

Washington State Criminal Sentencing Task Force
Meeting Summary: September 16, 2021
Virtual Meeting via ZOOM – [Link to recording via TVW](#)

ATTENDEES:

- **Task Force Members and Alternates Attendees:** see Appendix A.
- **Members of the Public:** James Chambers, Kelsey-Anne Fung, Bruce Glant, Cynthia Hollimon, Shawnte Holmes-Davenport, Cathy Johnston, Davian Kerrelola, Kelly Leonard, James McMahan, Bridget Molina, Gideon Newmark, Sydney Oliver, Megan Pirie, Joanne Smieja, David Trieweiler, Matt Tremble, Kehaulani Walker, Aracely Yates
- **Facilitation Team:** Amanda Murphy, Chris Page, Molly Stenovec, Maggie Counihan – William D. Ruckelshaus Center
- **Research/Technical Support:** Lauren Knoth, Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)

MEETING GOALS:

- Task Force introductions and updates
- Sentencing Alternatives Workgroup update
- Sentencing Grid Subgroup presentation and next offer of potential recommendations for Task Force Input

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, REVIEW AGENDA and GROUNDRULES

Amanda Murphy welcomed attendees and introduced herself and the rest of the facilitation team: Chris Page, Molly Stenovec, and Maggie Counihan with the William D. Ruckelshaus Center. The Ruckelshaus Center operates as a joint effort of Washington State University and the University of Washington as an impartial convenor and facilitator for collaborative multiparty public policy challenges in Washington state and the Pacific Northwest.

Members and alternates then introduced themselves and the perspective they represent.

CO-CHAIR UPDATES

- Looking forward to monthly Task Force meetings to allow both the subgroups and the Task Force to move at a thorough and deliberate pace on a complex set of topics and develop a package of recommendations for the 2023 Legislative session.
- **Membership:** Martina Kartman stepped down from one of the seats representing Interests of Victims. Legislative leadership is in the process of appointing Tiffany Attrill, who has been participating as an alternate to Riddhi Mukhopadhyay, also representing interests of victims. (Per operating procedures, both Tiffany and Riddhi can designate an alternate.)
- As the group discusses the various Offense Seriousness Levels and sentence length ranges, please also think about how the grid represents a series of human stories and lives.
- Appreciate all the time and dedication that members and alternates are giving during and between Task Force meetings.

FACILITATION TEAM UPDATES

Starting in October the Task Force will move from bi-monthly to monthly meetings. The Facilitation Team will send out updated meeting calendar invites through June 2022. The next meeting will occur on October 7, from 1-4:30 pm.

SENTENCING ALTERNATIVES SUBGROUP UPDATE

- All completed sets of past meeting notes are accessible on the [website](#).
- Continues to meet every other week and has been reviewing current state sentencing alternatives, their eligibility requirements, and how relate to the current grid.
- Group will review the Drug Offense Sentencing Alternative (DOSA), both prison- and residential-based, at the next meeting.

Sentencing Grid Subgroup Presentation & Discussion: Potential Recommendations, Tradeoffs, and Considerations**Potential Recommendations on Offense Seriousness Level (OSL) 10+ and Discussion**

During this session, the Grid Subgroup, with technical support from Lauren Knoth, Keri-Anne Jetzer, and Clela Steelhammer, recapped the potential recommendations from OSLs 10 and above discussed at the September 2nd meeting and presented additional recommendations in that portion of the grid. Full presentation begins at 00:23:10 – [follow this link to see the presentation](#).

Key takeaways from presentation:

- The Grid Subgroup is considering a formula to develop consistent increases in sanctions with OSL and Criminal History Score (CHS), intended to create durability and give implicit guidance to Legislators for future policy decisions. A formula could also consider other regulations, such as statutory maximums or minimums.
- The Task Force has already considered a potential recommendation to move several Class B felony offenses elsewhere in the grid, so (if that occurred) OSLs 10-16 in the simulation would include only Class A felonies and comprise a separate zone for violent offenses.
- Recalibrating which offenses fit each OSL could ensure that certain offenses make sense in the new structure; however, the Grid Subgroup is focused on the overall grid structure, rather than an offense-by-offense review.
- FY19 data shows that fewer convictions occur in OSL 10+ as compared to lower levels of the grid.
- Potential recommendations 12, 12a, and 12b apply to OSLs 10 and above. They focus on the unique characteristics of offenses and other laws associated with the upper range and ways that state laws (RCWs, or the specifics of the Revised Code of Washington) and the sentencing grid could become more consistent with each other.

