

Race and the Criminal Justice System Task Force  
Fifth Meeting  
May 19, 2011

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Bob Chang, Steven Gonzalez, Mary Yu, Jason Gillmer, Mary D. Fan, Anthony Gipe, mary Whisner, Jennifer Shaw, Estela Ortega, Theresa Wea, Bryce Blum, Aaron Howes, Nick Allen, Travis Stearns, Diane Clarkson, Magdaleno Len Rose Avila, Katherine Beckett, Monto Shan Morton, Mark Larson, Anita Khandelwal, Julius Debro, Nicole A. Gaines, Andrew Sachs, Fe Lopez, Kendee Yamaguchi, Paul Holland, Deanna Dawson, Ken Schubert, Jeff Hall, Michael J. Trickey, Bob Boruchowitz, Deborah Fleck, Luis Moscoso, Mary Helen Roberts, Keith Talbot, Sue Rahr, John McKay, Darby DuComb, Taki Flevaris, Karen W. Murray, Peter Holmes, and Mark Niles.

By phone: Carl McCurley, Chach Duarte White, Sahar Fathi, Tracy Flood, and Shanthi Raghu

(Quality of call-in transmission is poor.)

Revised Agenda (summary)

- I. Brief introductions (5 minutes)
- II. Recap (10 minutes)
  - a. March 2 presentation
  - b. May 1 presentation to conference of superior court judges
- III. Discussion of Working Groups (structure/organization) (10 minutes)
- IV. Reports from Working Groups and their next steps (30 minutes)
- V. New major undertaking: next Supreme Court forum. Juvenile Justice? (20 minutes)
- VI. Legislative dimension (10 minutes)
  - a. Representative Mary Helen Roberts (tentative pending special session schedule)
  - b. Representative Luis Moscoso (tentative pending special session schedule)
- VII. Next meeting and closing (5 minutes)

Revised Agenda (detail) and Summary of Discussion

- I. Brief introductions (5 minutes)
- II. Recap (10 minutes)
  - a. March 2 presentation
  - b. May 1 presentation to conference of superior court judges

Judge González convened the meeting and gave a brief report on the March 2 presentation to the Washington Supreme Court and on the May 1 presentation at the statewide conference of superior court judges.

It was reported that the Center for Court Research is working at full capacity which will limit its ability to respond to our research requests; we will need to prioritize our research needs to get the most important information that we need.

- many superior court judges recognize bias, but what's next; what can be practically done?
- looking into report and trying to define what to do.

- III. Discussion of working groups (structure/organization) (10 minutes)
  - a. Oversight, Community Engagement, Education (composition, roles)
    - i. Brief Analysis: Oversight has been underutilized; Community Engagement's role/tasks has not been clear—two prong: 1) organizational development; 2) outreach/education to

community (however defined); Education has not had clear tasks/timelines/expectations set

- b. Proposal: reorganize Oversight to have as its primary task organizational development + connecting/coordinating the work of all the working groups; merge Community Engagement with Education as Community Engagement and Education

We are expanding and broadening the leadership of the task force. The oversight working group is going to take on a stronger role. It will work to be more inclusive in its membership. It will also take on the task of organizational development, building the task force by reaching out to new organizations.

The community engagement and education working groups are being combined.

Suggestions from audience:

For the outreach plan, state specific purpose. What are the resources available?

Example of Asia Pacific Islander groups using churches as a means for outreach.

For the oversight group – push hard; we have a good forum

Give tools to lawmakers.

Learn about each other's struggles & strengths.

Consider getting info from the street level – gang members as resource.

Work on policy-making using the 5 proposals : education, resolve, identify corrective measures, measure and evaluate progress and resolution. There is a need to create prompts.

Because one of our attendees, a state representative, might have to depart early, we moved to Agenda Item VI.

#### VI. Legislative dimension (10 minutes)

- a. Representative Mary Helen Roberts (tentative pending special session schedule)
- b. Representative Luis Moscoso (tentative pending special session schedule)

Mary Helen Roberts:

-Problem has been identified

-Issues are seen through the eyes of conservative constituencies

-Seeking companions with common goals

-Limited resources

-Bring awareness to research

-Educate the public – change vocabulary

-Who do we incarcerate; why so long? Who are in our prison system, why are they there? We create these people.

-Punishment is not the solution, we need to reform rather than punish. Create and integrate a good system for social reform.

-Where is the study in the media? Bring research into public awareness – use media. Legislators pay attention to the media.

-Create workgroups within the legislators

Luis Moscoso:

-Taboos exist in the legislature. We need to educate the legislators, perhaps through caucuses

-Give legislators educational tools to work with

-provide more dialogue from the street level

Comments from the audience:

- Who is benefitting from prisons
- Needs public awareness on problem
- Use language and timing when providing info to public

We then moved to agenda item V. New major undertaking: next Supreme Court forum.

It was discussed and agreed that juvenile justice would be the topic for the next supreme court forum.

Juvenile Justice

- What data is currently out there now? Views are varied.
- Alternatives should be provided so juveniles do not end up in the criminal justice system
- Another political discussion
- Though 50% reduction of juveniles in detention centers, there are more kids in the court system
- Get kids out of the court system
- Judge Trickey shares that there are plenty of data on juvenile; be specific when asking for data
  - 70% of kids in the juvenile system are not in school
  - check schools for disciplinary record; special education
- look for alternatives to the justice system such as Team Child

Sign-ups for Juvenile Justice System Group

Bob Boruchowitz  
Chach Duarte White  
Estela Ortega  
Keith Talbot  
Darby DuComb  
Paul Holland  
Theresa Wea  
Diane Clarkson  
Julius Debro  
Magdaleno Leno Rose-Avila  
Luis Moscoso

We closed with a brief discussion of our next meeting venue, UW downtown Seattle facilities. We began a discussion about frequency of meetings, which the Oversight Working Group will determine.

We did not get a chance to discuss the reports from the working groups. The detail agenda presents in summary form the topics. Those interested can follow up directly with the working groups.

- IV. Reports from working groups and their next steps
  - a. Community Engagement
    - i. Hubs
      - 1. Pierce County
      - 2. Spokane County
    - ii. Developing circles of engagement
  - b. Research
    - i. Publication in 3 law reviews; Research Working Group is working on revisions for submission of draft for editing by July 15
      - 1. Gonzaga Conference, Sept. 23-24, 2011
      - 2. UW Law Review

- 3. SU Law Review
  - ii. Follow up research—support recommendations and implementation?
- c. Recommendations and Implementation
  - i. March 2 recommendations now with M & J
  - ii. Formulating recommendations to address directly our findings on disparities
- d. Education
  - i. Reaching students (law, college, high school)
    - 1. Rewrite report for high school audience
    - 2. Mobilize students to take on educational tasks—creating teachers/active participants, not just as audience/passive
    - 3. Develop discrete, concrete tasks
  - ii. Reaching public
    - 1. Report on strategic communications
    - 2. Send report to leaders of churches, synagogues, temples, mosques, civic organizations (rotary, kiwanis, etc.) along with offer to speak/engage with their groups
  - iii. Create list of target audiences; develop plan; assign tasks; check back points
  - iv. Legislature? (Discuss Agenda item VI here?)