 08-TC-03

Matter: State Authorized Risk of Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO)

Claimant: County of Los Angeles

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-7522

SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Harmeet Barkschat, *Mandate Resource Services, LLC*

5325 Elkhorn Blvd. #307, Sacramento, CA 95842

Phone: (916) 727-1350

harmeet@calsdrc.com

Lacey Baysinger, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

lbaysinger@sco.ca.gov

Allan Burdick,

7525 Myrtle Vista Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95831

Phone: (916) 203-3608

allanburdick@gmail.com

J. Bradley Burgess, *MGT of America*

895 La Sierra Drive, Sacramento, CA 95864

Phone: (916) 595-2646

Bburgess@mgtamer.com

Michael Byrne, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-3274
michael.byrne@dof.ca.gov

Gwendolyn Carlos, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
gcarlos@sco.ca.gov

Annette Chinn, *Cost Recovery Systems, Inc.*

705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 939-7901
achinnrcs@aol.com

Alan Deal, *Peace Officer Standards and Training*

Standards & Development Division, 1601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95816-7083
Phone: (916) 227-2807
alan.deal@post.ca.gov

Marieta Delfin, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
mdelfin@sco.ca.gov

Tom Dyer, *Department of Finance (A-15)*

915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
tom.dyer@dof.ca.gov

Susan Geanacou, *Department of Finance*

915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
susan.geanacou@dof.ca.gov

Dorothy Holzem, *California Special Districts Association*

1112 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 442-7887
dorothyh@csda.net

Kathleen Howard, *Corrections Standards Authority*

600 Bercut Drive, Sacramento, CA
Phone: (916) 445-5073
kathleen.howard@bscc.ca.gov

Mark Ibele, *Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee*

California State Senate, State Capitol Room 5019, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 651-4103
Mark.Ibele@sen.ca.gov

Susan Jensen, *SARATSO Review and Training Committee*

1515 S Street, Room 212-N, Sacramento, CA
Phone: (916) 327-5413
DAPOCASOMB@cdcr.ca.gov

Edward Jewik, *County of Los Angeles*

Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8564
ejewik@auditor.lacounty.gov

Matt Jones, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
matt.jones@csm.ca.gov

Ferlyn Junio, *Nimbus Consulting Group, LLC*
2386 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Suite 104, Sacramento, CA 95825
Phone: (916) 480-9444
fjunio@nimbusconsultinggroup.com

Jill Kanemasu, *State Controller's Office*
Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-9891
jkanemasu@sco.ca.gov

Anita Kerezsi, *AK & Company*
3531 Kersey Lane, Sacramento, CA 95864
Phone: (916) 972-1666
akcompany@um.att.com

Jean Kinney Hurst, Senior Legislative Representative, Revenue & Taxation, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814-3941
Phone: (916) 327-7500
jhurst@counties.org

Jay Lal, *State Controller's Office (B-08)*
Division of Accounting & Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0256
JLal@sco.ca.gov

Amber Lozano, *Department of Justice BCIA (D-08)*
Criminal Justice Statistics Center, P.O. Box 903427, , CA
Phone: (916) 227-3282
amber.lozano@doj.ca.gov

Kathleen Lynch, *Department of Finance (A-15)*
915 L Street, Suite 1280, 17th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
kathleen.lynch@dof.ca.gov

Hortensia Mato, *City of Newport Beach*
100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660
Phone: (949) 644-3000
hmato@newportbeachca.gov

Michelle Mendoza, *MAXIMUS*
17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340, Irvine, CA 95403
Phone: (949) 440-0845
michellemendoza@maximus.com

Howard Moseley, *Department of Corrections*

Board of Parole Hearings, P.O. Box 4036, Sacramento, CA 95812
Phone: (916) 323-1643
howard.moseley@cdcr.ca.gov

Geoffrey Neill, Senior Legislative Analyst, Revenue & Taxation, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 327-7500
gneill@counties.org

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*
1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Marianne O'Malley, *Legislative Analyst's Office (B-29)*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8315
marianne.O'malley@lao.ca.gov

Christian Osmena, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-0328
christian.osmena@dof.ca.gov

Karen Pank, *Chief Probation Officers of California*
1415 L Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 447-2762
Karen@warnerandpank.com

