

PSL



COMPARING TRAFFIC AND NON-TRAFFIC OFFENDERS  
INCARCERATED IN AND RELEASED FROM AN  
OREGON STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
IN 1980 OR 1981: A STATISTICAL STUDY



VICTOR ATIYEH  
GOVERNOR

Prepared by the  
CRIME ANALYSIS CENTER

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Dave Frohnmayer  
Attorney General

10/008

COMPARING TRAFFIC AND NON-TRAFFIC OFFENDERS  
INCARCERATED IN AND RELEASED FROM AN  
OREGON STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
IN 1980 OR 1981: A STATISTICAL STUDY

DECEMBER, 1985

By James Paul Heuser, Ph.D.  
Researcher  
Crime Analysis Center  
Criminal Justice Division  
Oregon Department of Justice

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain  
National Institute of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Further information regarding this report and the research it summarizes can be obtained by writing or calling:

Crime Analysis Center  
100 Justice Building  
Salem, Oregon 97310  
Phone (503) 378-4229

Prepared under Grant #84-BJ-CX-K025 from the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent official positions or policies of the Bureau of Justice Statistics or the Oregon Department of Justice.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author and the Crime Analysis Center would like to acknowledge the contributions of several people who made this study possible and/or who assisted in the research effort which culminated in this report.

First, we would like to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Niel Chambers and his staff (especially Ms. Joan Nelson) at the Oregon Corrections Division's Data Processing Unit. Niel provided not only access to the bulk of the data used in this study, but also shared his ideas about the uniqueness of the traffic offender population. Conversations with Niel proved very valuable to us in the area of conceptualizing the problems and issues to be addressed by this research effort. Joan Nelson's programming skills were instrumental in providing the necessary data tapes for the initial steps of accessing the data and generating a data base for use in this research.

Second, Mr. Robert Willstadter and Mr. Duane Harkness, both of Seattle, Washington, provided (via a research contract) the data tape and documentation for the final steps of accessing the data and generating a data base for use in this research. Bob also provided valuable comments on the use of this data set for analyzing the recidivism rates and patterns of the various groups of offenders studied in this effort.

Third, Captain John R. Ritter, Director of the Oregon State Police Bureau of Criminal Identification, deserves special acknowledgement for his efforts in locating and generating important CCH "rap sheet" data on the traffic offender group and a non-traffic offender comparison group of prison releasees identified in this research. These data proved to be especially important during the analysis phase of the research effort, and greatly added to the overall utility of the study. These CCH data could not have been obtained if it were not for the dedication and extra commitment of Captain Ritter and his staff - especially Mrs. Bernice Ensminger, Mrs. Pat Wiebe, and Mrs. Sharon Latimer.

Fourth, we would like to especially thank Mr. Dave Frohnmayer, Attorney General of Oregon, for his careful and critical reading of both drafts of this research report. We feel that Mr. Frohnmayer's review comments led us to make a number of wording changes which vastly improved both the readability and clarity of several key areas of the report narrative.

Last, members of the Crime Analysis Center are to be thanked for their valuable contributions to this research and to its successful conclusion as represented by this report. Dr. Clinton C. Goff, supervisor; Mrs. Marilyn Gilliam, word processing specialist; and Mrs. Pearl B. Heath, our remarkable volunteer worker, all contributed their skills and talents to this effort.

Dr. Goff assisted during all phases of the research and provided several important suggestions for data analysis and presentation during the research effort. Mrs. Gilliam not only provided expert secretarial and word processing support for this effort, but also made a major contribution to the research through her remarkable effort to code complicated computerized criminal history (CCH) "rap sheet" data on over 400 offenders subjected to indepth analysis during the course of this research. She also proofread drafts of various documents including this report. Mrs. Heath cheerfully provided many countless hours of clerical support for all phases of the research and graciously spent several hours proofreading documents and organizing materials for the effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . . i

A. INTRODUCTION . . . . . A-1

    What Are the Purposes of This Research? . . . . . A-1

    What is the Background of Interest and Concern for This Research? . . . . . A-2

    The Modern Debate Over Incarcerating Traffic Offenders . . . . . A-5

    The Need for This Research . . . . . A-6

B. THE PRISON RELEASEE COHORT COMPONENT OF THE RESEARCH: DESCRIPTIVE DATA B-1

    Who Was Studied and Why? . . . . . B-2

    What Were the Major Demographic Features of the Releasee Cohort? . . . . . B-3

        Ethnic/Racial Background . . . . . B-3

        Age . . . . . B-4

    What Brought These Individuals to Prison and What Do We Know About Their Prior and Most Recent Correctional History? . . . . . B-8

    What Was the Most Serious Prison Commitment Offense for Each of These Releasees? . . . . . B-8

    What Was the Type of Commitment Offense Noted Above? . . . . . B-12

    What Was the Class of Commitment Offense Noted Above? . . . . . B-14

    What Was the Sentence Length (in Months) Imposed for the Most Serious Conviction Offense Associated With the Original New Court Prison Commitment? . . . . . B-16

    What Was the Total Sentence Length (in Months) Imposed For All the Conviction Offenses Associated With the Original New Court Prison Commitment? . . . . . B-18

    What Was the Prison Time Actually Served by These Releasees Prior to Their Initial Release From Prison in 1980-1981? . . . . . B-20

    What Was the Prison Release Status of Each of These Releasees? . . . . . B-21

    Had These Releasees Ever Been Imprisoned Before as New Court Commitments? . . . . . B-22

How do the Various Important Subgroups of Releasees (As Classified by the Type of Most Serious Prison Admission Offense) Compare in Terms of the Above Sentence Characteristics? . . . . . B-23

    Sentence Length (in Months) for Most Serious Conviction Offense . B-23

    Total Sentence Length (in Months) . . . . . B-24

    Time Actually Served in Prison . . . . . B-25

    Proportion of Sentence Served . . . . . B-27

C. THE PRISON RELEASEE COHORT COMPONENT OF THE RESEARCH:

RECIDIVISM DATA . . . . . C-1

    How Was Recidivism Defined and Measured in This Research? . . . . . C-1

    What is the Overall Post-Release Recidivism Experience of This Prison Releasee Cohort? . . . . . C-4

    How Does the Recidivism (Prison Return) Rate of the Released Traffic Offenders Compare to the Recidivism Rates of Other Classes of Offenders? . . . . . C-5

    Which Group Returns Most Often for the Same Kind of Offense? . . . . . C-8

    Among the Groups of Returnees Arranged by Original Prison Admission Offense, What Differences Were There in Time to Return? . . . . . C-11

D. THE TRAFFIC OFFENDER VS. NON-TRAFFIC OFFENDER COMPARATIVE STUDY COMPONENT OF THE RESEARCH . . . . . D-1

    Description of the Study Groups . . . . . D-1

    What Comparisons Were Made Between These Traffic and Non-Traffic Offenders . . . . . D-2

        Demographic Variables . . . . . D-3

        Other (CCH-Based) Variables . . . . . D-9

APPENDICES

## TABLES

A-1	Yearly Trends in (DUII) Arrests and Arrest Rates, 1974 to 1984 . . .	A-3
A-2	Commitments to the Oregon Corrections Division for Driving-Related Offenses, 1978-1984 . . . . .	A-5
B-1	Sex of Prison Releasee Cohort . . . . .	B-3
B-2	Ethnic/Racial Distribution of Releasee Cohort . . . . .	B-4
B-3	Year Releasees Were Admitted to Prison . . . . .	B-5
B-4	Age of Releasees at Date of Admission to Prison . . . . .	B-6
B-5	Age of Releasees at Date of Release From Prison . . . . .	B-7
B-6	Percent and Frequency on Types of Serious Conviction Offense Associated With the Original New Court Prison Commitment . . . . .	B-12
B-7	Percent and Frequency on Class of Most Serious Conviction Offense Associated With the Original New Court Prison Commitment . .	B-14
B-8	Sentence Length in Months for the Most Serious Offense Associated With the Original New Court Commitment . . . . .	B-16
B-9	Total Sentence Length In Months Imposed for Those Conviction Offenses Associated With the Original New Court Commitment . . . . .	B-18
B-10	Length of Time Served in Prison in Days . . . . .	B-20
B-11	Percentage and Frequency of Parole Supervision Upon Release From Prison . . . . .	B-21
B-12	Prior New Court Prison Commitments . . . . .	B-22
B-13	Average Sentence Length Imposed For Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense . . . . .	B-23
B-14	Average Total Sentence Length Imposed For Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense . . . . .	B-24
B-15	Average Number of Days of Time Served in Prison from Admission to First 1980-1981 Release Date by Offense Type . . . . .	B-25
B-16	Total Prison Sentence Served by Offense Type . . . . .	B-26
C-1	Reasons for Return to Prison after Release . . . . .	C-4
C-2	Rates of Prison Return and Return for the Same Offense for Each Major Group of Releasees Classified by Original Admission Offense .	C-6

C-3	Rates of Prison Return and Return for the Same Offense for Each Major Group of Releasees Classified by Original Admission Offense . . . . .	C-7
C-4	Rates of Prison Return and Return for the Same Offense for Each Major Subgroup of Releasees Classified by Original Admission Offense . . . . .	C-10
C-5	Time in Days by Offense Type to Return to Prison After Release . . . . .	C-11
D-1	Comparisons Between Traffic Offenders and Non-Traffic Offenders . . . . .	D-4
D-2	The Results of t-Tests of Mean Differences for Comparing Traffic Offender and Non-Traffic Offender Study Groups (Independent Samples) on Selected Variables . . . . .	D-8

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a direct outgrowth of growing public concern with the problem of drunk driving and related traffic offenses in Oregon. As the volume of traffic offender arrests has swelled (especially for DUII or driving under the influence of intoxicants) in Oregon, the public has shown an increased willingness to promote tougher laws and more punitive measures directed toward the traffic offender. The immediate results of such recent legislation include higher jail and incarceration rates for traffic offenders, a greater use of probation supervision, and more fines and restitution. A secondary result of this "get tough" movement is a growing number of driver's license suspensions and revocations with a concurrent increase in the volume of arrests and incarcerations (or jailings) of motor vehicle operators who were caught driving while on suspended (DWS) or revoked licenses.

While the social costs wrought on the public by traffic offenders who claim lives and damage property are astronomical, the criminal justice system likewise expends a great outlay of dollars on these offenders. This is especially true of the traffic offender who is incarcerated in Oregon's state correctional or penal institutions. It is the incarcerated or imprisoned traffic offender who represents the crux of the problem for both corrections practitioners and policymakers.

Despite the "get tough" approach directed toward traffic offenders (especially DUII and DWS offenders), there is still a large cloud of controversy and debate surrounding the traffic offender and the new legislation. For one, corrections officials in Oregon note that traffic offenders incarcerated in prison each cost the taxpayers about \$39 per day for the period of their institutional stay. On the average they serve about 8 to 11 months in prison. Prior to this, their jail time amounts to a stay of about three (3) months on the average. They face, upon release from prison, an average of six (6) months on parole. Largely because of the expense and effectiveness issues, many legislators and policymakers question the appropriateness of

prison incarceration as a sentencing disposition for these convicted offenders. They wonder about the effectiveness of other alternatives - particularly for the traffic offender with alcohol (and drug) related problems.

The policy questions about incarceration vs. community alternatives for this class of traffic offender gain a particular significance when we consider the issue of prison overcrowding in Oregon. The stricter laws on DUII offenses combined with the greater use of driver's license suspensions and revocations may well lead to an increase in the size of the traffic (especially DWS) offender population held in the state prisons. In line with this thinking, we have some recent short term trend data indicating that both commitments to probation and to penal institutions have increased very rapidly in the last few years.

This research attempts to meet the critical need for data and information on the incarcerated traffic offender (especially the DWS offender). In particular, our aim is to provide the audience of this research report with information on who these traffic (DWS) offenders are in terms of their demographic, social, and criminal history background characteristics and recidivism patterns and how they differ from other inmate populations in terms of these characteristics.

For the purpose of this research, we identified (using the Oregon Corrections Division's Offender Tracking File) a cohort of all new court commitments who were initially released from an Oregon state correctional institution between January 1, 1980 and December 31, 1981. This cohort was composed of 2,857 prison releasees (or individuals) who logically could be tracked for a three year follow-up period from date of first 1980 or 1981 release. These 2,857 releasees had been incarcerated as new court commitments where the most serious admission offenses included various traffic or driving-related offenses and all other felony offenses. The information generated on this cohort of prison releasees constituted an offender recidivism data set which allowed us to profile the traffic and other (non-traffic) offenders in terms of various demographic, social, and correctional history characteristics, as

well as recidivism patterns. Because this study focused on incarcerated traffic offenders, recidivism was defined somewhat narrowly as return to prison in Oregon.

In addition to data provided on these releasees from the Corrections Division's Client Tracking System, we augmented our effort by including an examination of computerized criminal history (CCH) or "rap sheet" data from the Oregon State Police Bureau of Identification (OSPBI). CCH data were obtained on all 205 traffic offenders identified in the study and on a non-traffic offender comparison group of similar size which was randomly selected from all of the remaining non-traffic offenders in the study cohort.

In the introductory section of this report, we present data on yearly trends in DUII arrests (and arrest rates) and on commitments to Correction Division probation supervision and penal institutions in Oregon. All of these statistical series have demonstrated upward fluctuations and increases in recent years. Added to these alarming statistics is the sobering fact that, in Oregon last year, over four times as many people died as a result of traffic accidents (571) as died as a result of willful homicides (140). For the same period in the U.S., traffic fatalities outnumbered homicide victims by a 2.5 to 1 margin.

Overall, the study cohort of 2,857 prison releasees is demographically typical of incarcerated offenders. They are predominantly male (95.0%), white (81.2%), and young (two-thirds are in their 20's or are younger).

In terms of correctional history, the vast majority of releasees were relatively recent admittees (or commitments). Admission offenses ranged from murder to various lesser statute violations. Total sentence length ranged from 5 to 1,188 months with an average of 78 months imposed. Not unexpectedly, time served was considerably less, with an average of 528 days (or approximately 17 months) served (not counting time served in jail prior to incarceration). When released, most were placed on parole (93.6%). Approximately one in every eight or 12.1% had a prior prison commitment or admission

(i.e., prior to the current admission) which resulted from adjudication and conviction on new crime charges (rather than simply probation or parole rule violations).

In comparing groups of offenders in this study, traffic offenders had the lowest average sentence length imposed for both the most serious offense and for all conviction offenses resulting in imprisonment. In terms of time served in prison, traffic offenders had the least number of days on the average of time actually served. In addition, they ranked third lowest as a group in the average proportion of the prison sentence actually served.

The recidivism (or prison return) experience of this cohort and especially the various sub-groups of offenders was a focal point of this research. Overall, of the 2,857 releasees tracked after release, 29.5% (or 842) returned to prison within the three (3) year follow-up period after the initial release date in 1980 or 1981. This figure compares favorably with that obtained from an earlier (1984) prison releasee cohort study sponsored by the Crime Analysis Center. In this 1984 study, 32.2% (or 574 of 1,782 1979 releasees) were returned to prison.

Comparison of the traffic to the non-traffic offender groups provided some notable contrasts - especially in the area of recidivism patterns.

In terms of both return rate and average number of days until return (for the returnees), the traffic or driving-related offenders were in the middle range of the 14 major groups of offenders identified among the releasees. This finding was confirmed for the 1984 study as well. Some 27.3% (or 56 of 205) of the released traffic offenders returned to prison within three years of their initial 1980 or 1981 release date, and the average number of days to return (or readmission) for these 56 returnees was 423.3 days (or roughly 14 months).

Where the traffic offenders were notably different was in the area of most serious prison readmission offense. In both the current study and the 1984 study, the traffic offenders were much more likely to return to prison for the

same (most serious) offense which got them originally committed or admitted to prison. In both studies, nearly half of the returnees originally committed for traffic offenses were readmitted for another new court traffic offense conviction.

Perhaps the most interesting findings in the whole research effort involved examination of CCH or "rap sheet" data on the group of traffic offenders in contrast to the comparison group of non-traffic offenders.

