

Executive Summary

During the 2019 legislative session, the legislature passed, and the Governor signed [Senate Bill 577](#) (SB 577). Section 9 of this bill requires the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) to review all data pertaining to bias crimes and non-criminal bias incidents and to report the results annually on July 1. This is the sixth annual report and covers data on bias crimes and non-criminal bias incidents that occurred in Oregon during calendar years 2020 through 2024. Anyone interested in viewing the report in its entirety may do so by requesting a copy from the CJC at 503-378-4830 or by accessing this link: <https://www.oregon.gov/cjc/CJC%20Document%20Library/SB577ReportJuly2025.pdf>. General inquiries regarding this report should be directed to the CJC at 503-378-4830. Specific questions regarding the contents of this report can be directed to Ryan Keck, CJC's Interim Executive Director, at 503-871-1029 or Ryan.Keck@cjc.oregon.gov.

The full report displays summary data and empirical analysis of bias crimes and non-criminal bias incidents (referred to collectively as “bias-motivated” or “BM” reports/acts/experiences) from the [Bias Response Hotline](#) (referred to as the “BRH” or “Hotline”) established by the Oregon Department of Justice (ODOJ) dedicated to assisting victims, witnesses, and other reporters of bias crimes and non-criminal bias incidents. Results for the Hotline data reference initial bias-motivated reports to avoid overcounting of multiple reports.¹ In addition, the report displays data on bias-related criminal offenses taken from [Oregon's National Incident Based Reporting System \(NIBRS\)](#) housed within the Oregon State Police (OSP), and [merged criminal justice \(CJ\) data](#), which combines arrest data from the national Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS), court data for bias crimes taken from Oregon's Odyssey data system, and conviction and sentencing data for bias crimes from Oregon's Department of Corrections (DOC), with the district attorneys' data (DA Data) on the prosecution of bias crime referrals and cases to create one row of case-level information for each defendant referred or charged with a bias crime.

Key Findings

- In the 5-year period 2020 through 2024, BRH advocates were targeted in 390 *bias incidents*. Indeed, there was a 165% increase in bias incidents targeting the Hotline's advocates in 2024 compared to the previous year. It is unknown to what extent other crime victim advocates are also having similar experiences.
- After consecutive yearly increases from 2020 through 2023, bias-motivated reports to the Hotline decreased by 7% (2,932 vs 2,726) in 2024, due to a 24% reduction in *bias crime* reporting (see Table A1 in [Appendix A](#)). *Note*, the 2024 data do not capture advocates' additional workload due to processing 2,231 spam (i.e., incoherent, gibberish emails) and other non-bias related/mental health crisis/prank/harassing calls (14 hours per week) and responding to media and public data requests (8 hours per week).
- The 2024 decline in bias-motivated reports was not consistent across demographic groups. Bias-motivated reports with Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) victims (excluding Asian individuals), and gender non-conforming victims reduced by 16% and 34% respectively. In contrast, bias-motivated reports with female, white individuals, Asian individuals, and victims aged 60 or older increased by 18%, 105%, 46% and 14%, respectively due to an increased willingness by these individuals to report to the Hotline (see [Table 1](#)).
- Motivation for bias-motivated acts differed by victim demographics (see [Table 2](#) and A15 in [Appendix A](#)):
 - 96% (n = 444) of Black/African American, 87% (n = 179) of Asian, 76% (n = 233) of Hispanic, and 85% of (n = 29) of AI/AN victims were targeted due to anti-race bias, and few are targeted

¹ The Hotline data discussed in this report focuses on initial bias-motivated reports, i.e., bias incidents and bias crimes. *Repeat Report, Bias/Hate Criteria Not Met, Bias Against Non-Protected Class, and Unable to Determine* reports are discussed in Figures 1-3, and Tables A1-A8 in [Appendix A](#) and defined in [Determining Bias](#).

due to misidentification of their race or target substitution (98%, 79%, 99% and 90%, respectively, were targeted due to their self-identified race). White victims were primarily targeted because of sexual orientation (72%) or gender identity bias (64%), and few were targeted due to anti-white bias (n = 12; 5% of white victims).