Alice Park-Renzie, *County of Alameda*
CAO, 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: (510) 272-3873
Alice.Park@acgov.org

Anita Peden, *County of Sacramento*
711 G Street, Room 405, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-8441
apeden@sacsheriff.com

Keith Petersen, *SixTen & Associates*
P.O. Box 340430, Sacramento, CA 95834-0430
Phone: (916) 419-7093
kbsixten@aol.com

Jai Prasad, *County of San Bernardino*
Office of Auditor-Controller, 222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018
Phone: (909) 386-8854
jai.prasad@atc.sbcounty.gov

Mark Rewolinski, *MAXIMUS*
625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (949) 440-0845

markrewolinski@maximus.com

Kathy Rios, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-5919

krios@sco.ca.gov

Cynthia Rodriguez, *Department of State Hospitals*

1600 9th Street, Room 443, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 654-2319

cynthia.rodriguez@dmh.ca.gov

Matthew Schuneman, *MAXIMUS*

900 Skokie Boulevard, Suite 265, Northbrook, IL 60062

Phone: (847) 513-5504

matthewschuneman@maximus.com

Stephanie Scofield, *Assistant Executive Director, Peace Officer Standards and Training*

Administrative Services Division, 1601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95816-7083

Phone: (916) 227-2803

stephanie.scofield@post.ca.gov

Lee Scott, *Department of Finance*

15 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-3274

lee.scott@dof.ca.gov

David Scribner, *Max8550*

2200 Sunrise Boulevard, Suite 240, Gold River, CA 95670

Phone: (916) 852-8970

dscribner@max8550.com

Jennifer Shaffer, *Department of Corrections*

Board of Parole Hearings, P.O. Box 4036, Sacramento, CA 95812

Phone: (916) 445-7950

jennifer.shaffer@cdcr.ca.gov

Jim Spano, *Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 323-5849

jspano@sco.ca.gov

Dennis Speciale, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Accounting and Reporting, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

DSpeciale@sco.ca.gov

Meg Svoboda, *Senate Office of Research*

1020 N Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA

Phone: (916) 651-1500

meg.svoboda@sen.ca.gov

Jolene Tollenaar, *MGT of America*

2001 P Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95811

Phone: (916) 443-9136

jolene_tollenaar@mgtamer.com

Kemiko Tolon, *SARATSO Review and Training Committee*

1515 S Street, Room 212-N, Sacramento, CA

Phone: (916) 327-1841

kemiko.tolon@cdcr.ca.gov

Evelyn Tseng, *City of Newport Beach*

100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660

Phone: (949) 644-3127

etseng@newportbeachca.gov

Brian Uhler, *Legislative Analyst's Office*

925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 319-8328

brian.uhler@lao.ca.gov

Wendy Watanabe, *County of Los Angeles*

500 West Temple Street, Room 525, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8301

wwatanabe@auditor.lacounty.gov

David Wellhouse, *David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.*

3609 Bradshaw Road, Suite 121, Sacramento, CA 95927

Phone: (916) 368-9244

dwa-david@surewest.net

Hasmik Yaghobyan, *County of Los Angeles*

Claimant Representative

Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-9653

hyaghobyan@auditor.lacounty.gov



1600 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-2309

February 1, 2008

SUBJECT: SARATSO (State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders) Review Committee Notification

Senate Bill 1128, Alquist (Chapter 337, Statutes of 2006) established the state committee, known as the SARATSO (State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders) Review Committee, to consider the selection of the risk assessment tools for California. (Pen. Code, 290.04) This Committee has three representatives appointed from the Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Attorney General's office, and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). One mandate of the committee is to select a state risk assessment tool for juvenile sex offenders, female offenders and adult offenders, if an appropriate tool is available and approved by the committee. To that end, the Committee has heard testimony from several experts who have authored risk assessment tools. The Committee has considered all testimony and reviewed the presentations in concert with the associated requirements established by statute.

