UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON 1 CIVIL RIGHTS 2 3 IN THE MATTER OF: 4 ORIGINAL WASKINGTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE FACTFINDING 5 MEETING ON 6 DISPROPORTIONALITY WITHIN THE JUVENILE 7 JUSTICE SYSTEM 8 Washington State Conver : 1 and Trade Center 800 Convention Place 9 Room 402 Seattle, Washington 98101 10 Friday 11 June 9, 1995 12 The above-entitled matter came on for meeting 13 before William A. Wassmuth, Chairperson, at 9:00 a.m., pursuant to notice. 14 15 WASHINGTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON WILLIAM A. WASSMUTH' 16 17 SHERRY V. APPLETON ERNEST B. MARTIN 18 NORWARD J. BROOKS VELMA ROSETE VELORIA 19 KATHERINE M. BULLIT TOMAS A. VILLANUEVA 20 SHARON ANNE BUMALA JOHN SWEESY 21 JOHN CARLSON DOROTHY M. WEBSTER 22 JUANITA GRANT 23 GWENDOLYN R. GUA THOMAS V. PILLA, Staff 24 ALLEN D. ISRAEL GRACE HERNANDEZ, Staff

25

1	PRES	ENTERS
2	JUDGE NORMA HUGGINS	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
3	MICHAEL L. CURTIS	COURT SERVICES
4	DICK CARLSON	DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES
5 6	GEORGE S. BRIDGES	PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
7 8	WOODY VERZOLA	DIRECTOR, I-WA-SIL YOUTH PROGRAM
9	DAVID AKIMOTO	ATLANTIC STREET CENTER
10	GLENDA TANNER	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE
11	HARRIET WALDEN	MOTHERS AGAINST POLICE HARASSMENT
12	CHIEF ED CRAWFORD	KENT POLICE DEPARTMENT
13 14	HON. MARGARET PAGELER	MEMBER, SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL
15	JAMES KELLY	COMMISSION ON AFRICAN AMERICAN AFFAȚRS
16	SADIKIFU AKINA-JAMES	COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION
17 18	GREG HUBBARD	DEPUTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, KITSAP COUNTY
19	NED DELMORE	PROBATION SUPERVISOR, KITSAP COUNTY
20	SUSAN WAILD	
21	SUSAN WAILD	PROGRAM MANAGER, CONFERENCE COMMITTEE DIVERSION PROGRAM, KING COUNTY
22 23	STEVE JOHNSTON	ADMINISTRATOR, PIERCE COUNTY JUVENILE COURT
24 25	SID SIDOROWICZ	ASSISTANT SECRETARY, JUVENILE REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

1	<u>PRESENTERS</u> (continued)	
2	•	·
3	RAN T. SATTERBERG	CHIEF OF STAFF, OFFCE OF THE KING COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
4	SIMMIE A. BAER	SUPERVISING ATTORNEY.
5	DIRILI A. DADA	JUVENILE DIVISION, LAW OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC
6		DEFENDER
7	HON. IDA BALLASIOTES	REPRESENTATIVE, WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE
8	ANDREW DE LOS ANGELES	TRIBAL CHAIRMAN, SEQUAMEH
9	11.01.2 12.0 12.0	TRIBE
10	SUBMIT COMMENTS TO:	
11	THOMAS V. PILLA SENIOR CIVIL RIGHTS ANA	T VCM
12	3660 WILSHIRE BLVD STE LOS ANGELES CA 90010	
13	PH. (213) 894-3437 FAX (213) 894-0508	
14	FAX (213) 894-0508	
15	_	
16	_	;
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDINGS

(On the record at 9:00 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: This meeting of the Washington Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights is now in session. The purpose of this meeting is to obtain information and views relating to civil rights issues in the area of disproportionality within the juvenile justice system.

My name is William Wassmuth. I am the chairperson of the Washington Advisory Committee. This committee receives information and makes recommendations to the Commission in ares which the Committee or any of the subcommittees are authorized to study within the State of Washington.

Other members of the Committee that are in attendance at this meeting are: Juanita Grant; Ernest Martin; John Carlson; Katherine Bullit; Allen Israel; and Norward Brooks. Others from the Committee might be attending, throughout the day, as well.

Also with us are staff members, Thomas Pilla and Grace Hernandez, from the Committee's Western Regional Office, in Los Angeles, and we are delighted, and thankful to them, for their logistics work, in setting this meeting up.

Participants invited to address the Advisory

Committee have been requested to provide information on the following issues:

- A) Statewide efforts to deal with the issue of disproportionality as it impacts the juvenile justice system.
- B) Community-based efforts to deal with this issue.
 - C) Progress of Diversion Programs.
- D) Perceptions as to the success, the progress, and the remaining problems in dealing with disproportionality.

Among those invited to address the Washington Advisory Committee at this meeting are governmental officials, community leaders, and legal and advocacy organizations. The focus is to highlight successful efforts and programs which have been established, so that this information can be provided to other areas of the nation which may be experiencing similar concerns.

I was a meeting, coincidentally, yesterday, with some of these other chairs, and was explaining to them what they were doing, today. They were very information in getting some of this information to their groups, throughout the rest of the country.

This factfinding meeting is being held pursuant to the federal rules applicable to state

advisory committees, and regulations promulgated by the United States Commission on Civil Rights. All inquiries regarding these provisions should be directed to, either myself, as Chair, or to the Commission staff.

The Commission on Civil Rights is an

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the United States Government, established by Congress in 1957, and it is directed to:

- 1. Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;
- 2. Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- 3. Appraise federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws;
- 4. Serve as a national clearinghouse for information about discrimination; and,
- 5. Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

I would like to emphasize that this is a factfinding meeting, not an adversary proceeding.

Individuals have been invited to come and share with the Committee information relevant to the subject of today's inquiry. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the Committee.

Since this is a public meeting, the press, radio, and television stations, as well as individuals, are welcome. Persons meeting with the Committee, however, may specifically request that they not be televised. In this case, we will comply with their wishes.

We are concerned that no defamatory material be presented at this meeting. In the unlikely event that this situation should develop, it will be necessary for me to call this to the attention of the person making these statements, and request that they desist in their action. And such information will be stricken from the record, if necessary.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are knowledgeable in the area to be dealt with here, today. In addition, we have allocated time at the conclusion of the session, to briefly hear from anyone who wishes to share information with the Advisory Committee about the specific issue under

consideration, today. And, at that time, each person or organization will be afforded a brief opportunity to address the Committee, and may submit, as well, additional information in writing. Those wishing to participate in the open session must contact Commission staff as soon as possible in order to be briefed on procedural matters.

In addition, the record of this meeting will remain open for a period of ten days following the conclusion of the meeting. The Advisory Committee welcomes additional written statements and exhibits for inclusion in the record. These should be submitted to the Western Regional Office, and the address is obtainable from the staff, or from myself.

So let us proceed. Our first participants, this morning, will be, the Honorable Norma Éuggins, and Michael Curtis. And so, if I could invite you take a chair at the table, please. And if I could invite you, please, to identify yourself, by name, and a little bit of background, in terms of your experience and expertise, that brings you here, this morning.

JUDGE HUGGINS: My name is Norma Huggins, and I am Judge, in the King County Superior Court, here, in Seattle. I have been a judge, since 1983. I have been on the superior court, since 1988. I am not sure about

my level of expertise, but I was invited to participate in a factfinding group, or a study group, to look at the issue of disproportionality, in our juvenile justice system.

This committee's work was generated by a report, that I am sure that you are aware of, that was done by Dr. George Bridges, of the University of Washington, showing that, minorities are represented in the juvenile justice system in numbers that are disproportionate to their numbers in the overall community. He made some findings, preliminarily, in that report, which generated the committee that I was asked to cochair, with Judge Ricardo Martinez, who is supposed to be here, this morning, but I am not sure whether he has arrived, or not.

I was asked to make a brief presentation, regarding the mission, that we set out to achieve, and the results of the work that we did, with that committee. Michael Curtis, from the Office of the Administrator of the Courts, was the person who staffed that committee, did a great deal of the work, with that committee, wrote a number of our reports, and I am deferring to him, this morning, to make the presentation, in my stead.

MR. CURTIS: My name is Michael Curtis.

I work for the Washington State Office of the
Administrator for the Courts. I have worked, there, in
the capacity as the juvenile and family court
specialist, for the past ten years, and, prior to that,
I worked at -- juvenile court, in the tricities. And
so, I have an accumulated 21-plus years experience, in

the juvenile justice field.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And again, what Judge Huggins was referring to, was, legislation passed in 1993, House Bill 1966, pursuant to Dr. Bridges' report, that, amongst several other things, obligated the Office of the Administrator for the Courts to conduct several different programs, or do several different things, including to develop and to improve the collection and reporting of information on juvenile offenders, by all juvenile courts; to develop a curriculum for the general understanding of ethnic and cultural diversity, and its implications for working with youth of color, and their families (this curriculum was to be completed, by October, 1993, and thereafter, offered annually); to develop informational materials, describing juvenile laws, and juvenile court processes and procedures related to such laws, make such information available to the public, and similar information available to non-English speaking youth and their families; and,

lastly, to convene a working group, which Judge Huggins was referring to. The working group was to develop standards and guidelines for the prosecution of juvenile offenders, review any racial disproportionality and diversion, and review the use of detention facilities, and a way to reduce racial disproportionality.

The main thing confronting our office, when we were given this mandate from the legislature, was, in addition to the mandate, they gave us a walking \$50,000 to do all this, and we instantly decided that there is no way that we can completely do everything they want, with the amount of money they provided. So we had to prioritize what they asked us to do.

Fortunately, there were a couple of these areas, that were being done, already, through our minority and justice commission, and I will talk about that, a little bit later. And the two that we gave top priority to, one was the working group, which received the highest priority, and the other was the development of information materials.

So, after that decision was made, we were fortunate enough to have Judge Martinez and Judge Huggins volunteer to cochair our committee. Neither wanted to do it, individually, and I think we all

benefited, greatly, from having both of them involved.

After that, we were involved in selecting the membership of the working group, which became quite tricky, because we wanted to have as much diverse representation as possible, throughout the state, but we were drawing from groups which had been prescribed by the legislation, that identified who was to be a member, or who were to be members, of this group, and, when you are looking at superior court judges, juvenile court administrators, elected prosecuting attorneys, so on and so forth, you are not looking at a lot of people of color, from which to include on your commission.

It is interesting to note, that, of our 20-member commission, 12 members were persons of color, and that was more than the total of persons of color who are elected prosecutors, superior court judges, or juvenile court administrators. So we felt pretty good about that.

Finally, after we got our group together, we started meeting, in December, of 1993, met for a year, thereafter, initially reviewed Dr. Bridges' report, and accepted his initial findings. And then, the work group divided into subcommittees, looking into areas that were requested by the legislation, subcommittees being, prosecutorial standards, diversion, and use of

detention. We also had a subcommittee created, for coordinating public forums that we held.

The community hearings were to take place, in Yakima, Tacoma, Seattle, and then, we added a fourth hearing, at Echo Glen, the children's institution, because we wanted to meet with kids who were directly impacted by this situation.

The initial concern of the committee was, how to notify people about the hearings that we were holding. We wanted to have as much representation as possible, but we wanted to know how to reach the minority communities.

One thing that we did, was that, we sent out a notice, in both English and Spanish. It was sent to all superior court judges, all elected prosecuting attorneys, all juvenile court administrators, all, I believe it went to all state representatives, and state senators. And then, we used this resource directory, that was developed by the commission, the Minority and Justice Commission, of the Supreme Court, that is, Workforce Diversity Resource Directory. And so, we took all the addresses out of this, and sent notice to all the people listed, or all the agencies listed, in this document, also.

We also contacted people in each of the

communities, to be a community facilitator, for the public meetings. We made efforts to make it public-friendly. We had the meetings held at local high schools, and we provided Spanish interpreters, at all the sites.

Even with all that, the attendance was marginal, at best. I would say we averaged about 40 people, at each of the three hearings, held in the cities. And, although the turnout was, what we considered to be, light, I think that we did hear some interesting comments, and there were some consistent themes, throughout.

Themes that we heard from the hearings held, in the communities, were, concerns with parental empowerment, and the reinvolvement of the family, the needs for interpreter services, the public defender versus private attorney quality of representation, issues of workforce diversity, questions about law enforcement practices, questions on the juvenile justice system and Washington State's focus on building criminal history, and the need for transitional programs for youth released from secure confinement.

At Echo Glen, when we were meeting with kids, their concerns were somewhat interesting, and somewhat, at times, blaming, and, I do not know if they really had a clue, at some times, but I think we can take what they told us, and still have some direction. But issues they identified, were, the need for earlier intervention. It was like, "Why did you not help us, earlier?" Of course, this is great, in hindsight, when they are all locked up, now, in a state institution. The workforce diversity issue came up, again, the fact that they go to court, and everybody in the courtroom is Caucasian, does not make them necessarily feel like the cards are stacked in their favor. Labeling, and police harassment, and then, a perceived inconsistency, in sentencing, and we heard quite a bit of this, about, "Well, my codefendant did not get nearly the severe sentence that I did," and so on and so forth.

Anyway, we took all this information that we collected, from the public hearings, from the meetings that we had held, over the year, and then, we held a retreat, in September, and hired Dr. Donna -- to facilitate that. And, from that, we came up with our draft report, and then, completed our final report, to the legislature, that was distributed, in December, of last year. I brought copies of our report to the legislature.

Included in the report, were, numerous findings and recommendations, and I quess I do not want

to go through all of them. More, what I want to talk about, is, what has happened, since the report was completed.

One of the things that the working group felt, or believed, that, our role, in this process, was, up to providing the report to the Washington State legislature. After that point, it was not necessarily our role, to provide follow-through, and ensure that our recommendations were actually implemented. I think we were dependent upon those groups that we were making the recommendations to, such as the superior court, juvenile court administrators, and minority commissions, and so on and so forth, to pick up the ball, so to speak, and start implementation.

So, what has happened, since then, one of the recommendations, was for the prosecutors to adopt prosecutorial guidelines. Actually, that had taken place, in the year preceding. The legislation passed, subsequent to the House Bill 1966. And all prosecuting attorneys, throughout the state, have adopted guidelines, that were developed by the Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. There was an effort to codify those guidelines, this past year, in proposed juvenile justice reform legislation, but that did not pass the legislature.

Let us see. Other working group recommendations: legislation empowering, including parents in the juvenile offender process. One of the concerns of parents, is, they will come to court, and their child will be meeting with his or her attorney, and be advised not to talk with their parent about the case, and this infuriates most parents.

The idea was that, if there was provided a limited parental privilege, where, you could have a parent/child communication, and that parent would not be subpoenaed by the prosecution, to testify against the child, then there was, it created a situation where a defense attorney would feel comfortable, discussing the case with the parent. And so, that was one of the recommendations coming from the working group. This also was included in juvenile justice reform . legislation, proposed this year, that, again, did not pass, but it will probably be back, next year, is my guess.

One of our recommendations, was that, the model pattern form we have, for a detention order, includes, space for written findings, supporting the reasons why a judge has held a kid in detention. One of the findings of Dr. Bridges, was that, kids held in detention received more severe treatment than the kids

who are not held in detention. And so, the idea was, if a kid is held in detention, the court should explain the reasons why that decision has been made. And so, that was one of the minor things, that we recommended. The pattern forms committee did take that recommendation, and has revised the model pattern form order, on detention.

A lot of our recommendations were aimed at the local level, and I personally have no knowledge of what has been happening, at the local level, with those recommendations. I know that I have received multiple requests for copies of our reports, and many of them were from the local juvenile justice advisory committees, that were created, during the 1994 legislative session, that is to, the role of those committees, is to, advise the law and justice planning councils, of each county, on the issues of racial disproportionality in the juvenile justice system. So I believe that these groups are aware of what our recommendations are. What they have done to implement them, again, I do not know.

What we have done, at the Office of the Administrator for the Courts, first of all, we did convene the working group, and we provided the report to the legislature. I am currently involved in

developing an informational brochure about the juvenile offender process, and this is quite tricky, because I am attempting to do this, not using all the legal language, that we fling around, so easily, amongst ourselves, or those of us who have been in the system, forever, know exactly what we are talking about, but, if you give it to anybody else, they are going, "Yeah! Right!" So it has been kind of a challenge, but I believe that we have come up with a document, that is going to work sufficiently, and we are having that translated into various languages, and that will be distributed to the juvenile courts, throughout the state.

As far as, improvements in our information system, we currently have an information system, that has the ability to provide all the data, that Dr. Bridges was desiring, for his study. The problem with it, is that, it is very old technology. It is very nonuser-friendly, it is very labor-intensive, and many juvenile courts, because of workload reasons, do not avail themselves of all the abilities of the system, or do not enter all the data into the system, that it could actually handle, because it just takes too much time. The legislature, this year, has provided funding, for us to continue to improve our information

system, and hopefully, addressing some of the issues, of, creating a more up-to-date system, will also have this ancillary benefit, of improving the collection of

data relating to this type of issue.

With regard to educational programs, our minority and justice commission has been involved in several educational programs. Last year, they did several workforce diversity trainings, that they received very positive response on, and currently, they are involved in doing cultural diversity training, in several locations, throughout the state, and, again, have received very positive comment on this. And so, we have kind of left the training element, to the commission.

Also, the board for trial court education has adopted this policy, the philosophy, that, whenever anybody makes a presentation, or provides training, to members of the judiciary, or their support staff, that issues, with regard to cultural and ethnic diversity, should be integrated into whatever they are presenting, as much as possible.

So, that is kind of where we are.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay. Would you like to add anything, at this stage, or are you ready for some questions.

TUDGE HUGGINS: One of the things that we tried to do, as well, in forming the work group, we tried, very hard, to include law enforcement, because we know and understand, that, a lot of the disproportionality has to do with, who is brought into the juvenile justice system, to begin with, rather than, being taken home, perhaps, at the scene of an incident. We were not able to, or we did not get a response, from our invitation, but we tried to include as many of those parties, as we could, that, we know, impact the system, in a certain way.

So, we had some limitations, in that regard. The mandate from the legislature did not give us any responsibilities, or authority, after our report was filed, on December 15. So that is the reason why we have not followed up, or follow through, is because, we simply were not empowered to do so.

So we can make the recommendations, but we have no way of knowing how those recommendations will be guided through the legislature, if they will be adopted, and accepted. So it was not that, we just disbanded, because we thought there was no more work to be done. It was simply because, we did not have any authority to do so.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you. Committee

members, questions?

DR. BROOKS: I have a couple of -- number one, dealing with the curriculum that you talked about, and I assume that was the elected, as well as the law enforcement, people, you were talking? You mentioned something about a diversity curriculum.

MR. CURTIS: Oh, the cultural diversity curriculum? Actually, it is just offered to persons whom we provide education to, through the board for trial court education. And so, it is mostly judicial branch employees. Cultural diversity training for executive branch employees, or law enforcement, goes through the criminal justice training commission, or through the various agencies, such as, the Department of Social and Health Services.

DR. BROOKS: I was wondering, if there was any thought given to, perhaps, making it, sort of like a continuing education requirement, like, the attorneys, if you want to stay certified, you have to take so much continuing education, and had they thought about adding that, as a component, that would require all prosecutors, judges, police, take something like that, in order to continue the certification --

JUDGE HUGGINS: Certainly, that is, having it a requirement, by the Washington State Bar, or the

Seattle King County Bar Association, is certainly a possibility, that could be looked at. We do make recommendations, and did make recommendations, to the bar, that, in any of their CLE programs, that they include a section on cultural diversity, and I think the minority justice commission, and other groups, have made the same recommendations to bar associations.

We found out, in working with the domestic violence task forces, is that, that is one way to get this information out, and the training out, to the legal community, is to, ask that they include a 20-minute segment, or half-an-hour segment, or incorporate it into every CLE course that is taught, and that is one effort that we have tried to make. It is not mandatory, that judges or lawyers include this type of training, in their legal education, and I am not sure how they would make it mandatory, but we could certainly encourage the use of a portion of CLE presentations, to be devoted to this issue.

And I think that could certainly be done, by the supreme court of this state, and other bodies, that have the authority to do that.

DR. BROOKS: And the second one, is that, you also mention that you had a limited number of people of color, that hold these positions, as judges,

prosecutors, and so forth. I was wondering, do you know of any study that might have been conducted, which might analyze the difference in handling of offenders, whether it be in a court, or whether they were arrested by an officer of color, or whether they were prosecuted by a prosecutor of color, as opposed to those that were dealt with, by non-people of color? Have there been any comparative kinds of studies, that were done, to? I am not familiar with any. MR. CURTIS: I do not know if Dr. Bridges is going to be here,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

today.

He is here. He was here. JUDGE HUGGINS: MR. CURTIS: Well, it might be a good question, for him, because he is more into that research.

JUDGE HUGGINS: I would tend to believe -and I have no data on that issue, anyway -- I would tend to believe, that you would find little difference, if you did do such a study. I just do not believe, the way a person or a child progresses, through the system, I do not believe you would find a great deal of difference, there, but I do not know, certainly, for sure.

MR. CARLSON: So a black prosecutor, and a

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

white prosecutor, a black cop, and a white cop, tend to look at offenders, in given situations, pretty much the same way?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE HUGGINS: I did not say that. I said that, I thought, if you tried to make, or compare the numbers, that Dr. Brooks talked about, I do not think that you would find a discernible difference. And one of the reasons why I do not think you would find that difference, is because, outside of this county, you will not find minority prosecutors, in large numbers, You certainly will not find any black if at all. prosecutors, in any large numbers, or police officers, outside of this county. So I do not think that that is something that you would be able to look at, or that Dr. Bridges even would be able to look at, and draw any discernible differences, because of that fact.

If you had a system, where, you have prosecutors, police officers, probation counselors, judges, and social workers, all the way through the system, where you could make those kinds of comparisons, you might be able to make them, but I just do not think that you would able to collect the kind of data that you would need, to come to those conclusions.

MR. CARLSON: Any strong anecdotal evidence?

JUDGE HUGGINS: We did get a lot of anecdotal

evidence, from our hearings, in the community, particularly in Yakima.

MR. CURTIS: Yakima.

JUDGE HUGGINS: We had anecdotal evidence, there, that was just startling.

One of the best things, I think, that we did, in our efforts to reach out to the community, was to provide interpretive services, and to let the community know that those services would be available, because we had people who came to our hearing, in Yakima, made very impassioned pleas, told us about some hair-raising events, but they would not have been able to do that, if we had not, if we did not have the interpreter, who could interpret, for them, as well as, interpreting Dr. Bridges' presentation, to them, about some of the problems in the system. So we did get a lot of anecdotal information.

In Tacoma, of the things that we heard, from parents, more than any other community, I believe, is that, many of them had already participated in, and responded to, cries about disproportionality, and racial injustice, in the juvenile justice system. And they said things to us, like, "Well, we had a committee, just like yours, come through here, two years ago. They did a report, and that report now sits

in Olympia, on a shelf, and it is full of dust." So we did get a sense of frustration, from parents, about the participation that they had tried to have, in these issues, in their communities, and the lack of responsiveness.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also heard a lot of frustration from the group, in Seattle, I think, more than others, about, the way the law impacts their ability to effectively deal with the child, before they commit a crime, but while they are still having some difficulties, in trying to keep them in school, in trying to keep them at home, and off the streets. We heard a lot about the frustration that parents have, in that regard. That is one of the reasons why we came up with the idea of trying some, or recommending, that the legislature consider type of parental exceptions, to the evidence rule, so that parents could converse with their children, and their lawyers, about crimes, and have some privilege, that would prevent the prosecutor, on the other hand, calling them, as witnesses, against their child.

So we did hear a lot of anecdotal information, regarding everything from harassment by police officers, as perceived by some members of the communities, to the way in which the law excludes

parents from participation, in the process that involves a child.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think one thing, too, that is MR. CURTIS: key, in this whole thing, that we were informed of, through Dr. Bridges, was the time of detention, and that creates kind of a system issue, because, when a kid is put in detention, the system automatically kicks in most of the resources, because the timeframes are shorter, by statute. So you have to do things, in a shorter amount of time, which means that, again, the resources are focused on that kid. Well, you have the focus of the resources of the kid, in detention. ends up, that, they do have higher charges filed against them. They are found quilty of more serious offenses. They do get a more severe sentence, are found quilty of more severe charges. They do get a more severe sentence. But again, it is because of due process, to protect them of their rights, to make sure, because they are incarcerated, that the system works, swiftly.

And so, it is one factor, not to say that there is not some racism going on, out there, too.

I have a letter, here, that you might want to hear. This is from a mayor of a small eastern Washington community, that was somewhat enlightening,

if you would be interested in hearing this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes, please.

MR. CURTIS: It says, it is addressed to the disproportionality working group. It says, "Just maybe, there is not an overrepresentation of minorities in the juvenile justice system. In experiencing life for over 50 years, I have noticed that some minority kids act tough, to anyone, and show off, for their They can be seen, in stores, just waiting for the opportunity to shoplift, rough up someone, or some similar crime. For some reason, minority kids need to be tough. Can this come from an inferiority complex? If so, this needs to be taken care of, at home. complex leads to crime. This complex is caused by our current system of free handouts, through the welfare system, that does not make people accountable for their This helps in forming the attitude that, 'What is mine, is mine, and what is yours, is mine.' Until this attitude is changed by society, there are going to be a lot of minorities in the juvenile system. If the system dealt out real penalties for crimes committed, that would help reverse the so-called 'overrepresented minority,' and all juveniles in The solution is complex, and somewhat covered in the above paragraph. Children of all cultures must

1	be taught, that, in the U.S., the property of others is		
2	to be left alone, that hard work is what brings		
3	positive results. Dealing in riots and illegal		
4	activity can only bring prison terms."		
5	MR. CARLSON: What about that letter do you		
6	object to?		
7	MR. CURTIS: I think it is very tunnel-		
8	visioned and shortsighted, and does not take into		
9	account any kind of global perspective.		
10	MR. CARLSON: Global perspective, from a		
11	small town?		
12	MR. CURTIS: I consider myself having grown		
13	up in a small town, and I think you can still have a		
14	global perspective.		
15	MR. CARLSON: Point out, what, in that		
16	letter, is blatantly wrong		
17	MR. CURTIS: I think the perception,		
18	perceptions that kids are standing in stores, just		
19	waiting to shoplift?		
20	VOICE: Is what is wrong.		
21	MR. CARLSON: The stereotypes		
22	VOICE: happens, all the time.		
23	JUDGE HUGGINS: And it assumes that, all		
24	kids, or all minority kids, who are accused of crimes,		
25	commit them. And I think it also makes an assumption,		

that the only response, to this problem, is to teach kids responsibility.

One of the things that, I think, you would find, throughout the juvenile justice system, I do not care what color the kids are, there are certainly a number of kids, out there, committing a crime, and there are some really messed-up kids, out there. But, I think, for every kid you see, in juvenile court, who is having difficulties, there is at least one adult, if not many more than one adult, in their lives, who is not doing the things for that child that need to be done.

The problems that children have, if you read reports, and presentence investigative reports, in the juvenile justice system, you look at the problems that the child brings to you, in the juvenile court, but you look at the environment from which that child comes, and you see where the real problems in the kids lives are. They are not kids that just wake up, and decide, one morning, "I'm gonna be bad." They are kids living in situations that many of us, as adults, could not survive.

So, I think it places kids in a light, without looking at the spectrum, or the circumstances, that most kids become involved in the juvenile justice

system, because of. Certainly, there are some kids that we have to be concerned about the recidivism that they bring to the juvenile justice system, but I think we do have to have a much broader perspective, as to how we deal with those problems, rather than, saying that we just need to lock them all up, for a long period of time.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Could I ask you, you suggested that, your job stopped, when you submitted the report, and you are not sure of how the recommendations are going? Is anyone following up, on that, do you know?

MR. CURTIS: I think, well, James Kelly, from the African American Commission, I think, has done a yeoman's job, or a yeoperson's job --

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We will be hearing from him, later, so we can ask him, then.

MR. CURTIS: -- pushing these. But, again, at the local level, it is hard to say. And most of our recommendations, again, one of the requests from, actually, the minority commissions, was, to be succinct in our recommendations, and try to provide some concrete direction, and we think we have done that, by specifically identifying what each level can do, or what each agency can do, to impact disproportionality

in the system.

JUDGE HUGGINS: One of the areas that we try to push, very hard, and strong, in our recommendations, was that, involving diversion, where, we found, from some of the participants, on our committee, that, diversion is a successful program, but it is not as encompassing, as it could be, of youth of color. And one of the barriers, is language. So we made some very strong recommendations, for a more expansive use of the diversion process, because we do find that it is generally a successful process, for many, many youngsters.

So, we tried to make recommendations, that were easy to deal with, that did not cost a great deal of money, though we made some recommendations that certainly would cost money, if they are implemented.

Many of the recommendations that we made, have not been made, by us, for the first time. They have been made, before. They just simply have not been followed through with, before.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And that is a risk of, with this one, again, it sounds like.

JUDGE HUGGINS: It is, but there was more than one group, studying this same problem, and making recommendations, on this same issue, that was working,

at the same time that we were; the group that was headed, in part, by Judge Bobbe Bridge.

So, we are hoping, that -- and many of our recommendations overlap -- so we are hoping, that, just simply, by having other voices, saying the same things, at the same time, that they may receive more attention.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- to a conclusion --

Are there any last questions, from the Committee, a question for the judge?

MR. CARLSON: Judge, a lot of people, that I have talked to -- and I have talked, more, to crime victims, and police officers, than criminals, and public defenders -- think that, the message that keeps being sent, over and over again, by our juvenile justice system, is one of excessive leniency; that, more and more, it is easy to get away with criminal activity, which is why, in an area where we have so much more in expense on education, and social programs, and diversion, and whatnot, than ever before, that we also have record high numbers of violent juvenile offenses. Could you respond to that, from your perspective?

JUDGE HUGGINS: I think we certainly do have record high numbers of violent juvenile offenders, and I do not think that that is necessarily because we just

have juveniles who are offending, in an isolated society. We have record high numbers, in a lot of other things, as well. We have a great deal more trouble with our school systems, now, than we have had, in, maybe, in some years past. We have more trouble, with drug abuse, and alcohol abuse, maybe, than we have had, in generations, or decades, past. So I do not think that it is just the juvenile justice system, where we are seeing increasing serious problems. I think we are seeing increasingly serious problems, in a lot of aspects of our community life, and this is certainly one of the results of it.

I think that the general impression, and I probably can only speak best for myself, in dealing with juvenile justice issues, is, we have to answer some questions, for ourselves, as to how we are going to deal with our kids, as a precious commodity in our society. If we are willing to simply take kids, who commit crimes, and lock them up, until they are 21 years old, that is one way to deal with the problem. You will keep them off the streets. You will keep them from committing crimes, until they are 18 or 21 years old.

But what do you do with a kid, who is 21, or a person, who is 21 years old, when you put them back

on the streets, and you try to do nothing more than for them, other than lock them up? I think that is the other question that we need to ask ourselves, in how we deal with juvenile justice.

The system, as I have participated in it, and as I view it, is not a perfect one. Sometimes, I do not think it is even a good one. It is a system that needs a lot of work, and it needs a lot of resources, that it has never gotten. But I do believe, that, as long as we are dealing with children -- which is what they are -- that we need to deal with them, differently, than we do, with adults who commit crimes.

When it comes to children who commit serious crimes, like murder, I do not have any answers, and, generally, what we do, is, lock those kids up, for as long as we can, because we do not know what else to do with them.

But there are a lot of kids, and the greater majority of kids, do not commit murder, who are in the juvenile justice system, and it is those kids, I think, that we still have to do everything that we can, to try to save them, to try to rehabilitate them, and to try to turn them into productive citizens. How we go about doing that, I think minds differ, on how we do that, and I do not have any answers, in that regard,

but I am willing to work on the questions that they 2 present. Judge Huggins, and Mr. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: 3 Curtis, I thank you, very much, not only for your 4 presence, here, but for your work, in this area. 5 most important, and it is most important for those 6 young people, and it is most important to our society. 7 So, thank you, very, very much, and we appreciate your 8 taking time, to be here, today. 9 JUDGE HUGGINS: Thank you, for having us. 10 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you. 11 I am going to try to keep us as close to on 12 schedule, as possible, out of respect for the people 13 who have asked to be here, at a specific time. 14 understand Judge Bridge was not able to be here, today, 15 because of a change in her court schedule, but Mr. 16 Carlson is here. And so, we are ready for you, as soon 17 18 as you are. MR. CARLSON: As soon as I am ready? 19 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: As soon as you are 20 ready. 21 MR. CARLSON: Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I guess that means, as 23 soon as you can make your way to the table. 24

1

25

And, Mr. Carlson, for the record, would you

introduce yourself, and give a little bit of background, of what brings you here, this morning, and then, just proceed.

