



**OKLAHOMA CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
RECLASSIFICATION COORDINATION COUNCIL**

**FINAL REPORT**

**ATTORNEY GENERAL MIKE HUNTER  
CHAIRMAN**

**DECEMBER 31, 2019**



OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

December 31, 2019

Dear Governor Stitt, Senate Pro Tempore Treat, and Speaker McCall:

As chair of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Reclassification Coordination Council, it is my honor to share with you the inaugural year-end report as required by state law.

Created in 2018, the Council has been tasked by the legislature with completing a comprehensive review of Oklahoma's felony classification system. All 22 members bring unique criminal justice expertise encompassing service as law enforcement personnel, judicial system representatives, mental health and recovery professionals, private sector advocates, and state government partners. In our first year of work, the Council held eight public meetings and numerous committee meetings to begin the intensive process of reviewing all felony classifications, sentencing requirements, and other relevant information for the purpose of recommending wide-ranging systematic reforms to policy makers. We coordinated with a variety of stakeholders, including the Governor's RESTORE Task Force, and gained valuable insight that is reflected in the attached report.

This year's recommendations are a foundation on which we hope a future overhaul of the Oklahoma felony classification system can be built. Overarching recommendations for criminal justice reform are discussed, such as improving case management and data sharing across systems, increasing mental health access and diversion programs, and addressing domestic violence classification concerns. After extensive research into reclassification efforts in other states, the Council has also created a draft framework of a felony classification system that can be found in Appendix A of the report. Significant collaboration is still required, and the Council looks forward to continuing this meaningful work throughout the upcoming year.

If you would like additional information about the Council's work, feel free to contact my office. Increasing efficiency within our criminal justice system, while holding firm to the security of our citizens and the rights of victims, continues to be our driving commitment. Thank you for your support as we all seek a safer Oklahoma.

Sincerely,

Mike Hunter  
Oklahoma Attorney General

## **OKLAHOMA CRIMINAL JUSTICE RECLASSIFICATION COORDINATION COUNCIL**

The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Reclassification Coordination Council was created by Senate Bill 1098 in 2018 to undertake a comprehensive review of the felony classification system in Oklahoma. The 22-member council, chaired by Attorney General Mike Hunter, consists of members from law enforcement, the legal system, mental health, the private sector, and Oklahoma state agencies.

The Council held eight public meetings in 2019 and numerous committee meetings, which focused on reviewing potential recommendations regarding the classification of all felonies into appropriate categories, appropriate sentence lengths for each class of felonies, appropriate enhanced sentences for crimes committed after prior convictions, and other appropriate changes to improve the criminal justice system in Oklahoma and ensure the public safety of its citizens. The Council is comprised of committees that addressed the following topics: Current Oklahoma Laws, Other State Laws, Federal Laws, Other Appropriate Changes, Enhancements/Time to Serve/Parole Eligibility, Elimination of Certain Crimes, Data, and Legislation.

The Council heard from numerous private and public organizations, law enforcement personnel, state agencies, and Oklahoma citizens through presentations and meeting involvement. The information presented allowed the Council to thoughtfully consider and address problems the state of Oklahoma is facing in the criminal justice system. The following is a brief summary of the information that was presented to the Council and used in formulating the list of recommendations for 2019.

### **Overview**

The mission of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Reclassification Coordination Council is to create an effective and efficient criminal justice system that balances the need for rehabilitation with public safety and justice for victims. The Council was able to identify and address numerous areas of the criminal justice system that could be improved. This endeavor is a multi-year project that deserves ample time, attention, and thoughtfulness. While the work of the Council is not complete, the Council is eager to continue its work toward creating a criminal justice system that better serves all Oklahoma citizens.

### **Mission**

Two broad questions were posed to the group in order to distill the mission of the Council. The questions presented were: 1) What is the most important goal of the criminal justice system and why? And 2) If you were able to create a perfect system, what legislative recommendations would you make and why?

