

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING ILLINOIS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AUTHORITY

**December 7, 2007, 9:15 a.m.
120 S. Riverside Plaza, 21st Floor
Chicago, Illinois**

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Sorosky convened the regular meeting of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and asked Jack Cutrone, the Authority's General Counsel to call the roll.

In addition to the Chairman, other Authority Members in attendance were:

Chief David Bradford
Clerk Dorothy Brown
Sheriff Thomas Dart
Sheriff Jerry Dawson
Mr. Brad Demuzio
Ms. Barbara Engel
Mr. Norbert Goetten
Mr. Theodore A. Gottfried
Clerk Becky Jansen
Mr. Thomas J. Jurkanin
Honorable William Mudge
Ms. Maryana Spyropoulos
Mr. John Z. Toscas

Chairman's Remarks

Before calling for approval of the minutes of the September 7, 2007 Authority Meeting, Chairman Sorosky announced that Authority Board Member Ted Gottfried, Director of the Office of the State Appellate Defender, was retiring and that this would be his last Authority Meeting. Chairman Sorosky lauded Mr. Gottfried as an excellent lawyer, devoted to his clients. He added that Ted Gottfried always has been a strong advocate, vigorously asserting the rights of the accused to assure that the criminal justice system remained fair. Chairman Sorosky thanked Mr. Gottfried for his work on the Authority Board representing his constituency, and said he would be missed.

In response, Mr. Gottfried stated that he enjoyed his affiliation with the Authority Board. He remarked that he felt it was important to work together with all sides of the criminal justice system since it is one system, and to illustrate his belief, he recounted that when he started as a Public Defender at 26th Street, his best friends were the two State's

Attorneys in the courtroom with him, and the police officers who came to court. In conclusion, he thanked Chairman Sorosky for his comments.

{Chairman Sorosky moved that the Authority praise Ted Gottfried for his distinguished service to the Board and to the State of Illinois. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Toscas and approved by unanimous voice vote.}

Approval of the Minutes of the September 7, 2007 Authority Meeting

{Mr. Toscas made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 7, 2007 Authority Meeting. The motion was seconded by Sheriff Dart and approved by unanimous voice vote.}

Executive Director's Remarks

Director Levin updated the Board about the \$810,000 that was taken out of the budget as discussed during the last Authority Board Meeting. She reiterated that the \$810,000 was the Authority's state match for the federal dollars that it administers. The Director then reported that after the Board met in December, she had a number of meetings with CMS, and with the Governor's Office, both with then Deputy Chief of staff for Public Safety Jill Morgenthaler, Deputy Governor Louanner Peters, and Deputy Chief of Staff of Operations Bob Greenlee. She said that through the hard work of Authority General Counsel and Chief of Staff Jack Cutrone, and that of Acting Chief Financial Officer Ron Litwin, there was a solution in large part.

She explained that the Authority had some overmatch from other programs that could be used to help match the dollars. She added that the Authority also now is spending some of the federal dollars this year and postponing the match to next year to obtain the General Revenue in order for that to happen. The Director continued to say that with that ability, along with the fact that CMS was paying the Authority's rent until December 31, there were enough funds to manage without having to do anything that would affect employees, cut back any programs, or make other reductions, though more General Revenue will be needed next year. She also said that the amount of money that IPSAN owed the Authority, which put the Authority in debt with CMS, was forgiven by CMS.

The Director stated that for those reasons, it was decided not to ask the Board to write a letter to the legislature concerning the Authority's funding. She remarked that hopefully the budget will pass on time and that everything will be satisfactory; if not, she said that staff will be back to report at that time.

Turning to the Authority's move, she recounted that the reason the Authority occupies its current facility was largely because of the ALERTS police information systems. Thus she said that a move at some point was anticipated. She said that the lease was for 10 years, signed approximately four to five years ago.

She reported that the Authority was working with CMS on the move, with ICJIA Associate Director for Administrative Services Hank Anthony doing an excellent job toward that goal. She said that CMS advised her that the move would be into a temporary space for about a year because CMS cannot have temporary arrangements longer than 364 days. The Director said that the current plan is to move the Authority for about a year to 32 West Randolph on a number of different floors, which are not contiguous and which CMS is switching to best meet the Authority's needs. She said that it appeared that the Authority ultimately would move to a large space at the Thompson Center.