In terms of demographic characteristics, traffic offenders are slightly more likely to be males and significantly more likely to be non-whites than non-traffic offenders. Noteworthy is the fact that the risk of being a traffic offender varies considerably by type of ethnic group. American Indians are much more likely than Hispanics, and Hispanics are much more likely than whites to be traffic offenders.

In almost every comparison made, traffic offenders look different than non-traffic offenders. The profile of the traffic offender (as opposed to the non-traffic offender) is that of an offender with a CCH file showing more arrests for any offense and especially traffic related offenses - both before and after release from prison in 1980 or 1981.

Largely because of the difference between the traffic and non-traffic offenders in the numbers of CCH recorded arrests in Oregon, the traffic offender had significantly more reported offenses and especially traffic related offenses. Also, given the large number of arrests for traffic offenders (as opposed to non-traffic offenders), the traffic offenders had more arrests resulting in conviction on some charge or charges, more incarcerations (prison receptions), and more probation supervision periods. Despite these differences, however, the traffic offenders were less likely than the non-traffic offenders to have escaped from prison or to have parole revocations.

Given the greater number of arrests traffic offenders have in the CCH records, it is not surprising that these offenders have a longer criminal career as measured by the number of years between the first and the last CCH recorded arrest. On the average, the traffic offender had an additional five (5) years of criminal involvement.

Though we made no systematic attempt to compare the seriousness of the arrest offenses of traffic offenders with those of non-traffic offenders, there were some notable differences between groups in the frequency of certain kinds of offenses. For example, there were significant differences between the groups in terms of the numbers arrested, convicted, or imprisoned (or jailed) on "habitual traffic offender" charges. None of the non-traffic offenders as opposed to 20% of the traffic offenders were at least arrested at one time on these charges. Most significantly, more of the traffic offenders (83%) than the non-traffic offenders (26%) were arrested at least once on DUII charges.

Last, each group began their CCH recorded criminal careers at about the same time on the average (i.e., 20 or 21 years of age), but the traffic offender was more likely to begin his or her career with a traffic offense (37% vs. 10%).

The profile of the incarcerated traffic offender which emerges from this research is not totally unexpected. Many have wondered about their background of involvement in the criminal justice system and have argued that they may be far from innocuous in terms of their criminal career and the extent of their criminality. The chronicity of their involvement in traffic offenses and their heavy involvement in drunk driving both point to the need to examine the effectiveness of various sentencing dispositions (especially incarceration) with this group.

## A. INTRODUCTION

In this section of the report we introduce the reader to the purposes of the research described herein and discuss the background of the research in terms of some of the parameters of the problem of traffic offenses in Oregon and the need for this research on traffic offenders.

### What Are the Purposes of This Research?

The major purpose of the research described in this publication is to advance our understanding of the traffic offender, or if you will, the criminal who drives in Oregon. While this research has special significance for policy-makers and other professionals in Oregon's criminal justice system, there are implications which extend to the general public interest both here in Oregon and elsewhere. Oregon's situation with respect to traffic offenders and the serious problems they create is not unique in any way to this state alone.

The more specific purposes of this research were to (1) generate "profile" statistics on incarcerated and released traffic offenders (especially those imprisoned on "driving while on suspended license" charges), and (2) to compare these traffic offenders to other types of offenders housed in and recently released from Oregon's prisons. The intent of such a statistical and comparative study is to focus attention on the extent to which this class of offender presents the criminal justice system with both problems and needs and represents a draw on important correctional supervision, treatment, and other service delivery resources.

By choosing incarcerated or imprisoned traffic offenders we sought to focus attention on those offenders who have penetrated the criminal justice system further than most and who are considered among the most serious segment of the population in terms of traffic violations and offenses.

## What is the Background of Interest and Concern for This Research?

In Oregon, as in a number of other states, there has been a growing public concern in recent months about drunk driving and related traffic offenses. Increasingly, the public attitude has hardened when it comes to traffic offenders--especially those offenders driving under the influence of intoxicants (DUII) and those driving while on a suspended license (DWS). The public and many of its representatives in the different branches of government have shown an increasing willingness to promote legislation and support decisions which lead to the greater use of incapacitation as a deterrent for DUII and DWS offenses. An underlying message seems to be coming through loud and clear: The citizens of Oregon want tougher laws dealing with life-threatening problems posed by drunk drivers.

In 1983, the 62nd Session of the Oregon Legislative Assembly was the scene for a massive citizen lobbying effort against drunk driving. This effort was led by a very politically active citizen organization known as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) and joined by the Oregon Traffic Safety Council, the Governor's Task Force on Violent Crime, the Oregon Peace Officer's Association, and many others. Out of this effort, at least six different bills were enacted into law.<sup>1</sup>

The most prominent new piece of approved legislation was Senate Bill (SB) 710 which amended the respective Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) dealing with the suspension and issuance of occupational licenses for refusing the breath test or failing it. It also established community service sentences for various traffic offenses other than just DUII offenses and it requires the police officer to take custody of a person's license if the person refuses or fails the breath test. In addition, further suspensions are mandatory for refusing or failing the breath test and the ability to obtain occupational licenses is severely curtailed by statute. The most important feature of SB 710 (and also

---

<sup>1</sup> For a brief description of these bills as passed into law, see Mark Caillier, "Oregon Gets Tougher on DUII Violations," Oregon Peace Officer, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Winter, 1984), p. 9.

House Bill (HB) 2420 was the provision to lower the "blood alcohol" level standard to .08 from .10.

This recent public concern for developing legal deterrents to drunk driving is a product also of a real increase in the volume and rates in recent years of DUII arrests. Table A-1 displays the trends in DUII arrests over the last 11 years for which data are available in Oregon. As we can see, there has been (in general) a notable upward swing in the volume and rate of DUII arrests from 1974 to 1980 with some tapering off and reductions in 1981 through 1983 and a slight increase in 1984.

TABLE A-1: Yearly Trends in (DUII) Arrests and Arrest Rates, 1974 to 1984

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of DUII Arrests<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>Percent Change in Number From Previous Year</u>	<u>Arrest Rate Per 100,000<sup>b</sup></u>	<u>Percent Change in Rate From Previous Year</u>
1974	15,708		693.2	
1975	20,581	+31.0%	895.2	+29.1%
1976	23,351	+13.5%	997.5	+11.4%
1977	27,563	+18.0%	1,150.4	+15.3%
1978	26,850	-2.6%	1,086.2	-5.6%
1979	28,572	+6.4%	1,123.1	+3.4%
1980	31,398	+9.9%	1,193.6	+6.3%
1981	29,828	-5.0%	1,121.2	-6.1%
1982	27,370	-8.2%	1,030.4	-8.1%
1983	26,933	-1.6%	1,022.1	-0.8%
1984	27,105	+0.6%	1,019.0	-0.3%

Source: Crime Analysis Center, Department of Justice, Salem, Oregon, and Law Enforcement Data System, Executive Department, Salem, Oregon.

<sup>a</sup> Represents the number of arrests in which DUII was the primary or only charge.

<sup>b</sup> Based on number of arrests per 100,000 (general) population as estimated by the Center for Population Research and Census.

As an addendum to Table A-1 and the discussion of the data as presented, it should be noted that currently available figures for 1985 indicate that there may be a very sudden and dramatic shift in this trend in DUII arrests as reported in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program in Oregon. Comparisons between the first six months of 1985 compared to the first six months of 1984 reveal the following:

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Number of DUII Arrests</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
January-June, 1984	15,094	
January-June, 1985	12,194	-19.2%

Source: Law Enforcement Data System, Salem, Oregon (October 17, 1985).

Further, these figures (above) translate to an annual rate of 916.8 arrests per 100,000 population in the first six months of 1985 compared to a rate of 1145.7 DUII arrests for the first six months of 1984 - a reduction of 20%.<sup>1</sup>

The Law Enforcement Data System people note that this large decrease is apparently the result of stricter drunk driving legislation which went into effect in July of 1984.<sup>2</sup>

Besides UCR data on DUII arrest trends, there is also data available from the Oregon Corrections Division (OCD) which confirms that there has been in recent years an increasing number of commitments to both probation supervision and to

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Stephen C. Kincaid, Supervisor of the Uniform Crime Statistics of the Law Enforcement Data System, notes that, if this percent reduction figure holds true of all of 1985, it will be one of the largest reductions ever noted for a major UCR crime reported annually in Oregon.

<sup>2</sup> See Law Enforcement Data Systems, "Oregon Law Enforcement Agencies Report of Criminal Offenses, January through June, 1985" as released on October 17, 1985, p. 2. For a somewhat more cautious interpretation of these same data, see Barnie Jones, Senate Bill 710 and Traffic Safety: A Preliminary Report on the Effectiveness of Oregon's New Drinking Driver Law, Oregon Motor Vehicles Division, April 1985.

penal institutions for driving-related offenses. Table A-2 contains data on OCD commitments for driving offenses dating back to 1978.

TABLE A-2: Commitments to the Oregon Corrections Division for Driving-Related Offenses, 1978-1984

	<u>Commitments to Probation</u>		<u>Commitments to Penal Institutions</u>
1978	663		120
1979	991		176
1980	1,860		160
1981	2,625	+601.8%	167
1982	3,721	+150.2%	233
1983	4,106		239
1984	4,653		244

Source: Oregon Corrections Division, November, 1985.

As we can see from Table A-2, there has been a striking increase in both the number of commitments to probation and to penal institutions since 1978, the earliest year for which we could obtain data.<sup>1</sup>

Due to the effects of the Oregon Community Corrections Act on probation supervisions, the notable increase between 1979 and 1980 (+87.7%) should be regarded with some caution.<sup>2</sup> It is probably more realistic to turn most of our attention to felony commitments of driving or traffic offenders to the state's penal institutions. While the increases in commitments are somewhat less spectacular than those for probation supervision, there was still an increase of 103.3% in commitments between 1978 and 1984 and a 77.5% increase from 1980 to 1984.

The Modern Debate Over Incarcerating Traffic Offenders

Despite these data and the growing public support for a "get tough" approach to DUII and DWS offenders, there is still a large cloud of controversy and

<sup>1</sup> Reporting of commitments to probation cases officially began on January 1, 1979.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. O. R. Chambers, who furnished these data, points out that from 1980 on the probation commitment figures include misdemeanants. This is largely the product of provisions of the Community Corrections Act which provide counties with funds for probation supervision and services.

debate surrounding the traffic offender and the new legislation. For one, corrections officials in Oregon note that traffic offenders incarcerated in prison each cost the taxpayers about \$39 per day for the period of their institutional stay. On the average they serve about 8 to 11 months in prison. Prior to this, their jail time amounts to a stay of about three (3) months on the average. They face, upon release from prison, an average of six (6) months on parole. Largely because of the expense and effectiveness issues, many legislators and policymakers question the appropriateness of prison incarceration as a sentencing disposition for these convicted offenders. They wonder about the effectiveness of other alternatives - particularly for the traffic offender with alcohol (and drug) related problems.<sup>1</sup>

These policy questions about incarceration vs. community alternatives for this class of traffic offender gain a particular significance when we consider the issue of prison overcrowding in Oregon. The stricter laws on DUII offenses combined with the greater use of driver's license suspensions and revocations is sure to lead to an increase in the size of the traffic (especially DWS) offender population held in the state prisons.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Need for This Research

This research is based on the critical need for data and information on the incarcerated traffic offender (especially the DWS offender). In particular, our aim is to provide the audience of this research report with information on who these traffic (DWS) offenders are in terms of their demographic, social,

---

<sup>1</sup> For an important new study on drunk drivers, see the National Institute of Justice study entitled, Jailing Drunk Drivers: Impact on the Criminal Justice System, 1985.

<sup>2</sup> One important finding of the above cited study is that states with new laws imposing mandatory confinement sanctions on convicted drunk drivers dramatically increased the incarceration rates for such offenders. This finding includes drunk drivers convicted of their first offense.

While Oregon's new laws do not contain mandatory confinement sanctions, the emphasis on suspension of driving privileges can indirectly increase the incarceration rates by increasing the number of drivers at risk for driving while suspended arrests and convictions.

and criminal history background characteristics and recidivism patterns and how they differ from other inmate populations in terms of these characteristics.

Though this research is largely descriptive in nature, it is deemed an important starting point for any eventual attempts to form or shape public and agency policies with regard to the processing of traffic offenders in various components of the criminal justice system.

The reader should be aware, however, that studies of traffic offenders (even descriptive studies) are not particularly common and most existent studies are somewhat rudimentary attempts to describe traffic offenders or to compare the criminal involvement of traffic violators with that of the non-violating general public who drive.<sup>1</sup>

This paucity of research studies gains noteworthy significance when we consider the magnitude of both the volume of modern vehicular traffic and the accompanying traffic safety problems which have been with us for some time and about which we know so little.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a relatively recent article which summarizes much of the research associated with the latter emphasis, see Preben Wolf, "The Myth of the Respectable Traffic Offender: Twenty Years Later," in Sarnoff A. Mednick and S. Giora Shoham, (eds.), New Paths in Criminology, Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1979, pp. 79-88.

<sup>2</sup> It is also interesting that we seldom contrast the most serious result of criminal activity (i.e., willful homicides) with the most serious result of traffic accidents (i.e., fatalities). For example, in 1984 in Oregon and the U.S. the numbers of persons killed as a result of traffic accidents vs. as a result of homicides were as follows:

<u>Number of People Killed in:</u>	<u>Oregon</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
Traffic Accidents	571	46,200
Willful Homicides	140	18,692

Source: Law Enforcement Data System, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Oregon Traffic Safety Commission (Note: Willfull homicides exclude deaths caused by negligence)

B. THE PRISON RELEASEE COHORT COMPONENT  
OF THE RESEARCH: DESCRIPTIVE DATA

In this section of the report, we examine the data and findings from the prison releasee cohort component of our research. The main purpose of this component of the research was to generate comparisons between traffic and non-traffic offenders (or more correctly ex-offenders) released from Oregon correctional (penal) institutions and followed or tracked for three years from their respective release dates. A secondary purpose of this component of the research was to replicate, in part at least, the results of earlier studies of the recidivism patterns of releasees from Oregon correctional institutions. In particular, we were interested in how our results compared to those obtained from a recent study conducted for the Crime Analysis Center in 1984.<sup>1</sup>

Before examining our data and findings on the recidivism patterns of this cohort of releasees, it is important that we furnish some descriptive statistics on the full cohort of individuals studied. This will enhance our later discussion of our comparative results and will clarify our statements about the representativeness of the sample and subsamples of individuals studied. Also, the brief description of the methodology employed in this

---

<sup>1</sup> This attempt to partially replicate the results of earlier research was not an objective of this research as originally proposed. It is consistent, however, with its purpose in that these earlier studies examine the recidivism rates of various classes of offenders (including traffic-related and non-traffic offenders). As such, they provide a benchmark against which to establish recidivism rates for comparative purposes and they strengthen our faith in the current research and the validity of the research findings generated from it.

The most important study which is subject to partial replication in this research is that summarized by Robert Willstadter in a 1984 report entitled, "Recidivism of Releasees from Oregon Corrections Institutions." Although this earlier research study employs a larger and earlier cohort of releasees, it is nearly identical to our releasee cohort study in terms of both the methodological design and the specific measures of recidivism, as well as, certain other measures employed.

Where appropriate, we have included references to and statistics from these earlier recidivism studies.

component of the research is essential for making comparisons between the results obtained from this research and those obtained from earlier research studies.

### Who Was Studied and Why?

This study examines the recidivism patterns of 2,857 individuals (all new court commitments) released from an Oregon state correctional institution between January 1, 1980 and December 31, 1981. The information obtained on these releasees constitutes an (ex-) offender recidivism data set based on a three year follow-up period from date of first release.<sup>1</sup>

The 1980 and 1981 release period was selected because it is still contemporary and yet allows a full three years of follow-up. The three (3) year follow-up period is considered sufficient for measuring recidivism rates for most research purposes.<sup>2</sup> More will be said about the issue of an appropriate follow-up period later in this report.