Regarding the first question, almost all members stated public safety is the most important facet of the criminal justice system. Public safety concerns expressed by the members included keeping violent criminals off the streets, protecting citizens from habitual offenders, creating sentence consistency within the system, and providing mental health and addiction treatment options as well as rehabilitation efforts to decrease recidivism.

The second question allowed members the opportunity to discuss their ideal approaches to the criminal justice system. One common approach mentioned was to focus more resources on the juvenile justice system, which would allow youth to have positive interventions at earlier stages that

could prevent future criminal justice involvement. Early assessment and intervention was addressed, with the understanding that more funding would be needed to adequately manage and filter the intake of people into the system.

In addition, several members voiced concern over the lack of shared data among all agencies involved in criminal justice. Free-flowing information would aid the coordination of services and referrals as well as early diversion from the criminal justice system entirely.

In sum, the Council agrees the most important goals of the criminal justice system are:

- Public safety
- Accountability
- Justice for victims and society
- Meaningful rehabilitation and treatment for offenders to address recidivism
- Effective use of taxpayer dollars

With regard to a more perfect system, the Council agrees that the following factors are very important:

- More resources in the entire system
- Shared data for accountability
- Timely intervention
- Certainty in sentencing

## **Data Collection**

One of the main issues the Council faced was the numerous types of data in the criminal justice system. There is no uniform, statewide system for evaluating and accounting for people in the system, and each organization in the process defines a “case” differently. District Attorney Steve Kunzweiler explained law enforcement, district attorneys, and the Department of Corrections all collect information, but the information is not shared across agencies. Greg Williams, Department of Corrections (“DOC”) Deputy Chief of Operations,<sup>1</sup> presented to the Council on the storage and interpretation of inmate data. His presentation highlighted the differences in how state agencies use and interpret data. While numerous agencies use data independently, the collaboration of resources and information could allow the criminal justice system to operate more efficiently and successfully. It would also provide the needed information for accountability.

In order to have a complete picture of the criminal justice system in Oklahoma, we must adopt a uniform system of case management across the state. Currently, counties record criminal cases on a county-by-county basis. A statewide system would facilitate data exchange. The Data Committee expressed three main proposals that would serve this purpose. The first would be the creation of a statewide interface/data exchange system. Second, this system must include an analysis portion with information from the courts. Lastly, the Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation (“OSBI”) suggested the creation of a statewide warrant search system. By having these uniform systems in place, criminal

---

<sup>1</sup>Greg Williams is now the new Jail Administrator for the Oklahoma County Jail appointed by the Oklahoma County Criminal Justice Authority on November 18, 2019.

justice system data could be more easily accessed and understood, which is crucial for the creation and amendment of criminal justice laws and policies.

## **Mental Health**

Mental health and substance abuse issues were addressed at each meeting, becoming a main focal point of the Council. On February 14, 2019, the Council heard from Nisha Wilson, Director of Criminal Justice Services at the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (“DMHSAS”), and she explained Oklahoma has a very high rate of addiction and mental illness. Between 700,000 and 900,000 Oklahomans need behavioral health services, but the current funding only allows for one third of these individuals to receive help. She presented on criminal justice investment packages which addressed funds needed to divert people from the criminal justice system. According to her report, the current proposal for full implementation of the package estimates an investment of \$90,210,000 annually.<sup>2</sup> It is projected the implementation of the proposal over a five-year period would result in an 11,200 person reduction to the DOC inmate population, a \$233,000,000 net gain cost savings/avoidance to the state, and a \$123,000,000 annual cost savings/avoidance for every year beyond the initial five years. Ms. Wilson explained while there may be an upfront cost to treating mental health and addiction issues proactively in the criminal justice system, such efforts could provide financial payoff over time.

The Council also heard from Dr. Jason Beaman on the impact of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES). He presented information on how ACES impact drug use, explaining that for each individual ACE, a person’s risk of early drug use increases by two to four times. An individual with an ACES score of five or more is five to ten times more likely to start using drugs early. Additionally, the underlying trauma can lead to the adoption of high-risk behaviors, which can serve as an access point to the criminal justice system.

