

**WASHINGTON STATE
PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL ON
JUVENILE JUSTICE**

WA-PCJJ

Community Compensation Fund Workgroup

Meeting Summary
Thursday, March 14, 2024
3:00-4:30 PM | Via Teams

Welcome

Workgroup Co-Leads jd Nielsen and Heidi Sadri welcomed the group and attendees shared introductions via chat.

Attendees: jd Nielsen, Heidi Sadri, Izzy Eads, Jack Murphy, Norrie Gregoire, Judge David Keenan, Robert Hamill, Liz Trautman, Julian Cooper, Roshelle Cleland, Tiffany Attrill, Kelsey-Anne Fung, Jenny Young, Liz Mustin, Giannina Ferrara, Nicholas Oakley, Julissa Sanchez, Gus Patel-Tupper, Maty Brimmer, Kelly Olson, Daniel Lugo, Prachi Dave, Giannina Ferrara, Megan Allen

January Meeting Recap:

- Introduction of technical assistance provider Robert Hamill of Council of State Governments Justice Center
- Presentation by Washington State Center for Court Research regarding juvenile court restitution data analysis
- Presentation by Restorative Community Pathways regarding guiding principles for handling restitution payments
- Overview of Washington State Office of Crime Victims Advocacy (OCVA) and the statewide network of programs it funds
- Discussion regarding administration of Community Compensation Program by OCVA

Timeline:

Heidi provided a timeline for workgroup-related dates and deadlines for the remainder of the project:

4/13 Workgroup Meeting	Decide recommendations for program eligibility and expenses
5/9 Workgroup Meeting	Decide recommendations for program administration
5/14	Heidi will send an outline of recommendations to the workgroup for review
5/23 Presentation to PCJJ	Presentation of preliminary recommendations to Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice, workgroup member attendance welcome but not required
5/30	Deadline for feedback on recommendations outline. After this point, we are not able to make substantive changes to recommendations.
6/14	Heidi will send a first full draft of the report to the workgroup for review
6/21	Deadline for feedback on first full draft

7/11 Workgroup Meeting	Approve final draft
Late July through October	Reviews by Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice and DCYF

Discussion regarding timeline:

- What will be the structure of the PCJJ presentation and PCJJ’s decision-making? The presentation is an opportunity for PCJJ to hear about the project process, who has been involved, how we arrived at our recommendations, etc.; and add any of their own input. We do not anticipate individual councilmembers or the council as a whole to have reactions of surprise or strong concern. Many PCJJ councilmembers are on the workgroups as members or co-leads, and they have been receiving updates outside of the workgroups.

Youth & Service Provider Input

Input from [CHOOSE 180 Youth & Young Adult Advocacy Program](#) Members

Heidi shared input from young people who participate in CHOOSE 180’s Youth & Young Adult Advocacy Program.

Background:

- Feedback was contributed by 9 youth between the ages of 12 and 25 who live in King County and are training to be community advocates. Most are BIPOC youth, have been personally impacted by the juvenile or adult legal systems, and have experienced harm.
- Izzy Eads leads this group. Izzy and Heidi co-wrote an interview tool to ask youth for their input on this project. Izzy did one-on-one interviews with the Advocacy Program youth who wanted to participate.
- The interview tool used a hypothetical story where we asked youth to imagine that a classmate pushed them off of their bike, causing an injury, and stole the bike. We listed expenses that may result from that incident including the lost bike, medical bills, and missed work. We explain that the classmate was charged but that it may be some time before a judge orders restitution, and that the classmate may not be able to afford to pay that restitution. We also provided a backstory for the classmate, explaining what was going on in his life that led him to take the bike.
- We explain that we are trying to design a Community Compensation Program that would take care of those expenses, and we are looking for their input on how that program should work.

Please refer to the attached slides for the summarized feedback.

