



Susan Montee, JD, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

MISSOURI SEXUAL
OFFENDER
REGISTRATION
PROGRAM
FOLLOW-UP

August 2010
Report No. 2010-94



auditor.mo.gov



Susan Montee, JD, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

YELLOW SHEET

Findings in the follow-up audit of the Missouri Sexual Offender Registration Program

Sexual Offender Registration Program Improvements

Sexual offender registration compliance has significantly improved, with statewide registration non-compliance reduced from an estimated 36 percent in 2002 to approximately 7 percent as of March 31, 2010. In addition, the General Assembly, Department of Corrections (DOC) and Division of Probation and Parole (DPP), and Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) have generally implemented the recommendations in the prior audit report. The General Assembly passed various legislation since the last audit and the law enforcement agencies made various changes and other enhancements to their records and procedures to address recommendations. These actions contributed to the reduction in the rate of non-compliance with the registration requirements. As of March 31, 2010, Missouri had 10,549 actively registered sex offenders in 114 counties and one city (St. Louis) not within a county.

Further Improvements Needed

Further improvements are still needed to ensure (1) previously exempt offenders have re-registered, (2) further efforts are made to achieve substantial compliance with Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) requirements, (3) data matches are performed to help locate non-compliant offenders, (4) current notification procedures are properly performed, and (5) timely evaluation and treatment services are provided.

A June 2009 Missouri Supreme Court ruling resulted in 4,465 previously exempt sexual offenders being required to re-register on the sexual offender registry; however, 1,445 (32 percent) of these offenders had not re-registered as of March 31, 2010. In July 2009, the MSHP mailed letters to previously exempt offenders advising them of the June 2009 court decision and directing them to report and register with the chief law enforcement official in their county of residence within 3 days, unless they had already re-registered. It was initially the intent of the MSHP to allow applicable offenders 3 months to re-register; however, many of the letters came back undeliverable. Since October 2009, the MSHP has attempted to locate current addresses of applicable offenders and add them back to the registry.

In July 2006, federal legislation (SORNA) was signed into law, providing a comprehensive set of minimum standards for sex offender registration and notification. All states were initially mandated to meet SORNA requirements by July 2009. In March 2009, the MSHP submitted a SORNA compliance package to the applicable federal office for evaluation. In March 2010, the MSHP received the results of the federal review of the compliance package submitted for Missouri. While the federal authorities recognized and commended the state for the efforts made thus far, they concluded that Missouri had not yet achieved substantial compliance with the SORNA requirements. MSHP officials indicated necessary improvements can be made to achieve substantial compliance with the SORNA requirements by



Susan Montee, JD, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

YELLOW SHEET

the summer of 2011, if the needed legislative changes are enacted in the 2011 legislative session. The MSHP has requested and received approval from federal officials for an extension (to July 2011) to allow sufficient time to address current deficiencies.

Missouri employers had reported salaries or wages earned in recent periods by non-compliant offenders. However, none of the local law enforcement officials we visited accessed available current wage data to help locate and pursue non-compliant offenders. In addition, although the MSHP has access to state wage information, the current agreement does not provide for batch matching capability.

The prior audit reported local sexual offender registration units were not always made aware when an offender on the registration list had been incarcerated. The DPP addressed this problem in 2005 with an amendment to its procedures. However, during visits to some DPP offices, it was determined three of eight DPP offices visited had not properly implemented the new procedures.

Officials at the various DPP offices visited indicated sexual offender treatment is a critical aspect of the DPP process to help prevent offenders from committing further sex crimes. However, because some offenders were not able to pay for treatment and state funding has not been appropriated or designated for this purpose, treatment has not always been provided in a timely manner. According to DPP estimates, indigent sex offenders need evaluation and treatment services costing of over \$600,000 annually; however, the amount of recent funding provided for this purpose has been substantially below this amount.

All reports are available on our Web site: auditor.mo.gov

Contents

State Auditor's Letter	2
<hr/>	
Chapter 1	
Introduction	Background 3 Scope and Methodology 5
<hr/>	
Chapter 2	
Improvements and Other Developments Related to the Sexual Offender Registration Program	Compliance with Registration Requirements 7 Implementation of Prior Recommendations 8 Status of SORNA Implementation 13
<hr/>	
Chapter 3	
Further Improvements Needed in Managing the Program	Many Previously Exempt Offenders Have Not Re-Registered 17 Substantial Compliance With SORNA Requirements Has Not Yet Been Achieved 18 Data Matches Could Help Locate Non-Compliant Offenders 18 Some DPP Offices Did Not Implement New Procedures 19 Indigent Offenders Not Always Provided Timely Treatment 20 Recommendations 21 Agency Comments 22
<hr/>	
Appendix	Sexual Offender Registration Compliance 26
<hr/>	
Tables	3.1: Non-Compliant Offenders Match to State Wage Information for Third Quarter of 2008 and Previous Four Quarters 19 I.1: Sexual Offender Registration - Number of Sexual Offenders and Non-Compliance Rate by County at March 31, 2010 26

Abbreviations

CLEO	Chief Law Enforcement Official
DOC	Department of Corrections
DLIR	Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
DPP	Division of Probation and Parole
HB	House Bill
MSHP	Missouri State Highway Patrol
MULES	Missouri Uniform Law Enforcement System
RSMo	Missouri Revised Statutes
SAO	State Auditor's Office
SB	Senate Bill
SMART	Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (office)
SORNA	Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act



SUSAN MONTEE, JD, CPA
Missouri State Auditor

Honorable Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Governor
and
Members of the General Assembly
and
George Lombardi, Director
Department of Corrections
and
Ellis McSwain, Chairman of the Board
Board of Probation and Parole
and
John M. Britt, Director
Department of Public Safety
and
Colonel Ron K. Replogle, Superintendent
Missouri State Highway Patrol
Jefferson City, Missouri

This is a follow-up audit of Report No. 2002-41, *Missouri Sexual Offender Registration Program*, issued in May 2002. Objectives of this audit were to 1) determine the extent registration compliance has improved since the 2002 report, 2) assess the status of prior audit recommendations, and 3) determine the extent applicable law enforcement officials have implemented new sexual offender registration requirements mandated by the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA), which is Title I of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (a federal law).

During the current audit, we determined that registration compliance has improved; the General Assembly, the Department of Corrections (DOC) and the Division of Probation and Parole (DPP), and the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) have generally implemented the prior recommendations; and progress is underway in implementing the SORNA requirements. However, further improvements are still needed to ensure (1) previously exempt offenders have re-registered, (2) further efforts are made to achieve substantial compliance with SORNA requirements, (3) data matches are performed to help locate non-compliant offenders, (4) current notification procedures are properly performed, and (5) timely evaluation and treatment services are provided.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform our audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides such a basis. This report was prepared under the direction of John Luetkemeyer. Key contributors to this report included Greg Slinkard and Ben Douglas.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Montee".

