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To the Idaho Legislature and the Citizens of Idaho

Re: The Prosecution of Child Sexual Abuse

Sadly, 1997 saw an increase in the number of child sexual abuse cases in Idaho. The increase in the number of these cases should serve as a clarion call to all of us -- legislators, prosecutors, teachers, law enforcement officers and parents -- to do more to stop this senseless and devastating crime.

While abductions and abuse by strangers grabbed the headlines, these cases represent only a small proportion (7 percent of adult prosecutions and 1 percent of juvenile prosecutions) of the total number of cases. Most cases of child sexual abuse are committed by individuals known to the child and who the child has a reason to trust. Shockingly, some of those abusing our children will actually cultivate relationships with the child or the child’s parents in order to perpetrate the crime.

What is called for to prevent the crime of child sexual abuse is vigilance. Parents need to know who their children are spending time with so that childhood will remain what it should be, a time of wonder and innocence.

I hope that the information contained in this report will be of assistance to legislators in formulating policy to reduce the incidence of this devastating crime. Likewise, it is my hope that law enforcement prosecutors and judges, as well as those involved in the treatment of sexual offenders, will find the information in this report useful in working to punish, deter and treat those guilty of child sexual abuse.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Batt
Governor
To the Idaho Legislature and the Citizens of Idaho

Re: The Prosecution of Child Sexual Abuse

After four years of decline in the number of cases of child sexual abuse, 1997 saw an increase in the number of prosecutions. The total number of cases for 1997 stands at 332, an increase of 61 prosecutions from the 271 brought in 1996. While the increase in the number of cases is indeed disturbing, the 1997 figure is still well below the record number of 425 cases brought in 1993.

Most disturbing about the latest statistics is that in 38 percent of all cases of child sexual abuse, juveniles are not only the victims but also the perpetrators. In fact, much of the increase in this year’s numbers is caused by a significant increase in crimes committed by juveniles. The number of cases of child sexual abuse in which the adult was the perpetrator increased by 10 from 1996 to 1997, while the number of juvenile offender cases increased by 51. Approximately 50 percent of the victims of these juvenile sexual offenders are 7 years of age or less.

This year I am proposing major legislation to provide law enforcement and parents with tools which I believe will help to contain the problem of child sexual abuse. My legislation, which will be called the Child Protection Act of 1998, will contain three component parts. The first part is an improved sexual offender registry with broader public access to the information contained on the registry. The second part of the legislative package will create a juvenile sexual offender registry to address the increasing problem of juvenile sexual offenders. Finally, I will propose a law allowing for the civil commitment of the habitual predatory sexual offender. The legislation will also provide for the mandatory evaluation of adult sexual offenders upon conviction. This evaluation will assist judges in determining an appropriate sentence for those convicted.

With Best Regards,

Alan G. Lance
Attorney General
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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

>THREE HUNDRED THIRTY-TWO (332) CASES WERE FILED (205 ADULT CASES, 127 JUVENILE CASES) IN DISTRICT AND JUVENILE COURTS IN FY97. THIS REPRESENTS AN INCREASE OF 61 CASES FROM THE FY96 REPORT.

>NINETEEN (9.7%) OF THE 205 ADULT CASES HAD PRIOR CONVICTIONS FOR CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE.

>VICTIM GENDER WAS PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE FOR BOTH ADULT AND JUVENILE PERPETRATORS.

>SIXTY PERCENT OF THE VICTIMS OF ADULT DEFENDANTS WERE BETWEEN TWELVE AND SEVENTEEN YEARS OLD.

>SEVENTY-TWO PERCENT OF VICTIMS OF JUVENILE SEX OFFENDERS WERE UNDER ELEVEN YEARS OF AGE.

>FOURTY-SIX PERCENT OF THE ADULT ABUSERS WERE ACQUAINTANCES OF THEIR VICTIMS, 12% NATURAL PARENTS, 9% OTHER RELATIVES, 5% WERE STEP-PARENTS, AND 7% WERE STRANGERS.

>THIRTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF THE JUVENILE ABUSERS WERE ACQUAINTANCES OF THEIR VICTIMS OR THEIR PARENTS AND 36% WERE RELATIVES (NON-PARENTS).

>WHERE ADULT DISPOSITION WAS KNOWN, THE IMMEDIATE SENTENCE WAS 38% PROBATION; 15% PRISON; 38% RETAINED JURISDICTION. THIS REPRESENTS A DECREASE IN PROBATION SENTENCES AND AN INCREASE IN PRISON SENTENCES.
Total Charges, Prosecutions and Petitions for 1992 to 1997 in Idaho

FY97 Child Sexual Abuse Study
RESEARCH TEAM

The research team consisted of Professor Ted Hopfenbeck, Coordinator of Data Collection; Dr. Stephen Patrick, Coordinator of Data Analysis and Co-Principal Investigator; and Robert L. Marsh, Ph.D., Project Director and Co-Principal Investigator. Deborah Stone served as Research Associate and Joshua Marsh as Research Assistant. Rebecca Howell provided secretarial support.
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INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY
REPORT TO THE IDAHO LEGISLATURE