Lauren Knoth then recapped the Grid Subgroups potential recommendations and technical components presented during the September 2nd meeting. Those potential recommendations are below, with questions/discussion among members and alternates.

Recap from 9/2 CSTF meeting**Potential Recommendation #12:**

Increase the number of seriousness levels from 16 to 18 whereby:

- *OSL 18 is Aggravated Murder with a range of 25 to life regardless of Criminal History Score, unless defendant below a certain age (same range as in current grid)*

- *OSL 17 is Murder 1 and Homicide by Abuse with current ranges.*
- *OSL 16 is Murder 2 with current maximums, but minimums made consistent at 50% of the maximum.*

Grid Group considerations:

- This recommendation would expand the grid from 16 to 18 rows and make the grid more consistent with existing statutes.
- Current statute says the minimum for Murder 2 can be no less than 50% of the maximum, but current grid does not have a consistent relationship between the minimum and the maximum for each cell as one moves laterally across the CHS columns.
- Formula would apply to OSL 10-15.

Recap from 9/2 CSTF meeting: Potential recommendation #12a:

- *Collapse Malicious Explosion 1 & Trafficking 1 into OSL 15. Move all other offenses up 1 OSL. OSL 10 would then be available for Class A felonies in OSL 9 or lower that may need to be recalibrated.*

Grid Group considerations:

- Potential recommendation 12 leaves Malicious Explosion 1 and Trafficking 1 as the sole offenses in their respective OSLs.
- Shifting all other offenses up one OSL lessens the reductions in sentencing ranges between the current grid and the simulated grid.
- OSL 10 could provide a space to move up Class A felonies currently at or below OSL 9 (to distinguish them from Class B felonies). Example offenses include Robbery 1, Arson 1.

Recap: Potential recommendation #12b:

- *Collapse the ranges for Murder 1 for CHS 0-4 and 5-9+.*

Grid Group considerations:

- Proposed ranges would maintain or approximate current minimum sentences at CHS 0 and 5 and maximums at CHS 4 and 9+. Grid group discussion about that included the following:
 - Caution about potential for disparate treatment caused from variability in how judges approach sentencing, if provided more discretion
 - Wider sentence ranges could provide more leverage for defense attorneys during plea bargaining
 - Wider ranges could provide opportunity for prosecution to charge longer sentences
- Similarities between Murder 1 and 2 and potential racial disproportionality in the charging decisions

Task Force Input:

- **Q:** How do the proposed ranges compare to the current sentencing practices of the courts? **R:** Generally, we've found that courts sentence in the middle or near the low end of the range, so the proposed changes to the grid ranges may be smaller than they first appear, when compared to current sentencing practices.
- Hopefully we can develop a framework informed by current sentencing practices and allow judges to make decisions based on individualized circumstances.
 - There are two reports with data on where in the range: [Statistical Summary of Adult Felony Sentencing, Caseload Forecast Council](#), showing where in the range judges sentenced for specific offenses in FY19, and [20 Years in Sentencing: A look at Washington State Adult Felony Sentencing FY1989 to FY2008](#), summarizing where in the range judges have sentenced over the last 20 years.

