POR Working Group Poll

This report was generated on 12/14/21. Overall 21 respondents completed this questionnaire. The report has been filtered to show the responses for 'All Respondents'.

The following charts are restricted to the top 12 codes. Lists are restricted to the most recent 100 rows.

Do you favor status quo for the trigger of a restart of the 10-year registration period for “any conviction” resulting in incarceration? **Current law requires restart of Registration obligation after any conviction or revocation if the result includes at least a day of incarceration in jail or prison as part of the sentence or revocation.**

- No (17) 81%
- Yes (4) 19%

Do you favor modifying the trigger for a restart of the 10-year registration period from “any conviction” resulting in incarceration to remove most misdemeanors as restart convictions? **Restart of Registration obligation only after felony or gross misdemeanor convictions, Crimes-Against-the-Person convictions, or revocations for the above-mentioned crimes or for convictions that trigger registration. All restarts would require at least a day of incarceration in jail or prison as part of the sentence or revocation.**

- Yes (13) 62%
- No (8) 38%

Do you favor modifying the trigger for a restart of the 10-year registration period from “any conviction” resulting in incarceration to remove most gross misdemeanors and misdemeanors as restart convictions? **Restart of Registration obligation only after felony convictions, Crimes-Against-the-Person convictions, or revocations for the above-mentioned crimes or for convictions that trigger registration. All restarts would require at least a day of incarceration in jail or prison as part of the sentence or revocation.**

- Yes (12) 63%
- No (7) 37%
Do you favor retaining the status quo Mandatory Minimum for Failure to Register convictions? **Maintain the mandatory minimum of a year and a day in prison for 1st time Failure-to-Register conviction and two years for subsequent conviction.**

No (16) 80%
Yes (4) 20%

Do you favor modifying mandatory minimum for Failure to Register convictions? **Remove the mandatory minimum of a year and a day in prison for 1st time Failure-to-Register. Keep felony level offense for Failure-to-Register and maintain mandatory minimum for repeat conviction for failure to register.**

Yes (16) 84%
No (3) 16%

Do you favor status quo for False Imprisonment? **Keep False Imprisonment as in current law as a registration offense after being charged or petitioned for false Imprisonment and convicted or adjudicated of this offense or another arising out of the same set of circumstances.**

No (19) 91%
Yes (2) 10%

Do you favor modifying False Imprisonment to be registration offense for conviction only: **Limit False Imprisonment registration requirement to convictions only, removing same-set-of-circumstances conviction from the requirement.**

Yes (18) 86%
No (3) 14%

Do you favor the status quo of requiring juveniles to register? **Maintain registration requirement applicable to those convicted or adjudicated of registration offenses whether juvenile or adult.**

No (18) 86%
Yes (3) 14%
Do you favor removing juveniles from registry? **Make registration requirement only applicable to those convicted as an adult (at least age 18 or certified as adult).**

- Yes (12) 60%
- No (8) 40%

Do you favor limiting registration to juveniles 14 years and older? **If juvenile registration is retained, make registration requirement only applicable to those 14 and older.**

- Yes (14) 67%
- No (7) 33%

Do you favor providing a process to petition for relief from the registration requirement? **Relief from registration process for those subject to registration.**

- Yes (18) 86%
- No (3) 14%

Do you favor providing a special process for juveniles to petition for relief from the registration requirement? **Relief from registration process for those subject to registration.**

- Yes (18) 90%
- No (2) 10%

Under the current draft proposal, a 5-member review panel is contemplated for the relief process. (If you favor a relief process, should it require a unanimous vote from a 5-member panel to provide relief from registration obligation?)

- No (14) 74%
- Yes (5) 26%
Under the current draft proposal, a 5-member review panel is contemplated for the relief process. (If you favor a relief process, should it require a 4/5 vote to provide relief from registration obligation?)

Yes (10) 50%
No (10) 50%

Under the current draft proposal, a 5-member review panel is contemplated for the relief process. (If you favor a relief process, should it require a majority vote to provide relief from registration obligation?)

Yes (11) 55%
No (9) 45%

Do you favor a name change in the statute? Support change from use of the term “Predatory Offender” within the statute and registration system.

Yes (12) 57%
No (9) 43%

Do you support more data collection and funding for such data? Provide more funding for research and data collection aimed at the efficacy of the registry.

Yes (20) 95%
No (1) 5%

Do you support further study of homeless and institutional registration challenges to compliance? Support further study of registration requirements related to homeless and non-traditional living situations including those affected by physical and mental health challenges.

Yes (20) 100%
No (-)
Comments:

The other issue that needs addressing is a statute of limitations of sorts for the BCA to determine registration obligations (like 90 days after sentencing). There currently is no time limit for them to make this determination, so people who may have a registration obligation might not learn about it until years after their sentencing. Also, we need data from LE about how they are actually using the registry. Suggest a sample of 10-20 LE agencies, determine how many sexual assault or kidnapping crimes with unknown assailants they have had in the last 5 years, run through the ICRs and determine what cases, if any, were investigated (clearing or identifying suspects) using information that only the registry could provide. This is one of the more critical points needed to understand if the registry is working as originally intended.

I also support extending the period of the stay for juveniles to complete treatment.

Question 1 Comment: The BCA supports restart of registration periods for registrable offenses. The BCA would support the removal of certain gross misdemeanors and traffic offenses from the list of crimes that trigger a restart of the registration period. Question 3 Comment: Yes, as long as it is ensured that felonies are not being pled down as a mechanism to avoid registration. We would be concerned this would create disparities in those requiring registration. The BCA would support the removal of certain gross misdemeanors and traffic offenses from the list of crimes that trigger the restart of the registration period. Question 4 Comment: The BCA supports the language presented as reference information for questions 4 & 5 in the Poll Question Supporting Information document. Question 5 Comment: The BCA supports the language presented as reference information for questions 4 & 5 in the Poll Question Supporting Information document. Question 9 Comment: The BCA supports a judge making determinations for all juvenile offenders. Question 10 Comment: The BCA supports a judge making determinations for all juvenile offenders. Question 11 Comment: The BCA supports an “off-ramp” process for lifetime registrants. However, the BCA does not support the proposed “off-ramp” language. The BCA has no opinion on whether a 10 year registration period is the appropriate registration duration for most offenders. Question 13 Comment: The BCA does not support the proposed “off-ramp” language.

Question 1 Comment: The BCA supports restart of registration periods for registrable offenses. The BCA would support the removal of certain gross misdemeanors and traffic offenses from the list of crimes that trigger a restart of the registration period. Question 3 Comment: Yes, as long as it is ensured that felonies are not being pled down as a mechanism to avoid registration. We would be concerned this would create disparities in those requiring registration. The BCA would support the removal of certain gross misdemeanors and traffic offenses from the list of crimes that trigger the restart of the registration period. Question 4 Comment: The BCA supports the language presented as reference information for questions 4 & 5 in the Poll Question Supporting Information document. Question 5 Comment: The BCA supports the language presented as reference information for questions 4 & 5 in the Poll Question Supporting Information document. Question 9 Comment: The BCA supports a judge making determinations for all juvenile offenders. Question 10 Comment: The BCA supports a judge making determinations for all juvenile offenders. Question 11 Comment: The BCA supports an “off-ramp” process for lifetime registrants. However, the BCA does not support the proposed “off-ramp” language. The BCA has no opinion on whether a 10 year registration period is the appropriate registration duration for most offenders. Question 13 Comment: The BCA does not support the proposed “off-ramp” language. Question 14 Comment: The BCA would not oppose the registry being renamed, as long as the name is descriptive of the individuals on the registry.