THE PROSECUTION OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE IN IDAHO

JULY 1, 1996 - JUNE 30, 1997

INTRODUCTION

House Bill 362, passed in 1989 (adding section 67-1405 to the Idaho Code), expanded the Attorney General's duties to require preparation of an annual report to be submitted to the legislature reporting the incidence of felony child sex abuse charges filed in adult and juvenile courts in the state. A research team from the Department of Criminal Justice at Boise State University worked in conjunction with the Offices of the Governor and the Attorney General to collect data and prepare the report to comply with this legislation. Specifically, data was collected on child sex abuse cases filed from district and juvenile court files throughout the state for the period of July 1, 1996 to June 30, 1997. The data were analyzed by the research team and submitted to the Attorney General's and Governor's offices for review. The completed report was submitted to the legislative leadership by Governor Phillip E. Batt and Attorney General Alan G. Lance.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

A number of annual reports and one special report have preceded this study. The approaches (methodology) of the data collection in the earlier reports have varied widely but the past six reports have utilized a consistent data collection procedure. The following synopsis provides an overview of previous reports and the data collection procedures.
FIRST REPORT: January 1, 1988-December 31, 1989

The first report covered a two-year period from January 1, 1988 - December 31, 1989, and analyzed data collected by site visitation to all 44 counties under the direction of the Governor's Office. This report included sexual abuse information available from the agencies that dealt with various aspects of child sexual abuse. The Department of Law Enforcement provided information on investigation of known cases and the Department of Corrections focused on disposition of offenders under its jurisdiction. The Department of Health and Welfare reported the impact of child sex abuse on families and children.

No single department of state government was able to provide a complete accounting for each child abuse case as it was processed through the system. One of the recommendations of the first report was to develop a statewide system to record incidence, track case filings, and disposition of child sex abuse cases.

SECOND REPORT: July 1, 1989-June 30, 1990

This report covered child sexual abuse crimes from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990, utilizing data from state agencies. This time, however, an attempt was made to collect data directly from district court records and county prosecuting attorneys.

This report was based on a review on-site of courthouse case files of the state's six largest counties and nearby smaller communities. The survey, together with telephone and mail contact with the remaining counties, provided access to a data base sizeable enough to produce a document for the legislative report.

As in the first report, the 1990 study concentrated on child sexual abuse from the perspective of the criminal justice system. It assessed cases from prosecution to sentencing and disposition. The report provided information on plea bargaining arrangements,
suspended sentences, offender evaluation and punishment alternatives.

**SPECIAL REPORT: Sex Crimes Against Children**

In July, 1991, the Department of Health and Welfare issued a special report entitled *Sex Crimes Against Children*. This report analyzed complex issues of child sexual abuse from the vantage point of the largest state agency, the Department of Health and Welfare. The report examined nearly 1,900 reported cases of sex abuse from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990. It traced cases from initial report to investigation by caseworkers, referral to law enforcement, and disposition by the prosecutor and the courts.

Each county in the state was visited and data were collected on sex crimes committed against children by reviewing district court records of individual counties. The report analyzed the number and types of crimes prosecuted or filed for the year.

**THIRD REPORT: July 1, 1990-June 30, 1991**

This report provided information on adult and juvenile offenders. The incidence of juvenile sex abuse crimes had not been reported as a separate category in previous reports. A complete section was devoted to juvenile sex crimes for the first time. Offender age data, the relationship of the offenders to victims, demographic data on victims, and system processing information were collected on-site in each county for adults and juveniles. The data collected from court clerk records were verified with prosecuting attorneys in each jurisdiction.

**FOURTH REPORT: July 1, 1991-June 30, 1992**

This report provided information on adult and juvenile offenders as provided by the Clerk of the Court in each county and verified with the county prosecutor. The research staff reviewed case files on-site to determine offender age, the relationship of the offenders to
victims, criminal history, demographic data on victims, and case processing information. Presentence and sex offender evaluations as well were completed on the offenders. Rates of case filings were standardized for the first time based on county population. Data on Presentence and Sex Offender Evaluation was collected to determine if they were used in sentencing decisions.

FIFTH REPORT: July 1, 1992 - June 30, 1993

Court records were reviewed for juveniles and adults throughout the state in order to complete this report. Data were collected on the same variables as the previous report to insure consistency. Rates were reported in a standardized format based on county population.

SIXTH REPORT: July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1994

Court records were reviewed throughout the state for adults and juveniles accused of child sex abuse. Data were collected consistent with the reports from the previous two years. In addition to reporting standardized rates comparisons were made of reported incidence in the most and least populated counties.

SEVENTH REPORT: July 1, 1994 - June 30, 1995

Court records were reviewed throughout the state for adults and juvenile cases filed. Data were collected on variables consistent with the previous three years.