Information was presented showing a correlation between high rates of incarceration and low rank in education. States with high incarceration rates also had high ACES, high levels of poverty, lower-ranking public education systems, and low scores for overall health. According to the 2016 National Survey on Children’s Health, seven of the 10 states with the highest incarceration rates have significantly higher rates than the national average for the percentage of children aged zero through 17 with two or more ACES. *Forbes* recently wrote an article which listed and ranked each state based on the public school system. All 10 of the states with the highest incarceration rates were ranked in the bottom half for public education when considering factors such as performance, funding, safety, and class size. Notably, Oklahoma was ranked 33rd in the nation for education.<sup>3</sup> Under the World Health Organization’s definition of health, Oklahoma was ranked among the five states with the lowest health scores in 2018. Oklahoma also faces higher than average levels of poverty, with 13.0%

---

<sup>2</sup>Ms. Wilson provided a document showing examples of other states’ investments in criminal justice reform efforts. This document is attached as Appendix “D.”

<sup>3</sup>The *Forbes* article cited a study performed by the financial website WalletHub. The article can be found at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/reneemorad/2018/07/31/states-with-the-best-public-school-systems/#5242494e3897>. WalletHub’s 2019 study published on July 29, 2019, listed Oklahoma as 40<sup>th</sup> in public school rankings.

to 15.9% of individuals falling below the poverty line. With Oklahoma ranked number two in incarceration,<sup>4</sup> these statistics were especially impactful to the work and mission of the Council.

Throughout the meetings, it became clear the criminal justice system is becoming saturated with individuals with mental health and addiction issues, and the system is not properly equipped to meet all the needs. It is important to note the criminal justice system includes more than just inmates in DOC custody.<sup>5</sup> Cleveland County Sheriff Todd Gibson presented to the Council and explained that the counties are not financially equipped to provide the mental health and rehabilitative services required for inmates at the county level. DOC Deputy Chief of Operations Greg Williams<sup>6</sup> agreed, stating they are housing inmates with mental health and addiction issues without the necessary resources.

Sheriff Gibson expressed there is an influx of such persons in county jails due to less felony possession arrests and more misdemeanor possession arrests following the passage of SQ 780 and 781.<sup>7</sup> Former state legislator and QuikTrip Manager of Public and Government Affairs Mike Thornbrugh presented to the Council on August 20, 2019 on what his organization has experienced following SQ 780 and 781. He explained that QuikTrip has seen a significant increase in property crimes.<sup>8</sup> The Council will further evaluate data on property crimes following SQ 780 and 781 at the upcoming January meeting. Also following SQ 780 and 781, members shared concern there is less incentive for people charged with misdemeanor possession to participate in drug court programs, thus potentially minimizing the positive impacts of successful drug court programs.<sup>9</sup>

The Council agrees mental health and addiction treatment should be a priority, but the criminal justice system cannot handle the current financial burden. The Council would like to see earlier diversion programs that can help people exit the criminal justice system or avoid it entirely, and this will be a focus of the Council moving forward.

### **Domestic Violence**

On August 20, 2019, the Council heard from Candida Manion, Director of the Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault. Ms. Manion updated the Council on issues regarding

---

<sup>4</sup>A 2019 report by the U.S. News & World Report showed Louisiana as the top state for incarceration based on 2016 data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics. A 2018 study by the Prison Policy Initiative showed Oklahoma to have the highest rate of incarcerated individuals. The latter study included multiple categories, including pre-trial detention. Whether Oklahoma ranks first or second for incarceration rates, the rank is of great concern to the Council.

<sup>5</sup>According to the Prison Policy Initiative, there are approximately 13,000 people in local jail custody. See graph attached as Appendix “E.”

<sup>6</sup>See n.1.

<sup>7</sup>Since the implementation of SQ 780 and 781, the monetary savings have not been distributed to counties. We recommend the savings calculations, as computed by OMES according to 57 O.S. § 632, be appropriated by the Legislature to the County Community Safety Investment Fund as required by 57 O.S. § 633.