Because of our interest in a particular class of offender (i.e., traffic offenders), the unit of count was taken as the number of releasees (or individuals). The difference between "releasees" and "releases" becomes clear when we consider that some of these individuals were released more than once during the 24-month period from January 1, 1980 to December 31, 1981. In this study, an individual released, returned and released a second time during the 1980 to 1981 period was counted as one releasee, even though there were two releases. This is because we are interested in the "individual" rather than the "release" as the unit of count for our statistical analyses in this research.

---

<sup>1</sup> For each of these 2,857 releasees, there was exactly three (3) years of follow-up - including an adjustment for the 1984 leap year.

<sup>2</sup> While the length of the follow-up period for measuring recidivism varies widely and lacks a generally accepted standard, many criminal justice and related research agencies have adopted a 3-year follow-up period. This is largely because of a recent recommendation by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.

## What Were the Major Demographic Features of the Releasee Cohort?

Certain Oregon Corrections Division Offender Tracking System data elements were available to describe the major demographic characteristics of this cohort of 2,857 prison releasees. These data or variables and the uni-variate statistical distributions for each characteristic are listed and summarized as follows.

### Sex

As might be expected, this cohort of individuals is predominantly composed of males. Table B-1 presents data on the sex distribution of our cohort.

TABLE B-1: The prison releasee cohort employed in this study is predominantly composed of males.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Female	5.0%	(143)
Male	<u>95.0%</u>	<u>(2,714)</u>
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

As Table B-1 reveals, 95.0% of these 2,857 prison releasees are males.

### Ethnic/Racial Background

Given Oregon's demographic features<sup>1</sup>, we would have a strong expectation that a large majority of the individuals in our study cohort would be white in terms of their ethnic/racial background.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1980 the U.S. Census showed that of a total of 2,633,105 persons in Oregon, the major racial subgroups were whites (2,490,610 or 94.6%), blacks (37,060 or 1.4%), and American Indians (26,591 or 1.0%). Further, persons of Spanish origin or descent (as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau) numbered 65,847 (or 2.5%). The subdivision by race of these 65,847 persons of Spanish origin yields 34,598 classified white, 538 classified black, and 30,711 classified as other races. For further information and a discussion of how racial and ethnic groupings are reported, see U.S. Bureau of Census, 1980 Census of Population, Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population, "Chapter B, General Population Characteristics," Part 39, Oregon (PC80-1-B39), issued August, 1982, Tables 15 and 16 and Appendix B.

Table B-2 presents data on the ethnic/racial distribution of this cohort.

TABLE B-2: The prison releasee cohort employed in this study is predominantly composed of whites. The largest minority group represented consists of blacks.

<u>Ethnic/Racial Grouping</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Whites	81.2%	(2,320)
Blacks	10.9%	(311)
American Indians	3.9%	(111)
Hispanics	3.5%	(101)
Oriental	0.0%	(1)
(All) Others	0.5%	(13)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

From Table B-2 we see that a little over four of every five releasees are white (81.2%). The largest minority groups represented are blacks (10.9%) followed by American Indians (3.9%) and Hispanics (3.5%).

### Age

The age distribution and average age for this cohort of releasees is heavily influenced by the way in which age is computed. For example, we can compute a releasee's age as of the date that he or she was admitted to prison or as of the date that he or she was released. Since we have the admission date for each releasee and also know the number of days served, we can compute age at both admission and age at release for each of these 2,857 new court commitments released from an Oregon state prison between January 1, 1980 and December 31, 1981.

Before looking at the average age and age distribution as of the date of admission of this cohort of releasees, it is important that we look at how these individuals distribute by year of admission. Table B-3 represents this distribution.

TABLE B-3: The majority of these 2,857 releasees were admitted to prison in 1979 or 1980 (i.e., 66.9% or about two-thirds).

<u>Year Admitted to Prison</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
1965	0.1%	(2)
1966	0.1%	(2)
1967	0.0%	(1)
1968	0.0%	(1)
1969	-	(0)
1970	0.1%	(3)
1971	0.3%	(9)
1972	0.2%	(6)
1973	0.4%	(10)
1974	0.4%	(10)
1975	1.5%	(43)
1976	2.7%	(77)
1977	5.5%	(156)
1978	13.8%	(395)
1979	35.1%	(1,004)
1980	31.8%	(908)
1981	8.1%	(230)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

As the data in Table B-3 indicate, about two-thirds (or 66.9%) of the releasee cohort were admitted to prison in 1979 or 1980 and nearly nine in every ten (or 88.8%) were admitted in the four-year period from 1978 to 1981. We should keep these prison admission year figures in mind when we present a frequency distribution and calculate any measures of central tendency on time served in prison. Also, we should keep in mind that nearly 40% (39.9%) of these were admitted in the same two year release period (1980-1981) which gives this cohort its definition or main distinguishing characteristic.

Looking at Table B-4, we have presented the age at admission frequency distribution with the appropriate statistical measures of central tendency.

TABLE B-4: As of the date of admission, the majority of these re-  
 leasees (52.4%) were in their twenties and over half of them were  
 under 26 years of age.

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Under 20 Years	14.5%	(415)
20-29 Years	52.4%	(1,497)
30-39 Years	20.8%	(594)
40-49 Years	8.2%	(235)
50-59 Years	2.9%	(82)
60-69 Years	1.1%	(30)
70 or More Years	0.1%	(4)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

Measures of Central Tendency

Mean Age = 28.538  
 Standard Deviation = 9.449  
 Median Age = 25.919  
 Modal Age = 18.872  
 Lowest Age = 16.857  
 Highest Age = 75.608  
 Range = 58.752

As the data in Table B-4 indicate, most of the releasees admitted to prison in Oregon and first released in either 1980 or 1981 were young. Nearly nine of every ten (87.7%) were under age 40. With a mean age at admission of 28.5 and a median age of 25.9, we have further confirmation of a commonly quoted fact: "The propensity to crime is highest among the young and they basically populate our correctional institutions."

Data in Table B-5 on the age at first release (in either 1980 or 1981) further confirms what we have said above.

TABLE B-5: As of the date of release, the majority of these re-  
Teasees (54.7%) were in their twenties and over half of them were  
 under 28 years of age.

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Under 20 Years	6.3%	(179)
20-29 Years	54.7%	(1,564)
30-39 Years	24.2%	(692)
40-49 Years	9.8%	(280)
50-59 Years	3.7%	(105)
60-69 Years	1.1%	(31)
70 or More Years	<u>0.2%</u>	<u>(6)</u>
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

Measures of Central Tendency

Mean Age = 29.984  
 Standard Deviation = 9.614  
 Median Age = 27.277  
 Modal Age = 20.361  
 Lowest Age = 17.574  
 Highest Age = 76.411  
 Range = 58.836

What Brought These Individuals to Prison and What Do We  
Know About Their Prior and Most Recent Correctional History?

As we learned earlier in Table B-3, the study cohort of 2,857 individuals were all initially released in either 1980 or 1981 from prison stays which began anywhere from as early as 1965 to as late as 1981. However, the majority of these releasees (66.9%) were admitted to prison in the two year period of 1979 or 1980. In looking at these releasees, a number of questions surface. For example, we want to know the reasons for commitment in terms of the most serious commitment offense and want to determine the length of sentence imposed. Also, we want to ask if these individuals have had prior prison commitments in Oregon. In the next subsections of this report, we state some of the key questions and examine the available data to furnish answers.

What Was The Most Serious Prison Commitment  
Offense for Each of These Releasees?

The Oregon Corrections Division Offender Tracking System utilizes a number of criminal offense categories for describing commitment offenses and reasons for return to prison (or to field supervision). Appendix A in this report provides a complete listing of all the offense categories employed in this research study.<sup>1</sup>

For our purposes in this research, we have defined "most serious" conviction offense associated with the original new court commitment to prison as that offense with the highest seriousness score obtained from the Oregon Parole Matrix scoring system.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that for some analysis later in this report we collapse these many offense categories into 14 major categories.

<sup>2</sup> Later on in this report we will discuss situations where a less serious offense directed against the person outweighs a supposedly more serious offense directed against property and creates the need to clarify how our data were constructed.

Utilizing data presented in the first four columns of the table in Appendix B, we can array these 2,857 releasees across the various offense categories rated as the most serious arrest offenses for which conviction and prison commitment or admission followed.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that while we assume that all of these 2,857 imprisoned and subsequently released individuals should be regarded as felons, our data in Appendix B on the most serious commitment offense include several categories of misdemeanors and infractions (both considered less serious than felonies). Before we jump to the conclusion that the state of Oregon is imprisoning misdemeanants and lesser offenders, some explanations are in order.

First, for purposes of coding offenses into the computer for the Corrections Division Offender Tracking System, any offense directed against the person is considered more serious than any offense directed against property, and any offense against property is considered more serious than an offense involving a statute violation. Consequently, the most serious offense against the person (even if it is considered a misdemeanor) takes priority over a property offense (even if it is considered a felony).

Second, infractions, though they are considered less serious than misdemeanors, usually understate the seriousness of the crime or offense involved. For example, conspiracy to commit robbery is coded as an infraction for purposes of computer processing because the conspiracy part of the offense is categorized as such. While robbery itself would be considered a felony crime against the person, the conspiratorial nature of the crime takes precedence over the object of the conspiracy for classification. However, the fact that robbery in this example is a felony provides the basis for a prison sentence.

Third, the occasionally employed practice of merging multiple convictions with a single sentence may distort our understanding of the basis for imprisonment. For example, one arrest with an assault in the fourth degree (a Class A Misdemeanor) charge may be recorded in the computer as the most serious charge resulting in conviction and a jail sentence of six months. However, a second (later) arrest incident with a most serious charge of failure to appear in the first degree (a Class C Felony) results in conviction, and the two year prison sentence ordered by the judge is to be served concurrent with the sentence of the earlier arrest conviction on the Assault IV charges. Because the sentences for each conviction are merged, the computer picks up the prison sentence, but identifies the Assault IV charge as the most serious charge resulting in this merged sentence. The Assault IV charge, involving as it does an act directed against the person, takes priority over the Failure to Appear I charge which is defined as "against statute." Because of the way the computer is programmed for the Offender Tracking System, arrest incidents resulting in separate convictions but merged sentences may result in entries where the commitment offense may appear to be a misdemeanor, when in actuality, the basis for imprisonment was a felony as we would expect based on the Oregon Criminal Code. Also, data entry errors involving multiple convictions can cause the same problems.

Based on state statutes, Oregon Corrections Division penal institutions employ 204 offense classifications to categorize admissions. In Appendix B there are 98 (of these 204) offenses listed as the most serious admission offense manifested by each of the 2,857 individuals in our identified prison releasee cohort. Because of the diversity and number of listed offenses, it was clearly necessary to use some classification scheme or typology for grouping offenses. Partly because of the precedent established by the landmark study cited earlier,<sup>1</sup> and partly because of the logical appeal of replication, we elected to employ the following groupings of offenses for this study:

#### Persons Offenses

Murder-Related Offenses - murder, manslaughter and negligent homicide  
Sex Crimes - rape, sodomy, sexual penetration and sexual abuse  
Assault - all forms  
Robbery - all forms  
Other

#### Property Offenses

Burglary - all forms  
Theft - all forms other than motor vehicle theft  
Motor Vehicle Theft - all forms  
Forgery and Fraud - all forms  
Other

#### Statute Offenses

Driving-Related Offenses  
Drug Offenses - all forms  
Escape  
Other

It should be noted that these offense groupings are certainly narrower than what we had before, but they are much broader than the usual groupings we see in many studies of arrest offenses such as the Part I and Index crimes used by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program. For example, in the UCR offense classification system, Part I robbery is restricted to first, second, and third degree robbery. However, robbery as defined herein includes such forms as conspiracy to commit robbery and soliciting to commit robbery.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Robert Willstadter, Ibid., p. 3.

Aside from the appeal of replication, we also have some important divisions or distinctions between offense groupings. The person, property, and statute classification is important because it provides a crude, but important break developed according to the target of a criminal act. Also, the further subdivision of "offenses directed against statute" into driving-related, drug-related, and escape subcategories provides additional breaks which are of both substantive and theoretical importance.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Of course, there are also some dangers to premature and uncritical collapsing of various offense categories. One criticism of an earlier Oregon study of time served in prison - which employed nearly the same offense category groupings as used here - concerned the murder-related (or criminal homicide) offense group. Merging murder and manslaughter (both first and second degree) and criminally negligent homicide into one grouping masked a great deal of variation in sentence lengths and time actually served. See Robert Willstadter, A Comparison of Sentence Lengths and Time Served in Prison, Crime Analysis Center, Salem, Oregon, January, 1984 for a description of this research effort. Whenever possible in this research, we have furnished detailed breakouts to demonstrate the sources of variation in the statistical measures employed. For example, in examining recidivism or more specifically return to prison rates, we present our data for the major groupings and we also refer the reader to Appendix B for recidivism data on each specific prison commitment offense.

What Was the Type of Commitment Offense Noted Above?

In the previous subsection, we examined (using the listing in Appendix A and the table in Appendix B) the distribution of these releasees as arranged by the most serious offense conviction associated with the original new court commitment to prison. In this discussion we mentioned that there are three (3) major types of crime; i.e., crimes directed against persons, crimes directed against property, and crimes directed against statutes. Further, we added that the last type could be subdivided again into drug-related, driving- or traffic-related, and all other statute offenses (including escape).

Table B-6 contains data on the distribution of the type of most serious conviction offense associated with the original new court commitment to prison.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE B-6: The most common type of most serious conviction offense associated with the original new court prison commitment of these releasees was a property offense (47.0% or nearly half) followed by offenses against the person (32.2% or nearly one-third).

<u>Type of Offense</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Person	32.2%	(919)
Property	47.0%	(1,342)
Statute	16.8%	(480)
a. Driving-related	[7.2%]	[205]
b. Drug-related	[5.3%]	(151)
c. Other	[4.3%]	[124]
Unknown	4.1%	(116)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

<sup>1</sup> The figures in Table B-6 vary slightly from those which could be obtained from Appendix B. This is because we made some revisions in Appendix B. For example, arson offenses are erroneously listed as "person" offenses in the Offender Tracking System. While a change in classification to "property" offense will be incorporated in eventual revisions of the system, no such change has occurred yet. Therefore, we accept the classification or typing of offenses as they are extracted by the computer for Table B-6, but correctly note the actual classification of offense types in Appendix B. In general, however, there were very few instances where the computer results disagree with our rechecking of these types.

For an examination of Table B-6, we note that nearly half (47.0%) of the most serious prison commitment offenses were directed against property and nearly one-third (32.2%) were against the person. For this research, we are especially interested in isolating the 205 individuals identified as traffic offenders. We will focus on comparisons between traffic and non-traffic offenders in most of the remainder of this report.

The group of 205 releasees with a driving offense as the most serious conviction offense associated with the original new court commitment constitutes our basic study group of driving-related or "traffic" offenders. These traffic offenses include the following: (1) "Accident-related" driving offenses such as leaving the scene of an accident (hit and run situations) and failure to perform the duties of a driver as prescribed by law, (2) Driving while revoked, (3) Driving while suspended,<sup>1</sup> and (4) a generic category of all other driving-related offenses or "unspecified" driving-related offenses (which could include the above listed offenses).

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that driving while suspended and driving while revoked although similar have distinct meanings. The distinction is that "revocation" means termination thereof with new driving privileges obtainable only as permitted by law and "suspension" means temporary withdrawal of driving privileges for some period of time as determined by the nature of the offense for which suspended. With revocation, the license is gone and must be brought back. The privilege is gone and has to be reinstated. With suspension, the offender does not lose the license - only the temporary use of it. The privilege is only temporarily gone.

What Was the Class of Commitment Offense Noted Above?

Besides classifying prison commitment offenses by type, it is also possible to categorize them by class. Here we are talking about classes of felonies and misdemeanors (A, B and C), infractions, and other classes (including "attempts"). Table B-7 provides frequency distribution data for the class of most serious conviction offense associated with the original new court commitment to prison.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE B-7: The most common class of most serious conviction offense associated with the original new court prison commitment of these releasees was a Class C felony (50.8% or about half) followed by Class A felony offenses (26.9% or slightly over one-fourth). Felonies (both those specified and unspecified by class) accounted for 88.6% of all these offenses.