The Director then talked about the VOI/TIS grants situation stating that the Authority had received a one-year extension on the 10 year program, which expired on September 29, 2007. She said that all the local money had been spent, with a focus on using it for jails, and that DOC as well as Marilyn Mazewski and Steve Bernstein of the Authority's staff had done their best to try to spend the money. She added that the Authority was able to accomplish at least one innovative program with the consent of the Justice Department. She explained that it involved retrofitting the Department of Mental Health forensic wings to try to alleviate crowding in jails for some of the mental health forensic patients by returning them to DMH, thereby freeing up bed space for violent offenders. But she said that there still is a large lapse, primarily arising from the fact that Grayville and Hopkins Park were not built. She stated that the lapsed amount will be approximately \$20 million, which at one point ICJIA thought would be almost \$40 million.

The Director then said that there was good news to report, that an award had been named for Becky Block of the R&A unit, who heads homicide research and a number of innovate programs. She explained that it will be given annually by the Homicide Research Working Group for the best program by a practitioner to reduce homicide. She added that although Ms. Block is officially retired, she works for the Authority 75 days per year under the state system and hopefully will continue to come back 75 days in future years to help the Authority.

The Director also said that the Governor's Office is going to be unveiling an exciting new violence prevention initiative and that the Authority is going to be asked to contribute to it. She stated that it will be discussed at the next IJCIA Budget Committee and prior to that by the JCEC. She explained that the initiative will be an attempt to have community-based efforts fight juvenile violent crime, with the communities asked to develop the plans. She then inquired if anyone had any questions.

There followed a lengthy discussion of the Authority's proposed move to 32 W. Randolph, with various Board members asking questions and making suggestions as to possible actions that the Board might pursue. Director Levin said she would send an e-mail to Deputy Governor Peters, Bob Greenlee of the Governor's Office, and CMS Acting Director Maureen O'Donnell stating the Board's displeasure not only with having to move twice in less than a year but with the location as well, particularly in light of Sheriff Dart's description of the building's safety and security issues.

Chairman Sorosky then suggested that given that the Authority may be able to remain in its present location for a few months longer, it might be wiser for the Board to write a letter recommending that it be allowed to do so and that the Authority start searching for permanent space in a publicly owned building other than the Thompson Center in a more private setting. He stated that the letter also might emphasize the financial benefits of moving only once per Clerk Brown's suggestion, and that it additionally cite the detriments and deficiencies of 32 East Randolph described by Sheriff Dart. He said he thought such a message would have more currency and validity without offending anyone rather than being a meaningless protest letter.

Director Levin said that when similar arguments have been made and other locations suggested previously, they were rejected. She added that the Authority's finding other space on its own is not possible under the current rules, with Chairman Sorosky clarifying that he meant suggesting other places to CMS. At that point, Mr. Toscas asked Chairman Sorosky if he could make a motion summarizing the discussion.

{Mr. Toscas moved that the Board authorize the Chairman and Executive Director to prepare a letter to CMS with copies to the Governor's office and other pertinent individuals requesting that the Authority's temporary move be reconsidered and that its relocation take place at such time as the permanent facility is ready and open. Director Goetten seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.}

Director Levin thanked the Board and advised that she would call the Deputy Governor and let her know of its discussion.

Budget Committee Report by Associate Director for Federal and State Grants Unit John Chojnacki in the Absence of Committee Chair Eugene E. Murphy, Jr.

Mr. Chojnacki reported that the Budget Committee met to discuss funding plans for the following federal programs: Violence Against Women Act (VAWA); and the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA), saying that there were no designations made at the meeting. He stated that the Budget Committee voted to implement a future VAWA federal awards, which rendered designation reductions necessary, as recommended by the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee at its October 9, 2007 meeting and subsequent recommendations by Authority staff as follows:

number one, if necessary, designation reductions would be made by determining what percentage of current funding within the particular VAWA fund areas, such as law enforcement, prosecution, victim services, court and discretionary, is dedicated to each continuing program and making the next year's designation recommendations per that same percentage relative to federal award amounts dedicated to each VAWA fund area;

number two, no program's designation will be reduced by more than 20 percent the first year, and no program's designation will be reduced by more than 30 percent relative to its current spending the second year, and

number three, any funding recommendations will be made per the above guidelines and brought before a future Budget Committee meeting for approval.

He continued to say that any future VAWA designations including designations for the continuations of currently funded programs reduced per the recommendations above will be presented to the Budget Committee for approval at future Budget Committee meetings.