- After developing a sentencing grid framework, there may still be work to adjust the ranges and where offenses are classified. For example, if find that courts sentencing higher in the range for certain offenses, that could signify a need to consider reclassifying that offense to a different OSL.
- Still reflecting on the proposal – seeing merits and cautions. Merits include similarity to the current grid ranges. Cautious about having just two columns, which would bring challenges when prosecution and defense negotiate plea deals; perhaps six columns since there is merit in the opportunity for greater judicial decision-making, especially at the higher OSLs.
- Feel cautious about using current practices to guide changes since disproportionality is occurring under current practices. Encourage the Task Force to think about factors that may have contributed to disproportionality such as mandatory minimums and enhancements. Have concerns about prosecutorial influence in charging decisions because Murder 1 and 2 are so similar and also that two columns in the simulated grid increase potential sentence lengths for individuals with low CHS.
- Support eliminating offenses not charged in the last 20 years (e.g., malicious placement of explosive device).
- Support decreasing the range for individuals less culpable.
- **Q:** In thinking about increases to judicial discretion, what has the group discussed for safeguards to ensure that racial disproportionality does not perpetuate or increase? **R:** Legislators have begun conversations with Chief Justice Gonzales about the need for more transparency and measures to mitigate disparities. Chief Justice Gonzales knows a professor at Seattle University leading a team on developing tools to reduce racial and ethnic disparities that result from judicial discretion.
- **Q:** Could the Task Force address life without parole?
 - **R:** It's within the sentencing grid, so something within the scope of the Task Force—how would you like it to be addressed?
 - **R:** Support eliminating the possibility of life without parole.
 - **Follow-up comment:** On Sept. 2nd meeting, the Task Force considered a recommendation about recommending at the 20-year point, an automatic review of a person's sentence.
 - **R:** The Task Force also considered a recommendation to change the age threshold from 18 to 25—those recommendations get at the concern, but don't fully address.
 - **Follow up comment:** There are two different ways to reach a sentence of life without parole. First, aggravated first degree murder, which is aggravated murder plus aggravating circumstances—a member has only seen a few such cases in three decades. Second, through “three strike” prosecutions—some prosecutors are frustrated by this provision since once charging decision could lead to life without parole and another decision could lead to a lower sentence. This limits the opportunity for negotiation between those options.
- Several members discussed narrower ranges in the grid and potential implications for disproportionality.
 - Suggestion to establish a single number in each cell to limit racial disproportionality in judicial decision-making. Have concern with wide range in grid guidelines in this recommendation; however, may be able to support as part of a full package of recommendations that collectively compensate for racial disparity.
 - The current relatively narrow ranges within the cells limit judicial discretion and give discretion to prosecution—concern that establishing a single number in each cell would give prosecution further power, and the judge would have less ability to exercise discretion.
 - Suggestion that judges could still use mitigated/aggravated sentences in a grid with single sentencing guideline numbers.
 - Concern that in a single number or minimized range, the prosecution and defense could only recommend the sentence associated with the specific charge. Prosecutors would prefer

to negotiate within a sentencing range and have courts review the plea bargain and deviate depending on their perception, rather than negotiate on charging decisions, which are based on the evidence.

- **Follow up comment:** From 1994-2018, Arkansas had a single number in each cell. In 2019, the state returned to having a sentence range in each cell. **Potential follow up action:** Grid Group could have follow-up conversation on lessons learned in Arkansas.
- Current guidelines are based on practices from FY1979-1981. If we base a new grid on current practices, then current practices will continue. When other states enacted sentencing overhauls, their intent was to change current practices and reduce disparity.
- Before the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA), after prosecutors selected charges, judges could only determine minimum sentence and parole board decided the end point of each person’s sentence.
- Framers of the SRA assumed that courts would issue aggravating/mitigating sentences if the case did not fit within the range; however, exceptional sentences may not occur as frequently as envisioned.
- Several members encouraged the group to identify how potential recommendations explicitly lessen racial disproportionality and voiced hope that Washington will measure the effects of changes to the sentencing framework regularly and frequently, particularly related to racial disproportionality.
 - **Follow up comment:** Grid Subgroup has discussed how each potential recommendation could impact racial disproportionality. However, it is impossible to predict human behavior and how it would change or stay the same within a new sentencing framework. Ongoing and periodic lookbacks will be crucial. Literature and evidence suggest that single numbers for sentencing guidelines may increase opportunities for disparity, since so many points exist “upstream” of a judge’s sentence where disparate treatment can occur.
- Support shortening sentencing guideline ranges but have concern that a single number would shift emphasis onto the charging decisions.
- Concern that prison/jail dramatically affect a person. Simply lowering sentences will not affect an individual’s experience while in confinement or their behavior on release. Task Force must keep victims and community safety in mind and look at how programs, trainings, and treatment provide opportunities for people to rehabilitate themselves, and thus improve the effectiveness of the system and public safety.
- Suggestion for the Task Force to talk about definition of public safety.
 - **Follow up comment:** Task Force already had a meeting focused on public safety. Takeaways from those breakout and large group discussions: there are many definitions of public safety, and each member representing different constituencies sees public safety through a different lens. **Potential follow up:** Facilitation team will review summary of discussion on public safety with Co-Chairs.
- Reflecting on sentence length, how do we determine the optimal length that reduces recidivism?
 - **Follow up comment:** Grid group has discussed optimal sentence lengths, but not much data exists.
 - **Follow up comment:** Have understanding that criminality dramatically decreases with age, but at what age—30? 50? 70?
 - **Potential follow up action:** How have other jurisdictions determined sentence length?
- Recognize that racial disparity and disproportionality exists throughout society. Task Force has the challenge of finding ways to hold individuals accountable for disparate treatment, but various entities don’t want to give up power or engage in monitoring mechanisms.