For adults, the Committee has selected the Static-99 designed and cross-validated by Dr. Karl Hanson and Dr. David Thornton. This instrument is currently in use by CDCR as a tool to designate a parolee as a High Risk Sex Offender (HRSO). This instrument will become the only statewide risk assessment tool for adult males, which is mandated to be used by CDCR to assess every eligible inmate prior to parole and every eligible inmate on parole. This tool is further mandated for use by DMH to assess every eligible individual prior to release and by Probation for every eligible individual for whom there is a probation report. (Pen. Code, § 290.06)

For juveniles the Committee has selected the J-SORAT II designed and cross-validated by Dr. Douglas Epperson. This instrument will become the only state-authorized risk assessment tool for juveniles, which is mandated to be used by probation when assessing a juvenile sex offender at adjudication, and by CDCR/DJJ both prior to release from DJJ and while on supervision. (Pen. Code, §290.06.)

For female offenders the Committee has found that there currently is no risk assessment tool for this population that has been scientifically researched and validated. Therefore, the Committee does not have a recommendation

Implementation and Training:

SARATSO Review Committee
Page 2

On July 1, 2008 the Static-99 is mandated for use by the DMH, CDCR Parole and County Probation. Training-for-Trainers sessions will take place in the Winter/Spring of 2008.

This training shall be conducted by experts in the field of risk assessment and the use of actuarial instruments in predicting sex offender risk. Subject to requirements established by the committee, CDCR, DMH, County Probation Departments, and authorized local law enforcement agencies shall designate the appropriate persons within their organizations to attend training and, as authorized by the department, to train others within their organizations. Any person who administers the SARATSO shall receive training no less frequently than every two years.

The time factor is immediate. All agencies need to be fully trained for the July 1, 2008 implementation date.

If you have any questions or comments about the decisions of the Committee, please contact Kimberly Anderson, M.A. at (916) 651-2067 or by email at kimberly.anderson@dmh.ca.gov



State of California

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders Review Committee

1515 S Street, Room 212 North, Sacramento, CA 95811
Telephone 916.323.0384

Jack Wallace
Parole Administrator
Division of Adult Parole
Operations

Janet Neeley
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney
General

Mack Jenkins
Chief Probation Officer
San Diego County
Probation Dept.

Robert Lucas
Chief of Forensics
Department of Mental Health

May 3, 2011

Governor Jerry Brown
State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Brown:

This is to advise you that the California SARATSO (State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders) Committee has selected a violence risk assessment instrument for sex offenders, for use in California beginning in 2012. (See Pen. Code, §§ 290.04, 290.09.) The SARATSO Committee, after hearings in April 2010 on three such instruments, chose the LSCMI (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory). Dr. James Bonta is the author of the LSCMI and an internationally recognized expert on sex offender risk assessment. He will act as consultant to the SARATSO Committee on violence risk assessment.

The LSCMI must be used by sex offender management professionals beginning in 2012 to assess registered sex offenders while they are on probation or parole. (Pen. Code, § 290.09.) The tool measures the risk of violent re-offense, and is an evidence-based risk assessment tool. Violence risk assessment will supplement the static risk assessment now done in California using the Static-99R, and will be implemented at the same time as the use of dynamic risk assessment. The combination of these three instruments will give a better picture of the overall risk of reoffense presented by sex offenders on supervision.

The announcement of the selection of the LSCMI will be posted on the SARATSO Committee's web site,
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Parole/SARATSO_Committee/SARATSO.html, within 60 days.

Sincerely,

Janet Neeley
Deputy Attorney General, on behalf of
California SARATSO Committee

cc: Darrell Steinberg, Senate President pro Tem
John Perez, Speaker of the Assembly
Loni Hancock, Chair, Senate Public Safety
Tom Ammiano, Chair, Assembly Public Safety
Matthew Cate, Secretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation



State of California

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders Review Committee

1515 S Street, Room 212 North, Sacramento, CA 95811
Telephone 916.323.0384

Jack Wallace
Parole Administrator
Division of Adult Parole
Operations

Governor Jerry Brown
State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

Janet Neeley
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney
General

Dear Governor Brown:

Mack Jenkins
Chief Probation Officer
San Diego County
Probation Dept.

This is to advise you that the California SARATSO (State-Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders) Committee has selected a dynamic risk assessment instrument for use in California beginning in 2012. (See Pen. Code, §§ 290.04, 290.09.) The SARATSO Committee, after hearings in 2010 on three such instruments, chose the Structured Risk Assessment-Forensic Version (SRA-FV), which will be used without the violence risk assessment component of the tool. Dr. David Thornton is the author of the SRA-FV and a nationally recognized expert on sex offender risk assessment. He will act as consultant to the SARATSO Committee on dynamic risk assessment, and will provide the initial training for sex offender treatment providers in California on the instrument. The SARATSO Committee will make a separate selection later this year of a tool to measure risk of future violence.