Susan Montee, JD, CPA
State Auditor

Introduction

Background

Establishment of the sexual offender registration program was mandated in the federal Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. That act set forth minimum requirements states must meet regarding sexual offender registration or face the loss of some federal funding. Subsequently, the state of Missouri passed legislation¹ in 1994 creating the Missouri Sex Offender Registry, which was implemented in January 1995. Initially, all convictions/pleas related to sexual offenses under Chapter 566, RSMo, dating from January 1, 1979, were offenses requiring registration.

The purpose of the sexual offender registration law is to require persons found guilty of sexual and certain other offenses to register their name, address, and other information with local law enforcement officials and to make a listing of those offenders available to area citizens. The law makes it possible for citizens to obtain a listing of sexual offenders living in their local area, allowing an informed vigilance toward the protection of their families.

Sexual offender registration in Missouri is primarily managed by the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) at the state level and by the chief law enforcement officials (CLEOs) at the local level. The CLEOs represent county sheriffs and the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. These law enforcement agencies are assisted by the criminal court system, and the Department of Corrections (DOC) and its Division of Probation and Parole (DPP).

The MSHP is responsible for maintaining a central database of sex offenders required to register and an Internet website available to the public. CLEOs are responsible for maintaining sex offender registry information for their jurisdictions, ensuring offenders register or verify their information at the appropriate intervals, and providing updated registration and offender status change information to the MSHP. When the courts place sexual offenders on probation for offenses committed, the courts either notify offenders of their duty to register or they are notified of this responsibility by DPP officers. The DOC is responsible for notifying all applicable offenders of their duty to register as sex offenders upon release from incarceration from a correctional facility. When releasing an offender, the DOC is also responsible for notifying the MSHP and the CLEO of the county where the offender will be residing. If the offenders are under DPP supervision after release from prison, the supervising parole officers are responsible for ensuring they comply with the terms of their parole,

¹ Sections 566.600 to 566.625, RSMo. This section of law was repealed in 1997 and replaced with Sections 589.400 to 589.425, RSMo.

including meeting the sex offender registration and verification requirements.

Significant changes have been made to sexual offender registration laws since 1994. In 1997, state law was revised and registration requirements were expanded to include certain other crimes, including kidnapping, prostitution, incest, child abuse, and use of a child in a sexual performance. In 1998, the law was revised again to include a 90-day verification requirement for persistent and predatory sexual offenders and certain other offenders. In 2000, registration requirements were again expanded to require offenders who committed misdemeanor offenses to register. In October 2000, a Missouri Supreme Court decision,² limited the registration requirements to offenders moving into a county instead of to all offenders as under previous interpretations. Under this ruling, many offenders were not required to register.

The State Auditor's office (SAO) issued an audit report regarding this program and compliance with its requirements, (No. 2002-41, *Missouri Sexual Offender Registration Program*, issued in May 2002). That audit reported, based on a review of records in certain counties, approximately 36 percent of sexual offenders in Missouri had failed to meet their most recent registration/verification requirement. There were about 8,000 known sexual offenders at that time. In addition, various problems were reported that limited effectiveness of the sexual offender registration program in Missouri. To address problems cited in that report, the prior audit recommended the General Assembly revise or establish various state laws to help improve effectiveness of the sexual offender registration program. In addition, recommendations were made to the DOC and the MSHP for improving the registration program. See Chapter 2 of this report regarding improvements made to the sex offender registration program, including the implementation status of recommendations in the prior report.

Since the prior audit report was issued, various legislation and court cases have expanded and/or impacted the sexual offender registration program and sexual offender information available to the public. However, in July 2006, the Missouri Supreme Court³ determined the requirement for sexual offenders to register for convictions/pleas related to sexual offenses that occurred prior to January 1, 1995, violated the Missouri constitutional prohibition against laws which are retrospective. As a result of this court decision, approximately 3,800 affected offenders were placed on an exempt status listing and were no longer required to register. In June 2007, in a

² *J.S. v. Beard*, 28 S.W.3d 875 (Mo. 2000)

³ *Doe v. Phillips*, 194 S.W.3d 833 (Mo. 2006)

similar case,⁴ the Missouri Supreme Court ruled a law was retrospective (and therefore, unconstitutional) if it required an individual to register as a sex offender when the conviction occurred prior to the date registration was required for that offense. This decision resulted in additional sexual offenders exempted from the sexual offender registration requirements.

On July 27, 2006, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act (a federal law, P.L. 109-248) was signed into law. Title I of this Act, entitled the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA), provided a comprehensive set of minimum standards for sex offender registration and notification in the United States. Important areas of reform under the SORNA include, but are not limited to 1) extending the classes of sex offenders and sex offenses for which registration is required, 2) consistently requiring sex offenders to register and keep registration current, 3) requiring more extensive registration information, 4) requiring periodic in-person appearances by registrants to verify and update registration information, 5) broadening the availability of information concerning registered sex offenders to the public through posting on sex offender websites, and 6) adopting reforms affecting required duration of registration. All states were initially mandated to meet SORNA requirements by July 2009.

In 2008, Senate Bill (SB) 714 modified various provisions relating to sexual offenses and essentially authorized implementation of SORNA requirements in Missouri. However, some provisions of the SORNA, such as the treatment of DNA material were not addressed in the law. On June 16, 2009, the Missouri Supreme Court⁵ determined that sex offenders must obey the provisions of the SORNA, overturning the earlier July 2006 and June 2007 rulings which had exempted certain offenders from the requirement to register. As a result of this ruling, previously exempt offenders were required to re-register. The ruling affected 4,465 individuals. In July 2009, House Bill (HB) 62 addressing the treatment of DNA material, was signed into law to help allow for full SORNA implementation. Further information regarding the status of SORNA implementation is provided in Chapter 2.

As of March 31, 2010, Missouri had 10,549 actively registered sex offenders in 114 counties and one city (St. Louis) not within a county.

⁴ *Doe v. Blunt*, 225 S.W.3d 421 (Mo. 2007)

⁵ *Doe I v. Keathley*, 290 S.W.3d 719 (Mo. 2009)

Scope and Methodology

To determine the extent registration compliance has improved statewide since our 2002 audit report, we met with MSHP officials and obtained information on overall registration compliance. In addition, we compared registration compliance for the counties visited during the prior audit to current compliance in those counties as of March 31, 2010.

To determine whether recommendations in our prior report had been implemented, we reviewed legislative changes since the 2002 audit report was issued, met with officials from certain law enforcement agencies including the MSHP, the DOC and the DPP, three county sheriff offices (Boone, Greene, and Jackson Counties), and the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department to obtain information regarding the status of the recommendations. During our discussions with those officials, we obtained other information regarding the status of the sexual offender registration program, including progress towards implementing the SORNA requirements.

