1

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BRIEFING

EDITED

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2016

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Suite 1150 at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 9:00 a.m., Martin R. Castro, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARTIN R. CASTRO, Chairman

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair

ROBERTA ACHTENBERG, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director
MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner*

^{*} Present via telephone

STAFF PRESENT:

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD JENNIFER CRON-HEPLER, Parliamentarian TERESA BROOKS JOE D'ANTONIO

LATRICE FOSHEE

SEAN GOLIDAY

GERSON GOMEZ

ALFREDA GREENE

AYAN ISLAM

MARCLE NEAL

JUANDA SMITH

TAMIKA TUCKER

MORGAN TUFAROLO

MICHELE YORKMAN

DAVID MUSSATT, Director, RPCU

LENORE OSTROWSKY, Acting Chief, PAU

JOHN RATCLIFFE, Chief, BFD

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

SHERYL COZART
ALEC DUELL
AMY GRANT
JASON LAGRIA
CARISSA MULDER
ALISON SOMIN
KIMBERLY TOLHURST
IRENA VIDULOVIC

A-G-E-N-D-A

I.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA6
II.	PANEL ONE
schola histor practi they h	nal experts and legal
Vikrar Nusrat	Foster, Department of Justice, Director of the Access to Justice Office
Questi	ions from Commissioners41
III.	PANEL TWO
that he low-ir description revenues to the low-ir description regation of the low-ir description	nity leaders and advocates have work directly with individuals from home communities of colors and could libe how the deliberate of generating he through the municipal courts has lively impacted their lives, both directly hadirectly
Speake	er's Remarks
Starsk Natash	Harvey, Arch City Defenders
Questi	ions from Commissioners106

V. PANEL THREE

scholars and criminal justice
experts who can demonstrate empirically how the
practice of generating revenue through the
municipal court system has negatively impacted
low-income communities of color
Joshua House, Institute for Justice162
Janene McCabe, National Association for
Public Defense169
Alexes Harris, University of Washington175
Karin Martin, John Jay College of
Criminal Justice185
Questions from Commissioners193
VI. Adiourn Briefing

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:00 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Good morning,
4	everyone. We're calling this meeting to order. We're
5	beginning with a briefing of the U.S. Commission on
6	Civil Rights. It's currently 9:00 a.m. Eastern Time
7	on March 18th, 2016. This briefing is taking place
8	at the Commission's Headquarters at 1331 Pennsylvania
9	Avenue. Thank you.
10	(Off microphone comment.)
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. What would
12	I do without you, Madam Vice Chair and you, Panel? I
13	would not be heard. So let me start over again. The
14	briefing is coming to order at 9:00 a.m. Eastern Time
15	on March 18th, 2016.
16	You wouldn't think I've been doing this
17	for five years, right? I forgot to turn my mic on.
18	We're having the briefing here at the Commission's
19	Headquarters at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest in
20	Washington, D.C.
21	I'm Chairman Marty Castro.
22	Commissioners who are present with me at this briefing
23	are the Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson and Commissioners
24	Kladney, Narasaki, Achtenberg, and Heriot. I
25	understand that Commissioner Kirsanow's supposed to

1	be here. I don't see him.
2	PARTICIPANT: He'll be here at 10:00.
3	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: He'll be here at 10:00?
4	Okay, great. And then Commissioner Yaki is to be
5	attending by phone. Commissioner Yaki, are you on
6	the phone?
7	(No audible response.)
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, well he will
9	hopefully join us soon. Nonetheless, we do have a
10	quorum of the commissioners present. Is the court
11	reporter present?
12	COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Is the Staff Director
14	present?
15	DIRECTOR MORALES: I am.
16	APPROVAL OF AGENDA
17	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: All right, so the
18	meeting will now come to order. The first item is
19	the approval of the agenda. As you know, we've got
20	a briefing first and later in the afternoon we have
21	a business meeting.
22	So to the extent that we have any agenda
23	changes, I would entertain a motion either to approve
24	the agenda or any amendments that folks would like to
25	move to add anything to the agenda.

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Mr. Chairman?
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Your microphone.
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Mr. Chairman, I
4	would like to, oh the agenda for the business meeting?
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Business meeting, yes.
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I would like to
7	add a proposed administrative instruction 124 that I
8	have proposed and distributed to everyone. It's the
9	one about the time limits in submitting stuff to
10	Commission Members before the meeting.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. And stuff, you
12	mean the technical term stuff, right?
13	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes, technical
14	term stuff. If I may?
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'll provide it
17	to, I think Commissioner Heriot, we've provided this
18	to you and we talked about it yesterday.
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, so you made a
21	motion. Do we have a second?
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm just wondering
23	why we aren't doing this during the business meeting
24	instead of
25	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We are, we just have

1	to set the agenda for the business meeting right now.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But we should do
3	it, setting the agenda for the business meeting at
4	the business meeting.
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Well, we're doing it
6	now. This is the way we've done it the last two
7	times. So is there a second?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I second.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. Any other
10	amendments?
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. I would like
12	to amend the agenda to include a discussion of sending
13	a letter to the University of Connecticut and to the
14	Office of Civil Rights and the Department of Education
15	regarding the University of Connecticut.
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. Is there a
17	second to that?
18	PARTICIPANT: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. We have a second
20	to that as well. Any other amendments?
21	(No audible response.)
22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Hearing none, let us
23	move to approve the agenda with the amendments.
24	Commissioner Narasaki, did you have something?
25	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: No.

1	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. All those in
2	favor say aye.
3	(Chorus of aye.)
4	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Any opposed?
5	(No audible response.)
6	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Any abstentions?
7	(No audible response.)
8	PANEL ONE: PRACTICES OF MUNICIPAL COURT SYSTEM
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. So now we move
10	on to the briefing. As you know, today we are looking
11	at a very important issue, municipal policing and
12	courts, a search for justice or request for revenue.
13	In light of the 2015 Department of
14	Justice report on patterns and practices in policing
15	and municipal court practices in Ferguson, Missouri,
16	that commission's report, our commission's report
17	will be focused on some of those findings, but also
18	expanding it to other similarly situated
19	jurisdictions across the country that may be
20	experiencing similar issues.
21	This report will address specifically
22	enforcement of federal laws that violate Title VI of
23	the Civil Rights Act. This briefing was at the
24	request of and with the support of the majority of
25	the commission at the request of our Vice Chair. And

1	I would like to afford her an opportunity to say a
2	few words before we get started.
3	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you
4	very much, Chairman Castro. Good morning, all. I
5	want to begin by thanking the wonderful people behind
6	the scenes, as has oft been repeated when you see a
7	turtle on the top of a fence post, you know that he
8	didn't get there by himself.
9	Today's briefing is the product of much
10	effort by many individuals who you will not see today,
11	but we're here because they put us here. I thank all
12	of them. But let me say an extra word of thanks to
13	Angela French-Bell, Dr. Sean Goliday, Sheryl Cozart,
14	Jason Lagria, Pamela Dunston, and Latrice Foshee for
15	all of their hard work in putting the briefing
16	together.
17	I also think my fellow Commissioners for
18	supporting the briefing topic and thank their special
19	assistants for the valuable input throughout.
20	With this briefing, municipal policing
21	and courts, a search for justice or a quest for
22	revenue, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights seeks to
23	shed a bright light on the targeting of citizens by
24	police and the courts in order to generate revenue
25	and the illegal enforcement of fees and fines in

1	certain jurisdictions.
2	Justice, if it can be measured, must be
3	measured by the experience the average citizen has
4	with the police and the lower courts. Unfortunately,
5	the justice of today, using the barometer set forth
6	in that quote from our Supreme Court should give all
7	of us concern.
8	Too many citizens across too many
9	communities in our country see justice at a very low
10	level, even approaching injustice, for it is in the
11	municipal courts around America that distrust is in
12	the atmosphere rather than the sweet fragrance of
13	justice.
14	That's because our citizens assert that
15	they've come to be viewed as customers in a business
16	model rather than as citizens calling upon their
17	justice delivery system to do justice. Today, the
18	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights takes up this very
19	important topic.
20	In the wake of the civil unrest following
21	the killing of Michael Brown, the U.S. Department of
22	Justice investigated the Ferguson Police Department
23	and municipal courts. DOJ uncovered racially biased
24	policing which was fostered by the court system.
25	Among the gravest injustices uncovered

1 was the fact that the courts played a role in the 2 policing of community members and in collecting fees would municipality's 3 support the shortfalls. 5 Unfortunately, the practice of the patterns and practices of Ferguson is not an isolated 6 As America's civil rights watchdog, the 7 behavior. 8 Commission must investigate the pervasiveness of 9 issues similar to those found in Ferguson 10 recommend an appropriate response. 11 panels today consist of Our three 12 national experts and legal scholars, community 13 leaders and advocates, and scholars and criminal 14 justice experts. It's our hope that as we join this conversation and offer recommendations, 15 16 justice, the experience of average citizens with 17 police and the lower courts is improved. I thank you 18 so very much Mr. Chairman for affording me a few 19 minutes to say those things. Well, thank you, Madam 20 CHAIRMAN CASTRO: 21 Vice Chair for making this issue a priority for the Commission. 22 As we all know that, as we've seen in 23 our work, revenue and profit should never ever be the driving force for issues of incarceration, detention, 24

and certainly not how our municipal courts and police

1	function.
2	It creates a situation where it
3	denigrates our Government and makes it difficult to
4	defend when it's those communities are least able to
5	defend themselves that are victimized by this profit
6	mode of the system of justice.
7	So we will start now with a little
8	overview of some of the housekeeping functions on how
9	the panels will run today. During the presentation,
10	you'll see that there's a system of warning lights,
11	red, green, yellow like traffic lights.
12	Every panelist is going to have seven
13	minutes to make a presentation. And the green light
14	means start. Yellow means you've got two minutes to
15	go, start wrapping up. And red means stop.
16	If you go over the red, I'll try to
17	politely stop you and then we'll have an opportunity
18	to engage more with you when we have question and
19	answer period from the Commissioners. So don't fret
20	if you can't get everything out in that seven minutes.
21	Once that is done, each panel will move
22	forward. And my Commissioners will, in turn, seek
23	opportunities to engage with each of you. So with
24	that housekeeping out of the way, the first thing I
25	would like to do is introduce our first panel and

1	then swear you all in.
2	Our first panelist this morning is Lisa
3	Foster, director of the Access to Justice Office of
4	the Department of Justice. Our second panelist is
5	Vikrant Reddy, senior research fellow at Charles
6	Kotch institute. Is it Kotch or Koch?
7	MR. REDDY: Koch.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Koch. Our third
9	panelist is Nusrat Choudhury, staff attorney at the
10	American Civil Liberties Union Racial Justice
11	Program. And our fourth panelist is Emily Napier,
12	director of justice strategies at the Center for
13	Community Alternatives.
14	I'll ask each of you to raise your right
15	hand and swear or affirm that the information that
16	you're about to provide to us is true and accurate to
17	the best of your knowledge and belief. Is that true?
18	(Chorus of yes.)
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: All right, thank you.
20	Ms. Foster, please proceed.
21	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
22	good morning.
23	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Good morning.
24	MS. FOSTER: The Department of Justice
25	first

1	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Oh, you've got to turn
2	your microphone on.
3	MS. FOSTER: Oh, sorry.
4	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Sorry, everyone. You
5	have to just press the button.
6	MS. FOSTER: Good morning, again.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Good morning again.
8	MS. FOSTER: And thank you. The
9	Department of Justice first became involved in the
10	issue of fines and fees in conjunction with our
11	investigation of the Ferguson Police Department.
12	We quickly came to realize that the
13	problems we uncovered there were not unique to
14	Ferguson or to St. Louis County or even to the state
15	of Missouri. I want to emphasize that a lot of our
16	understanding came from the work of many of the people
17	who are on this panel and in this room, that is the
18	advocacy community in this country had been aware of
19	these problems for frankly longer than the Department
20	of Justice had.
21	It's difficult to overestimate the
22	breadth and complexity of these problems. There are,
23	in the United States today, approximately 6,500
24	municipal courts operating in 34 states. And when I
25	use the term municipal court, that I want to

1	emphasize, that's not the term that is always used by
2	the courts themselves.
3	Some of them are called city court, some
4	of them are called mayor's courts, they're parish
5	courts, they're justice of the peace courts. But
6	they share some common characteristics.
7	The vast majority are courts of limited
8	jurisdiction. That is they have authority to
9	adjudicate traffic violations and municipal code
10	violations. There are some that have limited
11	misdemeanor jurisdictions, some have full misdemeanor
12	jurisdiction, and a handful actually have felony
13	jurisdiction.
14	Some states have very few, some states
15	like New York and Texas have hundreds. Many of the
16	municipal courts are part time, and in 28 states one
17	does not need to be a lawyer to be the municipal court
18	judge.
19	Some state courts are unified. That is
20	the highest state court has direct authority over all
21	of the courts in the state including the municipal
22	courts, but in some states the municipal courts
23	operate independent of the state court system.
24	To add even more complexity to the
25	problem, these issues are not confined to municipal

In the states that don't have what are called courts. 2 municipal courts, they often are experiencing some of the same problems with respect to revenue generation and what in our view are unconstitutional practices even though they're occurring at the state court level. 6

> result of what the Department As learned, held in December we of last year unprecedented two day meeting. The first day, brought judges, court administrators, advocates, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and academics to the Department of Justice for a working session that we called poverty and the criminal justice system, the effect and fairness of fees and fines.

> Our goal in that session was to talk with justice system stakeholders about the issues of fines and fees, to highlight some of the reforms that have already taken place throughout the country, and to talk specifically about what the Department Justice could do to help state and local courts make needed changes.

> The second day was an expanded meeting at the White House that included a larger number of people from around the country including some of the people who had been victims of problems in their local

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	courts. At the end of those working sessions, the
2	Department pledged to continue its involvement in
3	this issue and to help state and local courts with
4	their efforts to reform.
5	On Monday of this week, I am proud to
6	announce that the Department issued its first efforts
7	in this regard. We did so by sending a letter to all
8	of the participants in our December meetings as well
9	as every state court administrator and every state
10	chief justice.
11	And we made four announcements. The
12	first is that the Department's Bureau of Justice
13	assistance will be awarding \$2.5 million in
14	competitive grants to state, local, or tribal
15	jurisdictions who together with community partners
16	want to test strategies to restructure the assessment
17	and enforcement of fines and fees.
18	The second is that again through our
19	Bureau of Justice assistance, we plan to provide
20	financial assistance to the National Task Force on
21	fines, fees and bail practices that is being led by
22	the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference
23	of State Court Administrators.
24	That task force had its first meeting on
25	Monday and Tuesday of this week in Arlington. It's

1 task force comprised of judges, state 2 administrators, advocates, two Department of Justice officials sit ex-officio on the commission. 3 And it will work to draft model statutes, 4 5 court rules, policies, and procedures, and serve as a clearinghouse for local and state courts for best 6 7 practices around the country. 8 Third, the Department issued a resource 9 quide which is a compilation of everything we could 10 find on the issue of fines and fees. And it's broken 11 down into multiple categories and is meant to provide 12 as a bibliography for people who are interested in 13 And it has links to everything that's the issues. 14 cited in the quide. 15 Finally, the Department issued a Dear 16 Colleague letter. And that letter is addressed 17 principally to state court administrators and state 18 chief justices. And the purpose of our letter was 19 to provide clarity with respect to the constitutional 20 principles at stake in the enforcement of fines and 21 fees. 22 set out seven principles that 23 believe are black letter law with respect to these 24 And I'm going to highlight just a couple of

them.

1	The first is that courts must not
2	incarcerate a person for non-payment of fines and
3	fees without first conducting an indecency
4	determination and establishing that the failure to
5	pay was willful.
6	Second, that courts need to consider
7	alternatives to incarceration for indigent defendants
8	unable to pay fines and fees. Third, that courts not
9	condition access to a judicial hearing on the pre-
10	payment of fines or fees.
11	Fourth, that courts must provide
12	meaningful notice when enforcing fines and fees.
13	Fifth, that they not issue arrest warrants or license
14	suspensions as a means of coercing payment when
15	individuals have not been afforded constitutionally
16	adequate procedural protections.
17	Six, that they not employ bail or bond
18	practices that cause indigent defendants to remain
19	incarcerated solely because they cannot pay for their
20	release. And finally, that courts safeguard against
21	unconstitutional practices by court staff and in
22	particular private contractors who unfortunately have
23	been some of the worst abusers in this area.
24	I'm going to stop there. I would like
25	to submit a copy of the Department's letter for the

1	record.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes.
3	MS. FOSTER: And I have copies for each
4	of the Commissioners if you would like.
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Great. And also if
6	you have that bibliography. I don't know if you have
7	that.
8	MS. FOSTER: I do. I have multiple
9	copies.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We would appreciate
11	that as well. You want to get those documents?
12	Thank you. Mr. Reddy?
13	MR. REDDY: Hi, thank you so much, Mr.
14	Chairman. And I want to thank the
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Is your mic on?
16	MR. REDDY: Oh, I did the same thing.
17	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you.
18	MR. REDDY: Mic is on now, correct?
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes.
20	MR. REDDY: Thank you so much. It's
21	great to be here this morning. I really appreciate
22	the invitation. I want to note that I am a member
23	of the Commission's Texas State Advisory Committee.
24	And it's a great honor and privilege for me to be
25	able to work with the Commission on a regular basis.