Discussion: New Zone for OSL 10+

Potential recommendations 12, 12a, and 12b have the potential to create a zone on the sentencing grid for Class A felonies and violent offenses. Additional questions for the Task Force members and alternates to consider include:

- What other forms of accountability could help victims? Considerations could include requiring courts to provide opportunity for a Victim Impact Statement, mandatory restitution.
- What other forms of accountability could be integrated for defendants? Considerations could include mandatory drug/alcohol assessments, specific sentencing conditions for repeat violent convictions.

Presentation of OSL 6-9, Potential Recommendations, and Discussion

The Grid Subgroup provided an overview of the middle portion of the grid: OSL 6-9, how a formula could apply, and Potential Recommendation 13, then discussed how other forms of accountability and supports for victims/survivors could be incorporated into the grid. [Follow this link to view the full presentation](#) and discussion (begins at 01:47:19).

After this presentation, the Task Force will have had presentations on potential recommendations from portions of the grid (conversation on OSL 1-5 in August, just wrapped up conversation on OSL 10+ that began on September 2). Next the Task Force will focus on the columns that move horizontally left to right along the vertical axis—CHS, multipliers, enhancements—before looking at the grid holistically.

Presentation Takeaways:

- Previous recommendations considered by the Task Force would move several Class C offenses down from this portion of the grid (to join other Class C offenses in OSLs 1-5), so mid-OSL offenses are mostly Class B and some Class A that represent a variety of offenses, including violent and sex offenses.
- Majority of offenses in OSL 6-9 are Class B felonies that carry a statutory maximum of 120 months.
- Setting the maximum guideline range at 108 months instead of 120 allows for a court to impose aggravated sentences or community custody terms of up to 12 months when warranted.

Potential Recommendation 13:

- *Create the grid ranges for OSLs 6-9 using 108 as the anchor point for the most serious maximum punishment for OSL 9, CHS 9+.*

Grid Group Considerations:

- Majority of offenses in these OSLs have a statutory maximum of 120 months, so current upper ranges in OSL 9, CHS 8 and 9+ are prohibited by statute.
- Formula: Calculation of upper range for CHS 9+ is based on anchor of 108, as well as the upper ranges for sentences in the left column (CHS 0). Calculations for the upper range in each cell are then based on consistent increases moving left to right from CHS 0 to 9+. Calculation of the lower range for each cell is based on the upper range value, which is consistent with current policy. Partial months are then dropped, so 7.2 becomes 7. A formulaic approach reduces the minimum and maximum in each cell—changes may be smaller in some cells for some offenses due to the Class B statutory maximum.
- The Grid Group discussed whether to develop a recommendation to move Class A felonies out of OSL 6-9, or to direct the Sentencing Guidelines Commission (SGC) to review those offenses in the context of a new grid structure.