We also reviewed the management of the sex offender registry by various chief law enforcement officials (CLEOs) while visiting the three sheriff offices and the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. In the same counties and the City of St. Louis we also visited a total of eight DPP offices (one each in Boone and Greene Counties and three each in Jackson County and the City of St. Louis) to determine if the recommendations related to the DPP in the prior report had been implemented. To review and evaluate the sex offender registry management process at locations visited, we interviewed agency officials and reviewed selected files to determine if the files contained appropriate documentation, such as current registration forms and other documents denoting offender compliance with registration requirements.

To determine the extent applicable law enforcement agencies have implemented new sexual offender registry requirements mandated by the SORNA, we met with appropriate MSHP officials, reviewed the SORNA requirements, and reviewed recent legislation intended to implement the SORNA requirements. We also obtained information regarding MSHP and DPP initiatives to improve the sexual offender registration program.

To review whether local law enforcement officials were using available wage information to pursue non-compliant offenders, we matched available state wage information for the third quarter of 2008 and the previous four quarters with non-compliant offender information from the MSHP database for all non-compliant offenders for the locations visited.

Improvements and Other Developments Related to the Sexual Offender Registration Program

Sexual offender registration compliance has significantly improved, with statewide registration non-compliance reduced from an estimated 36 percent in 2002 to approximately 7 percent⁶ as of March 31, 2010. The General Assembly and applicable law enforcement agencies have generally implemented the recommendations in the prior report and the state has made progress toward implementing the federal SORNA requirements.

Compliance with Registration Requirements

Sexual offender compliance with registration requirements has improved significantly since the prior audit. According to registry information maintained by the MSHP, non-compliance with sexual offender registration requirements was 7.1 percent at March 31, 2010, compared to an estimated 36 percent non-compliance rate reported in the prior audit report. See the Appendix for the total number of offenders, compliant offenders, non-compliant offenders, and the rate of registration non-compliance by county (including the City of St. Louis) at March 31, 2010.

Of the three counties we visited during the current audit, non-compliance with registration requirements decreased significantly compared to the prior audit. As of March 31, 2010, Boone County's non-compliance rate dropped from 20 percent to 10.6 percent, Greene County's non-compliance rate dropped from 22 percent to 3.0 percent, and Jackson County's non-compliance rate dropped from 45 percent to 11.1 percent. These counties were also visited in the prior audit.

Although compliance with registration requirements has improved since the prior audit, the reduced error rate does not consider those previously exempt sexual offenders who have not yet re-registered as required based on a June 2009 Missouri Supreme Court decision (see Chapter 3).

While registration non-compliance has decreased significantly, law enforcement officials we talked to indicated people should not be lulled into a false sense of security. Registration requirements are only intended to help make citizens aware of sex offenders living in their areas; they do not prevent sexual offenders from committing future offenses.

⁶ The MSHP provided statewide non-compliance data from its sexual offender registry database, which includes offenders who may have been registered at a local sheriff's office but had not yet been entered in the MSHP database. It also includes offenders who may have not yet registered at a sheriff's office and are shown as non-compliant until updated registration data is entered in the MSHP database. The "as of date" is noted because the registry changes constantly.

Implementation of Prior Recommendations

The General Assembly and applicable law enforcement agencies have generally implemented the recommendations in the prior report. In response to those recommendations, the General Assembly passed various legislation since the last audit. In addition, the DOC and MSHP made various changes and other enhancements to their records and procedures to address recommendations made to those agencies. These actions contributed to the reduction in the rate of non-compliance with the registration requirements.

Prior Recommendations to the General Assembly

Since the prior audit report was issued, various legislation has been signed into law to improve or enhance the sexual offender registration program, some of which addressed problems that required statutory change.

- In October 2000, a Missouri Supreme Court ruling⁷ determined the event triggering the registration requirement was the offender "coming into" a county. The effect of this ruling was to exempt from registration requirements any offender who was sentenced to probation and had not moved his county of residence.

In 2002, legislation⁸ was signed into law requiring all sexual offenders to register in their county of residence.

- At the time of the prior audit, sexual offenders who were incarcerated were subject to registration requirements. Because it was believed incarcerated offenders posed a negligible public safety risk and to ensure the efficient use of time and resources of law enforcement officials, the audit recommended state law be revised to exempt offenders from registration requirements during incarceration.

During 2002, legislation⁸ was signed into law that effectively exempted incarcerated sexual offenders from registering, but required those sexual offenders to register within 10 days of their release from incarceration.

- State law at the time of the prior audit only allowed the names, addresses, and crimes for which offenders were registered to be provided to citizens requesting the information. The audit reported publicly available information in most other states also included other information, including a photograph and physical description of offenders. In addition, three counties charged citizens for the cost of copying the requested offender list and one county charged offenders a fee each time they registered or verified their registration. These charges did not appear authorized under existing law.

⁷ *J.S. v. Beard*, 28 S.W.3d 875 (Mo. 2000)

⁸ SB 758 (2002)

In 2003, legislation⁹ was signed into law requiring a photograph of the offender be included in the information available to the public. Subsequent legislation¹⁰ passed and signed into law in 2006 expanded publicly available information even further including, but not limited to, any known aliases of the offender, a physical description of the offender, and a description of the offender's vehicles. In addition, a 2004 statutory change¹¹ authorized the CLEOs to charge a sexual offender a fee of up to \$10 for initial registration and a fee of \$5 for any change made after initial registration.

- The prior audit noted Missouri law imposed a lifetime registration requirement for all offenders regardless of the seriousness of the offense committed. Only seven other states had lifetime registration requirements and most states only required offenders to register for specific minimum periods, ranging from 10 to 25 years. The audit recommended an appeals process be considered that would allow an offender to petition the court to be relieved of the registration requirements after a mandatory period of time.

In 2006, legislation¹⁰ was signed into law allowing certain offenders of some lesser offenses (including some persons who were 19 years of age or younger when the crime was committed) to petition the court to have their name removed from the sexual offender registry after a mandatory period of time had passed. The court was authorized to grant this relief if such person demonstrated that he or she had complied with the registration requirements and was not a current or potential threat to public safety.

- Local law enforcement officials contacted during the prior audit indicated limited existing resources and manpower within their departments restricted their ability to actively enforce registration and verification requirements. They noted the program was mandated under state law, but there was no additional funding source to help pay local costs of enforcing the program. The audit recommended the General Assembly consider establishing local funding methodologies to assist local law enforcement officials in funding the costs of enforcing the registration program.

⁹ SB 184 (2003)

¹⁰ HB 1698 (2006)

¹¹ HB 1055 (2004)

In 2004, legislation¹² was signed into law allowing county commissions to create the County Law Enforcement Restitution Fund in their respective counties, which can only be used to pay law enforcement-related expenses. This fund is supported by court-ordered assessments or payments on certain criminal cases, not to exceed \$300. While it appears this fund could be used by CLEOs to help enforce the registration program, the extent to which such monies were used for this purpose could not be readily determined.