<u>Class of Offense<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Class A Felony <sup>a</sup>	26.9%	(769)
Class B Felony <sup>b</sup>	10.0%	(286)
Class C Felony <sup>c</sup>	50.8%	(1,451)
"Unspecified" Felony <sup>d</sup>	0.9%	(25)
Class A Misdemeanor <sup>e</sup>	1.4%	(41)
"Infraction" <sup>f</sup>	0.5%	(13)
"Old Code" <sup>g</sup>	3.1%	(88)
"Attempt" <sup>h</sup>	2.4%	(68)
Unknown <sup>i</sup>	4.1%	(116)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

<sup>1</sup> The figures in Table B-7 vary slightly from those which could be obtained from Appendix B. This is because we made some revisions in Appendix B. For example, leaving the scene of an accident or "hit and run" (DRIVACCI in row #26 of Appendix B was incorrectly labeled a Class A misdemeanor, when in fact it relates to a Class C felony. Where our information on the proper classification of an offense varies from that stored in the Corrections Division (CD) Client Tracking System, we accept the CD's computer results but note the actual class in Appendix B. In general, however, there were very few instances where the CD computer results disagree with our rechecking of these classes.

<sup>2</sup> The following explanations are in order:

<sup>a</sup> Class A felonies carry an indeterminate sentence having a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years.

<sup>b</sup> Class B felonies carry an indeterminate sentence having a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years.

From an examination of the data presented in Table B-7, we see that slightly over half (50.8%) of the most serious prison commitment offenses were classified as Class C felonies and slightly over one-fourth (26.9%) were classified as Class A felonies. Altogether, felonies (both those specified and unspecified by class) accounted for 88.6% of all these offenses. Actually, however, all of these offenses should have involved some felony offense as a basis for prison commitment. This is because by definition a new court commitment can only be sentenced to serve a prison sentence if he or she has been arrested for and convicted of committing a felony crime.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>c</sup> Class C felonies carry an indeterminate sentence having imprisonment of 5 years.

<sup>d</sup> "Unspecified" felonies refer to felony offenses which are "unspecified" by class (i.e., they make no reference to classes A, B and C). Murder and treason are both examples of "unspecified" felonies.

<sup>e</sup> A class A misdemeanor carries a definite sentence having a term of imprisonment (in jail) not to exceed a maximum of one (1) year.

<sup>f</sup> Infractions refer to a class of offenses punishable only by a fine, forfeiture, suspension or revocation of a license or other privilege, or other civil penalty. Infractions carry less sentence weight or penalty than misdemeanors.

<sup>g</sup> "Old Code" offenses refer to offenses listed in the Criminal Code of Oregon prior to 1971, but no longer listed today. An example is the crime of contributing to the delinquency of a minor.

<sup>h</sup> An "attempt" occurs when a person intentionally engages in conduct which constitutes a substantial step toward commission of a crime.

<sup>i</sup> Offenses designated "unknown" reflect situations where the prison commitment offenses have not been added to or updated in the Corrections Division's Client Tracking System.

NOTE: See footnote #1 on Page B-9 for an explanation of how misdemeanors, infractions, and "attempts" appear in this study of a prison release cohort. Also, note the footnotes at the end of Appendix B for important information related to these classes.

<sup>1</sup> By definition, a felony crime conviction carries a prison sentence for a term of more than one year of incarceration at a minimum. See footnote #1 on Page B-9 for an explanation of how some of these most serious prison commitment offenses do not appear to be felonies.

What Was the Sentence Length (in Months)  
Imposed for the Most Serious Conviction Offense  
Associated With the Original New Court Prison Commitment?

We can also array our 2,857 releasees across various categories which denote the length (in months) of the prison incarceration sentence imposed for the most serious offense associated with the original new court commitment discussed in the above sections. Table B-8 presents the frequency distribution for the range of sentences expressed in months of incarceration.

TABLE B-8: The majority of these releasees (77.8%) had prison sentences of five years (60 months) or less imposed for the most serious offense associated with the original new court commitment. The average sentence length was roughly 75 months of incarceration in prison.

<u>Sentence Length in Months</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
4	0.0%	(1)
5	0.0%	(1)
6	0.1%	(4)
12	1.5%	(42)
13	0.1%	(2)
15	0.1%	(4)
18	1.9%	(53)
21	0.0%	(1)
24	6.1%	(167)
27	0.1%	(2)
30	1.3%	(36)
34	0.0%	(1)
36	21.8%	(597)
38	0.0%	(1)
39	0.1%	(3)
40	0.1%	(2)
42	0.0%	(1)
44	0.0%	(1)
45	0.1%	(2)
46	0.1%	(4)
48	6.2%	(171)
51	0.0%	(1)
52	0.1%	(2)
54	0.1%	(4)
56	0.0%	(1)
60	37.5%	(1,028)
61	0.0%	(1)
72	1.7%	(47)

TABLE 8 (Cont.)

<u>Sentence Length in Months</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
84	3.2%	(87)
90	0.2%	(5)
96	1.9%	(52)
104	0.0%	(1)
108	0.2%	(6)
120	9.1%	(248)
144	0.5%	(13)
168	0.2%	(6)
180	1.4%	(37)
192	0.0%	(1)
216	0.0%	(1)
222	0.0%	(1)
240	2.8%	(76)
1,188	0.9%	(26)
Totals	100.0%	(2,740) <sup>a</sup>

Measures of Central Tendency

Mean =	74.884
Standard Deviation =	117.141
Median =	59.759
Mode =	60.000
Minimum =	4.000
Maximum =	1,188.000
Range =	1,184.000

As a group, this cohort of releasees had been sentenced to an average of 74.9 months of incarceration for the most serious conviction offense which resulted in a new court commitment to prison and eventually resulted in a prison release during the 1980 and 1981 period underlying our sample design for this research. A majority (77.8%) had prison sentences of five years (60 months) or less imposed for the most serious offense conviction associated with the original new court commitment.

<sup>a</sup> Excludes 116 cases where the most serious conviction (or prison admission) offense was "unknown" and one (1) case where the most serious conviction offense was known, but the sentence length was "unknown."

What Was the Total Sentence Length (in Months)  
Imposed For All the Conviction Offenses Associated  
With the Original New Court Prison Commitment?

In the above section we examined cohort data on the distribution of prison sentence lengths identified or associated with the most serious offense which resulted in conviction and commitment of these 2,857 individuals. Besides the most serious commitment offense, we can examine data on the total incarceration sentence length which resulted from all conviction offenses combined. Table B-9 presents the frequency distribution for this new range of total incarceration sentence lengths.

TABLE B-9: The majority of these releasees (75.6%) had a total prison sentence of five years (60 months) or less imposed for those conviction offenses associated with the original new court commitment. The average sentence length was roughly 78 months of incarceration in prison.

<u>Total Sentence Length in Months</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
5	0.0%	(1)
6	0.1%	(3)
12	1.0%	(27)
13	0.1%	(2)
15	0.1%	(2)
18	1.6%	(45)
21	0.0%	(1)
24	5.6%	(153)
27	0.1%	(3)
30	1.1%	(31)
34	0.0%	(1)
36	21.6%	(593)
38	0.0%	(1)
39	0.1%	(3)
40	0.1%	(2)
42	0.1%	(3)
44	0.0%	(1)
45	0.1%	(2)
46	0.1%	(4)
48	5.8%	(159)
51	0.0%	(1)
52	0.1%	(2)
54	0.1%	(4)
56	0.0%	(1)
60	37.4%	(1,026)

TABLE B-9 (Cont.)

<u>Total Sentence Length in Months</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
61	0.0%	(1)
66	0.0%	(1)
72	2.1%	(58)
83	0.0%	(1)
84	3.3%	(90)
90	0.1%	(4)
96	2.1%	(57)
104	0.0%	(1)
108	0.3%	(7)
120	9.9%	(270)
132	0.1%	(2)
144	0.4%	(12)
168	0.3%	(7)
180	1.4%	(39)
192	0.0%	(1)
216	0.1%	(2)
222	0.0%	(1)
240	3.1%	(85)
300	0.0%	(1)
360	0.1%	(3)
480	0.0%	(1)
<u>1,188</u>	<u>0.9%</u>	<u>(26)</u>
Totals	100.0%	(2,741) <sup>a</sup>

Measures of Central Tendency

Mean = 77.642  
 Standard Deviation = 118.089  
 Median = 59.817  
 Mode = 60.000  
 Minimum = 5.000  
 Maximum = 1,188.000  
 Range = 1,183.000

These releasees had been sentenced to an average of 77.6 months of incarceration for all those offenses resulting in conviction and the subsequent new court commitment to prison immediately prior to the initial 1980 or 1981 release. A majority of these releasees (75.6%) had total prison sentences of five years (60 months) or less imposed after conviction.

<sup>a</sup> Excludes 116 cases where the most serious conviction offense was "unknown."

What Was the Prison Time Actually Served by These Releasees  
Prior to Their Initial Release From Prison in 1980-1981?

As most observers of the criminal justice system have noted, it is one thing to examine total prison sentence lengths imposed on convicted offenders and it is quite another to examine the actual amount of time served in prison. In Table B-10 we examine data on the amount of time served in prison by these 2,857 individuals distributed across various categories or groupings arranged by length of stay expressed in days.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE B-10: While the time served in prison varies from a low of eight days to a high of 5,698 days (15.6 years), half (50.4%) of these releasees served one year or less. The median time served was 363.75 days and the mean was 528.33 days.

<u>Length of Stay in Days</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Under 30 Days	0.1%	(3)
30-180	18.0%	(513)
181-365	32.3%	(923)
366-730	29.4%	(841)
731-1,095	11.0%	(315)
Over 1,095	9.2%	(262)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

Measures of Central Tendency

Mean =	528.334
Standard Deviation =	521.652
Median =	363.750
Mode =	202.000
Minimum =	8.000
Maximum =	5,706.000
Range =	5,698.000

The average of 528.334 days (or 17.36 months) of time served contrasts greatly with the average prison sentence of 77.64 months noted earlier. More will be said about this discrepancy or difference in later parts of this report.

<sup>1</sup> Length of stay or time served in penal institutions is computed in days and measured from the point of admission to the point of the first 1980-1981 release. While transfer from one institution to another is accounted for in our calculation of time served, jail time is not included.

What Was The Prison Release Status of Each of These Releasees?

As the data presented in Table B-11 indicate, the majority (82.6%) of the 2,857 individuals in this study cohort were released to parole supervision. Another 11.0% were released "early" to parole, and the remainder (6.3%) were discharged. Combining the parole and early parole categories, 93.6% of these releasees experienced some period of parole supervision upon their release from prison.

TABLE B-11: Upon release from the prison, the vast majority of these releasees (93.6%) experienced some period of parole supervision.

<u>Release Status</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Discharge	6.3%	(181)
Early Parole	11.0%	(315)
Parole	<u>82.6%</u>	<u>(2,361)</u>
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

Had These Releasees Ever Been Imprisoned  
Before As New Court Commitments?

One last item relating to correctional or prior criminal history has to do with whether or not these individuals ever had a prior new court commitment to prison. In examining Table B-12, it appears that only a very few individuals (345 or 12.1%) had prior new court prison commitments in Oregon.

TABLE B-12: A small percentage of these 2,857 releasees (12.1%) had prior new court commitments to prison.

<u>Prior New Court Prison Commitment</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
No	87.9%	(2,512)
Yes	<u>12.1%</u>	<u>(345)</u>
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

How Do the Various Important Subgroups of Releasees  
(As Classified by the Type of Most Serious Prison Admission Offense)  
Compare in Terms of the Above Sentence Characteristics?

On page B-10 of this report, we identified fourteen (14) major groups of releasees as classified by the type of most serious prison admission offense noted. Each of these groups of releasees may vary in significant and important ways in terms of the major characteristics or variables discussed earlier in this section of the report. Because these differences may be related to eventual differences in the post-release recidivism experience of these releasees, we will discuss some of the more pertinent ones as follows:

Sentence Length (in Months) for Most Serious Conviction Offense

In Table B-8 on page B-16, we learned that (excluding the "unknowns") the average prison sentence length imposed for the most serious conviction offense

TABLE B-13: Of the fourteen (14) major groups of releasees, those with a traffic or driving-related offense as the most serious last prison admission offense had the lowest average sentence length (37.6 months) imposed for the most serious offense resulting in prison admission.

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type <sup>a</sup>	Total Number of Re- leasees Tracked	Average Prison Sen- tence Length in Months for Most Serious Prison Admission Offense	Standard Deviation
Person	1. Murder-Related	110	298.8000	413.1577
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	266	105.6654	129.5474
	3. Assault - All Forms	149	66.4832	28.8806
	4. Robbery - All Forms	337	98.3680	98.9115
	5. Against Person - Other	32	146.8750	277.9394
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	727	62.8514	37.8836
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	309	45.7282	15.1017
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	156	41.6859	14.6207
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	141	47.4043	17.0319
	10. Against Property - Other	34	62.0000	47.8989
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	205	37.6000	15.4058
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	151	53.1126	28.4674
	13. Escape - All Forms	43	44.3721	25.1216
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	81	45.6296	17.8413
	Total	2,741	74.8563	117.1410

<sup>a</sup> Excludes 116 cases where the most serious conviction (or prison admission) offense was "unknown."

resulting in imprisonment was about 75 months. Table B-13 reveals that there is considerable variation in this average, however, across the major groups of releasees.

As noted in Table B-13, traffic or driving-related offenders had the lowest average sentence length among the fourteen groups of releasees.

Total Sentence Length (in Months)

In Table B-9 on page B-18, we noted that (excluding the "unknowns") the total sentence length imposed for all conviction offenses resulting in imprisonment

TABLE B-14: Of the fourteen (14) major groups of releasees, those with a traffic or driving-related offense as the most serious last prison admission offense had the lowest average total sentence length (39.7 months) imposed for all conviction offenses resulting in imprisonment.

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type <sup>a</sup>	Total Number of Releasees Tracked	Average Pri- son Sentence Length in Months for Most Serious Prison Admis- sion Offense	Standard Deviation
Person	1. Murder-Related	110	301.4182	413.2338
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	266	109.5865	130.9051
	3. Assault - All Forms	149	73.7718	41.1014
	4. Robbery - All Forms	337	99.9703	100.0247
	5. Against Person - Other	32	150.6250	276.8013
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	727	65.0426	39.2313
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	309	49.2621	25.0061
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	156	42.4936	16.1051
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	141	49.5319	18.0877
	10. Against Property - Other	34	64.5294	45.9494
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	205	39.7366	16.2562
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	151	54.7815	32.1449
	13. Escape - All Forms	43	57.7674	48.4094
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	81	46.8148	20.3120
	Total	2,741	77.6421	118.0890

<sup>a</sup> Excludes 116 cases where the most serious conviction (or prison admission) offense was "unknown."

was roughly 78 months. As with the previous variable, there is considerable variation across the major groups of releasees. Table B-14 presents the data of interest.

As Table B-14 indicates, traffic or driving-related offenders had the lowest average total sentence length among the fourteen groups of releasees.

Time Actually Served in Prison

In Table B-10 on page B-20, we noted that for all 2,857 releasees, the actual time served averaged 528.3 days (or approximately 17-1/2 months). As with

TABLE B-15: Of the fourteen (14) major groups of releasees, those with a traffic or driving-related offense as the most serious last prison admission offense had the least number of days on the average (242.6 or roughly 8 months) of time served (or length of stay in prison from admission to first 1980-1981 release date).

