

A close-up photograph of a vibrant orange California poppy flower in full bloom, with its yellow stamens clearly visible. The flower is in sharp focus, while the background is a soft-focus field of similar flowers under a clear blue sky.

**CALIFORNIA**

**SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD**

**Year End Report | 2025**

**CASOMB**



In accordance with Penal Code Section 9001, subdivision (b), the membership of the board consists of:

**Bradley McCartt**

CASOMB Chair  
District Attorney, Los Angeles County  
Representing Prosecuting Attorneys

**Bryan Bishop**

Director of Operations for the California Department  
of Corrections and Rehabilitation  
Director of the Division of Adult Parole Operations

**Christina Bennett**

Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist  
Representing those who provide evaluation and  
treatment for adult sex offenders

**Ellen Coleman**

Public Defender, Los Angeles County  
Representing Criminal Defense Attorneys

**Heather Bowlds**

Deputy Director of the Division of Adult Parole  
Operations  
Designee for Secretary of the Department of  
Corrections and Rehabilitation

**Laura Lomeli**

Detective, Anaheim Police Department  
Representing Law Enforcement with Investigative  
Expertise

**Norbert Ralph**

Psychologist  
Representing those who provide evaluation and  
treatment for juvenile sex offenders

**Sarah Metz**

Director, UCSF Trauma Recovery Center  
Representing Experts in Sexual Assault and Victim  
Advocacy

**Yolanda Franco-Clausen**

Law Enforcement  
Representing Law Enforcement with Registration  
and Notification Responsibilities

**Vacant**

Chief Probation Officer  
Representing Chief Probation Officer

**Brian Segal**

Deputy Attorney General  
Representing Office of the Attorney General

**Caprice Haverty**

Psychologist  
Representing those who provide evaluation and  
treatment for adult sex offenders

**Deirdre M. D'Orazio**

Assistant Chief Psychologist  
Representing the Department of State  
Hospitals

**Frank L. Birchak**

Judge, San Diego County  
Representing California State Judges

**Katherine Lucero**

Director of the Office of Youth and Community  
Restoration  
Representing the Office of Youth and Community  
Restoration

**Monica Nino**

County Administrator, Contra Costa County  
Representing County Administrators

**Sandra Henriquez**

Chief Executive Officer, Valor US  
Representing Experts in Sexual Assault and Victim  
Advocacy

**Siri McLeod**

Senior Deputy Probation Officer, Placer County  
Probation  
Representing Probation Officers

**Vacant**

City Manager  
Representing City Managers



## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary -----</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Complaints and Certification -----</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Tiered Registration -----</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Juvenile -----</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Education and Media -----</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Research -----</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Human Sex Trafficking -----</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Polygraph -----</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Community Reintegration -----</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Sexually Violent Predator -----</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>State Authorized Risk Assessment Tools for Sex Offenders -----</b>	<b>19</b>

## Appendices

<b>A. Data on Registered Sex Offenders in California -----</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>B. Registered Sex Offenders by County -----</b>	<b>26</b>





## Executive Summary

The vision of the California Sex Offender Management Board (CASOMB) is to decrease sexual victimization and increase community safety. This vision is accomplished by addressing issues, concerns and problems related to community management of adults who commit sexual offenses by identifying and developing recommendations to improve policies and practices.

CASOMB is pleased to present its 2025 Year-End Report, which delineates the ongoing, collaborative efforts to advance evidence-based treatment modalities for individuals who have committed sexual offenses, while prioritizing the safety of victims and the community at large. CASOMB executes its statutory mandates by leveraging the diverse strengths and specialized expertise of its membership. This operational framework is facilitated through the establishment of standing subcommittees, each chaired by a designated subject matter expert and encompassing a broad spectrum of CASOMB members representing various sectors of the criminal justice system, treatment and intervention services, and advocacy groups. These subcommittees address critical issues, including but not limited to research parameters, human trafficking protocols, tiered registration implementation, optimization of treatment outcomes, and advocacy for public safety enhancements.

CASOMB seeks to ensure that treatment for individuals who commit sexual offenses is implemented in accordance with best practices, ethical, and legal requirements. The Complaints Subcommittee continued to see an increase in the number of complaints received in 2025. Of the complaints received, the allegations investigated involved a variety of issues, including not using CASOMB-certified providers, not following SARATSO policies and scoring procedures, not using assessment instruments as required by SARATSO, and not providing adequate supervision. The Complaints subcommittee received twenty-six complaints in 2025; however, 5 did not fall under CASOMB's purview for processing and investigation. Therefore, this subcommittee decided to update and clarify the Complaints Procedure. The Complaints subcommittee

continues to monitor trends, identify areas for improvement, and communicate these issues with the Board.

The Certification Subcommittee, in conjunction with the Complaints Subcommittee, created sanctions to address open complaints. The Certification Subcommittee proposed sanctions that are presented to and must be approved by the Board. During 2025, sanctions included decertification of individual providers, and one agency and one provider received letters of admonishment.

This year, the Community Reintegration Subcommittee began a paper discussing the laws and challenges to reintegration following adjudication and/or incarceration for Penal Code (PC) 290 registrants. It focused on the lack of accessibility to CASOMB-certified sex offender treatment for California's probationers and the impact to public safety.