EIGHTH REPORT: July 1, 1995 - June 30, 1996

The data collection procedures and methodology were consistent with the previous four reports. Data were collected on site for all counties reporting cases during FY96.
METHODOLOGY/DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

This is the ninth report submitted to the Legislature. This report includes data on adult and child sex abuse cases filed in FY97 (July 1, 1996 to June 30, 1997). Actual review of court records for this report was initiated in July, 1997, and continued through early December. All counties were contacted by mail by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court explaining the yearly data collection on cases filed in District Court for adults and Magistrate’s Court for juveniles for the annual report that is submitted to the legislature. Follow-up phone calls were made by the Research Team from the Department of Criminal Justice at Boise State University before data collection began. Facsimiles were sent to all county prosecutors requesting the case numbers of all cases filed during the study period. The information was collected primarily by on-site visits to all counties reporting child sex abuse cases (adult and juvenile). Members of the research staff consulted by telephone with any county requesting assistance in identifying child sex abuse cases. A total of 35 counties that reported cases were visited. Six counties reported no cases filed, and three counties with small numbers of cases were collected by telephone interview or facsimile. The research team reviewed files identified and supplied by the Court Clerk or the Prosecutor. County Clerks were asked to have the files on all felony and juvenile cases filed between July 1, 1996, and June 30, 1997, available for review. Only cases formally filed (district court for adults and petitions filed in magistrate’s court for juveniles) in FY97 were reviewed by the research team.

§§ 18-6605 and 18-6606), Forcible Sexual Penetration with a Foreign Object (I.C. § 18-6608), and Sex Offender Registration (I.C. §§ 18-8304 and 18-8311).

Counties tracked the cases utilizing different systems throughout the state. Many counties utilized the ISTARS system available through the Administrative Offices of the Idaho Supreme Court. (The system has not been standardized across all counties because of funding issues.) Some counties enter ISTARS data at the outset while others entered the case into the system at the final disposition. The Ada County Prosecutor's Office maintained a separate computerized system that tracked each case filed in both the adult and juvenile courts. Other counties maintained a separate manual system of the pertinent cases. On site data collection was done directly from the files provided to the researchers. The research team relied on the individual system that each county utilized to track cases that were filed. After data collection, confirmation letters/facsimiles were sent to respective county prosecutors providing a list of identified cases from their county and requesting any corrections. Every possible attempt was made to insure that all cases were included in this study. Since the state has not designed a standard statewide tracking system, a few cases may have been unreported.

The research team also requested updated dispositional information on those cases which were pending. Counties that provided dispositional information by facsimile through October 15, 1997 are included in this analysis. Cases that had not reached the dispositional stage were left in the “pending” category. Only cases filed in the district court for adults and petitions filed in magistrate court for juveniles and identified by the clerks or county prosecutors of that county were included in this report. Cases handled informally when charges were not filed were not included.

The absence of a uniform method of tracking cases and retrieving the data remains a serious issue beyond the scope of the present project. Recommendations have been made by the researchers to alleviate problems of data collection by developing a standardized tracking system.
ADULT CASES
ANALYSIS OF ADULT CASES FILED-CHARTS 1A - 18A
(FY97: July 1, 1996 - June 30, 1997)

The information from the adult cases is included in Charts 1A-18A and immediately follows the discussion of adult defendants. A total of 205 adult cases were filed in District court during the twelve-month period of July 1, 1996 - June 30, 1997.

Adult Defendants: Total Cases and Charges Filed-Chart 1A

A total of 335 charges were filed in the 205 cases in FY97 for child sex offense felonies in Idaho. This represents an increase of 10 cases or 5% from the FY96 report, an increase of 4 felony cases from FY95, but it is still below the 233 cases filed in FY94 and the 306 cases filed in FY93. There was an average of 1.63 charges files in each case.

Adult Defendants: Victim Gender-Chart 2A

There was a total of 249 victims in this survey. Victim gender was predominantly female representing 82% (N=205) of the victims. Reported female victimization was slightly less in this study period than victim gender reported in three of the past four surveys. Male victims represented 12% (N=29) of all victims in this survey. The gender distribution was approximately the same as the FY92, FY93 and the FY94 studies. The information on victim gender was not available to the research team in 15 (6%) cases. Some defendants had no Presentence Report completed and it was impossible to determine victim gender from court files.

Adult Defendants: Victim Age-Chart 3A

Two per cent (N=6) of the victims were under three years of age. Children from four to seven years of age represented 12% (N=30) of the victims. Eighteen percent (N=44) were
from eight to eleven years old. A total of 51% (N=126) of the victims were between the ages of twelve and fifteen. Nine percent of the victims (N=22) were between the ages of sixteen and seventeen and age was unknown for 21 (8%) of the victims. The percentage of victims under the age of three remained the same as in previous reports but victims from four to seven increased by 1.5%. Victims from eight to eleven years decreased by 4% but twelve to fifteen year old victims increased by the same amount. There was a 5% decrease in the sixteen-seventeen year olds.

**Adult Defendants: Number of Victims Per Case-Chart 4A**

Data presented in this chart represents the number of reported victims per case filed. Defendants in 84% (N=173) of the cases were charged with a crime against only one victim. There were two victims reported in 13% (N=25) of the cases. In seven cases (3%) there were three or more victims. The number of single victims decreased and those charged for sex crimes against two or more victims increased from the FY96 report.