1	And a great honor and privilege to serve my home
2	state.
3	What I'm going to do today, you've got,
4	or at least you will soon have a copy of my written
5	statement. But what I'm going to focus on in my oral
6	statement today is the perspective of this issue, on
7	this issue, excuse me, from a conservative or
8	libertarian point of view because I don't think that
9	it is something that is discussed a lot in the
10	national dialogue on this issue.
11	I think it's incredibly important, and I
12	think there are a lot of left/right areas of unity
13	that go unacknowledged.
14	I'll start by talking about the
15	philosophical issue here. The power to punish is the
16	greatest domestic power that a government wields.
17	And philosophers have debated the purpose of this
18	power for centuries.
19	And if you go to law school as I did,
20	you'll find on the first day of your criminal law
21	class you were told that after centuries of debate,
22	we've come down to four justifications.
23	Those justifications, broadly speaking,
24	are incapacitation, retribution, deterrents, and
25	rehabilitation. What professor never writes on the

1	chalkboard raising revenue? That has never been
2	considered one of the legitimate purposes of the
3	criminal justice system.
4	However, for a variety of reasons, we've
5	reached a point where in many, many places this is
6	exactly what is happening. We're here today
7	primarily, I assume, because of what happened to the
8	City of Ferguson two years ago.
9	The DOJ report from Ferguson determined
10	that something like 20 percent of that city's
11	municipal budget came from criminal justice fees and
12	fines. Ferguson's a small town. This also happens
13	in very big cities.
14	In Chicago which is the third biggest
15	city in the United States, 15 percent of the budget
16	that same year, 2014, came from criminal justice fees
17	and fines.
18	Now I want to say that it's not
19	illegitimate in some circumstances to expect a
20	convicted offender to bear the cost of at least a
21	portion of their own punishment in the criminal
22	justice system.
23	But when you've got enormous sections of
24	the local government's budget coming from criminal
25	justice fees and fines, I think you can reasonably

1 wonder whether or not the "quest for revenue" which 2 is the title of today's briefing, is displacing those four legitimate purposes of the criminal justice 3 system which I mentioned earlier. I think conservatives and libertarians 5 6 often worry that a conflict of interest is developing 7 in our criminal justice government institutions, that 8 police officers, the courts, the the community 9 supervision officers are in a position to raise 10 revenue through the execution of their day to day 11 functions in the criminal justice system. 12 And it's really profoundly disturbing. 13 found a quotation from one of the founding fathers, 14 George Mason who wrote that when the same man or set 15 of men holds both the sword and the purse, there is 16 an end of liberty. 17 I think it's something we should all be 18 concerned about. Some people may be a little 19 surprised that this is such an issue of discussion on 20 the right, but it really is and I don't think anybody 21 should be surprised in the slightest because 22 fundamentally, a conservative or a libertarian point

25 And the issue we're discussing today is

and government run amuck.

of view is one that is skeptical of big government,

23

1	nothing if not big government. I'm going to cite
2	some very prominent conservative and libertarian
3	voices that I think all of you will recognize, and
4	may surprise you here what people are talking about
5	on the right.
6	National Review's William F. Buckley,
7	Jr.'s magazine wrote that city's avarice tempts
8	police to arrest and jail too many people in order to
9	collect fines, fees, tickets and the like.
10	As the DOJ found in its report following
11	the Michael Brown shooting in Missouri, Ferguson's
12	law enforcement practices are shaped by the City's
13	focus on revenue rather than by public safety needs.
14	Grover Norquist is probably known to a
15	number of people in this room, he's a famous anti-tax
16	crusader. He serves on the Board of the National
17	Rifle Association. We actually held a summit on
18	criminal justice reform last November, Mr. Norquist
19	was there.
20	He said something very interesting about
21	how these criminal justice fees and fines begin to
22	ebb away at relationships between law enforcement and
23	community members. He said, you know, when you've
24	turned the policemen into tax agents, and in the bible
25	it's very clear that nobody likes the tax collectors

1	because that's the guy that's always looting you,
2	people hate that guy who's physically right there and
3	hitting you with \$100 fee or fine.
4	And we're putting into that position guys
5	who are wearing uniforms, and the kids are then
6	supposed to go to that guy for help? And then they
7	keep giving more tickets because we can't pay the
8	first ticket? We've turned these guys into tax
9	collectors and then we wonder why people hate them
10	because we don't read history.
11	The American Legislative Exchange Council
12	has actually passed model legislation, noting that we
13	ought to prioritize victims' restitution in our fees
14	and fines because, and I'm quoting from their model
15	bill here, research has found no direct correlation
16	between the payment of state criminal fines and lower
17	recidivism rates.
18	I could go on and on, and I did in fact
19	list several other conservative organizations that
20	have said very similar things in my written testimony.
21	I'm going to note a couple of prominent examples that
22	I find especially troubling that I think get to the
23	heart of what we're talking about today.
24	In one Louisiana municipality, the
25	offenders are charged \$100 just for the opportunity

1	to enter into a payment plan because they can't pay
2	the original fine or fee in full.
3	There is a small town in Illinois where
4	you were charged a \$30 booking fee upon arrest. What
5	was extraordinary about that fee to me is that if you
6	are later discharged, the fee is not refunded to you.
7	This actually went to court and was
8	upheld, but there was a dissent which I thought was
9	very powerful. The dissenting judge wrote that \$30
10	while perhaps a modest amount to "the governing class
11	in our society including lawyers and judges" is
12	nevertheless equivalent to the federal minimum wage
13	for more than half a day of work.
14	I'll conclude by offering three quick
15	recommendations to the Commission moving forward.
16	First of all, I think the jurisdictions generally
17	ought to limit fees and fines to an amount that is
18	adequate for satisfying retributive interests and for
19	the restoration of victims.
20	At a certain point beyond this point, you
21	have little more than mechanisms for raising revenue
22	with your criminal justice fees and fines. And I
23	think that setting some sort of a cap in jurisdictions
24	would be very helpful.

A second thing I want to note is that we $\,$

1	should ensure that our jurisdictions provide for
2	alternative mechanisms when people cannot pay fees
3	and fines. Community service is a very simple one
4	and there are many large states like Arizona, New
5	York, North Carolina that don't even have such a
6	provision.
7	We should also make sure that our
8	jurisdictions offer workable payment plans. There's
9	one notorious story from the Ferguson report in which
10	a woman who had accumulated something like \$1,000
11	worth of fees and fines tried to send in small
12	portions, \$25 checks, \$50 checks.
13	They were sent back to her because she
14	didn't pay the entire thing in full. She did end up
15	doing six days in total at different times in jail.
16	And the entire incident stemmed from \$151 parking
17	ticket.
18	Finally, the last thing I want to note is
19	that a very large part of the national conversation
20	right now surrounds criminal justice reform and the
21	reduction in incarceration rates in the United
22	States. I hope we continue to move in that direction.
23	It seems to me that what has happened
24	here and a big part of why we have moved to this kind
25	of a problematic system is that we ratchet up

1	incarceration; it became very, very expensive. We
2	started looking for ways that we could pay for it,
3	and we turned to criminal justice fees and fines as
4	the solution.
5	So my hope is that if we reverse the
6	incarceration problem, we may also reverse some of
7	those incentives.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Reddy.
9	MR. REDDY: Thank you very much, look
10	forward to questions.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Ms. Choudhury?
12	MS. CHOUDHURY: On behalf of the American
13	Civil Liberties Union, I thank the Commission for
14	both holding this briefing and inviting us to the
15	table. We have submitted a written statement to the
16	Commission on the topic of today's briefing.
17	And in the time allotted to me, I want to
18	do four things. The first is to address the scope
19	of the problem. The second is to discuss the
20	devastating impact on families, communities, and
21	public safety when courts turn to revenue generation
22	rather than the fair and equal administration of
23	justice.
24	Third is to discuss a series of best
25	practices that permit local governments to punish and

1 deter crime while also protecting constitutional 2 rights. And fourth, I ask the Commission to help end these practices by doing three things, issuing a 3 written report on their findings, recommending best 5 practices to address these problems, and holding an additional briefing on the role of 6 for-profit companies in fostering the abuses that we'll discuss 7 8 today. First, the scope of the problem. 9 10 2010, the American Civil Liberties Union and its 11 affiliates across the country have exposed 12 challenged courts and local and state governments 13 that illegally jail the poor as a result of abusive 14 practices that seek to generate revenue. 15 And we've done this in Colorado, Georgia, 16 Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, New 17 Hampshire, Ohio, and Washington, showing that this 18 truly is a national problem spanning from the Pacific 19 Northwest to New England, from the Midwest to the 20 Deep South. 21 Perversely, despite the goal to generate 22 these practices are not systematically revenue, documented to actually generate net revenue when 23 24 taking into consideration serious costs. Those costs 25 include the costs of policing, the costs of jail and

1	incarceration, and the costs of job loss, family
2	separation, and other harms imposed on impacted
3	people and their families.
4	These practices violate core
5	constitutional rights that the Department of Justice
6	has highlighted in its letter. But local governments
7	either intentionally flouts this clearly established
8	law, are woefully ignorant of it, or simply are unsure
9	how to apply it.
10	And the city of DeKalb County, Georgia
11	actually provides an illustrative example. In 2015,
12	the ACLU filed a federal law suit against the county
13	on behalf of Kevin Thompson, a black teenager who was
14	jailed because he could not afford to pay court fines
15	and probation company fees stemming from a single
16	traffic ticket.
17	Thompson wasn't alone. While black
18	people made up 54 percent of the DeKalb County
19	population in 2014, nearly every probationer jailed
20	in DeKalb County's court for non-payment of fines and
21	fees in the months leading up to the law suit were
22	black. And this was a pattern we observed in numerous
23	Georgia courts.
24	Thompson was jailed because of a scheme
25	to generate revenue for the county which in 2010 faced

1	a \$100 million shortfall. The county sought to
2	bridge the gap by enlisting a for-profit company,
3	Judicial Corrections Services to help boost
4	collections of fines and fees.
5	But that company had a direct financial
6	incentive against identifying the poor, against
7	helping the court do its job. And that's because
8	indigent people should have their company fees waived
9	or reduced.
10	When Thompson couldn't pay, his Judicial
11	Correction Services (JCS) probation officer not only
12	didn't explain his rights, but actually misinformed
13	him, told him that it would cost \$150 for a public
14	defender when in fact the true cost was \$50 and
15	waivable for the poor. Unrepresented, he showed up
16	in court and was jailed for five days, taken off to
17	jail in handcuffs in front of his own mother.
18	This leads to the second point, that the
19	jailing of poor people who cannot afford to pay fines
20	and fees deeply and devastatingly impacts them and
21	their communities.
22	ACLU plaintiff Qumotria Kennedy lost her
23	part time cleaning job and was separated from her
24	teenage daughter when she was jailed for unpaid
25	traffic tickets totaling more than \$1,000 that she

1 simply could not afford to pay. 2 Mississippi In another town, we interviewed a woman who was a domestic violence 3 Although she experienced frequent abuse survivor. 5 from her husband, she feared calling the police. on one occasion a year ago, she delayed calling the 6 police during an argument in which her husband was 7 8 violent. 9 She feared her own arrest. She finally 10 made that phone call, and actually her worst fear was 11 confirmed. She was arrested, taken away from her 12 children, separated from them for four days, and the 13 police never pursued her abuser. These practices 14 alienate entire communities and they undermine public 15 safety. 16 But this leads to my third point, that 17 courts and police must push back against the pressures 18 to generate revenue off the backs of poor people, and 19 reforms recently adopted by the City of Biloxi, 20 Mississippi illustrate exactly how. 21 Last Tuesday, the ACLU settled a class-22 action law suit against the City of Biloxi and the 23 for-profit company Judicial Correction Services (JCS) 24 to challenge the widespread arrest and jailing of 25 poor people based on arrest warrants charging them

1	with non-payment which weren't preceded by procedural
2	protections.
3	In the settlement, Biloxi adopted
4	sweeping reforms that truly provide a model for how
5	courts can administer justice fairly and equally.
6	And that model includes six critical components.
7	The first is the elimination of for-
8	profit probation for the collection of fines and fees.
9	And so this ensures that profit motivated actors do
10	not distort the city's criminal justice and civil
11	justice system.
12	Second, Biloxi has adopted detailed court
13	procedures and a bench card to guide judges step by
14	step on how to protect rights at every stage at which
15	fines and fees are imposed or collected, from initial
16	appearance to sentencing enforcement.
17	Third, Biloxi judges will now consider
18	ability to pay at the sentencing phase to prevent the
19	imposition of crippling fine and fee burdens that
20	poor people can never hope to repay.
21	Fourth, Biloxi has created a full time
22	public defender's office, taking seriously the role
23	and the need to provide counsel to the indigent at
24	every stage of the process including at sentencing
25	and also when jail is on the table for a charge of

1	non-payment.
2	Fifth, the Biloxi municipal court will
3	now offer numerous alternatives to incarceration for
4	people unable to pay their fines and fees. These
5	include payment plans, community service, and even
6	approved programs and job skills training, mental
7	health counseling, education and drug treatment.
8	And finally sixth, the Biloxi municipal
9	court has adopted a clear standard that judges can
10	apply for determining who is unable to pay a fine or
11	a fee. And judges will presume that someone is unable
12	to pay when they earn 125 percent or lower than the
13	federal poverty guideline, when they are homeless,
14	incarcerated, or reside in a mental health facility.
15	These reforms are a road map for the
16	future, and other cities should follow them, other
17	courts should heed, follow exactly these procedures
18	as they heed the Department of Justice's call to
19	reform their policies and practices.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms.
21	Choudhury. We'll get to you with some more questions
22	
23	MS. CHOUDHURY: Thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: in the next part of
25	the panel. Ms. Napier, you have the floor.

1	MS. NAPIER: Thank you for this
2	opportunity. Just to let folks know a little bit
3	about the Center for Community Alternatives because
4	I think we're one of the lesser known organizations
5	here, although we do have two people testifying so
6	that should mean something.
7	CCA is New York State's oldest
8	alternative to incarceration agency. We've been
9	operating for almost four decades now. And we're
10	unique in that we provide direct services to people
11	in the juvenile and criminal justice systems, but we
12	also engage in research, public policy development,
13	training, and advocacy to address the myriad barriers
14	that folks face in our programs.
15	And that is true of our work on the
16	financial consequences of involvement in the criminal
17	justice system. So in 2007 we published one of the
18	first reports in the country on this topic called
19	sentencing for dollars, the financial consequences of
20	a criminal conviction.
21	And we concluded even then in 2007 it is
22	time to confront our attraction to financial
23	penalties head on. We need to de-emphasize the goals
24	of revenue enhancement, cost shifting, and user fees.
25	Public safety is a community goal and a public good.

1 As such, the cost should be borne by the 2 public and not shifted to those who can least afford 3 these burdens. So now almost ten years later, we're encouraged to see this issue finally getting the national attention that it deserves. 5 In that sentencing for dollars report, we 6 7 cataloged every mandatory surcharge, fee, and civil 8 penalty imposed by New York State Statute on people 9 caught up in the criminal justice system. There were 10 almost 40 such penalties scattered throughout 11 multiple sections of the law making it 12 impossible to have a comprehensive view of 13 cumulative impact of those penalties. 14 The use of those mandatory surcharges 15 began in 1982, and the development of other 16 increasingly imaginative penalties flourished in the 17 And since then, the amounts of the existing '90s. 18 penalties have steadily increased, and new penalties 19 have continued to be imposed. 20 In a paper that we presented in 2008, we 21 examined the cumulative impact of those financial 22 penalties on individuals and their families. And so 23 I would ask you to consider the example of Lou, a 23 24 year old man struggling with heroin addiction who was

arrested and charged with driving under the influence

1	which is a misdemeanor.
2	The charge was reduced to a traffic
3	infraction of driving while ability impaired. But
4	despite the final outcome of not rising to the level
5	of a criminal conviction, Lou faced significant
6	financial penalties totaling \$1,795.
7	And there's a chart in my written
8	testimony that breaks down what each fee was. Only
9	\$500 of that \$1,795 was the fine, the actual sentence.
10	The rest of it was various fees, surcharges, et
11	cetera.
12	Explaining the impact of that financial
13	burden, Lou said the fines and fees just make a bad
14	situation worse. It's stressful. You're already in
15	a mess. It's a bad time in your life and it just
16	makes it worse. It's people who can't afford it who
17	are affected.
18	These aren't rich people who get caught
19	in these situations. It would have been impossible
20	for me to pay it. My mom paid it. But it doesn't
21	make you feel good on top of everything else that's
22	happening to have to go to your mom for something
23	like that.
24	So because Lou was not in a position to
25	pay due to his sporadic employment as a result of his

1	heroin addiction, the burden was shifted to his
2	parents. And reflecting on that, Lou's mother said
3	it was stressful. Here we are trying to think ahead
4	to retirement and we have this extra burden.
5	We didn't always have the money on hand,
6	so paying using credit made it even more expensive.
7	But most people wouldn't have and wouldn't even be
8	able to get the money. We accessed our home equity
9	loan for it. Lou's sisters were in college at the
10	time, and instead of helping them, we were paying his
11	fees. We felt obligated to pay to avoid long term
12	damage to Lou.
13	So in this situation, Lou's parents both
14	had master's degrees. They had jobs that provided
15	middle class income. They owned a home. And yet
16	even they struggled to stay on top of the financial
17	penalties that resulted from their son's criminal
18	justice system involvement.
19	And they're certainly not an anomaly, as
20	the net of our criminal justice system has expanded
21	to touch almost every family. But their relative
22	financial stability is also not typical of families
23	subjected to these financial penalties.
24	We explored the theme of family

obligation further in a paper that CCA released last

1	year. It was co-authored by a member of our Board,
2	Mitali Nagrecha, and she's going to speak on the next
3	panel. So I'll let her say more about that paper.
4	But I just want to quickly touch on the
5	area of child support. Even though it is slightly
6	off topic, it's certainly impacted by the criminal
7	justice system and by these various other fees and
8	penalties that people face.
9	And so in 2011, CCA began a four year
10	program for non-custodial parents who owe child
11	support, were unemployed, and were considered hard to
12	employ. It was funded by the U.S. Department of
13	Labor.
14	And the Department of Labor's criteria
15	for defining someone as hard to employ included
16	criminal justice system involvement because that's
17	such a barrier to employment. And so in that program,
18	it was a random assignment program.
19	And we over a two year recruitment period
20	enrolled 1,016 people in the study, 512 were in the
21	program group. And of those 512 people in the
22	program, 87 percent had some type of criminal history
23	record.
24	This was not a program for people with
25	criminal justice system involvement. This was a

1	program for non-custodial parents who owed child
2	support. But 87 percent had some type of criminal
3	history record.
4	More than 90 percent were men, and this
5	was in Syracuse, New York where 30 percent of the
6	residents are black, but 79 of the program
7	participants were black. Ninety percent of them owed
8	arrears, meaning only ten percent were up to date on
9	their child support obligations.
10	And they routinely owed amounts of five
11	or six figures. The average amount of arrears owed
12	at the time of their enrollment in the program was
13	\$14,420. And in New York State with an interest rate
14	at nine percent, the average participant accumulated
15	additional debt of almost \$1,300 a year.
16	Most of this was accumulating during
17	periods of incarceration or during periods that they
18	were out of work due to their criminal history record.
19	And so I think we really have to recognize the way
20	that those things are intertwined. And I'll save the
21	rest of my comments for discussion.
22	QUESTIONS FOR COMMISSIONERS
23	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. I'm going
24	to take the prerogative and ask a first couple
25	questions and then I'll open it to my Commissioners.