<sup>8</sup>Mr. Thornbrugh presented that since the passage of SQ 780 and 781, QuikTrip has seen a 300% increase in property crimes with lost inventory four times higher in Oklahoma than other states in which they do business.

<sup>9</sup>In fact, misdemeanor charges do not qualify a defendant for admission into most drug court programs. As such, there is now a greater need for exploration of misdemeanor diversion models, such as drug courts.

domestic violence. She presented three main recommendations: 1) increasing sentencing for domestic violence by strangulation, 2) amending 57 O.S. § 571 to change domestic violence from non-violent to violent, and 3) requesting data from the District Attorney’s Council on offenders to study domestic violence and aid prevention. The Council views domestic violence as a serious threat to the safety and welfare of Oklahoma citizens and looks forward to working with the legislature to create successful and thoughtful legislation.<sup>10</sup>

### **Categorization and Reclassification**

As of 2017, Oklahoma ranked number two in the nation in incarceration rates.<sup>11</sup> The 10 states with the highest incarceration rates included: Louisiana, Oklahoma, Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Arizona, Texas, Missouri, Georgia, and Florida. And according to a Prison Policy Initiative Report from 2018, Oklahoma would have the highest world incarceration rate if every U.S. state were considered a country. When examining these top 10 states for incarceration, the top two states, Louisiana and Oklahoma, do not follow a felony classification system. Louisiana did attempt to reclassify, but their legislature failed to adopt the measure.

The Other State Laws committee reviewed the sentencing reclassification efforts from Arkansas, Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, and Utah. This research included looking at classes, specific sentence types, sentencing ranges, enhancements, fines, and parole credits.<sup>12</sup> This information allowed the Council to use the previous trial and error of surrounding states to combine the successful methods of each system into a structure designed to fit the specific needs of Oklahoma. One main concern is the lack of data showing measurable success as a result of reclassification in these states.

A proposed classification framework was presented to the Council by District Attorney Greg Mashburn. Members of the committee went through all felony crimes in the state of Oklahoma and placed them into a category designated by a letter and number. While the proposed categorical system is not final, the most recent draft version of the classification is attached as Appendix “A.” The current version classifies crimes into 14 different categories, ranging from Category Y, including First Degree Murder, to Category D3, including crimes such as Bribery and Grand Larceny.

When addressing the merits of a flexible versus a rigid classification system, the members attempted to find a hybrid where consistency is balanced with flexibility. Victims and defendants, as well as society at large, deserve clarity and consistency with regard to sentencing so there are clear expectations for everyone. In turn, corrections officials need the flexibility of credits to incentivize good behavior and rehabilitation while in custody.

With this in mind, members discussed sentencing reform, consecutive sentences, prosecutorial discretion, and the parole process. In order to allow more flexibility to the courts, members discussed

---

<sup>10</sup>Senator Rob Standridge filed four domestic violence bills on December 2, 2019: SB1102, SB1103, SB1104, and SB1105. These bills address deferred prosecution agreements in domestic violence cases and increased sentencing for domestic violence by strangulation, domestic assault and battery against a pregnant woman resulting in miscarriage, and domestic violence resulting in great bodily harm.

<sup>11</sup>See n.4.

<sup>12</sup>A bound volume of the Report and Appendix of the Other State Laws committee, chaired by Speaker Pro Tempore Harold Wright, was presented to the Council on February 14, 2019.

lowering minimum sentences, modifying 85% crimes, implementing incremental sentencing guidelines for repeat offenders, and potential avenues for those with substance abuse disorders to exit the criminal justice system for more effective treatment. Under the current version, most of the minimum punishments have been removed. In order to provide certainty to defendants, victims, and society, we have suggested time served to range from 75% for the most serious crimes to 10% for the lesser crimes. We believe this strikes a balance between fairness and flexibility.