**Adult Defendants: Victim Relationship-Chart 5A**

Chart 5 indicates the relationship between the 249 victims and the 198 adult defendants (representing 205 cases). The data indicate that 12% (N=31) of the children were victimized by their actual parents and 5% (N=12) of the victims were abused by stepparents. (This is the sixth consecutive report where reported prosecutions have been significantly higher for natural parents than for step parents.) Other family members were charged with child sexual abuse for 9% (N=22) of the victims. Acquaintances were identified as the abusers in 46% (N=115) of the victims. Fourteen strangers (7%) were accused of child sexual abuse. The relationship was unknown for 22% (N=55).

Of the 249 victims, the relationship between the victim and the accused was known for 194 (55 were unknown) victims. Twenty-six percent (N=65) of the victims
were victimized by parents, relatives or step-parents. Forty-six percent (N=115) were victimized by acquaintances. A total of 72% (N=180) of the victims fit these two categories. Seven percent (N=14) were strangers. Most adults charged with child sexual abuse offenses knew their victims. The parents and children generally had reason to know and/or trust the defendant because the defendant was known by the child or the child’s parents. This parallels the findings in the FY92, FY93, FY94, FY95 and FY96 studies. The findings from this survey have been consistent for the last five years. Children are much more likely to be victims of persons they know (and their parents know). It is assumed that this type of perpetrator has legitimate access to the child.

**Adult Defendants: Presentence/Sex Offender Evaluation-Chart 6A**

Chart 6A shows the number of convicted perpetrators that had a Presentence Report and/or Sex Offender Evaluation completed before sentencing. Both Presentence and Sex Offender Evaluations were prepared in 52 (25%) of the cases. The survey indicated that 42 (20%) of the defendants had a Presentence Report only before sentencing. There were 28 (14%) defendants with neither. The remaining represent those cases Pending, Dismissed/Acquitted, or cases in the Unknown categories. This survey indicates that there was an increase of 5% of cases that had both a Sex Offender Evaluation and a Pre-Sentence completed.

**Adult Defendants: Prior Convictions-Chart 7A**

Chart 7A shows prior convictions of adults charged with a child sex abuse crime during this study period. Forty-nine (25%) of the 195 adults charged during the study period had prior felonies. Nineteen (9.7%) of the 195 adults charged had prior sex abuse charges. Ninety percent of the adult defendants (N=176) had no prior sex abuse convictions against
children. About half of those convicted previously for a child sex offense were convicted of Lewd and Lascivious Conduct.

**Adult Defendants: Type of Charges Filed - Chart 8A**

Chart 8A shows the breakdown of the 335 criminal charges filed against adults. Lewd and Lascivious Conduct (IC 18-1508) charges were most frequently filed representing 154 charges or 46% of the total. Rape (IC 18-6101) charges were filed 23 times (7%) during FY97. The charge of Sexual Abuse (IC 18-1506) resulted in 40 charges or 12% of the total number of charges filed.

These data were collected to determine which charges were most frequently used against child sex abusers. This is the sixth year this information has been collected. A detailed analysis of case files for the last five years indicates exceedingly wide variability in the types of sex abuse behavior and the actual charge filed. The Lewd and Lascivious statute continues to be used to prosecute cases ranging from fondling to actual copulation. Most charging decisions continue to reflect a decision in favor of filing the most serious charge possible, not necessarily the most accurate charge. This creates problems in developing treatment programs and education/prevention programs which require accurate data on criminal history.

**Adult Defendants: Dispositional Information - Chart 9A**

Fifty-four percent (N=111) of the defendants charged plead guilty and were convicted. An additional nine (4%) were convicted by trial. Cases are pending for 23% (N=55). Charges were dismissed against 9% (N=19) of the defendants and none were acquitted. The outcome was unknown for 8% (N=16) of the defendants because of incomplete records. None were amended to a non-sex abuse charge. Generally, the outcomes in the FY97 study
were consistent with previous studies. There was a slight increase (2%) of those who pled guilty.

**Adult Defendants: Sentencing Information-Chart 10A**

Chart 10A shows the sentencing outcomes for the adult defendants in this study. The sentencing decision is known for 109 of the cases. (The additional defendants are awaiting trial or the charges were dismissed.) Probation Only was the disposition in 38% (N=45) of the known cases. A Retained Jurisdiction sentence was given by judges in 38% (N=46) of the cases. (A sentence of Probation or Retained Jurisdiction was given in 76% of all cases with known dispositions.) Only 15% of convicted defendants (N=18) were sent directly to prison without a Retained sentence. These figures represent a decline of 4% of persons given probation and a decline of 2% of those given a Retained Jurisdiction sentence.