The Juvenile Subcommittee continued to advocate for a uniform, comprehensive approach to the treatment of youth who offend sexually in California. This subcommittee authored a Position Paper<sup>1</sup> on SB 1437, opposing this bill or any legislation that aims to reinstate registration for juveniles who commit sexual offenses. The Juvenile subcommittee continues to collaborate with external stakeholders, including the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR).

During 2025, the Tiered Registration Subcommittee worked on several key initiatives related to tiered registration. First, a collaboration with the Education and Media Subcommittee to create an FAQ sheet<sup>2</sup> detailing the tiered registration system, including information on tier assignments, registration periods, and eligibility for petitioning for removal. Additionally, the subcommittee authored a position paper on Senate Bill 680<sup>3</sup> to articulate the organization's stance on the legislation creating registration requirements for unlawful sex with a minor (PC 261.5).

The Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) Subcommittee is working on completing the last of four papers pertaining to the implementation of the SVP law. The final paper which focuses on SVP Sex Offense Specific Treatment Program Participation Rate is projected to be completed in early 2026.

---

<sup>1</sup> [AB 1437 Position Paper](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Tiered Registration FAQ](#)

<sup>3</sup> [SB 680 Position Paper](#)



The Research Subcommittee presented to the Board three studies analyzing the utility of the Stable-2007 risk assessment tool at detecting treatment change in adult males convicted of a sex offense.

CASOMB continues to work to improve California's Containment Model. Polygraphs are an important part of the Containment Model and are a valuable treatment tool. This year, the Polygraph Subcommittee edited the polygraph FAQ section posted to the CASOMB website and continued to work with experts in the field to ensure best practices.

When Assembly Bill 1015 established CASOMB in 2006, a core objective was to provide critical assistance to the Governor and the state legislature concerning all facets of sex offender management, including the statewide registration protocols. The California Sex Offender Management Board (CASOMB) maintains a steadfast commitment to enhancing public safety, providing robust support for victims, and addressing the complex challenges inherent in managing the sex offender population. The Board anticipates a sustained and productive collaboration with California's elected officials to ensure the enactment and development of judicious sex offender legislation and policies within the state.

## **Complaints and Certification**

### *Complaints*

Penal Code 9003 tasked CASOMB with creating certification standards for sex offender management professions. CASOMB Certification Requirements were created to satisfy this mandate and include a complaints procedure. The goal of the complaint's procedure is to identify individuals or provider agencies who are not complying with CASOMB Certification Requirements. The individuals identified as not being in compliance or in good standing, may receive sanctions that include a letter of admonition, mutual agreement, probation, or decertification.

Eighteen complaints from 2024 carried over to be completed in 2025. Thirteen of the complaints revolved around agencies ensuring that previous treatment gets considered when receiving a new or transferred client into their agency. A few allegations stated that upon beginning treatment at new agencies individuals who had formerly been in maintenance stage of treatment at a previous agency were removed from maintenance, simply due to the transfer between agencies. Many of these complaints were resolved informally with the agency's full cooperation.

The remaining five of the complaints from 2024 were in various stages of the investigation process and were all resolved in 2025. These investigations dealt with using uncertified clinicians, practicing telehealth in a state the individual was not licensed in, having more than nine people in group therapy, and 3 allegations included unprofessional conduct and unethical behavior to include over familiarization, poor boundaries, and multiple relationships.

The Complaints Subcommittee continued to see an increase in the number of complaints received in 2025. The Complaints subcommittee received a total of twenty-six complaints during 2025, however five of the complaints did not fall under CASOMB's purview to process and investigate. It is not uncommon for CASOMB to receive complaints that include allegations we do not have purview over, however this year we received complaints that solely included allegations against other entities (Department of Justice, Division of Adult Parole Operations, and individual Polygraphers), so this subcommittee decided to update and clarify the Complaints Procedure. The revised Complaints Procedure<sup>4</sup> details CASOMB's purview over treatment providers and includes an Appendix section that provides resources on filing complaints that do not fall under the purview of CASOMB.

Allegations that were investigated in 2025 involved a variety of issues to include: unprofessional and unethical conduct including boundary violations and over familiarity, not signing treatment plans, clients not having a clear understanding of their pathway to treatment completion, clients not being involved in the creation and maintenance of their treatment plan, unprofessional conduct-retaliation after filing a complaint, not using CASOMB certified providers, not following SARATSO policies and scoring procedures, not using assessment instruments as required by SARATSO, not providing adequate supervision, failing to implement the Containment Model-communicating with supervising agent at least once a month, making changes to treatment dosage without justification based on current changes to risk-relevant factors, change to dosage (intensity) of treatment which should be made in collaboration with the supervising agent, failure to sign informed consent and confidentiality paperwork, failure to maintain confidentiality, and boundary violations to include a sexual relationship with a client.

The Complaints subcommittee continues to monitor trends, identify areas for improvement, and communicate these issues with the Board.

---

<sup>4</sup> [CASOMB Complaint Procedure](#)

## 2026 Goals for the Complaints subcommittee

- Continue to process complaints in a timely manner
- Continue to monitor and report trends in complaints to CASOMB

## *Certification*

The Certification subcommittee continued to meet monthly and remained active throughout 2025. In conjunction with the Complaints subcommittee, sanctions were created to address open complaints. The Certification subcommittee suggests sanctions which are presented to and must be approved by the full Board. Of the investigations that were reviewed during 2025, sanctions included decertification of five individual providers, and one agency and one provider received letters of admonishment and were able to demonstrate a change in action through a corrective action plan.