As noted in the prior report, law enforcement officials still may not be using all available records (including state wage records) to locate, pursue, and prosecute non-compliant offenders (see Chapter 3).

- The prior audit determined criminal history record checks of persons on the family care safety registry (a registry maintained by the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services to protect children, the elderly, and disabled persons by providing information concerning family caregivers) would not identify certain offenders registered in the sexual offender database. The audit recommended the state law related to the family care safety registry should be amended to require criminal history record checks performed include a check of the sexual offender registry.

In 2003, legislation¹³ was signed into law requiring the Department of Health and Senior Services to determine if a child-care or elder-care worker is a registered sexual offender when performing the required check on the worker.

- At the time of the prior audit, many states had made their sexual offender registries available on the Internet. The audit recommended the General Assembly consider authorizing the posting of the state's sexual offender registry on the Internet, after appropriate consideration of privacy and due process issues.

In 2003, legislation¹³ was signed into law which authorized the MSHP, subject to appropriation, to maintain the sexual offender registry on the Internet and to include registered sexual offender search capability. Since that time, the MSHP has established and continues to maintain the sexual offender registry on the Internet. In addition, during the 2005 session, legislation¹⁴ was passed and signed into law that allowed

¹² HB 1055 (2004)

¹³ SB 184 (2003)

¹⁴ SB 73 (2005)

county law enforcement agencies to maintain local registered sexual offender information on the Internet.

In addition to the statutory changes discussed above, other significant legislation passed and signed into law since 2002 included, but was not limited to 1) a requirement the MSHP operate a toll-free telephone number to disseminate information regarding individuals registered as sexual offenders,¹⁵ 2) allowing the DPP officers access to a registered sexual offender's personal computer,¹⁵ 3) strengthening penalties for failing to register as a sexual offender, including imprisonment for not less than 10 years for a third offense of this crime,¹⁵ and 4) reducing the length of time a sexual offender has to register with law enforcement authorities from 10 days to 3 days, upon conviction, release from incarceration, or placement on probation.¹⁶

Prior Recommendations to the Department of Corrections

The prior report noted the DOC and the DPP are charged with various duties prior to and after an offender is released from prison. These duties include informing the offender of the responsibility to register as a sexual offender after release, obtaining the offender's intended place of residence, and preparing and sending the registration notification form to the MSHP and the CLEO in the intended county of residence. When an offender is released to parole, the DPP is responsible for monitoring and ensuring the offender complies with registration and periodic verification requirements. The audit disclosed various weaknesses in the monitoring and compliance procedures.

- The DOC offender tracking system could not provide the DPP officers or management with reports of offenders who failed to meet registration requirements. The prior audit reported the DOC had long range plans to improve the offender tracking system by providing offender compliance data, including system-generated reminders to notify the DPP officers when offenders are due to verify registration, management reports on offender compliance, and officer entry of updated offender registration compliance information. The audit recommended enhancement to the offender tracking system related to registration be pursued promptly.

Since the prior audit, the DOC has implemented system enhancements to address the problems previously reported. The DOC now generates a periodic listing of all supervised offenders required to register, along with error reports identifying non-compliant offenders. This information is provided to the supervising DPP district offices for follow-up. In

¹⁵ HB 1698 (2006)

¹⁶ SB 714 (2008)

addition, the DPP officials indicated agency staff now have access to information on the MSHP sex offender web site to track current registration and verification status of offenders.

- The prior audit report noted the MSHP and local sexual offender registration units were not always made aware of when an offender on the registration list had been incarcerated, resulting in those local registration units wasting time and resources trying to locate the offender. The DOC indicated procedural changes were in process to address this problem, and the prior audit recommended the DOC fully implement the planned procedure.

In September 2005, the DOC amended its procedures for notifying the MSHP and local law enforcement officials when applicable offenders are incarcerated or re-incarcerated. The new procedures require the DPP officers to notify appropriate law enforcement agencies of residency changes, including instances where sexual offenders' probation or parole has been revoked and they have been sent to prison. While the new procedure established appears adequate, during the current audit we determined some DPP offices visited had not properly implemented this notification procedure at the time of our visit (see Chapter 3).

- When an offender fails to comply with registration requirements, the probation officer should give the offender a specific directive to complete the registration and verification process. If the offender does not comply, the probation officer should issue a violation report. The prior audit reported very few parole or probation violation reports were issued for offenders who failed to meet registration and verification requirements. In addition, actions required by the DPP policies were frequently not performed properly. The audit recommended the DOC strengthen management oversight and compliance with department policy to ensure parole or probation violation reports are issued for offenders who fail to meet the registration and verification requirements.

Since the prior audit, the DOC has added key elements of the registration and verification process to its quality assurance procedures used by the DPP supervisors when reviewing parole officer files to ensure violation reports and other required registration forms are properly included. Statewide summary results of the DPP quality assurance reviews for calendar year 2007 (the latest year of review results prior to temporary suspension for revision) reported that violation reports were properly filed in 88.8 percent of the files reviewed. In addition, 93.8 percent of the files reviewed contained

verification the sex offender had registered with the local county sheriff and a copy of the notification was in the file. Our review of files at the DPP offices we visited during the current audit also indicated violation reports and other registration forms were generally included in the files as required.

Prior Recommendation to the MSHP

The prior audit noted the MSHP is responsible for maintaining a sexual offender database within the Missouri Uniform Law Enforcement System (MULES). Local law enforcement officials submit completed registration forms, verification forms, and changes of offender information to the MSHP, and the information is made available to criminal justice officials.

The audit reported the MULES did not record the date of offender registration or verification, resulting in the MSHP and the MULES users being unable to determine whether an offender had complied with registration or verification requirements.

In the response to the problem cited in the audit, MSHP officials indicated a major enhancement to the database was under development that would allow the input of actual registration and verification date information and allow the system to identify offenders who did not meet the requirements.

Since the last audit, the MSHP has made the planned system enhancements to address the problem reported. The actual dates of registration and verification are now captured in the database and available to determine whether a sexual offender has complied with registration and verification requirements.

The MSHP has also undertaken extensive efforts to implement many of the legislative changes that occurred since the prior audit. These efforts include, but are not limited to 1) establishing a statewide sexual offender registry on the Internet, which now includes significantly more information than was available at the time of the prior audit, and 2) establishing a sex offender registry hotline and a public awareness (poster) initiative. Other MSHP initiatives to improve the program and implement SORNA requirements are discussed below.