1	i bee commissioner Achtemberg is raising a hand.
2	Commissioner, just let me know and I'll put you on
3	the list.
4	I believe it was Ms. Foster who talked
5	about tribal jurisdictions. Could you speak a little
6	bit to this issue as it relates to the native tribes?
7	We're also doing another, a report on the conditions
8	of Native American Tribes.
9	MS. FOSTER: Our grant is available to
10	tribal jurisdictions. We actually don't have a very
11	good handle frankly on the extent of the problem in
12	tribal jurisdictions.
13	Our experience, and I think the
14	experience of advocates, is that this is less of a
15	problem in tribal courts than it is in state and local
16	courts. But I can't say that with any certainty.
17	We haven't heard of that many, of many
18	problems at all in the tribal courts. But our grant's
19	available to them should they want to participate in
20	making changes.
21	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: So none of the
22	information
23	MS. FOSTER: As I said, I can't say
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You don't know.
25	MS. FOSTER: with certainty. We

1	haven't either been informed about any or heard about
2	reports through the media or through the advocacy
3	community. Nor have we investigated the tribal
4	jurisdictions in this
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: But what I was going
6	to ask is none of them have asked for grant money?
7	MS. FOSTER: The grant just was released
8	on Monday.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
10	MS. FOSTER: And so
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Oh, so it's too soon
12	to tell.
13	MS. FOSTER: Yes, applications won't come
14	in until the end of March.
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: And what sort of
16	solicitation or information are you giving to the
17	tribes in particular about the availability of these
18	resources?
19	MS. FOSTER: Precisely the same thing we
20	do for everybody else. That is we post the
21	solicitation. We have a webinar on March 28th that
22	is widely broadcast to anyone who wants to
23	participate. And the information about it is in
24	various locations.
25	So we hope we will hear from some tribal

1	jurisdictions.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Great, thank you. And
3	for anyone on the panel, I think Mr. Reddy had talked
4	about the percentage of Chicago's budget that comes
5	from fees and fines. Well, I'm a Chicagoan. And one
6	of the issues that we've had for the last few years
7	is the issue of red light cameras, the placement some
8	folks say in communities of color or less affluent
9	communities and then issues of due process.
10	Do you know anything about, have you
11	addressed, looked at the issue of specifically red
12	light cameras in Chicago and how they may be part of
13	the structure of what we're looking at here in terms
14	of fees and fines?
15	MR. REDDY: Well, I don't know that I
16	would have much to say that would go beyond, I don't
17	have much to say that would go beyond your instincts
18	on the matter which is that they operate in the same
19	way these counterproductive fees and fines operate in
20	any other sphere.
21	You know, people get caught up in this
22	awful cycle. They catch one fine because they ran a
23	red light. It's difficult to pay that one. They
24	accumulate another, maybe they have to do jail time.

And a number of the people on this panel have

1	mentioned today that that kind of a problem has a
2	particular impact in poorer communities.
3	And I think it's pretty clear that the
4	red light cameras would have the same impact in those
5	communities also.
6	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Ms. Choudhury?
7	MS. CHOUDHURY: Just to address that
8	question, we have had reports from the St. Louis area,
9	of red light cameras and due process problems where
10	fines and fees, people are supposedly notified that
11	they've incurred a ticket for running a red light,
12	assess fines and fees.
13	And in one jurisdiction we know of an
14	incident where somebody was arrested for not being
15	able to pay that fine and fee without procedural
16	protections. So all of the problems can arise when
17	there isn't a hearing before a judge to assess whether
18	someone can pay that fine or fee, or contest the
19	charge itself.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Right. Ms. Foster,
21	would that, for example if someone wanted that issue
22	in Chicago to be investigated by the Justice
23	Department, is that something your office handles?
24	MS. FOSTER: Our Civil Rights division
25	is the place that would conduct any investigation. I

1 will say that our approach at this point is to try to 2 work with state and local courts. As I outlined in the meeting, there are 3 so many places in the country where these problems 5 are pervasive that to try to enforce or litigate our way to a solution to this problem is likely to be 6 We want to educate local courts, we 7 unsuccessful. 8 want to work with them and make changes. 9 Obviously, if there's а particular 10 problem in a community, our doors are open and we 11 have a lot of complaints that have been filed with 12 respect to these kinds of issues, and we take all of 13 them seriously. 14 I will say something about the red light 15 situation, and that is what everyone else has said. 16 The way it works is really no different than any other 17 traffic violation. And in many places, the fine 18 itself may be \$100. But on top of that fine, local jurisdictions are, and many states, are assessing 19 20 fees for a variety of things and they have nothing to 21 do with the violation. 22 So there may be a DNA fee when no one's 23 taking DNA from traffic violators. There may be a 24 fee for court improvements. There may be a fee for 25 something unrelated, a drug rehabilitation program.

1	And things that really, that legislators, state and
2	local have looked at the justice system as a way to
3	raise money.
4	And so on top of that fine are additional
5	fees such that in some places, California's a great
6	example, a \$50 ticket for running a stop sign, if
7	that's the fine, \$50, but the total amount you owe is
8	\$225 because of additional fees that the
9	legislature's imposed.
10	And if you're poor, you're not going to
11	be able to make, you may be able to make the original
12	fine, but you certainly can't make the original fee,
13	and suffer the consequences.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Right. Thank you.
15	Commissioner Achtenberg and then Commissioner Yaki,
16	could you mute your phone please? And after that,
17	we'll have the Vice Chair ask questions.
18	Commissioner Achtenberg? You have the floor.
19	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you, Mr.
20	Chairman. This is quite a devastating topic. And
21	I'm, although I'm quite interested in what violent
22	agreement we are all in, so this kind of thing doesn't
23	usually happen so I wanted to take a moment to
24	acknowledge.
25	Mr. Reddy, I'm quite interested in

1	whether or not you've examined any racial component
2	to all of this that you can validate exists or may or
3	may not exist in the view of your organization?
4	MR. REDDY: Well, I suppose I would say
5	two things about that. First of all, there's
6	obviously a racial dimension. It would be naive to
7	think otherwise.
8	As I just mentioned to the Chairman,
9	these problems tend to hit impoverished communities
10	harder than they would hit affluent communities and
11	you have more of those problems in many black and
12	brown communities, south United States.
13	Now having said that, I also think that
14	if we focus exclusively on that, and that's the way
15	a lot of the dialogue has taken place in the country,
16	it's an inadequate understanding. It occurs to me
17	that I'm sure in a number of jurisdictions across the
18	country, probably in rural Appalachia for example
19	these kinds of problems exist too.
20	To me the fundamental issue is not the
21	racial one which is not to say that the racial
22	disparity issue isn't important and isn't a
23	profoundly significant component of this, but it's
24	the broader question of political philosophy.
25	It's government powers and government

1	abuse of power, conflict of interest within
2	government institutions and the kinds of things that
3	political philosophers have been debating, as I said,
4	for centuries.
5	That I think has been our focus research
6	wise. But I do want to say that that doesn't mean
7	the racial disparity issue is irrelevant. Certainly
8	not.
9	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: And do you have
10	any information or material that measures the extent
11	of the disparity in terms of, in racial terms?
12	MR. REDDY: I didn't include any of that
13	in my testimony, either oral or written simply because
14	I didn't think it was, to use the economic term, my
15	comparative advantage. I assumed there would be many
16	people discussing that issue today.
17	I will tell you that in my footnotes,
18	there are a number of papers cited that do get into
19	the issue. I would be happy, you know, to talk about
20	it at a later juncture. It's not something I focused
21	on for my remarks today.
22	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Sure. I can
23	understand that, and I appreciate the clarity of your
24	response.

MR. REDDY: Sure.

1	MS. CHOUDHURY: If I could
2	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Please.
3	MS. CHOUDHURY: have a follow up
4	comment on that. The ACLU's racial justice program
5	
6	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Is your mic on?
7	MS. CHOUDHURY: It is. Oh, there we go.
8	The ACLU's racial justice program has been focused on
9	this issue for years precisely because of the racial
10	disparities that are involved.
11	And I think in the list of states that
12	we're working on, there are states like Maine and New
13	Hampshire, Washington where the racial disparities
14	aren't as prevalent simply because of the demographic
15	realities of those locations.
16	The reason we've litigated in places like
17	DeKalb County, Georgia, in places like Biloxi,
18	Mississippi is because the racial disparities were so
19	stark in relatively diverse areas that it really
20	underscored a larger problem.
21	Ferguson was not the first instance in
22	which the racial wealth gap, racialized policing, and
23	revenue generation combusted to create a situation
24	where a city's low income African-American community
25	was being trapped in a cycle of poverty and justice

1	system involvement.
2	And we have specifically targeted certain
3	locations to make that point clear. While race may
4	be part of the discussion more now following the
5	Department of Justice's powerful and insightful
6	report, before that report it was not.
7	I think this conversation focused more on
8	resources being wasted, which they are, on due process
9	problems, fairness issues which are issues. But the
10	racial dimension is huge, and I think we would be
11	remiss to ignore that in communities that are very
12	diverse.
13	DeKalb County is the home of Emery
14	University. It is the second wealthiest county in
15	the State of Georgia. And when you have a debtor's
16	prison in an affluent, racially diverse community
17	like that, it says something about how justice is
18	working, or not working.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Madam Vice Chair?
20	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you
21	very much, Mr. Chair. And this question is for all
22	of you. In doing our research, we ran across the
23	general argument that we must pay for these services
24	and that it's not unreasonable to call upon those
25	that are using the services to pay for them. How

1	would you respond to such an argument?
2	MS. FOSTER: Let me start. And I'm going
3	to cite the conference on State Court Administrators
4	who years ago, and their policy paper is included in
5	our resource guide, wrote a policy paper entitled
6	Courts Are Not Revenue Centers.
7	And what they said, and their consistent
8	view is that courts should be funded out of general
9	funds. Justice is not, it is a vital government
10	service, and our courts are a vital government
11	service.
12	And if we're going to have them, and we
13	obviously have to have them and need them and want
14	them, we should pay for them and they should be paid
15	for out of general funds. The idea that courts have
16	to pay for themselves is part of what has gotten us
17	into this problem.
18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Anybody else?
19	MR. REDDY: I put a lot of thought into
20	that very question. And the way I thought about it
21	was I looked at the phrase excessive fee, fee or fine,
22	excessive fee.
23	And I have some sympathy with the
24	argument that it's not unreasonable to expect people
25	using the services to pay for the services, especially

1	because I can imagine scenarios, extremely wealthy,
2	affluent white collar sorts of folks for example. I
3	just don't think it would be unreasonable to expect
4	them to contribute something.
5	It would be hard to draw that line,
6	however, between the person who's in a position to
7	contribute and who's not. That makes things very
8	difficult. So what I think is that you look at that
9	phrase excessive fee, I don't think the fee or the
10	fine is intrinsically illegitimate.
11	I think it is the excessive part that we
12	need to worry about. I think that at a certain point,
13	it does become illegitimate. I think that point,
14	this is a rough heuristic, but I think that point is
15	the point that goes beyond whatever is needed to
16	restore victims and whatever additional amount
17	satisfies retribution.
18	I think beyond that point if you start
19	going too far ahead, you become excessive which is
20	the word we're using today. And I think it does
21	become illegitimate. I think it's unconstitutional.
22	I think you get into a lot of problems. So I'm not
23	instinctively averse to it, but I'm reticent.
24	MS. CHOUDHURY: Just to add to these
25	points, two points. One is that fees are excessively

1	high, not just to pay for the cost of the criminal
2	justice system but to raise general revenue. And
3	we've provided two examples of this in our written
4	statement.
5	The first is a woman in Mississippi who
6	should have bene fined \$25 for driving with a defaced
7	tag. She was unrepresented at sentencing and was
8	ultimately assessed more than \$260 for a low level
9	offense.
10	And that extra money went to a local
11	assessment. What is that assessment for? Who knows.
12	What is it paying for? Is it going to the general
13	coffer or is it actually paying for some kind of
14	justice system cost? How much is it costing the
15	justice system for a woman who had a defaced tag that
16	simply needed to be made more clear that would justify
17	such a high fee?
18	Second is that in 2014, the year before
19	Kevin Thompson was jailed for fines and fees he
20	couldn't pay, the DeKalb County recorder's court, the
21	court that handled his traffic case made seven times
22	as much as its general operating funds.
23	Now there was a line item in the DeKalb
24	County budget for the court itself. But what we saw
25	was that the costs of running the court was \$3.8

1	million. The court collected in fines and fees with
2	the assistance of this for-profit company and
3	violations of people's constitutional rights \$30
4	million.
5	That money went into the general revenue
6	stream. If that's not an incentive to impose fines
7	and fees people can't pay, I don't know what is. And
8	so it's not paying for the cost of the general court
9	system, it's paying for the costs of the county.
10	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Ms. Napier,
11	you want to add something?
12	MS. NAPIER: Thank you. I would, I'm
13	sorry that I don't have data on this. But I think
14	an important question to ask is, you know, how much
15	of the projected revenue was actually being collected
16	since we are trying to extract that from people who
17	cannot pay it. Right?
18	And also what is the additional cost then
19	of dragging people back into court and locking people
20	up for non-payment. Right? We're actually accruing
21	additional costs then with our enforcement mechanisms
22	which is counterproductive.
23	And then also that a lot of this really
24	is the function and, you know, Mr. Reddy eluded to
25	this earlier, of an overgrown criminal justice

1 Right? And so the reason it costs so much system. 2 to run our criminal justice system is because it is so blown out of proportion at this point to the actual 3 problem of crime in our communities, right. 4 5 And we're dealing with crime in frankly 6 the wrong way many times. And so I think, you know, central to any resolution on this issue is the notion 7 8 of incarceration ending mass and ending mass 9 criminalization, not just incarceration. 10 MS. FOSTER: Let me add one point that I 11 think is important. When we talk about fines and 12 fees, we are, from the Department's perspective, we 13 are not talking about restitution to a victim. 14 So they're very separate things, and no 15 one is suggesting that restitution should be lumped 16 together with fines and fees. When a victim has been 17 injured, courts do and state law requires and federal 18 law requires that there be restitution and that's 19 important. 20 With respect to the amount of a fine and 21 fee, similarly from the Department's perspective, 22 we're not suggesting that poor people not be subject to fines or somehow be able to escape responsibility 23 24 for illegal behavior. That, I don't think anybody

is suggesting that.

1	But what we have is a system that has, if
2	we think about a pendulum, has swung so far in one
3	direction that it has resulted in the criminalization
4	of poverty and in the consequences that many of the
5	people on this panel have spoken so eloquently about.
6	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: If I might,
7	Mr. Chair, one more question.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Go ahead.
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: You know,
10	in order to get to the fine and the fee stage, one
11	must be charged or brought before the courts. And
12	one is more likely to observe violations of the law
13	if law enforcement is in place and ceased.
14	And so we've not said a word about
15	targeting or law enforcement efforts. I just wish
16	to hear something, you know, about that.
17	MS. FOSTER: I can give you the
18	statistics from Ferguson which I think are
19	symptomatic. So Ferguson has an African-American
20	population of 67 percent of the city's population.
21	But they were 80 that African-Americans
22	represent 85 percent of the stops by law enforcement,
23	90 percent of the citations, and 93 percent of the
24	arrests. That's a fairly stark disparity.
25	This statistic is true in Ferguson and

1	it's actually true for the most part across the
2	country. African-Americans are two times more likely
3	to be searched by law enforcement and 26 percent less
4	likely to be found with contraband, 26 percent less
5	likely to be found with contraband. Two times more
6	likely to be searched.
7	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Mr. Reddy,
8	you want to weigh in? You don't have to, I'm just -
9	-
10	MR. REDDY: I'll tell you what. If you
11	don't mind, I would like to tell a quick anecdote
12	that I think sort of gets at the problem that I think
13	your question is targeting.
14	It's an anecdote about how these things
15	get passed in the first place and how well intentioned
16	people trying to address real problems end up doing
17	very counterproductive things and how I think they
18	very frequently target minority and poverty
19	communities in particular.
20	When I was in Texas I was involved with
21	some work in the Texas legislature. And there was a
22	state representative who came from a black community
23	in Houston. He himself was African-American.
24	And there had been a serious problem in
25	this community with littering. And he was very

1	passionate about it. He talked to me about it and
2	he said look, I live in this community. It is out
3	of control, you have no idea how bad it is.
4	He cared deeply and I understood his
5	passion. He drafted this bill that suggested; right
6	now I think the fine for littering in Texas is around
7	\$300. This was going to ratchet the fines up into
8	the thousands of dollars. It also was going to
9	require 12 days jail time for people who were caught
10	littering.
11	And I understood why he cared so much
12	about it. One of the most successful marketing
13	campaigns ever is Don't Mess with Texas, it's a
14	littering campaign. I grew up with that campaign.
15	However, it occurred to me as he was
16	talking to me about this and as he presented this
17	bill to the legislators in the relevant Texas
18	committee that he was opening a terrible Pandora's
19	Box here because the police officers were going to
20	start enforcing this law, they were going to start
21	roping in a whole bunch of young men who are going to
22	start to resent them for it, they were going to get
23	caught in the very cycle of criminalization and
24	poverty that we're discussing today.

And what's so interesting about it is

1 that every stage, people are well intentioned. The 2 legislator meant well, the police officers are just 3 doing their jobs, the voters that vote for legislator care obviously about littering in their 4 5 community. 6 And yet you have these insidious 7 consequences. that bill I'm happy to say 8 defeated, but I think it's a good example of this 9 sort of problem we're dealing with because very, very 10 frequently bills like that are not defeated. 11 pass because somebody says we want to get tough on 12 littering. And I hope that gets somewhat to the 13 question you're asking. 14 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you. 15 MS. CHOUDHURY: Just a brief comment on 16 this well. The targeting of as low income 17 relatively communities for low level offenses 18 absolutely contributes to the problems that we're 19 discussing today. 20 And I think it's clear now based on the 21 data that from New York, the New York Police 22 Boston Police Department data, Department 23 Philadelphia Police Department data all 24 through racial profiling litigation or advocacy by 25 the ACLU and other advocates shows that sophisticated

1 regression analysis has been able to identify and 2 isolate the role of race of a community and the race subject in driving the number of 3 encounters in that location and a person's likelihood 5 of being stopped. And as we've heard already as well, the 6 7 likelihood of someone actually being found with 8 contraband or a weapon is lower if one is African-9 American than if one is white and lower if one is 10 Latino than one is white. And that is robust data 11 from three major cities, New York, Boston, 12 Philadelphia. 13 So what that suggests is that policing 14 even for low level offenses the kinds of behaviors 15 that many people from many communities are engaging 16 in is driving police activity against certain racial 17 communities with socioeconomic detrimental and 18 effects, kind of funneling them into the practices 19 we're talking about today. 20 The second and last point I'll make is 21 that just to provide a very clear, specific example 22 of this is the finding of the ACLU and a recent report 23 2013 that although all racial and ethnic 24 communities engage in marijuana use at comparable

rates as measured by the federal government, a black

1	person in the United States was 3.8 times more likely
2	to be arrested for simple marijuana possession.
3	And that disparity grew up to six times
4	in certain cities. The City of Milwaukee around
5	seven times, Brooklyn around nine times, D.C. also
6	very high. So what this shows is that the way
7	policing is carried out absolutely contributes to
8	this cycle of poverty in criminal justice
9	involvement.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Narasaki
11	and then Commissioner Kladney. And let the record
12	reflect that Commissioner Kirsanow now has joined us.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I thought Dave
14	was before me.
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: No, I have you first.
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Okay. Thank
17	you, Mr. Chair. I have a series of relatively short
18	questions. So what has struck me in all the reading
19	that we've done to prepare for the hearing is the
20	role of judges in the system.
21	And I was struck, Ms. Foster, by this
22	notion that a significant percentage of the people
23	running these courts are not required to be lawyers.
24	And I'm wondering what recommendations there are for
25	addressing that problem as well as I understand that

1	your, the Department's first goal is to do education
2	and outreach.
3	But it seemed to me in some of the
4	readings that we've done that some of the judges are
5	quite woefully ignoring the constitution. And so
6	what are the recommendations to try to hold judges
7	accountable when they are not paying attention to the
8	constitutional obligations?
9	MS. FOSTER: It's hard to know exactly
10	how many judges are not lawyers. And I'm not entirely
11	sure that's the full extent of the problem. As you
12	pointed out, there appear to be some judges who are
13	lawyers who do not
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: There are smart
15	non-lawyers and there are some not smart lawyers.
16	MS. FOSTER: Precisely. From the
17	Department's perspective, obviously it's the state
18	courts that have to determine, and state legislatures
19	that have to determine standards for municipal court
20	judges.
21	The Council on Chiefs and the Council of
22	State Court Administrators task force that met for
23	the first time this week, one of the things that they
24	are going to make recommendations about are how to
25	select judges, what kinds of educational requirements

1 there should be both with respect to whether they 2 should be lawyers or not and what kinds of additional judicial training needs to be done. 3 I think everyone recognizes that there is 4 5 a need for judicial training in this arena. For a 6 of reasons, and I can say this with 7 experience because I served as a state court judge 8 for ten years, judges operate in institutions. 9 And those institutions have been doing 10 this now for since probably the '80s when, 11 everyone's indicated, this wave of new fees and fines 12 and enforcement came into being in conjunction with 13 changes in our criminal justice system. 14 So a lot of judges aren't really aware 15 that what they're doing violates the Constitution. 16 can tell you anecdotally that the Chief Justice of 17 Texas who is a member of the national task force met 18 with his judges including all of his municipal court 19 judges and said that the vast majority of them were 20 chagrined and completely embarrassed to realize that 21 what they were doing was unconstitutional. 22 And so a huge part of this is awareness. 23 In the instances where someone is knowingly violating 24 the Constitution, obviously there are two ways that 25 that can be resolved, maybe three. One is through

1 appellate courts, although that is difficult in this 2 arena, and that's because nobody has lawyers for the most part in these proceedings. 3 There are very few places where there are 4 5 public defenders involved even though people But that is one avenue. 6 facing incarceration. then there have been notable examples of where courts 7 8 of appeals have told judges that they have to stop. 9 The second is through judicial 10 performance commissions, or in most states, every 11 state has some form of public commission that is 12 responsible for disciplining judges who behave 13 illegally or extra judicially or violate the cannon 14 of ethics. 15 I will tell you there is some concern in 16 some states as to whether the cannons of ethics apply 17 to municipal court judges. Again, the task force, 18 of the things it will be doing is making 19 recommendations that cannons of ethics apply and that 20 all municipal court judges are subject to whatever 21 the state's disciplinary proceedings are. 22 Finally, of course the Department could 23 in the case of a judge who was knowingly violating 24 civil rights, prosecute that judge. That would be 25 our least favorite way of resolving this issue.

