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Who We Are

The Sentencing Guidelines Commission:

- Derives its authority from the Sentencing Reform Act of 1981, RCW Chapter 9.94A, to advise the Governor and the Legislature on issues relating to adult and juvenile sentencing.

- Promotes accountability and equity in adult and juvenile sentencing, provides accurate and timely information about sentencing and recommends improvements in the criminal justice system.

- Is composed of 20 voting members who are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate plus four legislative members.

- Was established within the Office of Financial Management by Chapter 40, Laws of 2011.
Review of the Sentencing Reform Act

Under Chapter 299, Laws of 2018, the Sentencing Guidelines Commission was directed to review:

- The current sentencing grid and recommend changes to simplify the grid and increase judicial discretion.

- Fines, fees and other legal financial obligations associated with criminal convictions.

- Community supervision and community custody programs including eligibility criteria, length and manner of supervision, earned time toward termination of supervision and consequences for violations of conditions.

- Available alternatives to full confinement including work crew, home detention and electronic home monitoring.
Review of the Sentencing Reform Act

While achieving the goals of:

- Ensuring evidence-based policies and practices
- Promoting public safety
- Promoting simplicity
- Eliminating inconsistencies
Review of the Sentencing Reform Act

Results of the SGC’s review:

- Recommendations for policy changes
  - Sentencing
  - Community Supervision
  - Other

- Sentencing grid proposals
  - Option 1 provides a balance between increasing judicial discretion and maintaining the original design and structure of the SRA.
  - Option 2 increases judicial discretion and limits disproportionate sentences by subsuming sentencing enhancements, aggravating and mitigating factors, the drug grid and unranked offenses.
Sentencing Grid Proposals

Option 1
Option 1 Key Tenets:

- Increases judicial discretion
  - Jail cell ranges changed to 0 – 365 days regardless of offender score.
  - Prison cell ranges are increased by 20% on the upper and lower ends.

- Maintains jail/prison line.

- Retains all sentencing alternatives (FTOW, DOSA, SSOSA, FOSA).

- Retains history of decisions on scoring of offenses, community custody/supervision, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seriousness Level</th>
<th>Offender Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL XVI</td>
<td>Life sentence without parole/death penalty for offenders at or over the age of eighteen. For offenders under the age of eighteen, a term of twenty-five years to life.</td>
<td>192 - 384</td>
<td>200 - 400</td>
<td>209 - 416</td>
<td>217 - 433</td>
<td>225 - 449</td>
<td>233 - 466</td>
<td>250 - 499</td>
<td>270 - 540</td>
<td>296 - 592</td>
<td>329 - 658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL XV</td>
<td></td>
<td>123 - 220</td>
<td>134 - 234</td>
<td>144 - 244</td>
<td>154 - 254</td>
<td>165 - 265</td>
<td>175 - 275</td>
<td>195 - 295</td>
<td>216 - 316</td>
<td>257 - 357</td>
<td>298 - 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 - 148</td>
<td>82 - 163</td>
<td>89 - 176</td>
<td>96 - 192</td>
<td>103 - 205</td>
<td>110 - 221</td>
<td>130 - 259</td>
<td>142 - 283</td>
<td>167 - 332</td>
<td>192 - 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>12+ - 17</td>
<td>12+ - 20</td>
<td>12+ - 24</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
<td>26 - 52</td>
<td>33 - 65</td>
<td>41 - 82</td>
<td>50 - 98</td>
<td>58 - 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL V</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>12+ - 17</td>
<td>12+ - 20</td>
<td>12+ - 24</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
<td>26 - 52</td>
<td>34 - 68</td>
<td>42 - 84</td>
<td>50 - 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>12+ - 17</td>
<td>14 - 26</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
<td>26 - 52</td>
<td>34 - 68</td>
<td>41 - 82</td>
<td>41 - 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL III</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>12+ - 17</td>
<td>14 - 26</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
<td>26 - 52</td>
<td>34 - 68</td>
<td>34 - 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL II</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>12+ - 17</td>
<td>12+ - 22</td>
<td>14 - 26</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
<td>26 - 52</td>
<td>34 - 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL I</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>0 - 12</td>
<td>12+ - 17</td>
<td>12+ - 22</td>
<td>14 - 26</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentencing Grid Proposals

Option 2
Sentencing Grid Proposals – Option 2

Option 2 Key Tenets:

- Uses a two-step sentencing grid process.
- Increases judicial discretion.
- Increases the offender score columns from 9+ to 10+.
- Uses current offense classifications to denote offense seriousness.
- Incorporates sentencing enhancements and aggravating and mitigating factors into sentencing discretion.
- Retains all sentencing alternatives (FTOW, DOSA, SSOSA, FOSA).
Option 2 Two-Step Grid:

- **Step 1** – mandatory grid
  - Creates mandatory sentencing ranges based on offender score and offense classification.
  - Increases offender score columns from 9+ to 10+.