Status of the SORNA Implementation

As of July 2009, MSHP officials indicated all legislation needed to satisfy SORNA requirements had been enacted and those requirements were in the process of being implemented. In March 2009, as the lead agency responsible for implementing SORNA requirements in Missouri, the MSHP submitted a compliance package (along with a 1-year extension request, if Missouri did not meet the substantial compliance threshold) to the federal

Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART)¹⁷ office for evaluation. The SMART office evaluation determines if a state has reached "substantial compliance" with SORNA requirements. Those requirements were initially to have been met in July 2009. In May 2009, the SMART office approved the MSHP 1-year extension request for meeting the SORNA requirements. Later that month, the U.S. Attorney General granted a 1-year extension to all remaining states and Indian tribes (that did not already have an approved extension request) to meet the requirements because most states and tribes would not have met the initial due date. This effectively revised the date requiring "substantial compliance" to July 2010.

In September 2009, the MSHP responded to clarifying questions from the SMART office regarding its compliance submission. In March 2010, the MSHP received the results of the SMART office review of the SORNA compliance package submitted for Missouri. In its response, the SMART office recognized and commended the state for the efforts made thus far, but concluded that Missouri had not achieved substantial compliance with the SORNA requirements (see Chapter 3).

Under the law, states can request two 1-year extensions, which would make compliance with the SORNA requirements mandatory by July 2011. If a level of "substantial compliance" is not met by this final due date, the state will face possible sanctions, including the loss or reduction of certain grant funding.

DPP Initiatives

The DPP has implemented a number of recent program-related initiatives, including the two initiatives described below:

- Internet Monitoring - In March 2008, the DPP initiated a pilot project to monitor Internet usage of sex offenders. A contractor was hired to monitor Internet activity of offenders remotely and in real time, with reports generated and provided to the DPP officers. Based on information in the reports, officers can schedule polygraphs, investigate disclosed activities, and conduct violation interviews. Treatment recommendations could also result from information provided by the contractor. According to a DPP official, the program was expanded from a pilot program in January 2010 and as of April 2010, the DPP was in the process of developing bid specifications to rebid the contract.

¹⁷ The SMART office is a component of the Office of Federal Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice (a federal agency responsible for implementing the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act/SORNA).

-
- Halloween Restrictions - With the passage of legislation¹⁸ in 2008, statutory changes were made restricting specific sex offenders from certain activities on Halloween. Since that time, the DPP officers have issued directives to sexual offenders specifically requiring them not to participate in Halloween activities, remain in their homes from 5:00 pm to 10:30 pm, keep their porch lights off, and display no decorations. A sign must also be posted at their residences stating, "No candy or treats at this residence." The DPP has provided the signs that must be displayed. However, a Missouri Supreme Court ruling in January 2010 determined the 2008 law restricting Halloween activities are retrospective, and therefore, unconstitutional. As a result, offenders convicted before the law became effective are currently exempt from these restrictions.

Other DPP initiatives include polygraph funding, GPS (global positioning technology) monitoring to electronically track offenders, lifetime supervision (for certain offenses committed on or after August 28, 2006), participating in the on-line MULES registration process, and community supervision of sex offenders.

MSHP Initiatives

In recent years, the MSHP has implemented a number of program-related initiatives to improve registration compliance, two of which are described below:

- MULES Roll Out - CLEOs trained and granted access to the sex offender portion of the MULES can enter, modify, and make any necessary updates to any and all offenders in their jurisdiction on-line. The ability to enter registration data on-line directly to the MULES is in contrast to the former process in which all CLEOs submitted the same data in hard copy, by fax, or by mail and the data was entered in the system by MSHP staff. This initiative began as a pilot program in 2007 and as of April 2010, 92 of 115 jurisdictions (114 county sheriff offices and the City of St. Louis) and two DOC correctional facilities were entering sex offender data directly into the MULES. According to MSHP officials, this change allows Missouri to be compliant with the 3-day requirement of the SORNA.
- Address Verification System - Effective February 2009, the MSHP began sending letters to offenders to verify their addresses and to remind them of their requirement to register. If the offender does not register with the applicable local law enforcement agency within a specified period of time, a letter is sent to the local prosecuting attorney

¹⁸ SB 714 (2008)

for follow-up and possible prosecution. According to MSHP data, as of April 2010, over 5,000 of these letters have been sent to local prosecutors since inception of this program.

Other MSHP initiatives include providing updated forms (with added SORNA requirements) to all CLEOs, training CLEOs on SORNA requirements, continuous updating of the Missouri sex offender website to increase user friendly options, developing an email notification system, and attending national conferences to stay current on sex offender registry trends and administrative processes.

Further Improvements Needed in Managing the Program

A June 2009 Missouri Supreme Court ruling resulted in 4,465 previously exempt sexual offenders being required to re-register; however, as of March 31, 2010, approximately 1,445 (32 percent) of these offenders had not re-registered. In addition, federal officials have determined the state of Missouri has not yet achieved substantial compliance with SORNA requirements. Also, wage information has not been matched with non-compliant offender lists to help law enforcement officials locate and pursue non-compliant sexual offenders.

The DPP amended its procedures in 2005 to require its officers to notify the applicable law enforcement authorities when sexual offenders are incarcerated or re-incarcerated; however, some DPP offices had not implemented these procedures at the time of our audit. Also, some indigent offenders have been unable to receive evaluation and treatment services on a timely basis because limited funding has been made available for this purpose.

Many Previously Exempt Offenders Have Not Re-Registered

The MSHP and other law enforcement agencies should take action to locate and ensure previously exempt sexual offenders are added back to the registry. A June 2009 Missouri Supreme Court decision reversed the status of 4,465 previously exempt sexual offenders and required them to re-register on the sexual offender registry; however, as of March 31, 2010, many of these offenders had not re-registered.

In July 2009, the MSHP mailed letters to previously exempt offenders advising them of the June 2009 court decision and directing them to report and register with the CLEO in their county of residence within 3 days, unless they had already re-registered. According to a MSHP official, it was initially the intent of the MSHP to allow applicable offenders 3 months to re-register; however, many of the letters came back undeliverable. As a result, after the initial 3-month period had passed the MSHP decided not to add those offenders who had not yet re-registered back to the registry as non-compliant offenders. Approximately 2,150 offenders had not re-registered as of October 31, 2009, with 1,705 of the letters returned undeliverable.

Since October 2009, MSHP officials indicated they have attempted to locate current addresses of applicable offenders and add them back to the registry. However, as of March 31, 2010, 1,445 previously exempt offenders had still not re-registered nor had they been added back to the sexual offender registry as non-compliant offenders or some other designated status.

Some of these unregistered sexual offenders may have moved out of the state or may be incarcerated or deceased; however, the MSHP should continue efforts to locate and re-register these offenders. For those offenders

who cannot be located, the MSHP should consider adding them back to the registry as non-compliant offenders or some other designated status.