The Statement of Successful Completion of Sex Offender Treatment document was updated to remove outdated information. This subcommittee has also been working on redesigning the certification requirements. The intent is to streamline the application process to include both the provider and agency requirements in a new document called the CASOMB Certification Standards and Guidelines. This project is included in our goals for 2026 and will remain on the agenda for this subcommittee.

CASOMB authored and released an addendum to the Co-Facilitation Requirements for Students who have earned their master's degree<sup>5</sup>. This addendum addresses Doctoral level students who have already earned their master's degree or the equivalent. CASOMB has updated the co-facilitation requirements to reflect their training and experience for certification.

As of December 31, 2025, CASOMB has a total of 69 certified treatment provider agencies. When comparing end of year numbers for CASOMB certified treatment providers from December 31, 2024, to December 31, 2025, the number of total providers is 411.

	December 31, 2024:	December 31, 2025:
Independent	182	179
Associate	183	192
Student	41	40
Total All Levels	406	411

---

<sup>5</sup> [Addendum to the Co-Facilitation Requirements for Student Providers who have earned their master's degree](#)

## 2026 Goals for the Certification Subcommittee

- Develop CASOMB Code of Ethics
- Create Uniformity for Certification through the combination of existing Agency and Provider certification requirements: Continue to develop and Finalize *CASOMB Certification Standards and Guidelines*
  - Update section on Agency Certification Standards
  - Create CASOMB Supervision Standards

## **Tiered Registration**

The Tiered Registration subcommittee convened multiple times throughout the year to address critical issues related to sex offender registration and tiering. During 2025, the committee worked on several key initiatives related to tiered registration. First, a collaboration with the Education and Media Subcommittee to create an FAQ sheet<sup>6</sup> detailing the tiered registration system, including information on tier assignments, registration periods, and eligibility for petitioning for removal. In this effort, testimonials from individuals impacted by tiered registration were collected, and work is ongoing to find more personal stories and effective ways to share them with the public.

Additionally, the committee authored a position paper on Senate Bill 680<sup>7</sup> to articulate the organization's stance on the legislation, which concerned expanded registration requirements for certain sex offenses.

## 2026 Goals for the Tiered Registration Subcommittee

- Continuing to monitor legislation to ensure best practices for the state and to educate stakeholders on the tiered registration system, including the petition process for removal from the registry. This educational outreach also aims to support further changes that would align decisions more closely with an individual's risk level and existing research regarding sex offender registration and recidivism.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Tiered Registration FAQ](#)

<sup>7</sup> [SB 680 Position Paper](#)

## **Juvenile<sup>8</sup>**

In 2025, CASOMB continued to advocate for a uniform comprehensive approach to the treatment of youth who offend sexually in California. There continues to be no statewide mandated standard of care for youth who have sexually offended, nor does CASOMB have the jurisdiction to implement certification requirements and oversight for treatment providers who serve this population. Developing and requiring certification standards for treatment providers will ensure that assessment, treatment, and supervision of this population will be done in a consistent manner, grounded in research.

CASOMB continues to support a change in language to Penal Code (PC) 9000 to expand certification requirements to include those who also provide services to youth who have been referred by the courts or probation for a sexual offense.

In February of 2025, Senate Bill 1437 was introduced, proposing the amendment of PC § 290.008 to expand the requirement that juveniles who are wards of the juvenile court (for specified sex offenses) register as sex offenders if they are discharged from a secure youth treatment facility (SYTF). This Board swiftly entered the conversation, authoring a Position Paper<sup>9</sup> on SB 1437, opposing this bill or any other legislation which aims to reinstate registration for juveniles who commit sexual offenses. Reinstating juvenile sex offender registration contradicts empirical research, best practices in the field, and undermines public safety goals. Our position paper emphasizes that juvenile sexual reoffense rates are extremely low and that registration does not deter offending or improve outcomes. Instead, it imposes lifelong barriers to housing, education, and employment factors that increase instability and risk. CASOMB supports evidence-based, developmentally appropriate interventions focused on treatment, accountability, and rehabilitation. CASOMB also updated the Juvenile Registration Addendum: Registration is Counterproductive for Youth Who Have Offended Sexually<sup>10</sup> to expand on the current research surrounding the use of registration for juveniles who sexually offend. We will continue to monitor this bill and provide technical assistance and psychoeducation on the many counterproductive effects registration has on juveniles.

---

<sup>8</sup> The California Office of the Attorney General's representative on the CASOMB board was not a part of the Juvenile Subcommittee and accordingly abstains from adoption of this section.

<sup>9</sup> [AB 1437 Position Paper](#)

<sup>10</sup> [Juvenile Registration Addendum 2025](#)

The Juvenile Subcommittee continues to collaborate with external stakeholders, including the Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR). This collaboration is to ensure that we are providing our stakeholders with evidence-based research and information regarding supervising and treating youth who have demonstrated sexually abusive behavior. CASOMB has also partnered with the California Youth Defender Center (CYDC), formerly the Pacific Juvenile Defender Center, to educate individuals who are currently placed on the sex offender registry with a juvenile-only offense on how to access and qualify for a pathway off the registry. Currently the Department of Justice reports that there are 2,651 individuals who are currently required to register solely for a juvenile adjudication<sup>11</sup>.