- Around half of male and female victims were targeted due to anti-race; a third of female victims were also targeted due to sexual orientation bias; individuals with undisclosed gender were targeted due to anti-national origin (44%) and -race bias (39%); and gender non-conforming individuals were targeted due to anti-gender identity (89%) and -sexual orientation bias (55%).
- Law enforcement agencies (LEAs) forwarded 58% fewer bias-motivated reports to the BRH in 2024 (n = 132), compared to 2023 (n = 315), despite NIBRS reporting an identical number of bias crime victims for both years (n = 370; see [Figure 9](#) and [Table 5](#)). LEAs are only required to refer victims of bias incidents to the Hotline and are not required to forward BM reports to the Hotline directly.
- Of the 966 cases with a bias crime referral or filed charge from 2020 through 2024, 649 (67%) cases were filed with a Bias I/II charge, 108 (11%) were filed with non-bias charges only, 195 (26%) were declined/no filed and 14 (1%) are pending (see Table A55 in [Appendix A](#)).
 - Out of the 757 filed cases, 62% returned a conviction (i.e., pled guilty, convicted by jury or bench trial, or plea deal) on at least one bias (34%) or non-bias (28%) charge, and 20% each are open or resulted in no conviction (i.e., was disposed with a civil compromise, dismissal/no complaint, or acquittal/not guilty disposition). The conviction rate for cases filed in 2023 (61%) and 2024 (40%) are expected to increase in the upcoming months as open cases (26 and 90, respectively) are disposed (see [Table 18](#) and Figure A1 in [Appendix A](#)).
 - Of the 469 defendants with a bias or non-bias conviction, a combined 17% were sentenced to prison alone (3%) or along with post-prison supervision (14%), 7% were sentenced to jail alone, while almost a third received jail with probation (32%) or probation only (31%; see [Table 19](#)).

CJC's Recommendations

1. Additional research is needed to determine whether other (non-ODOJ) crime victim advocates and service providers are also experiencing higher levels of harassment; data is needed before occupation can be recommended as an additional protected class.
2. Given the increases in perpetrator [reporter status](#) (i.e., spam, harassing, or other contacts that target or divert BRH staff from their victim support duties), the ODOJ should continue to revise their existing staff support, safety and wellness policies as needed, and to utilize their automated spam folders.
3. The ODOJ should consider creating an additional staff position to assist the Hate Crimes Response Coordinator with media and other [public records requests \(PRRs\)](#) replies; screen, review and document perpetrator [reporter status](#) emails; and provide support for additional administrative tasks.
4. The Oregon Legislature should consider adding a public data exemption for the disclosures from victims of bias – equivalent to those afforded to domestic violence, human trafficking and sexual assault survivors' disclosures under [ORS 147.115\(1\)\(b\)](#). Any revisions should be included in the ODOJ media outreach campaigns and materials to assure victims that their privacy will be protected, thereby improving reporting rates.
5. Research is required to determine why bias-motivated reporting is declining (e.g., rapid federal law changes; fear of victimization disclosures being shared/released; bias has become too every day to bother reporting; confusion over the ODOJ vs U.S. DOJ's scope, responsibilities, and data vulnerability). The legislature should consider funding the ODOJ to expand its media outreach to educate the public about its services compared to the U.S. DOJ's and data request policies.
6. LEAs are not required to forward bias-motivated reports to the BRH. As LEAs create and refine their internal policies to meet SB 577 requirements, investigate increasing numbers of bias-motivated reports and complete their internal administrative duties, forwarding reports to the BRH may be an additional administrative step beyond LEAs current resource capacity. Research is required to verify that victim referrals to the BRH are ongoing, despite the decline in the forwarding of BM reports.