Substantial Compliance With SORNA Requirements Has Not Yet Been Achieved

While progress has been made, the federal SMART office has determined the state of Missouri has not yet achieved substantial compliance with SORNA requirements. This determination was reported to MSHP officials in March 2010, after the SMART Office reviewed the initial compliance package submitted by the MSHP in March 2009.

The report concluded additional procedural and/or statutory changes are needed in various areas, including but not limited to 1) the need to restructure the frequency of required registration for some offenses to coincide with the SORNA tier system, and 2) the need to fully meet the SORNA law enforcement community and general community notification provisions. According to the SMART office report, some sexual offenses require a higher (more frequent) degree of reporting than Missouri currently requires. Also, that report indicated Missouri could address many of the required notification provisions by adopting an automated (email) notification system.

MSHP officials indicated necessary improvements can be made to achieve substantial compliance with the SORNA requirements by the summer of 2011, if the needed legislative changes are enacted in the 2011 legislative session. In April 2010, the MSHP requested and received approval for an additional 1-year extension (to July 2011) to allow sufficient time to address current deficiencies. MSHP officials indicated efforts to address the community notification issue are currently in process, with an email notification system targeted to be implemented by June 30, 2010.

To achieve substantial compliance with the SORNA requirements, further efforts are needed to ensure necessary procedural and statutory changes are made.

Data Matches Could Help Locate Non-Compliant Offenders

The prior audit, using available state wage data, determined that many non-compliant offenders were employed in Missouri. During the current audit, we again determined that Missouri employers had reported salaries or wages earned in recent periods by non-compliant offenders. However, none of the CLEOs we visited accessed available current wage data to help locate and pursue non-compliant offenders. In addition, although the MSHP has access to state wage information, the current agreement does not provide for batch matching capability. The MSHP is currently limited to single individual inquiries and has not matched its non-compliant offender list with available wage information. As a result, such information is not readily available to the MSHP and other law enforcement officials to assist them in the pursuit of non-compliant offenders.

To determine if recent earnings had been reported in Missouri for non-compliant offenders, we matched non-compliant offenders for the locations we visited (three counties and the City of St. Louis) from the MSHP database (as of December 2008) with state wage information for the third quarter of 2008 and the previous 4 quarters. The results of our data match indicated of 282 non-compliant offenders in those areas of the state, 95 (34 percent) had earnings reported in Missouri since their last registration. Of these 95 offenders, 68 (72 percent) had earnings reported in the most recent quarter.

Table 3.1 shows by location the total number of offenders, number of non-compliant offenders, and number of non-compliant offenders with recent earnings reported.

Table 3.1: Non-Compliant Offenders Match to State Wage Information for Third Quarter of 2008 and Previous Four Quarters

Location	Total Number of Offenders	Non-compliant Offenders	Non-compliant With Earnings
Boone County	138	10	2
Greene County	327	15	7
Jackson County	1,047	87	29
City of St. Louis	688	170	57
Totals	2,200	282	95

Source: Prepared by the SAO based on MSHP and state wage data.

To assist in the location and pursuit of non-compliant offenders, non-compliant offender information should be matched with reported state wage information. To perform these matches, the MSHP would need to pursue an agreement with the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DLIR) providing for batch matching capability. In addition, approval from DLIR would be required to share this confidential information with the CLEOs.

Some DPP Offices Did Not Implement New Procedures

The prior audit reported local sexual offender registration units were not always made aware when an offender on the registration list had been incarcerated. That audit recommended the DOC and the DPP implement planned procedures to ensure the MSHP and CLEOs are notified when sexual offenders are incarcerated or re-incarcerated. The DPP addressed this recommendation in 2005 with an amendment to its procedures. According to the new procedures, when supervision of an offender has been revoked or suspended and the offender is sent to jail/prison, the supervising officer should complete the change of address form and distribute the form to various law enforcement agencies. However, during our visits to eight DPP offices, we determined the new procedures had not been implemented at some offices and the applicable CLEOs were not notified of offender status changes, as required.

Three of the eight DPP offices visited had not properly implemented the new procedures. The DPP officials at those three offices told us they were not aware of the new procedures or it was apparent they were not familiar with the procedures. After discussing this situation with responsible officials in those offices, we were told the required procedures would be implemented.

Failure to properly notify local sexual offender registration units when sexual offenders are incarcerated or re-incarcerated can cause those local law enforcement officials to unnecessarily waste time and resources trying to locate the offenders. To provide assurance that CLEOs are notified of offender status changes, including incarceration or re-incarceration, efforts are needed to ensure all DPP offices are aware of and implementing the amended procedures.

Indigent Offenders Not Always Provided Timely Treatment

Officials at the various DPP offices we visited indicated sexual offender treatment is a critical aspect of the DPP process to help prevent offenders from committing further sex crimes. However, because some offenders were not able to pay for treatment and state funding (including intervention fee funds)¹⁹ has not been appropriated or designated for this purpose, treatment has not always been provided in a timely manner.

According to recent estimates by the DPP, that agency supervises over 160 indigent offenders that need to be evaluated for services and over 400 indigent offenders that need treatment services (at an estimated total cost of over \$600,000 annually). The DPP officials indicated there were instances in two City of St. Louis DPP offices where required evaluations to determine the treatment needs of certain offenders were more than a year past due. In addition, parole officers reported that as of September 2007, 150 of 460 (33 percent) sex offenders in the City of St. Louis had trouble paying for treatment. Treatment could involve evaluation, counseling, and polygraphs (which are part of the treatment program). While the DPP provides funds to pay for polygraphs, it has not provided funds to pay for all indigent offender needs relative to evaluations or counseling.

Prior to state fiscal year 2010, local DPP officials indicated they had discussed the possibility of using intervention funds (in the DOC Inmate Revolving Fund) to assist indigent offenders with evaluation and treatment;

¹⁹ Section 217.690.3, RSMo, which became effective July 2005 authorizes the Missouri Board of Probation and Parole the discretion to charge offenders a fee of up to \$60 per month, to provide intervention services, to be deposited into the Inmate Revolving Fund established pursuant to Section 217.430, RSMo. Offenders are currently charged an intervention fee of \$30 per month.

however, the DPP officials at headquarters had told them these monies were not available for sex offender treatment. When discussing this situation with the DPP officials there was general agreement that treatment is needed by indigent sexual offenders; however, according to those officials, appropriation authority had never been received to spend intervention fee monies on indigent sexual offender treatment services.

Beginning in state fiscal year 2010, the DPP received an appropriation of \$3 million from the Inmate Revolving Fund for inmate reentry services, including sex offender treatment. However, according to a DPP official, only \$42,128 has been obligated for indigent sex offender treatment. Besides this amount, that official indicated approximately \$25,000 was expended/set aside by one region out of its operating funds for indigent sex offender treatment during state fiscal years 2009 and 2010. While some recent funding has been provided for indigent sex offender treatment, that funding has been substantially below the \$600,000 annual need estimated by the DPP. Considering the Inmate Revolving Fund had a balance of over \$16.5 million at March 31, 2010, it appears additional funding could be provided for indigent sexual offender evaluation and treatment services, if needed.