Lastly, this subcommittee began revising and updating the 2022 Guidelines for Treatment and Supervising Youth Who Have Committed a Sexual Offense. It is vital for CASOMB to update these guidelines because research, laws, and best practices in juvenile rehabilitation continue to evolve. Updated guidelines ensure that California's approach remains aligned with the most current evidence about adolescent development, trauma, risk assessment, and effective intervention strategies for youth with problematic sexual behavior problems. Since youth differ significantly from adults in cognitive, emotional, and social maturity, treatment models and supervision standards must reflect these developmental realities to promote accountability and long-term behavior change. Revising the guidelines will help standardize quality of care across providers, strengthen oversight and consistency in care, and support community safety through evidence-based, rehabilitative approaches.



---

<sup>11</sup> CASOMB Board Meeting, September 18, 2025, Department of Justice Update

## 2026 Goals for the Juvenile Subcommittee

- Complete revisions to the Guidelines for Treating and Supervising Youth Who Have Committed a Sexual Offense
- Complete Educational Initiative to inform individuals on the registry with a juvenile offense how to access the pathway off the registry
- Continue to provide technical assistance and information to legislature on juveniles who sexually offend
- Continue to educate legislative stakeholders on the importance of uniform application of treatment for youth across the state
- The Juvenile subcommittee agrees with the State Authorized Risk Assessment Tools for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) review committee recommending minor statutory changes to allow SARATSO to resume its role of selecting risk instruments for youth who have committed a sexual offense.

## **Education and Media**

The Education and Media Subcommittee continued its work on developing an educational video on Tiered Registration. The goals for this project are to provide an update on the implementation of the tiering bill as well as educating policy makers, legislators, and the public on how the tiering bill changed the landscape of sexual offender registration. The video will include testimonials from victim survivors and individuals who caused harm, both speaking of the impact of the bill. Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) featured in the video will explain current recidivism data, the current tiered registration bill, and how the changes to this bill will assist in efforts to provide services appropriately. In conjunction with the Tiered Registration Subcommittee, Education and Media was able to complete talking points for the video project. In addition, subcommittee membership reached out to previously supervised individuals and victim survivors for testimonials. Testimonials are a work in progress as there is hesitation for these individuals to commit to telling their stories in such a public fashion. The committee continues to seek the best solutions to keep individuals' identities confidential. The committee continues to work diligently to complete this project as the anticipated completion date will likely be 2026-2027.

This subcommittee, in collaboration with Tiered Registration Subcommittee, completed a list of Frequently Asked Question (FAQ)<sup>12</sup> regarding Tiered Registration. The goal of the FAQ was to assist in supporting the Tiered Registration position paper that was submitted to the legislature,

---

<sup>12</sup> [Tiered Registration FAQ](#)

educating key stakeholders and the public on current issues surrounding this population of individuals.

Lastly, the subcommittee began working on a reboot and redesign of the CASOMB website. The subcommittee aims to provide supervised individuals with a public facing online portal with resources regarding treatment completion, pathways off the registry, complaints procedures, and general resources. This will be the first of its kind for CASOMB as there is currently no self-service portal for supervised individuals to access this information. The website redesign is anticipated to begin in 2026, and completion is expected in 2027.

#### 2026 Goals for the Education and Media Subcommittee

- Continue to advise and educate key stakeholders and the public on CASOMB's vision, missions, and goals.
- Continue to provide education on the evolving research surrounding individuals convicted of registerable 290 offenses.
- Continue to collaborate with other CASOMB sub-committees to provide education and media support and services.
- Provide accessible resources for registered supervised individuals on a user-friendly public facing platform.

## **Research**

CASOMB promotes empirically supported interventions and educates its stakeholders on current and relevant research about best practices in managing and preventing sexual recidivism. The Research subcommittee is tasked with facilitating research projects on behalf of the Board, in alignment with current affairs that directly impact community safety and management of sex offenders under law enforcement supervision. Per Penal Code 290.04-290.09, California mandates certified treatment providers and agencies to administer the Stable-2007 risk assessment tool to assess dynamic, or changing factors, risk factors in a registered person's life. Scores are used to identify sexual offending individual's criminogenic needs (i.e., treatment targets) and aid in assessing risk for sexual re-offense.

With the Boards approval, the subcommittee completed and presented three studies to the Board analyzing the utility of the Stable-2007 risk assessment tool at detecting treatment change of adult males convicted of a sex offense. The Stable-2007 Change Over Time project is in the process of publication. The primary investigator and subcommittee chair presented the findings



of the Stable-2007 Change Over Time study to the Board highlighting its implications to the sex offender management field. Future presentations are planned once publication is finalized.

The subcommittee completed the Dimensional Structure and Measurement Invariance of the Stable-2007 (also known as Factor Analysis) paper. This project assessed the Stable-2007's factor structure and measurement invariance of scores in a sample of supervised individuals in the State of California. The factor analysis of the Stable-2007 is also in the process of publication.