The Council also believes recidivism is a major concern and a threat to public safety. Thus the current proposal for punishment after conviction of two or more felonies requires a defendant to serve 85% of the sentence before release. For lesser crimes, a defendant will be required to serve 20% of the sentence before release. The Council also plans to evaluate crimes for potential elimination or restructuring and address the categorization and penalty for drug crimes.

Under the mandates of SB1098, the Council is required to consider the fiscal impact of any recommended classification. Because the recommendation is incomplete at this time, a fiscal impact study has not been undertaken or considered by members. Once the classification is complete, members will work with legislative and executive staff to review and evaluate all fiscal impacts of the classification proposal.

### **Recommendations**

The Council tenders the current classification, attached as Appendix “A” and described in the previous section, as a working draft. We continue to gather information and look forward to working with fiscal staff to further develop our recommendations.

The Council also submits the following recommendations for improvements to the criminal justice system:

- Create and provide funding for a statewide interface/data exchange program that would accept all agency information from intake through discharge to final release. This would allow all access points to communicate and would allow the state to track outcomes and provide accountability.
- Create a statewide warrant search system. This would allow law enforcement agencies to operate more efficiently and provide accountability among the agencies.
- Support and promote early diversion programs for youth and young adults with an emphasis on mental health programming and addiction treatment.
- Provide more funding for specially trained mental health emergency responders who can assist officers in diverting offenders to appropriate treatment.
- Work with OMES to identify the savings from SQ 780 and distribute it to the County Community Safety Investment Fund as mandated and directed by statute.
- Provide funding to screen local jail inmates for criminogenic risks, mental health, and substance use disorder so inmates with these issues could be appropriately diverted to treatment programs.
- Create a pilot program (out-of-custody docket for deprived children and children in need of supervision) which would offer support and guidance for families and divert youths from

victimization and criminal and mental health court system involvement. The program should partner with a research university to track outcomes.

- Provide more training for the stakeholders in the juvenile justice system to support better outcomes.
- Support the expansion of juvenile drug courts and mental health courts. Currently, there are eight juvenile drug courts and 22 mental health courts, but more individuals could be served by these programs.
- Provide more funding for re-entry programs, post-incarceration supervision, and treatment of individuals while on probation and parole to discourage recidivism and encourage recovery.
- Provide a certificate of rehabilitation for those who have completed their sentences to recognize formal restoration and to demonstrate the offender is no longer a threat to public safety. This would help with future employability and be a formal recognition of reparation.

## **Conclusion**

The Council submits this year-end report and will continue to work on the classification proposal as well as other recommendations to improve the criminal justice system. Meetings have been scheduled for the following dates in 2020: January 22, March 3, April 14, July 21, September 15, and November 17.

**Appendix A: Proposed Framework for Classification System, Under Consideration of the Council**

CLASS	NEW RANGE OF PUNISHMENT	must serve	1 OR MORE PRIORS		2 OR MORE PRIORS	
			non-violent	violent	non-violent	violent
<b>Y</b>	<b>LIFE SENTENCE, DEATH PENALTY OR LWOP</b>					
<b>A1</b>	<b>10 TO 45 YEARS</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>20 + YEARS</b>		<b>85%</b>	
<b>A2</b>	<b>5 TO 40 YEARS</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>10 + YEARS</b>		<b>85%</b>	
<b>A3</b>	<b>0 TO 40 YEARS</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>5 + YEARS</b>		<b>85%</b>	
<b>B1</b>	<b>5 TO 20 YEARS</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>10 TO 40 YEARS</b>		<b>65%</b>	
<b>B2</b>	<b>0 TO 20 YEARS</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>5 TO 40 YEARS</b>		<b>65%</b>	
<b>B3</b>	<b>0 TO 20 YEARS</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>5 TO 40 YEARS</b>		<b>65%</b>	
<b>B4</b>	<b>0 TO 10 YEARS</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>5 TO 20 YEARS</b>		<b>65%</b>	
<b>B5</b>	<b>0 TO 5 YEARS</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3 TO 10 YEARS</b>		<b>65%</b>	
<b>C1</b>	<b>0 TO 10 YEARS</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>5 TO 20 YEARS</b>		<b>40%</b>	
<b>C2</b>	<b>0 TO 7 YEARS</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>3 TO 15 YEARS</b>		<b>40%</b>	
<b>D1</b>	<b>0 TO 5 YEARS</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3 TO 10 YEARS</b>		<b>20%</b>	
<b>D2</b>	<b>0 TO 2 YEARS</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2 TO 5 YEARS</b>		<b>20%</b>	
<b>D3</b>	<b>0 TO 2 YEARS</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2 TO 5 YEARS</b>		<b>20%</b>	