Based on estimates provided by the DPP, there is a significant need for evaluation and treatment for indigent sex offenders. Although the DPP has provided some limited funding for treatment, the current need is significantly greater than the amount of funding provided. Consideration should be given to using more of the available monies from the Inmate Revolving Fund for this purpose or pursuing other sources of funding.

Recommendations

We recommend the MSHP:

- 3.1 Continue efforts to locate those sexual offenders who have not re-registered and ensure those individuals are added back to the sexual offender registry. For those offenders who cannot be located, the MSHP should consider adding them back to the registry as non-compliant offenders or some other designated status.
- 3.2 Continue efforts to ensure the necessary procedural and statutory changes are made to achieve substantial compliance with the SORNA requirements.
- 3.3 Match non-compliant offender information with state wage information maintained by the DLIR. In its agreement with the DLIR, the MSHP should seek that agency's approval to share information with CLEOs to assist those law enforcement agencies in locating and pursuing non-compliant offenders.

We recommend the DOC and the DPP:

- 3.4 Ensure all DPP offices are aware of and implementing the amended procedures requiring parole officers to notify CLEOs of offender status changes, including incarceration or re-incarceration.
- 3.5 Consider using more monies from the Inmate Revolving Fund to assist indigent sexual offenders in receiving necessary evaluation and treatment services and/or pursue other sources of funding for this purpose.

Agency Comments

MSHP Response

The Missouri State Highway Patrol accepts the report issued by the Auditor's office detailing the progress of the Missouri Sexual Offender Registration Program. The Sex Offender Registry is governed by many state and federal laws, as well as the many court decisions concerning registered sexual offenders that have been issued in recent years. As such, the rules concerning the registry and what offenses, dates and persons are included therein are ever changing. This significantly increases the difficulty of managing the registry by state officials and our partner agencies that are tasked with registration responsibilities. While the recommendations made by the Auditor's office are accurate, the Missouri State Highway Patrol would like to respond on how it plans to fulfill these recommendations in a timely manner.

3.1 The Missouri State Highway Patrol agrees with the Auditor's assessment. For the past year the Missouri State Highway Patrol and the Chief Law Enforcement Official in each county and the City of St. Louis have worked diligently to locate these offenders and notify them that their status has changed per the June 2009 Missouri Supreme Court decision. As the Auditor's report indicates, as of March 31, 2010, the Missouri State Highway Patrol and Chief Law Enforcement Officials have successfully re-registered 3,015 (68 percent) of the 4,465 offenders that this court decision affects. However, the Missouri State Highway Patrol also realizes that public notification serves as a valuable tool in the location of these offenders. As such, the Missouri Sex Offender Registry Unit has notified the Chief Law Enforcement Official in each county and the City of St. Louis that the MSHP will be pursuing the initiative to place these offenders back on the public website by August 2010. Due to our partner agencies' concerns with how this will affect the non-compliance rates in their jurisdictions and the fact that it is likely that a significant number of these offenders no longer reside in their original jurisdictions, the MSHP is going to place these offenders into a special status queue on the website. This

will fulfill two goals: (1) it will notify the public of these offenders and their duty to re-register; and (2) it will not unduly raise the noncompliance rates of those jurisdictions that have diligently done all that they can to locate these offenders.

3.2 The MSHP fully agrees with this recommendation. At the time of this writing, only three states (Delaware, Florida and Ohio) have achieved substantial compliance with SORNA. The fact that 47 states remain noncompliant is evidence of the extreme difficulty of this task. Initiatives required by Missouri to become compliant with SORNA include procedural, technological and legislative changes. All procedural changes have been corrected and compliance in this regard is achieved. Technological changes include the implementation of an electronic method for community notification via the MSHP Sex Offender Registry website. This implementation is only weeks away and will be achieved well before the July 2011 deadline for compliance. Lastly, statutory language is currently being drafted by MSHP staff, and these changes will be shared with the State Sex Offender Management Subcommittee for review and comment. Once finalized, the State Sex Offender Management Subcommittee will work actively with the Department of Public Safety and the legislature to ensure that the necessary changes to Missouri statutes are enacted prior to the July 2011 deadline for SORNA compliance.

Additionally, with the passage of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, significant funding was to be earmarked by Congress for states to assist in achieving compliance with the SORNA requirements, and only a fraction of this funding has been appropriated by Congress.

3.3 Again, the MSHP agrees with the Auditor's assessment. MSHP staff currently has access to DLIR's wage data through the use of single query transactions. However, in order to automate this process a method of conducting batch queries will need to be developed. The MSHP is currently planning to upgrade its current Sex Offender Registry System, and the MSHP will explore including an interface with DLIR in the design of this system. It is the MSHP's understanding that DLIR currently charges a fee for the exchange of this data, and the amount of this fee will obviously enter into MSHP's deliberations. However, an initial plan would be that an automated interface would be pursued which would allow the MSHP to periodically query its list of absconded and/or non-compliant offenders to determine wage data/places of employment. Agreements would then need to be signed between DLIR, the MSHP and all Chief Law Enforcement Officials in

Missouri so that this data could be shared freely by law enforcement for the arrest and prosecution of failure to register offenses.

Overall, the MSHP is pleased with the Auditor's report on the Missouri Sexual Offender Registration Program. As the report indicates, significant progress has been made since the issuance of the last report in 2002. The MSHP would like to thank the Missouri Department of Corrections and Division of Probation and Parole, as well as the 115 Missouri Sheriff's offices, the prosecutors and the courts for their hard work and partnership in ensuring that the Missouri Sexual Offender Registration Program is a success. The MSHP will continue to work with the aforementioned agencies to fulfill the recommendations outlined in the Auditor's report in a timely manner in an effort to further improve the program.

DOC/DPP Response

3.4 The agency concurs with this recommendation. The Missouri Board of Probation and Parole is committed to public safety and devotes, as detailed in the follow-up audit report, significant resources to the effective supervision of sex offenders. The agency has worked closely with the Missouri State Highway Patrol and law enforcement across the state since the original audit to obtain a high compliance rate with sex offender registration requirements. While notification to law enforcement of an offender's incarceration has a neutral impact on public safety, as that offender is no longer in the community, procedure lapses in this area run counter to the agency desire for a strong partnership with law enforcement. The Missouri Board of Probation and Parole agrees that efforts are required, in locations where staff are not advising law enforcement of an offender's status change through incarceration, to better ensure understanding of this procedure and to monitor compliance. Appropriate action toward that end will occur.