#### 2026 Goals for the Research Subcommittee

- Complete Stable-2007 Change Over Time study.
- Continue to engage in research on behalf of CASOMB exploring best practices and current issues surrounding the community management of sex offenders.

### **Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Human Sex Trafficking**

The impact of the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) and human trafficking is profound and complex, spanning economic, social, and psychological dimensions. Efforts to combat these issues require global collaboration, improved enforcement, and a victim-centered approach that includes prevention, education, and comprehensive support for survivors. Despite growing awareness and activism, the scale of the problem remains staggering, and much more needs to be done to protect the most vulnerable members of society.

It is important for CASOMB to study CSEC and human sex trafficking because this knowledge helps the Board develop effective, evidence-based policies that protect victims and prevent future sexual harm. By understanding the causes and patterns of exploitation, CASOMB can improve prevention efforts, guide treatment and supervision practices, and strengthen coordination among law enforcement, child welfare, and treatment providers. Studying these issues also ensures that California's response is victim-centered, promotes rehabilitation for offenders, and enhances overall community safety.

In 2025, the Human Sex Trafficking (HST) Subcommittee narrowed its scope for a future research project to focus on sex traffickers. This subcommittee would like to take a closer look at this specific group of offenders to ensure we are providing the correct recommendations regarding treatment, supervision, and effective rehabilitation. Topics to be explored are: what are the recidivism rates for sex traffickers, what does a trafficker's entry into CSEC and trafficking look like, can this be prevented, what are the best strategies to supervise sex traffickers, and what intervention and prevention strategies can be used to specifically target traffickers?

This subcommittee continues to focus on gathering experts from the field to share perspectives, interventions, and research in this area. A presentation on the Five-Year Strategic Plan to Prevent & Address Child Trafficking in Los Angeles County was presented by Kate Walker Brown, from the Nation Center for Youth Law, in conjunction with subcommittee member Michelle Guymon. This subcommittee also brought a presentation to the full board titled “Preventing Gender-Based Violence and Disrupting Sex Trafficking Through Identity, Accountability, and Connection” about a prevention and intervention curriculum called “I Am.” This presentation shared a curriculum that can be used as a preventative method against sexual violence as well as intervention with youth with problematic sexual behavior. This subcommittee continues to track legislation and funding that affects the landscape of human sex trafficking.



#### 2026 Goals for the Human Sex Trafficking Subcommittee

- Continue to gather preliminary data for research project. Begin research project with the goal that CASOMB can utilize the data gathered to inform certification requirements and recommendations to stakeholders.

- Continue to review and monitor active legislation that relates to HST and provide technical assistance or guidance (if any) to stakeholders.
- Develop a focused strategy to better understand and address the role of *sex buyers* in the commercial sexual exploitation of youth.
  - The subcommittee will develop a focused strategy to better understand and address the role of *sex buyers* in the commercial sexual exploitation of youth.
  - This will include reviewing national research, identifying policy and legislative trends, and educating stakeholders on interventions that hold buyers accountable.

## **Polygraph**

Polygraph examinations are one piece of the containment model used among a specialized team of professionals who are trained in sex offender management practices. Polygraph testing is considered a treatment tool. The development of the type of examination and the test questions are routinely developed by the containment team (CT). The results are shared among the CT members. The CASOMB polygraph subcommittee meets every other month and consists of mental health and supervision representatives in addition to polygraph examiners. The polygraph subcommittee also seeks input and advice from other professionals when the scope of a topic is out of their purview (i.e. legal aspects). In 2025 the polygraph subcommittee edited the polygraph FAQ section posted to the CASOMB website. The subcommittee is currently focused on polygraph examination consent forms however these will not be completed until 2026.

The Risk Needs Responsivity model is the evidence-based approach to all aspects of sex offense management including polygraph. This suggests that the frequency and type of polygraph examinations administered reasonably match the risk associated with the person convicted of a sexual crime who is required to register. There are some provider agencies and independent providers that might have a set schedule for the frequency of examinations based on their treatment philosophy. The subcommittee updated the polygraph FAQ section to assure that the language is consistent with the Risk Needs Responsivity model.



#### 2026 Goals for the Polygraph Subcommittee

- Update and finalize consent forms.
- Review of the Garcia decision: the Garcia decision is related to how polygraph outcomes are utilized, and this subcommittee would like to provide clarification through a FAQ/fact sheet.

### **Community Reintegration**

Successful community reintegration of individuals required to register under California Penal Code (PC) 290 is vital for public safety and rehabilitation. Stability through treatment, employment, housing, and social support reduces sexual and general recidivism, while instability and isolation increase risk. Healthy reintegration helps individuals comply with supervision and registration mandates, lowers risk and increases protective factors which benefit community safety, reduces incarceration costs, and supports productive citizenship. Rooted in the goal of rehabilitation, effective reintegration acknowledges the capacity for change and focuses on evidence-based approaches that protect both individuals and the public.

This year, the community reintegration subcommittee focused on a paper which gives a broad understanding of the laws and challenges to reintegration following adjudication and/or incarceration for PC 290 registrants. The first paper explores access to affordable, specialized, sex offender outpatient community treatment specifically as it relates to supervised persons on probation. Notably, Probation Departments do not have designated funding specific to sex offender treatment. To further complicate this issue, CASOMB-certified sex offender treatment

is rarely covered by an individual's health insurance. This paper focuses on the lack of accessibility to CASOMB-certified sex offender treatment for California's probationers and the impact to public safety.