He added that in the area of VOCA, the Budget Committee voted to implement a future VOCA federal award rendering designation reductions necessary, based on the funding recommendations made by the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee at its October 9, 2007 meeting and subsequent Authority staff recommendations as follows:

number one, if necessary, reductions from current funding levels of up to 20 percent would be made for its future designations;

number two, 20 percent would be the maximum reduction to any single continuing program if fund levels stay the same, i.e., slightly smaller reductions across the board would be necessary if the VOCA federal fiscal year '08 award is equal to the VOCA federal year '07 award;

number three, staff will exercise discretion in the use of future VOCA federal awards prior to making funding recommendations to the Budget Committee, which may be influenced by future VOCA federal award amounts and/or the analysis of individual grantee's budgets and/or lapsing funds, and

number four, any funding recommendations will be made per the above guidelines and brought before a future Budget Committee meeting for approval and any future VOCA designations including the designations for the continuations of currently funded programs possibly reduced by the recommendations above will presented to the Budget Committee for approval at future meetings.

Mr. Chojnacki concluded his report. In the discussion that followed, it was clarified that Mr. Chojnacki's report was only informational, and that more information would be made available before the next Budget Committee meeting in early January. Director Levin added that letters had not yet been sent to the grantees but would be shortly to let people know what the situation is.

In discussing when the next Budget Committee meeting would be held, Director Levin said it needed to be in early January because one of the matters is the Governor's violence prevention program that he is hoping to launch in January and the issue of funding for it.

Fiscal Report by Acting Chief Financial Officer Ron Litwin

Chairman Sorosky then called upon Ron Litwin for his fiscal report. Mr. Litwin said that he would first discuss the actual expenses for FY07 and then expenses and obligations for the first four months of FY08. Directing attention to the FY07 General Revenue section, he pointed out that expenditures were less than budgeted in the personal services area, as well as in the associated lines of retirement, FICA, and group insurance, because of a number of vacant positions.

He moved to the General Revenue schedule for the contractual line where expenditures were less by \$132,000. He explained that this amount was due to a \$79,000 favorable variance in the not otherwise classified contractual line items, along with numerous other small items that accounted for the remaining favorable variance of \$53,000. He then turned to the EDP favorable variance of \$60,000 that was primarily due to a lower level of expenditures for professional services and reduced purchases of EDP equipment.

Mr. Litwin next discussed the Criminal Justice Information Systems Trust Fund, the expenditures for which had not changed since the last Authority meeting. At that point, Director Goetten asked if the General Revenue funds of \$489,000 lapsed, with Mr. Litwin responding affirmatively.

Turning to the Criminal Justice Trust Fund, he said that the federal spending for the year was lower than budgeted primarily because of the favorable variance of the \$19 million in the VOI/TIS program. He then pointed out that the \$810,000 in the next section for General Revenue was spent 100 percent. He added that the \$150,000 in the miscellaneous category represents the Capital Punishment Reform Act under the direction of Chairman Thomas Sullivan and the favorable variance of \$63,000 is due to lower than budgeted professional services expenses and again the not otherwise classified contractual expenditures.

Mr. Litwin noted that the Shared Services line item shows a favorable variance because most of the work of consolidation that was budgeted was actually performed in Springfield so there were no expenses in Chicago. Commenting on the Criminal Justice Information Fund, he said that it was created for nonfederal grants awarded basically to the Research and Analysis unit, and the favorable variance of \$400,000 was due to the fact that funding for the level of budgeted activity did not materialize. Discussing the last fund, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant, he said that expenses remained under the budgeted levels. He then asked if there were any questions concerning his recap of FY07.

In response, Barbara Engel asked if the Criminal Justice Information Fund is for the Authority's own research, with Mr. Litwin replying that it was established for nonfederal funding moneys and that the Authority did not receive any in that category last year.

He then directed attention to the first four months of activity for FY08 and commented that the month of July expenditures were authorized by an emergency budget bill because

of the problems that the State had enacting a budget. He said that the FY08 budget bill was signed by the Governor on August 23, 2007, and prior to that date in August only payroll expenditures were authorized so that the level of expenditures should normalize on a year-to-date basis as the fiscal year progresses. Mr. Litwin also noted that there is no further activity for the Criminal Justice Information Systems Trust Fund as it has been privatized.