3.5 The agency concurs with this recommendation. While not directly related to registration, the evaluation and treatment process does assist the agency in assessing risk levels and identifying areas that need to be stabilized for a sex offender to be successful while under supervision, including meeting the requirement to register as required.

The mandate for sex offender treatment is established in state statute and it is the offender's responsibility to pay for the cost of treatment (Sections 566.140 and 566.141, RSMo). The vast majority of sex offenders under field supervision pay for their treatment, and attend that treatment as required. Even so, the agency recognizes that some

offenders will struggle with payment due to indigence. In acknowledgement of this fact, the agency currently has contracts in place in two field regions, utilizing General Revenue funding, for sex offender evaluation and treatment (\$25,000 in each region). The four remaining field regions are in the process of securing contracts in this area at similar levels (Agency total for FY11: \$150,000). This funding commitment has been challenging given the reduction in the agency budget in FY11, but this is an important area that the agency is dedicated to addressing.

In addition to the General Revenue funding, Reentry Contracts (Inmate Revolving Fund) for FY11 are currently being evaluated for award. It is anticipated that additional resources for sex offender evaluation and treatment will be identified through this process. The agency believes the General Revenue commitment made for FY11 along with the Reentry Contracts will substantially address indigent sex offender evaluation and treatment needs. If a gap remains, the agency supports the Missouri State Auditor's recommendation to pursue other sources of funding for this critical area.

Sexual Offender Registration Compliance

Table I.1: Sexual Offender Registration - Number of Sexual Offenders and Non-Compliance Rate by County at March 31, 2010

County	Number of Offenders	Number Compliant	Number Non-Compliant	Rate of Non-Compliance
Adair	44	43	1	2.3%
Andrew	28	26	2	7.1%
Atchison	10	10	0	0.0%
Audrain	61	55	6	9.8%
Barry	79	69	10	12.7%
Barton	17	16	1	5.9%
Bates	57	52	5	8.8%
Benton	64	58	6	9.4%
Bollinger	33	30	3	9.1%
Boone	226	202	24	10.6%
Buchanan	212	210	2	0.9%
Butler	127	121	6	4.7%
Caldwell	22	22	0	0.0%
Callaway	103	102	1	1.0%
Camden	93	93	0	0.0%
Cape Girardeau	128	110	18	14.1%
Carroll	23	22	1	4.3%
Carter	21	19	2	9.5%
Cass	104	98	6	5.8%
Cedar	21	20	1	4.8%
Chariton	10	8	2	20.0%
Christian	88	85	3	3.4%
Clark	17	17	0	0.0%
Clay	240	231	9	3.8%
Clinton	29	29	0	0.0%
Cole	108	102	6	5.6%
Cooper	42	42	0	0.0%
Crawford	55	49	6	10.9%
Dade	17	17	0	0.0%
Dallas	47	42	5	10.6%
Daviess	20	20	0	0.0%
DeKalb	19	19	0	0.0%
Dent	38	38	0	0.0%
Douglas	33	29	4	12.1%
Dunklin	115	106	9	7.8%
Franklin	162	159	3	1.9%
Gasconade	31	31	0	0.0%
Gentry	9	8	1	11.1%
Greene	493	478	15	3.0%
Grundy	21	20	1	4.8%
Harrison	17	17	0	0.0%

**Appendix
Sexual Offender Registration Compliance**

County	Number of Offenders	Number Compliant	Number Non-Compliant	Rate of Non-Compliance
Henry	57	48	9	15.8%
Hickory	25	25	0	0.0%
Holt	15	15	0	0.0%
Howard	23	23	0	0.0%
Howell	113	100	13	11.5%
Iron	27	26	1	3.7%
Jackson	1,441	1,281	160	11.1%
Jasper	264	258	6	2.3%
Jefferson	275	265	10	3.6%
Johnson	67	66	1	1.5%
Knox	8	7	1	12.5%
Laclede	122	118	4	3.3%
Lafayette	63	60	3	4.8%
Lawrence	84	73	11	13.1%
Lewis	35	31	4	11.4%
Lincoln	111	110	1	0.9%
Linn	16	16	0	0.0%
Livingston	35	35	0	0.0%
McDonald	51	46	5	9.8%
Macon	37	37	0	0.0%
Madison	33	33	0	0.0%
Maries	15	12	3	20.0%
Marion	81	76	5	6.2%
Mercer	8	8	0	0.0%
Miller	58	58	0	0.0%
Mississippi	38	36	2	5.3%
Moniteau	23	19	4	17.4%
Monroe	28	28	0	0.0%
Montgomery	23	23	0	0.0%
Morgan	70	47	23	32.9%
New Madrid	50	40	10	20.0%
Newton	119	117	2	1.7%
Nodaway	18	18	0	0.0%
Oregon	29	24	5	17.2%
Osage	22	22	0	0.0%
Ozark	16	14	2	12.5%
Pemiscot	63	62	1	1.6%
Perry	28	27	1	3.6%
Pettis	105	94	11	10.5%
Phelps	88	86	2	2.3%
Pike	29	27	2	6.9%
Platte	63	63	0	0.0%

Appendix
Sexual Offender Registration Compliance

County	Number of Offenders	Number Compliant	Number Non-Compliant	Rate of Non-Compliance
Polk	48	31	17	35.4%
Pulaski	73	63	10	13.7%
Putnam	7	6	1	14.3%
Ralls	25	24	1	4.0%
Randolph	99	98	1	1.0%
Ray	46	43	3	6.5%
Reynolds	17	16	1	5.9%
Ripley	40	39	1	2.5%
St. Charles	305	303	2	0.7%
St. Clair	22	19	3	13.6%
St. Francois	177	175	2	1.1%
St. Louis	914	910	4	0.4%
St. Louis City	900	718	182	20.2%
Ste. Genevieve	36	36	0	0.0%
Saline	81	78	3	3.7%
Schuyler	12	11	1	8.3%
Scotland	5	5	0	0.0%
Scott	91	83	8	8.8%
Shannon	14	13	1	7.1%
Shelby	18	18	0	0.0%
Stoddard	82	71	11	13.4%
Stone	65	64	1	1.5%
Sullivan	16	15	1	6.3%
Taney	110	107	3	2.7%
Texas	37	37	0	0.0%
Vernon	44	37	7	15.9%
Warren	50	47	3	6.0%
Washington	84	78	6	7.1%
Wayne	30	30	0	0.0%
Webster	80	75	5	6.3%
Worth	2	2	0	0.0%
Wright	59	54	5	8.5%
Total	10,549	9,805	744	7.1%

Source: The MSHP sex offender online registry as of March 31, 2010. Information presented may differ from the local sex offender registries maintained by the CLEOs at that date because of a lag time between when CLEOs provide information to the MSHP and when it is entered in the MSHP online registry.