



Community Compensation Fund Workgroup

Meeting Summary

Thursday, November 9, 2023

3:00-4:30 PM | Via Zoom

Welcome & Introductions

Workgroup Co-Leads jd Nielsen and Heidi Sadri welcomed the group and all in attendance provided introductions.

Workgroup Members Attending: jd Nielsen, Heidi Sadri, Michael Althaus, Senator Noel Frame, Daniel Lugo, Evan Walker, Kelsey-anne Fung, Giannina Ferrara, Gus Patel-Tupper, Izzy Eads, Jonathan Stanbery, Julian Cooper, Julissa Sanchez, Kelly Olson, Larry Jefferson, Liz Mustin, Liz Trautman, Maty Brimmer, Prachi Dave, Stephanie Budrus, Jack Murphy

OJJ Staff: Jenny Young, Whitney Queral

Project Overview

Heidi provided an overview of the project, including proviso language and anticipated timeline. Please refer to attached slides.

Shared Agreements for Engagement

The group discussed shared agreements for engagement and decision-making. jd and Heidi offered an initial list, and the group added. Points included:

- Use clear and accessible communication. Avoid acronyms, use plain language. Create an inclusive space. Encouragement to come off mute to discuss and explain or to communicate offline with jd or Heidi.
- Create and support flexible options for participation from people with lived/living experience, both inside and outside of the workgroup. Heidi is working with several community organizations who facilitate youth groups to create opportunities for connection and exchange, particularly within the meeting spaces that those groups already have. We will compensate those lived experts for their time.
- Respect the privacy of anyone sharing their lived experience. Personal experiences shared within the workgroup are expected to stay within the workgroup. Center trauma-informed principles when we think about restoration for people who have experienced harm and people who have caused harm. Be mindful that we will be discussing potentially triggering ideas. Co-leads will be responsible for interrupting any conversation that becomes uncomfortable or hurtful to people bringing lived experience.

- We come from a place of shared understanding that people who we hold accountable for harm and people who have caused harm are often the same people. We are not using binaries or pitting groups against each other.
- In the absence of consensus...
 - o Distill around majority shared ideas as much as possible and capture all else.
 - o Aim for the best interest of all, but the final product should be in the best interest of the most, or the most impacted.
 - o Focus on alignment rather than consensus. Find where we align in some agreement around an idea. Where strong disagreements exist, present what the discussion was around the difference. Include minority reports along with final recommendations.
 - o Aim for unanimous, but accept x% (perhaps 80%) as consensus. Get to that goal by inviting opportunity and hearing input from all.
 - o Take temperature checks on group attitudes as conversations develop to assess where we are, be willing to negotiate concessions. Unanimity is ideal but shouldn't hold us back.
 - o Recommendation to establish shared values
- Stay grounded in our task – the “how” and implementation plan

The workgroup will return to this list at the next meeting. The workgroup also discussed establishing shared values to guide how we handle decision-making.

Presentation: Crime Victims Compensation Program

Maty Brimmer and Jonathan Stanbery from the Crime Victims Compensation (CVC) Program within the Department of Labor & Industries provided a presentation on their program followed by discussion with the group. CVC will share slides with Heidi for distribution to workgroup.

Presentation outline and discussion:

- CVC mission
- CVC eligibility requirements
 - o Workgroup reflections on these eligibility requirements: concern about the requirement to cooperate with law enforcement; concern about the requirements regarding recent felony convictions and LFO payments; concern about the exclusion of people incarcerated at the time of harm
 - o Eligibility criteria are captured in state law, [RCW 7.68](#); some come from DOJ federal grant requirements (this includes reporting to and cooperation with law enforcement)
 - o Eligibility does not require a conviction, offender, or any court proceedings
 - o Regarding whether families of people killed by police or the state are eligible for compensation, this depends on whether an investigation finds that the officer committed a crime. The [Office of Independent Investigations](#) does these investigations.
- CVC claim filing process
- How the CVC pays for services on approved claims
- CVC maximum benefits

- Common reasons why a CVC claim is denied
- Expenses not covered by CVC
- CVC contact information:
 - o Maty Brimmer: brin235@lni.wa.gov
 - o Jonathan Stanbery: stjq235@lni.wa.gov

Discussion and reflections on the presentation in relation to our project:

- Victims/harmed people and the people who caused harm are often the same people; these are the people that many of the organizations present serve; these people are almost categorically excluded by existing CVC program eligibility, meaning they cannot be made whole; there is an opportunity for our workgroup to tailor our recommendations so that we address disproportionate access to existing CVC and address the people most disqualified from being made whole under the status quo; CVC offers a model of what we can move away from, learn from what we identify as deficiencies
- Strong concern about requiring police reports; Black and brown people do not feel safe calling police, making police reports; want to make our proposal successful to the people who have historically been harmed by these systems

Presentation: Office of Crime Victims Advocacy

We decided as a group to delay this presentation until our next meeting to allow for extended conversation on the Crime Victims Compensation Program.

Discussion & Next Steps

The workgroup discussed how we intend to use our next meeting:

- Interest in hearing from experts in restorative justice practice; want to create a system where harmed people can access what they need faster than current system; requiring cooperation with police is alienating
 - o Recommendations to reach out to Restorative Community Pathways and Collective Justice
- Thinking about policymaking: Our current system of restitution is dictated by existing court systems; be mindful of aiming too broad and having too large of a price tag; we want to build a parallel/comparable process to replace an existing process; do capture people not served by current system, but be mindful of fiscal note ballooning
- Discussion about building a policy foundation that can be expanded upon later, such as adding property crime compensation or broadening eligibility
- Expanded discussion of CVC eligibility and efforts to make program available to as many people as possible within existing constraints, including supports when making police reports; grassroots efforts can change the laws that govern this program
 - o CVC is available to meet with groups for outreach or to share more information
- Encouragement to explore cost savings associated with avoiding court system involvement in delivering compensation to harmed party

For next meeting:

- Heidi will connect with Restorative Community Pathways and invite them to present and discuss with our group
- Presentation from Office of Crime Victims Advocacy (originally planned for November meeting)
- The Administrative Office of the Courts' research on juvenile LFOs (including detail on restitution) will be complete, we hope to be able to hear their findings

Next Meeting: January 11, 2024, at 3 PM