1	we have received some complaints with respect to
2	conduct in individual cases, and we are looking at
3	those as seriously as we look at everything else.
4	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Does anyone else
5	want to add?
6	MS. CHOUDHURY: Yes, just to add to that,
7	just last week the Macomb County Circuit Court in
8	Michigan granted a motion by the ACLU to exert super
9	intending control over the courtroom of the 38th
10	Judicial District.
11	So this was a judge who the presiding
12	judge of the District who kept imposing pay or stay
13	sentences. The ACLU has alerted this judge that
14	these practices were illegal. In 2011, the ACLU had
15	represented seven people in high profile criminal
16	appeals of their pay or stay sentences.
17	And this judge kept doing it. And
18	through a kind of interesting legal mechanism, we
19	were able to ask a higher court to literally order
20	this judge to follow the law, and that order did come
21	down.
22	I think those fact patterns are hard to
23	prove. We can't be in every single judge all the
24	time. And so the approach of creating a system change
25	where the culture changes, where the procedures

1	change and better, more equitable de facto procedures
2	are in place has the best potential of achieving
3	meaningful, systemic reform.
4	But let's be clear, we have no belief
5	that enforcement will not become necessary one day.
6	There must continue to be enforcement because the
7	specific litigation against jurisdictions that are
8	violating the law both highlights exactly where these
9	fissures are occurring, where structures aren't
10	working, and also the threat of enforcement brings,
11	we believe, other jurisdictions in line.
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great, thank
13	you.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: One more?
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. So Mr.
16	Reddy, you were talking about the notion of excessive
17	fees. And so one of the remedies that has been put
18	on the table is looking at proportional fees.
19	So looking at someone's income, gauging
20	some percentage so that it wouldn't be a set fee
21	regardless of who you are but allowing some punishment
22	of some kind. So I wanted to know what you were,
23	what your institute supports in terms of
24	alternatives.
25	And the second issue is it seems to me

1	that there's a difference between some of the
2	penalties versus these surcharges. So is anyone
3	putting out, since you mentioned Alec in your written
4	testimony, is anyone putting out some kind of
5	guidelines as to what is appropriate and not
6	appropriate in that arena because it seems to me that
7	that is also a huge problem.
8	MR. REDDY: Sure. Well, with regard to
9	the surcharges, you know, I agree completely. And I
10	like Ms. Foster's example of California where, so the
11	initial ticket is what the ticket costs but then there
12	are all of these bizarre fees and fines that get
13	attached to it, court improvement fees I think she
14	mentioned, other things like this that are not
15	associated.
16	I'm not familiar with anybody who's
17	putting out something like that right now other than
18	DOJ. But I think that those resources sound like
19	they would be a really useful contribution to the
20	dialogue.
21	The first question was concerning, it's
22	slipping my mind now, first question that you asked
23	me?
24	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Proportional
25	MR. REDDY: Oh, proportional fees. I

1	don't know that we have an institutional position on
2	that. But I certainly know that it's worth
3	experimenting with and looking into.
4	I wouldn't want that to replace the first
5	recommendation I made today which is finding a way to
6	cap the percentage of a locality's budget that can
7	come from criminal justice fees and fines.
8	As Ms. Choudhury mentioned, we have a
9	real problem with these fees and fines going into
10	paying not just for criminal justice functions.
11	That's debatable. But going into the general revenue
12	and paying for all the locality's functions that I
13	think is beyond the pale.
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Can I just ask
15	what, it's a factual thing. Are you aware of any
16	major legislation that Congress is moving on this
17	topic, and has there been any hearings?
18	MS. CHOUDHURY: There is a bill right
19	now, and I'm not sure what the status is, about ending
20	for-profit probation. And basically, withholding
21	federal funds from municipalities and I believe also
22	state government actors that employ these companies
23	to collect fines and fees because the profit incentive
24	is so distorting to the administration of justice.
25	MS. FOSTER: Let me just add that there

are federalism issues in this arena. These are state
and local fines and fees. And there is a limit to
what the Congress can do in this arena to tell a state
how to operate their state court system and their
kinds of funds and fees to impose.

With respect to day finds which is the

With respect to day finds which is the term that's used, and I do not know where the term day comes from with respect to proportional fines, I think it's in your resource guide. The Department of Justice through the Bureau of Justice Systems or the National Institute of Justice did a study in three jurisdictions some time ago about day finds.

It is the system that's in place in Europe They are proportional fines, and for the most part. if you think about the deterrent effect of a fine, there's some logic to it, that it's of greater deterrence if I'm speeding if income is mγ substantially higher than it might be to assess a fee that's proportional to my income than it is if I'm a low income person and it's proportional to my income.

The Department doesn't have a position to be sure on the issue. But there was a study done, and it's probably worth taking a look at. I believe it was three different American cities that experimented with it.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Kladney,
2	you have the last ten minutes.
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Ten minutes?
4	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you Mr.
6	Chair.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Oh, you want one
8	minute? Okay, so I'll give you nine. Commissioner
9	Heriot wants a minute.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Ms. Choudhury, I
11	found the settlement very interesting from Biloxi.
12	If I read it correctly, at arraignment there's rights
13	given and someone has to acknowledge a waiver of an
14	attorney, things like that. Then at sentencing, you
15	do it again, is that correct?
16	MS. CHOUDHURY: That's correct.
17	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And then if
18	there's a failure to pay, there's a 30 day notice
19	sent by regular mail. And then again you give rights,
20	is that correct?
21	MS. CHOUDHURY: Exactly.
22	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Okay. I did not
23	notice, maybe I did notice. But the attorney is
24	free, is that correct?
25	MS. CHOUDHURY: So the court now has an

1	affidavit of indigence that it will present at the
2	initial appearance and determine whether counsel is
3	required at no cost. And then because people's
4	financial circumstances can change, if the person
5	comes back, if the initial appearance doesn't include
6	a guilty plea on the spot and the person comes back
7	for trial, again that form is used to make sure that
8	the person is afforded counsel if required. And if
9	later in the process, and it could be months later -
10	_
11	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right.
12	MS. CHOUDHURY: a person's charged
13	with non-payment, again that form is used to assess
14	whether counsel is required.
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And then when a
16	counsel is provided, it is free, correct?
17	MS. CHOUDHURY: It is free.
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: In many
19	jurisdictions in these muni courts, having the honor
20	to have practiced in them, they actually charge you
21	for your defense lawyer as part of the fee. I know
22	in my jurisdiction it's \$350.
23	And the only time you get counsel in our
24	jurisdiction is when you're facing jail. Under this,
25	anyone who faces jail or not faces jail has a right

1	to counsel, is that right?
2	MS. CHOUDHURY: Absolutely. Yes, anyone
3	who's charged with non-payment has a right, is
4	informed of their right to secure legal counsel or to
5	request court appointment of counsel. And people who
6	are determined indigent will be afforded counsel at
7	no cost.
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And then the bench
9	card acts as a checklist for the judge, is that
10	required? Is there a checklist that's supposed to
11	be provided in every file? And, you know, they all
12	keep files on each case. Is there a checklist that
13	has to be completed by the court for those files?
14	MS. CHOUDHURY: So the person who's
15	charged with non-payment and that person's attorney
16	have what is also in the papers, an LFO, inability to
17	pay guide, a guide that helps the attorney walk the
18	defendant through what are my sources of income, what
19	assets do I have, what are my liabilities, what are
20	my monthly and annual expenses to help present that
21	court the information.
22	The form itself is not provided to the
23	court. But it helps the person who's charged with
24	non-payment put together the information to present
25	it in a way that the court can digest during the

1	hearing itself.
2	This bench card is kept on the bench to
3	help the judge at every stage of the process. And
4	it's organized to address initial appearance,
5	sentencing, compliance hearings, and even post
6	compliance hearing actions like sending a case to
7	third party collection by a private debt collector or
8	reporting purposes for driver's license suspensions.
9	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And this also gets
10	rid of the standard fine sheet, is that correct?
11	MS. CHOUDHURY: Exactly.
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And I also noticed
13	a unique provision in there about the FTA, that the
14	bench warrant's to be served during the day, business
15	hours and that the person is not to be taken to jail
16	but be taken directly to the muni court which means
17	the muni court has to be staffed so many hours a day,
18	is that correct?
19	MS. CHOUDHURY: That is correct. And
20	we've noticed is that in certain jurisdictions
21	failure to appears are often used as kind of a back
22	door to this phenomenon of modern day debtors prisons
23	where people don't know they have a right to request
24	an attorney, they don't know that they can make their
25	case to a judge who could reduce or waive their fines.

1	And the way we try to address that in
2	this settlement is to both advise people of their
3	rights at sentencing, so they know early in the
4	process that they have a right to counsel if they're
5	charged with non-payment, that their ability to pay
6	is a critical issue at all stages, and so they know
7	that the system is there to actually work with them.
8	And then later if someone does not appear
9	in court, the goal is to prevent preventative
10	detention so that those failure to appear warrants
11	are executed, the court is empowered to charge people
12	with failure to appear, but that the goal is to bring
13	them before a judge as soon as possible and only to
14	detain people who actually pose a flight risk.
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Well, I think it's
16	an excellent settlement. And I know you had said
17	that it should be used as a model probably throughout
18	the country. How long did it take to get to that?
19	MS. CHOUDHURY: We filed the suit on
20	October 21st of last year and entered settlement
21	negotiations
22	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: So they folded
23	pretty quick?
24	MS. CHOUDHURY: Yes. They called us
25	within 48 hours to negotiate. And I think in the

1	city's credit, they saw that they had a problem. They
2	saw that they had a massive problem and we were able
3	to show that 415 people were jailed on these failures
4	to pay warrants who couldn't pay and were stuck in
5	jail for days. And they took it seriously and we
6	worked very hard for about five months to bring this
7	about.
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Commissioner
9	Narasaki had talked about what kind of fees there are
10	besides fines. I mean, a fine is a fine. And I want
11	to list a few that I know of. And if any of you can
12	chime in, I think a laundry list would be helpful.
13	I know that in our municipal court you
14	have administrative court fees. I mean, that's like
15	\$150 a case. I know that you have domestic abuse
16	fee, you have a DUI court fee, you have a mental
17	health court fee, you have attorney's fees. You have
18	fees for if you don't want to go to jail you can get
19	an anklet and pay for that.
20	Those are the fees that come to my mind
21	and I would appreciate if you all not list it here or
22	tell me now, but if somebody could submit a list of
23	the kinds of fees that you know of, I think that would
24	be helpful for our report.

And the other thing I would like to say

25

1	is that I don't think going after individual judges
2	really makes much of a difference. One, they're very
3	hard to prove those cases. If you try to do ethical
4	disciplinary case, you got to be able to kill the
5	guy. Otherwise, you're not going to prevail.
6	And you're only fixing one problem. So
7	I think the cultural thing is a correct response. I
8	would like you to talk about court staff and the
9	problems with communicating and having defendants try
10	to pay fines, try to get information out of court
11	staff and the treatment of the people by the court
12	staff that you may have run into during your
13	investigations of this matter. Thank you.
14	MS. FOSTER: Let me start with what staff
15	because so many of these courts are small and part
16	time
17	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: We can't hear you.
18	MS. FOSTER: Because so many of these
19	courts are small and part time, the staff are also
20	often part time. In Ferguson, and this is true
21	throughout the municipal court system in Missouri and
22	true in other places as well, in Ferguson the court
23	was under the authority of the city's financial
24	officer.
25	And it was located in the police

1	department. Many of these municipal courts are
2	housed in police departments. You literally walk in
3	the police department door to go to the court.
4	The clerk is a part time clerk. There
5	are part time office hours. Many of these courts do
6	not have websites. You cannot find out when court
7	is in session. You can't find out if your ticket
8	requires a court appearance.
9	You can't find out what the fine is unless
10	you actually go to court. And court is held sometimes
11	in a school gymnasium, sometimes as I said in a police
12	department building. It varies enormously.
13	So part of what is in the Justice
14	Department's settlement consent agreement with the
15	City of Ferguson is measures to create some
16	independence for court staff as well as judges. The
17	problem of judges is equally fraught with conflicts
18	in, again, Ferguson is a great example. The judge
19	is part time, typically a lawyer in a law firm.
20	That judge may also be the prosecutor in
21	the next county and a judge in a different county,
22	and maybe the city count that the city attorney in a
23	fourth city. So there are problems with independence
24	of court officials.
25	I expect that again, coming out of this

25

1	national task force will be recommendations about
2	court administrators and court staff including
3	educating court staff and providing technology to
4	courts so that they can actually enter the 21st
5	Century and begin to make this easier for people.
6	Even if you could afford to pay or can
7	afford to pay these fees, it's not easy to do it.
8	And making changes that will simplify courts, provide
9	better notice is a start.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you.
11	Commissioner Kladney, I'm going to go to Commissioner
12	Heriot now to finish off the questions.
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Ms. Foster, this
16	is probably something I can get from the Colleague
17	Letter, but I haven't read it yet. And I promise to
18	read it, but you were talking about some of the
19	federalism aspects of all this.
20	And you said there's a limit to what
21	Congress can do. And of course, there's also a limit
22	to what the Department of Justice can do.
23	MS. FOSTER: Absolutely.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You have
25	separation of powers issues there in addition. What

1	statute does the dear, what statute if any does the
2	Dear Colleague letter rely upon or is it relying upon
3	just a straight constitutional argument or just a
4	straight argument about we think this is better
5	policy?
6	MS. FOSTER: So the answer is the
7	Constitution principally, that is we view our, one of
8	our obligations to make sure that the United States
9	Constitution is upheld throughout the country whether
10	it's a federal court, a state court, or a local court.
11	So we attempted to set out what are, in
12	our view, black letter constitutional principles,
13	first. To the extent the Department has enforcement
14	authority in this arena, it is either through Title
15	VI if there is a disparate impact to the conduct.
16	Or depending on the nature of that court,
17	if there are children involved, and unfortunately in
18	a lot of these circumstances there are children
19	involved because children can drive, that is people
20	under the age of 18 and are subject to these kinds of
21	tickets.
22	There are, I hasten to add, fines and
23	fees imposed against juveniles in juvenile courts,
24	justice involve children against the child and often
25	jointly and separately the child's parents.

1	And third, kids are subject to municipal
2	code violations or violations like jaywalking. So
3	to the extent there are children, our jurisdiction
4	comes under 18 USC 1441.
5	Similarly, as was the case in Ferguson
6	where the police department is so integral to the
7	conduct that's involved, we have jurisdiction over
8	1441, 14141, I'm sorry.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: How come when our
10	Dear Colleague letters that proceed just under a
11	constitutional argument? I mean, I'm always being
12	told how the Department of Justice doesn't enforce
13	the Constitution, they enforce statutes.
14	And there may be tons of these letters,
15	but how come when you get a letter that it simply
16	makes a constitutional argument rather than a
17	statutory argument?
18	MS. FOSTER: It actually is not terribly
19	common which I think underscores the seriousness with
20	which the Department takes this issue.
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Are there any other
22	precedents at all?
23	MS. FOSTER: I can't answer that. The
24	last one that I know we did was a statutory letter.
25	And that involved language access.