1.3

MR. CARLSON: Sure. I am Dick Carlson, and I am the operations manager for the King County Department of Youth Services. What that translates into, I have some ongoing responsibility for the probation and detention functions. I oversee those, for the department, for the juvenile court, in support of the juvenile court.

I would like to apologize, a bit, in that, I really had not anticipated being here, today, so, when I talked to Judge Bridge, yesterday afternoon, about 4:00, I got a sense of what she was going to try to present. And I would comment that both Judge Bridge and I met with this group, I believe it was last fall, and presented some material to you. And I think what she had wanted to do, and I will attempt to do, today, is, to kind of come back, and let you know a little bit about what has occurred, in the intervening six months, some of the efforts that have been taken, to deal with some of the issues we identified, last fall, and then, some of the things that are still in the works. You are going to hear from Dr. Bridges, after me, so I will not attempt to summarize that

report, but, other than to say that, that was certainly a primary mover, in a lot of the efforts that occurred, over the course of the last year, and that are ongoing.

Probably, three primary activities have occurred, in the intervening months. Paramount amongst those, is, the creation of a juvenile justice disproportionality committee, required and mandated by the legislature, in the 1994 session, and created, in conjunction with King County's regional law, safety, and justice committee, and that committee was charged with a number of tasks, that included, monitoring and recording juvenile disposition standards, commission proportionality, effectiveness, and cultural relevance of, the following: rehabilitative services, that are offered by county organizations, corrections facilities; rehabilitative services, offering in conjunction with diversion, from the juvenile court system, as well as parole and probation services.

A piece, that we are still trying to figure out how to operationalize, but an important point, and that was, a requirement that we review citizen complaints, regarding bias on disproportionality in the county's juvenile justice system, and what that, what the group is working with, is, a mechanism that allows us to effectively do that, without having to respond to

hundreds of individual complaints. The resources are not there. So, what we are looking at doing, right now, is, reviewing complaint systems, and summary data, on complaints that are made, with regard to that, to the organizations involved.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also have a requirement to submit, by September 1st, a report to the legislature, on our assessment of these particular issues, and we have been meeting, now, for about six months. Today's meeting was focused on the work plan, for the balance of the year. One of the things that we have had to do, is, because the committee is broadly represented, and has different levels of understanding, of how things operate, is that, we have attempted to bring everybody up to the same level of understanding, of how the system works. And that has meant that we have had the key actors, from all of the criminal justice agencies, and various decisionmakers in this process, present, to explain how they make their decisions, and respond to some of the questions that were raised, in Dr. Bridges' report. So it has been kind of an, we have been on an educational mission, to date. This morning's meeting, that I just left, was our first real session, to sit down, and figure out, "What are we going to do, about this?"

I think the committee is well aware of the fact that, there has been a great deal of talk, over the intervening two years, and there has been very little, in the way of direct steps taken, to materially impact some of the findings in Dr. Bridges' report. That is one thing, one step, that, I think, has great potential for us, locally, and because it is broadbased, and representative of just about all of the decisionmakers, I think, it has a good chance to result in some significant impacts.

Another piece, that you may have heard about, and that was approved by the county council, here in King County, about a week ago, is a program called, "Reaching Back, Giving Back," is a major community mobilization effort, out of the county's Department of Human Services. And the focus of that program is to provide an alternative to detention, primarily, at this point, for African American youth, who are presented for admission to detention, and who are being detained, for a couple of reasons, that Dr. Bridges' report points out. Primarily, there is nobody to accept responsibility for them, in the community, and assure they come back, for court hearings. And this program is proposed, to create a corps, of mentors, and volunteers, with active supervision, operating in

conjunction with our department, and others, who will monitor, and support, and help assure that kids show up for their court hearings, and monitor them, while they are in the community. I think the target date for that program, right now, to come on line, is, November, of 1995, and they are anticipating starting out with five kids a week, building to a caseload, an ongoing caseload, of around 90.

To give you some idea of what the impact of this, and why this, we are excited about this kind of an idea, is that, currently, 50 percent of the kids, who are presented, and detained, at our facility, have a warrant, associated with their presentation, which means that, even if the referral, that they are being presented on, might not be one that they ordinarily would be detained on, the warrant requires their detention. Those warrants are primarily related to failure to appear. They have not shown up for a court hearing, and, as a result, a warrant has been issued. And so, that is a big, big problem, that has impacted minority populations, significantly, and we are hoping this is a first step, to begin to deal with that.

In conjunction with that, the county
executive and county council funded some additional
resources, to the superior court, this year, added one

and a half judges, and some support staff, all to a goal, that the court has implemented, and that is, to cut down on the amount of time, from the filing of an initial charge, until the case is disposed of. accomplishing that, will impact two factors. Obviously, if it takes less time to move through court, those kids that are in detention will stay there, less time. Another piece of it, and probably the most significant impact, is that, if you reduce the number of court hearings, and shorten the amount of time, you reduce the opportunity for a kid to fail to appear, for court, and fail to participate in proceedings, thus reducing the numbers of warrants. You just make the whole system more efficient. Again, because warrant affect minority populations to a greater extent than nonminority, we are hoping that that will have a significant impact on what we are doing, as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There have been a number of intermediary steps, taken, and I can recount some of those, briefly, because, I think, part of what happens, is that, it is the big, flashy stuff, that gets a lot of attention, and the small, incremental steps, that are taken by departments, to address some of these issues, often get lost. And so, I just want to briefly capture some of those.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the area of training, which has been identified as a major issue, in addressing some of the issues that Dr. Bridges has identified, we have run all of our probation staff through training, on sensitivity, cultural diversity, and related kinds of subjects. We had a special workshop, a year ago, on working with Southeast Asian client populations. I want to talk about them, in a little more detail, in a little bit. Also, Spanish immersion training, for a large number of our staff, in order to deal with both language and cultural issues, displayed in the Hispanic The whole department, I think we may have population. mentioned this, last year, but our entire department, 300 staff, went through a cultural change process, three-day workshops for everyone, where we sat down, and reidentified how best to try and target working with minority populations, as well as other issues, in terms of how the organization did its job. We have ongoing diversity training, scheduled, again, for this year, to pick up the rest of our staff, and we are hoping that that will have, perhaps, some impact.

Information is the second category, that has a big role, in this. One of the most difficult pieces that, I think, the court has to try and resolve, is, how best to communicate all of its processes to the

people who are subject to them. We have, in the course of the past year, translated most of our initial information into six primary languages. Most of those are Southeast Asian, but we also have a couple of Central European languages, that have been translated, as well.

We have reorganized our diversion project, which was the focus of many of the concerns, raised in Dr. Bridges' report, so that, we have combined it, and restructured it, so that, the staff, in that program, can spend more time, trying to contact, and monitor, to make sure that the kids show up for their diversion appointments. Failure to appear for diversion appointments, in the community, is a significant cause of warrants being issued for arrests, subsequently, and the charges that are going to the conference committees, in the community, are generally, charges that do not result in detention time, if they were found guilty, in court.

So, you have got relatively low level kinds for charges. You have a process, that, maybe, does not communicate, or does not make the extra effort, to make sure that people get there, and the end result is warrants, that then result in detention, result in court hearings, and ongoing issues. So that was a

major piece. We have achieved some success, in that, the impacts of that program, I think, are going to be significant.

We have obviously contracted with a variety of interpreters. We have done a contract with the Red Cross, to access their language bank. More recently, our department is pursuing an initiative, where AT & T has available a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week, translator service, that we can access, by telephone, on any occasion, and they have access to any translation services that we would need, which, I think, is going to deal with all of that.

We found one interesting thing, in terms of, notice to people, particularly with people who, the parents are non-English speaking. The letters that were sent out, advising kids that a court date had been set, went to the kid. The kid speaks English, and reads it, intercepts it. The parents do not know there is a hearing, and fails to tell them. He does not show. And, the next thing, we have got this cycle going, again.

So we have changed our process, and we now send a letter, to the parents. We send a letter, to the kid. The letters to the parents include, translation notes, that say, that, they do not

translate the entire document, but they are a flag, that says, "There is material, here, you need to be aware of, and please contact us, or find somebody to translate this, for you." Either way, we will try to facilitate that.

We have a couple of things, in the works, as well. Our department has been using, our staff, actually, who are on light duty assignment, we are using those, to track warrants, and to track cases where kids fail to appear, before a warrant is issued, and try to bring them back in, and avoid the issuance of a warrant. And we have been successful, in that, as well. I think there is been a significant impact on how that will ultimately impact proportionality.

We have one other item, that is major, and that, sometimes, gets lost in this, and that is, this kind of technical, complicated issue. I will try to explain, briefly. It is, under the standard range sentencing format, adopted by the legislature. There, I think you are familiar with the fact, that there is, offenses, in age, and prior history, generate points. Those points, then, are converted into a sentence, and 110 points, or more, result in a period of incarceration in a state institution, if you are found guilty.

There is an option, that is presented, on 1 that grid, called an "Option B." Commitment is Option 2 Option B provides that the court can find, that, 3 there are reasons for not imposing the institutional 4 sentence, and maintain the youth in the community, on 5 6 supervision, up to a year, order detention, for up to 7 30 days, and impose other kinds of consequences. 8 County has, for some time, and continues to, lead the rest of the state, in terms of, the numbers of youth, 9 on Option B sentences, who are of color. Approximately 10 11 60 percent of the number of youth on those programs are minority youth, who would otherwise have been committed 12 to a state institution, for a period of time. 13 that, that, probably, in and of itself, is one of the 14 larger factors, impacting institutional 15 disproportionality. Had all those moved on the 16 17 numbers, and the state institutions would be 18 significantly greater, and the disproportionality, 19 there, would be representatively higher.

I think, with those, those are some of the things that have happened, in our community, ongoing.

I would, I have brought, today, hot off the presses, yesterday, we got a computer report, and one of things, I think, that people frequently want to know, is, information with regard to the kinds of offenses, the

20

21

22

23

24

25

reasons why people are being detained, how many youth, 1 in detention facilities, are of different ethnic 2 3 groups, and some of that kind of information. got, I will pass this out, now, for you, and I might 4 5 spend a minute or two, kind of walking through it, with you, explaining it. And then, you can respond to any 6 7 questions. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: 8 While those are going out, Mr. Carlson, you mentioned the creation of the 9 10 juvenile disproportionality committee? MR. CARLSON: Yes. 11 12

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Is this specifically for King County, or is that for the whole state?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARLSON: It is, this one, the legislature mandated, last year, that every regional law, safety and justice committee, in the state, recreate a committee, subcommittee, on disproportionality, and mandated further that they report, in September, of each year, on progress, in addressing the issue. That is a specific criteria, the ones I have mentioned, earlier, that we have to report them.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And how many regions are going to be in the state --

MR. CARLSON: It was basically by county, so,

50 yes, yes. I believe, in some of the smaller areas, the 1 regional councils, in some of the smaller counties, and 2 the state may have combined them, in a joint committee. 3 But, basically, there is one, for the entire state. 4 The state is represented --5 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And who would do the 6 follow-up, for those committees, do you know? 7 8 MR. CARLSON: I am sorry? CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Who would make sure 9

that they were happening, they were actually being formed?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CARLSON: The juvenile court administrator, and the regional, the chair of the regional law, safety and justice committee, the local committee, are charged with that responsibility.

> CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We --

MR. CARLSON: Okay. Briefly, by way of explanation, if you look at the first page, called "Detention Statistics, Summary Report for 1994 Detentions," the first thing, go up to the very bottom, you will get a sense. This is, what this is, is, a summary, of the youth detained, in the King County detention facility, during 1994, and the data that is broken from this, is based on that population. down at the bottom, you will see the percentages, for

the different ethnic groups, in detention, and how they are represented. I believe that first column, Asian, Dave Akimoto is going to be meeting with this committee, I think, later today, talking, and in more detail.

I would make a comment, on this, and this is one of the factors of having been with the department for a thousand years. I can recall a period of time, probably ten years ago, when, if we run this similar report, the percentage, here, would have been under, well under, 1 percent. It would have been a fraction of 1 percent, Asian, represented in the detention facility. The change in this population, in the last ten years, and particularly in the last five, is significant, is tremendous. It is the single largest increase that we have seen, in that group.

MR. CARLSON: Why do you suppose that is -MR. CARLSON: I think Dave can speak to that,
in more detail, but, in general, I would have to say
that it is due to an immigration, Southeast Asian. We
have got Pacific Islander, Cambodian, Nationalist
Chinese, Thai, groups coming in, following the initial
wave of the Vietnamese immigrants, and that has been a
significant influx, in the last, particularly the last
five, or the last ten.

MR. CARLSON: And when do you think that would have been 1 percent? I am sorry.

MR. CARLSON: I would say, before ten years ago, say, before 1985, you would not seen anything like this. It probably would have been well under 1 percent. And I could go back a little further, there, at times, when you could probably go a year, and you would not have seen an Asian name, in detention. So it is a significant jump.

DR. BROOKS: Excuse me. Are you saying that, then, it is because, there was an increase in the number of immigrants, or the types of immigrants?

MR. CARLSON: I think it is two things, and I think the raw number has increased, yes, due to the influx, the wave of immigration.

The second piece, that goes along with that, and that is, I think that you have to take into account the immigrant experience, and that is, you are moving to a new country. You have first generation immigrants, who do not speak the language. You have second generation kids, being raised in this culture. The conflict, between that, economic issues. You have the whole gamut of issues, that go along with an immigrant population. And I think that contributes, along with the increase in numbers.

DR. BROOKS: Was that not, before, the same? 1 Was that not the same thing, before, we had immigrants, 2 3 before? MR. CARLSON: We have. We have. The raw 4 numbers, as I understand, though, with, particularly, 5 the Vietnamese population, that came, in the 6 mid-Seventies, mid to late Seventies, were smaller, in 7 number, than what has occurred, in the course of the 8 last ten years. That is, I am sorry? 9 10 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We have people from the community, here, later. They will --11 MR. CARLSON: I think so. 12 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- statistical 13 information on that. 14 I think so. 15 MR. CARLSON: The only other things, that might, I will 16 17 just point out, and you can take a look at them, as you 18 go on: We have broken out, A offenders, B offenders, C offenders, D offenders, and so on, by gender, by 19 ethnicity, and then, reflected in the far right hand 20 corner, or the far right hand column, as a percentage 21 22 representation of the total population. For your, you are aware of this, I am sure, A 23 24 offenders are homicide, arson -- rate -- serious kinds

of felony offenses. B's are things like, robbery --

25

burglary, with sexual motivation, other kinds of offenses. C's are felony offenses, that include things like auto theft, and possession of crack cocaine, those kinds of things. D's and E's will be offenses, that are malicious mischief, third degree, theft three, theft two, those kinds of offenses, primarily property, with some assault four charges, in there. And then, what we have categorized as X's and Z's, are really not offenses. They are statuses, kids on parole, returning for court hearings, and being held for other jurisdictions, that kind of thing.

We have got that, for both 1994, and 1995.

And then, starting on the third page, we have broken it out, by actual offense. So you will see the same kinds of breakdown, for, starting with murder one, and going — on the last page, to the lower level offenses.

And we have done that, for 1994, as well.

I think, and I will close with this, is that, this is the first piece of information, that we have been working, for quite a while, to try and pull together. We have a whole series of reports, that we hope to have finished, by the end of this month, that are being prepared for the regional disproportionality committee, that will go into greater detail, and give us a little bit more insight, as to, hopefully, why

1	some of the things are
2	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We have a minutes'
3	worth of
4	MR. CARLSON: Sure.
5	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: questions
6	MR. ISRAEL: Mr. Carlson, do you keep any
7	other demographic statistics, regarding these people,
8	besides their gender, and their race, or ethnicity?
9	MR. CARLSON: We keep data on where they are
10	coming from, what part of the county.
11	MR. ISRAEL: Okay.
12	MR. CARLSON: We keep information, by
13	referral source, like which law enforcement agency.
14	And the two, I should say, the two do not always
15	overlap, where they live, and who is arresting them,
16	and sending them to us, are not always the same. We
17	track, by age, as well. And there are a couple of
18	other categories, in there, but those are the primary.
19	MR. ISRAEL: Education? Whether they are in
20	school, or not in school?
21	MR. CARLSON: We do not have that data, in
22	our system.
23	MR. ISRAEL: Whether they speak English, or
24	do not speak English?
25	MR. CARLSON: No. We do not have that.

MR. ISRAEL: Family demographics, family income, one parent, two parent, no parent?

MR. CARLSON: That information is in the hard files, but it is not in the computer system.

MR. ISRAEL: So there is no other way to correlate this? This is basically a presentation of data, which, it is just a presentation of data, in terms of an analysis? There is no way to correlate it with other demographic characteristics?

MR. CARLSON: There has been no analysis of this data. It is raw, at this point, and one of our jobs, for the next, through the balance of this year, for sure, is to try and analyze it, and associate it, also, correlate it, to those other things.

MR. ISRAEL: Other than anecdotal evidence, such as your comment, which strikes me as being valid, that is your comment about immigration, and the effect of immigration on these statistics, do you have any insights, as to whether you think that the offenders are disproportionately people who are not in school, or have dropped out of school, and disproportionately come from families with no parents, or one parent, as distinguished from two parents, disproportionately come from low income, rather than high income, families, in any sense?

MR. CARLSON: I can give you my sense of that, and I think that, that, to some extent, the information that Dr. Bridges will present, touches on the relationship of those issues. The short answer, "Yes." All of those things, historically, it is no big secret, as to what the causes of this kind of offense behavior, is, it is economic issues, it is parental guidance and support, and it is access to education, and other things. All of those are at the root of it. And, unfortunately, what we end up with, is, our average age, in detention, is around fifteen, and dropping, a little bit, right now, from what it used to be.

But, by the time they are with us, those factors have done their work, the lack of those things have done their work.

MR. CARLSON: Mr. Carlson? Two quick questions. Mr. Carlson, do these ethnic statistics bring out, and mirror, the adult offenders, as well, or are there some significant differences, between youthful offenders, versus adults?

MR. CARLSON: That is a really good question. You know, you are the first person who has ever asked that question, and I do not know why it has not been asked, or thought of, before.

I cannot answer it. My gut feeling, is that, probably, you are going to find that it does not, and I base that, simply, on this: that the gang activity occurring, particularly within the Asian immigrant population, is probably driving some of these numbers, and I do not know that it is there, for the adult population, yet.

MR. CARLSON: And the second question I have, is, you have a proportion of roughly 80/20, or 82/18, male to female. Has that changed, in the last ten years?

MR. CARLSON: Yes. It has gone up, a bit, for females. In past years, I think we used to figure in about 10 percent of the population, would be female. And, again, over the years, the kinds of offenses that females are committing has changed. It used to be self-destructive, kid, females, on what you might call, what we used to call, at that time. Anyway, prostitution. Runaway. Not runaway, so much, but the kinds of things that were aimed at themselves. Now, they are coming out, in aggressive, directed kinds of offenses, that, frequently, are against other people.

MR. CARLSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: The last question?

DR. BROOKS: I have --

The last one -- looking at the African

American percentage, is that up and down, relative

to -- was it higher, let us say -- ten years ago, five

years ago?

MR. CARLSON: I do not have the ten-year data, but I will give you my impression: it is up.

Not, I do not think, percentagewise, as much as the increase in the Asian, but my -- the African American population has always been represented, as far as I can recall, in detention. I am thinking, that, ten, fifteen years ago, you would have expected to see around 25 to 30 percent of the population, African American. Now, we are seeing, it pushes, bounces back and forth, between 35 and 40 percent. It goes over 40, occasionally. So, yes. That is an increase.

DR. BROOKS: Something I did not understand. You talked about the fact that you did not have resources, to do certain things, and I did not understand whether that was coming from a recommendation, or a report, or whether that was something the legislature had mandated that you do.

MR. CARLSON: I am not sure that I even recall that.

DR. BROOKS: Apparently, you have been talking about, not being able to respond to certain

things, that occurred. You knew that there were problems, but you could not respond to them. And I was just saying, if they were unfunded mandates, how could you ignore the fact, even though you do not have resources, because, that has been something that the legislature has imposed upon us, for a numbers of years.

MR. CARLSON: Yes.

DR. BROOKS: And it seemed as though we should, somehow, be providing the resources, to cover those unfunded mandates.

MR. CARLSON: Yes. I am struggling with the context of my comments, but --

DR. BROOKS: -- so, and the third one, was, too, you commented on the fact, that you were doing diversity training.

MR. CARLSON: Yes.

DR. BROOKS: And you have done a good job of making sure that your staff is exposed to it. Is that included somewhere in their performance evaluations, to see how they perform, now that they have gotten this? Because I do not see where it would do much good, to just give them the exposure to the training, if you are not going to hold them responsible for responding to the training.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

MR. CARLSON: A quick answer: it is not 1 included in the form, that is used to do the 2 3 performance appraisal. Where it is reflected, however, is the department, I have mentioned, the cultural 4 change process, that was initiated, last year. 5 are standing focus groups, in most of the major 6 sections of the department, right now, and this whole 7 issue of, diversity, and cultural awareness, is a big 8 focus, for the focus groups, and part of what they look 9 10 at, and review, and provide us with suggestions on. 11 is not, it has not yet been incorporated --12 DR. BROOKS: Do you intend to 13 institutionalize it? MR. CARLSON: That is my understanding. 14 The 15

personnel section is revising our performance appraisal forms, this year.

DR. BROOKS: And a final one, is that, you talked about the fact that we have language problems, in certain groups, and the parents therefore have not notified, are not aware, of certain --

Is illiteracy counted as a --

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It certainly is, if we are MR. CARLSON: aware of it. It is more difficult for us to know, on some of the initial contacts, because, for the most part, until the family is engaged, through a couple of hearings, the contacts that have been going out, are primarily going out, by mail. And there is very little personal contact occurring. So that, we may not know that there is a literacy problem, until we get further down the road, with it. It is very possible that people are not responding, and showing for court hearings, are not participating in it, because they do not, are not able to read.

DR. BROOKS: Is that -- in any way? Has that changed, the results, the, maybe, the reasons why they did not appear? Is it?

MR. CARLSON: If they are aware of it. Yes. It is taken into account.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Carlson, I just have one question. It is a programmatic question, regarding your alternative detention. Is that kind of a volunteer community program, or how is that funded?

MR. CARLSON: Yes. The program we are talking about, is actually occurring, within another county department, who is working with us. It is funded by county current expense dollars, straight out of the general fund, for the county, and it will be, the dollars that are there will be, used, to contract with a community organization, to develop a cadre of volunteers, mentors, to work with, in the juvenile

1	court setting, and make contact with kids who are
2	appearing before the court, and who, the court feels,
3	"I would not be taking this kid, if I had somebody, who
4	would step forward, and say, they would assure that
5	they would show up, for the next hearing." And that is
6	kind of what the focus is.
7	MR. MARTIN: Is that on a long-term basis, or
8	are they getting paid for that, or?
9	MR. CARLSON: No. They will be volunteers.
10	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Mr. Carlson, thank
11	you, very much.
12	MR. CARLSON: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you for taking
14	the time to be here, and giving the Committee your
15	work to address this issue of disproportionality in
16	the juvenile justice system. Thank you, very much.
17	Okay. Before we take a break, we have Dr.
18	Bridges with us, so, Dr. Bridges, if you would head up,
19	this direction?
20	DR. BRIDGES: I have got a slide presentation
21	that I would like to show, that might summarize some of
22	the ideas of where we are, in the state, right now.
23	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: The screen is behind
24	us, here, so, either can you read it turn around,

or move over to there? What is your --

25

DR. BRIDGES: Why not stretch your legs, 1 while I am putting this together? 2 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay. 3 DR. BRIDGES: It will only take a minute. 4 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: A short recess. 5 (Whereupon a short recess was taken.) 6 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay. 7 reconvene, please, and, Dr. Bridges, if you would 8 introduce yourself, and explain a little bit of why 9 your expertise, that brings you here, and the 10 background, that brings you here? And, are you going 11 to be standing? 12 13 DR. BRIDGES: I will stand, close to the mike. 14 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: 15 Okay. DR. BRIDGES: I think my slide projector just 16 lost its illumination bulb, and we may have to change 17 18 that, if you have got a spare. Let us see if it works. 19 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: There it is. 20 DR. BRIDGES: Good! It is working. 21 My name is George Bridges. I am professor in 22 sociology, at the University of Washington, and I feel 23 lucky to be here, to present, before the Committee, and 24 talk about these issues. This is a presentation that

overviews some of the concerns about

25

disproportionality. I will confess to you, I gave this, once before, to the legislature, and was told it was too academic, and I will try to remove the academic components of it, even though, I think it offers a useful description of where the -- is, and how and where it will go.

I have noticed a number of very, very prominent spokespersons, that you will have, covering this issue, today, and I hope this might serve as a baseline of information. I will make available to the Committee a hard copy of all the slides that I present, today, so that, you can have them, for any materials that you put together, on this issue.

Four questions: What is disproportionality? What causes disproportionality? What is being done about it, in the state? And, what additionally is needed, to reduce disproportionality?

I will not focus much, on the first. I think you pretty much know what the issue is about. But I think it is important, in considering the scope of the issue, to look at causes, because this issue cannot be reduced to simple explanations, like racism, or the fact that minorities are the only people, committing crimes. Both of those are far to simplistic. And so, we need to look at a more complex explanation, in order

to consider possible remedies.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let us go past the "What is disproportionality?" issue, because I think you know what it is. The term I use, just for the sake of this presentation, means, overrepresentation, given general numbers of the population. I was very pleased to see Mr. Carlson, Dick Carlson, here, make a presentation, on King County's new information system. information system was not in existence, when we did our original study, and, boy, I wish we had access to it, because we did look at the hard files, that were asked about, that do contain information on the family background characteristics of children, and how those play, in this very important subject. unfortunate that that information is readily accessible, in the automated system file, but we are pleased that they are, King County is, doing everything they can, to update and upgrade the quality of the information.

Disproportionality really has four causes.

Let me go through each of them, sequentially. If we begin with the idea that overrepresentation of minority children, in the courts, is a matter of concern, that, in and of itself, needs to be explained, we can think of around four major categories of factors, that

contribute to it.

The first, of course, is minority involvement in crime, that children of color come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Difficult living circumstances, is a problem that we all recognize, and clearly, it contributes to the fact, that, many more children of color, relative to the numbers of the general population, and whites, are arrested for crimes they have committed. And they do commit more crimes. And so, that is certainly one factor that is going to contribute to the overrepresentation.

It is not making any statement about, why they committed those crimes, or why they are involved. We know that they are involved, particularly in some forms of assaultive acts.

The question is, how much does that contribute to disproportionality, relative to three other causes? Let me go through those three other causes. And this general model is fairly well-recognized, in the research literature, on this subject. About 20 states across the nation have looked at this problem, and the findings are very consistent, across states.

Second: Prejudicial treatment of minorities by officials in the juvenile justice system, and law

enforcement agencies. Certainly, we know that all of us hold, to a greater or lesser extent, certain prejudicial attitudes about certain groups, and the extent to which those attitudes may translate into differential treatment of groups, by officials, is a problem, and a concern, that must also contribute to disproportionality. The question, of course, is, how much? How much of the overrepresentation in any stage of the juvenile justice system is the result of the prejudicial treatment, of minorities, by officials?

б

The third factor is, what I would call,
"inadvertent biases in court rules and policies."

Courts, as you well know, are guided by rules, some
formal, some less formal, that dictate, what happens to
children, as they progress through the court system.

For example, judges are given criteria, upon which they
must detain children, in the detention facilities that
persons like Mr. Carlson have described. Generally,
the law establishes three general factors, that they
must consider, but judges, themselves, must decide how
to interpret those factors.

Is the child a risk to the community? Is the child a risk or him or herself? Is the child likely to flee?

Those are fairly abstract, and every

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

individual judge has his or her own cues that they look for, in a child, to determine whether a child represents a risk. Some look at how they are doing, in school. Some look at their behavior, in court. And, to the extent that those rules, or informal policies and practices, that judges or other officials may use, to screen children, are inadvertently biased against minorities, then that will also contribute to racial disproportion.

For example, in King County, the disproportionality working group, that Mr. Carlson mentioned, which is a very active group, and very committed to doing something about these concerns, the judges sitting on the groups, quite certainly, said, "Well, the children, we detain, typically, when we do not have other information, the children were not doing well, in school, because we know, that, if a child is not doing well, in school, they are at potentially higher risk of committing crimes."

Well, to the extent that minority generally do not do as well, in school, perhaps because of problems, at home, or problems, in the schools, themselves, or interacting with teachers, they are at risk of being detained, simply because the judges, in King County, have adopted, in the past, that policy.

Now, in fairness to the judges, they are reassessing those kinds of screening criteria, because they recognize they are inadvertently and unintentionally working against children of color in the decisions they make. Inadvertent biases in court rules and policies.

And the fourth, is, inadvertent biases, in informal rules, informal practices. Certainly, while courts may have specific rules, governing who is screened, into detention, who is not screened, into detention, they may also have practices, like those that Mr. Carlson talked about, where children who have warrants out, for their arrest, are immediately brought in, and detained. To the extent that that informal practice of detaining children, with prior warrants, works to the disadvantage of kids of color, because they may not have stable homes, they may not get correspondence, or their parents may not understand the correspondence, that, too, will contribute to overrepresentation of kids of color, in the juvenile justice system

Now, in the research that we have done, we tend to think of minority involvement in crime, children of color are more heavily represented in crime, than they deserve to be, in juvenile court, and we define that as warranted disproportionality,

disproportionality that is explained by excessive commission of crimes. Most of the research across the nation, and in this state, suggest that, of all the racial disproportionality that you observe in the court, overrepresentation of kids of color, somewhere between 40 and 50 percent of it is explained by more heavy involvement in crime. So, a significant chunk of it is attributable to differential involvement: committing more crimes, getting more punishments.

There is that other 50 percent, though, and that other 50 percent is the percent, or 60 percent, that is some cause for concern. It is a cause for concern, because it means, that, the system is responding, whether it is motivated or not, intended or not, to minority children, differently than whites.

And that is a subject of great concern, for two reasons. One, it involves our children, and we, I think, as a society, need to be very concerned about our children, given the problems they are experiencing, given the increase in violence by those children; and also, it is a matter of justice. This is a legal system. This is a system of rules, and polices, that is designed to impose punishments. If that system is not imposing punishments — regardless of how serious the punishments, or severe the punishments, should

be -- if it is not imposing those rules, and those punishments, fairly, then we, as a society, have a problem. Punishments cannot deter, they cannot prevent, if the punishments are not imposed, effectively, and fairly.

So this is our model of racial disproportionality, and these are the factors that cause it. In terms of the next question, what is being done about disproportionality in the state, let me just give you an overview, because you will be hearing from people, from different counties.

Since the 1993 spending was completed, there has been a great of work that has been done, some of it more effective than others, at trying to remedy this problem, but I must underscore the fact that, this is not a simple problem, and good intentions goes a long way, but knowledge is limited on what works. And I will venture to say that, in talking with people, in other states, we are far and above further along, than almost any other state in the country. And I see that something that is quite a strong benefit, to our state.

What is being done, in the counties? Well, there are a number of programs, and let me just give you an overview of the programs that have been implemented, across the counties. Just a summary.

Of the counties, in Washington State, that are attempting to redress this problem, 28 of Washington's 39 counties are employing some form of diversity training. Diversity training takes various forms, in different counties, but a systematic number of counties are pursuing diversity training. I pretty much see diversity training, as a beginning point. certainly is not an end point, in dealing with some of the problems of children of color. But here is an illustration, that, I think, drives home the complexity of this problem.

When you have, in some eastern Washington counties, like Yakima, or Franklin counties, an increasingly large Hispanic population, and virtually no, or very few, court staff, that speak Spanish, or are Spanish, Hispanic origin, there is a communication problem, there, and that communication problem can create significant interaction difficulties, for court officials.