Category Y includes First Degree Murder. Category A1 includes Second Degree Murder. Category A2 includes First Degree Manslaughter or Human Trafficking. Category A3 includes Child Exploitation, First Degree Arson, and Assault and Battery with a Dangerous Weapon. Category B1 includes Consent to Child Pornography, and DUI with Bodily Injury. Category B2 includes Sodomy, and Second Degree Rape. Category B3 includes Aggravated DUI, and False Affidavits. Category B4 includes Domestic Assault and Battery with a Dangerous Weapon and Domestic Violence by Strangulation. Category B5 includes Second Degree Manslaughter. Category C1 includes Jury Tampering. Category C2 includes Fourth Degree Arson. Category D1 includes Home Repair Fraud. Category D2 includes Attempt to Escape. Category D3 includes Bribery and Grand Larceny.

## Appendix B: Members

Mike Hunter, Oklahoma Attorney General  
Steve Kunzweiler, District Attorney, District 14  
Greg Mashburn, District Attorney, District 21  
Chuck Jordan, Chief, Tulsa Police Department  
Donald Cluck, Chief, Tuttle Police Department  
Vic Regalado, Tulsa County Sheriff  
Clay Sander, Dewey County Sheriff  
Greg Williams, Deputy Director, Department of Corrections<sup>13</sup>  
Robert Ravitz, Chief Public Defender, Oklahoma County  
Craig Sutter, Executive Director, Oklahoma Indigent Defense System  
Terri White, Commissioner, Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services  
Ricky Adams, Director, Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation  
Bob Cook, Interim Director, Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs  
Jari Askins, Administrative Director of the Courts  
Steve Bickley, Executive Director, Pardon and Parole Board  
Candida A. Manion, Executive Director, Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault  
Fred Morgan, President, Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce  
Roy Williams, President, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce  
Alina Sorrell, Legal Department, Office of Governor J. Kevin Stitt  
The Honorable Wayne Shaw, Oklahoma Senate, District 3  
The Honorable Harold Wright, Oklahoma House of Representatives, District 57  
Kenneth Watson, Oklahoma County District Judge, Retired

---

<sup>13</sup>See n.1.

### **Appendix C: Meeting Dates**

The Council met on the following dates and times. Meetings were held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act and published on the Oklahoma Secretary of State's website.

- 1) Thursday, February 14, 2019, at 10:00 am at Oklahoma State Capitol Room 419C
- 2) Thursday, April 11, 2019, at 10:00am at Oklahoma State Capitol Room 419C
- 3) Tuesday, June 25, 2019, at 9:30 am at Oklahoma Office of Attorney General
- 4) Tuesday, August 20, 2019, at 1:00pm at Oklahoma Office of Attorney General
- 5) Monday, September 16, 2019, at 9:00 am at Oklahoma State Medical Examiner's Office
- 6) Thursday, October 10, 2019, at 10:00 am at Oklahoma State Medical Examiner's Office
- 7) Tuesday, November 12, 2019, at 10:00 am at Oklahoma State Medical Examiner's Office
- 8) Thursday, December 12, 2019, at 10:00 am at Oklahoma State Medical Examiner's Office