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type	Total Number of Releasees Tracked	Average Prison Time Served (Length of Prison Stay) in Days <sup>a</sup>	Standard Deviation
Person	1. Murder-Related	110	1344.8909	1094.1599
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	266	863.5602	711.7704
	3. Assault - All Forms	149	613.7987	435.4462
	4. Robbery - All Forms	337	779.4303	490.7983
	5. Against Person - Other	32	934.3750	904.4346
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	727	464.4663	376.5858
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	309	328.8091	222.7648
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	156	337.0385	235.8505
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	141	299.1702	212.7081
	10. Against Property - Other	34	507.5000	382.9250
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	205	242.6244	131.8363
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	151	290.9007	243.5453
	13. Escape - All Forms	43	620.0698	685.7944
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	81	355.7778	242.9962
Other	99. Unknown	116	408.1983	351.3995
	Total	2,741	528.3339	521.6520

<sup>a</sup> In computing time served, we have accounted for transfers from one institution to another. Jail time, however, is not included here.

total sentence length imposed, time actually served in prison (prior to the initial 1980 or 1981 release) varies considerably by type of releasee. Table B-15 contains data on the proportion of time served.

Examination of the results in Table B-15 indicates that traffic or driving-related offenders serve on the average less time in prison than most of the other major groups of offenders initially released in 1980 or 1981.

TABLE B-16: After drug offenders and forgery/fraud offenders, traffic or driving-related offenders served the smallest proportion (23%) of the total prison sentence imposed.

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type <sup>a</sup>	Total Number of Releasees Tracked	Average Percent of Total Prison Sentence Served	Standard Deviation
Person	1. Murder-Related	109	25.8%	15.7%
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	263	28.9%	13.8%
	3. Assault - All Forms	149	27.8%	12.6%
	4. Robbery - All Forms	335	28.8%	13.5%
	5. Against Person - Other	32	33.0%	19.6%
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	719	14.3%	14.3%
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	307	23.0%	14.3%
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	154	27.0%	17.4%
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	140	20.8%	12.7%
	10. Against Property - Other	34	28.3%	14.9%
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	205	22.7%	13.8%
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	151	19.8%	14.4%
	13. Escape - All Forms	43	27.3%	16.0%
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	81	26.4%	15.9%
	Total	2,717	25.3%	14.4%

<sup>a</sup> Excludes 116 cases where the most serious conviction (or prison admission) offense was "unknown." Also, we omitted 24 cases where individuals (releasees) served more than 100% of their original prison sentence.

See the note to the reader on page B-27 for an explanation of why these 24 cases were omitted and for a special caveat applied to interpreting our data on the proportion of prison sentences served.

### Proportion of Sentence Served

Knowing the length of the total prison sentence imposed and the prison time actually served, it is possible to compute a proportion or percentage of total sentence served for each individual. By converting total sentence length from months to days and dividing time actually served expressed in days by length of total sentence, we obtain a percentage for each individual. Aggregating these data, we note some variation across our major groups of releasees in the average percent of sentence served. Table B-16 contains the data on the average proportion or percentage of sentence time served by group.

As we can see in Table B-16, traffic or driving-related offenders serve 22.7% of their prison sentences on the average. Only drug offenders (with an average of 19.8%) and forgery/fraud offenders (with an average of 20.8%) serve smaller proportions on the average.

---

#### IMPORTANT NOTE TO THE READER:

Please note that we have excluded from the analysis of the proportion of prison sentence served, cases where we could not compute time served as a percentage of total sentence length (i.e., for the 116 previously cited cases with "unknown" prison admission offenses). Also, we excluded 24 cases where releasees "appeared" to have served more than 100% of the total sentence length originally imposed. Since it would have been both unlawful and highly unlikely that the Corrections Division was holding on to these individuals longer than allowed, some explanations are in order. In checking over data on these 24 cases with Mr. O. R. Chambers of the Oregon Corrections Division, we discussed a number of reasons and underlying scenarios which lead to this result.

First, because of the sole reliance on computing time served in prison based on the time interval between admission and release dates, it occasionally happened that the computation of time served in prison includes "dead time" or time when the individual is on escape or AWOL status. In fact, the accumulated total number of days served sometimes included many days or months of "dead time." Our data indicate that in 17 of the above cited 24 cases, dead time due to escape status was included in the computer calculation of time served.

Second, inaccurate or incomplete coding or reporting of sentence length or sentence start date also distorted our results on completing proportion of sentence served for some of these 24 cases. For example, in one case, we discovered an inaccurate prison sentence start date. In two other cases, we noted that the starting dates for concurrent sentences began later than the

original sentence. In three cases, the coding of the sentence length was based on a partial reporting of sentences. In each of these three cases, an offense carrying another sentence to be served consecutively was missed in the computing of total sentence length. In one of these three, the offense missed was more serious than the one used to determine prison sentence length.

Third, because of an escape or other new crime committed while in prison, more prison time was added to several individuals' original prison sentence and this new time was added to time served without a subsequent update on total sentence length. Altogether, in 15 of these 24 cases, the computer programming in our analyses resulted in inaccurate reporting of sentence length due to either consecutive sentence's received after initial admission (12 cases) or failure to note a consecutive sentence which was a part of the original prison term (the 3 cases cited in the above paragraph).

The problems of computing prison sentence length and actual time served are not limited to the above cited 24 cases. Rather, these misclassification errors and omissions of information may be found in the remaining cases in this study. These errors and omissions lead to a disclaimer statement that in an unspecified number of all cases we may be underreporting the judicial (prison) term and may be overreporting time actually served in prisons.

---

C. THE PRISON RELEASEE COHORT COMPONENT  
OF THE RESEARCH: RECIDIVISM DATA

In this section of the report, we focus on the recidivism patterns of traffic offenders compared to those of the other major offender groups previously identified in this report. We are specifically interested in how many of the 205 released traffic offenders returned to prison (i.e., recidivated), the timing of their return to prison (i.e., the number of days to return), and the reasons for their return. In addition, we are interested in how these traffic offenders compare to the other types of offenders in terms of their post-release experience.

Before examining the data on the recidivism patterns of these prison releasees, a brief discussion of how recidivism was defined and measured in this research is in order.

How Was Recidivism Defined and Measured in This Research?

Although this is a study of traffic vs. non-traffic offenders, it is still primarily a prison releasee recidivism study. Because of the focus on recidivism rates, it is important that we carefully define who is to be studied for how long and that we clearly define what constitutes the recidivism events.

On page B-2 we pointed out that, in this study of prison releasees, we were tracking 2,857 individuals from the point of initial prison release in 1980 or 1981 to the point in time exactly three years after this release date.<sup>1</sup> However, while we defined the study population and the follow-up period for tracking, we did not define what constituted the recidivism events.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that we have excluded from this study of 2,857 releasees those individuals (releasees) who did not have the opportunity to recidivate. Thus, individuals released to a federal prison or to another state prison were excluded, as were those individuals whose custody release was due to death.

A review of the research literature reveals that there is no single, universally accepted definition of prison releasee recidivism. One observer points out that in the absence of a universal definition the one employed in any particular study should be commensurate with the purpose of that study.<sup>1</sup>

Common measures of prison releasee recidivism include rearrest, reconviction, return to corrections authority or supervision, and reimprisonment. Since an underlying concern in this study is the prison supervision and institutional treatment of offenders, one of the most expensive sentencing dispositions in the criminal justice system, return to a penal institution is the recidivism measure that has been adapted for this research.

Besides focusing attention on reimprisonment as a recidivism event, this definition has certain advantages. First, it is relatively narrow and focuses attention on the most serious post-release criminal activity which leads to the most serious arrest disposition (i.e., imprisonment). Second, reimprisonment involves somewhat more precise record keeping in that institutional custody requires greater accuracy in recording a person's status and whereabouts and adds to police and court records the data gathering power of a corrections information system.

Return to prison or reimprisonment can be for several reasons. First, it can be because the individual (releasee) has been convicted of a new crime and he or she is made a new court commitment to prison. Second, it can be because he or she has violated certain parole rules (or conditions). Third, both of the previous two reasons or possibilities can occur together. Lastly, parole can be suspended as a result of a parole board finding of new criminal activity and/or a parole rule violation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Robert Willstadter, Recidivism of Releasees from Oregon Corrections Institutions, Crime Analysis Center, Salem, Oregon, 1984, p. 1.

While we are mainly interested in the prison return event itself, we should keep in mind that returnees follow different routes (above) to attain reimprisonment status. For most of our analyses in this section of the report, we will examine return to prison for any reason. From a recidivism analysis perspective, there are basically two reasons an individual is returned to prison: (1) Because there has been a conviction for a new crime, and/or (2) Because a parole rule has been violated. Where this two-fold distinction is relevant, we note it in our analyses.<sup>1</sup>

Besides the main measure of recidivism employed here, there also are certain secondary, recidivism-related measures utilized in this research. Two primary measures are (1) days to return, and (2) type of return or recidivism offense. Our interest in these two measures stems from our concern for the timing of recidivism events when they do occur and how these vary by type of released offender. Of interest here is whether certain offenders return more quickly (when they do return) than others also returning. Also, the reason for return or the offense resulting in a subsequent admission (i.e., readmission) to prison is important. Are there patterns of offense specialization or patterns of habitual involvement in certain types of crimes?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that in Appendix B we present recidivism data for each type of releasee (classified by the most serious previous admission offense) using all the major reasons for return. Also note that return to prison is categorized by the most serious offense involved, regardless of when the paperwork on this readmission is received at the respective penal institution. In addition, in some cases, the most serious charge at the time of admission was a parole rule violation, but subsequently a determination was made that new criminal activity also had occurred. We therefore classified these returns by the most serious new crime.

<sup>2</sup> For a relatively recent summary of a research project on crime switch patterns, see Robert Willstader, "Crime Switch Patterns in Adult Criminal Careers," 1980. Although this research uses only major types of offenses (which excludes driving or traffic-related offenses, it does employ the Oregon CCH data base throughout the analyses of crime switch patterns. Also note that, because an important part of this research was concerned with the nature of the most serious subsequent admission offense in relation to the most serious previous admission offense, we have included this information on all study cases - including even some where one or the other was unknown.

What is the Overall Post-Release Recidivism  
Experience of This Prison Releasee Cohort?

In this study of 2,857 releasees, 2,015 (or roughly 7 in every 10) individuals released in 1980 or 1981 were not returned to prison within exactly three (3) years from the date of release. This means that 842 (or 29.5%) were returned. If we exclude those 116 releasees with "unknown" prior commitment offenses, we are left with 2,741 releasees of whom 787 (or 28.7%) returned to prison. The frequency distribution for the exact reasons for return is presented in Table C-1.

TABLE C-1: Roughly 30% of the releasees were returned to prison, with new court commitment (on a new crime or crimes) and parole rule violations being the most common reasons for return.

<u>Reason for Return</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency (N)</u>
Did Not Return to Prison	70.5%	(2,015)
New Court Commitment	8.4%	(240)
Parole Violation - New Crime	1.8%	(50)
Parole Rule(s) Violation	7.8%	(224)
Parole Rule(s) Violation Plus New Crime	5.8%	(166)
Parole Suspension	5.5%	(156)
Other <sup>a</sup>	0.2%	(6)
Totals	100.0%	(2,857)

<sup>a</sup> While the Corrections Division Client Tracking System maintains an "other" return reason code, it is currently not in use and was rarely used at the time of this study. More importantly, it has no general interpretation. Without a review of hard copy data on these six (6) cases, we cannot provide the reason for return. They remain here "unspecified" in terms of return reasons.

Of the approximately 30% returning, the most common return reasons were new court commitment (8.4%) and parole rule violation (7.8%).

In the beginning of this report, we alluded to the fact (on page B-1) that we were using this research to partially replicate the results of an earlier Crime Analysis Center study by Willstadter in 1984 which traced the recidivism patterns of 1,782 individuals released from an Oregon state prison in 1979.

The major finding of this earlier study (which we will refer to hereafter as the 1984 study) is that of these releasees, 574 (or 32.2%) were returned to prison within three (3) years.<sup>1</sup>

Table C-3 extends this analysis by including the same prison return data from the earlier (1984) study by Willstadter.

Examination of the data in Tables C-2 and C-3 provides a basis for answering the following specific questions about the recidivism experience of each of these 14 major groups of released offenders.

How Does the Recidivism (Prison Return) Rate of the Released Traffic Offenders Compare to the Recidivism Rates of Other Classes of Offenders?

In column D of Table C-2 we see that, of our 205 traffic offenders, 56 (or 27.3%) returned to prison within three years of release. This figure places the traffic offender group of releasees in about the middle or moderate range of recidivism rates. Excluding the unknowns, the traffic offender recidivism rate ranks eighth among the 14 offender groups. Auto theft (or UUMV) offenders with a 37.2% return rate rank first, and murder-related offenders with a 13.6% return rate rank last among the 14 groups.

An examination of the data in column D of Table C-3 reveals a somewhat similar finding for the earlier 1984 cohort study. In this study, the traffic offender group ranks in the middle range of recidivism rates, with 42 of 116 (or 36.2%) returned to prison during the three (3) year follow-up period.

---

<sup>1</sup> We refer to our attempt to compare our results with those of the earlier 1984 study as a "partial replication." This is because there are some known and unknown differences between the current and the earlier study. For example, the 1984 study includes among the 1,782 releasees, 244 cases which were originally committed for parole rule violations and which were not new court commitments. Of these 244 cases, 83 or 34.0% were returnees. Omitting these cases, we are left with 1,538 releasees of whom 491 or 31.9% were returnees. When we omit these parole rule violators, we are left with a group which is more comparable to our 2,857 releasees. Also, the percentage returning in the 1984 study is somewhat closer to our current study percentage.

**TABLE C-2: Rates of Prison Return and Return for the Same  
Offense for Each Major Group of Releasees  
Classified by Original Admission Offense  
(Current Study N=2,857)**

	(A) Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type	(B) Total Number of Releasees Tracked	(C) Total Number of Returnees	(D) Returnees as a Per- cent of All Releasees	(E) Number of Returnees Returned for Same Offense <sup>a</sup>	(F) Returnees Returned For Same Offense as a Percent of All Returnees
Person	1. Murder-Related	110	15	13.6%	1	6.7%
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	266	44	16.5%	13	29.5%
	3. Assault - All Forms	149	39	26.2%	1	2.6%
	4. Robbery - All Forms	337	93	27.6%	12	12.9%
	5. Against Person - Other	32	6	18.8%	0	0.0%
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	727	257	35.4%	61	23.7%
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	309	91	29.4%	12	13.2%
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	156	58	37.2%	5	8.6%
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	141	48	34.0%	4	8.3%
	10. Against Property - Other	34	7	20.6%	1	14.3%
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	205	56	27.3%	26	46.4%
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	151	33	21.9%	5	15.2%
	13. Escape - All Forms	43	13	30.2%	1	7.7%
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	81	27	33.3%	2	7.4%
Other	15. Unknown <sup>b</sup>	116	55	47.4%	10	18.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,857</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>18.3%</b>

<sup>a</sup> For entries in this column, the most serious type of offense at first readmission to prison must match the most serious type of offense at last admission to prison. For example, in the above table in row #11 we learn that, of the 205 traffic offenders released from prison, 56 (or 27.3%) returned, and of these 56 returnees, 26 (or 46.4%) returned for the same offense (i.e., a driving-related or traffic-related offense).

<sup>b</sup> Earlier (on page B-15) we mentioned that these "unknowns" represented cases with paperwork delays in terms of updated information in the client tracking system. While we essentially ignore these cases in our analyses, it is of some interest to note their high prison return rate (i.e., 47.4%) and the large percent of these returnees (18.2%) returning for an "unknown" readmission offense. Excluding these 116 releasees, we have 2,741 releasees with a return rate of 28.7% (or 787 returnees). Of these 787 returnees, 144 (or 18.3%) were returned for the same offense.

**TABLE C-3: Rates of Prison Return and Return for the Same  
Offense for Each Major Group of Releasees  
Classified by Original Admission Offense  
(1984 Study N=1,782)**

	(A) Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type	(B) Total Number of Releasees Tracked	(C) Total Number of Returnees	(D) Returnees as a Per- cent of All Releasees	(E) Number of Returnees Returned for Same Offense <sup>a</sup>	(F) Returnees Returned For Same Offense as a Percent of All Returnees
Person	1. Murder-Related	48	20	41.7%	1	5.0%
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	90	23	25.6%	8	34.8%
	3. Assault - All Forms	75	22	29.3%	0	0.0%
	4. Robbery - All Forms	170	54	31.8%	9	16.7%
	5. Against Person - Other	19	7	36.8%	1	14.3%
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	449	160	35.6%	31	19.4%
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	178	58	32.6%	7	12.1%
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	98	38	38.8%	9	23.7%
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	87	17	19.5%	6	35.3%
	10. Against Property - Other	9	1	11.1%	1	100.0%
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	116	42	36.2%	17	40.5%
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	25	10	40.0%	0	0.0%
	13. Escape - All Forms	47	16	34.0%	1	6.3%
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	127	23	18.1%	3	13.0%
Other	15. Parole Rule Violation <sup>b</sup>	244	83	34.0%	38	45.8%
	Total	1,782	574	32.2%	132	23.0%

Source: Willstadter, Ibid. (1984), pp. 5-14.