- **Step 2** – presumptive grid
  - Uses current offense classifications to denote seriousness levels (A+, A, A-, etc.)
  - If factors exist, judge considers them to impose an appropriate sentence.
  - Judge also considers:
    - The guidelines in the grid
    - The purpose of the SRA; and
    - The circumstances of the offense and if the sentence is reasonable.
Step 1 – Mandatory Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1y+-Life</td>
<td>1y+-Life</td>
<td>1y+-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
<td>5y-Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0-5y</td>
<td>0-5y</td>
<td>0-10y</td>
<td>6m-10y</td>
<td>6m-10y</td>
<td>1y+-10y</td>
<td>1y+-10y</td>
<td>3y-15y</td>
<td>3y-15y</td>
<td>4y-15y</td>
<td>4y-15y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0-3y</td>
<td>0-3y</td>
<td>0-3y</td>
<td>0-4y</td>
<td>0-4y</td>
<td>0-5y</td>
<td>6m-5y</td>
<td>6m-5y</td>
<td>6m-5y</td>
<td>9m-5y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Step 2 – Presumptive Grid

### Offender Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10y3m-28y</td>
<td>13y-30y</td>
<td>16y-30y</td>
<td>19y-31y</td>
<td>21y-31y</td>
<td>24y-35y</td>
<td>25y-37y</td>
<td>27y-40y</td>
<td>29y-43y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6y-15y</td>
<td>8y-16y</td>
<td>10y-17y</td>
<td>11y-19y</td>
<td>13y-20y</td>
<td>14y-22y</td>
<td>15y-24y</td>
<td>16y-25y</td>
<td>18y-27y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3y6m-7y6m</td>
<td>4y6m-8y</td>
<td>5y-9y</td>
<td>5y-9y</td>
<td>6y-9y</td>
<td>7y-10y</td>
<td>8y-11y</td>
<td>9y-12y</td>
<td>10y-14y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1y9m-3y6m</td>
<td>2y-4y</td>
<td>2y6m-5y</td>
<td>3y-6y</td>
<td>4y-6y</td>
<td>4y6m-7y</td>
<td>5y-7y</td>
<td>6y-9y</td>
<td>6y-9y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6m-1y6m</td>
<td>9m-1y6m</td>
<td>1y-2y</td>
<td>1y2m-2y</td>
<td>1y4m-2y6m</td>
<td>1y6m-3y</td>
<td>2y-4y</td>
<td>3y-5y</td>
<td>4y-6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0m-1y</td>
<td>6m-1y4m</td>
<td>1y+1y6m</td>
<td>1y4m-2y</td>
<td>1y4m-2y</td>
<td>1y8m-2y6m</td>
<td>1y8m-2y6m</td>
<td>2y-3y</td>
<td>2y-3y4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0m-1y</td>
<td>9m-1y</td>
<td>1y+1y4m</td>
<td>1y+1y4m</td>
<td>1y2m-1y8m</td>
<td>1y2m-1y8m</td>
<td>1y4m-2y</td>
<td>1y4m-2y</td>
<td>1y6m-2y6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-3m</td>
<td>0-6m</td>
<td>0-9m</td>
<td>3m-1y</td>
<td>3m-1y</td>
<td>3m-1y</td>
<td>6m-1y</td>
<td>9m-1y</td>
<td>1y+1y6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1m</td>
<td>0-2m</td>
<td>0-3m</td>
<td>0-6m</td>
<td>0-9m</td>
<td>0-1y</td>
<td>3m-1y</td>
<td>3m-1y</td>
<td>6m-1y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations for Policy Changes

Sentencing
Recommendations - Sentencing

- Unranked Offenses – Assign a seriousness level to all unranked felonies and add them to the bottom of any grid, current or proposed, with a 0 - 12 month presumptive range.