So, diversity training, in that context, is very important. Until then, the mix of the -represents more the mix of the population. Diversity training is a beginning step, for efforts to deal with some of these difficult problems, raised by a dramatic influx in minority population, and also, some of the

social and economic problems they have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Information. About 19, almost 20 counties, are, routinely, now, collecting information, on the problems of children of color, and analyzing it. The kind of information that we saw Mr. Carlson present, here, is, what many towns are trying to do, to figure out where the problem lies, and what they can do about it.

Many other counties are also, but not all of them, and this is a source of concern, giving to the court, to parents, or shows and informational materials on how the court works. My personal view, is, it is a little disappointing that only 19 of the 39 counties have informational brochures, that are in different languages. Now, in all fairness, in some of the counties, there is no diversity in the population. They are all white, and they all speak English, and language problems are not prominent. There are counties, though, that have increasingly large Hispanic population, and have no informational brochures, in Spanish. And, hopefully, with the efforts of Mr. Michael Curtis, and the administrator of the courts, that problem will be resolved, within this next year. But, in a recent trip, for example -- Yakima -- as part of an ongoing study, you walk in the front door of the

juvenile court, and you see almost all the parents, and the children, in the court, are Latino, and you see no informational materials, in Spanish, knowing fully well that most of the parents do not speak English. That is a problem that needs to be remedied.

In terms of research, 16 of the counties have a staff person, who is looking at what the causes of disproportionality are, and how those problems can be remedied.

Staff diversity is a fourth category, and it is the extent to which courts are increasingly making their staffs racially more diverse. I think that is another important step. Only 7 of the 39 counties are doing that, but, in fairness to those counties, it is because very few counties are in a hiring mode, right now. The budgets simply do not permit that: The only counties that are, have pursued the minority staff -- Pierce County, for example, has done a very effective job. King County has a fairly diverse staff, and Yakima County is increasing, with its new detention facilities, its staff diversity, as well.

Some other things that counties are doing alternatives to detention. Some counties, six of them, are trying to find different ways of dealing with children. King County's reaching back/giving back

program is a model, that is being adopted, across the state, albeit in smaller amounts, to try and find ways of keeping children of color out of detention facilities.

Why do we want to do that? Well, the typical crime, in juvenile court, let us be very clear about this, is not assault. It is not murder. It is not robbery. It is shoplifting.

There are 30 to 40,000 children, referred through the juvenile court, in the state, every year. A lot of kids, a lot of referrals, with typical offenses, relatively -- and my words, here, not the court's -- trivial. And so, we are not talking about serious criminal offenders, in most counties, in detention populations. In fairness to those counties, we have seen dramatic increases in youth violence, and I would not contest that, that assertion. But, in terms of detention, there are children in detention, that may not need to be in detention, because they do not represent a significant to the community. Some counties are trying to pursue that, with them, by trying -- and other supervised ways of -- out of detention.

There is a reason for doing that, and the reason is, children, in detention, are less capable, of

preparing, in effect, a legal defense, when they are detained, and when they are not.

Most courts rely on volunteers. Volunteers play a critical role in the court system. And so, you find 12 out of 39 counties developing programs, to sensitize their volunteers, to diversity issues, or to hire a diverse set of volunteers.

Fifth: Diagnostics. Some courts developing new diagnostic procedures for screening children, in and out of steps like diversion, and other programs, are designed to address this. So things are happening, in this state, with respect to disproportionality.

It is a slow, steady process, because, in part, there are no real concrete solutions, that lend themselves to quick fixes. Diversity training, are immediate steps, and some of the others that I have mentioned, are, immediate steps that counties are taking, but, clearly, those effects will not be seen, for a number of years, in terms of, this specific problem.

Let me -- now, about, where our measures are taking us. There are measures that are trying to address minority involvement in crime. The state, every year, you may or may not know this, gives the counties, excuse me, every biannum, approximately

\$20 million, to address the problems of juvenile crime, at risk youth. Those funds are directed to counties, to develop programs, in helping children who are at risk of committing crimes, to prevent them from committing crimes.

So the state is doing something about minority involvement, in crime. Whether \$20 million is enough, it is not my position to say. That is clearly what the legislature has committed, and that is where those resources are going.

Diversity training, and a number of the measures that we have seen, are trying to deal with potential prejudicial treatment of minorities, by court staff.

In fairness to court staff, I will also say that, we have, I have, interviewed hundreds; of people, over the last five years, in the courts, and police departments, that some of you have, and I have not met a person, yet, that I have talked to, that hates persons of color. And so, the kinds of prejudicial practices, that we might see, in this court, are not the egregious acts of racism, that might some allege. The problems are far more complicated than that. It is, subtle differences in treatment, that contribute to the problems of disproportionality.

I think, over the long haul, two factors will shape attitudes about minorities. One, brute force of demographic change. Our state, like many other states, is undergoing a demographic upheaval. Within the next 30 years, whites will be the racial and ethnic minorities, in this state. We will be in a state predominantly comprised of Hispanics, Asians, blacks, and whites. That is going to change attitudes, no matter what. It will take time. The demographic changes will contribute to that. And these kinds of programs will help sensitize us to some of the differences that, perhaps, some of us may not have had exposure to.

made, are what I will call, the inadvertent biases in the court rules and policies, and in informal rules and practices. So, if there is additional work, that needs to be done, by the legislature, or perhaps in conjunction with this committee, it is, how can these rules and practices of courts be made more racially neutral? And there are ways in which that can be done. An illustration might help.

In 1977, on this date -- took a very, very bold move, in juvenile court. It was one of the first states, and only states, to enact presumptive

sentencing, for juveniles. Big sentences, tailored to fit the child, but primarily, the crime. You commit this crime, you serve this time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Most states do not have that model. Why is that a good model? Well, in terms of disproportionality, it is a good model, because this state is one of the only states that has found very few race differences, at sentencing. The result of sentencing model, strict penalties, for the commission of crimes, has almost eliminated race differences in the treatment of children, at sentencing, in this state. If you look at research, in other states, that have a more flexible social service model, or social work model, of sentencing, they have pronounced racial differences. So one of the unintended effects, of the 1977 law, the presumptive sentencing of juveniles, was, to eliminate, in effect, discretion, on the part of judges, that led to pronounced racial disparities.

There is, however, discretion in other stages of the juvenile justice system, and one can reason, that, perhaps, greater structure in that discretion might reduce some of the disproportionality that we see, there.

Fine. Let us go on.

What do we know about what has happened,

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

since 1991, and 1990? And I will say, at the time these slides were made, we did not have 1994 juvenile arrest data, but, basically, and I can comment on what the data suggest, with the exception of 1992, it was an odd year, and the number of counties that contributed to these data, we see, certainly, in 1993, and more, in 1994, an increasing concentration of minority children, who were arrested. So, as we look at the volume, and kinds of cases, that come up before the juvenile court, over the last four years, and I am appending, and adding, 1994 data, here, is that, there is an increasing concentration of children of color in arrest data. That leads to a slight, but increasing, concentration of juvenile referrals.

Now, these data do not include King County, but the trends are basically the sam. Between 1991 and 1994, the overall concentration of children of color, with the exception of 1994 -- 1994 is a projected number, not an actual number, my bet is, the actual number will be a little higher, on the blue bar, if you will -- an increasing concentration of children of color, coming to the juvenile court.

So, we see higher concentration of children of color, being arrested. We see higher concentration of children of color, referred. Referral

is the process by which someone comes to court. It includes arrests, and other ways by which children come to court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What has been beneficial, is, at the same time, we see increased concentration of juvenile diversions, minority children, and diversion. Well, what does this mean? I think the measures, that I described, before, by courts, is to try and do something about this problem of disproportionality as Diversion is the process reflected in this number. whereby children, whether they are black, white, or of any race, are given a second chance. They are not prosecuted, for their minor offenses, or their firsttime offenses. They are basically told, and asked to sign an agreement, that says, "You made a mistake. you do this, again, I will prosecute you. This time, we will just watch you, if you agree not to commit any additional crimes."

What is encouraging about this statistics, with respect to disproportionality, is, a much larger, and we are talking percentage points, here, but that translates into many hundreds of children, of color, are now being diverted, whereas, before the 1993 study, that you read, you were not. I think an increasing sensitivity to the possibility that these children can

be given a second chance, is resulting, in terms of overall impacts, on disproportionality, at additional stages of the process, I think the benefits will be seen, over the next three to five years.

Having said that, though, we still have an increase in concentration, among those kids prosecuted. Children of color are prosecuted, at higher rates, than white children, even after you adjust for differences in the severity of the crimes, the backgrounds of children, and other factors that might contribute to prosecution decisions. We are not sure why that has happened. We have some ideas about it, and indeed, when I talk with the prosecutors, across the state, they have given a variety of, I think, very compelling explanations. Nevertheless, we find, that, legally relevant factors do not explain why minority children are prosecuted, at higher rates than white.

To give you an illustration, and we will close, on that, and maybe take some questions, because I am sure you must have them, and I am sure that there are issues, here, that you are concerned about.

Let us compare two counties. These are 1991 data, but the same kinds of facts can be exhibited in more current data. And I am comparing two counties, King County, and another urban county, in Washington

State, that will go unnamed. Here is what we are comparing, and I can do this, by means of a more — but, basically, what we are doing, is, we are saying, if children have identical crimes, identical criminal histories, and pretty much identical backgrounds, what is the likelihood that they will be prosecuted for a crime?

In King County, you see, on average,

9 percent of white children, are prosecuted, whereas,

19 percent of identical children, identical, in the

sense of crime and criminal history, and other legally

relevant factors, are prosecuted. It is a difference

of 10 percent. Actually, it is a difference,

10 percent is the absolute difference, but they are

prosecuted, at a higher rate.

Now, if you take another urban county, in Washington State, and you find that, whereas 20 percent of whites, in that county, are prosecuted, nearly 50 percent of minorities, in the county, are prosecuted. What is the difference, between the two counties?

Well, one of the major differences, is, King County has prosecution guidelines, guidelines that structure the discretion of prosecutors, and how they make their decisions.

-- to his great credit, has established very strict rules by which his prosecutors operate, and how they make decisions, who they decide to charge with the crime, and who decide not to charge with the crime.

The other urban county does not have guidelines. One can reasonably argue, that, part of the difference between these counties, in terms of the overall magnitude, of race difference, is, the absence of prosecution guidelines, in the urban county.

This gets at that issue of informal rules and practices. By establishing internal rules, procedures governing who gets prosecuted, and why, we can reduce some of the disproportionality and overall levels of prosecution, and that is why Judge Huggins' committee recommended to the legislature, in 1994, that the state adopt prosecution guidelines, statewide, so that, we can attempt to tackle this very complicated problem.

I do not see prosection guidelines as a panacea. It will not eliminate the problem. But it is a small step, and, perhaps, attempting to address some of those issues.

Yes?

MR. CARLSON: George, which one of those counties do you think will have a higher juvenile crime rate?

DR. BRIDGES: They are very similar. 1 2 similar. Follow-up? The same number of crimes MR. CARLSON: 3 committed, by having such a high declining rate of 4 5 prosecution? DR. BRIDGES: I am not following you, John. 6 7 Help me out. MR. CARLSON: Well, it seems that, my 8 concern, is, the sum total of your recommendations and 9 suggestions, would make the criminal justice system 10 toward juveniles more lenient, than it now is. 11 DR. BRIDGES: Absolutely not. 12 MR. CARLSON: And, well, for instance, you 13 talked about alternatives to detention. 14 DR. BRIDGES: Right. 15 MR. CARLSON: Well, a lot of people, on the 16 17 street, would read that, as, you are less likely to 18 face punishment, for what you do. And there is another 19 kind of disproportion, we have not talked about, today, and that is, the disproportionate categorization of 20 If you are a person of color, you are 21 crime victims. far more likely to be a victim of crime, than if you 22 23 are a Caucasian. If you are in a lower socioeconomic 24 strata, you are more likely to be a victim of crime,

than if you are wealthy. And our main problem, with

25

our juvenile justice system, today, as I see it, is that, as it has grown more permissive, and lenient, since the 1977 juvenile justice reforms, juvenile crime has exploded, and there has been a massive increase in victimization, and, of course, disproportionately, this has affected people of color, people who are poor.

That is the follow-up. That is my concern with your recommendations.

DR. BRIDGES: I think we need to be really clear, here.

Two things. First: We can separate accountability, or punishment, or severity, and punishment, softness or hardness of the juvenile justice system, from fairness. I think we have to separate those issues.

I think, quite clearly, you are absolutely right, on this account. The nature of some juvenile crimes, has changed, dramatically, and horribly, in the last 20 years. I think we agree on that. The rate of juvenile violence has increased. Those crimes must be responded to, with severe accountable penalties.

So, I would argue, that, the penalty structure, the sentences imposed, for certain crimes, may be, or those that are in place, may be inadequate, and that, the penalty structure must change, okay? So

I grant you that.

What I would argue with you, and argue, out of a principle of, right or wrong, right and wrong, is, regardless of the penalty structure, the system must be fair, and it must be fair, for those who are punished. And, to the extent that victims need a voice in that process, they should be granted a voice.

So, I would argue, that, in fact, we are must separate the severity, and certainty, of punishments, from whether the system is fair.

I do not think anyone, in this group, would want a system of punishment, that is arbitrary or capricious. You certainly could not be arguing for that.

What I think the public wants, is, when someone commits a crime, that that person is punished.

Now, the dilemma we have, though, is, in the current system, setting aside the issue of punishment and severity, one of the study findings, was that, white kids get their cases dismissed, more than black kids. The judges or prosecutors just drop them.

Now, the question is, why? Why is that a crime? That is a separate question. But, if that is caused by any of the four factors, apart from the severity of crimes, established, that I reported,

earlier, then I think we, as a society, have propagated a system of justice that is inherently unfair.

Let me make one more comment.

MR. CARLSON: Okay. Okay.

DR. BRIDGES: One more comment. I think you are making a serious mistake, by assuming, that the cause of the increase in crime, and violence, in our state, and in our society, is a failure of the juvenile justice system. That is a mistake, and it is wrong.

And here is why I think it is wrong.

What we know, is, Washington State, as compared to many other states, has probably one of the clearest, firmest, and most severe sets of penalties, for juveniles, than any other state.

Now --

MR. CARLSON: No.

DR. BRIDGES: -- is this? Let me finish.

Let me finish. We have presumptive sentencing. How many other states have that? Very few. Very few.

That is the beginning, and what I would argue, is, that, how could anyone reasonably argue, that the cause of crime, is a failed justice system? I do not think it is failed. I think it is not as effective as it could be, but to say that it is the sole cause of crime, is myopic.

б

DR. BRIDGES: Two things.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I want to ask, give everybody a chance, so that we can keep fairness, so that everybody has a chance to ask questions. We only have about five more, five or ten minutes of questions, from Professor Bridges. So, does anyone else on the Committee?

DR. BROOKS: I have --

The noticed that you had disproportionality, of the prosecution, and there was no disproportionality of the rest, by the offices. Did you look at that?

Because, sometimes, it is the cause of these arrests, that leads to prosecution.

DR. BRIDGES: We were not able to collect data on arrest practices. And so, unfortunately, the information I have, is not useful, to really get at, who gets picked up, and who does not get picked up, relative to their involvement in crime?

That is a significant issue. It is a significant issue, for children of color, because a lot of the kids that we talk to, say that, they are routinely harassed by police.

I have ridden around, in patrol cars, in four major communities, in the state, in the middle of the night, during the day, and I have observed some

practices that I wondered about, but I can honestly say 1 2 to you, I have never seen a law enforcement officer 3 harass a person of color. But there clearly is anecdotal evidence, to suggest that law enforcement is 4 somewhat selective, in the way they go about arresting 5 people, for crime, and that may contribute to this. 6 7 But I do not have any evidence, systematic evidence, that that occurs. And so, I really cannot 8 comment, other than that. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Other questions? 11 MR. ISRAEL: Professor Bridges, of the four 12 factors leading to disproportionality, on your chart, 13 you say that 40 to 50 percent of disproportionality can 14 be attributed to disproportionate involvement in crime. 15 And then, we have three other factors, that, you said, 16 50 to 60 percent. 17 DR. BRIDGES: Yes. 18 MR. ISRAEL: Have you been able to break down 19 those factors, and describe the percentages 20 DR. BRIDGES: No, I have not. And I would be 21 way out of line, if I even tried to quess, for you, today. 22

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

proportion of that 50 to 60 percent is over prejudice,

things, that concerns me -- somehow, is, what

It seems to that one of the

MR. ISRAEL:

23

24

25

as distinguished from, the inadvertent bias? 1 Inadvertent biases, it seems to me, if I can 2 paraphrase, there are court rules, that are formal and 3 informal inadvertent biases, which, on the face of --4 5 racially -- seeking some other criteria, but they tend 6 to have a disproportionate effect. They are a factor, applied, in a racially -- and, the goal that they seek 7 to achieve is a legitimate goal, for example, the one 8 that has been expressed here, on a couple of occasions, 9 if somebody did not appear -- court, then you put out a 10 warrant to arrest them, and if the effect of that, is 11 racially disproportionate, but it is not noticed, so 12 13 what? Good question. 14 DR. BRIDGES: I would say, in

DR. BRIDGES: Good question. I would say, in terms of three factors, those three factors, overt prejudicial treatment of minority children, is a relatively small percentage, of the 50 to 60 percent. I would say, it is not a huge percentage. I would say, it is a small percentage.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, but that is, I cannot give you a number, and that is a personal opinion, based on my discussions, and observations, of many cases, many officials, in many complex.

Now, your "so what?" question, I think it is a legitimate question. This is a legal system. The

juvenile justice system is a legal system. It is a legal system that is designed to be fair, and intended to be fair. Indeed, the 1977 act was established, with the purpose of uniformity and fairness in mind.

Here is the dilemma, and it relates to one of the findings in the study, that, really, that troubles me, personally, and I am a native of this state. I would like to think that I live in a state, where the system of justice is as fair as possible.

Children who are detained -- that means, held, prior to any disposition of their case -- stand a much greater chance of being punished severely for their crimes, than children who are not, independent of the crime, itself, their criminal history, or other background characteristics. The question that this committee must address, is, is that fair? İs just simply being detained a factor that should go into whether someone receives more severe punishments?

One person described it as baggage. If you get detained, you carry baggage with you, to sentencing, and that baggage affects the outcome of the sentencing process.

So, to the extent that detention practices, by court officials, inadvertently affect minority children, in a way that they do not affect whites, will

not only affect the detention. We are affecting the sentencing, and how much time is spent. And that is what is problematic.

MR. ISRAEL: But that is not a question of fairness and disproportionality. That is a question of fairness, for anybody, white or black, who is detained, who has --

DR. BRIDGES: Absolutely.

MR. ISRAEL: So --

DR. BRIDGES: Absolutely.

MR. ISRAEL: If the rule that is being applying, formally, or informally, is not a reasonable rule, it does not achieve any legitimate social goal, then, we ought to be looking at that goal, not because it creates a racially disproportionate result, but because it is unfair to every individual that carries that baggage.

DR. BRIDGES: I agree with you, completely. The only reason that it came to our attention, was that, we were looking at race, and, sure, enough these rules became apparent, as drivers. So, if you were to describe me as a one-issue person, I hope you would not, but if you were, I would be focusing on race, and I would say, "Here are these rules. How do we explain why race differences occur?" And we would say, "It is

these rules." And you are absolutely right. The rules are problematic, and they may disadvantage other groups, just as much, but, to the extent that children of color are going to be more likely to fall into the category of problematic, because of these rules, then they are the ones that are going to be hurt.

It is the rules, then, I would argue, or the informal practices, that might be the focus of change.

Is that addressing your concern?

MR. ISRAEL: Well, to some extent. I guess it is a question, it is a fundamental question, that we all have to ask, whether we are concerned with fairness and justice, among racial groups, or fairness and justice, among individuals. It seems to me that the individual who is detained, whoever that is, if the baggage of being detained --

DR. BRIDGES: Yes.

MR. ISRAEL: -- causes an unfair outcome, unrelated to what they have done, the severity of what they have done -- that is the concern, not whether a particular racial, or ethnic, or sexual, or gender, or other group, as a group, is unfairly treated.

DR. BRIDGES: Only to the extent that the group, as a class, is so disadvantaged, on this characteristic, does it become a group issue. And you

are right. If any individual is harmed, I am not sure that is the right word, here, but, if any individual is placed at a disadvantage, then -- should be concerned about that.

(Discussion was held off-microphone.)

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: No. I am sorry. Not at this stage.

Last question?

MR. CARLSON: Yes. No. Regrettably, I have to go, and I have an appearance I have to give, and wish I could stay here, longer. But I am wondering why it did not occur to you, George, that, maybe, the flaw in the system, is that, it is not strict enough, with young white offenders, rather than being too tough on African Americans.

DR. BRIDGES: It did.

MR. CARLSON: Well, actually, when I saw your alternatives, to reduce disproportionality you were talking about alternatives to incarceration, and home detention, rather than other detention. Maybe the system is just too easy, is too lenient, across the board, and is too lenient, especially on white offenders, rather than African Americans. I have, myself, have never met a police officer, who would agree with your statement, that we have a strict

juvenile justice system. Most officers are tired of seeing young offenders laugh at the juvenile justice system they do not take it seriously.

DR. BRIDGES: I think, what I said, was, strict, compared to other states. It was in comparison. I think I would agree with you. The fact that we give kids second chances, and, until recently, third second chances, or fourth second chances, that is not strict. So, there may have been a communication problem, there. I think, compared to other states, we do have a strict set of sentencing guidelines.

The state has to ask, "What are we going to do about juvenile crime?" And, certainly, one option to racial disproportionality is, to make it fair, by punishing white kids, more.

There becomes a cost issue, and, when we consider what we have put before the legislature, in terms of, any suggestions, the first question was raised, "What is it going to cost?" And, when we increase the penalties, for white kids, who represent a large volume of children that go through the courts, the increased costs become traumatic.

And so, ultimately, the state, people like ourselves, have to decide, "What do we want to pay for it, and how do we pay for it?"

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Do you have any final 2 remarks you would like to make to this group? 3 DR. BRIDGES: No. I just would say, I 4 5 commend you, for examining this issue, and, if I could be of any assistance, please let me know. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay. Thank you for the assistance you have already provided, in terms 8 9 of the study that you have done, and the ongoing work 10 that you are doing, and we thank you, also, for being 11 here, with us, today. 12 DR. BRIDGES: You are welcome. 13 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We appreciate it, very much, Professor. 14 15 DR. BRIDGES: You are welcome. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: If we could have the 16 Committee back up to here, I guess it would be easier. 17 18 VOICE: Thank you. 19 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes. Thank you, very 20 much. 21 And our final, this morning, is a group of 22 witnesses, Woody Verzola, David Akimoto, and Glenda 23 I would like to have you move, to the table, 24 please, and I think we are going to need an extra 25 chair, here.

A fair comment.

1

If I could ask you to introduce yourselves, and to, just briefly, tell us the background that brings you here, this morning, and your area of expertise, I would appreciate that, very much, for the record.

MS. TANNER: My name is Glenda Tanner, and I am the director and founder of -- society, out of Tacoma, Washington. I have been on the governor's advisory committee, with respect to the study that you just heard, from Dr. Bridges, and, also, I have been involved with different community activities, throughout Tacoma, and Seattle, that has anything to do with juvenile youth.

Our program deals with, how do I want to say? We work with youth that are out in the community. We assist in trying to get them gainful employment. We try to find proper housing. We are sort of like a surrogate family to the youth in the community. We encourage them, and work with them, to go to, as an example, a vocational college, and we are really encouraging our youth, in Tacoma, to try and apply for African American college, outside of the State of Washington.

We feel that, if we get them away from around the surroundings that they are in, and they go, and see another lifestyle, of African Americans, down south,

i.e., Morehouse, in Atlanta, Georgia, it would be more

beneficial for them.

MS. VERZOLA: Good morning. My name is -I work with United -- Trust foundations -I-Wa-Sil Youth Program, at the minority juvenile
justice improvement project. I am the project
coordinator. The minority juvenile justice improvement
project works, primarily, with kids who are currently
being held in the Department of Youth center facility
of detention.

The purpose of the program is to provide services for the youth who are in there, and who are there, in there, and also, to work with rehabilitation counselors and defense attorneys, to provide services within the community, in the -- detention time.

The program has been existent, for the past 20 years, and I have been there, for five years, so I believe that I have an insight, of the juvenile justice system, and how it works.

MR. AKIMOTO: Good morning. My name is Dave Akimoto, and I am the executive director of the Atlantic Street Center. We are a private nonprofit, that works, extensively, with young people, in the inner city of Seattle. We work closely with the

1	Department of Youth Services, and King County juvenile
2	court, primarily, in that capacity, with African
3	American youth. And the other hats I wear, are, I
4	chair the Asian and Pacific Islander task force on
5	youth, and that, the focus of that effort, is to, look
6	at the gang-related problems, as it relates to the
7	Asian and Pacific Islander community. Prior to that, I
8	have been involved as the executive director of the
9	Asian counseling and referral service. I also work
10	with the county, in terms of looking at this issue, of
11	disproportionality, in the juvenile justice system.
12	I will be speaking to you, this morning,
13	primarily, representing the issues and the needs,
14	within the Asian and Pacific Islander community, as it
15	relates to disproportionality.
16	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Great. Thank you.
17	Who is going to begin?
18	MS. VERZOLA: Okay. I will do it, then.
19	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Great.
20	MS. VERZOLA: Okay. I have my little speech,
21	all written out, so please bear with me.
22	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I appreciate that.
23	And if you would, maybe, move just a little closer to
24	the mike, that would be great. Thank you.
25	MS. VERZOLA: Is that good?

MS. VERZOLA: Is that good?

1

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: That is great.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. VERZOLA: Okay. The purpose of the I-Wa-Sil Youth Program, is to foster individual and group changes in attitudes, values, and behavior, leading to cessation of illegal and abusive activities, and towards positive reintegration in family, school, and neighborhood communities. Program services are designed to offer supportive opportunities for youth to reenter public school, to enter and complete GED, vocational training, or to obtain employment with career potential. The program assists youth to alter patterns of dependency and destructiveness, and to establish long-term life adjustments of lasting values, for youth, their families, and their respective communities.

In my five years' employment in the minority juvenile justice improvement project, of the I-Wa-Sil Youth Program, I have had an opportunity to observe the juvenile justice system, and how it works. I can honestly say that the system is not fair, and tends to be prejudiced to minority youth.

In a study done by Dr. George Bridges, in 1993, which you have heard, titled, "Racial disproportionality in the juvenile justice system," demonstrates that there is disproportion, at every

phase of the system, but what is most profound, on the sentencing of confinement. This is a quote. "On average, youth of color were sentenced to confinement, at a rate four times higher than whites."

I believe that this phenomenon has adverse effects, within our communities. Young people distrust police officers, because they believe the officers are there to only harass them. For the parents, it causes ocnfusement, and a feeling of powerlessness to act, or ask, for and about their sons and daughters.

(Audio failure hereafter. Solicit and substitute written copy from I-Wa-Sil Program.)

MS. VERZOLA: The system -- if the parent happens to be on -- language, other than English, they are in for a surprise. The questions they may have for their children may go unanswered, for days, and even --

Neither the parent nor the child is given enough information about the system, and its intricacies, many times, causing more problems for the child, and their families. If a youth is arrested, if a minority youth, that comes from a single family household, they are more likely to -- but, when arrested, the youth -- school, they are more likely to be detained.

I have seen youth detainees, with no previous

record -- which -- charge, because --

I believe the people in power, such as -perceptions of -- that compound the problem. Not long
ago -- justify the high number of young Latinos
incarcerated --

In Seattle, the Department of Youth Services has a constant number of Latinos who speak little or no English, coming through the system, yet, there is not one bilingual -- counselor for these youths.

What this means, is that, the youngsters who will be more likely to -- while -- and will be more likely to be found guilty, and sentenced to confinement. I have never seen a probation counselor who instead -- trying to find services within the community for this youth --

-- minority youth offenders -- lack of -minority community and agency resources -- system come
to the United -- Foundation I-Wa-Sil Youth Program to
develop the minority -- improvement project -disproportionality. The project objective is -- the
following: provision of advocates -- minority youth
admitted to juvenile detention -- providing information
on juvenile -- procedures -- families, assisting and
contacting family members -- assistance -- juvenile,
locating and arranging alternatives to -- detention --

assistance, supervision of community service -- youth, and information on -- services -- such as education -- programs, drug and alcohol -- or treatment facilities, and family counseling services.

We work approximately with 130 to 150 youth a year, the majority being Native American and Latino youth, and -- by urban -- policy research and -- based on -- and I quote, "The proportions of Native American youth -- Department of Youth Services has -- since project inception. In 1988 -- Native American youth accounted for 5 percent of all -- detention. In 1991, this proportion increased to 3 percent. Considering that Native Americans only account for approximately 1 percent of the population of King County, this is a substantial decrease. However, this group is still overrepresented --"

Furthermore, Hispanic are admitted to detention in disproportionate numbers, and there are still no professional staff employment by the Department of Youth Services to act as translators. Disproportionality is still a major problem in communities of color. Recent studies, such as the one by Dr. Bridges, show that this problem is not going away. Understanding information of people of color needs to be at every level of the juvenile justice

system, in order to finally break free from this trend.

If you have any comments or questions, I will be more than happy to answer them for you.

(Discussion was held off-microphone.)

MR. AKIMOTO: All right. I will address my comments primarily to the issues of Asian and Pacific Islander youth, as it relates to juvenile detention, and disproportionality. I believe that, oh, but, before I get into that, let me kind of give you a framework, in terms of, how big the population is, and so forth.

The Asian and Pacific Islander community is the largest racial minority community in King County. We number approximately 118,000, which is about 12 percent. Statewide, the number is two hundred and, about, 240,000, which is about 4 percent. These are data that I just got, from David -- of the Washington Commission on Asian American -- so it is relatively current.

Clearly, you know, that there is disproportionality, in the system, as it relates to African American youth. That is well-established.

Now, the cause of that, of course, is less clear.

If you look at the data with respect to A/PI youth, it is not there. It does not show that, in the

Bridges study.

However, I think, if we look at what is going on, in the community, and that is primarily what I will be talking about, I think that, unfortunately, what we will see -- in the very near future, will be -- such data.

I believe that, earlier, this morning, you heard from Dick Carlson. He and I were meeting, at 7:30, on this very issue, as a matter of fact, in terms of the King County group, looking at disproportionality and he shared, with that group, and with you, that the Asian population, in the Department of Youth Services, is 12 percent.

Now, that, coincidentally, does mirror the population data, for the overall Asian community.

I believe he also showed that, if you look at this, ten years ago, it was probably 1 percent, or no percent, or whatever. So the growth is incredible.

And so, that is something that I think we need to pay real close attention to.

One of his colleagues, and one of my colleagues -- also said, that, and she is in charge of much of the city probation unit, at DYS, and she said 40 percent of her caseload are Asian and Pacific Islander youth. This problem is going through the

roof, and I, from the City of Seattle's anti-gang report, and I would like to quote this, "In Seattle, gang-related youth violence is most prevalent in the African American and the Asian and Pacific Islander In 1990 and 1991, 64 percent of all communities. qang-related incidents were in African American communities, with only 16 to 20 percent of the incidents involving Asian and Pacific Islander young people. However, for the past three years, the number of gang-related incidents for African American youth and young adults has stabilized, while the number of incidents involving A/PI youth has grown dramatically. From 1991, through 1993, the number of gang-related cases involving African American young people, handled by the police gang unit, has remained the same: cases in 1991, and 347 in 1993. During the same time period, 1991 to 1993, the number of A/PI gang incidents has almost tripled, rising from 89, in 1991, to 355, in 1993, an increase of 298 percent. If you speak to anybody who is close to the situation, in the juvenile court, in probation, with the police department gang unit, they will readily state, that these are the facts, in terms of the prevalence of the problem within the Asian and Pacific Islander community."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are some other data, that I think are

especially disturbing. If you look at the Seattle Public Schools' profile report, that breaks out academic achievement, and expulsions, and dropouts, and so forth, one thing I want to call out, very clearly, is that, the group, and this is a subset of the A/PI community, the Samoan community, one-third of all high school age Samoan youth have been kicked out. And we have a very serious, it is no surprise, that we have a serious problem, within juvenile court, and within gang-related incidents, with the Samoan community.

