

RE: Questions re: emails



BORT Alison * PSRB <Alison.BORT@oregon.gov>

Fri 11/9, 11:06 AM

Jayme Fraser



Reply all

Inbox

You replied on 11/9/2018 11:39 AM.

Hi Jayme,

Thank you for taking the time to discuss your follow-up questions with me yesterday afternoon. After speaking with you subsequently, you explained that your position is to seek clarity and solely to fact check; however, respectfully, they continue to strike me as loaded and conclusive that our agency has been intentionally dishonest. In the spirit of collaboration, transparency and our commitment to providing the truth, I will provide a single response to your questions as a whole.

You explained that your questions stem from our records release of communications about the post-recidivism study started by my predecessor. As I have shared, since I started in June 2018, this study has been placed on hold until a time when the resources are available to continue with it. When we released the records you requested about the study, I was hoping that it would shed light on the work the agency has done to address the questions that you were asking, demonstrate that our agency shares the concerns others have with post-jurisdiction, and explain (consistent with the Board's responses) that partnerships with statisticians and credentialed researchers are required for our agency to do this type of rigorous research. Unfortunately, your follow-up questions suggest that our agency has been untruthful or dishonest. This interpretation is truly disappointing, especially given the hours of time, staff and financial resources our agency has dedicated so that you can conduct your investigation and inform the public on how our agency does its work.

While standing by the previous responses our agency submitted to you, I would encourage you to re-read them, as there is not anything that would suggest we are being inconsistent, dishonest or untruthful about our role or about the information we have provided. As written, I believe those responses will give your readers a very good understanding of the Board's duties and limitations.

I also wanted to respond to the several questions you ask about the preliminary data that was gathered in the infancy of our project. This data has not been statistically analyzed, and it would not only be irresponsible (and for me as a licensed psychologist, unethical), but potentially harmful for the agency (or any entity) to share it with the public at its current stage. Please review our previous response #5 which gives examples of the types of analyses one might consider and evaluate with regards to these types of statistics.

Regarding an update on your request for exhibits. We have summarized all of your requests into independent files. This required approximately 3 hours of agency staff time and resources, and we are waiving those fees. The next step is that I need to review the files in the context of the public statements you provided to determine whether they can be released and if so, if they need to be redacted. Previously, we have sent this to our legal counsel to complete. Thus far, our agency has spent \$16,125 solely in legal fees completing requests for you. Due to timeframe in which you hope to receive these records as well as the cost our agency has already spent, we will be completing this part of the records request within the agency. We will continue to waive the fees associated with your requests up to this point. Any additional requests for records will require reconsideration of your fee waiver.

I believe that we will be able to have our response for Rieschel completed by the end of today.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Thank you,
Alison