- Enhancements
  - Eliminate mandatory stacking of subsequent enhancements.
  - Make all enhancements eligible for good time as applied to the underlying sentence.

- Offense Seriousness Levels – The SGC did not know which grid, current or proposed, the Legislature would pursue and thus, was unable to complete a review. The SGC offers its assistance to review offense seriousness levels once a grid is chosen.

- Offender Scoring – Data analysis by the Council of State Governments Justice Center provided curious results about the relationship of Washington’s offender score to recidivism rates. Complex statistical analysis is needed to interpret the results.
Recommendations - Sentencing

• Pre-Sentence Investigations
  o Increase the occasions when a PSI can be requested.
  o Make PSIs available earlier in the court process.
  o Relocate the duty to complete PSIs requested by the superior court judges to the superior court.
  o Increase cultural competency to reduce the disproportionality in PSIs.
  o Exclude risk-assessment information and sentencing recommendation from PSIs.

• Sentence Alternatives – Make alternatives to confinement available to the sentencing judge.
  o More than 90% of felony sentences include a term of confinement.
  o Probation terms can be successful.
Recommendations for Policy Changes

Community Supervision
Recommendations – Community Supervision

- Supervision should be based on Risk Need Responsivity model and not solely on offense type
  - Aim for appropriate community supervision population
    - Higher recidivism rates for individuals releasing from prison to community supervision with low or moderate risk.
    - Lower recidivism for individuals released from jail with community supervision.
    - Half of jail sentences do not receive community supervision after release.
  - Evidence-based approach tailored to the individual
- Front-load reentry services for all felony offenders being released from confinement.
Recommendations – Community Supervision

• New supervision terms should be set concurrent to prior supervision terms.
  - More than 80% of felony J&S forms do not specify the relationship of a new supervision term to a prior supervision term.
  - Supervision would focus on the initial period of transition.
  - Increases public safety by allowing enforcement of all supervision conditions of multiple supervision terms. Example: DOSA revoke cannot occur until DOSA supervision term is active.

• Encourage motivational-focused supervision.
  - Part of RNR approach
  - Referee vs Coach
Recommendations – Community Supervision

- Add behavior-based incentives to community supervision.
  - Part of RNR approach.
  - Reduce costs without impact to public safety.
  - Missouri's use of compliance credit.

- Simplify tolling of supervision terms by limiting tolling to absconders.
  - Lack of consistent tolling rules creates complexity in identifying and calculating tolling.
  - DOC does not have a reliable mechanism to track jail confinements not ordered by DOC.

- Expand DOC’s range of violation sanctions.
  - Flexibility for DOC to sanction undesired behavior accordingly.
  - Should include nonincarceration-based punishments.
Recommendations – Community Supervision

• Supervision requirements and violation sanctions should be individualized.
  
  o Be based on risk and need, the undesired behavior and the circumstances.
  
  o According to WSIPP, using RNR to individualize supervision requirements and violation sanctions can reduce technical violations by 16% and produce a benefit (minus costs) of over $8,000 per individual.
Recommendations for Policy Changes

Other
Recommendations – Other

- Legal Financial Obligations
  - The SGC supports the work being carried out by the LFO Stakeholder Consortium through the Minority and Justice Commission.
  - Encourages use of available tools, such as the LFO calculator created by the LFO Stakeholder Consortium, to assist with the computing of legal financial obligations.

- Post-conviction Review – There is wide support for a review of incarcerated individuals who have long sentences.

- Sovereign Immunity – The SGC is mindful of the effect that the waiver of sovereign immunity has on decision-making by agencies and individuals and believes this topic should be included in any SRA reform discussions.
Recommendations – Other

• Sentencing Outcomes Interface - Create an interface in the justice data warehouse located in OFM to provide sentencing information
  o Would allow judges to query records of similar cases when making sentencing decisions.
  o Would also benefit prosecutors and defense attorneys as they work on their cases.

• Standard Recidivism Report - Create research position in the Washington State Statistical Analysis Center dedicated to research on recidivism of justice-involved individuals.
  o Washington does not have a standard statewide recidivism report.
  o SAC is creating a justice data warehouse and all records will be linkable to the P20W (education data warehouse) data, thus providing a data-rich source for studies.

• Full-time SGC Staff – Increase the FTE allocation to the SGC to 1 FTE.
Currency of Accountability

Locus of Decision-Making
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