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. That
3	concludes the first panel. I want to thank all of
4	you for participating. And hopefully you'll be
5	sticking around for the rest, but if not we want to
6	thank you for your participation today.
7	We'll ask Panel 2 to begin to move to the
8	front to take your seats so that we could continue.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
10	went off the record at 10:33 a.m. and resumed at 10:34
11	a.m.)
12	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, can we get order?
13	We're going to begin the second panel.
14	PANEL 2 - COMMUNITY LEADERS AND ADVOCATES
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. Let me
16	first introduce the panelists to you all.
17	Our first panelist is Thomas Harvey,
18	Executive Director of Arch City Defenders.
19	Our second panelist is Starsky Wilson,
20	co-chair of the Ferguson Commission.
21	Our third panelist is Dr. Natasha
22	Goodley, first Vice President of the NAACP,
23	Hillsborough County Branch.
24	And our fourth panelist is Mitali
25	Nagrecha, Board Member of the Center for Community

1	Alternatives and a former fellow at the Brethren
2	Justice Center.
3	I will ask all the panelists to please
4	raise your right hand and swear or affirm that the
5	information you are about to provide us is true and
6	accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief, is
7	that correct?
8	(Chorus of yes.)
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, thank you. Mr.
10	Harvey, you have the floor for seven minutes and
11	following the system of red lights.
12	MR. HARVEY: Thank you so much for
13	inviting me to testify today. It's quite an honor.
14	My name is Thomas Harvey, I'm the
15	cofounder of Arch City Defenders. It's a 501(c)3
16	nonprofit civil rights law firm providing holistic
17	legal advocacy to the poor and homeless in the St.
18	Louis region and beyond.
19	We use direct services, impact
20	litigation, policy and immediate advocacy as our
21	primary tools to promote justice, protect civil and
22	human rights. And attempt to bring about systemic
23	change on behalf of the poor and communities of color
24	directly impacted by the abuses of the legal system.
25	I had, vou have a copy of my written

1 statement, and I'm going to deviate from that based 2 on the first panel. I wanted to, I jotted down some 3 just notes here and I'm going to extemporaneously about what my reflections are. 4 One, I just want to, I would forefront 5 race in all of the analysis of the municipal court 6 practices and procedures and the systemic violations 7 8 of the constitution that you've heard about and read 9 about. I would say that this is obviously not 10 11 it's more widespread then we image. 12 clearly not just about money, although in 13 jurisdictions that has become, that has taken its 14 primary purpose. 15 I would say that in our, in the courts 16 attempt or mindset, this seems to be about punishment, 17 even when the people who are before the court are no more criminals than those free Black men in post-18 19 reconstruction American who are arrested on vagrancy 20 loitering charges and other Black Code charges, 21 cases. 22 I would say that at odds with the instinct 23 to punish in those courts, even heard here reflected on the earlier panel, is the instinct not to punish 24 25 those who are running those courts. You heard that

1	the folks running those courts, judges, prosecutors,
2	had been systematically violating the constitution
3	for quite some time. Have admitted it.
4	And when those folks are, when that's
5	brought to the attention of the authorities, the
6	response is, they need some more education, they maybe
7	need a cheat sheet on what the constitution is. But
8	never, or almost never, is the idea of punishing them
9	for their illegal acts forefront.
10	And I would urge this Commission to hold
11	another hearing, to explore ways in which judges and
12	prosecutors who willfully, or otherwise violate the
13	constitution, can be held accountable for that.
14	I think that it's absurd that people who
15	are among the most well educated in this country, who
16	have gone to at least four years of college, three
17	years of law school, taken the bar examine,
18	undoubtable gone through continuing legal education
19	classes and seminars, can somehow pretend as if they
20	don't understand the most basic tenants of the United
21	States Constitution.
22	And with that, I'd like to read something
23	that I've read recently. It's a quote from Douglas
24	Blackman, Slavery by Another Name. And it's in the
25	introduction. If you're not familiar with it, it's

2	He says, the records demonstrate the
3	capture and imprisonment of thousands of random
4	indigent Black citizens, almost always under the
5	thinnest chimera of probable cause or judicial
6	process. Instead of evidence showing Black crime
7	waves, the original records of county jails indicated
8	thousands of arrests for inconsequential charges or
9	for violations of law specifically written to
10	intimidate Blacks.
11	Changing employers without permission,
12	vagrancy, riding freight cars without a ticket,
13	engaging in sexual activity or loud talk with White
14	women.
15	The record is replete with episodes in
16	which public leaders face the true choice between a
17	path towards complete racial oppression or some
18	degree of modest, civil, equality and emphatically
19	chose the former. This was not the unavoidable event
20	caught driven by invisible forces of tradition.
21	Sentences in these courts are handed down
22	by provincial judges, local mayors and justice of the
23	peace.
24	Dockets and trial records were
25	inconsistently maintained. Attorneys were rarely

1

a fantastic book.

1	involved in the sides of Blacks and the revenues were
2	in the tens of millions.
3	Now, that was 1903. That was 1903. One
4	hundred and 11 years later, 116 years later, 15 years
5	later, we're having the same conversation. We're
6	having exactly the same conversation.
7	This is well worn. Everybody knows it's
8	happening. I shouldn't say everybody. To some folks
9	who don't have to go into these courts, they may not
10	be aware.
11	But for poor people and Black people in
12	St. Louis County, and across the United States, this
13	isn't new. Department of Justice didn't tell the
14	anything that they didn't know already. They don't
15	need any further study of it. They need something
16	done.
17	And we've already tried to sit down to
18	talk to people about what could be done and how they
19	could be better education in addition to their
20	undergraduate degree and their laws school and
21	passing the bar, and they're either, it's not getting
22	through or they don't care.
23	And I would suggest that many of the
24	people in these courts do not care about poor people.
25	They do not care about Black people. And when you

1	combine those two things, no one, judges,
2	prosecutors, local NAACP, National NAACP, Department
3	of Justice, no one listens to them.
4	I'm glad that we're having this
5	conversation. I'm hopeful that something productive
6	will come of it. I feel, I hope that we're not having
7	a similar hearing 111 years from now. Thank you very
8	much for your time.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Harvey.
10	Mr. Wilson, you have the floor.
11	MR. WILSON: Mr. Chair, Commissioners,
12	thank you very much for the opportunity to share today
13	a bit of our experience and findings from the Ferguson
14	Commission and the St. Louis Metropolitan Community.
15	My name is Starsky Wilson. I serve as
16	President and CEO of Deaconess Foundation. The
17	Health Conversion Foundation, focus on child well-
18	being in the St. Louis Metropolitan community related
19	to United Church of Christ. Also served as Pastor
20	of St. Johns Church, the beloved community in North
21	St. Louis City.
22	And as noted before, from November of
23	2014 through December of 2015, I served as Chairman
24	of the Ferguson Commission. Currently an
25	incorporator for Forward Through Ferguson

1	Incorporated, a nonprofit entity established to
2	continue evaluation, measurement and communication,
3	related to the 189 calls to action in the Forward
4	Through Ferguson Report found at
5	forwardthroughferguson.org.
6	You received in your briefing materials
7	a 17 page document that shared a bit about the process
8	of the Ferguson Commission. How it worked, the folks
9	that it engaged and some of its findings.
10	Which included the integration of several
11	of the reports that have been referenced in the first
12	panel, the Department of Justice Report, from March
13	of 2015, the Arch City Defenders White Paper on the
14	municipal courts in the St. Louis Metropolitan
15	community and several different reports on the
16	operations and the footnotes. Operations of things
17	like the Municipal Court Improvement Community that
18	was working there.
19	I will also seek to give some context to
20	the recent report of the Missouri Supreme Court panel,
21	which was appointed to study these issues throughout
22	the State of Missouri, who took into consideration
23	some of the Commission's report.
24	I will, more than anything else, I want
25	to read, not read back to you, a lot of which you

1 portion that got, expect for the notes, the 2 amplification of voices who are affected by this work. 3 To speak of the Commission itself and its process over the course of just under a year and a 4 5 half, there were some 70 public meetings held that engaged 3,000 citizens of the St. Louis Metropolitan 6 7 Community. And the marshaling of some 30,000 8 volunteer service hours in order to produce these 9 findings. Studying a wide range of issues that were 10 exposed, clearly did not begin, but were exposed with 11 the August 9th, 2014 murder of Michael Brown, Jr. by 12 Officer Darren Wilson. 13 As we begin to study these things, we 14 begin to recognize that the disproportionate contact, 15 with the young Black and poor people particularly in 16 North St. Louis County, by police, was driven by the 17 need for the courts to serve as an ATM for a system 18 of municipal fragmentation that racialized 19 embedded racial segregation in our region. Because 20 it quite frankly began with racial segregation in our 21 region. 22 To provide a bit of context, some of these 23 small municipalities, 91 of which exist in St. Louis 24 Metropolitan, St. Louis County, were created through 25 racialized covenants, from people who are fleeing the

1	city. Primarily beginning with the East St. Louis
2	race rights in 1918.
3	What they did was created municipalities
4	that were not large enough to actually support
5	themselves. And because they can't support
6	themselves, they use the courts to do that.
7	Unfortunately, what we continue to find
8	is that in some of those cases, more than 60 percent
9	of the city's revenues, so not just the courts, but
10	the city's total revenue, came from the courts. And
11	this, because of the disproportionate contact with
12	young Black and poor people going through these
13	communities.
14	As we note, the commissions process
15	included the participation of grass roots, sitting
16	municipal court judges, prosecutors and mayors in the
17	process. And as you have seen throughout this, they
18	have come up with several recommendations.
19	I'll just say this for the sake of those
20	recommendations. There is a call and a need for
21	federal intervention and action in the State of
22	Missouri, as it relates to this.
23	And I'll point to this on two levels.
24	First, while we were doing our work, there was also
25	the assignment of what was called the municipal court

1	improvement committee that was the same judges, the
2	same prosecutors giving the appearance that they
3	wanted to do something about these issues. But they
4	operated in secret. They documented meetings where
5	they kept community members out and they sought to
6	preserve the status quo.
7	Recently, the Missouri Supreme Court
8	panel that was appointed here, that included judges,
9	former judges, attorneys, also came back noting the
10	issues. Noting that they couldn't really dispute
11	their challenges, but saying that the courts didn't
12	have the authority.
13	The Missouri Supreme Court didn't have
14	the authority to intervene, even though there was
15	some responsibility for supervision and oversight.
16	And they clearly noted these issues of a lack of
17	oversight.
18	Particularly in St. Louis County. Which
19	has twice, I think maybe three times as many courts
20	under appropriate supervision, then the nearest
21	county in our state.
22	So they're clearly supervisory issues.
23	But those with the most immediate responsibility have
24	shown a desire to either protect the system or to
25	look like they're doing something even when they're

1	not. And usually that's unfortunately through
2	panels, commissions and the like. I'll say that with
3	some concern about that with our own work.
4	And then finally this issue that
5	education doesn't change behavior. I noted that I
6	work in a Health Convergent Foundation. One of the
7	things that we found, particularly with this
8	challenging issue of smoking cessation, that
9	education absolutely, absolutely never
10	worked.
11	The only thing that stopped people from
12	smoking, even the voices of their daughters, I'll say
13	this as one who lost a father-in-law to lung cancer,
14	even the voice of his daughter, the voice who is in
15	the medical profession, his wife who's in the medical
16	professions who deeply cared and loved him, never
17	stopped him from smoking. The one thing that stopped
18	people from smoking is taxing cigarettes.
19	So I say it to say, education,
20	particularly in the places that we call upon to give
21	us enforcement, like the Department of Justice, will
22	absolutely not resolve this issue, rather enforcement
23	must. And it must for the sake of Dawn.
24	Dawn, as spoke into your materials, is a
25	resident of North St. Louis County whose story is

1	chronicle in the report platform at
2	forwardthroughferguson.com.
3	forwardthroughferguson.org.
4	She is a student at a University in North
5	County. She says this, simply going to school can
6	be scary because you don't want to get pulled over.
7	You know you won't be able to pay the ticket and so
8	you take the chance and hope you don't get pulled
9	over, but it's scary.
10	It's scary that day after day, just
11	trying to go to school, to be worried about, will
12	this be the day I get pulled over, will this be the
13	day I get caught.
14	At one point I had four warrants because
15	I couldn't afford to get car insurance, I couldn't
16	afford to get my car registration and pay my property
17	taxes. So I would end up having to drive illegally
18	because my plates would be expired.
19	I couldn't do anything about it so I would
20	get pulled over. And I would explain this to the
21	cops always, because you would hope that the cop would
22	be understanding. But they would always give you a
23	ticket.
24	You can't afford to pay the ticket
25	because if you could, you would have gotten your car

1	taken care of. So you end up not being able to pay
2	the ticket and then you get a warrant.
3	Once you get into that cycle, it's
4	really, really hard to get out of because there are
5	a lot of fees. You can try to get a lawyer, you can
6	post bond. If you get pulled over and you can't post
7	bond, you just do the time served.
8	This is absolutely not about justice.
9	Clearly it is a cycle. A perverse and pervasive
10	cycle of getting people into debt as prisoners and
11	quite frankly, not serving or pursuing public safety
12	either.
13	This is what we have found time and time
14	again. We look forward to fielding your questions
15	and providing more context as we have the occasion.
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Mr. Wilson.
17	Ms. Goodley, you have the floor.
18	MS. GOODLEY: Good morning. Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Good morning.
20	MS. GOODLEY: Thank you for this
21	opportunity to represent the residents of Tampa,
22	Florida.
23	About a year ago, one of our local
24	newspapers, The Tampa Bay Times, which is one the top
25	ten newspapers in the country, did an article. And

1	the article stated that the Tampa Police Department
2	wrote more tickets last year then the Sheriffs'
3	offices in Hillsborough, Pinellas and Pasco Counties
4	combined.
5	And more capita than cops in
6	Jacksonville, Miami, St. Petersburg and Orlando. The
7	States four largest, other largest cities.
8	And no other law enforcement agency in
9	the state arrests more people than the Tampa Police
10	Department. The Tampa police wrote more tickets for
11	bicycle offenses than any other law enforcement
12	agency in the state. And that eight of the ten
13	cyclists were Black, according to an investigation by
14	the newspaper.
15	The Hillsborough County branch, NAACP,
16	has approached the police department, the mayor, the
17	city on several occasions regarding these statistics.
18	One, Pinellas County, all the counties are in Tampa
19	Bay. Pinellas County is our neighboring county.
20	Pinellas County has the largest
21	population pro rata in the state. But yet we write
22	more tickets than Pinellas, Hillsborough and Pasco
23	County sheriffs' offices combined.
24	After the article we demanded an
25	investigation into the Tampa Police Department

1	through the chief of, the then chief of police, Jane
2	Castor. TBD launched an investigation through their
3	cop's division, which we were later advised it should
4	have been through the civil rights division and not
5	the cops. And ironically, the former chief of
6	police, Jane Castor, now serves on the cop's division
7	as well.
8	They came to Tampa. They did an open
9	forum with the community. And for months sought the
10	communities direct input on issues with TPD. The
11	community was advised that a report would be issued
12	at the end of the year. December 2015 no report was
13	given.
14	When we followed up with the department,
15	we were told it would be January 2016. January came
16	and went, no report was given. And as of today, when
17	we inquire as to what the findings were, we're told
18	not to inquire anymore, they would let us know.
19	This is a huge issue in Tampa as far as
20	the bicycle stops are concerned. In urban
21	communities, individuals are stopped for riding their
22	bicycle without having a bike light. Or they're
23	stopped because they're riding on the sidewalk.
24	But they're only stopped in the urban
25	communities. They're not stopped in the more fluent

1	neignborhoods.
2	Individuals who ride, we have a pathway
3	along the river called Bayshore Boulevard.
4	Individuals are not stopped on Bayshore Boulevard for
5	riding their bicycle without having bike lights.
6	We've noticed an increase in a number of
7	Black individuals being stopped for bicycle arrests.
8	Once they're stopped they're frisked, they're
9	searched and they're ran through the system to see if
10	they have any warrants. And this only occurs in the
11	urban communities.
12	One of the individuals stated, when I see
13	TPD on the street, I do get nervous. I don't get
14	nervous because I'm up to no good, but because of who
15	they are and what they represent in our community.
16	We've worked hard to try to get TPD to
17	rethink the process of the bicycle stops. It's not
18	that, I understand if you stop individuals and they
19	have warrants or whatnot, then of course what happens,
20	happens. But when you only stop Black individuals
21	in urban communities, there is a problem.
22	We do have a bicycle share program within
23	the city where you can rent a bicycle and ride it
24	through the city and return the bicycle, with using
25	your credit card. Initially those bicycles did not

1	have blke lights anywhere on the bicycle.
2	And so individuals could rent the bicycle
3	that the city provided, with no bike light, and not
4	be stopped. But if you were riding your own bicycle
5	with no bike light, you were stopped.
6	Also, with the bicycles that they
7	implemented, after this went through the news and
8	everything happened, they quietly placed lights on
9	the front, but not the back. Although their
10	requirements are that they're on the front and the
11	back of the bicycles.
12	Our police officers also, our law
13	enforcement, have a Bill of Rights written into the
14	State Constitution. And it literally gives the
15	enforcement officers more rights than normal
16	citizens.
17	We've been working to also encounter that
18	through amendment. It protects law enforcement
19	officers in a legal construct that even the citizens
20	of Tampa do not have.
21	Case in point, we had a police officer
22	who went to the strip club, got drunk, crashed into
23	the car in front of him. He was placed on leave and
24	quietly rehired in six months. You know that would
25	never happen to any of the citizens in Tampa.

1	So we've worked with other organizations
2	to devise an amendment to change the City constitution
3	to allow police officers to have the same rights as
4	normal citizens and not be, and not have more rights
5	than we have.
6	We asked, in doing this, we asked the
7	mayor and the chief of police to institute a citizen's
8	review board. That was our solution.
9	The citizen's review board would have
10	subpoena power, have a budget and operate to review
11	the police department. We went through a lot of
12	clash, we clashed back and forth with the mayor and
13	he finally instituted a citizen's review board with
14	no subpoena power, no power. And he appointed nine
15	of the 11 people on the board.
16	So we, again, have an amendment that
17	we're pushing to have a new board created that has
18	power. So that we can review the cases that come
19	before the police department and bring some
20	transparency to the Tampa Police Department.
21	Unbeknownst to the residents, across the
22	nation, people believe that Tampa Police Department
23	and the residents of Tampa have a wonderful
24	relationship and that community policing is
25	instituted. And unfortunately it is not.

1	That's not the case. The officers do not
2	know the community. Community policing is not
3	instituted. And it amazes us how the front can be
4	placed across the nation that we operate this way
5	when in actuality, we do not.
6	And so we're hoping that we can do
7	something soon, before an episode like Ferguson or in
8	other cities, occurs. Thank you.
9	MS. NAGRECHA: Thank you for having me.
10	Today I will speak primarily about the Commission's
11	question as to how these fees and fines impact
12	American society at large.
13	I'll note that I have also been a co-
14	author on a paper that surveyed these practices in 15
15	seats and can answer more general questions later.
16	But I will speak today about a paper that
17	I released that argues that these fees and fines harm
18	the indebted individual's family and friends. As
19	these individuals are made to rely on their networks
20	of support to help them pay.
21	And so family and friends often, also
22	from low-income communities, band together to support
23	their loved ones so that their loved ones can avoid
24	the severe consequences of nonpayment.
25	And so what we find is that we are

1	inadvertently basing these fees and fines, not on the
2	individual's ability to pay, but on their families
3	attempts to help them pay. And that we are, in broad
4	scale, impacting, negatively impacting, communities
5	of color.
6	We based the conclusions in the paper on
7	40 interviews. And before I turn to the details of
8	that paper, I will note sort of where this project
9	came from.
10	And so one, we were often asked, by
11	legislators, and we haven't talked that too much yet
12	today on the role of legislators, but a lot of these
13	additional surge charges that others have mentioned,
14	are statutorily passed.
15	And so we heard from legislators who were
16	sympathetic to push back on fees and fines that they
17	wanted to know more about family impact. And they
18	saw it as a way to counter the "make the offender
19	pay" logic.
20	We also, around the time we were
21	researching this paper, we had been in touch with a
22	jurisdiction in Massachusetts where they had been
23	levying a jail fee. And that jail fee was found to
24	have been improperly collected from the individuals.
25	And what we found is that the

1	individual's family members were the ones to call to
2	get that money back because they had been the ones to
3	pay in the first place.
4	Finally, in my research I have found that
5	the kind of default policy position is to say that,
6	we should just tailor the fees to an individual's
7	ability to pay.
8	But as we thought about it more, we
9	wanted, we started to reflect on what exactly should
10	be taken into account and how accurate can we be.
11	And what did returning individual's financial
12	situations look like.
13	And really, were we ignoring the reality
14	that we in fact know that most people in the criminal
15	justice system come from indigent communities.
16	For this paper we conducted 40 in depth
17	interviews with individuals that had fees and fines.
18	And we asked them detailed questions about their
19	financial situations. Most, I'll note most of the
20	people were post-incarceration, and so they had had
21	some criminal justice system involvement.
22	And we asked individuals about their
23	criminal justice debt. Their fees and fines. We
24	asked them about their other debts. We asked them
25	generally about their current income, their prospects

1	of income. So their level of education, their
2	likelihood to find a job.
3	We asked them about all of their
4	expenses. We asked about their public assistance,
5	if any. And then we asked in detailed, about what
6	supports they were getting from their community and
7	their family.
8	We asked them where they were living.
9	And we were trying to get a real sense of their
10	ability to pay and their networks of supports.
11	We also asked folks about their
12	experiences with the collection mechanisms. Such as
13	wage garnishment, driver's license revocation,
14	arrests and incarceration.
15	And what we found is that, well, our
16	primary finding was that as we suspected, individuals
17	are getting by through a reliance on their networks
18	of support.
19	Of the individuals we interviewed, 70
20	percent spoke to that and spoke to how they were
21	surviving financially, because of the fees and fines,
22	by relying on their family.
23	Thirty percent spoke specifically to
24	getting cash assistance from family. Forty percent
25	lived with a family member and paid little to no rent.