Robert Lucas
Chief of Forensics
Department of Mental Health

The SRA-FV must be used by sex offender management professionals beginning in 2012 to assess registered sex offenders while they are on probation or parole. (Pen. Code, § 290.09.) The tool measures dynamic (changing) risk factors which are empirically related to the risk of reoffense, and is an evidence-based risk assessment tool. Dynamic risk assessment will supplement the static risk assessment now done in California using the Static-99R, and will give a better picture of the overall risk of reoffense presented by sex offenders on supervision.

The announcement of the selection of the SRA-FV will be posted on the SARATSO Committee's web site,

http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Parole/SARATSO_Committee/SARATSO.html, within 60 days.

Sincerely,

Janet Neeley
Deputy Attorney General, on behalf of
California SARATSO Committee

cc: Darrell Steinberg, Senate President pro Tem
John Perez, Speaker of the Assembly
Loni Hancock, Chair, Senate Public Safety
Tom Ammiano, Chair, Assembly Public Safety
Matthew Cate, Secretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation



State of California

State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders Review Committee

1515 S Street, Room 212 North, Sacramento, CA 95811

Telephone 916.323.0384

September 26, 2013

Brenda Crowding
Parole Administrator(A)
Division of Adult Parole
Operations

Governor Jerry Brown
State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

Janet Neeley
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney
General

Dear Governor Brown:

Mack Jenkins
Chief Probation Officer
San Diego County
Probation Dept.

This is to advise you that the California State Authorized Risk Assessment Tool for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) Committee has selected a new dynamic risk assessment instrument for use in California beginning in 2014. (See Pen. Code, §§ 290.04, 290.09). The SARATSO Committee, after public hearings in July and August 2013, selected the STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 at the SARATSO Committee public meeting on September 12, 2013. This instrument will replace the Structured Risk Assessment-Forensic Version (SRA-FV). Recent studies show that the STABLE-2007 is valuable in assessing sex offender recidivism because it adds incremental validity to predicting risk of sexual reoffense when used in conjunction with scores on the static risk assessment instrument used in California, the Static-99R.

VACANT
Department of Mental
Health

The STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 must be used by sex offender management professionals beginning in 2014 to assess registered sex offenders on probation or parole. (Pen. Code, § 290.09). The tool measures dynamic (changing) risk factors that are empirically related to the risk of reoffense, and is an evidence-based risk assessment tool. Dynamic risk assessment, along with assessment of future violence risk, gives a better picture of the overall risk of reoffense presented by sex offenders on supervision. The announcement of the selection of the STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 has been posted on the SARATSO Committee's website, www.saratso.org.

Sincerely,

Janet Neeley
Deputy Attorney General
On behalf of the California SARATSO Committee

cc: Darrell Steinberg, Senate President Pro Tem
John Perez, Speaker of the Assembly
Loni Hancock, Chair, Senate Public Safety Committee
Alison Anderson, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Tom Ammiano, Chair, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Greg Pagan, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Jeffrey Beard, Secretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Richard Gordon, Chair, Assembly Rules Committee
Jon Waldie, Chief Administrative Officer, Assembly Rules Committee

[Home](#)[Meetings](#)[Risk Assessment Instruments](#)[Trainings](#)[CASOMB Certification](#)[Contact Us](#)[Provider-Probation-Parole-DSH Secure Login](#)[Secure Login Information](#)[FAQ's](#)[Calendar](#)[Legal Issues](#)[SARATSO Review Committee](#)

Janet Neeley, California Attorney General's Office

Brenda Crowding, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

Vacant, California Department of State Hospitals

[SARATSO Training Committee](#)

SARATSO Review Committee members, and Mack Jenkins, Chief Probation Officer of San Diego

Trainings

Training Information

[STATIC-99R \(Static Risk\)](#)[JSORRAT-II \(Juvenile Risk\)](#)[STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007](#)[LS/CMI \(Violence Risk\)](#)

SARATSO Trainers

SARATSO must certify all scorers on the Risk Assessment tools. All classes must be taught by certified trainers in order for scorers to receive certification.