I do encourage you, if you, as you look at the issues of disproportionality at least most of the discussion that has occurred, to date, has to do with, once a kid hits the system, then is there disproportionate treatment, and that is what you are looking at. Well, what is going on, prior to his or her involvement with the system? Are they being kicked out of school? Is school really an ineffective experience, for a lot of these kids? What is going on, with the police departments? A whole host of issues that have to do with the real world, in which our young people are growing up, that have, perhaps, more to do with the disproportionate treatment of our young people, than the system, itself.

Now, I am not going to stand here, or sit

here, and say that the system is working perfecting, either, but I think we need to look at the big picture.

Now, a couple of other factors, as I say, the data, today, do not necessarily substantiate that, there is disproportionate treatment of A/PI youth, in the juvenile justice system. However, if you look at these other incidents, number one, is that, there is higher criminal activity, right now, than ever before, in the Asian community, so we are going to see a greater wave hit the system.

The other issues that you need to look at, are, cultural, or the appropriateness, the ability, for the providers, in the system, whether we talk about police officer, social workers, screeners, at detention, probation officers, through the entire, in the juvenile court system, itself, do you have people who understand language and culture?

And I want to reaffirm what my sister, here, had to say, about the Native American, and the Spanish-speaking, that there are a paucity of such providers, for those groups. Similarly, we see a paucity, if not a nonexistence, of people who understand language and culture, throughout the system. So, if you overlay that, on this increased demand, what are you most logically going to get? You are going to get a lot of

misunderstand, and, I would probably say, mistreatment, and disproportionate treatment, of kids, from these particular ethnic groups. And I would also say, that, the issues of language, and culture, and understanding, are not restricted, only to A/PI, Native American, and Spanish-speaking, but also, most certainly, to our African American youngsters.

So, I would say, in conclusion, you can expect to see this, because all the indicators are there. There is disproportionality in our school system. There is disproportionality in our service delivery system, and, unfortunately, I think, we are going to see more of those kids, because of that mistreatment, are going to hit the juvenile justice system. I wish, I really wish, and pray, that we would not see this, with the community, or with any of our kids, but it is going to happen. I really do fear that.

Part of it, you also wanted to know, what are we doing about that? Through the task force, we are — this is the Asian task force on youth — we are busily working with our Seattle police department, to recruit people, to work in the police department. We are working closely with the department of youth services, and we work, Bob Williams, I think, will be speaking to

you, later. Judge Bobbe Bridge, we have talked to, extensively, in terms of, how we recruit people, who are culturally, or bilingual, or bicultural, and can work with the kids, in the most appropriate way.

So, just to conclude my remarks, as I said, the data are not necessarily there, right now, but all indicators, outside the system, proper, do point in one direction, and that is, that is not something I am happy to report, but those are the facts, as they are.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much.

MS. TANNER: I, too, will be coming from the standpoint, of, community-based organization, and I would like to read, briefly, with respect to what -- goals are about.

Our goals are to: Attempt to assist the recidivism rate, in Tacoma; improvement in a relationship between juvenile probation officers, teachers, and other persons of authority, as well as their personal relationships; savings of approximately \$22,000, annually, in tax dollars, for each participant, that does not return to detention, providing alternatives to antisocial behavior, for supporting educational ambitions; and providing gainful employment opportunities, and job retention, preservation of families, and acceptance of child

support responsibility.

Our objectives are: Monitoring of participant projects, within the program, assessment of mental health needs, including anger management, and referral to the SHF agencies, as needed; advocate participant interest, as they learn how to access services provided by community agencies, utilizing hands-on approach.

And then, we also deal with the real life skills training. We deal, a lot, with culture diversity training, for young women and men, including principles of self-esteem, and rites of passage, as well as workplace literacy.

Last but not least, we establish a youth employment support service, that pays. It is staffed by -- youth -- for referral from -- employment security, et cetera, for work site developers, on an as-needed basis.

And the bottom line, to a lot of things, that I see, and I am one to just speak from the heart, and from the gut: We had a lot of work to do, in order to even stop our youth from getting to Raymond Hall, which is our juvenile detention center, in Tacoma. There is a lot of pain, there is a lot of anger, and people do not like to address the fact, there is a lot of racism

going on. That is the bottom line. And it is a very touchy subject, and, every time we try to talk about it, no one wants to deal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is my understanding, that, the attitude of an agency comes down, from the top. So, if you have someone, at the top, that does not believe that there is racism going on, then that attitude is going to trickle down, and those are the types of things that we are dealing with. I feel, just like my counterparts have stated, that, in order to make a difference, we need to place people of color, in key positions, people that know how to relate to the youth that are coming into the juvenile system. If you are afraid of me, because I have dookey braids in my hair, and because I am dark chocolate, and my pants are sagging, and you are dealing with the typical stereotype, that I am a bad person, then we are not going to be able to communicate, because you have got all these preconceived ideas, as to the type of person that I am. Whereas, if you have someone, that understands this body language, and understands where these kids are coming from, then I think we are going to reach them, much better.

Example: I go, each Friday, to a juvenile detention center, down the road, a bit. I am not going

1 t
2 m
3 G
4 P
5 k
6 C
7 W
8 t
9 h
10 t
11 a
12 u
13 C
14 a
15 s

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to name any names, but what is happening, is, the large majority of the staff, that is employed, are from Yelm, Graham, Roy, Yakima, Olympia, okay? And these are people are not used to being around African American kids. So, consequently, when you have a kid, that calls them an MF, they get automatically written up. Whereas, if that kid, first of all, they are not going to call me an MF, because of the type of rapport that I have, with them, the thing called "respect." there is a certain group of kids, that I will not even attempt to work with, because I know I do not understand the culture, and I would be an idiot, to come over, and try and work with the Chinese culture, and tell them how they are supposed to access the system. I do not have that expertise, and that is what is going on.

You have a group of people, that do not understand a culture, that is trying to work with those people, within that culture, and it is like mixing oil and water together. Consequently, the kids, at this particular detention center, what is happening, is, I have a young lady, say, for example, a 25-year-old white female. She has never been called an MF in her life. So, instantly, it offends her. Which it should. But if she understood the buttons that are being

pushed, and where these kids are coming from, there is a way to really work with them, and to gain their respect, as well as give them respect.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am not trying to minimize the fact that these kids commit crimes. Yes, they do. But there are things that we can be doing, in the community, to eliminate that. In the summertime, we work with youth, to attempt to have them get summer youth employment. A large number of the youth that we work with need jobs, all year round, because of the family structure. One of the things that we found out, last year, is that, what we are attempting to do, is, open up a savings account, for the youth, so that they would be able to purchase clothing, for school. But Mom is over here, and Mom need Jane's check. So, subsequently, they are coming back, and letting us know, that, "Mrs. Tanner, I need to borrow \$20," or, "Can Paige loan me this, until I get my next check, because my Mom needs this money, to pay a light bill?," or, "My Mom stole my money, for a drug habit."

And one of the things that is happening, also, with respect to our kids, is, when they go into the juvenile system, and I am still learning a lot about it, is that, they come back to the same environment, that is not working. So, a specific

example, a youth goes to Raymond Hall, okay? And let us say, for example, he got busted, for crack cocaine, okay? And he gets sent up to Green Hill. And he is there, for three years. There is not too much happening, okay? So, therefore, when he comes back, to Seattle, or to come back to Tacoma, he is coming back to the same environment. Nothing has changed.

The same thing that is going on, with respect to gang kids, that may have done a drive-by shooting. And say, for example, I am dealing with a Crip. And a Crip shot a Blood, or a BGD, okay? Now, he has five years, at Green Hill. But what is going on, in the community, is that, these kids normally know when this person is going to be getting out of Green Hill, before they do. So they are laying low, waiting on this person to come back. They have not forgotten anything. So it keeps going on and on and on.

And, my thing, is, what we are trying to do, what we are struggling with, is, trying to see, what in the world can we do, to make a difference?

I can pump a kid up, and build self-esteem, and motivate them, until the cows come home, but if they are home life, if the environment, does not change, for them, the cycle is going to continue. And I am very concerned, particularly the African American

males, and there is a disproportionate number of our youth, that are incarcerated.

And I don't care what nobody say: I know it to be a fact. I am a mother of four. I have two black sons, and two daughters, and I have six grandkids.

I am not out here, for my health. There is a major problem, and if we do not address this issue, immediately, we are going to see the repercussions.

And then, to go even beyond that, on the white side, America needs to wake up, because it is not just our kids. We are talking about the disproportionality of it, but it is a rise, with respect to our white kids, also. There is a problem, from the suburban area, on out. It is not just an economic problem. It goes across the board. It is not just a mother on welfare. It goes across the board. We have kids in our program, now, whose fathers are engineers, at Boeing. The mother is a lawyer, in Tacoma. It does not matter, because the bottom line is, the kids are not getting the attention that they need.

In the schools, there are no programs.

After-school programs, when we grew up, we were able to participate in after-school programs. Everything has been cut. And so, therefore, the adults are sitting

here, saying, "Well, what is wrong with these kids?"

The problem with our kids is that they have nothing to

do. All we concentrate on is how to punish them, and I

cannot understand, how could we, as a community of,

supposedly, intelligent people, can abandon our youth,

like we have done? Our youth do not have anything to

do. ...

Thank you, very much.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Is there a question from the Committee.

DR. BROOKS: I have one. You talk about the requirement of having ethnic people on staff. Do you know whether it is a job requirement, of the institutions, that they include that?

MR. AKIMOTO: I would doubt, that it is a requirement, although I think it could be, that it could be written in, such that, the ability to have experience, to work with certain groups, could be, I think, a legitimate job duty. But I do not believe that there is such stipulation, in any of these.

DR. BROOKS: Yes. Language is such an issue, it seems to me, that, language, regardless of the race, that the person on the staff should be able to, there should be a requirement, that the people, that can communicate, in that particular, are those particular

languages. Now, the problem that we get, there are so many languages, I guess, so many dialects -- I assume, I do not know -- that, to provide that amount, it would probably be very difficult. But it seems to me, that, somewhere along the way, somebody should put that in, as a requirement, that we begin to direct that, because, as far as I know, when I was in government, that it was not that, even mentioned as desirable. So, if it is such an issue, why are we not pursuing that --

MR. AKIMOTO: We should, and, by the way, there are not, I mean, yes, there are many languages, but I think we could focus on a few major ones. Why there are no bilingual, Spanish-speaking probation officers, I mean, that is beyond comprehension, to me. And then, in the Asian groups, if you focus on the Vietnamese, and Cambodian, and Samoan, I think, and Filipino, a few dialects, there, I think you have got the bulk of it. And that, you do get into some of the lesser groups, but, that is going to capture most of it.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes?

MR. MARTIN: I have got a question, for Ms. Tanner. You talked about the environmental change, whereby taking black youth, out of the community, and sending them down south, to college, how effective is

that? How long has that been?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is just something that we MS. TANNER: are trying to do. Basically, the only way that I am able to deal with this, now, is that, some of the youth, that are incarcerated in the detention centers, which is like prison, for adults, and what we are able to do, is to, take the Pell grant information into the jail, and deal that information out. And these are for youth that are within 60 days, that are going to be released, back into the community. And what we would do, is, submit that information, and, if they accept it, with respect to the Pell grant, then you know they will also be able to qualify for the loan. Then, what we do, is, that information is forwarded down to Morehouse, Declock, Atlanta U., Fisk, or wherever. it is up to the university or the college, as to whether or not they will accept it.

One of the things that has been difficult, though, is, as I stated, earlier, when that young man, or young lady, comes back to the community, if we do not have something in place, within the first 60 days, we normally lose them.

So, we do not have a plan. That is just something that we are trying to do, on our own. It would be really nice, if there was a team of people,

that could come together. It would also be real nice, if we could just, if there are some youth, in Seattle, that have been incarcerated, and acting out, if there was a way we could send that person to a relative, in Mississippi, give them a way, for a change, or someone from Tacoma, and I am from Louisiana. Send them down to Louisiana, although, I realize that there are gangs, there. But, meanwhile, what we will be doing, is, working with them, with respect to dealing with their attitude.

Working with these youth, it is like, we have to start, from scratch. We have to deprogram these young people. You have got young people, that have been misused, and abused. Physically. Mentally. Any way you can think of. In the home. At the school.

And the bottom line, is this, and this is the thing that I see, and I am truly a youth advocate. The reason a lot of our children have the problems that they have, today, is because of adults. And we, as adults, have to deal with responsibilities.

Our youth receive guns, from adults. Our youth are beaten, and sexualized, by their parents. Our youth are not given the proper education, in school. It is adults that are selling the drugs to them.

When you look at the whole picture, it is we, as adults, it is like we are feeding off our own kids.

And the bottom line, is, you pay now, or you pay later.

So we are going to continue to try, in our own way, and we have been working with Safe Street. Tuskegee, we are doing some things with Tuskegee, this summer, and there have been some monies, put together, and we are going to be able to send some of the kids down to Tuskegee, and they will be coming back, giving a report, to a group of other kids, on the atmosphere, down there.

MR. MARTIN: Into the home -- were done, from, what --

MS. TANNER: They are just going to go down, for a week, and they have been working on this plan, for a year. So this would be the first attempt, this summer.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: If I could ask all three of you, to respond, just briefly, to this. It sounds like you are all very aware of Dr. Bridges' report, and the juvenile justice, racially disproportionate, disproportionality, work group. Is that kind of information making it out to those of you, that are doing the work, out in the communities? I am not doing a check on whether you have done your

1	homework, or not. My point is, whether that
2	information is being available, or do you see that as a
3	working kind of solution. Are we headed in the right
4	direction, with that, or is that, is that going to
5	affect do you see it as affecting what you all
6	normally do?
7	MS. VERZOLA: I was part of that working
8	group.
9	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay.
10	MS. VERZOLA: And I believe that it is a step
11	in the right direction. I believe that the
12	recommendations are good practice. I believe some
13	of those recommendations have been put into practices,
14	within some counties, and it seems to be working. It
15	is a slow process, and it is going to take time.
16	I think we are just becoming aware, as a community,
17	about how big, and how much of a problem, this truly
18	is. And I think that it is going to take some time.
19	It is not going to happen, overnight.
20	Disproportionality did not happen overnight this has
21	taken years, to build up.
22	But I believe, that, we are taking a step in
23	the right direction.
24	MR. AKIMOTO: I just got a copy of it, this

morning. I think that the work group, this was

25

convened, by both --

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: By legislative mandate.

MR. AKIMOTO: Right. I know. But who is the chair?

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Oh. Cochaired by Judge Huggins.

MR. AKIMOTO: Yes. Okay. I just got a copy of that, those recommendations, this morning, and I have to say, that it would have helped us, had we gotten it, and this is the King County group, had we gotten it, earlier, because we really, we were converging, and agreeing on a lot of these issues, but it probably would have saved us some time. But we are thankful that we have it, now.

(Discussion was held off-microphone.)

MS. BULLIT: It seems to me, that community organizations have a great responsibility, toward this early intervention, that is so much needed. Are you getting help, from the state, or the county, and the cities, in doing this? Or, also, your work with people who are incarcerated, and in detention, in helping them, with the return to the community. That is a major responsibility. Are you just doing that, on your own, or are you getting good help, from the juvenile

justice system?

MS. TANNER: With respect to the -- that we used to see, out in Tacoma, these are starting to improve, again, for us. In dealing with the youth that are going through transition, to come back into the community, we are trying to negotiate, now, because we are talking \$230 a week, and it is really not enough money, but what we are doing, is, we have a passion, and it is about saving some of our youth. So, a lot of times, we are just volunteering our time, that we are spending, to reach young people, and we are spreading thin.

We do receive some monies, from the government's juvenile justice advisory committee. We are working with Raymond Hall -- and I see Steve just came in -- with respect to youth, that are inder home monitoring. So there are some things that are starting to accrue, in Tacoma.

I think our community needs to be a little bit more aware of the extent of the problem that we have, within the community. And all we can do, is, keep chugging along, and keep writing proposals, and try and get more money.

So, money, for me, is nothing. The key factor, I know I need the money, to pay my staff, but

it is not the one big factor, for me. If I can just change, just one child's life, that will be a difference, for me.

And I realize, that, we, right now, we are dealing with approximately 350 to 400 children, in Tacoma. And I have a staff, of, there are three people, full-time, and three people, part-time. And my blood pressure is up, but I have been working, all night, too. But the honesty, the sincerity, and the people who really want to make a change, they are different, and they are really making a difference.

And the other key factor, is that, we realize that we do not have all the answers. I would be an idiot to think that. I just have a small piece, of part of the puzzle. So it is very, very, very important, for us, to interact, and network; with other agencies. So we are doing that, quite a bit.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Any other responses, to these questions?

MR. AKIMOTO: Yes. I can respond. In terms of the agency I run, the Atlantic Street Center, whose primary focus is the African Americans — there is some moral support, from our own Department of Youth Services — operation, to provide, I think, some creative alternative services, for young people.

However, as it relates to the Asian and Pacific
Islander community, I would say there is a huge gap,
there. I mean, there simply are not services, there.
And most, you could, I think, expand that, also, to the
Spanish-speaking, and Native American communities.
I believe that there is just very little there. There
is something there, for the African American kids, but
the gap, again, is just huge, in terms of, really,
providing an adequate alternative.

MS. VERZOLA: And that is also, to make a small comment, in terms of prevention, I think prevention is key, in terms of the roles that we play, and we do have some programs, that deal with early intervention and prevention. However, the reality is, that, budgets are being cut, left and right, and social services are not a priority, on anybody's list. So it is making it harder for us, in terms of the money. However, it is forcing us to work together, and that, also, is a resource, that has not been tapped into, properly, in the past, I believe — on the community-based organizations.

It is important to follow kids up, in the whole process of juvenile, what we do, at I-Wa-Sil, we take a person, from the moment they walk into the courtroom, until the moment they, whether they go home,

or they go into an institution, and walking through the whole system, who are there, for them, and even when they go to the system, they go to Green Hill, or they go to Echo Glen, we do have a program, that follows them, there, because it is important for them to keep in touch, and maintain communications within their own community, because this is the community they are going to come back to, eventually. So they need to know where to access services, where they are in fact released, from these institutions. But, again, funds has been a major problem, with developing more programs, such as this one.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Mr. Israel?

MR. ISRAEL: Yes. One of the things that concerns me, greatly, is the problem, language problem, communication problem, between the youth, and the justice system. Does the juvenile justice system accommodate community translators, or is it hostile to community translators? Does it allow you to bring somebody in, from the community, who can facilitate communications?

MS. VERZOLA: I will tell you what my experience has been. It is Washington State law, that, for court proceedings, if the defendant does not speak English, that there be a court-certified interpreter

for that young person. So this is the law, and it has been in place for about four, maybe five years. Before that, a person, if they did not speak English, they sometimes went in, without interpreters, sometimes they grab — interpreter, without necessarily knowing that this person could do the job, although they had good intentions.

So, when they go into, in front of a judge, they have somebody, there, for them, now. However, the process is more than just going in front of a judge. You need to be able to interview the youth, within detention. You need to be able to interview a youth, and their family. You need to be able to explain to the youth who is in detention what the rules are, when they are in there. You need to be able to let them know what is happening, in terms of their cases. There is nothing around, for these young people, under these circumstances.

What has happened, and what is still happening, is that, the probation counselor will use another youth, who is bilingual, to do the interpretation, when they are doing the interviewing, for the sentencing. They will not pay for an interpreter. They will use a brother or sister, in the family, that might be bilingual, to do the

interpretation.

Now, this is a two-edged sworn. It is good that somebody is doing the interpretation. However, I am worried about the type and the quality of interpretation that is being provided. The young person is — the interpretation, and — so that the parent knows the whole story.

So, what does the parent -- get? What is the probation counselor really getting?

When they are downstairs, in the detention facility, there are certain rules, that they need to know about. They are -- if, what are the everyday, day-to-day, live-in, rules, that they have to go by? There is nothing. The words are not there.

There is, I believe, one juvenile counselor, not juvenile counselor, probation officer, that speaks Spanish, and English, and he is the one who -- called in, to do the interpretation, and deal with the youth. However, if he is not there, that day, or if it is his day off, or if it is not his shift, these young people will not receive the services that they need.

And it has gotten to the extent, where a young person was ill, for two days, before he was able to communicate, that he needed to go see a child.

So it is a great problem, and I believe that

there are two answers to it. I believe we need to hire 1 more bilingual staff -- hire more bilingual staff, both 2 in operations services, and also, the people who, the 3 correction officers. And also, there should be some 4 sort of a interpreter bank, interpreter bank, 5 interpreters bank, where people can be called, when 6 interpretive services are needed, and there is nothing 7 like that, in the DYS, right now. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Any other questions? 10 DR. BROOKS: Yes. A final one. earlier, some of those had given the same statistics 11 12 that you did, and the question was asked, can we give

> And they say that --(Laughter.)

some reasons why the increases occurred, in Asian,

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or --

MR. AKIMOTO: Well, you know, I think, as you probably know, in the last ten years, there is, first of all, an overall increase in youth violence. We know that. From 1981, to 1991, youth violence doubled. know that.

The Asian community has experienced, just demographically, tremendous growth. So part of it, is simply, a demographic phenomenon, that you have got more people, and Asians, Pacific Islanders, are a

higher representation of the total population. It follows, logically, that you are going to see more of those kids, in the system, first.

Secondly, prior, going back, to earlier times, the bulk of the Asian community was Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino. Getting into second, and third, and, now, for example, with my children, fourth generation, and hence, a probably higher acculturation, better understanding with language and culture, and being able to be successful, in being a part of this community, and society.

Yes. So the third factor would be, yes. There has been a steady immigrant and refugee flow. The nature of that flow, especially from Southeast Asia, has been from individuals who are very different from the Southeast Asian refugee group, in the community and the communities. Those individuals, in the earlier flow, were much more highly educated, perhaps were bilingual and bicultural, and were able to more easily adapt to the American way of life.

More recently, we are seeing those who have less education, people who are not able to get white collar jobs, and, hence, are in a position of having, requiring, both mother and father to work, and having, therefore, very little understanding of the American

education system, and having little understanding about the social service delivery system, and then, also, working very low wage-paying jobs, and really being absent from the household, and from being able to take a very active role in parenting their children. part of that has led to the increased gang activity, and so forth. So we are starting to see much more criminal activity, out of that group. So I would say, that is, more or less, what we are seeing.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We want to thank each one of you for taking the time to be with us, today.

Have you got a final remark

MR. AKIMOTO: Yes. I would like to make one final remark.

And that is, that, you are an advisory body to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. It would seem to me, that, you can look at anything you want to, in terms of our community, and in terms of civil rights. You have, for whatever reasons, chosen to look at the juvenile justice system. If part of the rationale for that, is that, you were concerned about our kids, and you were concerned, in particular, with respect to the equal application of civil rights to all of our kids, I would say, that, rather than looking, you are going to need, you have to do what you have to do, but, perhaps,

it might be more beneficial, in the long run, in terms
of impacting our kids, if you looked at what is going
on, in our education system.

Is there equal opportunity, equal treatment,
of our children of color, in our education system? And

of our children of color, in our education system? And I would argue, that that would be time, much better spent, than looking at the kids, once they are so far down the road, that they end up being prosecuted for juvenile crimes.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Final remarks from the rest of presenters?

MS. TANNER: I agree.

MS. VERZOLA: I second that.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Again, thank you for your time, in coming here. We obviously cannot solve all the problems, by any means, but, hopefully, by providing you this opportunity to get your voices, and heard, through this kind of a channel, maybe we can all help them, take them all one step along the way, to support your concerns with the kids that you work with, in the educational system, or in the juvenile system. You care about the kids, and we applaud you for that. Thank you all, very, very much.

MS. TANNER: Thank you.

MR. AKIMOTO: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

1	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We will break, for
2	lunch, and our lunch break is relatively short, so I
3	would like to have us be back at here, at 1:00 o'clock,
4	please, and it is okay for us to leave our materials
5	here.
6	(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., a luncheon recess
7	was taken.)
8	
9	
10	
11	·
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	;
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

AFTERNOON SESSION

(On the record at 1:15 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I want to officially reconvene this meeting, of the Washington Advisory Committee of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. We will continue the process that we began, this morning, of obtaining information, and views, relating to civil rights issues, in the area of disproportionality, within the criminal justice system.

And I have advised, and asked, everybody, including the Committee members, to remember our guidelines, for this morning, and, as we get to the questions, I would ask you, also, to direct the questions, through me, so that we can keep the questions, evenly spaced.

And so, we are ready to begin the afternoon session, and our first participant, this afternoon, is Harriet Walden, from Mothers Against Police Harassment. And, Harriet, we welcome you, and ask you to identify yourself, a bit, in terms of your background, and what expertise you bring to this. And then, begin, whenever you would like.

MS. WALDEN: I thank you. My name is Harriet Walden, and I am the cofounder of Mothers Against Police Harassment. It is a police accountability

And, as a result of that, we started Mothers

Against Police Harassment. We have monthly meetings.

We meet with young people, and we meet with parents.

group, also, a group that teaches young people their

organization, about five years, this coming September,

out of an incident that happened, with my children,

clear, to me, that we needed an organization that was

being young people, just being kids. All our kids are

and, as a result of that incident, it became very

advocating for young people, or young people, just

not criminals, they are not all gang members, they

shooters. Some of our kids are just regular kids,

are not all gang-bangers, and they are not all

rights and responsibility. We started this

In 1991, I was appointed by then-governor,
Booth Gardner, to be part of the juvenile issues task
force. That gave me a good opportunity to go around
the state, to listen to what the parents had to say, at
those public hearings, and it gave me a real good feel
of what is happening, here in the State of Washington,
and how parents are really frustrated. They are
frustrated with the system. They are just frustrated,
that it seems to be, there is no place, for them, to be
able to get the help that they need for their children,

no matter if they live in a rural area, or they live in an urban area. So, as the results of that, we have just been doing lots of work, in this area.

Again, we advocate for youth, and young people, particularly, and we have seen that racism, and disproportionality, interleaved, and intertwined. It is a fundamental link, and we will do a parallel. We will draw a parallel vision, for you, as we make, as I make, our presentation, about disproportionality.

Since 1990, there has been a real move, across the nation, to criminalize all our youth, and that, granted, some of our kids have done some very heinous crimes. On some levels, they have not made us proud. And, consequently, that has kind of like turned the tide, in America, against youth, and that is really what is happening, right now.

We have been trying to effect a change, at the front end, so that our youth and young adults can survive that encounter with the police, without an arrest. We are called to many areas, in the state, to work with the mothers. Our latest place, that we were called to, was Federal Way, and this is an example of racism, that could lead to disproportionality.

There is a family, in Federal Way, a black family, who asked a European American family to stop

making noise, outside of their driveway, late at night. As a result of them going out there, a fight broke out, and the white neighbors tore down the black people's fence, and beat them, beat them up, severely beat them up. One boy lost his teeth, and put the other fellow in a choke hold. And, when the police came, when the King County Police came, they arrested the black people, and charged them. And, to this day, there are no charges being brought against the white family. And this is the parallel track, again, with disproportionality and racism, and how it affects people, in King County.

We worked, also, in Redmond. In Redmond, all the youth, in Redmond, all the Hispanic youth, and all the African American youth, in Redmond, have had their photograph taken, and that has been ever since 1991. All these kids, their photographs are taken, and they are in the King County Police gang file, or in the file report. And all these children are not gang members. We have had several, we have went out to Redmond, to work with families, out there, to try to resolve that, that situation.

We have been to Tacoma, Federal Way, Kent,
Marysville, Port Angeles, Bellingham, Bremerton,
Everett, Odessa, and Olympia, and all over King County,

2

and we were recently called up to Marysville, to help with the farm workers, and the amount of racism that is happening, up in that county, up in northern Snohomish County, where a lot of farm workers are.

We do educational workshops, for young people, on their rights and responsibilities, and when they are stopped, by the police. And our prescription, for public safety, is, jobs, education, plus treatment, will equal public safety.

Disproportionality is a big problem. What contributes to the increase of this problem, again, like I said, is racism, and it goes hand in hand. And Dr. Bridges has a wonderful report, here, and I am sure you have already heard from him, this morning, but it does not talk about racism. I mean, you know, you cannot deal with disproportionality, unless you talk about racism, and the fundamental cause of disproportionality, in America, is racism, and we have not dealt with racism. So, again, and now, in the 1990's, we have a new word, that has been coined, but actually, it goes hand in hand, with racism.

What contributes to the increase of this serious problem confronting our children? What is the lack, number one? We believe one of the fundamental causes of disproportionality, in the State of

Washington, is the lack of discrimination, that the 1 police have, when our kids come up, when they encounter 2 3 African American kids. There is a discretion, and it is a lack of that discretion, that, usually, leads to 4 our kids being arrested. There are the stereotypes, 5 that our kids are criminals, or, if you get two or 6 7 three black kids together, there, in a gang, and an 8 example of discretion, up until 1992, the Bellevue 9 Police Department did in-house diversion. And that 10 in-house diversion meant that, those kids who were offenders, when they went through that in-house 11 12 diversion, it was not part of their criminal record. 13 It was never a part of their criminal record. That is 14 no longer going on, in Bellevue Police Department, but 15 that was an example of discretion.

Another example of discretion, was that, around the same time, I think, one of my sons, named Omahi, was riding in a car, going over the emergency island, and the car broke down. It was a junker car. It broke down, on the bridge.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I got a call, from the Mercer Island Police
Department, telling me that he had picked up my son,
because the car had broke down, and what I wanted him
to do with him?

Well, I mean, you would not get that kind of

call, from Seattle. I mean, you know, it just would not happen.

And, at that particular time, I had told my son not to go out of the home, and he did go ride in that car, so I just told him to keep him, at the station, and I would go pick him up. So, I mean, that was a nice, but that was a discretion, that is not afforded our children, usually, in Seattle.

And I also would like to give you an example of a lack of discretion. A lack of discretion, is when, sometimes, a police car, the police stops a car, for a minor traffic infraction. One of the police that I am talking about was recently in court, and he was asked, "Why did he stop this car, for this minor traffic infraction, that had four black youths in it?"

He said, "Oh, because I wanted to;"

And this is a lack of discretion, that is shown African American kids, mainly in the heart of Seattle, and the kids call it "jackin'." They get stopped, all the time. And, of course, this encounter, in the police, leads to, a lot of time, an arrest. And then, of course, that leads to being, goes to the prosecutorial practices.

Another discretion, that happened, that, recently, here, was a judge, this year, in Wenatchee.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

He declined to decline the two youths, over in Yakima, who had killed a homeless gentleman, a homeless man, there, with 18 bullet holes. Most of the children, in Seattle, are never, they always, they are usually, declined, as a juvenile, and tried as an adult. So this is a judge that used some discretion. And he also used the discretion, over there, to keep these white youths out of the adult system. And so, he sentenced them, to sentence, their time, for killing this gentleman, in the juvenile system. And these children will never go into the adult system. And this is another example of discretion, that the judge used, but this type of discretion has not been used, for African American kids, not too much.

The other thing that leads to disproportionality is the prosecutorial practices, that, assuming three or four kids are gang members, usually, when a report is turned in, by the police department, assuming that the kids are gang members, these children are usually charged. Then there is a law called "encompassed liability." The encompassed liability assumes, that, all youths are guilty, by association. So, if all you got in a fight, then everybody would be guilty, here, no matter who the person who started the fight, and that is encompassed

liability.

And, if you have been noticing, reading the editorials around the country, most of the editors are saying that, the militia, the whole militia movement, should not be branded as a bad movement, because of McVeigh. So they will not want to use encompassed liability, in that area, but it is okay to use encompassed liability, when the kids are involved. So that is another reason that leads to disproportionality.

The other thing that leads to disproportionality is a lack of translators. A lot of the kids do not speak English. There is a serious problem, with English as a second language. A lot of times, the families, or the parents, do not understand English, and, by the time they go to court, the kids have, sometimes, is what we heard, up in Marysville, is, the kids are trying to fake it, that they understand the language, and, by the time they go to court, they have faked it, enough, to get themselves in more serious trouble, before they have to really admit that they do not understand the language.