The paper also highlights that although there are existing revenue streams created by the Legislature to assist the reintegration of Probationers and Parolees; these laws do not set aside funds specifically to assist individuals who must register per PC (§) 290. To achieve the goals of successful reintegration, we suggest that these laws need to carve out funding for treatment, job training, and housing explicitly for this group of reentry persons. As pointed out in our CASOMB 2024 Year End Report, in addition to treatment, housing and employment opportunities are necessary variables that support successful reintegration into the community. The stability of these two areas in a Probationers or Parolee's life can be the key component of their success.



#### 2026 Goals for the Community Reintegration Subcommittee

- Continue to inform the public on the impact of registration/notification on sex registrants and their ability to reintegrate into the community. The next policy paper will focus directly on access to employment and its impact on successful community reintegration.

### **Sexually Violent Predator**

Across the five state hospitals in California, there are approximately 5,533 forensically committed individuals. This number includes 957 individuals pursuant to the Sexually Violent Predator (SVP) law, all of whom are at the secure state hospital in Coalinga. Additionally, there are currently 17 SVP committed individuals in the community based Conditional Release Program (CONREP), a population that comprises about three percent of all CONREP placements across California. There are 23 additional SVP committed individuals at the DSH inpatient facility (DSH-Coalinga) court

ordered to SVP CONREP pending placement. Since the SVP law was enacted, 60 SVP committed individuals have been placed in SVP CONREP. Of the total number ever placed in SVP CONREP, 47 percent have achieved full discharge, meaning they are free persons no longer under the aegis of the SVP law.

Utilizing evidence based best practice guidelines, in 2018 CASOMB set objectives for completing four papers pertaining to the implementation of the SVP law. CASOMB previously published three of the papers, and in 2026 CASOMB plans to complete the fourth paper. The CASOMB SVP papers outline areas of review and recommendation in the SVP program, 1) Sexually Violent Predator Project: Introduction 2) Duration of SVP Detainee Status, and 3) Sexually Violent Predator Project: Conditional Release Program Housing and Community Placement Barriers, and Sexually Violent Predator Project: Conditional Release Program Housing and Community Placement Barriers Addendum, 4) The final paper, SVP Sex Offense Specific Treatment Program Participation Rate, is projected to be completed early in 2026.

The SVP SOTP Participation Rate Paper identifies a low treatment participation rate among CA SVPs compared to other SVP programs nationally. Contrary to the purpose of the SVP law and what the citizenry likely assumes, only about half of the persons with sex crimes committed to the state hospitals pursuant to the SVP law participate in the state's Sex Offense Specific Treatment Program (SOTP). This paper describes the treatment enrollment rate, resultant areas of concern, and evidence based best practice recommendations for improvement.

Other notable SVP program events over the past year are the California State Auditor audit of the SVP program. We note that CSA's findings were generally consistent with those of the CASOMB SVP papers. Finally, on October 10, 2025, Senate Bill 380 was signed into effect which requires DSH to study the feasibility of establishing state-run transitional housing facilities for SVP persons. We note that in the CONREP Housing and Community Placement paper, among CASOMB's recommendations is the implementation of transitional facilities as a less restrictive alternative to full confinement before standard CONREP for SVP persons that have completed the inpatient treatment program.

In conclusion, CASOMB identifies that changes to the SVP law and its implementation could facilitate necessary improvements to the system of services that prevent sexual reoffending in California. CASOMB will disseminate the completed SVP papers to the range of stakeholders involved in the California SVP arena and create opportunities to provide education on these papers.



# END THE VIOLENCE

## 2026 Goals for the Sexually Violent Predator Subcommittee

- Finalize the fourth SVP paper: SVP Sex Offense Specific Treatment Program Participation Rate







## **State Authorized Risk Assessment Tools for Sex Offenders**

The State Authorized Risk Assessment Tools for Sex Offenders (SARATSO) Committee is a separate state committee that is integral to, related to, and aligned with CASOMB. However, SARATSO and CASOMB have different statutory roles and mandates.

In 2006, SARATSO Committee was tasked with selecting reliable instruments for determining the risk of sexual reoffense for sex offender registrants. In 2012, this expanded to include instruments that estimate risk of violence and dynamic risk for sexual recidivism. The Committee is tasked with providing training to SARATSO-certified trainers in California. SARATSO Committee retains experts at the top of the sex offender risk assessment field who provide advice on training and curriculum development.

### **Ineligible to Score on the Static-99R**

SARATSO, Penal Code (PC) section 290.04(b)(1) states “Commencing January 1, 2007, the SARATSO for adult males required to register as sex offenders, shall be the STATIC-99R risk assessment scale, which shall be the SARATSO tool for adult males.” PC 290.06 states that “every eligible person” shall be scored and further explains that an “eligible person” is determined “pursuant to the official Coding Rules designated for use with the risk assessment instrument by the author or any risk assessment instrument (SARATSO) selected by the SARATSO Review Committee.”

The Static-99R is not validated on and therefore not recommended to be used on the following populations, individuals assigned female at birth, those whose only sexual offense was committed when they were an adolescent (under the age of 17), consensual sex between similar age peers, individuals who have possession of child sexual exploitation materials, and individuals whose sexual offense was not sexually motivated, such as human sex trafficking.