Task Force Input/Questions:

- **Q:** Can you clarify whether the anchor was based on the presence of so many Class B felonies in this zone? **R:** Yes, the thinking being that if there are Class B felonies in OSL 9, then all the sentencing guidelines in that OSL should be valid sentences within the statutory maximum. Without recalibration, Class A felonies could potentially have a 63-month reduction at OSL 9, CHS9+.
- Concern for recommendation as is, unless also include a recommendation to move Class A felonies to a higher seriousness level.
- **Q:** The statutory maximum is 120 months, but the anchor point is 108-- Can you provide more context behind that thinking? **R:** Two reasons for setting the anchor at 12 months under the statutory maximum. First, to allow judges and prosecutors to seek aggravated sentences in egregious instances and for those sentences to be above the standard range. Second, to allow for community supervision to be included with a standard range sentence at the highest OSL and CHS. The period of incarceration and community supervision must be within the statutory maximum.
- Concern that the anchor points below the statutory maximum, rather than consistent with, does not reduce complexity, but ok with the approach assuming judges understand it.

*Previous **Recommendation 12a** empties out OSL 10. Class A felonies in OSL 6-9 could be recalibrated by the SGC (moved to a higher OSL) to moderate the reductions in sentences for Class A felonies since they are not held to the Class B statutory maximum.*

Grid Group Considerations & Potential Recalibration Options:

- The reductions in guideline ranges in OSL 6-9, to bring all ranges within statutory maximum for Class B felonies, may not apply to Class A felonies.
- Discussions about whether to develop a recommendation to recalibrate certain classes of offenses or to request the SGC to examine and propose recalibrations of offenses under the new structure.
- Already had some discussions about moving Class B felonies from OSL 1-5 and group will continue to explore recalibration as it begins to look at the whole grid.
- Recalibration example shows Class A felonies in OSL 7-9 and how sentencing guidelines could increase/decrease in various scenarios, such as increase by one OSL or maintain current OSL in simulated grid.

Task Force Input/Questions:

- Grid group has discussed adding a Repeat Violent or Repeat Serious Violent column or zone (that could allow the courts to treat those individuals and situations differently) but hasn't fully engaged in conversations about the vertical axis.
- Defense expressed support providing a framework to the Legislature, then elected officials make determinations about whether a crime is a Class A or B felony and what punishment and culpability to associate with that crime.
- Constitutionally, Legislators have responsibility to determine accountability for crimes, but appreciate guidance and buy-in from the Task Force and/or the SGC. Legislators expressed support for a comprehensive package of recommendations, or at least options for consideration.
- Prosecution expressed interest in potential for sentence length reductions in the SW grid corner, if/when paired with additional services or accountabilities—as well as for a formula-based approach to the grid. With a formula-based approach, have been thinking about the sentence guideline differences between the current and simulated grids and how potential sentence length reductions are offset by other forms of accountability or considerations of victims—it's easier to see that offset in the SW portion of grid.

- Have some concerns about where the simulated grid would potentially increase sentence lengths, but also see these potential changes as part of a larger puzzle.
- Law enforcement expressed concern for any potential new grid framework if it lacked recommendations for offense-specific recalibration, especially in the upper range OSLs. Expressed support for reducing complexities and errors in the system, but that should be paired with proper adjustments for accountabilities for crimes.
- Reminder that the grid is layered and complex. Right now, the simulated grid represents a framework or the background for a much more complicated landscape portrait. (The group will talk about whether and where to add flowers and trees to that landscape at future meetings.)
- Concern that different positions are so far apart that Task Force might not reach consensus.
- Contemplating how past practices, rather than science and data, have informed current sentencing and perceptions of appropriate sentence lengths. Also thinking about how the U.S. has the highest rates of incarceration in the world along with the highest rates of crime—this is an opportunity for a different approach.
- **Q:** What’s the genesis of the sentence guideline ranges? And what does research or scholarship on incarceration lengths and recidivism show?
 - **R:** No single answer to the second question, “what is the correct sentence length?” because there are different fundamental reasons for incarcerating individuals. Could potentially measure recidivism, but it’s difficult to find similar cases. Many studies have noted variations in the quality of incarceration and often suggest that the types of programs available play a greater role in determining recidivism than length of stay. In some instances, policy changes have allowed some comparison in sentence length, but that cannot be generalized to beyond a very specific offense. Research has also observed that peer, family, and community supports can strongly influence recidivism, so it becomes challenging to look at other states or countries and simply adopt their approach.
 - Where do we have some data is on the perceived appropriate sentence length in Washington. We find that, on average, courts sentence at 30% of the range or below the midpoints. The simulated grid reduces the maximum sentence length guidelines, but by sentencing below the midpoint courts are signaling that the upper range of the sentence guideline ranges may be too long.
- Support for basing recommendations on the research and data we *do* have, for example on the effectiveness of community-based therapeutic approaches for reentry and public safety.
- Recognize that different values and perceptions of accountability inform sentence length, rather than science; however, some data points to the value of programs and educational opportunities.
- From a law enforcement perspective, it’s challenging to work with crime victims and families when the individual who committed the crime has a history of violence. Different for the individuals at the lower end of the grid, who may have been at the wrong place at the wrong time or made a mistake that does not warrant separation from society.