Static-99R

For the Static-99R, certified trainers are probation, parole and DSH personnel who were trained by SARATSO expert Dr. Amy Phenix in 2012-2013. [Click here](#) to find a certified trainer on the Static-99R.

Static 99R Training - Basic Coding

Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2014

Time: 8:00am-5:00pm

Training Location: Sacramento County Youth Detention Facility
9601 Kiefer Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95827Trainers: Renee Rodgers
Steven Mason

Tuition: \$100, STC Cert # 0026-067995

This training is currently full.

Other Info: Contact Renee Rodgers at rodgersr@saccounty.net or 916-874-1526

Static 99R Training - Advanced/Re-Certification

The advanced/re-certification training on the Static-99R is designed for scorers who have taken the basic Static-99R coding class and who have scored at least 10 cases in the past year. (Those who have not scored more than 10 cases but who need re-certification should re-take the basic coding class). The advanced class will include a brief review of the basics, a facilitated discussion regarding complicated scoring cases, a focus on improving scoring skills, and then a more advanced scoring practicum. A test case must be passed at the end of the course for certification purposes. (This is not a Train the Trainer Course).

Date: March 6, 2014

Time: 8:00am - 5:00pm

Training Location: Sacramento, Ca

Trainer: Mike L'Ecuyer, Ventura County

Registration: [Registration Form](#)

Tuition: \$100 (STC Certification Requested)

This training is currently full.

Other Info: Sign up with CPOC, Whitnee@cpoc.org or Fax registration form to 916-442-0850 or mail check to CPOC Foundation, 1415 L Street, Ste. 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

Static 99R Basic

Date: Thursday, March 13, 2014

Training Location: Sacramento, Ca

Trainers: Kevin Samsel, Humboldt County
David Haner, Orange County

Tuition: \$100

Registration Link: <http://www.cvent.com/d/34q0jg/1Q>

STC Certification: #0767-060591

Other Info: Mail check to CPOC Foundation, 1415 L Street, Ste. 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Any questions, contact Whitnee Reynolds at Whitnee@cpoc.org.

Static 99R Basic

Date: June 18-19, 2014

Time: June 18: 1:00pm-5:00pm

June 19: 8:00am-5:00pm

Training Location: Youth Detention Facility
9601 Kiefer Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95827

Trainers: Renee Rodgers & Steven Mason

Cost: Free

Other Info: contact Renee' Rodgers 916-874-1526 or
rodgersr@saccounty.net for enrollment info.

[Return to top of page](#)

JSORRAT-II

SARATSO is in the process of certifying probation and parole officers who were trained on the JSORRAT-II by Dr. Douglas Epperson in 2013 and who have regularly scored the JSORRAT-II. For questions, please contact SARATSO staff at dapocasomb@cdcr.ca.gov

JSORRAT-II Basic Course

JSORRAT-II Training A basic coding class on the JSORRAT-II (juvenile static risk assessment tool) is for beginners who are not certified to score the JSORRAT-II currently, or for those who want basic training again.

Date: February 27, 2014

Time: 8:30am-5pm (lunch provided)

Training Location: Sacramento

Trainer: Dr. Doug Epperson

Cost: \$125 (STC Tuition \$100 and \$25 Registration Fee)

This class is currently full.

Registration Link: <http://www.cvent.com/d/04q0l6/1Q>

STC Certification: #0767-068990

Registration Deadline: February 13, 2014

[Return to top of page](#)

STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007

In September 2013, the SARATSO Committee adopted a new dynamic risk instrument, the STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007. Statewide training will be offered on these tools in winter-spring 2014 for certified treatment providers. Providers must be trained on the new tools in 2013-14 by a SARATSO certified trainer. (Andrew Harris' presentation at ATSA 2013 is a SARATSO certified trainer). Until providers obtain such training, the previous dynamic tool, the SRA-FVL, should still be used.