The third area, that leads to, actually, the fourth area, that leads to disproportionality is the mental health. By the time a black child is in the

thir
thir
more
more
ther
alco
chil

third grade, most of the, a lot of the, male children, are branded as having learning disabilities. There are more children with learning disabilities, now, than there were, 30 years ago. We wonder why. And the alcohol fetal syndrome, and attention deficit syndrome, children, do not understand the consequences of their actions. How many of these children are going through the King County juvenile system?

And then, the fifth one, is, the economics.

It makes it an uneven justice system. The prosecutors, or the public defenders, are overloaded, and some of the youth just do not come from families, who are able to support them, and be there, for them, at the time.

And many of them are detained, for not showing up, for their court procedures.

Probably, one of the biggest causes, that is going to affect disproportionality later on, is, the "Three Strikes and You're Out," law. We are looking at locking up kids, in this state, up to 25 years, beginning at age 13, for some of the crimes that have been committed. Are we safer, today?

And we have to understand the fastest part of our economy is the prison economy. And I would like to just read you this quote, here, that says, "The longstanding, mainstream American tradition of harsh

punishment, to secure cooperation and obedience, whether by the police, prison, or parents, who practice corporal punishment, has produced children, who are disillusioned with cooperation, and increasingly inclined to use violence, themselves. And this quote is from "On the Edge." It is a history of poor, black children, and the American dream, and it is by Carl Nightingale.

And to add to that, to add to that hopelessness of millions of people without jobs, and then, there is the violence, on the media, and all of these things, that adds to this idea, to this violence, that we are living in, today.

There are some programs that are making a difference, in King County. Some of those programs are, Sisters in Common. That is a program, that is worked, with female offenders, and they work with them, and with their families, to give these young children some self-esteem, to encourage them to be attached to their community, to help them to develop conflict resolution skills, and to teach job readiness skills to them. So this is a real good program, that is going, right now, in Seattle.

Another one, of course, I am sure Dr. Bridges talked about the diversion program, and that program,

that is pretty successful, in lowering disproportionality.

And I would like to just say a little bit about we do, at Mothers Against Police Harassment. Again, we offer educational workshops, on what to do when you get stopped by the police. We believe, with more information, our children can make more intelligent decisions, like in driving with alcohol in the car. It is illegal. I mean, a lot of kids do not know that. I mean, you need to have your seat belt on. So we teach them the things that they need to know, in order to be legal.

We also teach them the reality of 593, Three Strikes and You're Out. I mean, we need to give them as much information as they possibly could have.

I think that some of the solutions, or the solutions for disproportionality is to, really be willing to look at the fundamental cause of disproportionality as it relates to racism, the lack of discretion, the prosecutorial practices, and to put more money into priorities, for far, for funding for jobs, for treatment and education. A lot of these children need jobs. I believe that children who are more successful, are the children who have something to do.

My kids all had to have a job, by the time that they were eight years old, and nine years old. And so, that meant they had to have paper routes. And, one time, I had five routes, in my house. If you have ever had a paper route, then you know, if you have one paper route. If you have five, that is pure madness, but I had five paper routes in my house. My son, that was nine years old, had two routes, and somebody else had one route. And so, but, it was the important thing, is that, they were busy, and more of children need jobs.

We might need to look at how we can change some of the laws, so that 13-year-old kids can find something to do, with all that energy, and all that hormone training, or hormone changing, in the body, and adequate treatment. We should have treatment, on demand, in this country. We should have treatment, on demand, so that, the children who are involved with drugs, or are out there, selling drugs, can get the help that they need. The children who are out there, selling drugs, need to understand, that, that that is not a viable income. And it is not the way to go, and more education.

And each child, that has been arrested for a violent act, should have a mental evaluation. I mean,

to say that a person who has committed a violent act, 1 is functioning, on all levels of reality, I think, is a 2 misnomer. There is something desperately wrong, with 3 people who kill people. People who are violent, there 4 is something wrong, and we need to be able to find out 5 if there are children, who had abuse, in their lives, 6 7 how many of them have been in and out of foster care, how many of them have seen violence in the home, 8 9 either have been recipients of violence, whether in the 10 home, or in the streets. And we need unified standards, of equality of 11 12 practice, in arrest, and prosecution, of all our 13

children, and we need, just, equal standards, Thank you. throughout the state.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much, Ms. Walden.

Questions, from the Committee?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. BROOKS: Any ideas how we might remove racism, from --

MS. WALDEN: Well, I think that, one of the things, that we could do, is, come out of the denial, and come back, and deal with the advent of the so-called discovery of America. We need to go back, and deal with the fact, that, it was discovered, on violence, I mean, that we eradicated millions of people

who lived here, in order for us to have this country, today. It was a violent act, and violence is anything that destroys the soul, is my definition of violence, so all violence does not kill the person, but it destroys the soul.

Slavery was a violent act. It also destroyed, not only the soul, but it destroyed lives. And so, I think, that, in order for us to move forward, we need to deal with the reality, that it happened, that people are still having effects from it, today.

We have some native people, in this country, who have to prove this they are tribes, in the land of their birth. I mean, there is something wrong with that, and until we are really willing to look at the fundamental causes of this, and to come out of the denial, and deal with it, it is painful. It is painful to acknowledge that our ancestors did some terrible things, and that we are still benefiting, or we are still not benefiting, from what our ancestors did.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Harriet, have you seen any progress?

MS. WALDEN: Well, I have seen some progress.

I do not see nearly as many children taking the

position, on the street, now. Taken the position, is

that, when the police stops you, you have to get on the

floor, or get on the ground, with your hands above your head, and, you know, I mean, that dehumanizing position. I do not see that happening, as much as it was, before.

I think that people are willing to talk about the police, now. They are willing to talk about them, because they are our public servants. They work for us. They are not volunteer policemen. And I think, that, one of the differences, now, is that, people are willing to complain, and to say that, "I am not pleased," or that, "There is something happening, here," and that is a big change.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: What would you credit the changes, why are they happening? What can we have more of, to bring more changes?

MS. WALDEN: Well, we can have more people coming forward, to talk about the reality of what is happening to them, in this society. If they have had, whether it is a negative, or a positive, encounter, with the police, they need to feel free enough, in this society, if this is a free society, people need to feel free enough, to either come forward, to say, "Officer Friendly was very nice to me, today," or, "Officer Friendly was not friendly to me, today, and I want to make a complaint," or, "I want to recommend

him, for a recommendation." But we need to have people, to feel free enough, to do that, and, in the past, people have not felt that type of freedom.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Other questions?

Harriet, thank you, very much, for taking the time to be with us, and thank you, for the work that you do, too. It is good.

MS. WALDEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much.

Okay. And our next -- go ahead.

(Discussion was held off-microphone.)

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes. Chief Ed

Crawford, Police -- for the City of Kent, and Margaret Pageler, from the Seattle City Council, and we welcome you both.

MS. PAGELER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We are pleased that you are here. We have been hearing from various speakers, all morning, and we are delighted that you are here, and you will give us your perception, as well. So, I do not know who is going to start, but we would like to have each of you just give a little brief background, and to identify yourself, for the record, and also, give a little background of the experience, that brings you here, besides the titles that you bear,

and then, just dive into it. We have about 25 or 30 minutes, about 15 minutes apiece.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. PAGELER: Yes. I am Margaret Pageler. I am a City Council Member, first term City Council Member and I chair the public safety committee, and, I must say, the experience that brings me here, is the experience of my title, and that, as public safety chair, I have been a member of the regional law, safety and justice committee, which Chief Crawford has been the chair, or cochair, of, during the time that I served. And so, I have had an opportunity to deal with the regional issues, with respect to law and justice. As you probably know, the City of Seattle has a police document, but our municipal court does not typically deal with juvenile offenders. That is handled, in the county, the county court, and the county prosecutor's office, and we do not, although the juvenile facility is in our city boundaries, it is not within our jurisdiction, our jurisdictional authority.

So, as a council member, I have no responsibility, for the system, that deals with juveniles, after they are arrested. And so, my interest and involvement has been as a member of the regional team, that works through that regional committee, to address problems, that we all care about.

When I first began my service, we had a spate of shootings, in the central area, that really galvanized my attention and my concern. Working with James Kelly, who I see is going to be addressing you, soon, we began to look at the problems that impact youth of color, particularly in the central area, and then, expanded our focus to young people, in the Asian American community, as well.

And, so, I was very interested in Dr.

Bridges' study of disproportionality, in the detention facilities, and talked to him, separately, and in his presentations, about, what were the causes, what were the things that we could do, and how we should be addressing those issues?

I know that you have had, and will have a broad array of presentations, about different programs. I thought I would like to just talk about a couple of things, that, some of which, we were doing, before the study, and some of which emerged, from the study, or suggestions that emerged, from the study, and then, with some comments, based on our study, more recently, of overcrowding at the juvenile facility.

Disproportionality is a function of a number of factors, and racial bias in the system is only one of them. So it would be a mistake to only look at

racial bias, though I expect the mission of this commission is to address those issues, but I would like to caution you, that, one of the things that contributes to disproportionality in the system, is the location of the juvenile justice facility. It is downtown Seattle, and, if you are a three-member, or twelve-member, police force, in a far southern, or a county sheriff, out in the far reaches of the county, the considerations that you would take, to bring a juvenile in, and book them, into detention, are going to be different, than the considerations that one of our Seattle police officers might make.

And it is tempting to say, when you see the outcome, that that is based on race. I suggest to you, that, frequently, those decisions are based on time, and time priorities, of the work site. For a supervisor, out of Enumclaw, or Issaquah, or North Bend, to say, "Yes, you should take the two and a half hours, to go into the city, fight the traffic, do the booking, another hour to get back, and that is going to leave me short of the staff that I need to keep this city safe, for the next four hours," is a much bigger decision, than to say, to a Seattle police officer, "Yes, take this youngster in, and book them."

And so, a child that might be equally

dangerous, out in the suburbs, might not be booked, 1 because of that, the simple logistical issue of getting 2 the child into the city, and back. And one of the big 3 issues that we are dealing with, in the regional 4 committee, is the need for a justice facility, for 5 youngsters, out in the suburbs. We will not have that 6 solved, in the next couple of years, but, three to six 7 8 9

facility.

years down the line, we may actually be able to address that. So just would like to caution you, that, even if we got all the racial bias out of the system, which we

will work to do, until we have a more convenient

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11

10

The other things, is that, people, the officers know, that, if they bring that child into the city facility, the parents are going to have a very difficult, coming in, to hearings, and following up, as well, so there may be a reason for keeping the kids, for a couple of hours, in the lockup, and then returning them, to its parents. The chief, here, can tell me more about what those items, what the rules are, so I will not say the wrong thing, but I think those decisions are sometimes made, based on logistics, as well as, or, rather than, on issues of race, or even, consideration of how dangerous this child is.

Now, that having been said, some other things

that we found out, about disproportionality, and why youngsters are more likely to by e detained, if they are kids of color, they are, particularly with our Asian communities, and our recent immigrants, they come to this country, with a whole different perspective, about law enforcement, about the police. They do not know about Officer Friendly. They know about the officer who is the arm of the political branch, and is there to enforce, and they know that, your first rule, is, you never tell the truth to an officer, you never, you know? And I work, in China, and Taiwan, so I came with some of those prejudices.

Our police department, the south precinct, a couple of years ago, entered into a partnership with the Refugee Women's Alliance, where, as soon as the youngster got in trouble with the law, that were from one of the new Asian communities, the new immigrant communities, the Refugee Women's Alliance would be given a contact, with that family. The Women's Alliance set up a program, set up programs, in the languages, of these different immigrant communities, where, they would have series of evening meetings. One would be with one of our community police team officers, coming in, to tell people, "Okay. This is what policing is like, in the United States. We need

your help. We need your help. We need to help you. We want to keep your kid out of trouble. If your kid gets in trouble, these are the steps you need to take." And that would be interpreted, in ways that made sense to the community, and then, the parents could talk among themselves, and develop a support network, themselves.

The next meeting might be a meeting with school officials. "Okay. Here are the rules about school. Here are the rules about attendance. Here is where you get help, if you do not understand the assignment. Here is the translation services we have. Here is what happens if your kid does not attend." So parents are getting that message, from somebody other than their child.

What if your kid does get into the juvenile justice system? Well, you have to be at those hearings, you have to understand about the plea, you have to follow up. There are a lot of steps. And, if a parent misses those steps, the court has to assume that this is a child that is basically unsupervised, and the likelihood of the child being detained is higher, as you heard, this morning.

So, helping parents through that system is part of what the Refugee Women's Alliance did, through

these classes. After about the first year of this program, our police officers reported to us, that the recidivism rate, on the kids whose parents had participated, was astonishingly low, and, what was more, their brothers and sisters had not offended, either. So they were able to stop the family pattern, of dysfunctional and antisocial behavior.

I do not know, but, whether, I think, I believe, this followed up one of the other suggestions, that came out of that, and out of Dr. Bridges' study, was that, videotapes be developed, and you could have a voice over, in a number of languages, where, you walked parents through the process, particularly the juvenile justice process. They understood what the terminology meant, and what the requirements were, of following their child through the process, and, with the voice over, in different languages, with different narrators, that might be a way, short of the structured meetings, to get that information to parents, so that, they can participate, after —

With respect to our African American youth, I think that we have fallen down, by not having community diversion programs, that really met their need, and so, I would congratulate the county people, Larry Gossett, and others, who are working on the Reaching Back,

Giving Back, project, to provide that diversion, for
kids, that is more likely to be effected, early on.
My kids all survived, because they got diverted to
programs, that, not only put them, made them do
community service, and pay for their crime, gave them a
hope of a clean record, but, actually, in some cases,
got them into the workforce, because their volunteering
gave them some work schools, and some work contacts.
So, if we can make that work better, for our people of
color, that will serve them, I think, in a multiplicity
of ways.
So those are some of the suggestions that I
have, for your consideration.
CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much.
MS. PAGELER: I took my turn, so.
CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much,
Margaret.
CHIEF CRAWFORD: Thank you folks, very much,
for allowing me to talk to you. My name is Ed
Crawford. I do not know why I am here. I am not
really a subject matter, I guess I am a subject matter
expert, but, I am just as confused as everyone else.
I have 30 years of law enforcement
experience. I was a state trooper, for 25 years, and,

the past four years, I have been the police chief, in

25

the City of Kent, and I am a member of the Washington
State. So I kind of, well, on one side of me, I am the
old policeman, on the other side of me, I try to think
about, particularly, because, in law school, trying to
develop our Constitution. The Constitution is so
extremely to us, and it is extremely important to the

police.

And then, during this past period of time, I have had the opportunity to serve with the regional law, justice, and safety, and other things, in kind of the south county. The City of Kent is located south of King County, or south of Seattle, and is one of the suburban cities. It is of moderate size, and it has a police department, of about 100 officers, and we have a city jail, one of the few city jails in the State of Washington, that houses about 100 people, a day, and it is a very fine structure.

Kent is, you would think of it as a very wealthy town, compared to others, and they have certainly allocated a lot of resources, to one social service side. One percent of their general fund budget is annually committed to the social service side of the city, and they certainly have funded the public safety side.

For me, listening to the presenters, I still

am still trying to figure out how to be a good policeperson. I still go back to my old days, in 1964, when they asked me, why did I want to be a state trooper?

And I said, well, I wanted to make the policing business better. I had been stopped, in my youth, and felt that, maybe, I was not treated, correctly, and I wanted to treat people, right.

And, over the years, as I was an academy instructor, and other things, in my tenure of time, we always try to say, to our people, "The good policeperson is that person that will always treat the individual, as they want to be treated, themselves."

And, over the past four or five years, those roots have really come back, because I found state trooping was rather easy. I had many instances, other than driving, and accidents, and some of those things. But, when you dealt with what we call, "violators," you have a smile on your face, and you try to talk them into the ticket, and, pretty soon, and you generally, you have a set standard. In our state, it is anyone over 10 miles an hour. It did not matter who you were, where you were going, what you were doing. You got it. And you smiled, and thanked them, and the rule was always, you thank them, when they take the ticket from

your hand, and you will find that they always thank you, back.

(Laughter.)

CHIEF CRAWFORD: And the smile, you know, and, okay. It is a personal contact.

And then, I went into city policing. Boy, what a change! What a change! Because, now, you are trying to decipher and define, what people mean, by, "protection."

And we all talk about the rapers, and the muggers, and the shooters, and the people that kill people. We all know that, definitionwise, those are the people we really want to go after, and that is easy, to define how to go after those folks.

But what about, the disturbance in the neighborhood? What about, the safety of our families, and friends, and neighbors, when they see people walking down the street? And what about, the people that we have, in our society, that really do not care a twiddle, about any one of us? And they would just as soon step on our heads, as look at us. And they are not robbing and killing. They are just, doing things, bad, to us.

And society asks the police to handle those folks. And I am just as confused as everyone else,

because, there are always two sides to every story. So we are constantly in the conflict, of trying to get our police to be on one side, aggressive, and handle those problems, but, on the other side, have that compassion, and responsibility, and willingness to try to get the story out, to see what really is the effect.

And so, you become a peacekeeper, but also, a protector, and also, I think you have to verge on the social service side. And it really causes a lot of confusion.

I think we are doing better than we have ever done, because I think that people like Councilperson Pageler have demanded that the city hire those types of individuals, that can take these confusing areas, and try to sort them out. And I think that will be the certain statement, of the police business, by being able to address all of these issues.

Now, this really has not helped, with disproportionality, but I would like to lead, to kind of explain, a little bit, where the police become confused, and why so many instances are misinterpreted, because I never go a day, that I do not find a misinterpretation, in how a person was stopped, what was said to the person, and how our officers conducted themselves. And, you know, very frankly, most of the

time, it is not the officer that is right. It is just that the officer had reasons, why they had to do what they had to do.

Example, and it shakes me, in my socks, because I am not used to that, either. I am used to policing, in the Sixties and Seventies, where you walked up to someone, and, just by size, or, you know, you wear your hat tall, and you look like you should be able to take care of it, and people will accept the authority.

Last week, coming out of an apartment complex, one of our officers, and we believe, and we have a very important rule, in our city, that you have patrol district coverage. That is beyond everything else. They have to get permission to leave their district. And so, we are always, we can be anyplace, in a minute or two.

And we get a call, on a fight, and their guns were displayed, or knives, or whatever, and, lo and behold, a car pulling into the driveway, and here comes a car!

Now, in the old days, we would have just, stopped the car, and I walked up, and said, "Hey! Who are you? What are you doing? Hi!" Or, "Hi! What are you doing? Where are you going?" And people would

have talked to you, probably.

But, now -- and this is what we teach, because the officer would be disciplined, if he did not do it, this way -- stops the car, pulls his gun, and takes them out, at gunpoint.

Now, these are young kids. Two of them. No shirt on. Pants, very low. They search them out. And you know what? .38 caliber revolver, in their shorts.

So what happens, in the police business, is, the problem of, kind of affirmations, reaffirming themselves, consistently, is, they are always working, in this environment, that is bad, that you and I do not see, all the time, every day, but they do. And so, I will guarantee you, the next stop will be just like that.

And so, we have got ourselves in kind of a circular motion, and we cannot seem to slow it down.

And I do not know how to get out of that thing, other than, doing some of the things that, I think, that the community has been trying to do.

One example, is in the south end, there is a thing called, "Project Lighthouse," and I know Seattle, and other areas, do it, all the time. And it is just good, old-fashioned drop-in centers, that try to teach the kids, and the young people, some values, try to

give them some advice, in terms of counseling and tutoring, try to give them an opportunity to go to someone, who is a role model, and try to give them a hot meal.

Now, where the police come in, to this thing, is, I think, that, you put the stiffarm, a little bit, on some of the business, particularly when you go visit them, in uniform, and you can get the businesses to start giving meals, and supplying these things. And that is okay. I think that is great, instead of making the workers, there, with these groups, try to get these different things for our community.

As a matter of fact, we were talking, just recently, here, about jobs. What we have tried to do, in trying to just start a program, and consulting, together, with the local chamber of commerce, and the local parts department, is trying to say, "Hey, chamber, would you give us 25 job spots, and, remember, every kid has got to lose their first job."

You know, everyone complains, "Well, we have done this, before, and they go for two days, and they never show, again." Well, that is okay. "They go three days, and they get fired." Well, every kid has got to be fired. We have all been fired. I have been fired, from my first job, also. So we have to talk our

1 businesspeople into this.

And then, we have got them going, and there, you seem to be willing to help out. Now, the next question, is, trying to get the kids.

You know, I said, I was a little difficult.

"What about transportation problems?," because they said, "There are transportation problems."

And, like I said, "Well, you cannot take a check?"

" No."

You know why? The environment is too unsafe.

And the whole environment, in many instances, is such,
that there is no one there, to transit for them.

So, what I see us doing, is, having to go through a lot more difficult evaluations, to help out, than what we used to have to do. So, now, to try to deal with the jobs, we have to try to figure out transportation, not only finding a place to work. That is the easy part. Now, we have to figure out the transportation, and the opportunities to move them back and forth, and trying to help them out, in terms of the work ethic, and trying to be that support factor.

Part of this stuff is what Lighthouse does.

And I see, and we have just copied the City of Seattle,
and other places, and King County, and Bellevue, and

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

other places.

Another thing that we have tried to do, in the south end, was, we have tried to involve a committee called, "South County Violence Task Force." And it is just a group of a whole bunch of people, that come in, once a month, to try to figure out what is happening, now. What are the strategies, what are we trying to get to, does anyone have any clear ideas, and what are the some of the failures, and some of the success points? So, at this next meeting, this month, we are going to be talking about a program that was just started, in terms of, kind of mobile recreational unit, that goes around, because we have a lot of it, in my location, a lot of multifamily homes.

And so, we are trying to do a mobile recreational van, that goes around, and works with the kids, instead of going to a central spot. One, the central spots are so costly, and it is hard to build, and it is hard to get the money, and so on. They are trying to take this route, and trying to deal with counselors, and supporters, and toolers, and other people.

So we are trying to work in that area, but everyone has a good idea, and it is hard to get your arm around all of this stuff. But people truly are,

working, at trying to make this very confusing area, of how to keep our people safe, productive, have them grow into older adults, that have a future, and I think the police officers are trying to do that, also.

I am not suggesting, for a moment, that the police have totally clean hands. They make mistakes. They get mad. Anyone, have you ever been, has anyone ever gotten you mad? They get mad. They can be vindictive. And you can really push their button. I see it happen, all the time.

Our job, is to try to -- with them, a little bit, slow them down, keep them safe, but make sure they solve all us, the way we need to be served. And that is why I personally respect committee hearings, like this, because what you are, I perceive, trying to say, is that, we have a problem. We want us all the work together, and we cannot accomplish this thing, that we call our society, in a civilized way, without all of us trying to get our arms around this problem. So I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, Chief. Questions?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Chief Crawford, I am aware that the City of Seattle has a diversity training

program, not only in the police department, but also, engineering and other departments. Does the City of Kent have a diversity training program for its officers? If they do, does it have any impact?

CHIEF CRAWFORD: Yes. We have a diversity training program. Now, is it the same as the City of Seattle? No.

One, is that, it is a smaller city, a smaller area. We have an advantage, within our city, is, every Friday is training day, because of the hours that they work. And so, we have an eight-hour training segment, every Friday. We have diversity training, every year.

What you will find, an advantage, are the smaller police, and I came from one, a very large department, is that, morays, and attitude, and kind of, "This is how I want it to occur," can kind of permeate the agency, easier, than a larger agency. And, in the police business, I think that a problem that police have, in our country, today, is trying to get the mission of the chief, down to the working officer, every day, all the time, and have them interpret it, the same way the chief wants it interpreted. And that is a challenge, but I think it is a challenge, in every organization, every person in America.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Other questions?

DR. BROOKS: Chief, could you give me the percentage of arrests, by ethnic groups --

CHIEF CRAWFORD: No, I cannot. And one reason, is, is that, it fluctuates, and it is, and I think it is very small. Now, when you talk about juveniles, and arrests, and, again, we kind of walk the line, that Margaret Pageler just said. By the time we get to the youth center, 30 miles away, during rush traffic, the center is probably full. We do not want to go down there, if we do not have to. I see the trips to the center, as very few.

But we also have, in an interesting observation, to talk about, kind of a mobile community. We, because of all of the apartment complexes, and the makeup of the community, I could not really tell you what is happening, tomorrow, because it changes, so rapidly, just by the makeup of the apartment complexes.

Now, what we did do, several years ago, and we found that it works, very well, and we call it apartment management, you know, the managers of the apartment complexes are part of this whole makeup, of trying to have a good, safe community. And if you have apartment complexes, that get out of control, you really have problems.

And so, we found, that, apartment managers

try to make sure, that they have responsible renters. 1 2 Now, the unresponsible renters have to go somewhere. 3 I am not suggesting that. But, when they work, real hard, to have responsible renters, that the juvenile 4 5 problem is lessened. I am not following, but, go on. DR. BROOKS: 6 7 The juvenile percent of providers, that is updated -- it was about 36 percent, African Americans, 8 9 that were detained, I guess, I guess that is the right 10 word. And then, when I listened to the fact that the 11 suburban are probably using a little bit more 12 discretion, by not coming there, Councilman, does that 13 mean that the large percentage of that 36 percent, or 14 most of them, are coming out of Seattle? 15 MS. PAGELER: I think you need to ask the juvenile justice people, the folks that run the center. 16 They would have the statistics on that. 17 I am not 18 certain about. 19 DR. BROOKS: I was just wondering, about that, because I --20 21 MS. PAGELER: Yes. 22 DR. BROOKS: -- had not thought about that, the fact that the distance made a difference. 23 24 MS. PAGELER: Yes. 25 DR. BROOKS: But it does bring up the second

question, and that was, that, when they talked to us, 1 the different presenters, this morning, indicated 2 3 that the judges have farmers, that they use, to determine processes that they go through, like the 4 prosecutor has some standards that they follow. But, 5 6 when they get to law enforcement, they have a lot more discretion. And that seemed to be a problem, in 7 8 listening to people talk about, just the law enforcement, and how they interacted with the different 9 10 ethnic minorities. And I was wondering, could you offer some suggestions, on how that might be put in 11 12 some perspective, that would allow more standards, so 13 that, maybe, we could reduce some of the incidents, that lead to arrests. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHIEF CRAWFORD: You know, where my confusion, sort of develops, is where, when I ask, last summer, there were some Asian -- and that, it has been for the past five or six or seven years. Remember, the police are usually on the end of that curve, so, by the time they -- able to develop the process.

And what I hear, in terms of my questioning, "How do you deal with this problem?," one way to deal with it, is, you kind of bird-dog that.

Now, to some people, that would be very offensive. To other people, they would think that that

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

is one safe way, to deal with these individuals, that are constantly trying to get loose from the police -- to rob someone's home.

And, so, I wish I could give you an easy answer, but, when you try to couple the officer safety, and knowing, full well, that people do not tell you the truth, if they are violating a law, and you stop them. They do not do that, generally.

And so, what happens, in the police business, is that, it is hard -- I used to say, just in my little, fleeting days, "I cannot put your thumb into my cigarette lighter, and your nose will turn red, if you are lying to me," so the police have indicators, and they, even profiles, and they do all of these things, that all of us say, are dastardly, and should not be done. But, yet, on the other hand, we are asking them to go out, and make us safe, and capture these individuals.

So, it is a very perplexing business.

I think the police, personally, are doing the best they can, particularly, by trying to make sure that they involve the community, and not being so secretive, and being open, to the questions, and also, being very responsive, to the complaints that come in. And I think, if we continue, on that route, a little bit

longer, we will come a little bit closer to the center.

Everyone will then agree.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Chief, I do not want you to judge the Federal Way police document, but I think you were here, and heard Ms. Walden's incident, about what happened, in Federal Way, a little bit earlier. If something like that was, if a complaint like that, was brought to you, what would be the normal procedure that you would go through, in dealing with that kind of result?

CHIEF CRAWFORD: Well, the first thing, I have been in the business, for so many years. I have never heard any statement, on anything, that, once you get it all worked out -- stuff, it is the same.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I understand that.

CHIEF CRAWFORD: And I also feel, and I have, again, been in the business, for so many years, that, all of us perceive, because everyone thinks that policing is very simple. We see too much of it, on television, and policing is probably one of the most difficult sociological concepts, in the world, trying to determine things, when people are not telling you the truth.

Our standard, and I believe that this is what police chiefs believe, everywhere, is that, you protect

people's rights, and that, you will arrest the law violators, and you will try to get to the truth of the matter. And, if you do not have those standards, you cannot survive, because there are too many people telling you, you made a mistake.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: If a case, like that, was brought to you, though, and after it has all been done, and then, there was a complaint filed, with you, as chief, saying that, your officers did such and such, what would you do, with that complaint? And I am not, I do not mean, by that --

CHIEF CRAWFORD: We would do, as most agencies do, an internal investigation, to find out what happened. And, of course, that is why police officers, nationwide, shudder and shake, when they see the internal investigator coming to their door. And we would get all of the reports and documents, and try to figure out what happened, in a legal fashion, so that we can understand.

Now, what I saw, and I used to work in internal affairs, for some years back, is that, a lot of complaints, and issues, are not necessary the legal side of it. It is perception of all of this. And what you really need, is for someone to say, "I am sorry," and "I will try to change." And if we can do a little

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

bit more of that, and I am talking from the police Stop worrying about the lawsuit! If we can just tell some people, "I am sorry, we will try to change our operation, and I am sorry I offended you, seven if it is your perception, and get out of this legal stuff, I think we will be better off.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Councilwoman Pageler and Chief Crawford, thank you, both, for taking the time from your busy schedules to be here, and we appreciate the work that you do, and we appreciate your being here, very much, to help us with this. you.

Next, we have, James Kelly, and, I apologize. I very probably am not going to say the name, completely right. Sadikifu? Sadi? That is probably why I am not going to say it, right, because that is not spelled right, on here. I apologize. Would you say your name for us?

MS. AKINA-JAMES: Sure. I will say it. is Sadikifu Akina-James. It is a misspelling, in the last name.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay. I appreciate Thank you, very much, for being here, and if you, Ms. James, if you would also introduce yourself, and then, we would appreciate it. We have about 25

minutes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KELLY: Thank you, very much. For the record, my name is James Kelly. I am the executive director of the Mid-Washington State Commission on African American Affairs. I am really pleased to have this opportunity to talk to you, and thank you, very much, for the invitation.

I would have to agree with Councilperson Pageler had said, earlier, and that is, the issue dealing with disproportionality is a very complex, controversial, and critical issue, and I am glad that this commission is examining the juvenile justice system. Before going to my presentation, I would just only have a request of the Commission, that I think there are some important players, that, at least, are not scheduled, today, on the agenda, that, I think -and that is, I think, you need to talk to a representative from, what I call, the administrator for the courts, or the court administrators, their association. I think it is very important that you talk to, one, the association, of what they call, Sheriffs and Police Chiefs --

It is very that you also include a discussion with the Washington State Law Enforcement Association.

That is the police union. And then, fifth, you should,

it is important to talk to what we call, "WAPA," which is the Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. Those are some of the major stakeholders that are shaping the kind of public policy, that the legislature tries to address, as it pertains to juvenile justice, and also, as it pertains to disproportionality.

Who are these children that are being referred to our criminal justice system?

What we have discovered, is, when I first got involved, in this issue, what really led the Commission to looking at the issue of disproportionality, was a statement, that was made by a European philosopher, that says, "The true measure of a society can be seen, in how it treats those who we admit in prison."

And what we have decided that, we wanted to look at, children, and, on a national level; back in 1990, we looked at data from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, found out, that, anywhere between 50 to 60,000 children, across this country, are being detained in some kind of juvenile facilities, and that, out of the 50 to 60,000 juveniles in custody, about 56 to 60 percent of those were youth of color, primarily African American.

Closer to home, we discovered, back in 1990, when we started, and this information has now been

updated, Dr. Bridges, from whom you have heard, earlier, looked at the composition of the juvenile justice system, and — those, who are in the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration's system. Again, back in 1990, close to 38 percent of those children, who were in the juvenile justice system, were children of color, compared to their population of only 13 percent. But now, in 1994, youth of color constitute about 44 to 46 percent of those who are now in the Juvenile Justice Administration position.