Turning to the Criminal Justice Trust Fund federal expenditures and obligations, he said that activity is 67 percent of the appropriation primarily due to rollover obligations from the prior year for the various programs and that is the reason it may seem high being only four months into the fiscal year. He then explained that the next section of the General Revenue matching expenses was the line item that was vetoed and the \$13,000 represents the expenses that were incurred through the emergency budget period. He repeated that the Criminal Justice Information Fund was created for nonfederal grants awarded to the Research and Analysis Unit, and the appropriation of \$400,000 is established to provide spending authority as grant funding is received, with none so far for FY08.

Finally, he stated that the Juvenile Accountability expenses remain under the budgeted levels basically because of the slow start to the year referenced earlier.

In response to Mr. Litwin's call for questions or comments, Mr. Goetten asked if the Authority anticipates filing a petition for supplemental appropriations in light of the reductions with Mr. Litwin saying it does not.

Approval of S.T.O.P. Violence Against Women in Illinois A Multi-Year Plan: FFY06-08

Chairman Sorosky then called upon Ron Reichgelt to relate information concerning the Authority's VAWA funding. Mr. Reichgelt presented the revised VAWA implementation plan that was developed and submitted to the federal government last year as a three-year plan for the implementation of the Authority's VAWA violence against women funds over those three years. He stated that because of the 2005 reauthorization of VAWA, the Authority was required to submit a revised plan explaining the use of its victim services funding per a new regulation.

He said that the VAWA portion of money is split five different ways: prosecution, law enforcement, victim services, courts, and discretionary funds. He explained that the victim services portion, which comprises 30 percent of the overall award, is now being required to set aside 10 percent of the 30 percent of the Authority's award for underserved populations. He continued to say that the Authority needed to revise the VAWA plan to show how that requirement was going to be met in Illinois. He stressed that this plan had already been approved by the Board last year and submitted to the federal government, but that it was only this one section that had to be revised. He added that in Illinois the Authority's victim services money is split evenly between the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence and the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault, with each of those agencies utilizing their victim services funds almost 100 percent for

underserved populations. Therefore, he said that an approval of the plan with the revision of the section on page 54 -- unserved and underserved areas of the population – was being sought, i.e., how the Authority’s victim services money will be utilized in Illinois to meet the requirement of serving underserved populations.

Mr. Reichgelt asked if there were any questions, with Director Jurkanin inquiring if a motion were needed for approval.

{Upon an affirmative response, Mr. Jurkanin so moved. Ms. Engel seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.}

Sex Offenders – The Adam Walsh Act and How It May Impact Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Act Funding, Presentation by Jack Cutrone

Chairman Sorosky thanked Mr. Reichgelt. He then gave background on the next topic involving a relatively new area of criminal law, sexual offender activities and sexual offender programs and requirements after conviction of a sexual offense. He introduced Jack Cutrone to speak about these matters, with Mr. Cutrone focusing on the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006. Mr. Cutrone explained that President Bush signed it into law on July 27, 2006.

Mr. Cutrone said he would be discussing Title I of that Act, which involves sex offender registration and notification, also known as SORNA.

He pointed out that in 1996, the federal government passed the Jacob Wetterling Act, which attempted to make uniform some of the varying state sex offender registration provisions, but since then, Wetterling has been amended, with a patchwork of differing state statutes regarding sex offenders.

Mr. Cutrone highlighted that the purpose of these registration laws is to promote public safety by giving the community information about sex offenders and also by making sex offenders feel they may be under scrutiny and thereby hopefully reduce recidivism. He added that the notification portions of the program go to parents and the public generally and are available for potential employers, schools, and private agencies providing services to children. He said that the Adam Walsh Act was intended to make uniform among all jurisdictions certain minimum standards regarding sex offender registration, with one of its goals to prevent sex offenders from disappearing from view by moving to another state, as well as from jurisdiction shopping.

Further he outlined the various areas of reform on which the Adam Walsh Act concentrated: extending the class of sex offenders and offenses for which registration is required; making consistent the registration requirements in the jurisdictions where an individual sex offender may reside, work or go to school; requiring that more registration information be given and in-person appearances to update information; increasing generally the period of registration for sex offenders, and broadening the availability of information on sex offenders through websites and other means.

Mr. Cutrone related that the Adam Walsh Act, creates three tiers of sex offenders. He outlined each tier and its requirements. He added that the tier system also controls the duration of registration and frequency of reporting, and went on to define the sex offenses, which are criminal offenses, under Adam Walsh.