<sup>a</sup> See footnote "a" in Table C-2 for an explanation of what is meant by "same" offense.

<sup>b</sup> If we exclude the 244 parole rule violators, we have 1,538 releasees with a return rate of 31.9% (or 491 returnees). Of these 491 returnees, 94 (or 19.1%) were returned for the same offense.

Excluding the parole rule violators, this recidivism rate places the traffic offender group fifth out of the fourteen major groups.

Which Group Returns Most Often for the Same Kind of Offense?

Besides the rate at which groups of released offenders recidivate, it also is possible to determine if the recidivists returned for the same kind of crime which lead to their original commitment or admission to prison.<sup>1</sup>

Examination of the data in both Tables C-2 and C-3 (column F in each) reveals that of the fourteen (14) major offender groups released from prison, driving-related or traffic offenders are the most likely to return for the same offense - i.e., another traffic offense.<sup>2</sup> This finding holds true for both the 1984 and the current cohort study.

In Table C-2 we find that 46.4% (or 26) of the 56 returnees originally admitted for traffic offenses in the current study were readmitted for another traffic offense. After traffic offenders, the group with the next highest percentage (29.5%) is the sex offender and abuse group.

Data from Table C-3 on the 1984 study cohort confirms the same result - the traffic violators have the largest percentage (40.5%) of returnees returning to prison for the same offense as that which resulted in the previous admission.

---

<sup>1</sup> Return to the same type of crime is understated somewhat in this research in that we have focused attention on only the most serious prison admission and readmission offenses. For example, a traffic offender returning for murder and a traffic offense would show up as returning for murder and not another traffic offense. Because of the focus on the most serious admission and return offense, we actually under count the number of returnees returned for the same offense in many instances.

<sup>2</sup> In this analysis we omitted the "unknowns" and "parole rule violators" from consideration. Also, we disregarded any category having fewer than five (5) returnees due to the problem of interpreting percentages.

Before leaving this area of data analysis, it is of some interest to look at our traffic offender group in terms of each of the four component offender subgroups. These groups were described on page B-13 and can be listed here as follows:

1. "Accident-related" driving offenses (or DRIVACCI),
2. Driving while revoked (or DRIVREVO),
3. Driving while suspended (or DRIVSUSP), and
4. Other (unspecified) driving-related offenses (or DRIV).

Within each of these categories in the current study there is considerable variation in both the prison return rates and in the proportion of returnees who return for the same offense. Table C-4 presents the data of interest here.

In looking at Table C-4 we see that each subgroup of traffic violators have different recidivism or return rates and that among returnees the proportions returning for the same offense also varies considerably. In terms of the DRIVACCI group, none of the six returned. Both the DRIVREVO and DRIVSUSP groups had similar return rates (27.3% and 27.5% respectively) although the DRIVSUSP returnees are somewhat more likely to return for the same offense (44.0% of them) than the DRIVREVO returnees (33.3% of them). Lastly, the DRIV or "unspecified" group returned half of the releasees (3 of 6 or 50.0%) and none of these three (3) returnees returned for the same offense.

**TABLE C-4: Rates of Prison Return and Return for the Same Offense for Each Major Subgroup of Releasees Classified by Original Admission Offense (Current Study N=205)**

(A) Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type	(B) Total Number of Releasees Tracked	(C) Total Number of Returnees	(D) Returnees as a Percent of All Releasees	(E) Number of Returnees Returned for Same Offense	(F) Returnees Returned For Same Offense as a Percent of All Returnees
1. DRIVACCI	6	0	0.0%	-	
2. DRIVREVO	11	3	27.3%	1 <sup>a</sup>	33.3%
3. DRIVSUSP	182	50	27.5%	22 <sup>b</sup>	44.0%
4. DRIV	6	3	50.0%	0	0.0%
Total	205	56	27.3%	23	41.1%

<sup>a</sup> Note that one (1) returnee was returned for a related offense - i.e., driving while suspended.

<sup>b</sup> Note that two (2) returnees were returned for a related offense - i.e., driving while revoked.

Among the Groups of Returnees Arranged by Original Prison Admission Offense, What Differences Were There in Time to Return?

Besides reason for return and most serious offense for which readmitted to prison, it is possible in our analysis to examine our major groups of returnees in terms of the average number of days to return or readmission.

Table C-5 presents the data of interest here.

TABLE C-5: Among the various groups of returnees, the "other" property offenders return the soonest and the murder-related offenders return the latest. Traffic offenders are among those who stay out the longest before returning.

(Current Study N=842)

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
	<u>Most Serious Last Prison Admission Offense Type</u>	<u>Number of Returnees</u>	<u>Mean Time in Days to Return</u>	<u>Standard Deviation for Means in Column C</u>
Person	1. Murder-Related	15	496.3	291.7
	2. Sex Crimes and Abuse	44	415.0	285.7
	3. Assault - All Forms	39	393.6	274.7
	4. Robbery - All Forms	93	390.4	286.3
	5. Against Person - Other	6	361.5	274.5
Property	6. Burglary - All Forms	257	405.7	259.6
	7. Theft - All Except UUMV	91	414.8	302.3
	8. Auto Theft (Including UUMV)	58	341.5	253.6
	9. Forgery and Fraud - All Forms	48	416.8	275.1
	10. Against Property - Other	7	233.6	140.2
Statute	11. Driving-Related (Traffic)	56	423.3	312.5
	12. Drug Offenses - All Forms	33	424.3	257.0
	13. Escape - All Forms	13	378.7	289.7
	14. Statute Offenses - Other	27	457.6	299.8
Other	15. Unknown	55	338.3	237.9
	Total	842	399.8	274.2

As indicated in Table C-5, there is considerable variation among the fourteen (14) groups of returnees in terms of the average time to return expressed in days. Beginning with traffic offender returnees, we find that this group is not among those who return early when they do return. In fact,

their average of 423.3 days to readmission places them among the group who stay out the longest. Only murder-related, "other" statute offenders, and drug offenders stay out longer on the average. "Other" property offenders are the group with the fewest average number of days to return. Murders and related offenders stay out the longest.

D. THE TRAFFIC OFFENDER VS. NON-TRAFFIC OFFENDER  
COMPARATIVE STUDY COMPONENT OF THE RESEARCH

In this section of the report, we examine the data and findings from an attempt to compare our previously identified group of traffic offenders with a representative group of non-traffic offenders selected via systematic sampling procedures from all the non-traffic offenders in the prison releasee cohort. Our purpose is to contrast traffic and non-traffic offenders in terms of various aspects of prior criminal history. This will allow us to make statements or assertions about the type of problems each class of offender presents the criminal justice system.

Description of the Study Groups

In our total prison releasee cohort of 2,857 individuals, we identified 205 traffic offenders based on the criteria of most serious prison commitment offense. Because of the need to identify a comparison group of non-traffic offenders of similar size, we selected, via systematic sampling, a group of 204 non-traffic offenders.<sup>1</sup>

Combining these two groups, we had 409 individuals (releasees) upon which we obtained computerized criminal history (CCH) "rap sheet" data from the Oregon State Police Bureau of Identification (OSPBI). An initial check of these "rap sheets" revealed that CCH information could not be obtained on five (5)

---

<sup>1</sup> Systematic sampling is also known as patterned, serial, or chain sampling. Basically, with systematic sampling we have a list of identification numbers, names, or items in some sort of order. In our case, we had 2,652 non-traffic offenders arranged in order of OSPBI SID numbers. Because we wanted a sampling of roughly 205 non-traffic offenders, we had to select one-thirteenth of these 2,652 individuals, or one in every 13 cases. Beginning with a random start, our computer program selected every 13th case to give us a random sample of 204 non-traffic offenders.

Systematic sampling is in our case an efficient approach to selection of a comparison group in that it is simple, direct, and inexpensive. See Morris James Slonim, Sampling, A Quick, Reliable Guide to Practical Statistics, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1960, pp. 57-59 for a brief discussion of systematic sampling.

individuals who subsequently were omitted from the study.<sup>1</sup> In addition, seven (7) others were deceased and also were omitted from the study.<sup>2</sup>

What Comparisons Were Made Between These  
Traffic and Non-Traffic Offenders?

Several items of information were obtained from each CCH "rap sheet" using the data form attached as Appendix C. While there are several items of information possible from "rap sheets," we focused on certain measures of past criminal involvement which would reflect the volume of arrests, the length of the criminal career, and the various arrest dispositions encountered in the computerized criminal history. These data should summarize the more salient features and parameters of these individuals' criminal careers as reflected in the OSPBI "rap sheets" and given the limitations of the Oregon CCH data base.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Two of the traffic offenders and one non-traffic offender had invalid SID (subject identification) numbers - due probably to data entry errors in either the Corrections Division's Client Tracking System or in the OSPBI's CCH file. Because of time constraints and the small number of individuals, we simply omitted them from the study.

<sup>2</sup> It is of some interest (but little wonder) that five (5) of the deceased were in the traffic offender group and only two (2) were non-traffic offenders. We know that at least one of the deceased (a traffic offender) died in a traffic accident after his release from prison. Because of our interest in having a long enough post-release follow-up period to examine CCH records, we elected to omit these seven (7) individuals from this part of our research.

Also, it should be noted that the CCH data base is limited to only certain arrests. Some years ago Oregon passed legislation which required the CCH system recording of arrests and dispositions associated with all felony crimes and any sex and drug related misdemeanors. While lesser offenses can be used to establish a computerized criminal history on an individual or can be added to an existing one; the reporting of such offenses is not mandatory and is relatively uncommon.

<sup>3</sup> Mainly, we should be aware that our CCH data base here does not tap into the out-of-state criminal histories of these offenders. (The only exceptions are a handful of older cases where the OSPBI added some arrest data from FBI "rap sheets.")

In the following subsections, we will compare our traffic and non-traffic offenders on each of the more pertinent variables or items of information coded from the OSPBI CCH "rap sheets" as obtained on these individuals.

### Demographic Variables

In Table D-1, we have arrayed data on all of the more pertinent variables in this component of the study. The three demographic (or "face sheet") variables which stand out are sex, race, and age.

Beginning with sex, it appears that most of the traffic (98.5%) and non-traffic (95.5%) offenders are males. Though the non-traffic offenders are slightly more likely to be female (4.5%) than are the traffic offenders (1.5%), this difference is not statistically significant (at the usually accepted .05 level).<sup>1</sup> (Note that the difference here does approach the usual standard of statistical significance, however.) The results do suggest, however, that women may be somewhat less likely than men to be traffic offenders.

Ethnic status presents a somewhat different picture. Traffic offenders are significantly more likely than non-traffic offenders to be non-white.<sup>2</sup> Of the traffic offenders, 21.8% are non-white compared to 15.5% of the non-traffic offenders.

Before leaving ethnic status altogether, there is a curious result in the bivariate association between study group (or type of offender) and ethnic status. Of the 43 non-whites among the traffic offender group, 25 (or 58.1%) were American Indians, and among the 31 non-white among the non-traffic offenders, 7 (or 22.5%) were American Indians. Put in other terms, the risk of being a traffic offender may vary considerably by type of minority group. In these data, the percentage of each minority group who fall in the traffic offender group varies from 78.1% for American Indians, to 50.0% for Hispanics, and 39.3% for blacks.

---

<sup>1</sup>  $\chi^2 = 3.00088$  with 1 degree of freedom is significant at only the .0832 level.

<sup>2</sup>  $\chi^2 = 12.08531$  with 3 degrees of freedom is significant at the .0071 level.

TABLE D-1: Comparisons between the 197 traffic offenders and the 200 non-traffic offenders in our comparison group reveal several differences between each study group. In this table we look at several items of information (or variables) obtained from computerized criminal history "rap" sheets and from correctional history data tapes to make our contrasts.

TRAFFIC Offender Study Group			Item of Information (or Variable) and Response Categories (or Values)	NON-Traffic Offender Study Group		
Frequency	Percent	Measures of Central Tendency		Frequency	Percent	Measures of Central Tendency
3	2%		1. Sex			
194	98%		Female	9	4%	
			Male	191	95%	
			2. Ethnic Status			
154	78%		White	169	84%	
11	6%		Black	17	8%	
25	13%		Indian	7	3%	
7	4%		Hispanic	7	3%	
			Oriental			
			Other			
			3. Admission Year			
			1972	2	1%	
			1973	1	0%	
			1974	1	0%	
			1975	2	1%	
			1976	5	2%	
			1977	11	5%	
5	3%		1978	37	18%	
73	37%		1979	56	28%	
84	43%		1980	72	36%	
35	18%		1981	13	6%	
			4. No. of All Arrests Before Release			
		8.969	Median		5.625	
		9.685	Average		6.875	
		1-27	Range		1-33	
			5. No. of All Arrests After Release			
		1.750	Median		1.214	
		2.477	Average		2.195	
		0-12	Range		0-13	
			6. No. of All Arrests (Total)			
		11.133	Median		8.147	
		12.162	Average		9.070	
		1-30	Range		1-37	
			7. No. of Traffic Arrests Before Release			
		4.397	Median		0.263	
		4.756	Average		0.690	
		0-17	Range		0-8	
			8. No. of Traffic Arrests After Release			
		0.957	Median		0.149	
		1.431	Average		0.380	
		0-7	Range		0-4	
			9. No. of All Traffic Arrests (Total)			
		5.939	Median		0.443	
		6.254	Average		1.070	
		1-17	Range		0-10	

TRAFFIC Offender Study Group			NON-Traffic Offender Study Group			
Frequency	Percent	Measures of Central Tendency	Item of Information (or Variable) and Response Categories (or Values)	Frequency	Percent	Measures of Central Tendency
		14.542	10. No. of All Recorded Offenses			10.583
		16.056	<u>Median</u>			12.115
		1-38	Average			1-43
			Range			
		7.222	11. No. of All Recorded Traffic-Related Offenses			0.443
		7.904	<u>Median</u>			1.240
		1-22	Average			0-12
			Range			
		6.750	12. No. of Arrests Resulting in Conviction			4.190
		7.447	<u>Median</u>			4.855
		1-19	Average			1-19
			Range			
		3.732	13. No. of Arrests Resulting in Incarceration or Jail Sentences			2.440
		4.234	<u>Median</u>			3.180
		1-13	Average			1-12
			Range			
		3.859	14. No. of Traffic-Related Arrests Resulting in Conviction			0.263
		4.320	<u>Median</u>			0.625
		1-12	Average			0-6
			Range			
		2.234	15. No. of Traffic-Related Arrests Resulting in Incarceration or Jail Sentences			0.149
		2.619	<u>Median</u>			0.365
		0-10	Average			0-5
			Range			
		2.151	16. No. of Probation Supervisions			1.287
		2.513	<u>Median</u>			1.585
		0-10	Average			0-9
			Range			
		1.730	17. No. of Prison Receptions			1.680
		2.162	<u>Median</u>			2.150
		1-8	Average			1-11
			Range			
		0.179	18. No. of Parole Revocations			0.269
		0.360	<u>Median</u>			0.515
		0-4	Average			0-7
			Range			
		0.047	19. No. of Prison Escapes			0.095
		0.096	<u>Median</u>			0.215
		0-2	Average			0-4
			Range			

TRAFFIC Offender Study Group			NON-Traffic Offender Study Group			
Frequency	Percent	Measures of Central Tendency	Item of Information (or Variable) and Response Categories (or Values)	Frequency	Percent	Measures of Central Tendency
			20. Ever Arrested, Convicted Jailed, or Imprisoned on "Habitual Traffic Offender" Charges?			
157	80%		0=No	200	100%	
19	9%		1=Arrested	0	0%	
9	5%		2=Convicted	0	0%	
10	5%		3=Imprisoned	0	0%	
3	2%		4=Jailed	0	0%	
			21. Ever Arrested, Convicted, Jailed, or Imprisoned on "DUIL" Charges?			
33	17%		0=No	149	74%	
19	10%		1=Arrested	14	7%	
38	19%		2=Convicted	18	9%	
18	9%		3=Imprisoned	1	0%	
89	45%		4=Jailed	18	9%	
			22. Did First Arrest Involve Traffic Related Charges?			
110	56%		0=No	171	85%	
72	37%		1=Yes	20	10%	
15	8%		9=Unknown	9	4%	
			23. Age at Time of First CCH Recorded Arrest			
		19.264	Median			18.745
		21.559	Average			20.140
		12.01-54.27	Range			12.31-63.65
			24. Age at Admission to Correctional Institution			
		30.921	Median			24.705
		33.840	Average			27.088
		19.20-68.65	Range			17.45-66.34
			25. "Length of CCH Career" in Years <sup>a</sup>			
		13.128	Median			7.528
		14.909 <sup>b</sup>	Average			9.612 <sup>c</sup>
		0.00-51.04	Range			0.00-36.57

<sup>a</sup> The "length of the CCH career" is computed simply as the amount of time in years between the date of the first recorded arrest and the date of the last recorded arrest in the CCH "rap sheet" for each individual.