1	We had seven people say that they were relying on
2	their family to be able to eat.
3	And to be clear, these questions were
4	answered in the context of asking folks about their
5	fees and fines. It was that that was pointed to as
6	a destabilizing factor.
7	I will tell a story, and I will try to
8	tell it quickly. I will tell the story of Monk, who
9	when he spent a few years in prison, and a child
10	support order had gone into effect when he was
11	incarcerated. And Monk had tried to communicate to
12	the family court that he was in prison, but came out
13	to understand that that debt had continued to accrue
14	while he was incarcerated.
15	Monk also then had a number of fees
16	related to driving offenses. And again, this is
17	something we've heard about and is featured in the
18	Ferguson Report.
19	And so he immediately started owing on
20	these debts, including the child support. And that
21	one in particular, he was given two months to find a
22	job.
23	As we know, there are many barriers to
24	individuals finding employment with a criminal
25	justice record, and he was unable to start paying

1	right away. And so Monk speaks very clearly about
2	the ways in which he relied on his family.
3	So he said he would borrow \$25 here and
4	there to make payments wherever he thought he might
5	see a warrant. And so he would try to, you know, he
6	hoped that that goodwill gesture would at least put
7	off the possibility of incarceration.
8	He did in fact became incarcerated and
9	had to borrow money to secure his release. And he
10	spoke of how this impacted his childcare
11	responsibilities.
12	He spoke about how he lived with his
13	girlfriend. Because that helped them make it
14	financially.
15	And he also spoke very clearly about the
16	emotional support that he received from his family.
17	And the emotional support they provided during these
18	stressful times.
19	And so I'm going to skip the quote by
20	Monk, that I think actually does a great job of sort
21	of tying it up, and
22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Well go ahead.
23	MS. NAGRECHA: Okay. So Monk says, when
24	you come home, you might still have fines from the
25	DMV. Lots of jobs need a driver's license now, so

1	if your driver's license got suspended you have
2	surcharges. You have to deal with that on top of
3	finding a job.
4	So in my situation, you have to get your
5	driver's license back together, pay rent, pay fines,
6	so no warrant, pay child support, so no warrants, and
7	now everything is falling short in the house. You
8	want to take care of your kid, but you're taking care
9	of all these fines.
10	As a grown man, you don't want to be
11	laying in your family house. You're a grown man, you
12	need your own.
13	You come home from prison with more
14	problems than you went in with. It doesn't stop
15	because you got locked up.
16	And I will just make a quick point. I
17	think that recently, and as I wrote my testimony for
18	today, I've really come to see this as one more way
19	in which our criminal justice system has become
20	disproportionate. And so now not only do you have
21	the offense related penalties over incarceration, you
22	have these fines that you follow you for a long time
23	after.
24	And now we know that those fines impact
25	your family and your community. And I think we've

1	gone clearly too far.
2	And I think that if we also mentally
3	picture this happening in an affluent White
4	community, I think you would, I think we'd see that,
5	I don't think those communities would let this go on.
6	And I think that, you know, I feel it's important to
7	reiterate there is a racial component here.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. I'll oper
9	up with the first couple questions and my
10	Commissioners can indicate to me their interest in
11	asking as Commissioner Achtenberg.
12	I want to commend, on the record, the
13	work that our Missouri State Advisor Committee did.
14	And has been doing on the issue of what happened in
15	Ferguson.
16	I attended their first hearing on the
17	issue, as it relates to the killing of Michael Brown.
18	And it was at that hearing where I first heard about
19	this issue of municipal fees and fines. So it was
20	before the DOJ even issued its report.
21	And even then, you know, with the very
22	limited knowledge that we had at that hearing, it
23	seemed to me that it was outlandish that folks were
24	being, in essence, put in prison for debts. The
25	committee did not go in depth into this issue, and

1	obviously we are.
2	But one of the things that came out on
3	the police force side of that testimony that day was
4	a small municipality. I believe its name was Ana or
5	Santa Ana or something like that.
6	MR. WILSON: St. Ann.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: St. Ann. That was, it
8	was testimony from a member of the public, Hispanic
9	woman, limited English proficient, that that
10	particular jurisdiction was being abusive of Latinos.
11	And I'm wondering, in any of your focus
12	on the issue of fines and fees, have you seen the
13	Hispanic community, or other limited English
14	proficient communities, also being victimized by
15	this? And if so, if you could talk to that.
16	MR. WILSON: So I'll speak to the, where
17	we saw really not as much from a data standpoint, but
18	a narrative standpoint. Specifically, with St. Ann.
19	So yes, because this is North St. Louis
20	County, we did see that. We also note here that the
21	practices go beyond the ethnic group.
22	So I had the occasion, in early October,
23	to visit the St. Ann Police Department. Because it
24	is also, as we talk about profitability, St. Ann is
25	one of the large municipalities and has the capacity

1	to have a larger jail, a larger courthouse. And thus
2	has a contractual agreement to house people who have
3	been arrested in other places.
4	And so I visited and spoke with the chief
5	of police, who happens to be Hispanic, in St. Ann.
6	The relatively new chief of police there happened to
7	be Hispanic.
8	Because all of the people who were
9	arrested in Ferguson protesting, including the 13
10	people who had been arrested the night before for a
11	noise ordinance violation in front of the Ferguson
12	Police Department, largely young people, were housed
13	at St. Ann. Because Ferguson was building a bigger,
14	nicer, newer jail. And so they couldn't actually
15	house the people that they were arresting.
16	And so we found ourselves there. And had
17	the occasion to talk to the police chief about this.
18	Specifically this issue. Because he bore the burden
19	of being a Hispanic chief of police having to respond
20	to these same kind of issues.
21	And so what it had to do with, quite
22	frankly, is some of the work that was growing in the
23	area. And the same need to traverse through an area
24	that has racialized policing.

And so, yes, they absolutely found it in

1	the Hispanic community. It's one of the growing
2	communities, but quite frankly, one of the less
3	visibly communities in St. Louis. North St. Louis
4	County and in St. Charles.
5	While the demographics are about the same
6	as the nation, you don't have any that I, any Hispanic
7	elected officials in St. Louis City or in St. Louis
8	County, who are at large. And so you do see that in
9	that community.
10	Where we didn't see it is in areas where
11	there are model minority communities. We do not see
12	disparities in the Asian-American population or ever
13	with us. We have us a large and growing Bosnian
14	population in the St. Louis metropolitan community.
15	One of the largest in the nation.
16	While we saw it in the Hispanio
17	community, while we saw it in the African-American
18	community, we didn't see it in the numbers as it
19	relate, or the narratives related to "model minority
20	communities."
21	MS. NAGRECHA: That's interesting.
22	Anybody else? Yes, Mr. Harvey. Oh, I'm sorry, Ms.
23	Goodley.
24	MS. GOODLEY: Yes, as you know, Tampa,
25	Florida has a very high Hispanic population. So

1	we've noticed the trend in the Hispanic communities
2	as well as the Black communities. And so we partnered
3	with several organizations, Hispanic organizations as
4	well, to put an end to the bicycle stops, the
5	targeting of the minority communities, for fines and
6	fees as well.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. Mr.
8	Harvey.
9	MR. HARVEY: So St. Ann, so first of all,
10	the City of Missouri keeps statistics on disparity in
11	traffic stops and they have since 2000, as a result
12	of allegations of racial profiling and traffic stops.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
14	MR. HARVEY: So there's a brief
15	digression on that. There used to be a press
16	conference every year to tout the findings. But the
17	numbers keep getting worse so press, the document is
18	released, but there's no longer a press conference on
19	this.
20	In St. Ann, it relates to this issue of
21	revenue and who you arrest in order to raise the
22	revenue through the incarceration of people. In St.
23	Ann, in 2011, Latinos were 11 times more likely to be
24	arrested than White people living in St. Ann.
25	St. Ann is situated on Highway 70, a major

1	East/West highway. And this has to do with what
2	Reverend Wilson was saying about the jail they built.
3	That's another revenue source. Because they contract
4	with 24 towns in our region that are too small to
5	have their own jail, and then they hold people at a
6	daily rate.
7	They also contract with immigration
8	detention. So when they pulled over this 11 times
9	more Latinos on Highway 70, which they say is a drug
10	corridor, it gives them reason to stop these folks.
11	It's kind of a win-win, sarcastically,
12	win-win situation for them. In that, if they have a
13	warrant for their arrest and want municipality, they
14	jail them, they charge that municipality, X amount of
15	dollars a day to hold them.
16	If they don't, and they have a problem
17	with their immigration status, they send them briefly
18	off to immigration detention before they are then
19	returned to St. Ann's jail where they are held at an
20	even higher dollar daily rate. So it's all
21	interrelated.
22	MS. NAGRECHA: You know, and I don't have
23	sort of anecdotes in my mind, but I think it's
24	definitely an important question because I think
25	also, in ACLU's example, I believe that jurisdiction

1	ara in race provide counser at any point where
2	incarceration was an issue.
3	But in many of the jurisdictions we had
4	looked at in the Brennan Center report, the failure
5	to appear or the failure to pay a fine, was handled
6	through a civil contempt procedure that didn't always
7	have counsel associated with it even if incarceration
8	was on the table.
9	And so I think there may be situations in
10	which individuals, with limited English proficiency,
11	for example, would face incarceration on these
12	matters without the assistance of counsel.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: One last question for
14	Mr. Wilson, and I'll give it to Commissioner
15	Achtenberg.
16	In reading your materials, it indicates,
17	I believe, that your Commission has not expired yet,
18	is that right? Or has it already?
19	MR. WILSON: The Commission expired
20	December 31, 2015.
21	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
22	MR. WILSON: What we did was setup a
23	successor entity with some of the initial staff from
24	the Commission. So three staff members from the
25	Commission and five Commissioners, three
	11=11 = 0=000

1	incorporators.
2	So five Commissioners are serving ar
3	organizing board. The three of us, as incorporators,
4	are also supporting that work to assure translation
5	and the accountability around some of the
6	Commissioner findings.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: So it's now a non-
8	profit? Is that it?
9	MR. WILSON: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: And so it's going to
11	continue to do some work or?
12	MR. WILSON: It continues to do work.
13	It's currently convening to do education around the
14	racial equity lens. And also to support folks who
15	have taken up some of these costs to action in
16	different areas.
17	So a case in point, there's a Cradle to
18	Career initiative that has taken the section or
19	policies related to young people and youth at the
20	center. That is seeking to drive those, and so forth,
21	through Ferguson, is providing support to them.
22	There's also continued conversation about
23	some of these findings, particularly related to
24	municipal courts. And so we're still in conversation
25	about weighing into the public dialogue to pressure

1	the Missouri Supreme Court to take actions, related
2	to some of the reform.
3	So that staff is helping to do that. And
4	also helping organizationers to assess their
5	alignment with the commissions' findings. So it
6	created tools to assess organizations and their work
7	on how they are aligned and how they could be better
8	aligned.
9	And so that's part of the work in the
10	non-profits.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: So will it focus just
12	on Ferguson or on the St. Louis County and its
13	counties?
14	MR. WILSON: Yes. Although not
15	appropriately named, the Ferguson Commission has
16	always had a regional lens on its work. And so all
17	of the findings, and even our meetings, we're very
18	clear to have, through half the St. Louis region, to
19	make sure to have input from citizens near to where
20	they are. So we'll always have, and always has, had
21	a regional frame.
22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: And do you think it
23	will continue to look at some of these Hispanic
24	community issues?
25	MR. WILSON: Absolutely.

1	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
2	MR. WILSON: No, we continue to do that.
3	Our most significant input, quite frankly from the
4	Hispanic community, had to do with the Hispanic
5	chamber, the Mosaic project, which is another project
6	related to immigration in St. Louis, in the economic
7	and equities area. But there are ways they we need
8	to translate it into others.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: All right, thank you.
10	Commissioner Achtenberg.
11	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you, Mr.
12	Chairman. To Mr. Wilson and Mr. Harvey.
13	Could you talk again? You said that the
14	fragmentation is essentially an artifact of racial
15	history that the creation of 189, however many
16	municipalities there are in this region, essentially
17	is an artifact of racial history.
18	And the fact that these municipalities
19	are not sustainable on their own because they're so
20	small. They have to pursue tactics like the tactics
21	being pursued here in order to sustain themselves
22	economically.
23	I'm wondering if you could elaborate or
24	that. And then talk about whether or not things like
25	consolidation, restructuring of these municipal

1	entities is anything that is being considered at any
2	level, in terms of a possible way of getting at the
3	sustainability issue. I mean 189 municipal functions
4	are having to be supported. It seems to me to be
5	mind boggling.
6	And I didn't realize the relationship
7	between that and the racial history of the area. But
8	now that you say that, something has to explain how
9	this came to be. It certainly didn't come to be by
10	accident.
11	MR. WILSON: Sure.
12	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: If you could.
13	MR. WILSON: Sure. And I'll make one
14	correction. The 189 is the number of caused to action
15	that came out of the report.
16	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: I beg your
17	pardon. I really missed
18	MR. WILSON: The number of
19	municipalities, I'm sure will give you great, will
20	harden you even more. There are only 91
21	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Oh, well
22	terrific.
23	MR. WILSON: in this metropolitan area
24	of 2.8 million people.
25	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: My mistake.

1	Okay.
2	MR. WILSON: But I said that to say, and
3	Thomas and I were talking about this before, Dr. Todo
4	Swanstrom, who does place based research or
5	communities out of the University of Missouri St.
6	Louis, notes two significant indicators of racial
7	segregation in the metropolitan area.
8	One of them is the number of
9	municipalities per 100,000 people. Another is the
10	number of school districts per 100,000 people. St.
11	Louis is the only metropolitan area that ranks in the
12	top three, actually we're third in both of those
13	categories, across the nation.
14	And so that is, that speaks to the kind
15	of structural racialized element of this and how it's
16	embedded in our governmental realities.
17	As we talk about the proliferation of
18	fragmentation, yes it is connected to a racialized
19	history.
20	So there is another report called, The
21	Making of Ferguson. I forget the authors name.
22	And it speaks to the housing approaches
23	over the years that have led to this kind of
24	segregation, that literally goes back a hundred

years.

1	And some of it has to do with people, how
2	we're migration, White flight and the establishment
3	of not just communities, but based upon the history
4	of racial neighborhood and racialized covenants in
5	the City of St. Louis. Where one would make an
6	agreement that I will not sell my house to people of
7	a different color and make that agreement with people
8	in my neighborhood.
9	Once we move to Ferguson or to Florissant
10	into North County, rather than setting such a
11	covenant, we just incorporate. And we determine who
12	lives in our neighborhood.
13	And so there's some municipalities,
14	literally, with less than six, 700 people. But
15	there's a mayor and there's a board and in some cases,
16	a police department that's that small.
17	And so here we get to the same
18	sustainability issue. And where we see a
19	proliferation of, it's not just a number of elected
20	officials, but the number of municipalities, the
21	number of courts, the number of police departments.
22	And so the capacity to hold these things accountable
23	is a critical issue.
24	Consolidation has been a long-standing
25	conversation in the St. Louis community. It is

1	larger than a conversation about city-county merger,
2	because the city is essentially also a county in our
3	governmental polity.
4	The conversation has shifted somewhat to
5	one of municipal consolidation. And so you see in
6	our calls, not a call from municipal consolidation,
7	but municipal court consolidation for the sake of
8	supervision and to take the economic incentive out of
9	the courts.
10	In the DOJ report, I believe it is
11	documented. The direct connection between the city
12	manager and a police chief asking for the writing of
13	more tickets in order to make the budget, well, that
14	all comes through the courts, of course for the sake
15	of enforcement.
16	And so part of what we suggest is, if you
17	have the capacity to consolidate where these courts
18	are not directly tied to these small municipalities,
19	you don't have the economic incentive driving that or
20	the municipal level. But we clearly see that that
21	is necessary now in order to pay the salaries for the
22	part-time counselors, the part-time mayors, the part-
23	time city clerks.
24	The one other thing that's pointed out in
25	another report, I'll just note really quickly, From

1	Better Together. An organization that's been driving
2	a lot of our municipal conversation, our regional
3	conversation, about consolidation and governmental
4	restructuring.
5	Is the small number of law firms who if
6	you map back, all of these courts, all of these city
7	counselors, there's a handful of law firms that are
8	providing all those counseling services.
9	And so getting beyond, and as we talk
10	about the conflicts, we can talk about someone being
11	a judge in one place and a prosecutor in another and
12	the city counselor in another, but the reality is,
13	there's a handful of law firms who are providing all
14	of these services to all of these municipalities.
15	And when we start appointing panels to
16	look at these things, we're appointing judges and
17	people who are former judges, who are partners in
18	these law firms, to study these things. And so we
19	have inherent conflicts and reform there.
20	So this is just, I'll stop there. But
21	yes, that's something that's being looked at.
22	The one thing I will say really quickly
23	is that we're able to push and pass with grass roots,
24	grass tops working together. A bill called Senate
25	Bill 5 in the State of Missouri that put a further

1	cap, there was already a cap on the amount of revenue
2	that could come from minor traffic violations and
3	fines from municipality at 30 percent, is now brought
4	down to 20 percent. And 15, 12 and a half in St.
5	Louis County. Where it was most egregious.
6	And that was able to pass within one
7	legislative session. We've seen a couple of
8	responses.
9	Number one, the municipalities have filed
10	suit to block that legislation. And number two, we
11	have seen an increase, because this focuses on traffic
12	fines, we've now seen an increase in some areas and
13	some municipalities, as much as 50 percent within a
14	year, of them writing now housing code violations to
15	make up the gap.
16	So it's the same economic incentive and
17	now they're just trying to find a way around it.
18	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: And has this
19	court consolidation gave any traction?
20	MR. WILSON: Maybe Thomas can speak to
21	that.
22	MR. HARVEY: No. Because, I mean, well
23	so has it gained traction? Yes. Every single entity
24	that has taken a position on this, that does not
25	involve municipal court judges and prosecutors, savs