Other aspects of the Act's registration requirements he covered included: retroactive registration, types of registration information, initial registration, responsibility to keep information current, and the duty of the jurisdiction. Mr. Cutrone then turned to the Act's notification provisions. He discussed notification to the public by posting on the sex offender website, targeted notifications, and information available to law enforcement. He further outlined mandatory, discretionary and prohibited website information, along with other required website information and registry information available to law enforcement only.

Mr. Cutrone next turned to the issue of compliance with the Adam Walsh Act, which is required on the third anniversary of the signing of the Act into law, July 27, 2009. He said that if Illinois does not comply with the Adam Walsh Act, the Authority will lose 10 percent of its funding every year under the Justice Assistance Grant program, which currently is the Authority's major source of funds. He noted that some jurisdictions such as California opted not to comply, forfeiting their funding and staying within their own existing registration requirements. Mr. Cutrone pointed out that Illinois's current registration act is close to compliance, actually having a broader class of offenses requiring registration than those of the Adam Walsh Act and including address verification not required by the Adam Walsh Act.

He then addressed the compliance issues in Illinois, i.e., Illinois requires less information at the time of registration; and, what he characterized as a major concern, some offenders who will be Tier II offenders and therefore subject to a 25-year registration term are now subject only to a ten-year registration term in Illinois. He also cited retroactivity as problematic as far as some members of the legislature are concerned, along with juvenile registration legislation that passed almost unanimously through the Illinois legislature that is contrary to Adam Walsh. Another issue he raised pertained to the Adam Walsh Act software requirement of being able to share information with other jurisdictions, which is not currently possible with the system the state now uses.

In closing, Mr. Cutrone reported that compliance will be determined by the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART). He said solutions for full compliance in Illinois include: passing new legislation, and changing software to meet the required capability, which is being developed by the Department of Justice and will be available without cost to the states. He added that grants also will be offered to help states make the transition to comply with the Adam Walsh Act.

Sex Offenders – Housing Restrictions for Sex Offenders, Presentation by Alyssa Williams-Schafer

Mr. Cutrone introduced Alyssa Williams-Schafer, Coordinator for Sex Offender Services for the Department of Corrections to speak on housing restrictions for sex offenders. Mr. Cutrone explained that as Coordinator for Sex Offender Services for the Department of Corrections, Ms. Williams-Schafer oversees various of DOC's programs including: the Sexually Violent Persons Evaluation Unit, Sexually Dangerous Persons Treatment Program, Chicago Special Needs Treatment Center, and the East St. Louis Sex Offender Treatment Program. He added that she also coordinates DOC's tracking program for sex offenders, oversees the approval or denial of sex offender parole placements, is an administrator of licensing for transitional housing in Illinois, conducts training for staff working with sex offenders, works with state and local entities regarding sex offender legislation and is the DOC's representative on the Illinois Sex Offender Management Board.

Ms. Williams-Schafer said that she wanted to talk about legislation that has passed regarding sex offenders and some implications of that legislation on different entities throughout the state. She pointed out that there has been an influx of sex offenders legislation passed in about the last five years pertaining to residency restrictions, and registration requirement changes. She stated that specifically she wanted to talk about residency restrictions, citing the fact that Illinois has had a 500-foot law residency restriction for some time.

She remarked that 22 states now have residency restrictions ranging anywhere from 500 to 2,000 feet, contingent upon whether the parole or probation officer decides the particular offender is a risk to offend against children and stipulates some type of residency restriction. She explained that the Illinois 500-foot restriction for sex offenders of child victims means within 500 feet of a playground, a day care center, a school or any facility that exclusively provides services to minors under the age of 18.

She discussed other states' footage requirements, including Iowa and the City of Dubuque where sex offenders cannot live within a whole particular area and are placed in rural locations. She said that Illinois has been successful in maintaining its 500-foot residency restriction although several legislators have proposed 750 feet, 1,000 feet, and recently a 2,000 residency restriction. She added that when Iowa passed its residency restriction, one of the Representatives from the Rock Island area decided that he would try that for Illinois.

She said that after having discussing the ramifications of that potential residency restriction on the state with him, he opted not to move forward. She added that instead, he created an interstate task force whereby Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, and Illinois all met to discuss the impact of sex offender legislation on the states and how to work together to make things function better on an interstate basis as well.