**Adult Defendants: Offender/Victim Ethnicity-Chart 11A**

Information was collected on ethnicity of the accused offender and the victim. Victim ethnicity was overwhelmingly Caucasian with 167 (67%) victims. Hispanic victims represented only nine (4%) of the victims. Victim ethnicity could not be determined in 72 (29%) cases. One hundred thirty-four (65%) of the victims were victimized by a member of their own ethnic group. Eighteen (9%) were victimized by a member of a different ethnic group and the ethnicity relationship was unknown for 53 (26%) of the remaining victims. As in past surveys, child sex abuse in Idaho is intra-racial.

Offender ethnicity data showed that 81% (N=166) of the total were Caucasian and 13% (N=27) were Hispanic. One of the accused (.5%) was Black and two (1%) were Asian. The remainder (5%, N=9) were recorded as unknown or other. The data is consistent with the ethnicity noted in previous surveys.
Adult Defendants: Location of Child Sexual Abuse - Chart 12A

One hundred twenty-two (60%) of the alleged offenses occurred in a residence. Fifty-nine (29%) of the locations could not be determined from court or police records. Twelve (6%) were in other locations such as a car and 12 (6%) occurred outside. This was consistent with the findings last year.

Adult Defendants: Educational Level-Chart 13A

Educational data on adult defendants was available for 110 of the 205 cases. Of that 110, 22% (N=45) had not completed high school. Twenty-two percent (N=45) had completed high school and 10% (N=20) had some education beyond high school (college or vocational/technical). Information was not available for 95 of the cases.

Outcomes of Retained Jurisdiction - Chart 14A

This survey marks the second year of the analysis of the Retained Jurisdiction Sentence (Idaho Criminal Code, Section 2601). Although the time frame is short, this research will continue with offenders sentenced under the Retained status in future years.

There were 45 persons that were sentenced under this statute as of October 15, 1997, representing persons charged in FY97. Of that number, 18 (39%) were still completing their period of incarceration and evaluation in the Department of Corrections. It was not known if they would be released on Probation or complete their sentence in prison. Of the 28 that completed the initial incarceration period, 10 (22%) were sent to prison to complete their sentence and 18 (39%) were released on Probation.

Adult Defendants: Offender Occupation-Chart 15A

Defendant occupation data was collected and available for 136 of the adult defendants. Nineteen percent (N=39) were unemployed, 20% (N=40) worked at unskilled
jobs, 21% (N=43) worked in skilled labor occupations, 2% (N=5) were in service fields, 1% (N=2) were professionals, .5% (N=1) was a student, and occupation was unclear for the remaining defendants.

**Analysis of Determine and Indeterminate Sentences - Chart 16A**

Data was collected on the 120 people sentenced and the length of their sentence when the report was completed. These data include persons sent directly to prison, those sent directly to probation, and those on a Retained status. Fifty-eight percent (N=70) received a fixed or determinate sentence of 36 months or less. Forty-five percent received indeterminant sentences of 61 months to life.

**Sentencing for Those Sent to Prison - Chart 17A**

The data in this chart refers to convicted perpetrators sent to prison and not given a Retained Jurisdiction sentence. These data indicate that the majority of defendants (72%) sent to prison had determinant sentences of 36 months or less. Ninety per cent (N=16) had an indeterminant sentence coupled with the determinant sentence of 49 months to 300 months.

**Adult Defendants: Income-Chart 18A**

Income data was available for 134 of the 205 cases. The defendants in the majority of the cases (N=106 or 52%) earned $15,000 or less annually. Thirteen percent (N=28) earned more than $15,000 annually. Income was unknown for 35% (N=71) of the cases.
Adult Defendants: Age Relationship Offenders and Victims-Chart 19A

This chart shows the relationship between age of perpetrators and their victims. It provides a graphic representation that shows a preponderance of perpetrators in their 20's and 30's with teenage victims.
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JUVENILE CASES
ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CASES FILED-CHARTS 1J-12J

There were a total of 127 juvenile cases filed in FY97.

**Juvenile Offenders: Total Petitions and Charges Filed-Chart 1J**

Chart 1J indicates that 127 petitions were filed against juveniles representing 209 charges. This represents a significant increase of 51 cases over the 76 juvenile cases filed in the previous report (FY96), an increase over the 94 cases filed in FY95 and the 123 juvenile cases filed in FY94. In this report period there was an average of 1.65 charges in each petition.

**Juvenile Offenders: Victim Gender-Chart 2J**

There were 163 victims listed in the juvenile petitions. Victim gender was predominantly female representing 64% (N=105) of the total number of known victims. (Females represented 82% of the victims for adult offenders.) Male victims represented 29% (N=47) of the total for juveniles. Female victimizations remained almost the same as last year and male victims increased. Male victims of juvenile perpetrators were over twice as high as male victims of adult perpetrators. The information on victim gender was not available to the research team in 7% (N=11) cases. Some juveniles had no Social History completed and it was impossible to determine victim gender from the petition.

**Juvenile Offenders: Victim Age-Chart 3J**

For the 127 juvenile cases reported (with petitions filed) during the study period, the age of the victims was known for 148 of the 163 victims. Victims under three years of age comprised 8% (N=13) of the total study population. Victims from four to seven years comprised 41% (N=67) of the study population. Children eight to eleven years were victims
in 23% (N=38) of the cases. Another 16% (N=27) were from twelve to fifteen years of age and the remaining 2% (N=3) were sixteen or older. Age was unknown for 9% (N=15) of the victims.