1	that we ought to consolidate these courts.
2	But unfortunately, the municipal and
3	judges and prosecutors have much larger sway with the
4	folks who are going to make those decisions. So the
5	Ferguson Commission made it its number one overall
6	recommendation with respect to the justice for all
7	category.
8	We recommended it. A local law school
9	recommended it. Better Together recommended it.
10	I mean you can just line up every
11	community organization in the region, and the people
12	in those communities who've been directly impacted by
13	these courts and they say, I don't want 81 courts in
14	90 towns. I'd like to have fewer courts. And I'd
15	like to have fewer police officers on the streets
16	pulling me over because I'm too poor to pay a traffic
17	ticket.
18	But, there's a lot of resistance. And
19	one of the things that Reverend Wilson alluded to
20	early was the, I found this like an incredibly
21	insulting thing, is after the Ferguson Commission
22	met, concluded its meetings, its public meetings, its
23	working group meetings, made all these
24	recommendations, the public participated, within a

week, the Missouri Supreme Court said they were going

1	to appoint a committee to examine the problems in the
2	municipal courts. As if to say, thank you very much
3	general public, that's really cute that you came up
4	with some suggestions, but now the adults in the room
5	are going to say what's possible.
6	And then these folks went out, they
7	didn't actually set foot in these municipal courts to
8	observe what happens, but they made recommendations
9	and said, they don't have the authority to or the
10	Supreme Court doesn't have the authority to order the
11	consolidation of the courts. And they also said, if
12	this is something that needs to be done, it would
13	have to come through the legislature.
14	So you ended up with one would be powerful
15	organization telling another would be powerful
16	organization, you have to do it.
17	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: I didn't see
18	in the materials whether or not the justice, the
19	United States Justice Department, has expressed any
20	opinion on the consolidation issue. I understand
21	they wouldn't have, or they probably wouldn't have
22	direct jurisdiction to, but perhaps they've opined?
23	I don't know the answer to that question.
24	MR. HARVEY: No, I don't believe so. And
25	I think that, I mean of course they're limited to

2	region. So Ferguson can become a shining city on a
3	hill for racial justice in America, and it won't
4	impact the other 90 towns in the region.
5	The hope is they'll be some dominion
6	effect. But folks are pretty resistant to making
7	these changes.
8	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thank you.
9	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We're going to go to
11	Commissioner Kirsanow. Commissioner Kirsanow
12	followed by Commissioner Narasaki and then
13	Commissioner Kladney.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
15	Chairman.
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You're welcome. Is
17	your mic on, Commissioner?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't know.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: There, it is now. It
20	is. Okay.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thanks, Mr.
22	Chair and to the Panelists also. Question for all
23	of you, anyone who wants to chime in.
24	Are these fees and fines themselves
25	intrinsically bad or is it the offenses to which they

Ferguson and Ferguson is just one of 91 towns in the

1	are levied, upon which they are levied, or is it the
2	level of fines is too expensive? Or is it all three?
3	And should we eliminate these fines,
4	lower them, what's your opinion?
5	MS. NAGRECHA: I can jump in. I think
6	it's all three. And so I think, one, there's the
7	fine itself that's the punishment for the offense.
8	And I, there too the amounts have increased.
9	I think the real issue is around all of
10	the fees and surcharges that are attached on top of
11	that. And so there was references on the first panel,
12	and I think there are many examples.
13	But in Texas, at least at the time of my
14	research, and I think there have been some efforts
15	there to reform, judges would have a full list of 30
16	surcharges that the legislature, at the state level
17	only, had added on that would be assessed on top of
18	a criminal's violation.
19	And I think it's important to also note
20	that, so that would be at the state level. And then
21	each county or town may have added additional fees.
22	The jail itself might have additional
23	fees. If the person ended up on any type of
24	supervisor, that would have separate fees. And so
25	the number of those types of charges have added up.

1	And I think in a place like New Orleans,
2	for example, if you look at the list of all the
3	surcharges and fees, it's almost a little bit comical.
4	It really is. There's a few for kind of every cause
5	that exists in a state.
6	And then I think, you know, the research
7	has also shown that the amount per fee has also
8	increased. And so, when I started this research in
9	2010, I would always say that we should tailor the
10	fees to people's ability to pay.
11	But as a practical matter, one, that's
12	just not very possible because the fees attach at
13	some many different places. And individuals are not
14	on notice and there's no sort of cumulative invoice
15	that says everything.
16	But, two, I just, you know, I more believe
17	that most of them just should not exist at all.
18	There's really no justification for them. And the
19	process of trying to assess a poor, obviously a poor
20	person's ability to pay is a silly one.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Follow up
22	question. If there aren't these fees or fines for
23	these particular lines of offenses or if the fines
24	should be lowered, has there ever been a study
25	strike that.

1	I live in inner City Cleveland. Have
2	lived in the same house for 32 years. And there are
3	sometimes unintended consequences. In other words,
4	eliminating certain things, such as a fine, doesn't
5	necessarily have a linear of consequence.
6	In my neighborhood, for example, when we
7	didn't have a, there was a speed trap, which I hate.
8	But when that speed trap was there, we found a lot of
9	things happen in our neighborhood.
10	One is, a decrease in littering, a
11	decrease in vandalism, a decrease in speeding. And
12	yes, people were fined.
13	When that was eliminated, there was a lot
14	more littering, a lot more vandalism, property values
15	started to get lowered. When you lower the property
16	values, what happened is the tax base shrinks, people
17	start moving out, the schools suffer.
18	And I wonder if anyone has studied the
19	dollar value of not having fees and fines for certain
20	offenses.
21	Because a number of my neighbors moved
22	out. The schools were getting bad, liter all over
23	the place, the property value was falling. Some of
24	them were losing, \$10, \$15, \$30,000 off the property
25	value.

1	I understand the fees are \$2, \$3, \$50,
2	\$100, \$300. But property values are something too.
3	And also the safety of your children.
4	The kids in the neighborhood would cross the streets
5	with people flying by at 50 miles an hour. That
6	stopped when we had fees and fines attached to it
7	with the traffic stop.
8	So has anyone studied that? The
9	unattended affect, the residual effect of eliminating
10	or lowering the deterrent value of fees and fines?
11	Black people suffer from that too.
12	MR. HARVEY: I mean I don't know of any
13	study examining that issue. But I would suggest that
14	there is no deterrent effect to assess a fine when
15	somebody is too poor to pay it.
16	So at the time of Mike Brown's murder, in
17	a region of 1.2 million people, there was 700,000
18	warrants for arrest in St. Louis County and City
19	combined. People spend weeks on end in jail because
20	they can't make the payment.
21	If their car can't be repaired, if
22	they're getting a ticket because their car, they
23	haven't registered their vehicle because the vehicle
24	can't, they can't pay for a repair on the vehicle,
25	fining them doesn't help them fix the car. If we

1	want to help them fix their car, let's help them fix
2	their car.
3	And the same would go to their driver's
4	license suspension and the issue of car insurance.
5	The most common violations that we saw for our
6	homeless clients, who have literally been made
7	homeless as a result of their contact with this legal
8	system is, no proof of insurance, failure to appear,
9	driving while suspended and failure to register their
10	vehicle. Every one of those ordinance violations is
11	as a result of their poverty.
12	And so to, I understand what you are
13	saying, there may be some unintended consequences of
14	removing the deterrent effect, but there is no
15	deterrent to someone who is unable to pay.
16	Now on the flip side, if you are able to
17	pay, you suffer no consequences. You can get a lawyer
18	in St. Louis County to handle your traffic ticket for
19	\$39. And you pay that lawyer \$39, you never go to
20	court, the lawyer probably never goes to court and
21	you then pay a fine to the city.
22	So that's not a consequence to people of
23	means. That's not a deterrent to people of means.
24	They don't suffer the additional impacts of their
25	driving violations because they're able to get their

1	moving violation turned into a non-moving violation
2	with a quid pro quo of a payment to the municipality.
3	So their license never gets suspended, their
4	insurance costs never go up.
5	So they're able to actually avoid the
6	responsibility for their traffic infractions. So I
7	understand what you're saying, but I don't know of
8	another study like that and I would suggest that it's
9	not a deterrent.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The deterrents
11	of infractions though, I mean there is a reason why
12	we don't want people driving without insurance.
13	There's a reason why we want people to have
14	functioning tail lights.
15	Again, the little kids in my
16	neighborhood, we need those functioning tail lights
17	because you don't people to get rear-ended, when that
18	hits the kid who's crossing the streets. There are
19	reasons for that.
20	So what do you do if you don't impose
21	fines and penalties? What is the deterrent if people
22	without, with no means, aren't deterred by this?
23	MR. HARVEY: This imaginary, like
24	indigent scofflaw, who has the means
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It's not

1	imaginary in my neighborhood.
2	MR. HARVEY: who has the means to fix
3	their car, get their license reinstated, pay for their
4	insurance, I would say, I mean we can talk to the
5	social scientists in the room and they can tell us if
6	there is a statistically significant enough
7	percentage of people in the country who have the money
8	to fix their car and just refuse to do it.
9	In our case, again, we work with a fairly
10	narrow percentage of the population because they're
11	all homeless folks and people who are on their way in
12	to homelessness. And so those people don't, I mean
13	I sit down and do a budget with them. They don't
14	have the money to make the repair. They're not
15	choosing
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If they're
17	homeless, why do they have a car?
18	MR. HARVEY: This is how, so of course -
19	-
20	MR. WILSON: Maybe they live in their
21	car.
22	MR. HARVEY: they live in their car.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: What is striking
24	to me here is this idea that there are no consequences
25	to behavior whatsoever.

1	MR. HARVEY: Respectively, it's not that
2	there's no consequences. I would urge you to
3	consider that the clients that I represent have
4	already faced the most serious possible consequences
5	for their poverty.
6	They're already living in the car that
7	when they are arrested, gets impounded, and all their
8	I mean effectively they've just now been evicted
9	or had their house repossessed as a result of, I think
10	what is very likely racial profiling.
11	And to discuss whether or not there's
12	going to be some consequence for them is absurd. They
13	have already suffered the most serious consequences
14	possible.
15	MR. WILSON: So with respect to the
16	Commissioner's question, first question, I think it
17	is important for us to remember that we're having a
18	discussion about structures and not about individual
19	responsibility.
20	Because, as has been noted by my
21	colleague, the exact same infractions could come upon
22	two equal citizens in our community. And there are
23	disparate impacts based upon how much money they make.
24	Or how much access they have to people with certain
25	educational credentials. And that is inherently un-

1	American. It is wonderfully capitalists, but it is
2	inherently un-American.
3	So as we consider the structure, while I
4	don't know of the circumstance of the narrative that
5	you speak of in the neighborhood, I do know that
6	structurally, in Missouri, in particularly in St.
7	Louis County, if wanted to equalize the options for
8	deterrents for these two people, then what we'll be
9	talking about is things that have equal value.
10	And so one of the things that the
11	Commissioner findings suggested was the consideration
12	of a community service option for people. The
13	understanding that people don't have the same access
14	to literacy and so they may not even know what their
15	rights are in this situation. So educating them or
16	options and their rights.
17	But also assessing their capacity to pay.
18	Respectfully to the other panelists, assessing their
19	capacity to pay and offering alternatives that don't
20	have to do with how much money they have. But there
21	may be other things that they have to give, as it
22	relates to community service.
23	So that's one of the things. And it gets
24	to your first question about whether the fees and the
25	fines are an issue. I think the fees and the fines

1	are an issue because they rely only on someone's
2	position within a capitalist system to know whether
3	they can get justice.
4	And so if we add community service as an
5	option and begin to assess ability to be pay, and be
6	thoughtful about the question of how does this amount
7	of money or this amount of service drive public
8	safety, then we get to a more equitable assessment.
9	On the issue of the offenses, absolutely
10	yes there are some offenses. Like, I don't know,
11	failure to appear.
12	That people get higher fines for a
13	failure to appear and they have the capacity for that
14	to be stacked. So when we talk about the amount of
15	these offenses, to the third part of your question,
16	that is a problem as well.
17	So I can get one ticket and end up with
18	four violations, based upon failures to appear, and
19	get warrants for the failures to appear. Not just a
20	failure to appear, which has its own cost, but a
21	warrant for not appearing.
22	And one of the reasons why I may not
23	appear is because of the limited number of court
24	hours, because you have part-time courts, part-time
25	judges. Some courts that are only opened twice a

1	month.
2	And guess what? If you're Starsky Wilson
3	and you work in an office downtown and you work for
4	a salary not a wage, you can schedule time to be off.
5	If you are, I don't know, Darryl Wilson, who works on
6	a wage job, then you don't have those same privileges.
7	So what we're suggesting is that we are
8	treating people differently based upon their position
9	in society, based on their position economically or
10	educationally. And that is what must be meted out
11	as it relates to the civil rights and human rights
12	issues that we're seeing in our courts.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you,
14	Commissioner Kirsanow. We're now going to move on
15	to Commissioner Narasaki followed by Commissioner
16	Kladney.
17	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you, Mr.
18	Chair. So several of you on the Panel, in your
19	opening statements, made it pretty clear that you
20	feel that the federal government needs to be doing
21	more than what they're talking about doing. And also
22	that something needs to be done about judges.
23	If you were here for the earlier Panel,
24	you heard that Commissioner Kladney and I have a
25	slight disagreement about the extent to which you

1	should look beyond education and look to, how do you
2	enforce against judges who are, in my opinion,
3	willingly ignoring the constitution. So I would love
4	to hear your opinions on that. So I mean
5	MR. HARVEY: Yes, I definitely agree that
6	there should be some consequence. It's an odd
7	transition.
8	There should be some consequence for the
9	group of people who, as I said, have gone to law
10	school, went to undergraduate school, went to law
11	school, passed the bar and are willfully ignoring
12	that.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well we heard
14	today that some of them actually aren't even lawyers.
15	MR. HARVEY: Yes, that's true.
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So you can't even
17	disbar them because they don't have a license to begin
18	with.
19	MR. HARVEY: So there's a, I was in
20	Washington, D.C. at the DOJs convening in December
21	and the chief judge in Ohio was talking about the
22	bench card that they created after, I think the local
23	branch at the ACLU, brought it to her attention that
24	judges were systematically violating the
25	constitution.

And I asked her if anybody in Ohio had admitted they had been jailing people illegally, had suffered any consequences, and she said no. And her question was, I can see if after we had told them they were doing this wrong they kept doing it, we ought to punish them.

And it struck me that when my clients go into, when my homeless clients, going into a casino in the middle of winter to get out of the cold so they don't die, no one says, here's a cheat sheet on how you could get a blanket or go to a homeless shelter, they take them to jail for trespassing.

And so what you're aettina is something that frustrate me about this entire process which is, powerful people get education and vulnerable people get punishment. And the punishment on the vulnerable people has much longer lasting consequences than it would on the powerful people.

Now, that being said, I recognize there are limited resources and spending those resources on prosecuting judges across the country would be a shocking number of judges you'd probably have to jail for violating the constitution. And I'm just talking about the ones who publically admit that they've done it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	But if you prosecuted, if the federal
2	government prosecuted one municipal court judge in
3	St. Louis County, that would change that dynamic
4	forever.
5	There are part-time jobs that are add-
6	ons. They make \$40 or \$50,000 extra bucks a year.
7	That pays for their kids to go to a private school in
8	St. Louis County so they don't have to be subject to
9	the failings of our public educational system in St.
10	Louis. And further isolates them from the problems
11	that they see every day as a judge.
12	But if one of those judges even faced
13	briefly, prosecution, I think it would have a long
14	range affects. And I think it's potentially ripe.
15	Some that we found through our
16	investigation, the warrants issued for people's
17	arrest, are automatically generated by a computer
18	software system. And if there's inactivity on a
19	file, a warrant is issued for someone's arrest.
20	In some towns, there's no authorizing
21	statute for the failure to appear, there's no
22	ordinance authorizing the offense of the failure to
23	appear. Yet thousands of people have been jailed and
24	lost their licenses and lost their jobs, et cetera.
25	So I would definitely encourage some

1	prosecution. And I should say, I rarely encourage
2	prosecution of anyone.
3	MR. WILSON: So I begin this with a
4	confession that on August 10th, 2015 I was arrested
5	with 67 other people, largely clergy, in an action of
6	over 300 people trying to deliver to the U.S. Attorney
7	an invitation for the Department of the Justice to
8	act on the report that it made in Ferguson on March
9	of 2015. Because they knew about the issues and we
10	hadn't seen movement. Or on the report that they had
11	in Cincinnati or in Cleveland, related to the
12	policing.
13	And was remarkable shocked to find that
14	at the point that I began to be arrested by U.S.
15	Marshalls, at about the same time the Attorney General
16	was addressing the Fraternal Order of Police in
17	Pittsburgh, that I wanted her to do something about.
18	Those things being said, it's just
19	shocking to be thoughtful about the supports. I mean
20	this is where we're talking, standards and supports.
21	We're talking about providing supports to
22	people whom we believe are violating people's civil
23	rights. Rather than setting standards for these
24	people. And holding these people to the standards
25	that we know are already in place and imbedded with

1	the law.
2	And so my invitation is to be thoughtful
3	about both, but to push beyond, quite frankly, the
4	individual accountability of a judge, who should have
5	never been on the bench anyway. But rather the
6	structural interventions, in the same way we do with
7	police departments.
8	So I wonder why the March 2015 report or
9	the City of Ferguson winked and nodded at what was
10	going on in the courts. Winked and nodded at what
11	was going on in Jennings just a municipality away.
12	I mean there's literal references that
13	this happens in other places, but we're not going to
14	do anything about it. We see it, but we're not going
15	to do anything about it.
16	And then we have this question about
17	individual judges without talking about structural
18	interventions in the courts in the same way we talk
19	about them in the police department.
20	So maybe I don't know enough about the
21	system. I understand federalism, and I heard that
22	invoked earlier. And quite frankly, what I'm also
23	hearing that is that, well, this is a state's right

implications for me, as a Black man, in America.

And that has

issue.

24

25

all kind of historical

1	But I say that to say, I believe that the
2	appropriate standard setting and the holding of
3	standards has to do with the structures of the courts
4	and the municipalities. In the same way that we see
5	it in police departments.
6	But, it must come more swiftly, even then
7	we have seen in some of the police departments, when
8	we even have such documentation for this issues. And
9	we have a department of government that has clear
10	responsibility in as much as we have for policing,
11	also has it for the courts.
12	So maybe their elements, clearly their
13	elements are the law that I do not understand. But
14	when I see structural interventions through consent
15	decrees and whatnot with police departments, I wonder
16	why we're not doing the same with the court. And
17	maybe that's with the city, I'm not sure, the
18	municipal unit. But it seems that that structural
19	change can be brought to bear in those same, on
20	parallel tracks.
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thanks, that was
22	very helpful. And I should note, as an Asian-
23	American woman, we're not too keen on being referred
24	to as the model minority.