<sup>b</sup> Includes two cases with 0.00 values due to only one CCH recorded arrest.

<sup>c</sup> Includes eight cases with 0.00 values due to only one CCH recorded arrest.

Age of offender is a somewhat ambiguous variable or concept when it comes to these data and these individuals. This is primarily the product of when or at what point in time we measure, or more correctly calculate, an individual's age.

In this component of the research, age can be calculated at three (3) separate points in time. These are as follows:

1. Age at point of first OSPBI CCH recorded arrest date,
2. Age at admission to prison (and for which release first occurred in 1980 or 1981 in this study), and
3. Age as of date of first release from prison in 1980 or 1981.

Of these three points in time, the first two are the most critical or important for our purposes and are discussed below.

According to our review of Oregon CCH "rap sheets," our traffic offenders were first arrested at an average age of 21.6 years. In contrast, the average age at first CCH recorded arrest for non-traffic offenders was 20.1 years. Not only is this difference statistically significant, but according to the t-test results (item #18 in Table D-2), traffic offenders are significantly older on the average than non-traffic offenders as of the date of their first arrest.

Age at admission to prison (prior to the first release in 1980 or 1981) also was significantly different. For the traffic offenders, the average age at admission was 33.8405 - significantly higher than the average of 27.0879 years for non-traffic offenders. As we shall see in the next subsection, part of this difference may be due to the apparently longer period of involvement traffic offenders have in the criminal justice system in Oregon.

TABLE D-2: The Results of t-Tests of Mean Differences for Comparing Traffic Offender and Non-Traffic Offender Study Groups (Independent Samples) on Selected Variables

Variable	Study Group <sup>a</sup>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t Value <sup>b</sup>	Degrees of Freedom	Two-Tail Probability <sup>c</sup>																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
1. Mean Number of All Arrests Before Release From Prison	Traffic	9.6853	5.050	0.360	5.43	394.76	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	6.8750	5.255	0.372				2. Mean Number of All Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	2.4772	2.600	0.185	1.06	394.87	0.288	Non-Traffic	2.1950	2.688	0.190	3. Mean Number of All Arrests	Traffic	12.1624	6.017	0.429	5.14	394.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.0700	5.971	0.422	4. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Before Release From Prison	Traffic	4.8020	2.764	0.197	19.04	272.47	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6900	1.254	0.089	5. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	1.4518	1.643	0.117	8.16	291.39	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3800	0.842	0.060	6. Mean Number of All Traffic Arrests	Traffic	6.2538	3.279	0.234	19.99	282.68	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.0700	1.593	0.113	7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562	8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000
2. Mean Number of All Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	2.4772	2.600	0.185	1.06	394.87	0.288																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	2.1950	2.688	0.190				3. Mean Number of All Arrests	Traffic	12.1624	6.017	0.429	5.14	394.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.0700	5.971	0.422	4. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Before Release From Prison	Traffic	4.8020	2.764	0.197	19.04	272.47	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6900	1.254	0.089	5. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	1.4518	1.643	0.117	8.16	291.39	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3800	0.842	0.060	6. Mean Number of All Traffic Arrests	Traffic	6.2538	3.279	0.234	19.99	282.68	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.0700	1.593	0.113	7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562	8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516								
3. Mean Number of All Arrests	Traffic	12.1624	6.017	0.429	5.14	394.79	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	9.0700	5.971	0.422				4. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Before Release From Prison	Traffic	4.8020	2.764	0.197	19.04	272.47	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6900	1.254	0.089	5. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	1.4518	1.643	0.117	8.16	291.39	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3800	0.842	0.060	6. Mean Number of All Traffic Arrests	Traffic	6.2538	3.279	0.234	19.99	282.68	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.0700	1.593	0.113	7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562	8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																				
4. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Before Release From Prison	Traffic	4.8020	2.764	0.197	19.04	272.47	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	0.6900	1.254	0.089				5. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	1.4518	1.643	0.117	8.16	291.39	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3800	0.842	0.060	6. Mean Number of All Traffic Arrests	Traffic	6.2538	3.279	0.234	19.99	282.68	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.0700	1.593	0.113	7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562	8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																
5. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests After Release From Prison	Traffic	1.4518	1.643	0.117	8.16	291.39	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	0.3800	0.842	0.060				6. Mean Number of All Traffic Arrests	Traffic	6.2538	3.279	0.234	19.99	282.68	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.0700	1.593	0.113	7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562	8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																												
6. Mean Number of All Traffic Arrests	Traffic	6.2538	3.279	0.234	19.99	282.68	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	1.0700	1.593	0.113				7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562	8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																								
7. Mean Number of All Recorded Offenses	Traffic	16.0558	8.100	0.577	4.89	394.56	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	12.1150	7.953	0.562				8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138	9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																				
8. Mean Number of All Recorded Traffic Offenses	Traffic	7.9036	4.356	0.310	19.62	270.79	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	1.2400	1.952	0.138				9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223	10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																
9. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	7.4467	3.898	0.278	7.28	376.08	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	4.8550	3.152	0.223				10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164	11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																												
10. Mean Number of All Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	4.2335	2.628	0.187	4.23	387.45	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	3.1800	2.318	0.164				11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078	12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																								
11. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Conviction	Traffic	4.3198	2.396	0.171	19.70	274.24	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	0.6250	1.100	0.078				12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056	13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																				
12. Mean Number of Traffic Arrests Resulting in Incarceration	Traffic	2.6193	1.793	0.128	16.16	268.51	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	0.3650	0.791	0.056				13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112	14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																
13. Mean Number of Probation Supervisions	Traffic	2.5127	1.853	0.132	5.35	384.21	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	1.5850	1.589	0.112				14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112	15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																												
14. Mean Number of Prison Receptions	Traffic	2.1624	1.462	0.104	0.08	393.33	0.935																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	2.1500	1.584	0.112				15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063	16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																																								
15. Mean Number of Parole Revocations	Traffic	0.3604	0.705	0.050	-1.92	377.53	0.056																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	0.5150	0.891	0.063				16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040	17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																																																				
16. Mean Number of Prison Escapes	Traffic	0.0964	0.329	0.023	-2.56	320.41	0.011																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	0.2150	0.566	0.040				17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580	18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																																																																
17. Mean Age at Admission to Correctional Institution	Traffic	33.8405	11.218	0.799	6.84	358.77	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	27.0879	8.202	0.580				18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362	19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																																																																												
18. Mean Age at Time of First Reported Arrest	Traffic	21.5592	6.329	0.451	2.45	376.10	0.015																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	20.1404	5.117	0.362				19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																																																																																								
19. Mean Length of CCH Career in Years	Traffic	14.9092	9.690	0.690	6.15	364.13	0.000																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
	Non-Traffic	9.6123	7.295	0.516																																																																																																																																																																																																																							

<sup>a</sup> There are 200 traffic offenders and 197 non-traffic offenders in each of these comparisons.

<sup>b</sup> The t-test values are calculated based on separate rather than pooled-variance estimates.

<sup>c</sup> The two-tailed test probability is used here because we are primarily interested in whether or not the two means are significantly different (or unequal). When we discuss alternative hypotheses or the idea of one mean being significantly larger than the other (directionality of difference), we simply divide the two-tailed probability by two, giving the appropriate one-tailed probability.

### Other (CCH-Based) Variables

In turning our attention more fully to the data presented in Tables D-1 and D-2, there are a number of important differences between our traffic and non-traffic offender groups. These differences can be summarized as follows:

1. Traffic offenders had significantly more CCH recorded arrests before release from prison.<sup>1</sup> (The means were 9.7 arrests compared to 6.9 arrests.) However, the average number of arrests after the initial 1980 or 1981 release did not differ significantly by study group.
2. Counting all CCH recorded arrests, traffic offenders had significantly more arrests on the average (12.2) than non-traffic offenders (9.1).
3. Traffic offenders had significantly more traffic-related arrests both before and after release from prison than did non-traffic offenders. The means before release were 4.8 and 0.7 for the respective groups and 1.5 and 0.4 after release. Most striking of all is the comparison between study groups on the total number of CCH recorded traffic arrests. The average for traffic offenders was 6.3 compared to 1.1 for the non-traffic group.
4. Besides number of arrests, these groups also can be compared in terms of the number of arrest charges or offenses listed.<sup>2</sup> For all offenses, the traffic offenders averaged 16.1 and the non-traffic 12.1 - a statistically significant difference. In terms of traffic-related offenses, the traffic offenders had on the average 7.9 such offenses compared to an average of 1.2 traffic-related offenses for the non-traffic offenders. This was also a statistically significant difference.

---

<sup>1</sup> By "before release from prison," we mean mainly prior to the institutional stay or prison commitment which resulted in initial release in either 1980 or 1981. However, it should be noted that it is possible some arrests may have occurred during the period of prison stay.

<sup>2</sup> Multiple counts of an offense are included here as separate offenses.

5. Statistically significant differences also were obtained for various measures of arrest disposition. Given the larger volume of arrests for the traffic offenders, one would expect that the traffic offenders would have on the average more arrests resulting in conviction and incarceration (including both jail and prison). This proved true when considering both traffic-related and all arrests combined. (See variables #9-12 in Table D-2.)
6. While traffic offenders have on the average significantly more probation supervisions (2.5) compared to non-traffic offenders (1.6), there is no significant difference in the average number of prison receptions (2.2 vs. 2.2).
7. Despite there being no significant difference in the average number of prison receptions, traffic offenders have significantly fewer parole revocations on the average after release (.36 compared to .51) and a significantly lower mean number of prison escapes (0.96 compared to .215).
8. If we crudely measure the length of one's career in crime as the elapsed time between the first CCH recorded arrest and the last such arrest, there is one more significant difference. On the average, the length of the CCH career is 14.9 years for the traffic offenders and 9.6 years for the non-traffic offenders.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> These means include ten cases (two traffic and eight non-traffic) having only one recorded CCH arrest, and therefore "0.0" values on the length of the CCH career. One should also remember that arrest dates in the CCH system are subject to some errors. For example, with remanded juveniles, the arrest date is usually the date of the remand (or transfer of jurisdiction to adult court) hearing rather than the date of the arrest which resulted in such a hearing. Also, the arrest date may reflect the date that an individual's arrest data are entered into the system in cases where the actual arrest date is unknown (as in cases where an individual is transferred from out-of-state to the supervision of the Oregon Corrections Division). In addition, the reader should be reminded that the entries in the Oregon CCH file do not accurately and completely reflect all of an individual's criminal involvement or "career in crime."

Besides quantitative differences between these two groups in such areas as mean numbers of arrests, offenses, arrest disposition events, and duration of CCH career in years; there are also qualitative differences between these groups.

One important area where there are qualitative differences between these groups and the apparent criminal careers of each type of offender involves alcohol and drug problems, particularly driving under the influence of intoxicants (DUII).

Looking at variable #21 in Table D-1, there is a statistically significant difference between these groups in terms of the proportions of each who have at least been arrested on DUII charges. A startling 83.6% of the traffic offenders compared to 24.4% of the non-traffic offenders had at least one DUII arrest listed in their CCH "rap sheets." In terms of DUII arrest dispositions, 72.5% of the traffic offenders and 18.8% of the non-traffic offenders were previously convicted (at least once) on DUII charges. Slightly over half (53.5%) of the traffic offenders were either jailed (44.5%) or incarcerated (9.0%) on DUII charges compared to 9.6% of the non-traffic offenders (with 9.1% jailed and 0.5% imprisoned).

With the heavy loading or weighting of the traffic offenders on DUII and other traffic-related arrest charges, it is not surprising that there would be a statistically significant difference between the study groups in terms of the number (or percentage) of each who have been arrested on charges of being habitual traffic offenders. Among the traffic offenders, 20.5% were arrested at least once on habitual traffic offender charges. This breaks down to 9.5% at least arrested, 4.5% convicted, 5.0% imprisoned, and 1.5% jailed on charges of being a habitual traffic offender.

In contrast, none of the non-traffic offenders (0.0%) had ever been even arrested on such charges.

One last comparison between study groups involves an assessment of the type of charge or offense listed as the basis for the earliest arrest incident coded on the CCH "rap sheet." The question which follows is whether or not that first CCH recorded arrest involved a traffic-related charge or charges. Again, there is a statistically significant difference. For the traffic offenders, 36.0% had at least one traffic-related charge listed as an arrest offense. For the non-traffic offender group, 10.1% started with an arrest containing at least one traffic-related offense.

By way of summary of the most important findings in this section, it appears that the traffic offender (in contrast to the non-traffic offender) has a more extensive or pervasive career in crime in terms of its duration and the volume of CCH recorded arrests and reported offenses. This finding on the volume of arrests and offenses holds true when we consider all arrests and all offenses, as well as, all traffic-related arrests and offenses.<sup>1</sup>

Most striking is the extent to which the traffic violator tends to have a monopoly on related traffic offenses - especially the offenses of DUII and being a habitual traffic offender. Also, the traffic offender has many more arrests on the average for traffic-related offenses and is over 3.5 times more likely to have a first CCH recorded arrest involving traffic-related offenses.