Discussion:

- We should include a recommendation that judges or other appropriate figures be required to inform impacted people about a Community Compensation Program. We can’t expect people to go looking for it.
- The hypothetical example used with the youth was a lower level of harm where a resolution could be worked out, and this is reflected in the responses that the current system doesn’t foster restoration or reconciliation. In a situation where there was a more significant amount of harm

or trauma, having the person who caused that harm removed from the life of the harmed person may be desired.

- People experience harm differently and we can't assume what they would want as a monolith. Restorative justice is always a solution, but what that looks like varies.

Input from Sexual Assault Service Provider Working Group

Heidi shared input from leaders of several organizations across the state who provide services to survivors, victims, and people impacted by sexual assault. Heidi joined one of their regular meetings and discussed this project.

Please refer to the attached slides for the summarized feedback.

Discussion:

- In the world of criminal justice reform, there is a myth that victims service providers are opposed to any reform. It's important to listen to victim voice, not use a one-size-fits all approach (especially by treating sexual assault offenses like others), and collaborate on an equitable system that includes accountability but works for everyone.
- We should consider how the [Lifeline Support System Pilot](#) may be able to complement a Community Compensation Program.

Best Practices & Recommendation Development: Program Eligibility & Expenses

Robert Hamill of [Council of State Governments \(CSG\) Justice Center](#) presented best practices and recommendations for program eligibility, eligible expenses, expense verification, and interaction with the existing Crime Victims Compensation Program.

Goal: Consider Robert's recommendations and decide to either adopt those as our own recommendations or discuss an alternative recommendation. If more time is needed to develop an alternative recommendation, we will schedule an additional opt-in meeting.

Please refer to CSG slides. We covered slides 1-16. The remaining slides will be covered in the May meeting.

Discussion:

- Regarding language and access to the application, be mindful about using language lines. They often lack ability to convey context/nuance, not trauma-informed.
- Are there any compensations programs that do not require any third-party verification that the harm/crime occurred? Robert: Not aware of any. Often trying to strike a balance of minimizing barriers with the reality that documentation is important for government programs.
- In Iowa, was the ability to waive the requirement to report to law enforcement part of the initial program setup, or was it an expansion? Robert: It was an expansion based on a reinterpretation of existing regulations.
- Would a charge need to be filed in order for someone to be eligible? No, our proviso language does not assume a requirement that charges need to be filed to establish that someone was

harmed by a juvenile criminal offense. This is the same with the existing Crime Victims Compensation Program – it does not require a charge or finding of guilt.

- Our current Crime Victims Compensation (CVC) Program is subject to both internal audit and federal audit. Must be able to support all decisions and document all exceptions. Caution about a need for preparation to stand up to scrutiny, review.
- If a suspect is unknown, would the default be to apply to CVC? Eligibility for the Community Compensation Program would require that the harm was known to have been caused by a juvenile.
- If the victim was in the act of committing a felony at the time the crime occurred, would that disqualify someone from eligibility? Robert: Recommendation is to not assess this question or any other questions about prior interaction with law enforcement or criminal justice system. The Office for Victims of Crime within the US Department of Justice has issued recommendations encouraging states to move away from those types of eligibility requirements.
- This year the Washington legislature passed [SB 5937](#) with changes to eligibility for victims' compensation. Left in place the requirement for cooperation with law enforcement but codified for CVC language to align with the federal rules that allow for exceptions. This makes it easier for CVC to waive the requirement to cooperate with law enforcement.
- Would the program be available to currently incarcerated individuals? Yes, could apply and be approved if they meet eligibility criteria. Their medical expenses should be the responsibility of the state, but if they have other expenses or have additional expenses following release, those should be compensated.

The workgroup agreed to adopt the recommendations presented.

Next Steps

- We will extend our remaining meetings to 2 hours
- May 9th meeting:
 - o Feedback from girls and young women at Echo Glen
 - o Recommendations for eligible program expenses
 - o Recommendations for program administration

Next Meeting: May 9, 2024, at 3 PM