We decided, that, we wanted to know the extent of which disproportionality was occurring. As Dr. Bridges has said, and I will not repeat his presentation, his findings were pretty — basically saying that, he concluded, after a two-year study, that, despite low arrest rates, that whites and youth of color were referred to the juvenile courts, substantially higher, that youth of color were more likely than whites to be detained, and youth of color were adjudicated for more offenses, at a disproportionate, higher rate, than whites, and, at last, that youth of color were more likely to be sentenced to confinement, because of some certain issues.

But the state has made some tremendous

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

strides toward addressing racial disproportionality. In 1993, the Washington State legislature enacted what they called the -- House Bill 1966. It is the Racial Disparity Act. The act was designed to remedy problems of racial and ethnic disproportionality in the administration of juvenile justice. The act contains about eight provisions, and several of those provisions look at different areas. The first area, that the legislature requires to be done, is, one, I think, Mike Curtis, from the juvenile administrator -- talked about this, earlier, was, improvements either for the collection and analysis of the information -prosecuted, adjudicated -- in juvenile courts. other, was, provide extensive and routine diversity training for law enforcement, and juvenile justice officials.

And that is basically one thing that we discovered: The state did not have jurisdiction over law enforcement -- alluding to, earlier, and -- the legislature thought that, maybe, one way, on looking at providing some training, or affecting the way that officers relate to youth of color, was through the Tacoma Justice Training Commission, which is --

The other, was, making sure that there were information -- and translated, to talk about court

processes and procedures, and then, the fourth issue 1 was talking about specific criteria, for the use of 2 The fifth was talking about consolidating 3 detention. juvenile services dollars, which is, money that comes 4 from the states and county -- making sure that 5 counties, now, must include in their plans, for these 6 7 funds, how they are planning to reduce disproportionality, and you do have a couple of court 8 administrators, who explained what those programs are 9 10 all about. And the last issue, which has been one that we are still working with, and that is, developing 11 12 uniform practices, in regard to prosecution and adjudication of juvenile offenses. 13

In 1994, the legislature had the bill they called -- House Bill 2319, and that was the Omnibus Youth -- Prevention Act. And there is a provision, that is contained in there. There are two things that have to do with addressing disproportionality.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One was, that, the law mandates that all prosecutors develop what they call "prosecutorial standards," and it was in accordance to the racial disproportionality study. And, second, there was a provision in there, that talks about, and Councilperson Pageler mentioned a little bit about it, and that is, they have established, throughout the state, what they

call, "regional law justice councils," that mainly, primarily, their focus -- looking at jail population, what needs to be done about that situation.

But the legislation clearly says, that, there needs to be an advisory committee, made up of people, from the regional law, safety and justice committee, as well as, about five members from the community, and their specific purpose is to look at the -- of disproportionality, to address concerns, that the community has raised, particularly as it pertains to bias, in sentences, and prosecution. And my understanding, effectively, in September, this group is supposed to be providing an annual report, to the legislature, regarding some of their findings, on what is happening. It is important that we -- reviews, or ask the question, to what extent are they in compliance with the law?

Let me just close, by basically saying that, I think there are about three issues the Commission will be working on, during the subsequent legislative session, and I am pleased to see that, one of the individuals who has been working very successfully on behalf of the Commission, is, Representative — is here — certainly will appear from Representative Bobby — this afternoon.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that Dr. Bridges probably said to you, that, the state has made, the courts have made, tremendous progress, toward addressing disproportionality. Certainly, every county seems to have, one, diversity training, that has been going, on an ongoing basis, for the staff. Second, there has been tremendous hiring, in regard to making sure that there is, first, representation within the juvenile court systems. But the policy decisions seem to be in areas that needs to be treated, more, and specifically, is, as Dr. Bridges might have alluded to, earlier, it is policy regarding who is detained, and not detained, certainly, a great emphasis on alternatives to detention, and again, we will be back, at this legislative session, talking about more of some structure, in regard to prosecutorial standards, which would include the data collection mechanism, that, we think, is very important, to look at the demographic characteristics of those, who are being prosecuted, and we are asking that the prosecution supply that information. And then, last, but not least, we want to make sure that the system finds ways of making sure, that, it is more friendlier, to parents, and kids. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much.

Ms. James?

MS. AKINA-JAMES: I am Sadikifu Akina-James, and I am manager of the Community Services Division, for King County. And the Community Services Division is where most of the county's current expense-funded community-based social services are located, at least -- furlough services.

And it is not juvenile justice anything. It is primarily youth and family type services, that we have gone to community services, like Project Lighthouse, that the police chief, from Kent, just mentioned.

What I am going to talk about, is, one response to disproportionality, that King County will be implementing, is funding, and will be implementing. And the background, to this, as to how this project came about, is that, in 1993, when Dr. Bridges had issued his report, which had been commissioned, by the Commission, the previous county executive invited Dr. Bridges, and James Kelly, to come to a candidate meeting, and talk about that report, and its findings. And then, the county executive asked the departments, that we can think of, any way in which we might respond?

And our department, which, my division is

located in the Department of Human Services, we looked at the possibility of coming up with some kind of community-based alternatives to detention, that would address the highest, the population with the highest detention rate, which is African Americans, at this point, according to Dr. Bridges' report.

Ultimately, one of the things that Dr.

Bridges found, was that, part of the disproportionate problem, in terms of detention, had to do with judges at least understanding a perception of a lack of community or family support, or structure, for the youth, that would enable them to stay with the community, and have the judges feel that they could rely upon the youth to return from their court appointments. Therefore, they were detained, when detention was not mandatory. We are talking about cases where detention was not mandatory.

We finally came up with the idea of looking at community-based alternatives to detention, for African American youth, the population with the highest proportion, disproportionate, detention rate, and we had a goal, from that, for our format, which was, to empower the African American community, to take responsibility, for African American youths, who are involved in the juvenile justice system. So we had to

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have a strategy, for reaching that goal, which, another goal would be, obviously, to reduce the disproportionate detention of African American youth by providing alternatives to detention.

But, in order to achieve the first goal, we looked at having some kind of community mobilization project, to involve the community, make them aware of the issue, and to get the community's involvement -- to such a concept. We contracted with the Black Child Development Institute of Seattle, to conduct something called the "African American Strategic Family Community Empowerment Campaign," and the goals, if I can review the goals of that, very quickly, and I will try to give a little synopsis of what that was about, so I can go on to the meet of it. The goals of the project, were, to promote the principles and values embraced by accomplished African Americans, which guide youth in their development into strong, healthy, mature, and responsible adults, and I have to say, right here, our definition of "accomplish" is not the traditional one. It did mean, "accomplished, in job, or career," but it also meant, "accomplished, in community service," or, "accomplished, in family life," which means, you were able to raise a family, and your family did okay, when you were raising them, so, therefore, you were

|

accomplished, and you know some of what it takes.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Other goals, were to, describe the traditions, values, and cultural practices of African Americans, in King County, which act as protective vectors for African American youth, to build a stronger and more powerful sense of individual and collective responsibility among African Americans, for the welfare of African American youth, and to harness the knowledge, skills, expertise, and spiritual power, of these accomplished African Americans, to create a community-based strategy, designed to rescue African American youth from the juvenile justice system, and, to identify, and gain commitments, for resources that the African American community is willing to pledge to a strategy, which reduces the disproportionate detention of African American youth, and to involve African American youth in this process, in the process that was going on.

This group, basically, held 20 caucus groups, throughout King County, that did involve 175 accomplished African Americans. There were also focus groups, with 100 African American youth, which, that involved a variety of youth, who were incarcerated, at Green Hill, to youth, down at DYS, to youths, who were, quote, "at risk," to youth, who were involved in a

church, Saturday school, who were not at risk, who were doing well.

The result, and, to put it in a nutshell, the result of that, which was a report that described what African American adults, at least, a group of African American and Latin American adults, in King County, felt were the strategies, in terms of prevention, intervention, and treatment, and recovery, that would be a program for African American youth, and, specifically alternatives to detention for African American youth, and the same thing, for African American youth, themselves, and that is embodied in this report, of which I will leave a copy, for the record.

After King County received this report, and I certainly glossed over what happened, in that process, but that process was something, in itself, and one result, was that, we had 80 African Americans, who made a commitment, to become involved, in some way, in the alternatives to detention for African American youth. When King County received this report, we put together a work group, to design the parameters for alternatives to detention project, and that was an internal county work group, and it included, actually, several of the people you have, on here, today. It included Judge

Huggins, Judge Ridge, Red Cutler, who at that time, was the deputy prosecutor for juveniles, here in King County, the Region IV, JRA administrator, the Region IV, DCFS administrator, representatives from the defenders' association, Dick Carlson, who we had here, this morning, representatives from some of our own internal systems, including mental health, other representatives from DYS, people who had any involvement or tangential involvement in the juvenile justice system.

This group helped us to determine the populations of African American youth, to -- we would focus any alternative detention project, and we kept up with two populations. One would be, African American youth who are on their first appearance, or who are detained, at DYS, within the first 72 hours; after their detention, who were not mandated to be detained, to try and have them released, within the first 72 hours. The second population, would be youth who already have failed to appear, in one of their numerous appearances, where they should have, and for whom bench warrants have been issued, to bring them back, into the process, to try to get those warrants quashed, and whenever their issues were settled, and resolved.

Following that, we did develop a program

plan, which, just last week, was approved by the county councils, law, justice, and human services committee. The county has committed \$350,000 to an alternatives to detention project, for African American youth. We have \$56,000, from the governor's advisory committee, on juvenile justice, and some commitments, from Sid --who, I see, is later here, this afternoon --Sidorowicz, to help us with some federal matched funding.

I forgot, I have not said what the core of the project is. The core of the project, is that, we will try to, within the first 72 hours of a youth being detained, to match them up with a mentor, or a community-based organization, that will have responsibility for their oversight, for them to be released into the community, who will have responsibility for their oversight, and to ensure that they would return, for all of their court appearances, and provide them, and their families, with the services that they would need, in order for the youth to be on the right path, and, hopefully, not return to the juvenile justice system.

I think I have said that, in a nutshell.

I did not go into the details of the project, which,
there are lots of details, and I will leave a copy of

1	the program plan, for this project, which we will be
2	releasing the request for proposals, for this project,
3	next week. It is not that the county would operate
4	this. We would release a request for proposals, for
5	operation of a community-based organization.
6	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Ms. James, is this
7	brand new, or is this a?
8	MS. AKINA-JAMES: This is brand new.
9	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Models, elsewhere, in
LO	the country, or did you all create it?
L1	MS. AKINA-JAMES: We created this. I am not
L2	aware. I am sure there must be some other models, or
L3	something, in the country, but the Reaching Back,
L4	Giving Back, project, is one, we came up, here, and we
L5	expect that the design of the project will take it to
L6	account the principles, and the values, that were
L7	described, by people, from the community. And so, our
L8	goal, here, is to empower the community, this
L9	particular community, so it is based among the people
20	of this community.
21	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Fine. Sounds
22	exciting.
23	Questions from the Committee?
24	DR. BROOKS: Mr. Kelly, just one. We heard

from the Asian group, and some of the others, and their

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

groups, and they say that, language is a causal factor, that needs to, what they feel, is --

Have you done any studies, to see what might be causal factors, for African Americans? Because we have like a 36 point some percent, based on the latest statistics that have.

Well, I think Dr. Bridges' MR. KELLY: Yes. report, Dr. Brooks, comes to the closest thing, and this deals with the issues. I think that, as Margaret Pageler said, earlier, what we have discovered, with African Americans, is that, too often, when you afford more discretion -- let me back up -- when you afford discretion to police, prosecutors, and judges, there needs to be safeguards in place, because, too often, what they are using, as Dr. Bridges' report highlighted, earlier, is social conditions, for social factors, regarding their decision to detain. example, as Sadikifu describing, in her project, it is entirely in and out of school, what is going on with the family. That has nothing to do, with what we call, "establishing racial, the neutral decisions," and that is, "What is the severity of the offense, any kind of prior history?."

Although that legislation, and those principles, are in place, too often, what happens, is,

judges, or prosecutors, or law enforcement, based upon,
again, social factors, are making some decisions,
trying to arrest, prosecute, or detain. And what we
are discovering, particularly, with being an African
American, it was those social factors, that contributed
more to, certainly, the likelihood of them being
detained.

. 9

And so, what our emphasis has been placed on, is, making sure there are neutral, race-neutral policies, that we define as basically looking at the severity of the offense, and looking at the prior history. There is this factor, of, whether or not the person is a flight, or whether they would be a risk to the community, if released?

But we are asking them to follow the rule, and not make up subjectivity, subject to -- and decision.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Other questions?
Thank you, both, very, very much.
MR. KELLY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, for taking the time, to be here, and I also thank both of you.

I know your work, James, and I appreciate -- hearing about yours, today, Ms. James, but that, both of you are doing projects, and doing work to solve the

problem. We hear about the problem -- hear -- happy, 1 to solve it, and we appreciate it, very much. Thank 2 3 you. MS. AKINA-JAMES: Thank you. 4 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Looking a little to 5 the west, we have Greg Hubbard, from the prosecuting 6 attorney's office, in Kitsap County, and Ned Delmore. 7 MR. DELMORE: Harold Delia is not here. 8 9 Ned Delmore. Thank you. (Discussion was held off-microphone.) 10 MR. HUBBARD: And you want Mr. Delmore's --11 going to be timely, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Delmore is 12 13 actually, perhaps, a bit more relevant, to this committee, because he actually, Mr. Delia is an 14 15 administrator, like myself, and Mr. Delmore actually 16 works with children and parents, so, he is sort of in the trenches, along the front lines. So that might be 17 even more valuable, for the Committee. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We always have the 20 lucky breaks. If you could introduce yourself, briefly, for 21 22 the record, note your name, and then, also, the title, 23 and then, proceed.

MR. DELMORE:

24

25

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

will probably start this out, but I will introduce

Thank you.

I think Mr. Hubbard

myself. I am Ned Delmore. I have been in Kitsap
County, their juvenile court, for the last six months.
I came from King County, and my present position, is
that, I am supervisor, and manager, of the probation,
and of the department, at Kitsap County, and I do
manage to also carry a small caseload of families and
youth, while doing my work.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: And my name is Greg Hubbard.

I am the deputy prosecutor in charge of juvenile prosecutions, over in Kitsap County, and, like my friend, Mr. Delmore, I, too, was the long time prosecutor, for King County, for about 15 years. I was supervisor of the juvenile court unit, for over eight, and I am very fortunate that I received a new challenge, in midlife, and was able to sneak across the other side of the Puget Sound, and work over at Kitsap County. But I did enjoy my experience, in King County, and I think I can provide some information for the Commission, regarding the very critical issue of disproportionality.

When Dr. Bridges did his report, he spent a lot of time, down in King County. We opened up all our files to him. We made ourselves available, for any comments that he had, and continue to do so, over the

King County and Kitsap County. Both Mr. Delmore and I are members of the juvenile justice subcommittee, that Mr. Kelly referred to -- the regional law, safety and justice committees. The juvenile justice subcommittee is very active, in Kitsap County. We met, just yesterday. We are looking forward to getting together, to prepare our report, to the legislature, which is due in September.

Some of the issues surrounding disproportionality, in Kitsap County, are similar to those surrounding issues, statewide. The thing that we discovered, most, over there, when our committee started meeting, here, in February, was, the disproportionate number of youth of color initially detained, in our detention facility. We had about a 24-bed detention facility. There are generally about 40 folks, in there, now. There is going to be a levy, a bond issue, before the voters of Kitsap County, in September, to build a new facility, both juvenile detention, and the juvenile justice center, over there, at Port Orchard, this September. It is a substantial project.

But we did notice that there were many. The percentage of youth of color incarcerated was substantial. And so, what the department did, was, in

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

conjunction with the superior court judges, the law enforcement agencies, my office, and that of the department, itself, hired Emmett Bell, an outside consultant, and it established some detention intake standards, that are indeed race-neutral.

The issues surrounding detention have to do with, danger to the community, and likelihood of failure to appear, and we established this race-neutral detention intake standards, with regard to those two They go into effect, on June $10^{\frac{th}{t}}$, which is tomorrow, and we are very curious to see how they work out. Mr. William Trumper, who is the detention services manager, and I, have been throughout the county, training law enforcement officers, from Bainbridge Island, down to South Kitsap County, and, like I said, we are very interested in seeing how things are going to go. We will be assessing those detention intake standards, to see their effectiveness, over the next six months, to see how things are going, but we are very optimistic, that this will decrease disproportionality.

I think I was here, for the tail end of Chief Crawford's remarks, and, as he indicated, sometimes, when you are out on the street, 2:00 o'clock in the morning, tempers flare, and things like that. We are

hoping that our detention intake standards preclude some of those detentions, where the kid fails the personality test of the police officer. We are hoping it is going to be crime-driven, and based upon statutory considerations.

Now, I must take exception with my friend,
Mr. James Kelly, who indicates, that failure to attend
school, is not a valid, it is more of a social, than a
statutory reason. What we have discovered, over the
years, is that, a failure to attend school means that a
child is much more dangerous to the community than one
not attending school. And so, failure to attend
school, rather than a social condition, is truly a
statutory condition, of both danger to the community,
and likelihood of failure to appear. So I am going to
take exception to Mr. Kelly's remarks, that judges
should not be considering failure to attend school.

I also indicate that Mr. Kelly said that you folks might want to visit with the Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, WAPA, if you will. I might offer the information, that I might share, with the juvenile committee, of the association, and we met, just last Friday, to discuss our annual training, where we get representatives from most all the 39 counties, and this has been an issue, for the

association, that has been great, and, in fact, it was considered so -- last year, that we invited Mr. Kelly to address our annual training, and he did spend an hour, with us, discussing the issues of disproportionality in the State of Washington, in juvenile justice.

Because Washington is so diverse, itself, many of our county representatives do not have much cultural, or racial, diversity, in their counties.

In -- County, in northeast Washington, they might have, functionally, no African American peoples. They might have some Native Americans, some of the counties to the east, Yakima, and some of the Tricities, have more of a Hispanic population. But we were happy to have James, there, and we are going to continue, in our ethical treatment, which is mandated by the bar association, and part of that training, that we will have, on the statewide level, is based upon disproportionality.

In addition to the detention intake standards, one of the things that my boss, the newly-elected prosecutor of Kitsap County, Russ Howke, has developed, are these prosecution standards. The prosecution standards in Bill 1966, that are mandated by the state, are somewhat general, in their application. Over at Kitsap County, we are

establishing more specific standards, with regard to 1 charging on each individual crimes, the number of 2 3 counts, and things like that. So we are very aggressive, in establishing some prosecution standards, 4 both for charging, and disposition, in Kitsap County, 5 because, one of the issues the judge, that George 6 Bridges, discovered, was, especially in the juvenile 7 system, that the prosecutor's decision on what crime to 8 charge, has a big impact on whether the case is 9 diverted, or whether it is filed, and processed, for 10 juvenile court. And if there are race-neutral 11 standards, as to, to guide young prosecutors, in making 12 13 their charging decisions, then we can be more fair, in determining which cases get diverted, and which 14 15 actually get filed, and processed, in the juvenile

court.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Last but not least, we are, in conjunction with the department, over in Port Orchard, we are having some dispute resolution training, and a two-day training session, on the next two Fridays, and that would include diversity training, in which members of the juvenile probation staff, law enforcement, my office, and members of the community, will participate in a two-day training program, for dispute resolution, that will include a substantial portion of time, to

cultural diversity training.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am happy to entertain any questions.

Othewise, Mr. Delmore can describe to you some of the things that the youth department do, at the probation level.

MR. DELMORE: I will be, all right?

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes. Let us let you go first, and then, we will ask questions, of both of you. That is fine.

In the 15 years that I was in MR. DELMORE: King County, we developed the finest policies and procedures manuals, that I have ever seen. And I came to learn, and understand, the policies and procedures mean absolutely nothing, unless they are enforced, unless they are held to a standard, by people in the department. And so, consequently, I have come to King County, to try to do something, better, and I have come there, knowing that there are no policies and procedures. There are very few standards, and we are in the process of developing them, now, and I believe we are going to do them, right, because we learned a lot from our King County experiences. And so, I move to the intake criteria, that Mr. Hubbard spoke to, and I think this is critical to disproportionality.

The police officers could, with impunity,

drop any kid off, at the door, and they would be taken in, no questions asked. That will not happen, any more, in Kitsap County. So Mr. Hubbard, and Mr. -- are working the community, working law enforcement.

And this is going to be a tough road. There is going to be some conflict, around this, but I think we have started a process, here, and we are not turning back. Our administration believes this is the way to go, and we are not deterring from our task.

Secondly, we have developed and incorporated alternatives to detention. We do not believe every kid needs to be locked up. There are multiple ways of treating kids, and you need to open your mind, on some of these things. You need to screen the kid, properly, you need to do your work, up front, properly, but you can find alternatives to detention, in the community, besides maximum security detention.

So we begin electronic monitoring, which is not for everyone, and it is not a panacea, it is not a great program, but it is a good program, and it allows kids to be back in the community, to be going to school, to be going to counseling, and continuing to do the things to realize and improve themselves. If they screw up, then they deal with the felony charge of escape.

So, you have got both protection to the community, which is very important, and you also have a kid that is back in the community, being supervised, better, than they have ever been supervised, before. So we have improved on our alternatives to detention. And thirdly, I would just like to reiterate what Mr. Hubbard said about diversity training. need it, in Kitsap County, badly, and we are doing something about that, and we continue, in our belief, to bring people into our department, to confront issues around our racism, around disproportionality and we are welcoming it. We know that we need it, and so, we are on that track, and we feel determined to continue on that track, and we feel good about where we are going.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Ouestions from the Committee?

MR. MARTIN: Just one question. In Kitsap County, which is west of us, is there a significant population of juveniles, who are minority, as compared -- kind of doubt it, I mean, Kitsap is mostly Caucasian, is it not?

MR. DELMORE: It is mostly Caucasian, but you have got a large population of military base folks, in that community. And so, consequently, you have a significant number of people youth.

5

MR. HUBBARD: Mostly in Bremerton, where the big naval operation is, over in Bremerton, and, as you know, the military is very culturally diverse. In the more unincorporated parts of the county, it is mostly Caucasians. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: What is your interaction with the Native American population, and how they impact on courts, or how? I know they have some separate judicial systems, but.

MR. HUBBARD: The Squamisha nation, is up at sort of the north end of the county, the northeast part of the county, near Bainbridge Island, and we do see them, occasionally, when the Native American kids go over the reservation, but they have their own juvenile court system, up there. They have been very interested in having us come out there. We just have not had a chance to do that, yet. We are very much interested in developing a partnership, with the Squamisha, and I think they feel the same way.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And did you bring a copy of the detention intake standards, perchance, with you? Is that something that we could enter into the record?

MR. HUBBARD: I would love to. I did not bring one. I would love to send you that.

1	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Could you do that?
2	MR. HUBBARD: You bet!
3	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Okay. If you would
4	check with Tom?
5	MR. HUBBARD: Mr. Pilla?
6	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes. With Mr. Pilla,
7	before you go, and make sure that you have the address
8	and can send those up to him.
9	MR. HUBBARD: I would be happy to.
10	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And the prosecution
11	standards, too. I think both of those pieces would be
12	great, to have incorporated into these plans.
13	MR. HUBBARD: You bet, Mr. Chairman!
14	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Questions?
15	MR. ISRAEL: Mr. Hubbard, you said that you
16	have adopted, effective tomorrow, intake standards,
17	which are race-neutral. Are the ones that are in
18	effect, today, not race-neutral, or are they merely
19	subjective, in their application?
20	MR. HUBBARD: There are no detention
21	standards, effective today. That has been part of the
22	problem.
23	Let me give you an example. There were no
24	standards. If the law enforcement officer tried to get

off the detention, that child was admitted. For

instance, about two months ago, a kid was, I got in, Monday morning, and discovered that a kid had been there, Saturday, and Sunday night, because, Saturday afternoon, he was caught smoking, in Port Orchard!

It is a crime, in the State of Washington, for, actually, in a Class III civil infraction, to be caught with tobacco, when you are under 18 years of age. It just is.

Generally, an officer then take your cigarettes, and throw them away. If you really flunk the personality test, an officer will cite you, and you can be fined \$50.

This kid really flunked the personality test, and the officer brought him to attention, and he was booked, for two days, on a Class C misdemeanor, in the City of Port Orchard!

It was a white kid, so there was not any disproportionality there, but that, generally -- and the kid lived in Port Orchard -- that kind of crime, with that kid's social history, why is he in detention?

And so, there are going to be detention standards. There are going to be some, effective tomorrow, and that kid would not be detained.

MR. ISRAEL: That young person would not be detained, after June 10^{th} , no matter how disrespectful

and abusive he would be of the police officer?

MR. HUBBARD: Exactly. If the kid was a resident, he would certainly be -- his parents would have to come down, and get him. But he would not be detained, if he was simply abusive, and he flunked the personality test. That is correct.

MR. ISRAEL: And you are sure that is progress?

MR. HUBBARD: I think it is progress. There is a big cultural change, in our community, about that, where the police feel, that, if a kid mouths off, they want to send him to detention, but, like as I indicated, we have 24 beds, and, quite often, there are over 40 kids in detention, and, my feeling is, I do not want to have to release a burglar, or an assaulter, to have somebody in possession of tobacco, no matter how rude the kid is.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: When would that become a crime? When would the rudeness to the police officer, in itself, become a crime?

MR. HUBBARD: If the kid lies to the police officer, for instance, that is obstructing a public servant, or providing false information, if he lies, but, generally speaking, just somebody being abusive to a police officer, whether they are a juvenile, or an

adult, is not a crime.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Yes. But there is a line, there, somewhere, and, when he crosses that line, then it becomes another issue, right?

MR. HUBBARD: Exactly. And then we are happy to accept them, if that cross that line.

DR. BROOKS: I have one, for Mr. Hubbard.

I was just fascinated with your discussion with the school attendance, because, even though, I guess, it is race-neutral, and that, anyone that would not attend could be affected by that, but it seems to me, that, with some of the ethnic minorities, that you have some problems, associated with just school attendance, that would create disproportionality as an example, alienation, from school, because of the way they are treated, at the school. Income levels, and the lack of value placed on school.

So, by using that, as a criteria, it seemed to me that it is going to lead to disproportionality.

MR. HUBBARD: And therein lies the nub, Mr. Brooks, because, is disproportionality discrimination, or is some disproportionality actually warranted? And I think Dr. Bridges makes that distinction, in his report, that not all disproportionality is, per se, bad.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

1	DR. BROOKS: I understand.
2	MR. HUBBARD: Yes.
3	DR. BROOKS: But using school attendance, as
4	a criteria, to make that determination.
5	MR. HUBBARD: That is not the sole criteria,
6	but if you are the judge, considering whether to make a
7	release decision, would that information be something
8	you would consider, in determining whether the kid
9	(A) is going to be a danger to the community, or
10	(B) going to appear for court, if he is not enrolled in
11	school. If he is not enrolled in school, what is he
12	doing, with his time? If he has got a job, that is
13	certainly different. But, if he is not enrolled in
14	school, if he is not, if he does not have a job, what
15	is that kid going to do, with his time?
16	DR. BROOKS: Okay. You said, attendance,
17	before. I thought you were looking at his attendance
18	record. But you mean
19	VOICE: It is background, too.
20	MR. HUBBARD: If I said, "attendance," then I
21	misspoke.
22	DR. BROOKS: Okay.
23	MR. HUBBARD: It is really enrollment.
24	DR. BROOKS: Okay.
25	VOICE: Okay.

1	MR. HUBBARD: And, yes. If the kid is
2	enrolled in school
3	VOICE: Okay.
4	MR. HUBBARD: the judge can order him to
5	attend
6	VOICE: Okay.
7	MR. HUBBARD: in part of the conditions of
8	release. But if he is not enrolled in school,
9	generally, the court will say, that, "I am happy to
10	reconsider your detention status, if you are either
11	gainfully employed, or enrolled in school."
12	VOICE: Okay.
13	DR. BROOKS: Okay.
14	VOICE: Thanks.
15	DR. BROOKS: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Other questions?
17	Thank you, both, very much. It sounds like
18	you are setting out some good directions.
19	VOICE: Good luck!
20	MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: It is a little more
22	manageable
23	(Laughter.)
24	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much,
25	for your time. We appreciate it, very much.

And our next two, Steve Johnston, and Susan 1 2 Waild? MS. WAILD: Waild. Thank you. 3 Yes. (Laughter.) 4 5 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Good to have you both, here, thank you, very much, and I would like to have 6 you both introduce yourself, before we begin, please, 7 and your name, and what you are representing, and for 8 our record. 9 Thank you. 10 MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. I am proud to be here. My name is Steve Johnston. 11 I am the 12 juvenile court administrator, from the Pierce County Juvenile Court. This is my, what, twenty-second year, 13 14 with the juvenile court? I have been the court administrator, for the last fifteen. 15 I have been three-time president of the Association of Juvenile 16 17 Court Administrators. I have been here, for a while. 18 Thank you, very much. 19 I probably take a little bit different view, 20 than probably what Greq suggested, that I be here, in 21 terms of juvenile court. And wherever juvenile courts are, these days, and what, certainly, the role, and the 22

23

24

25

the responsibility of the courts.

Certainly, we know, that, in Pierce, again, a

broad view, relative to disproportionality, and what,

lot percentage of the kids that are referred to us, are kids fifty-nine, probably, about 39 percent. We also know that almost 60 percent of serious criminal activity referrals are kids of color. We also know that the vast majority of our kids, that come to us, families are in the poverty level, single parent homes. The average grade level of the kid, who is coming to us, their academic standards, is five years behind That is average. grade level.

We can do a number of things, that Dr.

Bridges has suggested, and we do. I think we do hire,
at Pierce County, a diverse, competent staff.

Thirty-five percent of our staff, both professional,
and nonprofessional, in other words, probation,
detention, are folks of color.

We do have detention standards, which are neutral. A kid coming in, will not get in, for having cigarettes, or whatever. It is very, very strict, who can come in, who does not. We do have culture diversity training. We do contract with a diverse group of folks. We do try to, as best we can, in diversion, and our volunteers, represent the community. We do those things.

What we cannot do, and what we are having a great deal of difficulty, as I see it, the last few

years, both in this state, and the nation, is the sense, that, we have abandoned, I think, intervention, as a strategy, and, by implication, we have abandoned juvenile court.

We have, in state after state, and this state, we have lowered to age of jurisdiction, in some cases. We have enhanced punishments for certain sorts of crime. We are dealing with criminal behavior with sanctions, and so on. We have gotten away from what I believe was the principle of the juvenile court, when it was first founded, almost nine years, to deal with individuals, that kids are in fact different. Massive intervention does work. We have gotten away from that.

What has happened, I think, and I think it is a shame, more and more, and you heard, this morning, and you have heard it, today, that we want to keep kids out of the juvenile justice system. There is a sense, out there, that, once a kid is arrested, and comes to the juvenile court, that it is abandoned, it is too late, almost, by reference, a trashing.

I think, in many respects, that is the shame, of what has happened.

We know, we have gotten to a point, where, in this state, and others, again, since we have abandoned intervention, we have spent our money. We talked about prevention. It is almost as if we focus on two things. We focus on prenatal care, and we focus on building more prisons, and there is a huge gap, in between.

We have been focused on prevention, in these things, for years. Kids are coming to us, at record levels. Probably, in 1994, in this state, certainly in Pierce County, we have the highest referral rate we had ever had. Our institutions are full. We are, almost all of our, are at 140 capacity.

As a juvenile court administrator, and I represent every juvenile court administrator, here, who runs a detention center, do you think we want kids in detention?

This is, I hate it, when a kid is in detention. It is necessary, at times. There is no question about it. But the liability is tremendous. We do not want kids in detention. We do want these alternatives.

What happens, is -- and this is a fact -- too oftentimes, they are getting, going back to the psyche, what was a juvenile justice situation, now, it is lost. None of the people, we talk a lot, but not a lot of people really want to take on these kids. They would rather deal with the girls' clubs, and boys' clubs, not with these sorts of kids, even though, even though,

when that kid is in detention, for a period of time, you can make tremendous, tremendous gains. We can, in fact, bring that kid's reading level up.

The problem becomes, who to pass the torch to? Everything we do, oftentimes, in the facilities, you put a kid back out. Everything that has been gained, has been extinguished. It is extinguished, within a week. That, I think, is important.

I disagree, somewhat, with both Dr. Bridges, and I respect Dr. Bridges, very much, and I have worked, very closely with him, over the few months.