The number of four to seven year old victims decreased from 45% to 41% from FY96 and children from eight to eleven remained the same. Forty-nine percent (N=80) of the victims were seven years old or younger. A majority of 118 victims or 72% were eleven years of age or younger during this study period.

**Juvenile Offenders: Number of Victims Per Case-Chart 4J**

The number of victims was known for all 127 juveniles petitioned. Eighty percent of the juveniles (N=102) had been charged with violations against a single victim. There were two victims in 16% (N=21) of the cases and three or more victims in 3% (N=4) of the cases. This is comparable to last year’s report.

**Juvenile Offenders: Victim Relationship-Chart 5J**

Chart 5J shows the relationship between the 163 victims and the 127 petitioned juveniles. Relatives (non-parents) were charged with offenses for 36% (N=58) of the victims. Acquaintances were identified as the abuser for 38% (N=62) of the victims. Only one victim (less than 1%) was abused by a stranger. The relationship could not be determined for 26% (N=42) of the victims. No victims in this study were abused by a parent or step-parent where victim relationship was known.

Most juveniles charged with child sexual abuse knew or had some familiarity with their victims. The parents and/or children generally had reason to trust the offender because the offender was known by the child or their family.

The surveys for the past four years have indicated that only three strangers have molested children where victim relationship was known. This is a dramatic indication that
children are at risk from persons they know (or parents know) and have some legitimate access to the children.

**Juvenile Offenders: Social History/Sex Offender Evaluation- Chart 6J**

The data in Chart 6J show the number of adjudicated juveniles that had a Social History or Sex Offender Evaluation completed before disposition. Eighteen percent (N=23) of the known juveniles had only a Sex Offender Evaluation completed before disposition. Both a Social History and Sex Offender Evaluation were prepared in only 13% (N=17) of the known cases. Juvenile offenders with neither, as determined by the case files, comprised 17% (N=22) of the study. The petition was Dismissed or the juvenile was Acquitted in 13 cases and 19 cases were Pending. The information was unavailable or incomplete in 33 cases. Although it was assumed that the majority had some type of investigation completed before disposition, incomplete records and the absence of a tracking system made it impossible to determine whether Sex Offender Evaluations and Social Histories were completed.

Criminal history data was limited because of the absence of complete Social Case History records in the court files. Six had prior felonies and two were charged with prior sex offenses. This is particularly problematic for the state with pending legislative proposals to register predatory offenders because there is an absence of data on sexual history.

**Juvenile Offenders: Types of Charges-Chart 7J**

Chart 7J shows the types of petitions (charges) filed against juveniles. Lewd and Lascivious Conduct (IC 18-1508) petitions were most frequently filed representing 138 (85%) of the total petitions. Rape (IC 18-6101) charges were filed four times (2%) during the year.
These data were collected to determine which charges were most frequently used against juvenile child sex abusers. As with adults, there was an exceedingly wide variability in the types of sex abuse behavior and the actual charge filed. The Lewd and Lascivious statute was used most frequently.

**Juvenile Offenders: Dispositional Information-Chart 8J**

Chart 8J shows dispositional information on juveniles. The outcome was not available in the court records for 31 juveniles. Sixty-four were sentenced under the Youth Rehabilitation Act. Twenty were Detained under the YRA and 44 were released under supervision. The petitions were dismissed against 13 of the juveniles and the disposition was pending in 19 of the petitions. This indicates an increase in the Detained Status and decline in the Released to Supervision from the previous survey.

**Juvenile Offenders: Offender/Victim Ethnicity-Chart 9J**

Seventy-nine (62%) of the juveniles petitioned into court committed the sexual offense on a child of the same ethnic status. Eight (6%) abused a child of a different ethnic group and ethnic relationship was unknown in 40 (32%) cases.

**Juvenile Offenders: Offender Ethnicity-Chart 10J**

The petitioned Offender’s ethnicity was overwhelmingly Caucasian representing 83% (N=105) of the offenders. Six percent (N=8) were recorded as Hispanic. Four percent (N=5) were listed as Other and the remaining five (4%) had no race recorded in their files. This represents an increase in Caucasian offenders but a decline in Hispanic offenders from the previous survey. The current figure represents a lower proportion of Hispanics than recorded in the census data.
Victims, where ethnicity was known, were primarily Caucasian representing 63% (N=103) of the children abused. Only five (3%) of the victims were Hispanic but the large number of victims whose ethnicity was unknown limits any conclusion that might be drawn.

**Juvenile Offenders: Location of Child Sexual Abuse-Chart 11J**

Seventy-four (58%) of the juveniles committed their offense in a residence. Location was unknown for 42 (33%) juveniles. Six (5%) occurred outside and five (4%) in other locations such as a car.

