

April 10, 2017

RE: SB 767

TO: Senate Judiciary Committee Sen. Floyd Prozanski, Chair Sen. Kim Thatcher, Vice Chair Sen. Michael Dembrow

Sen. Dennis Linthicum Sen. James Manning Jr.

## Chairman Prozanski and members of the committee:

I am writing on behalf of Oregon Voices in strong support of SB 767. The study that it proposes will provide important information about sex offense recidivism that we do not have at present, particularly because current data does not distinguish between a new sex crime and any other kind of felony offense. Further, such a study will begin to provide important information about recidivism that will allow us to track the effectiveness of the new system of risk levels provided by HB 2549 from 2013.

The CJC should be able to develop data from two developing processes. First, since 2014, adult males leaving incarceration have been administered the Static-99R—the tool adopted by rule for that population. And young people and women have had the LS-CMI risk tool done on them. That means that cohorts for at least two years will have completed three years after release and can be surveyed for three-year recidivism rates, including breakdowns by the risk levels established by the new system.

Secondly, scoring data for persons who were already on the registry before 2014 is being assembled as well. In the first year, the work concentrated on persons who carried the "predatory" distinction based on the old system. Since that designation will go away in favor of risk levels in 2019, the board chose to begin with this group and about 2000 had been processed by January of this year. In addition, the board has decided to accept with review the static scores that have already been done, and that will comprise a group of about 13,000 other persons on the registry, many of whom have been on the registry for crimes that date back decades. This data set will provide a large body of information about recidivism over much longer periods, and again that information also yield information about recidivism rates in each risk level.

The ongoing processing of both groups (those scored as part of the release and supervision process and those already on the registry being scored by the Parole Board process) will continue to supplement and enrich the data gathered by the study proposed in this bill.

It is critical to have the CJC enter the picture now, however. The Parole Board process is being done with limited resources aimed at the scoring of people for classification. And while the scoring they are doing of people with old offenses includes a review of their criminal record up to the present, their focus is on the classification of individuals, not the assembly of overall numbers. The CJC can work with the board's processes, insure that date being assembled is both accessible and searchable going forward, so that the ongoing process of scoring and classification in the future can be accessed easily for ongoing recidivism data.

Oregon Voices believes that policies dealing with sex offenses should be based on the best available evidence. Up until now, some of that evidence has not been available for either the public or for policy makers. The proposed CJC study will provide important information on sex offense recidivism, and it will do it in a way that will help all of us track the effectiveness of the new system as it is implemented in upcoming years.

I wish that I could be at the hearing in person to answer questions that this might raise, but I am prevented from doing so by an unavoidable conflict. If the committee does have questions about some of what I have mentioned regarding the Parole Board process, you could confirm or clarify that through Michael Wu or Christine Herrman of the board. I would also be happy to discuss this further with anyone, since I serve on the committee working with the board on implementation.

Finally, I hope that the committee will see fit to send this bill to the floor with its solid support.

Sincerely,

Ken Nolley

**Oregon Voices**