Ms. Williams-Schafer then talked about the efficacy of residency restrictions citing several news articles and pieces of research saying that they are not necessarily effective. She added that they are not proven to prevent recidivism of sex offenders, with research indicating that about 92 percent of sex offenders know their victims. She said the majority groom their victims by getting into the family and do not go into schools or snatch a child off the side of the road.

She said that Illinois has gone over and above the footage requirement and described legislation that was passed in 2005, HB 350, Public Act 94-0161, that says no sex offender who is under supervision whether it be parole, probation or court supervision can reside with another sex offender in the same address, in basically the same residence, the same apartment building, the same apartment complex, the same condominium unit or the same condominium complex as any other individual that they know has committed a sex offense. She added that this piece of legislation can make it difficult to track sex offenders.

Ms. Williams-Schafer went on to describe the Department's specialized unit of parole agents who only supervise sex offenders. She stated that the agents' case load levels have been reduced to better manage sex offenders, and contact standards have been increased, with some of the highest contact standards within the state. In addition she said that the parole agents do a monthly check to ensure that sex offenders are in compliance with the law, known as a code 22. She outlined an offender tracking system and automated management system used to do case management, including checking the state police registry for every address of every sex offender on parole to ensure there is no other sex offender residing there.

Ms. Williams-Schafer pointed out that besides the one-sex-offender-per-address law, the Illinois Department of Corrections undertook efforts in combination with it such as licensing transitional living homes, which she supervises and personally visits and licenses. She said that previously DOC contracted with people who were paid to provide a service; now the only licensing exemptions are a DHS home, DCFS home, or licensed medical facility.

She listed a series of stipulations that are placed on the transitional homes by the law and by administrative rule created by DOC. She said that she must personally approve all treatment plans for every sex offender in the transitional homes regardless if they are on parole, probation or court supervision and that the facilities must notify the police department, public/private elementary and secondary schools, public libraries, and each residential home or apartment complex within 500 feet. She added that the Illinois State Police Web Site now indicates the particular homes on their website and there are other mandatory rules, including the need for architectural approval, and emergency and operational plans.

She remarked that because of the 500-foot restriction, along with the other transitional living home regulations, and the one-sex-offender-per-address situation, there are problems finding homes for sex offenders. She said that currently there were 1,100 sex

offenders on parole, and as of five or six days ago, 467 individuals sitting within the Department of Corrections who have reached their period of parole or mandatory supervised release with no place to go. She added that everything possible has been done to try to place them yet no approved site has been found because they cannot meet the requirements of the legislation or the requirements of parole supervision.

She related a number of options that have been explored to try to provide a solution, but which were met with community opposition, and in some jurisdictions, have resulted in extending the 500-foot residency restriction to 1,000 feet. She said that other states have been contacted for ideas and unfortunately are encountering the same difficulties, with those offenders not placed, returned to prison. She added that a federal class action lawsuit is now pending against the Department of Corrections for violating sex offenders' civil liberties by not releasing them from prison.

She said that she is hesitant to release 467 sex offenders into the community homeless because they will not be able to be supervised, but at the same time she does not want to house 467 individuals who need to be out on parole. She said she wanted them out in the community being supervised and being treated by sex offender management or an approved provider. She added that those doing their parole time on the inside are coming out with no supervision or treatment requirements and do not even have to provide an address where they are going to live.

In conclusion, Ms. Williams-Schafer said that as per her remarks, the issue of sexual offenders presented a difficult dilemma and she welcomed ideas for better dealing with the problem. A discussion then ensued with questions by Chairman Sorosky, covering the value of registration requirements, residency restrictions and loitering laws, and Ms. Engel addressing the need for more money for research on sex offender treatment efficacy, treatment itself, and public education.

In response, Ms. Williams Smith-Schafer recounted some discussions that took place within the legislature along those lines, but said that it was difficult to have politicians publicly support those concepts or to quell overzealous legislation because they do not want to appear that they are not harsh on crime. She reiterated that housing for sexual offenders was a very a problematical issue, often causing situations that impeded their obtaining available supervision and treatment. Thanking the Board for inviting her, Ms. Williams-Schafer added that her presentation was available on the Illinois State Bar Association website and that she would be happy to send it to anyone who wanted a copy.

Chairman Sorosky then complimented and thanked Ms. Williams-Schafer for her presentation. Receiving no response to a call for old or new business, he asked for a motion to adjourn, saying that this might be the Authority Board's last Board meeting in its present location.

{Ms. Engel's motion to adjourn was seconded by Director Jurkanin and passed by unanimous voice vote.}