**Appendix D: Other States Criminal Justice Reform Investments  
(Provided by Nisha Wilson)**

<b>Diversion Points</b>	<b>Description and Examples of Current Investments</b>	<b>Current Investments</b>	<b>Additional Needs (Oklahoma)</b>	<b>Total (Oklahoma)</b>	<b>Other States Reform Investment Examples</b> <i>*Examples were in addition to their existing treatment investments before criminal justice reform</i>
<b>Prevention Pre-booking</b>	<p>Oklahoma has trained 975 police officers and sheriff deputies in Crisis Intervention Training. These officers are trained in identifying mental illness, the de-escalation of crisis, and how to access mental health professionals.</p> <p>Oklahoma currently has limited mental health emergency responders to help law enforcement when they encounter situations where individuals have mental illness. These responders assist officers with accessing treatment to divert arrests when appropriate.</p> <p>Oklahoma has limited crisis center capacity throughout the state. The four centers that currently exist offer locally based services that can prevent longer inpatient stays and increase system efficiency. Reduces law enforcement transport, increases local service connection, and decreases criminal justice interaction.</p> <p>Oklahoma has a waiting list of over 600 people in need of residential substance abuse treatment, including methamphetamine, which serve as alternatives to incarceration.</p> <p>Oklahoma has Systems of Care Programs to intervene with youth and families with mental health and substance abuse issues, who are at high risk of entering the criminal justice system, located in all 77 counties.</p>	<p>\$90,000</p> <p>\$1,750,000</p> <p>\$14,000,000</p> <p>\$15,246,865</p> <p>\$10,900,000</p>	<p><b>\$500,000</b></p> <p><b>\$4,000,000</b></p> <p><b>\$7,500,000</b></p> <p><b>\$12,000,000</b></p> <p><b>\$4,100,000</b></p>	<p>\$590,000</p> <p>\$5,750,000</p> <p>\$21,500,000</p> <p>\$27,246,865</p> <p>\$15,000,000</p>	<p><b>Arkansas-</b> Additional \$6.4 million for operation of crisis stabilization units and crisis intervention training for law enforcement</p> <p><b>Hawaii-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$10.6 million to expand the availability of community based treatment providers</p> <p><b>Idaho-</b> Additional \$2.4 million to expand community-based substance abuse treatment</p> <p><b>Kansas-</b> Additional \$8 million to expand community-based behavioral health treatment</p> <p><b>Nebraska-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$15.3 million to expand the availability of community based treatment providers</p> <p><b>North Dakota-</b> Additional \$7.5 million to expand community-based behavioral health treatment</p> <p><b>Texas-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$241 million funded substance abuse residential treatment beds</p> <p><b>Vermont-</b> Portion of the overall \$6.3 million expanded substance abuse treatment in the community</p>
<b>Initial Detention/At Booking</b>	<p>Oklahoma currently has limited resources to identify persons being brought to or being held in jails that could be diverted into alternative treatment services. Criminogenic risk, mental health, and substance abuse screenings for each county with treatment and medication programs to divert offenders.</p>	<p>\$5,000,000</p>	<p><b>\$250,000</b></p>	<p>\$5,250,000</p>	<p><b>Hawaii-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$10.6 million to expand the availability of risk and needs assessments</p>

Diversion Points	Description and Examples of Current Investments	Current Investments	Additional Needs (Oklahoma)	Total (Oklahoma)	Other States Reform Investment Examples <i>*Examples were in addition to their existing treatment investments before criminal justice reform</i>
Post- Booking/ Initial Hearing	Oklahoma County has a day reporting program where individuals with mental illness report for daily treatment while waiting for a disposition of their case as an alternative to jail incarceration.	\$80,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,080,000	<b>Alabama-</b> Additional \$28 million for community based services for probation/parole population
	Oklahoma has limited treatment for individuals on probation/parole who are high risk for incarceration due to technical violations related to mental illness and/or methamphetamine and other substance abuse dependence.	\$200,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,200,000	<b>Indiana-</b> Additional \$30 million for mental health and substance abuse treatment for individuals with felony convictions and additional \$25 million for evidence-based and technology-based programs for moderate to high risk offenders on community supervision  <b>Texas-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$241 million funded mental health and substance abuse treatment for individuals on parole and probation  <b>West Virginia-</b> Additional \$9 million to expand substance abuse treatment for people under supervision
At Disposition or Sentencing	Oklahoma is a model state for drug courts based on outcomes.	\$19,739,830 + Med Costs	\$5,000,000	\$24,739,830	<b>Georgia-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$57 million funded expansion of drug and mental health courts
	Oklahoma has funding for only 20 mental health courts to divert eligible, non-violent offenders from incarceration.	\$3,178,000 + Med Costs	\$8,240,000	\$11,418,000	<b>Texas-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$241 million funded expansion of drug courts
	Oklahoma has only eight juvenile drug courts to divert eligible youth from the criminal justice system. Juvenile and family drug courts provide rehabilitative support to families involved in the criminal justice or child welfare systems.	\$426,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,426,000	
	Oklahoma has limited resources for youth in the OJA system that have mental health and substance abuse issues. Provide substance abuse and mental health treatment for youth in the OJA system to prevent future involvement.	\$146,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,146,000	