PLEASE NOTE: This 16 hour training will include 12 hours of classroom training (8 hours on the first day, 4 hours on the second day); Approximately 2 - 2 ½ hours of Independent Offsite Case Scoring Exercises; and approximately 1 ½ - 2 hour follow up Webinar. All participants must complete and pass all aspects of the 16 hours to become certified scorers. If you have attended/plan to attend a standalone STABLE-2007 training conducted by an approved trainer, additional ACUTE-2007 trainings, Independent Offsite Case Scoring Exercises, and follow up Webinars will be offered. Please continue to check back for updates.

STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 Training

Date: February 18-19, 2014

Time: February 18: 8:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m.

February 19: 8:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m.

This class is currently full.

Training Location: COSD-Medical Examiner/Forensic Center
5570 Overland Ave., Ste 101
San Diego, CA 92123

[Directions](#)

Trainer: Katherine Gotch, MA

Registration: [Registration Form](#)

Fee: \$100 (16 hour training- includes material)

CEU: Available

Other Info: Training required every 2 years by law to certify or re-certify scorers

STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 Training

Date: March 5-6, 2014

Time: March 5: 8:00 a.m.-5:00p.m.

March 6: 8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Training Location: 1515 Clay Street Rm 11
Oakland, CA 94612

Trainer: Robin Wilson, PhD

Registration: [Registration Form](#)

Fee: \$100 (16 hour training- includes material)

CEU: Available

Other Info: Training required every 2 years by law to certify or re-certify scorers

STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 Training

Date: March 18-19, 2014

Time: March 18: 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

March 19: 8:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Training Location: Los Angeles County Probation Department
8240 S Broadway Avenue
Whittier CA 90606

Trainer: Robin Wilson, PhD

Registration: [Registration Form](#)

Fee: \$100 (16 hour training- includes material)

CEU: Available

Other Info: Training required every 2 years by law to certify or re-certify scorers

STABLE-2007/ACUTE-2007 Training

Title: CCOSO Pre-Conference

Date: May 6-7, 2014

Time: May 6: 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

May 7: 8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Training Location: San Diego Marriott Mission Valley
8757 Rio San Diego Drive
San Diego, California 92108

Trainer: Katie Gotch, MA

Registration: TBA

Fee: \$100 (16 hour training- includes material)

CEU: Available

Other Info: Training required every 2 years by law to certify or re-certify scorers

[Return to top of page](#)

LSCMI

The LS/CMI certified trainers are treatment providers who were trained by Dr. Tom O'Connor

on the LSCMI in 2011-2013. [Click here](#) to find a certified trainer on the LSCMI

LSCMI Training

LS/CMI Training This basic coding class is for beginners who are not currently certified to score the LS/CMI, for those who want basic training again, and for those needing re-certification. (An advanced class to re-certify scorers [required every 2 years] will be scheduled for Summer 2014. If your certification has expired because it has been more than 2 years since your last SARATSO training, it is permissible to take this class as a re-certification class.)

Date: Tuesday, March 11, 2014

Time: 8:30A.M. - 4:30P.M.

Training Location: Ziggurat Building, Executive Dining Room
707 Third Street
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Trainer: Shannon Smith, LCSW

Registration: [Registration Form](#)

Fee: \$50

CEU: Available

Other Info: Training required every 2 years by law to re-certify scorers and advanced trainers.

Materials Prior to the training, you will need to get the LS/CMI Preview Kit from Multi-Health Systems (www.mhs.com). The Kit is required for the class and for scoring the tool after you are certified. You can order the Preview Kit by calling MHS at (800) 456-3003 and requesting the Kit (Product Code LSCM03). The Kit costs \$88 plus tax (the total will be approximately \$115 with tax and shipping) and you must use it to score your clients via an automated, online format. It can take up to a week to receive the kit, so ORDER IT EARLY.

CEU's

California State University, Sacramento College of Continuing Education is an approved provider by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS), provider number PCE 4089. This course meets the qualifications for 6.0 hours of continuing education credit for MFT's and/or LCSW's as required by the California BBS. Please note that there will be specific instructions and required registration upon arrival at the course in order to receive credit and certification of attendance in the course.

Contact us at dapocasomb@cdcr.ca.gov with any questions.

[Return to top of page](#)

Additional Resources

To see the materials that certified trainers use in training, please contact SARATSO at dapocasomb@cdcr.ca.gov.

[Certified trainers](#) must follow uniform programming in order for a class to be SARATSO certified. Click here to see the certified trainers [User Guide](#).