I do agree, that the court should take into account social issues. I do think that we have got to be concerned about that kid, who is not in school. Who going to advocate for him? It has to be us.

I do, am concerned, that, when we have that kid, who desperately wants to get out of the game, our only option, is, to send the kid right back into the same situation. He does not have a chance.

That is where we come, that is where we disagree, in terms of dealing with social issues, in terms of, alleviating, that is what the court historically has done, in all aspects of society. To deny that, of the juvenile court, I think, is counterproductive.

I believe that the judges, in fact, should have more discretion, than they do, now. It ought to be broadened, and we ought to be accountable, and we are willing to do that, for that discretion.

I think, when we have got this kid, before us, that everything is crying out for these needs. To not be able to provide that, I believe, is criminal.

When we have got a kid, that our only option, is sending a kid home, to a situation that, we know, will not work, or, sending a kid to a state institution, those are the only options that the court has.

Those are things, where, this is, again, a 26-year juvenile court person, who has literally, juvenile courts, I think, are somewhat unique, too. You understand, these kids live with us. We live with them. We know them, very well. We see the baggage that they come. We are appalled at what they do. We are also appalled at what has happened to them. And I do not think anyone knows, as we do, what those situations are, and, to suggest, I think, that we should not intervene, or be concerned about those social issues, that is what we are all about, what the juvenile court was founded for, in the beginning.

The attitude, that the community has, I think, truly has contributed to the abandonment of our kids, of all kids, in particular, kids of color.

That is kind of where, as I, one juvenile court administrator, am coming from, in this whole situation. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much.

MS. WAILD: My name is Susan Waild, and I am with diversion services, in King County, and I am here to talk about, specifically about, diversion services, but I would like to reiterate some of what Steve said. Having worked, years ago, with the group homes, and when we had group homes, in King County, we had places for kids to live, both before and after. They were institutionalized, and we do not even seem to have those, these days. So I am here, at Tom's request, to talk about diversion. So, so much for my editorial comment.

Diversion is the legally mandated alternative to court, for kids. It is, there is a very complex and very finite statute, around diversion, as to, who is referred to diversion. If you read the statute, there is, by crimes, and by criminal history of the kid, it will define, who gets to go to diversion, who must be referred to diversion, and who cannot be referred to

1 div2 may3 of4 cou

diversion. There is then this middle ground, where you may be sent to diversion, and that is at the discretion of the local prosecutor, or the local, in some counties, the prosecutor is giving this authority to the probation officer, to screen those cases, my point being, that, it is very structured, who gets into diversion, and who does not get referred to diversion, and it is by crime, and criminal history.

Obviously, diversion is meant to be, for the first-time, minor offenders. It is not for your more serious offenders, so that, the kinds of cases that we see, in diversion, throughout the state, are your thefts, your shoplifts, some of your assaults, your famous malicious mischief, your teenagers. We do not see cases like burglaries, rapes, robberies, those kinds of cases. Those are sent to court, where they are seen, before the judge.

In King County, last year, we saw about 3,500 kids. 3,500 kids.

And the way we have got it organized, in King County, and I am most familiar with that program, although I am familiar with some of the other counties, is that, we have got committees of trained volunteers, that we recruit, and we train, and we supervise, throughout King County. These volunteers, these

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

committees, we specifically recruit, from the philosophy that that committee should reflect what that community looks like.

So, we would look at the demographics, for those communities, and try to match those, as much as we can, so that, the youth coming before our panel, of two to four volunteers, sees a wide range of people.

I mean that, ethnically. I also mean that, socioeconomically, and agewise. Our youngest volunteer is 18, and our oldest is 75. So we try to make the wide range, believing, that, this is a community response to a community problem, and not all the kids that get in trouble, need to go before a judge.

Sometimes, they just need to go before their neighbors, and be held accountable, there.

We also try to hold onto some treatment, trying to get the kids to some services, that we see that they might need, that, when we see that, by the course of the interview. We interview the youth, and we interview the parents, and we talk about what is going on, with the child, both, not just the offense, but what are they doing, in their life? How is school, family, those kinds of issues?

And, when you do see that there is something, that is happening, that they might need more services,

W

we direct them to those services. We do not provide them. We direct them to those.

Okay. The volunteer component, I think, is what makes our program successful. We have 500 volunteers. We are constantly recruiting, constantly training, and there are some other attempts, too, I want to address, about the disproportionality.

In King County, our biggest expenditure, to late, and we have been forcing it, is that, every youth, or parent, who does not speak English, we will provide an interpreter, at that meeting. So that, it used to be, ten years, parents would bring a friend, or a relative, to interpret, and that has sometimes caused problems, in the family. So now, we use interpreters, for every youth, and/or parent, who does not speak English.

When we first find out, that they do not speak English, a lot of times, it will be a friend, who calls, in response to our notification, about diversion, for the parents, saying, "This family does not speak English." So then, we will start using the interpreter, right then, on the phone, to start explaining the process.

We also are working, in King County, with some of the outreach centers, and the ethnic

associations, to try to help us, both locate kids, and to participate in the diversion process.

We were having a difficult time, a while ago, locating, and finding, kids on the local Shute Indian reservation. And so, if they do not respond to the diversion notice, what happens, is, they then end up in court. And what we did, is, recruit a member of that tribe, to help us locate those kids, and help bring them in.

We are also using those kinds of associations, and activities, for after diversions, when there are classes, or there are educational opportunities, or community service, that they can tie in, and connect back with those committees, and those associations, to do that.

We also have tried a pilot project, that we are just finishing up for, which is, we wanted to know if -- let me back, for just a minute.

When we first get a case, we tried, through the mail, to notify the family, to contact us, if they want to go through diversions about this offense. We will send out two letters. We then do at least two follow-ups, to talk to the parents, because sometimes those parents just do not get to the mail, fast enough, so we want to give every opportunity to bring them back in.

If they still, if we cannot locate them, then they will go through, and try to locate, and guess at, what kind of school district they are in, or what school they are in. Frankly, it is much easier, in smaller school districts. You can call some of the school districts, and find out where they are registered. And, others, they do not know.

So we try the schools, we try all of those interventions. Then, what we try to do, even after we had talked to them, if they did not respond to our notice, we have tried a pilot project, on what we call "the tracker," and Yaas Meet has been going out, trying to meet with these people, and get them into diversion, and see if it works. She is just finishing up that project. We do not see a big change in the numbers, frankly, but we have not run them, real thoroughly. And so, that is, we are seeing how that pans out.

That, in essence, is diversions. So, if you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

I do want to ay one thing, though. If the kids do not have a place to live, and they are not enrolled in school, we cannot find them. We just simply cannot find them. And then, what happens, is that, those kids, their cases are sent back to the

1	prosecutor, and then, they are filed on, because they
2	have still committed an act. And that is when, I
3	think that is our biggest frustration, is when kids are
4	not living anywhere, and they are not enrolled in
5	school, to get our hands on them.
6	And then, there are only limited resources,
7	we could do. There would be nothing that we would like
8	better, than to see a kid, who is not connected to
9	school, and does not have a safe, public place to live,
10	for us to say, "Here! Here!" We do not have those
11	resources.
12	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: What happened to the
13	group homes?
14	MS. WAILD: They have, kind of
15	systematically, been
16	MR. JOHNSTON: Eliminated.
17	MS. WAILD: eliminated, by the state.
18	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Why, do you know?
19	Financial?
20	MS. WAILD: Money. Money.
21	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Money?
22	MS. WAILD: Money, and philosophy, I believe.
23	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Or lack of were
24	they successful?
25	MP JOHNSTON: We thought so There is a

different philosophy, that, in addition, the state law changed, some time, ago, and basically, the courts lost their ability to place them.

MS. WAILD: And group homes lost their contracts.

MR. JOHNSTON: The only ones that place, now, are Department of Social Services, and Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration. The courts are not.

We have gotten into this situation, in which, basically, the courts supposedly deal with the offender, okay, the juvenile offender. The Department of Social and Health Services deals with the kid, who is dependent. And we made this assumption, many years ago, of a totally different. Well, obviously, they are not. It is odd to me, that a kid can be an offender, at one time, it is my jurisdiction, or juvenile court's. The next day, the kid is a runway. Then he becomes a responsibility of the Social and Health Services. Again, the same kid. We have not quite figured out a way to deal with that. That is one of the flaws, I think, in the current cases. Okay. So.

MS. WAILD: In detention centers, there was a program, that I was involved with, and, basically, when kids were running away, or on the streets, they could come to this group home, and we would work with them,

for two to four months, and their families, and try to figure out what was going on, and either get them back home, or get them to a relative's home, or, if they needed treatment, getting them to a long-term treatment facility, and that was, that contract was eliminated.

It was eliminated.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Questions from the Committee?

MR. JOHNSTON: James mentioned consolidated juvenile services, and the attempts at dealing with disproportionality. Sid will talk about that, but I can leave you, basically, our application, to the state, which kind of summarizes, if you will, what our efforts are, and what our response to those requirements are, and I think this is relatively, I think, typical, probably, of all the juvenile courts. We will leave that here, for you, and any questions about this, later on, please contact me.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And do have a question for you. The chair was not ready, quite, to dismiss you guys. We will make sure that everybody else has a chance to ask a question.

As I understood, Mr. Johnston, and correct me, if I am wrong, but that, you do believe that intervention system works, with young people. I have

heard that, fairly strongly.

We are particularly concerned about the disproportionality thing, and, I guess what I would like to have you address, for a moment, if you could, is, your beliefs, in terms of the intervention system, around the disproportionality question. If we went back to, if we moved the engine back in the direction of intervention, as opposed to, criminal — all the time, would that be a plus, or a minus, in terms of addressing the issue of disproportionality? Can we treat kids, more equally, more justly, within that intervention model?

MR. JOHNSTON: I do not know, in many cases, that we want to treat kids, in the same way. What we do want to deal with, are those issues, those issues, that are contributing, if you will, to criminal behavior, that brings them to us, in the first place. What we, I think, do, can do, a very good job of -- I do not think we can do a heck of a lot, quite frankly -- of stopping that referral, in the first place. But I think we can do a heck of a lot more, to help that kid not reoffend, again. That is the rub, and that is where, I think, where we really come in, and I think our, oftentimes, our hands are tied, and -- do a good job, on that.

disproportionality, to the juvenile courts, in my mind. Again, we are seeing an awful lot of need, out there, the schools, being one of them. And, in Pierce County, kids of color are dropping out, at about the same rate, that they are being referred to us, for criminal behavior. I think we can do a far better job, given the resources and the ability, for instance, and entering into reasonable agreements, with schools, to try to keep those kids in school. I think we can do a lot better job, if you will, marshaling a whole number of resources, to do that. I think that the juvenile court can probably do a good a job, as anybody, in that particular area. So I see that is really where our goal is, in reducing that disproportionality.

That is the key, relative to

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Intervention is more effective, it sounds like, if the judicial system has more discretion. We have heard, from other sides, today, that, the more standards, the less disproportionality. And, as I understood you, you said, "Hold us accountable, but give us more discretion, and we will do a better job on that."

How can you hold the system accountable? What would you suggest, for?

MR. JOHNSTON: I can tell you, from my past

experience, again, going back to, I alluded, earlier, that, a kid, one day, is this, and, another day, is this, at a time, at one time, when the juvenile courts do have far more discretion, everyone knew in that community, who -- can go to, that was me. If there was an issue, it was me.

It is very, we have gotten ourselves into a situation, now, where we have so compartmentalized everything, it is every easy for us, and we do it, all the time. We do it, all the time, and I think that is unfortunate.

I think those of us, in the system, are certainly willing, very much. Who is accountable? And that is basically what I am saying.

MS. WATLD: I would just like to add, it is still a question of resources. If a kid does not have a place to live, and he does not have a school, to be involved in, you are fighting an uphill battle.

MR. JOHNSTON: Part of the, one of the things, about detention, going back to detention, and a kid, we have, again, very strict screening. Time, and time, and time, again, a kid will come to us, that is divertable, who should not stay. Time, and time, a gain, the police are saying, "I have no choice. The parent is refusing to take the kid home. There are no

other alternatives." And they bring them to us.

We do our best, then, to call the parents, and say, "Get in here," but oftentimes, it is impossible. Basically, what we do, then, the following morning, we simply get a court order, and we take them over to the Department of Social and Health Services, by court order, because, now, the kid is dependent, because no parent or guardian is there. The kid walks out the back door. That is a significant, significant problem, for most of us.

Something like, oh, I am trying to think, off the top of my head. Last year, we had something like 3,500 injuries, of which 2,700 individual kids, we released, within four hours, 600 or 700 kids. Many of those kids, again, were kids, where parents refused to take them in, and find other alternatives, and that is a real problem.

So, there is that issue, out there, too.

MS. WAILD: These are not necessarily bad

parents. These are parents that are -- are just -
MR. JOHNSTON: Who have been fed up.

MS. WAILD: I mean, they have tried, and tried, and tried, and there is nothing out there.

I mean, they are just frustrated. That is what you see, in the system, is the frustration.

MR. JOHNSTON: You will get kids, and I do 1 not know how we deal with this. We will literally, and 2 you will hear this, all the time, from parents, "Thank 3 God my kid is in the juvenile justice system. Somebody 4 is going to do something about it." 5 MS. WAILD: Anything. 6 MR. JOHNSTON: And it is costly. 7 Given that, I am sorry. I do not believe it 8 is going to be developed, and be out there. If that is 9 the case, who is going to do it? We are. We need to. 10 11 I just, I am a realist. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Any final questions? 12 13 MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. 14 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, both, very, very much. We appreciate your time, and we appreciate 15 16 the work that you do. Thank you. We will take a five-minute break. 17 18 (Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m., a short recess was 19 taken.) 20 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Welcome, Sid, and 21 please --22 MR. SIDOROWICZ: Thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- identify yourself, 24 for the record, again, and where you are from, and

begin, as you wish.

25

MR. SIDOROWICZ: I am Sid Sidorowicz, or, for the record, Gerard Sidorowicz. Everybody calls me Sidorowicz. And I am the Assistant Secretary for the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration, in DSHS. Thank you, for this opportunity to talk to you about the things, that we are doing, in DSH, inside JRA, to try to address disproportionality in juvenile justice.

First, let me give you some background, about JRA. We are part of DSHS. Until May, of last year, we were part of the Children's Administration, so we were organizationally with the child welfare, adoption, foster care, CVS, functions, of the department. In the last legislative session, in 1994, with the Youth Violence Bill, the legislature created a separate organization, within DSHS, solely for juvenile justice issues, and I have been the assistant secretary, in that position, since it was created, last year. I have created organization charts, both in DSHS, and JRA, to your staff, for the record.

We provide juvenile services, directly, and through contracts, with local governments, and private vendors. We have two main service delivery divisions, in our administrations, Institutions, and Community Services. And, again, I have given the staff a copy, or two copies, of our last annual report, so you can

see what services we provide, as you have time.

We operate six institutions, mostly, well, all, from western Washington, running from Naselle, in southwest Washington, up to Indian Ridge, which is outside of Arlington. We have seven state operating group homes, for juveniles, and we contract, for another 220 group home beds. And we have six regions, that operate parole, or contract for parole, and they are the ones who work with community programs, in the counties, or with things like consolidated juvenile services. We have got about 1,400 youth, in our institutions, today, and we have about 850 youth, out on parole. We will have, probably, over 2,000 youth, committed to us, in this fiscal year.

The efforts that we have, to address disproportionality, occur within the context of the department's overall agency diversity initiative, and this was started under Secretary Thompson several years ago, and it was intended for the department, to improve our responsiveness to minority populations, as a whole. So, some of the things that I talk about, are specific to us, but really, the entire department, and all the divisions, have plans, similar to the one I am giving you, that set out guidelines, and goals, for them, to increase the cultural appropriateness of their

services, hire more diverse staff, and to build a greater community capacity, with minority communities.

The diversity initiative embraces minority affairs, disability affairs, and sexual minority issues. The secretary has a separate office, that manages the diversity initiative, that reports to her, and I have a diversity coordinator, who reports directly for me, to me, and works with the regions, and institutions, in trying to address issues, at their level.

The increasing disproportionate impact of juveniles, in the minority system, in the juvenile justice system, of minority youth, really culminates in the JRA system. About 50 percent of the youth committed to us, are youth of color, so it far outweighs their representation, in the community, in the State of Washington.

As Steve Johnston mentioned, we are growing, growing rapidly, and unfortunately, the percentage of youth of color, is growing, disproportionately, to the population, as a whole. The conditions they are in, are difficult. We are operating at about 140 percent capacity, and three or four of our institutions, and, overall, right about 120 percent, are capacity. We are engaged in an ambitious capital program, over the next

few years, to try to build our way up, to meeting the needs of these youths.

established, in JRA, sets goals, both on the community, and the institution side, for working with these youths. You have heard a little bit about our efforts, on the community side. We have been involved in, and we oversee, the disproportionality -- and we are the contractors with Dr. Bridge. We manage the oversight committee. He reports, to us. His next report is due to us, in July. And then, we have the responsibility, on an ongoing basis, to report back the legislature, in December, about the efforts of local communities, to address disproportionality.

We distribute the consolidated juvenile services funds, and we have included minority population, and poverty, as factors, in a distribution formula, at legislative direction, over the last couple of years.

So one of the things we are trying to do, with consolidating juvenile services, as we work with Dr. Bridges, and with communities, is, try to identify, what kind of programs, work best for them, to help them disseminate information, and then, through our contracting process, try to make sure that they make

the best efforts, they can, at using those funds, to address disproportionality, within the context of their overall consolidated juvenile services plans.

In our directly managed programs, we have tried to increase the breadth of program available, to minority youth, in the institutions. We have community organizations, in Tacoma and Seattle, who provide contracted services, in our institutions, at Echo Glen, Maple Lane, and Green Hill. They may work with young fathers, work with issues about African American males, and their history, and their transition back to communities. And we have tried to expand cultural programs, for Native American youth, at all the institutions. And they sell things like sweat lodges. We contract with the native program, out in Spokane, to work with some programs, for us.

We try to continuously measure our programs, for impact on minority youth, and, if I can take you, for a couple of minutes, into this handout, I gave you, and send you up to page 111, this is part of a larger report, we give to the secretary, throughout the department, about our efforts, at addressing minority issues, and what we have tried to do, is, put together some data, that we look at, on a routine basis, that helps to inform our program changes, and

where we want to make some -- and we are constantly changing this, as we are finding different ways to measure what we do, and things that might provide more meaningful information, for ourselves.

In most cases, we have, as you can see, on page 111, for, say, employee -- comparisons, we have a client target, and, what that says, we are trying to provide services to our clients, based on their representation, after commitments, to us. So, not within the community, we want to reflect the clients, who we have to serve, directly, and those are the ones who committed to us.

So, in the case of African American employees, for example, the working age population, in our category, is less than 6 percent. And yet, close to 20 percent of the youth committed to us are African American. So, our goal, is solely to raise the employee profile, to match that client target. So, we look at this data, and we try to ask ourselves, "Where are we?," with that client base.

One of the other things you can see, is that, if you look at page 113, we look at the clients served, in specific programs, and, on the right-hand column, on 113, it shows, for example, mental health program caseloads. So, combined minority, is, about

25 percent, of the population, in the mental health programs, is minority, compared to about 50 percent, of their representation in the population, as a whole.

So this kind of data leads us to ask, "Well, okay. What is going on, with that population, and why are we short, in providing that added service, or service that would reflect their percentage of the population?"

In the case of mental health, if I could just kind of digress, into that, for a minute, what this reflects, is, participation, in our mental health cottages, which are the most severe mental health diagnosis, of the youth, in institutions, and that is not necessarily distributed equally, across the population. So, one of the things we are asking ourselves, is, "Well, this does not really tell us what we want to know. What we really want to know, is, not how many minority youth are at this severe level of psychosis, but, rather, how many receive mental services, as a whole?" And what we do not get data on, is, how many visits might minority youth have, with the psychiatrist who visits the campus, rather than, being put in a mental health cottage.

So, what that is going to lead us to, is, to change this data set, to try to give us information,

that is more meaningful. We might look at it, positively, that, fewer minority youth are this psychotic, that we need to put them in a severe mental health mix, or security cottage. But we do not really know, from the data that we have.

So that is kind of how we used this data, to try to support our program decisions. On pages 116 and 117, we show how the youth are distributed, across security levels, for example, and we noticed, at one point, that fewer minority youth were achieving minimum security status. So there are questions, about, how do we gauge security level, and can we move to a more objective analysis, of how we do that? We have tried to do that. We have a risk assessment tool, and we are always trying to refine it, to being more culturally appropriate, and also, to identify problems that we may have, that, we have to address the programming, to try to help youth achieve that level of security.

So, again, one of the things we have done, is, refine our risk assessment process, to get more minority youth to sign in to the minimum security level, which has given them greater opportunity to participate, in group home programs. One of the things we found, a couple of years ago, was that, minority youth were not getting into the group home, community

programs, at the same percentage that they are represented, in the institutions. And two things we have tried to do, there, one, again, is look at how they get into security levels. But then, the second is, we have tried to put out proposals, in the last couple of years, for group homes, and there, we have tried to emphasize programs that might better serve minority youth, and one of our contractors, that started with us, last year, in Tacoma, specializes in working with minority youth, and trying to transition them into job training programs, in the construction industry, in Pierce County. Hence, it has been a real positive program. It has given them opportunities to get into a program level, that they did not have, before.

A couple of the other things we are trying to do, now, is, as we have measured sort of participation, in programs, and we have gotten better, at gaining access to youth, we are now trying to access more minorities, into the programs. Now, we are trying to move towards measuring your success. It does not really matter, much, if they get into the programs, if they, either do not make the best use of that opportunity, or the programs we are providing them just are not adequate, for what their needs are.

So, we have undertaken, and again, this is part of an effort, of the department, as a whole, to try to move towards measuring outcome, and trying to find out, what is it, we actually want to achieve, with these youth, and then, how can we begin to measure those outcomes, and use them both, to inform the decisions on every particular case, and then, also, how we make management decisions, about use of the resources.

So some of the things we have looked at, there, is, measuring competencies, in a more objective light. We are working with the University of Washington, on trying to identify, what are the kinds of skills that youth need to be developing, as they move into our system? And then, how can you get staff to, in a more objective way, determine whether a youth has achieved that skill? And some of the simple things, we think we want, out of our youth, is the skill of managing their anger, being able to withhold their impulsiveness, at times. And that goes heavily into determining, how you get access to services, and lower security levels, and your success in programming, but how it is going to be fairly subjective, right now, and we have tried to move into a more objective phase.

There are some other areas, where we are

trying to look at how youth can succeed better, in our programs, and, going back to something Steve Johnston said, these youth have fairly severe needs, by the time you get to us. Seventy-five to 80 percent have some kind of chemical dependency issue, that needs to be addressed, and it just cannot be ignored, while they are with us. About 45 percent have very significant health issues. A substantial portion are behind, in their school levels.

I guess, where I would differ, with the previous, with Steve Johnston, is, the price that these youth pay, to get services from us, is, loss of liberty, and other youths, who get into the service delivery system, do not often have to pay that price. So we agree, that, many youth who come to us, this is the only opportunity for them to get into mental health services. Often, it is the first time they have had health care, dental health services. But it is a pretty heavy price to pay, to say that, for them to continue to get those services, they should lose their liberty.

So our interests are, in building bridges, through the parole system, so that youth, when they come to us, we get them on the track, but then, once they leave, they get into the service delivery system

that they are entitled to, as are all other youth, so that they can maintain access to services, without having to continue to pay that heavy a price.

The last thing, in terms of what we have been doing, in the program, again, is hiring. We have tried to increase our hiring of minority staff, beyond that reflected in the general population, and, while we have great strides to make, we have had a fairly steady increase, over the last couple of years, in the percentage of staff, who are minority.

If you look where we distributed those institutions, it is fairly difficult. One of our institutions may sell, it is not a diverse community, although, I understand, now, that, the population continues to grow, in African Americans, moving more into the Naselle area, but also, we are in Chehalis, and Rochester, not very diverse communities, by any means. So, it is difficult. And, since we are a growth industry, we are more attractive, right now, but, historically, we have not been able to manage much diversity.

Finally, I want to just talk a little bit about what I see, as our challenges, in the future, and some critical issues. And the first is, using the experience we have gained, in the disproportionality

study, and some of work we have done, right lately, to make sure that the services, we need to provide better services, to youth, before they committed to us. We have adjusted our funding formula, but that does not mean we know much about how the money is used, and whether it is used to the best effect, at the community level, before youth get sent to us. And our goal is to work with the counties, and the juvenile court administrators, to disseminate best practices, identify what works, and try to cooperate with them, and use the state's resources, to try to address this issue, more.

Again, focusing on success, and programs, we are not satisfied with access to services, and we want to make sure that our programs are successful, for these youth, because the price of failure is fairly high. If they continue to commit crimes, they are more and more likely to move to the adult system, at a younger and younger age.

And then, finally, we want to work with the legislature, and community groups, and all the proposals to reform the judicial system, or juvenile justice, and making sure that we do not, somehow, exacerbate disproportionality. It is true that the juvenile sentencing system, and its structure, and standards, has dramatically reduced disproportionality

_

at the point when the judge makes his sentencing decision. He has not done much, up to that point, but the system is so structured, that it really does limit, if not eliminate, disproportionality, in that decision, about who gets how much time.

I do not think we could say, that, the simplicity of its structure has really met the challenge, we have, of trying to protect public safety, while addressing these youths needs. So, I do believe that the system needs a greater amount of discretion, but, structured in a different way. If you look, again, at the kind of decisions we have tried to make, and the tools we have tried to use, I think that they cannot be implemented, in juvenile courts, in our system, but they do not necessarily have to be statutorily structured. That overlays judicial discretion.

So I think that is a real challenge for us, is, how to give up the system, that we have, and we know about, and try to make a better system, recognizing that our system just does not do it. So, any questions.

(Discussion was held off-microphone.)

DR. BROOKS: Yes. I have a -- concern -- DSHS -- I guess, you are a division of.

What is going on, preventively,
preventatively, to prevent the occurrence of this
increased population into your system? I think, that,
even though I do not know, I assume some research has
been done, like, babies of crack mothers, alcoholism,
lack of nutrition, all of those things, tend to have
neurological kinds of impact, on people. And, if that
is occurring, and they cannot get through the schools,
and they cannot get through that, they will eventually
wind up in your system.

And is there any coordination going on, at some other part of DSHS, to try to provide some preventative measures, to somehow, either keep that from happening, identify, early enough, so that they can intervene, and maybe make some corrections, before they get to you?

MR. SIDOROWICZ: Well, certainly, I think the department has a structure, and probably more than our system, supports early intervention, with youth and families. And the legislature has made more and more investments, in that area, over the last few years.

Last year was the Youth Violence Bill. There was a creation of this whole new system of planning, at the local level, and service delivery, that engages communities, in trying to build better prevention

strategies. And they have, not only funded the planning part, but they have begun to fund the service delivery part of that.

This year, with the runaway issues, whether you agree with the strategies they took, or not, it was an attempt to get at some of these youths problems, a few steps before they get to us.

So, there are structures, around trying to get better prevention services, but I think the question for us, is, again, have those been, somehow, disproportionately used? And the diversity initiative, that we have, is replicated, in other parts of the department. And if you look at some of the struggles we have, in the last couple of years, they are around implementing a more diverse program, over the system. And let me just give you two examples.

One is, we undertook, in Children and Family Services, a strategy, to recontract all our group homes. This was before I left children's services, and came over to juvenile rehabilitation. And part of the purpose of that, was to, get more minority providers, providing services, to the high number of minority youth in the foster care system.

It took us, probably, three years, to negotiate with the current providers, putting that in

RFP, and there is a lot of political pressure, because, and I do not mean this, in any disparaging way, but they have built local community programs, that work. And we have a fixed amount of money. And we said, "We want more providers, and that means, some of you may lose the current contracts that you have." And there was hell to pay, around doing that. We think it is a better system, now, but it was not simple.

And the other areas, in children's mental health, I think we all agree, that, minority youth do not get adequate access, to the mental health services, for children. In the regional support network contracts, our guides, our goals, for parity, that minority populations are served, equal to their representation in the community. And the department is now taking steps, to enforce that part of the contract, where the system failed to achieve, and I believe we are in court, on that issue.

So, you have to ask, not only, is there a prevention, but, does it work, for minority populations? And that is our challenge, and I think we are engaged in that.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Other questions?
Thank you, very much.
MR. SIDOROWICZ: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Good luck on the 1 job --2 MR. SIDOROWICZ: Pardon? 3 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Good luck on the 4 5 job --Thank you, very, very much. 6 And the next group, Dan Satterberg, and? 7 MS. BAER: Simmie Baer. 8 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Simmie Baer. We see 9 10 you, again. 11 MS. BAER: Hi. Thank you, very much. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: 12 MR. SATTERBERG: Good afternoon, Mr. 13 Chairperson, the Committee. My name is Dan Satterberg. 14 I am here for Norm Allen, the county prosecuting 15 attorney. I have just a few comments to make, before 16 turning to over to Ms. Baer, a few comments, on what we 17 18 are doing, locally, in King County, to address the issue, that you are here, to talk about. It really is 19 a topic that, we feel, is highly relevant. I think 20 there is a sense of urgency, in juvenile court, right 21 22 now, in King County. We have experienced a record 23 number of criminal violence, in 1994, particularly 24 within the violent crime area, and, unfortunately, with 25 homicides. It reflects a national trend. In 1993, in

King County, we filed more murder cases, in juvenile court, that we had, the previous three years, combined, and we repeated that number, in 1994. So there is a serious problem, with regard to youth violence. It cuts across all communities. But the issue, that you are talking about here, is particularly important, because of the overall increase, that we have seen, in juvenile court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, sometimes, prosecutors have some reservations, about hearings, and studies, having to do with, entitled, "The Disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System." I think, part of that fear, is that, disproportionality will be equated with discrimination, and that, they will be synonyms, used, in the studies. We know of no purposeful discrimination, in, among dedicated system professionals. It is, I think, a widespread feeling, in the law enforcement community, and the prosecutors, particularly, that there are a number of socioeconomic factors, that lead to disproportionate arrest rates, that are far upstream, from a deputy prosecutor's desk, and we do not feel that the race of a person, whose appears on a file, in a deputy's desk, is, at all, an important factor, in determinations.

But it is not helpful, to be defensive. And

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so, we have discarded that fear, and have willingly participated, not only participating in studies, but agreed to be studied, by researchers, to find out if in fact there is systematic discrimination, if disproportionality is in the justice system, or if it is, in act, just reflecting what is upstream, from the justice system.

We think it is important, not just to study, but to act upon, the findings of those studies, with an intent toward leveling the playing field of anyone charged with the crime. To that end, we have participated, as a prosecuting attorney's office, with two studies, done by Dr. Bridges, and we are involved, right now, in a study, we are being studied, in fact, by the University of Washington Sociology Department, Professor -- and Weiss. In fact, even as we speak, those two are in the prosecutor's office, right now, interviewing several deputy prosecutors. They had a team of research assistants go into our basement, and pull 500 different pleaded penalty cases, and they are looking at a number of the factors, where prosecutorial discretion was exercised, and they are approaching that study, very scientifically, to figure out if there is something within the system, that helps to contribute to the results, that we see.

So we are a willing laboratory mouse, for this study, because we think the issue is that important, and we want to know the answer, more than anyone.

Secondly, we had an ongoing effort, to have the standards by which the county prosecuting attorney files, and disposes of, his cases, continually under review, that we train new deputies about those standards, and that we really preach standards, to the rest of the prosecutors, in the state, that recently adopted, as far as juvenile standards, on filing disposition, in the statewide, almost all 39 counties, I think, have prosecutors adopted the same kind of standards that we have, so that, there is some reference point to the exercise of prosecutorial discretion.

We have an ongoing juvenile court work group, that we participate in, which uses the Bridges, as a reference point, to come back, and look for ways to better level the playing field, for all people, in juvenile court. One of those programs, I am sure you have heard of, today, already, is, Reaching Back, Giving Back. It is the detention alternatives for minority youth. This comes directly from a study, from the findings of the Bridges study, that minority youths

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were twice as likely to be detained, in pretrial, and that, there are certain things that follow the pretrial detention, which created an uneven playing field.

