

Race and the Criminal Justice System Task Force
Fourth Meeting
Justice Fred H. Dore Courtroom
Seattle University School of Law
February 17, 2011

Meeting Notes

Agenda

- I. Brief introductions and summary of previous meeting (10 minutes)
- II. Report on March 2 presentation to Washington Supreme Court (10 minutes)
- III. Reports from Working Groups and Discussion (40 minutes)
- IV. Discussion of next steps (20 minutes)
- V. Adjourn general meeting, and convene working groups (10 minutes; some working groups might meet beyond the 9am end time of the general meeting)

Attendees: Bob Chang, Steven Gonzalez, Mary Yu, Jason Gillmer, Mark Niles, Emily McClory, Van Chu, Joey Cronen, Christopher Choe, Keith Talbot, David Perez, Rachelle Heinzen, Allison Durazzi, Jeff Hall, Gail Stone, Wilma Stordahl, Lam Nguyen-Bull, Andrew Sachs, Travis Stearns, Anne Benson, Peter Holmes, Darby DuComb, Monto Morton, Patrick Oishi, Myra Downing, Bob Boruchowitz, Chach Duarte White, Jackie McMurtrie, Karen W. Murray, Victor King, Michael Kim, Veronica, Alicea-Galvan, Donald Horowitz, Erick Michl, Jon McKay, Kelli Carroll, Ken Schubert, Matthew Sanders, Aaron Howes, Ron Wilson, Mary Whisner, Taki Flevaris, Alison Holcomb and Fe Lopez.

Phone: Sharon Payant

Introduction new members: Beckett, Zarowsky, Whisner, Galvan, Duretsky and many others.

Judge Gonzalez spoke about plan for March 2 Meeting with Supreme Court justices: Tracy Flood to introduce Task Force. Judge Gonzalez will offer remarks then move to first part of meeting with researchers giving history from 1980's. The second part will have UW present research on drug prosecution cases. The third part will have SU present on institutional bias.

Work Groups to Present

1. Recommendation group with Larson, Yu, Daugaard
2. Discussion
3. Sue Rahr will facilitate
4. Recommendation

Report from Work Groups

1. Community Engagement
Fe Lopez, Ron Wilson - Eastern Washington and Rodriguez – Kennewick
Announced the CLE: Advocacy Strategies for Protecting Civil Rights

The group is continuing to expand community outreach to Eastern Washington and with Pat Oishi's help in Pierce County. Encouraging community based organizations to spread the word.

2. Research

Beckett, Alexes Harris, Taki Flevaris, David Perez, Mary Whisner, Stephanie Wilson. (powerpoint) Existing data do not accurately portray crimes, incarceration stats, ethnicity, arrest stats from reported crimes.

Comments: Should be more discussion on other areas outside the minority justice commission; how are communications delegated to other areas outside the commission; who owns the data and who has access to data?

Why not create a forum to change or transform to change? Present and educate; push the data out.

McCurley: Data is available.

Comment: How do judges access data? Is there uniformity in data? Categorize data recording guidelines; improve data quality. Example: Latino surnames to identify the proxy; use coding. Inaccurate data cause disproportioned information.

3. Proposed Recommendations from group. (powerpoint). Seven points.

Comments: Need evaluation tools for recommendations - judicial information system, county clerk and administrator; Access to Justice Board.

How is progress measured? More alternatives should be made available; more training. A forum should be throughout the adjustment process. Count race and ethnicity. Include other court systems. Within the power of the court, how far can they engage? Educate lawmakers. Current collection of data is not "racist"- collecting ethnicity info is considered "racist." How do we use the data? How are decisions made? Add Evaluation to the list of Recommendations.

Continue to work after March 2. March 2nd is the groundbreaking day. Continue the Task Force meetings on a quarterly basis. Engage the community more. Use the media in a way not to compromise the role of the judge. How are the recommendations going to affect the current system? Where will the recommendation go? How are remarks addressed quickly? What is the immediate solution? The task force "do not have teeth," too dry, too academic. How to approach the opening remarks at the March 2nd meeting? Use "anger" to generate attention. No data will convince the judges if not accompanied by passion and heart. Who will lead the discussion?