Discussion – Other forms of Accountability

The Grid Group has begun to consider how reductions in sentence lengths could coincide with increases in additional forms of accountability in the grid for both defendants and for victims/survivors. Additional forms of accountability for defendants that could be integrated to the grid could include mandatory drug and alcohol assessments, with different requirements for different categories of offenses. Additional supports that could help victims and survivors could vary throughout the grid, but suggestions include

- mandatory restitution for offenses in OSL 6-9
- court must provide opportunity for a victim impact statement in OSL 10+

Possible action item: Task Force members and alternates will reach out to respective constituencies for additional ideas and options for appropriate supports for survivors/victims and other accountabilities for defendants that could be incorporated onto the grid. Members and alternates will submit these ideas to sentencing.taskforce.ruckelshaus@wsu.edu.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS:

Below are a summary of the comments and questions shared by public attendees, with any follow-up comments or responses made by Task Force members and alternates. Full questions and comments can be [viewed by following this link to TVW \(this portion starts at 2:48:39 in the meeting recording\)](#).

James Chambers: Spoke about his personal experience and the lack of opportunities for substance use treatment and other programs for individuals with long sentences. He described how he changed over the years and became a completely different person from when he first received his sentence. Expressed support for 20-year look backs on sentencing and for programs that will support individual change and allow them to return to the community.

- Lydia Flora Barlow, Waldo Waldron-Ramsey, and Chris Poulos are working with the Department of Corrections on a few projects to change the culture and improve program opportunities in prisons.
- **Follow up:** Julie Martin provided an overview of some of the work being done at DOC, including reducing frequency an individual may be moved to a different facility and communicating to the Legislature what kinds and levels of programs can be offered with current resources, and what additional things could be offered. Working with individuals who have been incarcerated, in addition to reviewing data on program effectiveness, will be key to identifying what programs are needed. The ongoing pandemic and current outbreak of COVID-19 pose short-term challenges to these long-term goals.

Kehaulani Walker, Families of the Incarcerated: Representative Goodman, you mentioned that ultimately the Legislature makes sentencing decisions, per the Constitution -- could you tell me the article that you were referring to.

- It's in the case law--Washington State Supreme Court has ruled repeatedly that the legislative branch of has the sole authority to develop the framework for determining punishments for crimes, which in turn the courts use to determine individual sentences.

Kehaulani Walker, Families of the Incarcerated: Shared her personal story and the many opportunities for decisions and mistakes that occur prior to, yet still influence sentencing outcomes. Also described errors and sentence miscalculations that have occurred on Judgement and Sentencing forms.

Megan Pirie: Expressed support for the Task Force to consider racial equity, describing personal experience of knowing women with similar charges as she who are still incarcerated because of skin color. Encouraged the Task Force to think of community safety in a way that doesn't just involve incarceration but includes reentry and restorative justice.

Bruce Glant: Described his efforts representing individuals arrested for violent sex crimes through undercover law enforcement operations. Many of the individuals he represents are serving sentences from 6 years to life yet didn't commit harm and don't have prior convictions. Encouraged the Task Force to consider ways to reduce sentences or make sentencing alternatives available for those individuals.

