

**SUPPORTING SB 379 (JONES) AND SB 380 (JONES) – PROTECTING COMMUNITIES FROM SEXUALLY VIOLENT PREDATORS**

The Antelope Valley has become the default site in Los Angeles County for court-ordered placements of Sexually Violent Predators (SVPs), individuals convicted of serious sexual offenses who are civilly committed to state mental hospitals upon completion of their prison terms, under California’s 1996 SVP law.<sup>1</sup> Upon court-approved release (conditional release), these SVPs are placed in communities under supervision by the state’s contractor, Liberty Healthcare.

Since 2014, three SVPs have been conditionally released into the Antelope Valley, with a fourth released without any supervision. Christopher Hubbard, known as the “Pillowcase Rapist,” was first placed in Lake Los Angeles in 2014, removed in 2015, ordered re-released to Juniper Hills in 2024, and placed in 2025. Calvin Grassmier was placed in Littlerock in 2021. Lawtis Rhoden was placed in northern Lancaster in 2022 by an Orange County court, claiming no suitable housing was available in Orange County. Steve Jackson, a previously designated SVP, was unconditionally released and allowed to live unsupervised in Littlerock. He is now registered as a transient.

These placements are alarming because, as of today, no other SVPs have been placed in any other part of Los Angeles County. The rural Antelope Valley is repeatedly targeted, given that its current geography meets the legal requirements. However, it is children and families who bear the actual burden of the court’s decisions. The Department of State Hospitals (DSH) and Liberty Healthcare claim the selections comply with state law, including meeting minimum distances from schools, parks, and victims. Despite this, minimal compliance ignores the safety realities on the ground.

The Antelope Valley must no longer serve as the default site for SVP placements. In 2024, during a court hearing regarding the proposed placement of an SVP in Juniper Hills, the LASD Palmdale Station Captain testified to the site’s unsuitability and the

-MORE-

<sup>1</sup>[SVP FACT SHEET & PROCESS DOC FINAL](#)

MOTION

SOLIS	_____
MITCHELL	_____
HORVATH	_____
HAHN	_____
BARGER	_____

serious public safety risk it posed. He explained that the location is over 20 miles from the nearest Sheriff Station, resulting in delayed emergency response times. The site itself is remote and difficult to access, with unmarked, isolated, and lacking essential infrastructure, including cell service, lighting, and navigable roads. With only one or two patrol units available to cover hundreds of square miles, law enforcement presence in this area is already stretched thin. Similar past placements have resulted in 180 calls for service and necessitated sustained law enforcement patrols. This pattern of disproportionately placing SVPs in the Antelope Valley while citing rurality as a justification, without regard for actual law enforcement capacity or resident concerns, is unsustainable and simply unjust.

In response to persistent public safety concerns raised by Antelope Valley residents and law enforcement, as well as the current SVP placement procedure, State Senator Brian Jones authored two bills – SB 379 and SB 380. Existing state law directs DSH authority to identify potential SVP community placement locations provided that SVPs are not: (a) in proximity to past victims or victims' next of kin, and (b) near populations consistent with the victims 'profile.' Their profile may include "gender, physical appearance, economic background, profession, and other social or personal characteristics."<sup>2</sup> As currently written, state law does not require DSH to consider the capacity of local law enforcement or public safety when identifying prospective placement locations. If enacted, SB 379 would expand placement requirements to include public safety considerations.

To further safeguard the community and inform future legislation, SB 380 would require DSH to conduct an analysis "of the benefits and feasibility of establishing transitional housing facilities for the conditional release program."<sup>3</sup> This analysis would support future legislative efforts to improve the conditional release program, including the community placement procedure. These facilities could offer safer, more controlled alternatives to scattered placements, ease the burden on local communities, and help shape better public safety policies.

**I, THEREFORE, MOVE** that the Board of Supervisors direct the Chief Executive Office's Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations Branch support of SB 379 AND SB 380 (Jones).

# # #

KB:lg/ag

---

<sup>2</sup>[05/25/25- SB 379, Senate Floor](#)

[Analyseshttps://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202520260SB379](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260SB379)

<sup>3</sup>[05/27/25- SB 380, Senate Floor Analyses](#)