So we are in favor, of anything that introduces the structure into young lives, that may not have known structure, before. One of the things, I think, that we need to do a better job, in this county, is, with access to diversion. Diversion is the one chance that a young offender has, to avoid the stigma of being a convicted offender. It is a chance that too many people do not avail themselves of, either because there is not sufficient structure in their home, to recognize the importance of that chance, to go outside the criminal justice system, to resolve a criminal charge, or that, there is not sufficient structure to keep appointments, to keep a schedule, to know what date, when, where you are supposed to be, to meet the juvenile court conference committee, for that opportunity. So I think that is another area, that we all recognize, ought to be worked on, in order to provide better access to all people who are eliqible for diversion.

We have been, also, working on some of the legislation, which, unfortunately, did not pass, this year, the legislature, but the goal of the legislation

is to, again, focus on minor and middle offenders, young people, before they get too far down the road, into crime, and to open up some of the very small standard ranges, that are presently there, standard ranges for young offenders, of zero to three months, of community supervision. And, during that 90 days, in theory, the system is supposed to reach in, and make some significant changes to provide for the young offender. We know that is not realistic. It is hard to even meet the probation officer, more than once or twice, and then, your time is up.

So, we want to return, in a limited way, to more judicial discretion, to get us through the twelve-month period, for the judge to order something like continued school attendance, for the remainder of the school year, because we know that truancy is such an important first signal of whether there is trouble ahead.

So, we will back, in the 1996 session. Maybe Representative Ballasiotes can speak about that, as well, with some ideas, to really grab the attention of young offenders, when they first get into the system, and not wait until the bullets start flying, before we start to apply resources to the problem.

So, in conclusion, the prosecutor's office

believes this is an issue, that is worth, not just a study, but action, and not just to study, but we are being studied, willingly, as a laboratory animal. We are concerned, really, as a member of the community, and as a member of the criminal justice system, with balancing the number of concerns that we have, here, to make sure that we have a system, that is, to ensure public safety, but also, ensures fairness and justice, for everyone who is involved. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much.

MS. BAER: Good afternoon. I am glad I have only sat through two speakers, because I feel, if I had been here, all day, I probably really would have exploded.

I see no progress, in the way children of color are treated, in the juvenile justice system. If anything, it is regressing, and it is very, very dismal, and I wish some of my clients, or just some of the kids that are not even my clients, that I see in the high schools, when I go talk to them, throughout the year, how they are treated, when they are out on the street, doing nothing wrong.

I provide lip service, but I do not see those programs, anywhere. There are, in the past three

months, the number of children in detention has reached an all-time high, and I am sure that the disproportionality is at the same level.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The continuum of care is not even being used, any more. Yes, there is supposed to be this Take Back, Reach Back, and we talked to somebody, in the county, George Leonokis, from SCRAP, and myself, about, if we really want to get children of color out of detention, that are preadjudicated, we need to be able, you should create a program, where you have somebody, who will come in, and will say, "I will be responsible. bring them to court." Kids are detained, because their parents are not there, and they are not in school, and the county was going to start a program, that was going to provide that link, of getting them to school, or making sure that they have a home, to go to; some kind of alternative, so they do not have to go to detention. That does not exist, yet, and, as I said, the continuum is not being used, for preadjudicated kids. electronic bracelets are being used, for kids that are already sentenced.

I listened to Sid Sidorowicz, talk about the new contracts, with these agencies, that are hiring more people of color, and the agency that was given the most contracts, to work in the children's services, was

5

a for-profit agency, to work in human services, that already contracts with some of the existing group homes, that we get the majority of our assault fors out of, because they are the least trained people, working with the most severely disturbed kids.

And so, I just, I listen to this, and I just want to scream, and just say, "Wait a minute! Wait a minute! Wait a minute! Where is the progress? Show me, show my kids, that I work with."

As I said, I go to the high schools, and middle schools, all year along, to with kids, about their rights, that they have rights to lawyers, when they are stopped by police. They do not have to talk to the police. And, inevitably, what the discussion breaks down, into, are, all the kids of color saying to me, "Is it for the police to do this? Is it okay for the police to do this to me? The police said this to me. The police took me here. Is that okay?" And when a 12-year-old is asking you, "Is it okay for a police officer to grab me, and check my pockets?," that hurts.

"No!," I say to them, "that is not okay!"

You know, these kids are not being treated,
any better, on the street. But we have been doing
this, talking about how to file police harassment
claims. And now, I am going to the schools, with the

forms, and the information, and we sit down, in groups,
predominantly young African American men, and we are
filling out police harassment forms, because they know
the particular police that are doing this to them, you
know? It is not a secret.

And so, I say, again: Show me the progress.

I would love to see progress.

You know, George Bridges identified exactly where the disproportionality occurs, in the system, specifically, with the police. I have not seen any change. If anything, summer is coming along, and it is getting worse and worse. I live in the central district, and I see what goes on.

And George Bridges identified the problem, in preadjudicatory detention. Children of color are detained, more than other children, before their case is resolved. That has not changed.

As I said, we have got more kids, in detention, now, than ever. They are starting to double-bunk. That has never happened, before.

We are talking about programs, and JRA, and this and that. They are being sued, for excessive use of pepper spray, and illegal use of pepper spray, on the kids in Green Hill.

I! Show me the progress.

Recently, Pat, over at Evergreen Legal
Services, wrote a grant, called, "Team Child," which is
trying to take a holistic approach to juvenile justice.
So that, when the clients, in my division, the offender
clients, come into the juvenile justice system, we will
have a legal services attorney, who is experienced, in
educational law, and public entitlement law, to deal
with our clients, because, right now, inevitably, a
judge says, to a child who is being sentenced, "You
have got to go to school."

Who helps get that child into school? Who tries to figure out if that child is a special ed child, and if the school is complying with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, the federal statute.

In this state, unlike most states; a child has a Constitutional right to an education. There is great federal, great state, and, in this state, Constitutional law, that guarantees a right to a quality education for these kids, but nobody knows how to access those services. Those kids' parents do not. The school's solution is to expel kids, in the largest number, ever, and everybody knows, expulsion, and delinquency, and truancy, go hand in hand.

So this attorney will work on the education

issues, of our clients, and the public entitlement issues. Under the Medicaid statute, there is a program called, "EPSDT," Early Periodic Screening Diagnostic and Treatment. The federal law mandates the states to identify every Medicaid child, in their state, and notify them, that they are eligible for all these kinds of evaluations, and services, that would follow the evaluation. They do not do that, when there is a 29 percent compliance rate, in this state, now.

This attorney will identify those children, who are Medicaid, which is a huge percent of our clients, and start processing those eligibility claims. So that, when a judge says, "You have to go to school," hopefully, we can make that meaningful, because the judge has no jurisdiction over the school districts, only over the child. So all they can do, is, if the child does not go to school, do a probation violation hearing, and put them in detention, or, tell them to go to school, again.

So what we are hoping, is that, with this new attorney, in our division, whose sole purpose, is to explore, and pursue, the education, and public entitlement, needs of our clients, that we will be able to see a result, at the end of the funding year, through an evaluation, that is built in, through Mark

Gazelle, at the University of Washington, that, taking this type of approach to juvenile justice, really does help prevent the offending, that we are trying to peel away the different layers of what is causing a child to reoffend, and that, we have this population, that is right there, and available, and who are in need of, as everybody has said, these services.

And what is interesting, is, they are eligible. So far, the Congress has not cut these services. So they are entitled. It is not as if we are going to go in, and sue the government, for money that is not there, or things that these children do not deserve, and that, they do deserve it, and they are supposed to be getting it, but they are not, in large numbers, getting these services.

So, under the project, Team Child; that is what we hope to put into our practice, of juvenile justice, and juvenile law, and that will begin, July 1st, because we did get funded.

So, what our office, individually, as the public defender, is trying to do, with disproportionality, is to keep raising people's consciousness about it. As I said, I do not see that it is getting better, for these kids. I do not see that they are any less scared, or being treated any

better.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think, in fact, it is the opposite, that the Congress, our own state legislature, is creating an atmosphere of fear and hatred of children, and that, before we pass strict gun control, let us put more of them in the adult system. That is the way to solve the problem. I do not see that that is the way to solve the problem.

One last example I can give you, is, our office represented a young African American child, that was involved in a shooting, at Garfield High School, a local high school, here. The evening of that shooting, Norm Maling got on T.V., and said, right in the high school gymnasium, "I am going to make an example of this child, I am going to put him in the adult system," without knowing anything about that child. That child had no parole history, no gang involvement, no truancy problems, and it outraged the African American community, at Garfield. That was not a sensitive move, by the prosecutor's office, but that is, to me, the way things are moving. It is not, I do not believe we are becoming more sensitive to the needs of children of color. If anything, I think we are trying to push it out of our minds, and under the carpet.

And if we really cared, we would commit a lot

of money to children's services. And we give it a lot of lip service, but we do not give it the money. Children do not vote. Children do not have power. And they are not receiving the best that we can give them.

And we deserve the best that we can give them.

Children are salvageable. They do not get the way they are, on their own. And I do not see that

Children are salvageable. They do not get the way they are, on their own. And I do not see that DSHS is doing any kind of preventive services. If anything, money has been slashed. Programs have been cut.

The legislature passed a new bill, that parents can commit their children to drug and alcohol treatment, without the child's consent. We have had children, in our office, and offender kids, who would give anything to go into treatment. There is no treatment, in this county, or really, in this state. We have had plenty of kids.

I say, if you build them, we will come. We will tell them to go get treatment. They do not exist.

So, I think parents are going to be very shocked, when they see that, there is nowhere to drop their kids off, for treatment. It does not exist.

I mean, so that is how, if we care, we would provide the best, and we do not. So, I do not see the progress, and I wish I did.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Ouestions?

2

Ms. Baer, what I am hearing, is that, you see

3

a general turning away of attention to youth, as a

4

whole, and that that reflects, disproportionately, upon

5

youth of color, is that right?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BAER: Absolutely. I think, the money is going to building prisons, and, since they are the majority of kids, in the detention centers, right now, I am sure they will be the majority of the people in the prisons, because they already are, and, rather than spending the money at deinstitutionalizing the juvenile, JRA, and building more community programs, and community facilities, and strengthening the communities, we are moving towards just building more stark institutions. And, because the money goes into that, it does not go into aftercare. So, when these kids come out of JRA, and they have benefited from the program, in there, they are lost, in their communities, because parole has no money. So, they are dropped.

MR. SATTERBERG: I think Ms. Baer raises an example, that, it is good, sometimes, to have real life examples, when you want to sympathize with the system, and how we deal with the case. We have got a 15-year-old student, who is selling drugs, in school. He gets some of his drugs taken from him. He goes home, takes

a gun, that he has stolen from a family member, a 9 millimeter gun, 14 rounds in it, comes back, and draws it, and starts firing. He shot 14 times, in a crowded hallway, during the lunch period, could have killed 14 people, only he hit two students, by the grace of God, not by any action of his.

And people say, "What should we do with this kid?"

The social worker approach, you focus on the child. You could think about the other kids, the other thousand kids, in that high school, the impact that this event had on them.

I guess no one has cornered the market, on the ultimate wisdom, in a case like that, or other cases, that are routinely going through the system. We have to balance public safety, with the due process rights, and the fairness rights, with the purposes of juvenile court, with the limited jurisdiction of juvenile court, and this child was kept in juvenile jurisdiction. He got about a four and a half sentence. He will be out, when he is nineteen. And this is a kid, who committed premeditated, attempted first degree murder. He knew what, he intended to kill this other boy, said so, went home to get his gun, and did so. A very serious crime, and we do not need to know a

whole more than that, to know that, he posed a danger, if not treated in a serious manner.

So, that is a good example, for you to think about, when we think about a system, that is designed and to respond to those types of cases.

This is not a situation of disproportionality that was created, overnight. It took many years, to get here, and you are not going to fix it, overnight. I think the progress, that we can see, if you want to look at, the glass being half full, instead of half empty, is that, you have got a commission that is studying this. We have had a couple of very reputable studies, that pointed out some decision points, in the process, from arrest, to disposition, that we are going to focus on, to level the playing field, a little bit. And I think we all recognize that there are other socioeconomic factors, upstream from the criminal justice system, that deserve our attention.

But I think progress can be seen, in concrete ways, like the dedication of \$350,000 of King County current expense money, to work this Reach Back, Give Back, program, which may not be in full swing, yet, but, nevertheless, that is a commitment, that is real. When you put dollars where your concerns are, that is progress.

1 So I do not see quite the doom and gloom. I never expected that it would solve this problem, 2 It is going to take a lot of time, and a 3 overnight. lot of concerted effort. 4 MS. BULLIT: Could you tell us the number of 5 6 that bill, you mentioned, that was to give help, to 7 young offenders? MR. SATTERBERG: It was House Bill 1255. 8 And, up till about the second to the last day of the 9 special session, it still had some wheels, but it went 10 11 away. It was also going to put hundreds 12 MS. BAER: more children, automatically, in the adult system, 13 14 without a hearing, for --MS. BULLIT: That same bill? 15 MS. BAER: 16 Yes. 17 MS. BULLIT: Okay. I mean, we would have been left 18 MS. BAER: 19 with, probably, kids in the juvenile justice system, 20 that may have committed, only, like, car thefts, and I 21 do not think that that is what the juvenile justice 22 system was created for. It was created, to serve kids, 23 that are serious, as well as nonserious, offenders. 24 MR. SATTERBERG: It had to do with firearms.

A juvenile who committed a violent offense, using a

firearm, was one of the sections, that was being 1 debated, about whether, like this 15-year-old kid, went home to get a gun, and shot someone, to shoot somebody else, whether that was appropriately a juvenile case. The part of the bill that I was referring to, was designed to open up your juvenile discretion, to tailor a sentence, to meet the needs of the kid, to get rid of these limited, zero to 90-day probation sentences, and open it up, so that we could have an impact on the kid's life. So, the whole thing will be up, for redebate, every section, next year.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. BROOKS: I just had one final question. Early on, you talked about, downstream, you mentioned that, within the prosecutor's office, that you had, there might be a result of disproportionality, but it was not discriminatory. Does that imply that there, perhaps, is discriminatory action, downstream, that causes disproportionality?

> MR. SATTERBERG: I meant, upstream.

DR. BROOKS: I mean, upstream.

MR. SATTERBERG: Yes. Well, I think, that is beyond my expertise. But, if you have got, what I am pointing at, is that, the society that produces the children, that get arrested, only after they are

arrested, do we have any impact on what happens to 1 them. So, there is a whole lot that happens, before we 2 see them, and that, we do not know how to be 3 responsible, for, we do not know how to fix, and that 4 5 is why they --CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you. Thank you, 6 7 both, very, very much. I appreciate your giving us the time --8 9 MS. BAER: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- to come, this 10 afternoon, to share your insights. Thank you. 11 Representative Ballasiotes, thank you for 12 coming. Would you introduce yourself, for the record, 13 and then, begin? 14 MS. BALLASIOTES: For the record, I am 15 Representative Ida Ballasiotes, from the 41 to District, 16 17 and I am also the chair of the House Corrections Committee. And, at the end of the day, I do not know 18 19 what more I can add, at this point! 20 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And, if I could 21 interrupt, for just a minute, as we have found out, in 22 the last few witnesses, we are getting some more 23 insights, from every -- so --24 MS. BALLASIOTES: I can give you the

frustrations, of the legislature.

I believe Bill 1966 was mentioned, earlier in the day, and I will leave you a copy, and it is relating to implementation of the juvenile justice racial disproportionality study recommendations. And some of those issues have been met, and some have not. They are primarily, data gathering, and that sort of thing.

My committee held a hearing, on February 15th, where Dr. Bridges and James Kelly were there, and brought out the issue of disproportionality. And I think it provided some insight to the Committee, and I have to say, I think some people do not believe it is an issue. And I think we have to be very candid about that.

And, oftentimes, the legislature just, either does not believe it, or, wants very simple answers, to, I think, what is a very complex problem.

And, well, House Bill 1255 was mentioned, here, and, I thought, would have been a very good start, to solving some of, just the juvenile issues, not necessarily just disproportionality, but other issues, in the juvenile justice system. And the wheels fell off, so to speak, because it was incredibly expensive.

What it would have done, is, provided more

secure beds, for juveniles, that have not been added to, since the Juvenile Justice Act was passed, in 1977, and we have seen an incredible difference, between the kids you saw, in the system, then, and the kids you are seeing, now, and we desperately need that space. And it just was not provided for.

Now, I made a goal, for myself, is to take that issue, on, next session. I believe we have had something like, seven studies, in the last ten years, on juvenile justice. We know what needs to be done. There is not anything we really do not know, that we cannot do, and the commitment comes, and do we want to fund it, and get it done?

We are seeing more violent crimes, and you have heard two divergent ideas, here, on what happens, when a kid fires a shot, in a school. Well; in this case, I would have to come down on the prosecutor's side. This was a frightening crime. I mean, you cannot come into a school, and fire a 9 millimeter gun, and say, "Gee, let us look into this kid's background, and find out what caused it."

As legislators, we are under pressure, if you will, to solve these problems. I am not sure they are all solvable, in the near term. I think it is going to take time. We did not get here, overnight. And there

are some very complex, disturbing problems.

We are seeing eight-year-old sex offenders.

I find that, more than I can handle. I just think that is outrageous. And what do you do, with a kid like this?

And, you know, you hear other people say, "Oh, prevention is the key."

Well, yes. But what do you mean by, "prevention?" And when do you start working with a child?

Obviously, with that eight-year-old, you had to start working with them, when they were three or four, and do you, will you impose yourself on a family? I do not think so.

So, we are faced with so many issues, here, and, I think, the problem we have, before us, with juvenile justice, is, even far more complicated, and much deeper, than we are seeing. We see the obvious, the drive-by shooting, and this sort of thing. And people say, "Oh! Do something about it! Put those kids away!"

Well, you do not put them away, forever. And they come out. And, currently, it costs about \$55,000 a year, to keep a child in the juvenile justice system. That is an incredible amount of money.

And I have not seen, quite frankly, all that much improvement. We have devoted a great deal of time, on improving the system, primarily, right now.

Our committee worked on, and I worked on, before, improvements in the adult system.

And we are focusing on work and school, tying into privileges, and hoping to develop an individual, with some skills, and self-discipline, so, when they do get out, they will be able to make something of themselves.

I hope it works. I know it sounds very simple. "Give them work skills, do this, and, when they come out, they will go to work." I do not know. I really do not know. But I think we have to try, and that is where we are, right now.

And, with kids, I have often said; in speeches that I have given, I do not know how you teach a child respect, and, by the time we get them, or we see them, they are thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen, and that groundwork has not been done. And you teach a respect, by example, and they obviously have not had good examples, whether it has been at home, or at school, or wherever. And their example has been, either their gang, or their peer group. And, that is pretty tragic.

But I do not want to see any more lives 1 2 ruined, or any more families ruined, and we are trying, I will tell you. If it is, one of the things we hope 3 to do, is, and when it comes to, when a kid finally 4 gets to sentencing, has committed a crime, is, develop 5 6 simpler sentencing grid. You have heard about it. is complicated. The people that work with it, at some 7 point in time, throw up their hands. We would like to 8 9 base it on a couple of factors, rather than half a 10 dozen, those two factors being, the seriousness of the crime, and the criminal history of the individual, and 11 12 go from there. Right now, it is just, it is unwieldy. 13 I was on juvenile justice task force, last 14

I was on juvenile justice task force, last year, and we know what we have to do. We have not done it. And I will just be very blunt about that. We have not done it.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, as far as I am concerned, you pay now, or you pay later. And, unfortunately, that is what is happening. And we have to be committed to spending that kind of money.

I think we can do some things, better, more efficiently, than we have. The Juvenile Violence Bill, last year, gave us the authority to establish a boot camp, and I do not mean in the sense of, military marching, and so on, but, a camp, based on some work

skills, getting up in the morning, accomplishing 1 something, a schedule, which you find a lot of kids 2 have not had. We have not done that, yet. I hope to 3 do that, again, next year, as well. 4 I will take any questions, at this point. 5 I think we know what the problems are. It is just the 6 7 solutions. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Representative, you 8 alluded to, earlier, that you are not sure, as I 9 understood you, that you were not sure that your fellow 10 legislators always understood. Well, I think we have 11 two questions, here. 12 13 MS. BALLASIOTES: Yes. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: One is, is, dealing 14 with juvenile involvement in the criminal justice 15 system, period. And secondly, what is more 16 17 appropriate, in front of this committee, today, in terms of the disproportionality questions. 18 19 Could you expand on that, a little bit, in 20 terms of? I do not mean, just in terms of criticizing your fellow legislators. 21 I think. 22 MS. BALLASIOTES: No. 23 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: How do we address 24 that?

MS. BALLASIOTES: Not just for them, but even

just people in general. I think they look at the behavior, and say, "Take care of that!"

And, in Dr. Bridges' study, talking about, I mean, you know it is there, and he wants to know, how it gets there, and what we can do to change it, I am actually interested in why it is there. And I am not sure that we have the capability of developing legislation, to answer some of those questions.

I think we are talking about, subjectivity, that is not always apparent to people. I think we can develop the greatest system in the world. The Sentencing Reform Act, for example, was designed to have consistent sentences, throughout the state. That is why it was developed. And I have always said: You add people to a perfect system, and it just sort of, it is not so perfect, after a while, because your own biases, apparent or not, come into that decisionmaking.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Where do you think the legislators pick up their information, in terms of, what they feel like the public generally wants, on this issue? Where does that come from? I mean, let me do a little background, while you are thinking about an answer, to that.

MS. BALLASIOTES: We get it, from hearings. We get it, from our constituents. We get it, from

newspapers. We get strong messages, from the media,
very strong messages, from the media.

You have some radio programs, on both sides,
talking about issues. We get it, from staff, who
sometimes do not have an entire picture. We get it,

sometimes do not have an entire picture. We get it, from a lot of places, but I think legislators primarily want to respond, to the public. Okay? What is the pressing problem, today?

People are, they are afraid, today, okay?

Crime has gotten very random, and what really frightens them, a gun, in the hand of a 15-year-old. It really scares them, because it can happen, anywhere.

And, what Ms. Baer referred to, is kids being tried, sent to adult court, with no hearing, was not exactly correct. It had to be a crime, committed with a firearm. It had to be sixteen or seventeen.

There was some proposed legislation to have kids as young as thirteen and fourteen, bound to adult court, if they committed a crime, with a firearm, automatically, and I do not think that is the way we want our system to work. That meant, just without any defined hearing.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Let me get back, to my question, once more.

MS. BALLASIOTES: Okav.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Are your legislators 1 going to be listening to studies, such as, 2 professionally done studies, such as Dr. Bridges did, 3 or are they going to pay more attention to what is, 4 somehow, a public perception, in effect? 5 MS. BALLASIOTES: When Dr. Bridges did his 6 first study, I felt it was very incomplete, because it 7 was done on about 180 kids, and this was, not this last 8 year, but the year, before. He since followed up, with 9 a second, which, I thought, was more complete, and made 10 11 more sense. If I had to talk about politicians, 12 13 generally? Most of them respond to perceptions. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I quess that concerns 14 me, because --15 MS. BALLASIOTES: There are some, that do 16 17 not. CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- I heard Dr. Bridges 18 19 say, this morning, for example, when he made his presentation to the legislator, he was criticized, for 20 being too academic, and that concerns me, a little, 21 that remark. 22 But I also am concerned about. 23 MS. BALLASIOTES: Remember one thing. 24 legislature, anywhere -- and in our state, because we 25

are citizen legislators -- are a microcosm of what you see, in society, and your neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: But they are also leaders. They are also leaders.

MS. BALLASIOTES: Some are. Some are. Some are not. Because, when you get the group together, you will have different levels of that.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I understand that we are dealing with reality, here.

MS. BALLASIOTES: Right.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: But, in terms of the goal, the goal is that, they are leaders. And so, if 90 percent of the population feels that crime is on a rampant, runaway rate, but the statistical evidence says that it is not, I would hope our legislature would listen to the statistical evidence, and not to the perception of that 90 percent. That is erroneous, as a matter of fact.

MS. BALLASIOTES: Well, we do get.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And I would hope that they would be willing to listen to the accurate studies. And I think that reflects, in terms of our questions, here, as well, and in terms of the question that is before this very group, is that, the will, these days, to simply lock away young people, and

adults, as well, and, the longer we lock them away, the 1 2 better, and throw away the key, that, even though that is somehow the public perception, and will, I do not 3 share that, for example. 4 5 MS. BALLASIOTES: So here is one public, CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: 6 that does not agree. But, on the other hand, that we 7 realize that that does not work, and that the 8 legislator persons would take some leadership, here, in 9 saying, "We are not going to just respond to this 10 perception, that is out there, including the perception 11 that, sometimes, we do not care, if they are people of 12 color, we do not care, if they are kids of color. Let 13 us get them out of the system." 14 MS. BALLASIOTES: Just get them out of your 15 hair. 16 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: "Get them into the 17 18 jails." MS. BALLASIOTES: Yes. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: "And we have got 21 everything taken care of." I want some leadership, is what I am pushing 22 23 for --MS. BALLASIOTES: I know. 24

-- some real

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH:

leadership, on an issue, based on statistical 1 2 information, based on what is true, not based on people's fears. 3 MS. BALLASIOTES: Well, you are asking human 4 beings to respond, and react, in a different way than 5 they typically do. I think we do have leadership, to 6 7 do, as you say. I think we have to have good information, to do that. 8 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: 9 And I agree. 10 MS. BALLASIOTES: And I think, why people 11 react, in that way, because they look at the problem, 12 and know, really know, that it is more complex than what we are seeing, and you do not know which area to 13 14 plug into, first, because it is huge, and it is 15 complex. 16 No. I agree. Yes.

Prevention is the key. But, how do we do that?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have not heard any really good ways. pour a ton of money into different programs, that have had moderate success, and some, not success, at all. And people reach a point -- and people, I am just saying, collectively -- where they are unwilling to really pay for any more things that have not worked, well.

And I understand what you are saying. Let us

1	have some leadership, to come up with something better.
2	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Jails are not working,
3	real well, and we keep paying for them.
.4	MS. BALLASIOTES: The what?
5	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Jails are not working,
6	real well, and we keep paying for them.
7	MS. BALLASIOTES: I realize that. But then,
8	I think, the public thought, again, is, "But they are
9	off the street, and, while, they are there."
10	(Discussion was held off-microphone.)
11	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Any other questions?
12	I doubt it.
13	MS. BALLASIOTES: We will try to do a good
14	job. It is a formidable job.
15	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I know
16	MS. BALLASIOTES: And I am tired of studying
17	it, ad nauseam. We know what we need to do.
18	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: That is probably my
19	concern, I guess
20	MS. BALLASIOTES: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: is that, we all
22	know that it is a very formidable task, and it is a
23	very complicated issue.
24	MS. BALLASIOTES: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: But, build more jails,

2 simplistic solution. MS. BALLASIOTES: Right. 3 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And I just want to 4 keep pushing us in the direction of not succumbing to 5 the simplistic solution, here, and getting ourselves 6 locked into a position, where we are spending all of 7 our money, on jails, on the simplistic solution, and we 8 9 do not have anything left, for the more complex solution, which maybe is going to be tough, and 10 difficult, to work out. 11 MS. BALLASIOTES: Oh, I am sure it will be. 12 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: But it has some 13 14 chances. So. MS. BALLASIOTES: But, I think it is one way 15 of individuals feeling they still have some control 16 17 over what is going on, is, to get those individuals, 18 that are destructive, out of our society, for at least 19 some period of time. 20 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: And then, relative to 21 our question, today, the perception that some of those 22 persons who are destructive, fit more into certain 23 categories, and certain groups --24 DR. BROOKS: Yes.

and lock them up for a longer period of time, is a

1

25

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- than others, and

so, we lock away, more of those groups, than we do, of 1 2 others. That is our concern. Representative, thank you, very, very much --3 MS. BALLASIOTES: You are welcome. 4 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: -- for expending your 5 time, for coming, and keep up the work. 6 MS. BALLASIOTES: Well, thank you. 7 VOICE: Thanks. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: We do have, we have open session, and we do have one person who has 10 requested to present to us, Andy De Los Angeles, and, 11 12 if you would come, and introduce yourself, please, 13 Andy, and? 14 CHAIRMAN DE LOS ANGELES: My name is Andy De Los Angeles. I am tribal chairman, for the Segwameh 15 Indian Tribe, and I am also employed by the Division of 16 17 Children and Family Services. I work in child care services, and my specialty is Indian child welfare, 18 19 although I am not here, to speak, or represent, the 20 Division of Children and Family Services. 21

Twenty years ago, or so, I attended to U.S.

Civil Rights Commission Hearings, on Indian issues,
with Washington State. I did not testify, because
there were so many Native Americans, who were more
eloquent with the conditions, of us, back then. I will

22

23

24

never forget some of the emotional words, from Indian leader, tribal member, and urban Indian.

And the Washington State department, the department hands, who danced a shuck and jiving team, making excuses of low minority hire numbers, to wholesale adoptions of Indian children. But I will never forget the heated questions, from the Commission, to our state attorney general, Slade Gordon.

Washington State, and the tribes, have made some progress. But the issues, usually, involved, before and after litigation.

So many things have not changed. Racism is alive and well. All we have to do is, look at the numbers of population, being served, in Children and Family Services, and the juvenile justice system.

There is a direct correlation between Native American children, coming from homes, they are given enough services, and/or, taken from homes, or come from multiple foster home placements, who eventually end up in the juvenile justice system.

Indian tribes believe that early tribal identification, tribal case plan involvement, and relative placement, builds stronger moral cultural values, and communities. That is why we have the Indian Child Welfare Act.

I would like to present the Commission a

statewide study, that was done by the ASHS DCFS, and

was provided to the tribes. The study was done by a

private consultant.

This is a quality assurance study, on the compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act. This study shows, region by region, how the state is woefully inappropriate.

If one of the outcomes of the hearings, 20 years, ago has been this study, then I testify, de facto, racism is alive, and well.

I am concerned, that, if Congress continues to do the block grant funding, with the states, and not to the Indian tribes, that this will have a major impact on the tribes, here, because, if this study demonstrates the state's compliance to federal law, I can only imagine what is going to happen, when the state is going to manage our money.

I can also testify, that, while PSHS DCFS tries to comply, with a law that is 18 years old, today, I can tell you that the Division of Juvenile Rehab does not adhere to the Indian Child Welfare Act, and they do social work, in DJR, in regards to placement, employment, and what the kid is going to do, when he gets out; nor, does the juvenile justice

system. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Any questions, for Mr. De Los Angeles?

What was the study that you referred to, I am sorry, on the state --

CHAIRMAN DE LOS ANGELES: It was a study done by a private consultant, named Thomas Monner. I have served on that Indian child welfare quality assurance, to review, close to, if not over, 65 percent of the Indian child welfare cases, throughout the State of Washington. It was an 185-question study, that looked at minimum compliance, to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

I must say, that, that was, it is a very important thing, because, 61 percent, or, I think it is 61 percent, is what I was told, the last time, that social workers are paid 61 percent, by the Federal Government. The money that they spend, turning their work out, is, 61 percent of the time, is covered by the Federal Government. That impacts Indian child welfare, children, very significantly.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: Thank you, very much, for your comments, Mr. De Los Angeles.

VOICE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WASSMUTH: I just have a couple of closing remarks, and then, we will conclude.

This concludes the Advisory Committee session 1 2 on civil rights issues in the area of disproportionality within the juvenile justice system 3 on behalf of the Advisory Committee, I want to thank --4 officially, through the record, because I have thanked them, individually, but not all of them are here, at the moment -- all our participants, for their contributions to the effort.

And I want to be sure to thank the members of the Advisory Committee, who were here, as well, today. It has been a long day, and we have listened to a lot, and I really appreciate your hanging in there, and your attentiveness, and your responsiveness, with the questions.

The record of this meeting will remain open for a period of ten days from this date. The Advisory Committee welcomes additional written statements and exhibits for inclusion in the record. These should be submitted to the Western Regional Office, and the address is available, from Tom, and Grace.

So, thank you, all, very much, and we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p.m., the hearing was closed.)

25

24

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE This is to certify that the attached proceedings before In the Matter of: WASHINGTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE were held as herein appears and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Department, Commission or Agency. OFFICIAL REPORTER DATE: JUNE 9, 1995