**Juvenile Offenders: Age of Offenders-Chart 12J**

The juveniles charged with child sex abuse were generally twelve years of age or older.

**Juvenile Offenders: Age Relationship: Offenders and Victims-Chart 13J**

Chart 13J graphically shows the age relationship between victims and perpetrators. This demonstrates that a significant number of teenage perpetrators choose very young victims.
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This year's report includes the sixth analysis of data standardized to the population in each of the 44 Idaho counties based on the 1990 U.S. Census. The standardization of prosecution by population allows for valid comparisons of incidence prosecutions across the state and the criminal justice response. The data is reported per 10,000 persons. Smaller counties are corrected to conform with this reporting standard and the comparisons (rates) are accurate throughout the state.

There were 205 adult cases and 127 juvenile petitions of child sexual abuse filed in district and juvenile courts during FY97 (July 1, 1996-June 30, 1997). The total number of cases filed in the period covered by this report was 332. This represents an increase from the 271 cases files in FY96, an increase of 37 cases from the 295 in FY95, a decrease of 24 cases from the 356 reported for FY94, a decrease of 93 from the 425 cases reported in the FY93 study and a decrease of 40 cases from the FY92 survey when 372 cases were reported.

Incidence of Case Filings by County-Table 1

The overall incidence of child sex abuse is reported by county and type of offender (adult or juvenile) for every county in Idaho. This information was taken from the records provided to the research team by the county clerk's office and the county prosecutor in Idaho's 44 counties.

Case filings were standardized and a rate calculated based on the most recent census data. The rate for adults was calculated and is reported for each county in the column Adult/Rate. The rate for juveniles was calculated and is reported for each county in the column Juvenile/Rate. A total rate for each county was calculated and the combined adult and juvenile
rate is reported in the column Total/Rate. (Adams, Butte, Clark, Lewis, Oneida and Teton reported no cases and their rate is reported as zero.)

The Total (mean) Rate of the child sex abuse court cases filed by county for the study period was 3.94/10,000. The standard deviation was 4.47/10,000. Over 95% of the counties fall within a range of plus or minus two standard deviations (4.47 x 2=8.94) from the average of 3.97 cases per 10,000. This means that 95% of Idaho counties reported from zero (0) to 12.88/10,000 child sex abuse cases filed during the study period. (This is skewed because of the rate in Camas County. If Camas was removed from this analysis the standard deviation would be 2.7 and 95% of the counties would report from 0 to 9.34 cases).

The average rate for adults (Adult/Rate) in each county was 2.49/10,000 with a standard deviation of 2.74/10,000. The total rate for juveniles (Juvenile/Rate) was 1.47/10,000 with a standard deviation of 2.46/10,000.

**Filing Rates in the Most Populated Counties-Chart 1T**

Chart 1T shows the incidence of child sex abuse in the 10 most heavily populated counties. County population varies in these 10 counties from a high of 205,775 in Ada County to 26,622 in Bonner. Total/Rate varies from a high of 5.4/10,000 in Bannock County to a low of 1.6/10,000 in Kootenai County. Bannock and Kootenai fall within one standard deviation of the Total (mean) Rate of 3.97/10,000. This indicates that all of the 10 most populated counties are grouped around the average incidence for the state.

**Filing Rates in the Least Populated Counties-Chart 2T**

Chart 2T shows the incidence of child sex abuse in the 10 least populated counties. The Total/Rate varied from a low of 0.0 in Adams, Butte, Clark, Lewis, Oneida and Teton to a high of 27.5 in Camas County. Most small counties report no prosecutions but Boise, Custer and Lincoln are grouped around the state average. The rate per 10,000 in Camas County is above
the expected but the small county population of 727 exacerbates their average. During the previous five years Camas County reported no cases.

**Idaho Counties with Greatest Incidence of Child Sex Abuse Case Filings by County-Chart 3T**

Chart 3T shows the counties with the highest incidence of cases filed for child sex abuse. The rate is shown for Adults, Juveniles and the Total/Rate per 10,000. The figures are standardized based on 1990 census data allowing for valid comparisons among the counties regardless of population density. In the current FY97 report, Cassia County (19,532) reported the lowest Total/Rate with 5.1/10,000. Camas County (727) reported the highest rate with 27.5/10,000. Camas County with a population of 727 prosecuted one adult case and filed one juvenile petition. Franklin County (population 9,325) had the second highest with a Total/Rate of 10.7. This represented eight adult prosecutions and two juvenile petitions.

Again, as mentioned in the previous reports, the small population of many Idaho counties skews the findings. The dynamics of this type of crime as well as the age of the victims may account for under-reporting. The higher reported numbers may also indicate more aggressive enforcement efforts and prosecution. Trend analysis over time is providing a clearer picture of incidence by county and the justice system response.

**Gender and Gender Relationships-Chart 4T**

This chart examines offender-victim relationships. Females were the most predominant victims representing 76% (N=253) of all identified. Male victims represented 17% (N=56) of the victims.