Diversion Points	Description and Examples of Current Investments	Current Investments	Additional Needs (Oklahoma)	Total (Oklahoma)	Other States Reform Investment Examples <i>*Examples were in addition to their existing treatment investments before criminal justice reform</i>
<b>While Incarcerated</b>	Oklahoma has two co-occurring therapists and limited substance abuse treatment within the Department of Corrections system; however, it is insufficient to fund the staggering needs.				<p><b>Georgia-</b> Portion of the additional overall \$57 million funded substance abuse treatment in prison</p> <p><b>Texas-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$241 million funded mental health and substance abuse treatment in prisons and jails</p> <p><b>Vermont-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$6.3 million funded substance abuse treatment in prisons</p>
<b>Reintegration</b>	<p>Oklahoma has just four specialists located in the prison setting to assist with the development of discharge plans for those with mental health needs.</p> <p>Oklahoma has only four intensive care teams to assist those with mental health needs who are leaving prisons and reentering the community. These teams assist with linkage to housing, employment, treatment, and medications to keep individuals from recidivating.</p> <p>Oklahoma does not have a Program of Assertive Community Treatment (PACT) which specializes in the forensic population.</p> <p>Oklahoma has few resources to assist with employment and housing for those reintegrating from and at high risk for involvement with the criminal justice system.</p> <p>Oklahoma has limited services for individuals who began substance abuse treatment while incarcerated, but need these services to continue upon release, such as the Tulsa’s Women in Recovery Program. Services for individuals at risk of re-entering without continued substance abuse treatment.</p>	<p>\$160,000</p> <p>\$780,000</p> <p>\$0</p> <p>\$1,021,592</p> <p>\$629,000</p>	<p><b>\$2,000,000</b></p> <p><b>\$6,120,000</b></p> <p><b>\$2,000,000</b></p> <p><b>\$6,000,000</b></p> <p><b>\$17,500,000</b></p>	<p>\$2,160,000</p> <p>\$6,900,000</p> <p>\$2,000,000</p> <p>\$7,021,592</p> <p>\$18,129,000</p>	<p><b>Connecticut-</b> Additional \$13 million for re-entry programs to promote successful transition from incarceration to the community</p> <p><b>Georgia-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$57 million funded prison re-entry support</p> <p><b>Hawaii-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$10.6 million to expand the availability of re-entry support</p> <p><b>Georgia-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$57 million funded vocational and on-the-job training</p> <p><b>Montana-</b> Portion of the overall \$3 million initial investment funded supportive housing programs</p> <p><b>Texas-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$241 million funded halfway houses and re-entry services</p> <p><b>Vermont-</b> Portion of the overall additional \$6.3 million funded transitional housing support</p>
	Note: Figures detailed above are estimates. <b>TOTAL</b>	\$73,347,287	<b>\$90,210,000</b>	\$163,557,287	

Appendix E: Prison Policy Initiative Population Graph

# How many people are in Oklahoma's criminal justice system?

78,000 Oklahoma residents are behind bars or under criminal justice supervision.