- From January – November 2022, Washington State Institute for Public Policy will be comparing demographics and outcomes between individuals convicted as a result of the Net Nanny Sting Operations and individuals, not part of Net Nanny, but convicted of similar crimes or faced with similar charges.

Bruce Glant: Expressed hope for a bill next legislative session that would allow resentencing to occur for individuals without a prior criminal history.

Verbatim Public Comments and Questions Submitted via Zoom Chat Function:

Bruce Glant: Doesn't research also show that long sentences have a negative impact? And isn't this based on the sentencing averages the judges have been issuing which are I believe it was said 33% of the maximum sentences?

Joanne Smieja: Why are all sex offenses grouped together? Do we actually believe a 19-year-old looking at an illegal depiction of a 15-year-old is equivalent to a 45-year-old sexually molesting a real child? Our sex offense laws need to recognize the heterogeneity of the offenses and of the people convicted of a sex offense. Since people convicted of a sex offense are treated differently than people convicted of other offenses, I encourage you to expand your task force to include someone who is directly impacted by our sex offense laws. All sex offenses are group together on the slide called "Open Discussion" which is currently being shown.

Megan Pirie: Instead of adding a subgroup to this those voices should be at this big table not minimized to another conversation.

Cathy Johnston: The question "Different requirement for violent or sex offenses? Seems to promote these are similar. As does the top question "drug and alcohol assessments." Sex offenses are not necessarily violent: EX: young people viewing sexual images on the computer. Sex offense. not violent. The consequence is Sex Registration requirement.

ADJOURN

Upcoming Meetings:

2021

October 7, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

November 4, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

December 2, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

2022

January 6, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

February 3, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

March 3, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

April 7, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

May 5, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

June 2, 1 pm – 4:30 pm

CSTF Members & Designated Alternates		
	Affiliation/Perspective Represented	Attendance:
Jon Tunheim	Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys	✓
Russell Brown (alternate)		✓
Lydia Flora Barlow	Statewide Reentry Council	✓
(Christopher Poulos)		✓
Rep. Roger Goodman	Washington State House of Representatives	✓
Sen. Chris Gildon	Washington State Senate	✓
Sen. Manka Dhingra	Washington State Senate	✓
Rep. Carolyn Eslick	Washington State House of Representatives	
Sonja Hallum	Washington State Office of the Governor	
Elaine Deschamps	Washington State Caseload Forecast Council	
(Clela Steelhammer)		✓
Julie Martin	Washington State Department of Corrections	✓
(Mac Pevey)		✓
Judge Wesley Saint Clair	Washington State Sentencing Guidelines Commission	✓
(Keri-Anne Jetzer)		✓
Suzanne Cook	Statewide Family Council	✓
(Melody Simle)		
Judge Josephine Wiggs-Martin	Superior Court Judges' Association	✓
Gregory Link	Washington Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys; Washington Defender Association	✓
(Kim Gordon)		
Chief Gregory Cobb	Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs	✓
(Chief Brian Smith)		✓
Councilmember Derek Young	Washington State Association of Counties	✓
Judge Veronica Alicea-Galván	Washington State Minority and Justice Commission	

(Frank Thomas)

Chief James Schrimpsker	Fraternal Order of Police, Labor Organization Representing Active Law Enforcement Officers in Washington State	
Nick Allen	Columbia Legal Services, Representing Interests of Incarcerated Persons	✓
(Nick Straley)	Columbia Legal Services, Representing Interests of Incarcerated Persons	
Waldo Waldron-Ramsey	Washington Community Action Network, Representing Interests of Incarcerated Persons	✓
(Ginny Parham)	Washington Community Action Network, Representing Interests of Incarcerated Persons	✓
<i>Vacant Seat</i>	Representing Interests of Crime Victims	
Riddhi Mukhopadhyay	Sexual Violence Law Center, Representing Interests of Crime Victims	
(Tiffany Attrill)	King County Prosecutor’s Office, Representing Interests of Crime Victims	