---

<sup>1</sup> The lone exception involves the mean number of all arrests after initial release (in 1980 or 1981) from prison. Even this statistically insignificant difference is in the direction of more arrests for the traffic offender group, however.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Description of Offenses Employed in This Research Study

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Offense</u>	<u>Description</u>
ABUS	Sexual Abuse	HOMINEGL	Negligent Homicide
ABUSI	Sexual Abuse I	INCE	Incest
APPE	Failure to Appear	KIDN	Kidnapping
APPEI	Failure to Appear I	KIDNATTE	Attempted Kidnap
ARSO	Arson	KIDNCONS	Conspiracy to Kidnap
ARSOATTE	Attempted Arson	KIDNI	Kidnapping I
ARSOI	Arson I	KIDNII	Kidnapping II
ARSOII	Arson II	MANS	Manslaughter
ASSA	Assault	MANSI	Manslaughter I
ASSAATTE	Attempted Assault	MANSII	Manslaughter II
ASSAENDA	Assault by Endangering	MIST	Mistreatment
ASSAI	Assault I	MURD	Murder
ASSAII	Assault II	MURDATTE	Attempted Murder
ASSAIII	Assault III	MURDSOLI	Soliciting to Commit Murder
ASSAIV	Assault IV	NONS	Criminal Non Support
BURG	Burglary	OBSTHIND	Hindering Prosecution
BURGATTE	Attepted Burglary I/II	PAROVIOL	Parole Violation
BURGI	Burglary I	POSSFISH	Unlawfully Possessing Food/Fish
BURGII	Burglary II	PROSCOMP	Compelling Prostitution
CHEC	Negotiating a Bad Check	PROSPROM	Promoting Prostitution
CHILENDA	Endangering The Welfare of a Minor	RAPE	Rape
COER	Coercion	RAPEATTE	Attempted Rape
CONS	Conspiracy	RAPEI	Rape I
CREDCARD	Fraudulent Use of a Credit Card	RAPEII	Rape II
CUSTI	Custodial Interference I	RAPEIII	Rape III
DRIV	Driving Offense	ROBB	Robbery
DRIVACCI	Hit Run/Attend Veh/Prop-Injur	ROBBCONS	Conspiracy to Commit Robbery
DRIVREVO	Driving While Revoked	ROBBI	Robbery I
DRIVSUSP	Driving While Suspended	ROBBII	Robbery II
DRUG	Drug Offense	ROBBIII	Robbery III
DRUGACTI	Criminal Activity in Drugs	ROBBSOLI	Soliciting to Commit Robbery
DRUGATTE	Attempted Criminal Activity in Drugs	SMUG	Smuggling
DRUGDISP	Delivery of a Controlled Substance	SODO	Sodomy
DRUGMANU	Manu of a Controlled Substance	SODOATTE	Attempted Sodomy
DRUGOBT	Obtaining a Drug Unlawfully	SODOI	Sodomy I
DRUGPOSS	Poss of Controlled Substance	SODOII	Sodomy II
DRUGRECO	Tampering With Drug Records	SODOIII	Sodomy III
DRUGSALE	Sale Controlled Substance	SOLI	Soliciting a Crime
ESCA	Escape	THEF	Theft
ESCAATTE	Attempted Escape	THEFATTE	Attempted Theft
ESCAI	Escape I	THEFCONS	Conspiracy to Commit Theft
ESCAII	Escape II	THEFDECE	Theft by Deception
FORG	Forgery	THEFEXTO	Theft by Extortion
FORGDEVI	Possession of Forgery Device	THEFI	Theft I
FORGI	Forgery I	THEFII	Theft II
FORGII	Forgery II	THEFSERV	Theft of Services
FRAU	Fraud	THEFVEHI	Possession of Stolen Motor Vehicle
FRAUPUBL	Unlawfully Obtaining Public Assistance	VAND	Vandalism or Criminal Mischief
HARR	Harassment	VANDI	Criminal Mischief I, Vandalism I
HOMIATTE	Attempted Homicide	WEAPPOSS	Unlawful Possession of Weapons
		WEAPXCON	Ex-Con in Possession of a Firearm

APPENDIX B

Listing of Prison Return Outcomes for Major Groups of Releasees Categorized by Most Serious Last Conviction Offense and Tracked for Three Years in This Study

Most Serious Last Admission Conviction Offense/Category			Percent by Reason for Prison Return Category <sup>d</sup>							
Offense <sup>a</sup>	Type <sup>b</sup>	Class <sup>c</sup>	Number of Releasees Tracked	Did Not Return to Prison	New Court Commitment	Parole Violation New Crime	Parole Violation Rule(s)	Parole Violation Rule(s) Plus New Crime Conviction	Parole Suspension	Other
1. ABUS	PERS	AT	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2. ABUSI	PERS	CF	62	80.6%	8.1%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%	4.8%	0.0%
3. APPE	STAT	CF	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4. APPEI	STAT	CF	21	57.1%	4.8%	0.0%	9.5%	9.5%	14.3%	4.8%
5. ARSO	PROP	OC	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
6. ARSOATTE	PROP	AT	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7. ARSOI	PROP	AF	12	75.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	0.0%
8. ARSOII	PROP	CF	8	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9. ASSA	PERS	CF	5	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%
10. ASSAATTE	PERS	AT	8	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11. ASSAENDA	PERS	OC	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12. ASSAI	PERS	AF	21	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	23.8%	14.3%	4.8%	0.0%
13. ASSAII	PERS	BF	76	80.3%	5.3%	1.3%	9.2%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%
14. ASSAIII	PERS	CF	35	68.6%	20.0%	0.0%	2.9%	5.7%	2.9%	0.0%
15. ASSAIV	PERS	AM	3	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
16. BURG	PROP	CF	7	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
17. BURGATTE	PROP	AT	25	68.0%	4.0%	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%	12.0%	0.0%
18. BURGI	PROP	AF	367	62.9%	10.6%	2.2%	7.4%	6.3%	10.6%	0.0%
19. BURGII	PROP	CF	328	65.9%	11.3%	1.8%	7.0%	4.3%	9.8%	0.0%
20. CHILENDA	PERS	AM	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21. COER	PERS	CF	6	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
22. CONS	STAT	IN	5	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23. CREDCARD	PROP	CF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
24. CUSTI	STAT	CF	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
25. DRIV	STAT	CF	6	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
26. DRIVACCI	STAT	CF	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
27. DRIVREVO	STAT	CF	11	72.7%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
28. DRIVSUSP	STAT	CF	182	72.5%	11.0%	0.5%	6.0%	7.1%	2.7%	0.0%
29. DRUG	DRUG	AF	16	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
30. DRUGACTI	DRUG	AF	41	70.7%	7.3%	0.0%	9.8%	2.4%	7.3%	2.4%
31. DRUGATTE	DRUG	AT	2	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
32. DRUGDISP	DRUG	OC	20	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%
33. DRUGMANU	DRUG	AF	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
34. DRUGOBT	DRUG	BF	4	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
35. DRUGPOSS	DRUG	OC	54	77.8%	13.0%	1.9%	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
36. DRUGRECO	DRUG	CF	8	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
37. DRUGSALE	DRUG	OC	2	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
38. ESCA	STAT	CF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
39. ESCAATTE	STAT	AT	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
40. ESCAI	STAT	BF	8	75.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
41. ESCAII	STAT	CF	33	69.7%	3.0%	3.0%	12.1%	9.1%	3.0%	0.0%
42. FORG	PROP	OC	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
43. FORGDEVI	PROP	CF	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
44. FORGI	PROP	CF	129	64.3%	10.1%	3.1%	7.8%	10.9%	3.9%	0.0%

Most Serious  
Last Admission  
Conviction  
Offense/Category

Percent by Reason for Prison Return Category<sup>d</sup>

Offense <sup>a</sup>	Type <sup>b</sup>	Class <sup>c</sup>	Number of Releasees Tracked	Did Not Return to Prison	New Court Commitment	Parole Violation New Crime	Parole Violation Rule(s)	Parole Violation Rule(s) Plus New Crime Conviction	Parole Suspension	Other
45. FORGII	PROP	AM	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
46. FRAU	PROP	CF	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
47. FRAUPUBL	PROP	CF	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
48. HOMIATTE	PERS	AF	8	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
49. HOMINEGL	PERS	CF	24	79.2%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%
50. INCE	STAT	OC	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
51. KIDN	PERS	BF	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
52. KIDNATTE	PERS	AT	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
53. KIDNCONS	PERS	BF	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
54. KIDNI	PERS	AF	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
55. KIDNII	PERS	BF	11	63.6%	27.3%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
56. MANS	PERS	BF	12	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
57. MANSI	PERS	AF	20	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%
58. MANSII	PERS	BF	14	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
59. MIST	PERS	CF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60. MURD	PERS	UF	25	80.0%	4.0%	4.0%	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
61. MURDATTE	PERS	AF	5	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%
62. MURDSOLI	PERS	AF	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
63. NONS	STAT	CF	13	61.5%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%
64. POSSFISH	PROP	CF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
65. PROSCOMP	PERS	BF	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
66. PROSPROM	STAT	CF	1	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
67. RAPE	PERS	CF	8	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
68. RAPEATTE	PERS	AT	21	90.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
69. RAPEI	PERS	AF	73	87.7%	1.4%	2.7%	5.5%	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%
70. RAPEII	PERS	BF	22	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
71. RAPEIII	PERS	CF	19	84.2%	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%
72. ROBB	PERS	CF	4	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
73. ROBBCONS	PERS	IN	5	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
74. ROBBI	PERS	AF	156	75.0%	7.1%	0.0%	8.3%	7.1%	2.6%	0.0%
75. ROBBII	PERS	BF	121	74.4%	3.3%	3.3%	10.7%	5.8%	2.5%	0.0%
76. ROBBIII	PERS	CF	50	62.0%	10.0%	0.0%	16.0%	4.0%	8.0%	0.0%
77. ROBSOLI	PERS	BF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
78. SMUG	PROP	CF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
79. SODO	PERS	CF	2	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
80. SODOATTE	PERS	AT	4	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
81. SODOI	PERS	AF	40	77.5%	10.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	5.0%	2.5%
82. SODOII	PERS	BF	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
83. SODOIII	PERS	CF	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
84. SOLI	STAT	IN	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
85. THEF	PROP	CF	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
86. THEFATTE	PROP	AT	2	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
87. THEFCONS	PROP	IN	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
88. THEFDECE	PROP	CF	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
89. THEFEXTO	PERS	BF	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
90. THEFI	PROP	CF	294	70.7%	6.8%	4.1%	8.5%	5.4%	4.1%	0.3%
91. THEFII	PROP	AM	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
92. THEFSERV	PROP	CF	4	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
93. THEFVEHI	PROP	CF	156	62.8%	8.3%	4.5%	7.1%	7.1%	10.3%	0.0%

Most Serious Last Admission Conviction Offense/Category			Percent by Reason for Prison Return Category <sup>d</sup>							
Offense <sup>a</sup>	Type <sup>b</sup>	Class <sup>c</sup>	Number of Releasees Tracked	Did Not Return to Prison	New Court Commitment	Parole Violation New Crime	Parole Violation Rule(s)	Parole Violation Rule(s) Plus New Crime Conviction	Parole Suspension	Other
94. UNKNOWN	UNKN	UK	116	52.6%	16.4%	0.9%	12.1%	12.1%	6.0%	0.0%
95. VAND	PROP	OC	4	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
96. VARDI	PROP	CF	5	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
97. WEAPPOSS	STAT	CF	4	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
98. WEAPXCON	STAT	CF	23	60.9%	17.4%	0.0%	13.0%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%

<sup>a</sup> See Appendix A for a brief description of each of these offenses as they are coded in the Oregon Corrections Division Offender Tracking System. Offenses designated "UNKNOWN" reflect situations where the prison commitment offenses have not been updated in or added to the computer file. Offenses with the suffix abbreviation "ATTE" refer to "attempts." According to the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), Section 161.408(1), an "attempt" is described as an inchoate crime. "A person is guilty of an attempt to commit a crime when he intentionally engages in conduct which constitutes a substantial step toward commission of the crime." With the exception that attempted murder or treason is regarded as a Class A felony, an attempt is rated as one classification below that normally imposed for the offense involved. For example, an attempt would be classified a Class B felony if the offense attempted is a Class A felony. Offenses with the suffix abbreviation "CONS" refer to acts of "criminal conspiracy." According to ORS Section 161.450(1), one is guilty of criminal conspiracy if ". . . with the intent that conduct constituting a crime punishable as a felony or a class A misdemeanor be performed, he agrees with one or more persons to engage in or cause the performance of such conduct. Criminal conspiracy is classified for the purpose of sentencing as the same class as the crime to be committed which is the object of the conspiracy. Lastly, offenses with the suffix abbreviation "SOLI" refer to the crime of solicitation. ORS Section 161.435(1) states that a person commits the crime of solicitation if ". . . with the intent of causing another to engage in specific conduct constituting a crime punishable as a felony or as a Class A misdemeanor or an attempt to commit such felony or Class A misdemeanor he commands or solicits such other persons to engage in that conduct. As with "attempts," criminal solicitations are rated one classification below that normally imposed for the offense solicited.

<sup>b</sup> The codes used here can be listed and described as follows:

PERS = Offense or crime directed against the person  
 PROP = Offense or crime directed against property  
 STAT = Offense or crime involving a statute which is not considered a crime against the person or against property  
 DRUG = A specific subclass of statute offenses involving controlled substances and drugs

<sup>c</sup> The codes used here can be listed and described as follows:

AF = Class A felony  
 AM = Class A misdemeanor  
 AT = Attempt  
 BF = Class B felony  
 CF = Class C felony  
 IN = Infraction  
 OC = Old code offense  
 UF = Unclassified felony  
 UK = Unknown

Note: According to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS 161.505) an "offense" is ". . . conduct for which a sentence to a term of imprisonment or to a fine is provided by any law of this state or by any law or ordinance of a political subdivision of this state." Further, an offense is classified either a crime or a violation or an infraction. A crime (ORS 161.515) is an offense for which a sentence of imprisonment is authorized. A "crime" is considered either a felony or a misdemeanor. Felonies involve sentences with a maximum term of imprisonment of more than one year (ORS 161.525). Misdemeanors involve sentences with a maximum term of imprisonment of not more than one year (ORS 161.545). A "violation" is an offense punishable only by a fine, forfeiture, fine and forfeiture, or other civil penalty (ORS 161.565). An "infraction" is an offense punishable only by a fine, forfeiture, suspension, or revocation of a license or other privilege, or other civil penalty (ORS 153.270). An "old code" offense refers to an offense listed in the Criminal Code of Oregon prior to 1971 and no longer described in the current code. For example, "contributing to the delinquency of a minor" is one such offense which falls into this category.

<sup>d</sup> Basically, there are two major reasons why an individual is returned to prison: (1) because he or she has been convicted of a new crime, or (2) because he or she has violated a parole rule or rules. Of course, both possibilities can occur together. Also, parole can be suspended as a result of a finding of new criminal activity and/or a parole rule violation.

TRAFFIC OFFENDER STUDY (1985)  
"RAP" SHEET SUMMARY FORM

APPENDIX C

CRIME ANALYSIS CENTER  
October 1985

1. Card Number:  2. Study Group: 1-Traffic Offenders  2-Comparison Group

Deceased? (1=Yes & "BLANK"-No)  
↓  
3. OSPBI No.:

4. Sex (F or M):  5. Race: 1-White  2-Black  3-Indian  4-Hispanic  5-Oriental  6-Other

6. Date of Birth: Year   - Month   - Day

7. Date of Admission to Prison: Year   - Month   - Day

8. Date of Initial Prison Release in 1980 or 1981: Year   - Month   - Day

9. Date of Earliest CCH Recorded Arrest in Oregon: Year   - Month   - Day

10. Date of Latest CCH Recorded Arrest in Oregon: Year   - Month   - Day

11. Most Serious Commitment Offense:

12. Total Number of All CCH Recorded Arrests "Before" and "After" Release Date Listed in Item #8: Before   After

13. Total Number of ARRESTS "Before" and "After" Release Date Listed in Item #8 Which Were Traffic or Driving-Related: Before   After

7670A/10-8-85

14. For the TOTAL Number of ARRESTS Counted in Item #12, Provide the Following OFFENSE COUNTS:

a. Total Number of All CCH Recorded Arrest Offenses:

b. Total Number of All CCH Recorded Arrest Offenses Which Were Traffic or Driving-Related:

15. For the TOTAL Number of All ARRESTS Counted in Item #12, Provide the Following Counts:

a. Number Resulting in Conviction on Some Charge(s):

b. Number Resulting in Sentences of Actual Jail Stay or Imprisonment:

16. For the TOTAL Number of TRAFFIC or DRIVING-RELATED ARRESTS Counted in Item #13, Provide the Following Counts:

a. Number Resulting in Conviction on Some Charge(s):

b. Number Resulting in Sentences of Actual Jail Stay or Imprisonment:

17. CCH Custody Segment Counts:

a. Number of Probation Supervisions:

b. Number of Prison Receptions:

c. Number of Parole Revocations:

d. Number of Prison Escapes:

18. Was This Individual Ever Arrested, Convicted, and Imprisoned on Charges of Being a "Habitual Traffic" Offender? 1-Arrested  2-Convicted  3-Imprisoned

19. Was This Individual Ever Arrested, Convicted, and Imprisoned on Charges of Driving Under the Influence of Intoxicants? 1-Arrested  2-Convicted  3-Imprisoned

20. Did the First CCH Recorded Arrest Involve Any Traffic-Related Offenses? 0-No  1-Yes  9-Unknown