The offenders were overwhelmingly male, representing 96% (N=320) of the accused perpetrators. Female perpetrators represented 4% (N=12) of the total.
The analysis of gender relationships between the accused and the victim indicated that 78% (N=258) represented different genders. In 15% (N=51) a sexual act occurred between the same gender and it was unknown for the remaining.

**Rates / Standard Deviations of Child Sex Abuse Prosecutions-Chart 5T**

This chart shows the trends in child sex abuse prosecutions from 1992 to 1997. It is clear from this analysis that the decline in prosecutions in FY95 and FY96 may have been reversed. The current reported rate in FY97 appears to be closer to the prosecution rates in FY92, FY93 and FY94.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Adult Count</th>
<th>Juvenile Count</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Adult Rate</th>
<th>Juvenile Rate</th>
<th>Total Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>205775</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>3254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td>66026</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benewah</td>
<td>7937</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>37583</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>13552</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td>26622</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>72207</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>8332</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>90076</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>6963</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>19532</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>8505</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>21205</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>9323</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>10937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>11844</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td>11633</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>13783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16543</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>15138</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td>69795</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>30617</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td>6899</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>3516</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>3308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>23674</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td>19361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td>33754</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>3492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>8392</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>16434</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>7086</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td>13931</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teton</td>
<td>3439</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>53580</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>6109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8550</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total/Avg/Std Dev | 205 | 127 | 332 | 2.49/2.74 | 1.47/2.46 | 3.94/4.47 |
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1st Victim Gender
- Unknown (23, 7%)
- Males (56, 17%)
- Females (253, 76%)

Offender Gender
- Males (320, 96%)
- Females (12, 4%)

Gender Relationships
- Different Gender (258, 78%)
- Same Gender (51, 15%)
- Unknown (23, 7%)
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Trends In Incidence and Prosecution of Child Sex Abuse - Table 2

Table 2 shows the reported rate of prosecution over a six-year period for both adults and juveniles. This provides a more accurate picture of the variation of prosecution over time. Based on the six year rates (per 10,000 population) of prosecution, most counties that reported higher rates in a particular reporting year regressed toward the state averages in subsequent reporting periods. The average six year rate was 3.5/10,000 prosecutions per year.

Table 2 and Chart 5T show a trend analysis of prosecutions in this state over time. The highest number of adult prosecutions and juvenile petitions occurred in FY93. After relative stable rates from FY92-FY94 the prosecution rates declined for two years and then increased this year. Data collection and analysis in the 44 counties have provided few clues to this phenomenon. Aggressive prosecution, evaluation, and punishment/treatment of offenders may contribute positively to reducing incidence. Also, increased education of both parents and children may positively impact prevention strategies. This annual survey continues as a useful tool to continue to monitor the trend over time.

The increased attention of the state to child sex abuse crime may have sensitized parents to taking precautions with their children as well as made children aware of appropriate and inappropriate touching.

Still it is important to note that a trend in this type of crime emerges only slowly and a decline in a one or two year period may be the normal variation that would be expected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rate 92</th>
<th>Rate 93</th>
<th>Rate 94</th>
<th>Rate 95</th>
<th>Rate 96</th>
<th>Rate 97</th>
<th>92-97 Avg.</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rate 92</th>
<th>Rate 93</th>
<th>Rate 94</th>
<th>Rate 95</th>
<th>Rate 96</th>
<th>Rate 97</th>
<th>92-97 Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannock</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benewah</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>Lemhi</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>Nez Perce</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>Shoshone</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Teton</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 3.74, StDev: 3.52
CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

The data in this report summarizes child sex abuse prosecutions in Idaho in FY97 as stipulated by the Idaho Legislature. Data was collected throughout Idaho by a Research Team from the Department of Criminal Justice at Boise State University in accordance with the guidelines specified by the Governor's and Attorney General's Offices. Data was collected on-site in 35 counties and three counties were collected by facsimile. The number of actual cases was sent to the prosecuting attorney in each jurisdiction for verification. All corrections that were sent to the project team by mid-November, 1997 were included in this analysis.

This report marks the sixth year that data has been standardized for cross county comparisons. This type of analysis provides policy makers at the local and state levels with accurate comparative data to determine the counties with higher incidence.

A total of 332 cases of child sexual abuse were prosecuted during the study period FY97. Of that number, 205 were adults and 127 were juveniles. The Total (Mean) Rate of cases filed by county (standardized to census data) was 3.94/10,000.

The average Total Rate (Adult/Rate) for adult child sex abuse felony filings was 2.49/10,000. The average Total Rate (Juvenile/Rate) for juvenile child sex abuse petitions filed was 1.47/10,000. The Adult and Juvenile rates have increased from FY96.

The data in this study further indicated that child sexual abuse occurs most frequently between the victim and an acquaintance or relative. This has significant implications for policy makers in preventing child sexual abuse and treating those persons convicted of this type of crime.

Any conclusions about this information should be guarded because of the nature of child sexual abuse and the low incidence of reporting. This research is determining incidence over time. This would be greatly facilitated by the development of a state-wide standardized tracking method. A standardized data collection system statewide would greatly facilitate comprehensive data collection.