The Static-99R should not be scored on individuals ineligible for scoring per the Static-99R Coding Rules. Given the number of decisions that are tied to this designation, it is important that

California use evidence-based methods for determining HRSO status. In the absence of a validated risk, Structured Professional Judgement (SPJ) by a trained and qualified individual is recommended. The full guidelines can be found on SARATSO's website.

### **Juvenile Recidivism Assessment Tool**

Prior to the California Juvenile Justice realignment, SARATSO had selected the Juvenile Sex Offense Recidivism Risk Assessment Tool – II (JSORRAT-II) to assess risk of sexual reoffense for juveniles. Welfare and Institution Code (WIC) 706 states that SARATSO only be scored for juveniles transferred to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). The juvenile justice realignment closed DJJ and had the unintentional effect of eliminating SARATSO mandated scoring for juveniles. This leaves a gap of providing the courts with a juvenile's potential risk for reoffense, during the adjudication process. Changing the language in WIC 706 to a minor "who has been adjudicated for a sexual offense" would amend this oversight and restore SARATSO's ability to select and train probation officers in scoring of the selected SARATSO for this population.

### **Training**

SARATSO Review Committee selected the Static-99R for adult males to predict risk of sexual reoffense; the Stable-2007/Acute-2007 to assess dynamic risk factors related to sexual reoffense for adult males; and the Level of Services/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) for assessing violence potential. All scorers and trainers must pass an initial training and then be recertified every two years on the instrument(s) they use. Many departments and agencies rotate staff through different positions or hire new staff, which necessitates ongoing training. In addition to providing training on how to score the instruments, SARATSO also certifies trainers.

In 2025, SARATSO hosted 11 Static-99R scorer trainings; 7 LS/CMI scorer trainings; 6 Stable-2007/Acute-2007 scorer trainings, and 2 Training for Trainers (T4T) for new trainers and 2 T4T Recertification Events. SARATSO certified trainers conducted 49 agency-hosted trainings, compared to 57 trainings in 2024. The trainings certified 384 individuals on the Static-99R, 198 on the LS/CMI, and 204 on the Stable-2007/Acute-2007.

SARATSO also hosts Containment Model Trainings, which provides an overview of applying the containment model, and the evidenced-based practice of the Risks-Needs-Responsivity principals to sexual offender management and treatment. During 2025, SARATSO hosted one live training to supervising officers and agents. The training accommodated 64 individuals. To increase the

number of individuals trained, SARATSO should increase the number of trainings provided annually, utilize virtual training, and create on-demand training modules. Additional funding is needed to expand training and reach a wider audience.

### **Score Submission and Annual Report Results**

SARATSO risk instrument scores must be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ shares the submission rates with the SARATSO Review Committee annually. In 2024, the score submission rate for the Static-99R was ninety-nine percent (99 percent) for county probation departments. Through an effort of ongoing communication, training and accountability, probation departments' awareness and compliance with this mandate has consistently been high over the past few years. A survey was sent to county probation departments to clarify any issues surrounding Static-99R score submissions. The results of the survey are reported below.

Score submission for the dynamic (Stable-2007) and violence (LS/CMI) risk instruments are more difficult to track due to the constantly fluctuating numbers of offenders participating in sex offender treatment in the community. SARATSO requests data from county probation and state parole to help track the number of dynamic and violence risk assessments that should be completed. SARATSO received data from 54 out of 58 county probation departments and parole for the 2024 year. SARATSO requested the total number of registered sex offenders on probation or parole at any time during the 2024 year, and a point in time count of the total number of 290 registrants in treatment as of December 31, 2024. As of December 31, 2024, the counties who participated reported that of the 3,658 individuals under supervision, 1,601 were enrolled in treatment. Meaning, 44 percent of those supervised by probation were in treatment. This is 2 percent less than in 2023. Fifty-six percent (56%) were reported as not attending sex offense specific treatment. Of those not participating in treatment the following reasons were provided: successfully completed treatment (20%); at large (13%); in custody (12%); terminated supervision without completing treatment (11%); not court ordered either due to being placed on PRCS or court supervision (8%); and other various reasons.

Regarding state parole, there were a total of 7,097 sex offender registrants under supervision during 2024, an increase of 264 individuals. As of December 31, 2024, 6,452 supervised persons were enrolled in treatment. Of the 645 not enrolled in treatment, reasons for not attending included parolee at large status (26%), medical or mental health needs (10%), successfully

completed treatment (9%), and no reason was reported for fifty-five percent (55%) percent of the cases.

When comparing the SARATSO Annual Tracking form and DOJ Score Submission Report, the number of Stable submissions were significantly less than expected based on the number of individuals enrolled in treatment. Out of the 1,601 submissions, 739, or approximately 46 percent, of all expected Stable scores were received. This is a 6 percent increase from 2023. DOJ received 6,274 Stable-2007 scores for parolees. Not all individuals are eligible for scoring on the Stable-2007, this represents an estimated 97percent score submission rate for parole.

For the LS/CMI 1,037 scores were received for individuals on probation or Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS). This represents approximately 65 percent of those enrolled in treatment. Parole submitted 4,781 LS/CMI scores, representing approximately a 74 percent score submission rate. This is lower than in previous years.

SARATSO was able to track which agencies submitted scores for both the LS/CMI and Stable-2007 for 2024, by viewing submissions in the GEARS software system. In 2024, CASOMB had approximately 68 certified agencies. Of the 68 agencies, 51 agencies utilized GEARS to submit LS/CMI and Stable scores. Approximately 17 agencies did not submit LS/CMI scores and Stable scores via GEARS in 2024.

### **Probation Survey: Court Referrals for Static-99R Scoring of Misdemeanant Cases**

A survey was sent to all county probation departments through the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) organization. The survey was designed to elicit information about which counties are not receiving referrals to score the Static-99R, and under what circumstances. Fifty-three counties responded to the survey. Thirty counties, or 57 percent, of respondents, noted their county does not receive referrals to score the Static-99R on misdemeanor cases. Twenty-two counties, or 42 percent of respondents, reported that their county consistently receives referrals.

For the counties not receiving referrals, a variety of reasons were listed including: the court not knowing they needed to refer to probation, the lack of Presentence Investigation Reports for misdemeanor cases, the quick handling of the cases, pre-plea cases being missed, high staff turnover in the courts, and lack of probation presence for misdemeanor cases. Numerous

counties indicated they rely on the DOJ to provide them with a quarterly list of cases that have not been scored. This work-around helps to increase the score submission rate; however, it is preferred that the referrals come from the court.

A couple of counties noted they do not consistently receive referrals if the court believes the individual(s) are ineligible for scoring, such as Penal Code Section 311 cases. All cases should be referred for scoring and the SARATSO-certified scorer should determine if an individual is ineligible for scoring. Some counties noted the opposite can happen in which the court orders a case to be scored and does not accept that the person is ineligible for scoring.

The results of the survey were shared with the Judicial Council. Education of the judges, district attorneys, and court clerks about SARATSO requirements is recommended. Communication between the key stakeholders and policies for the court referring cases to probation departments for scoring all Static-99R should be implemented.

## **Research**

SARATSO has encumbered funds for a validity project for the STABLE-2007. A validity project utilizes the individuals score on the risk instrument and any recidivism events, to determine if the instrument is measuring what it states it is measuring. The project will use archival data only.

The project is in the initial stage of securing approvals to conduct the research and access the data. The project, from securing approvals to writing up the results, is estimated to last approximately two years. The research project plans to include recidivism data with up to a 10-year follow-up period.



## Appendix A

### Data on Registered Sex Offenders in California

Sex Offender Registration In Community	Registered
December 2024	75,382
December 2025	74,395

Sex Offenders In Custody	In State Prisons	In Civil Commitment (SVP)
December 2024	20,338	949
December 2025	20,669	957

Sex Offenders On Community Supervision	On State Parole	On Conditional Release (SVP)
December 2024	11,799	19
December 2025	12,096	17

Numbers reported as of January 1, 2026

Not all sex offenders who have committed a sexual offense have been detected

## Appendix B

### Data on Registered Sex Offenders by County

COUNTY	Estimated Population	Active Sex Offender Registrants in the Community	COUNTY	Estimated Population	Active Sex Offender Registrants in the Community
Alameda	1,662,482	2,146	Orange	3,175,427	2,565
Alpine	1,177	2	Placer	421,446	546
Amador	39,563	91	Plumas	18,885	50
Butte	207,525	759	Riverside	2,495,640	4,193
Calaveras	44,722	107	Sacramento	1,604,745	3,670
Colusa	22,026	53	San Benito	66,822	120
Contra Costa	1,158,225	1,332	San Bernardino	2,207,424	4,452
Del Norte	26,544	119	San Diego	3,330,139	3,695
El Dorado	190,770	335	San Francisco	842,027	990
Fresno	1,037,053	2,344	San Joaquin	805,856	1,801
Glenn	29,369	75	San Luis Obispo	279,337	427
Humboldt	133,817	383	San Mateo	748,337	668
Imperial	186,499	258	Santa Barbara	447,132	692



Inyo	18,800	44	Santa Clara	1,922,259	3,093
Kern	923,961	1,823	Santa Cruz	263,710	372
Kings	154,015	439	Shasta	180,201	706
Lake	67,254	298	Sierra	3,170	10
Lassen	28,716	96	Siskiyou	43,311	198
Los Angeles	9,876,811	13,056	Solano	449,839	857
Madera	162,599	411	Sonoma	482,848	688
Marin	254,550	140	Stanislaus	555,765	1,228
Mariposa	16,917	64	Sutter	100,257	305
Mendocino	89,827	253	Tehama	64,827	287
Merced	293,080	676	Trinity	15,884	75
Modoc	8,491	59	Tulare	487,209	1,087
Mono	12,684	17	Tuolumne	54,357	166
Monterey	438,831	665	Ventura	829,005	886
Napa	136,124	167	Yolo	225,433	360
Nevada	100,354	147	Yuba	85,023	329
			<b>Total:</b>	<b>39,529,101</b>	<b>60,875</b>

State of California, Department of Finance, E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State with Annual percentage January 1, 2026

Active Sex Offender Registrants by County made available by the California Department of Justice as of December 31, 2025





[www.CASOMB.org](http://www.CASOMB.org)