MR. WILSON: My apologies.

1	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: My suggestion
2	would be to rethink that. We're proud of the
3	successes of our community, but we also have huge
4	issues. Including civil rights and discrimination
5	happening.
6	MR. WILSON: Yes, ma'am.
7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So I want to get
8	at this whole notion of the fees and fines and
9	penalties. Because it is a conundrum, right?
10	We want people to have car insurance to
11	protect other people that they might encounter,
12	right? So there is a legitimate safety issue.
13	On the other hand, does it make sense to
14	jail someone who then cannot earn money, and takeaway
15	their car so they can't earn money, in order to ever
16	be able to actually pay that.
17	I feel like perhaps, in some areas, we
18	need to be focused on, how do we change that. What
19	kind of support.
20	Because even if you change the response
21	and say, okay, you're going to get community service
22	instead of having to pay, the person is taking time
23	to do the community service and still isn't getting
24	car insurance, right?

So I do think that there's a challenge

1	there that as a society we need to figure out. I
2	just don't think that the system we have is clearly
3	going to lead to the result that we want.
4	It seems to me that one of the problems
5	is we're trying to fix the fees issue around the
6	edges. And the bigger issue, to me, seems to be that
7	municipalities are, because of unwillingness or
8	inability to raise funds through taxes, to actually
9	pay for all of the programs that these surcharges and
10	fees, which are all very well meaning, right?
11	Drug addiction, domestic violence,
12	improving the court system, we all want that. But
13	why should the poor people be the people who are
14	paying? It seems like it's just a regressive tax.
15	I'm just wondering if I am the only one
16	who feels that way or if there's been some thoughtful
17	announce on that?
18	And then my second question is just, is
19	there research sets that have been done to quantify?
20	So Commissioner Kirsanow wanted to
21	quantify, what's the damage in terms of not having
22	these fines?
23	I am interested in whether people are
24	trying to quantify, how much does it cost our society
25	to have this kind of structure, right? Because if

1	you're trying to collect \$50, but then you're jailing
2	someone, and my understanding is it costs far more
3	than \$50 a day to jail someone. You know, at the end
4	of the day, are you actually raising the revenue you
5	mean to, and then you have the collateral
6	consequences.
7	So I'm wondering, what kind of research
8	is being done on that to show society that in fact,
9	this doesn't make, it doesn't make morale sense, but
10	it also doesn't make economic sense.
11	MS. GOODLEY: Well, I think for us, in
12	Tampa, Florida and in Florida, we have a lot of
13	privatized prisons. And so I think, when you look
14	at the whole spectrum, it does make sense.
15	Now granted, they're going to jail
16	initially, but then that, as time progresses, it then
17	turns into ending up in prison for a lot of them.
18	Because it's over a year. A year and a day.
19	But it makes sense, because they make
20	money from that. And so in Florida, we have the
21	issue of the school to prison pipeline, same thing,
22	in how that funds the state. And with privatized
23	prisons, it's still making money. So it's not
24	morally right, but it's financially right to do so.
25	I know for us, with the bicycle arrests,

1	when a person is stopped, because they don't have a
2	bike light, the first thing they're asked is to
3	produce a receipt for the bicycle or that their
4	bicycle has been registered with the police
5	department. Which is not a requirement to have a
6	bicycle.
7	If you can't show that your bicycle has
8	been registered or that you own your bicycle, through
9	a receipt, your bicycle is confiscated. So now you
10	end up with no means of transportation, from what you
11	had. So again, the city is making money.
12	What happens to those bicycles? They go
13	into the little pound and for nine times out of ten,
14	they stay forever. Because if they don't have the
15	receipt on them, nine times out of ten they don't
16	have the receipt, period, any longer. I know I don't
17	have the receipt to my bicycle.
18	So I think it is making money. And I
19	think that's part of the reason.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I'm going to move on
21	now to Commissioner Kladney and then the Vice Chair.
22	We're supposed to end at 11:55 for a ten minute break.
23	I'm going to let it go a little longer so that you
24	all can get some questions in.
25	Okay. So we'll go to ten after to allow

1	the three of you to ask questions, and then we'll
2	take a ten minute break.
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, Mr.
4	Chairman. Commissioner Kirsanow, I just want to tell
5	you I feel your pain.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Again?
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Again. I don't
8	live in the inner city, but I do live on a road where
9	people, in a residential place, where people used to
10	speed at 50 and 60 miles an hour past my house. And
11	we don't have photo speeding speed traps. So I have
12	a suggestion. Speed humps. They work very well.
13	Thank you.
14	But I would like you all to clarify, I
15	don't think, and I don't think Commissioner Kirsanow
16	was thinking this, but we're not talking about getting
17	rid of fines altogether and we're not talking getting
18	rid of some fees altogether, correct?
19	MR. WILSON: You're right.
20	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: If someone gets a
21	DUI and they need to get a urinalysis once a month or
22	occasionally, they should pay for that. I mean what
23	we're talking about is generally, fees being
24	disproportionate to the offense. Is that correct?
25	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir.

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And we're talking
2	about making fines that tell a person you shouldn't
3	be doing this, but scale it to their income and
4	ability to pay, is that correct?
5	MR. WILSON: Yes. Along with having
6	other options there for them. And supports.
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right. Like
8	community service or things like that.
9	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Is that correct?
11	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir.
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I just want to
13	make that clear for the record.
14	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir.
15	MR. HARVEY: For people who are
16	determined to be indigent, no, I disagree with that.
17	And I tend to think giving community service,
18	depending on who those people are, is excessive.
19	So for example, we represent many mothers
20	with children who are at emergency homeless shelters.
21	And one of the reasons they got there is contact with
22	the courts.
23	And when we get involved, we do an
24	assessment and we go out to court. And now, after
25	everything we've been going through, the courts are

1	more inclined to offer community service as an option.
2	They didn't use to offer that at all as an option.
3	But ironically, one time, they wanted to
4	assign our client to do community service at the very
5	shelter she was staying with her children. They
6	didn't know that she was staying there. And I think
7	there's something really problematic about that.
8	That woman doesn't need to be punished at
9	all for a driving violation that occurred, by the
10	time she was homeless, it occurred eight years ago.
11	This is way in the past.
12	To go do community service without a
13	vehicle, while their driver's license is suspended,
14	is exceptionally difficult. And she has to get
15	childcare.
16	So I think for people in that situation,
17	and I realize we're talking about a reactively small
18	percentage of people
19	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Well that's what,
20	I would hope you point that out.
21	MR. HARVEY: Yes. I just want to make
22	sure that we, for the record, we carve out a place
23	for people who are truly indigent and don't have the
24	ability, community service is not a viable option
25	either.

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Okay. Anybody
2	else like to respond? Yes, ma'am.
3	MS. NAGRECHA: Yes. To sort of follow
4	on Thomas' point. One, yes. I do believe that there
5	are a number of fines that will exist as a penalty
6	for the violation and that those fines should be
7	proportionate. And I think we've talked about that.
8	And I do see someplace for fees for people
9	who could afford it. So your example, for example,
10	about the urinalysis makes sense to me.
11	I guess I push back because again, if you
12	look at the list of these fees in any given
13	jurisdictions, there are dozens and dozens of them.
14	And I think that we are very far from a place of a
15	perfect procedural system in which we are assessing
16	people's abilities to pay up-front and having an
17	awareness of all the fees that might attach to them
18	through this court contact.
19	And therefore, I think we do need to
20	consider that having that many fees just does not
21	make sense. And that there isn't really a rational
22	for them.
23	And I think we also need to keep in mind
24	the reality of who touches our courts. And
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY. So how do we do

1	that? How do we decide what fees are rational and
2	what fees are not rational? I mean I think that's
3	an important aspect.
4	I mean we can say that generally. And
5	how do we find a rational basis for fees?
6	MS. NAGRECHA: Yes. You know, I think
7	one easy starting place is that fees that end up in
8	a general revenue fund are probably not very rational.
9	And I think from there, I do, I see that
10	it's a complicated question, I just, you know, in a
11	lot of places, for example, there will be a fee for
12	a DARE program or something of that nature. And I
13	think
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Something
15	unrelated.
16	MS. NAGRECHA: Right, something
17	unrelated. And so I think while that's a rational
18	government function, that funds towards that type of
19	activity needs to be a portion through a normal kind
20	of budget process.
21	Where different needs are assessed
22	against each other. And we come to a conclusion
23	about what, as a community, can be afforded, in terms
24	of programming versus charging the program fees to
25	whoever happens to touch the court system. And those

1	people are often poor.
2	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right. I think
3	that's a very important point. Thank you.
4	MR. WILSON: Thanks, Mitali. I think to
5	this point, what we're speaking of, is the
6	insufficiency of many of courts who deal with the
7	realties that they find themselves in. So two
8	recommendations in the Ferguson Commission findings
9	get to this structurally.
10	Number one, you shouldn't be able to have
11	a part-time court. We're speaking to certain
12	capacities and competencies that are required in a
13	court, which require some scale.
14	So one of the things we call for is full-
15	service full-time courts. But this matter of
16	assessment, the people's capacity to pay, the peoples
17	need, is a case management issue. This is a social
18	work competency.
19	So what we call for is community justice
20	centers. Now particularly in places where we know
21	that there's desperate impact from poor people to the
22	courts.
23	Well, who has the capacity to deal with
24	them? Well, many times lawyers are not trained in
25	this manner, the judges who sit in these places,

2 trained in this manner. And so one of the things that in your 3 detailed, kind of written statement from us, is a 5 description of the creation of community justice system centers that have this social worker case 6 7 management capacity to actually bring this kind of 8 assessment to bear on someone's need. But also be 9 thoughtful about the supports that are required for 10 people, if these are about, again, public safety and 11 they're about public service as well, as courts are. 12 And they are, in many ways, people's 13 first contact with the systems and governance that 14 they have to trust. Then maybe we should be talking 15 about the things that those folks need as well. 16 that's one thing I kind of suggest there as well. 17 MS. GOODLEY: If I might add also. 18 also, we shouldn't tie the number of tickets and fines 19 into an officer's pay or his productivity ratio. 20 in Tampa that's the case. 21 The productivity ratio is calculated by 22 the number of hours worked, divided by the number of 23 tickets and arrests. Because then that allows the 24 officer to, or the department, to target areas to 25 increase their productivity.

particularly even those who aren't lawyers, are not

1	Which will increase their chances of them
2	being promoted and moving up within the force. I
3	think if we remove that aspect on the police officer's
4	yearly review, that would help.
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: His bonus.
6	MS. GOODLEY: His bonus, yes.
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I have one last
8	question for the Reverend. You mentioned that the
9	jail is being expanded in county or somewhere, you
10	were giving an example.
11	MR. WILSON: Yes, sir.
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Do you know, a lot
13	of jails that are expanded and a lot of jails that
14	are built, new jails, especially in smaller
15	jurisdictions or even larger jurisdictions, doesn't
16	the money come, a lot of the money come from the
17	federal government? Do you know that?
18	MR. WILSON: Well, one of the things that
19	we saw to address, I'm not sure as much with this
20	specifically, so that I'm not sure of. But one of
21	the things that we noted a concern for is the amount
22	of resources that are coming into local police
23	departments and municipalities around any kind of
24	local oversight. Particularly for police.
25	So this was really in our area around

1	police. Because it's becoming, maybe equipment, but
2	it's coming as a grant. Those kind of things come
3	from the federal government.
4	And we also note that some of these
5	smaller municipalities are actually engaging kind of
6	tax levies for the sake of this as well. So I'm not
7	sure in these cases specifically, but that's a concern
8	with like the policing. I'm not saying, I don't know
9	of the same as it relates to the court.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, Commissioner
12	Heriot?
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, I just had a
14	real quick question of Mr. Harvey. Exactly what
15	criminal charges
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Your microphone,
17	Commissioner. There you go. Start again.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Could you hear me?
19	I just wanted to ask. You were talking about criminal
20	charges, but exactly what charges would you regard as
21	appropriate?
22	MR. HARVEY: You mean for, do you mean
23	at the municipal ordinance level or just in general
24	in the world, in the span of human behavior?
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: In the span of your

1	testimony, of course.
2	MR. HARVEY: Well, I mean, so to be clear
3	that the stuff that we're talking about in St. Louis
4	County, these are courts of limited jurisdictions.
5	They only have authority over their own ordinances.
6	And so there are assault ordinances in
7	those towns, right? You can be charged with assault.
8	It's a parallel ordinance to the misdemeanor, the
9	state level statute.
10	If there is a serious crime, what I would
11	actually call a crime, the state picks up those
12	charges. I would say 99 percent. I don't know the
13	number.
14	A vast majority of the cases that are
15	prosecuted in our municipal courts are not crimes.
16	By definition, they're not crimes.
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I thought you were
18	talking about prosecuting people that are involved in
19	the court system?
20	MR. HARVEY: Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm
21	sorry, I apologize. I didn't understand that. Your
22	question.
23	There is a section in the federal code,
24	I don't know it off the top of my head, that allows
25	for the prosecution of judges and prosecutors who

1	willfully violate the constitution. I can get you
2	the section of the code if you'd like.
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: If you could do
4	that, yes.
5	MR. HARVEY: Brandon Buskey wrote an
6	editorial in the New York Times about it, in November
7	I believe.
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Are you thinking
9	of any other charges?
10	MR. HARVEY: Not at this time, ma'am.
11	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes, if you could
12	provide us with that. Yes?
13	MR. WILSON: I was going to say, one
14	thing that gets to, and we see it as it relates to
15	prosecutors, is the kind of prosecutor's beliefs.
16	I'd imagine that this extends to judges as well. But
17	the protections we give people for offenses that occur
18	by virtue of them engaging in their office.
19	So if there is this kind of blanket
20	coverage of judges, if that extends the same to them
21	as it does for officers and it does to prosecutors,
22	the privileges that we give there, then you would
23	have a difficulty at getting it. That kind of

So it requires kind of an assessment of

1	the license that we give to these officers who are at
2	large. And maybe points us to these structural
3	interventions.
4	MR. HARVEY: Yes, I'm sorry, real quick
5	I would just say that along with what Reverend Wilson
6	is alluding to, it's working around issues of
7	qualified immunity and the abstention doctrine that
8	prevents some of these prosecutions from going
9	forward in the federal courts. And it's very
10	important they go forward in the federal courts,
11	rather than state courts, because some many of these
12	relationships make it difficult for people to be
13	neutral.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Actually, Commissioner
15	of the Vice Chair has a question.
16	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: And this is
17	a very quick one. More in the nature of a statement.
18	I want to thank each of you for taking
19	your time to come and be with us. We setup the first
20	panel in a way that we could receive testimony
21	regarding the pervasiveness of illegal enforcement of
22	fines and fees aimed at generating revenue.
23	And we put this Panel together so that we
24	could receive concrete evidence about the effect that
25	this action has on individuals. And I want to say

1	that each of you, through your stories, have done a
2	very good job of that.
3	Ms. Foster, from our first panel, said
4	early on that this is a very complex issue. And I
5	haven't heard anything said here today that would
6	cause me to disagree with that.
7	I want to ask you, Mr. Harvey, because it
8	appears that at least one possible solution, to these
9	problems, is the reduction in the number of these
10	municipal courts. And if I understood you correctly,
11	Mr. Harvey, you said that the Supreme Court of
12	Missouri, after convening a hearing or working on
13	looking at this issue, came back and said that they
14	did not have the authority to reorganize the courts.
15	And you seem to disagree or to have a
16	problem with that. And I wanted you to share with
17	us, whether you take issue with that, and if so, why?
18	Because it seemed that the Supreme Court
19	was saying that this is something that the legislature
20	must deal with. This is dealing with the setup of
21	the courts and they're the ones, constitutionally,
22	that would have that authority.
23	Talk to me, if you will, about that issue.
24	MR. HARVEY: Certainly. I mean in part,
25	I would say even if, legal analysis is legal analysis.

1	So they can come up with their report
2	that, with their conclusion, that they don't have the
3	authority to do it. Meaning there's nothing
4	explicitly written in the constitution that says the
5	Missouri Supreme Court has the right to order the
6	reorganization of the courts. I think, I mean that's
7	true, on its face.
8	There's also nothing that says they don't
9	have the authority to do that. Which is pointed out
10	in the decent by Professor Ken Norwood, of one of the
11	nine people who were on that working group.
12	And she believed that even if the panel,
13	even if they found that the Supreme Court locked a
14	specific provision entitling to do that, they ought
15	to advocate for it. Because it was such a clear need
16	in the community.
17	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Okay, and
18	that's different.
19	MR. HARVEY: Certainly.
20	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: That's
21	absolutely different
22	MR. HARVEY: That's different.
23	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: from what
24	I thought I hear you saying.
25	So in affects, supervising their courts,

1	which is of course within the authority of the Supreme
2	Court, some would argue that within that supervising
3	authority, is the right in the authority to
4	restructure.
5	MR. HARVEY: Yes. I believe that. I
6	believe that that's right. Because following the
7	Department of Justice's report on Ferguson, they
8	ordered appellant Court Judge Roy Richter, to sit.
9	They moved him from the appellant court to Ferguson's
10	municipal court to hear cases.
11	The presiding judge in St. Louis County
12	has the authority to reorganize those courts. She
13	has supervisory, superintending authority over those
14	courts.
15	I believe there are many ways in which
16	either body could assert that authority. And they
17	are just simply reluctant to do so.
18	Part of it is, I mean political pressure
19	is, but I believe that there's the legal mechanism
20	for them to do it through the existing provisions in
21	the Missouri constitution.
22	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Complicated
23	issue. Thank you very much.
24	MR. HARVEY: Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You know, Karen, I'm

1	going to wrap it, we're already over.
2	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: No it's fine. I
3	was going to say, I'll wait till the third panel.
4	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, great. I would
5	ask, on behalf of the Commissioners, if each of you
6	could send to us, submit to us, a list of
7	recommendations, in writing, that you would recommend
8	to us to deal with.
9	I know some of you may have already
10	touched on that in your written remarks, but if you
11	could elaborate that would be appreciated.
12	Thank you all, this was a great Panel.
13	We are now going to take a ten minute break and then
14	convene back for the third panel. Thank you.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
16	went off the record at 12:08 p.m. and resumed at 12:18
17	p.m.)
18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Back on the record. So
19	we are now going to begin with our third panel of the
20	day.
21	I trust you were all here earlier to, how
22	the warning lights work. Green, go, you've got seven
23	minutes. Yellow, two minutes to wrap up. Red, time
24	to stop and we'll begin to ask you questions.
25	I'm going to introduce the panelists and

1	then we are going to swear them in. Our first
2	panelist is Joshua House, attorney at the Institute
3	for Justice.
4	Our second panelist is Janene McCabe,
5	Steering Committee Member for the National
6	Association of Public Defense.
7	Our third panelist is Alexes Harris,
8	Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of
9	Washington.
10	And our fourth panelist is Karen Martin,
11	Assistant Professor of Public Management at John Jay
12	College of Criminal Justice.
13	I'll ask you all to raise your right hand
14	and be sworn, that you swear or affirm that the
15	information that you are about to provide to us is
16	true and accurate to the best of your knowledge and
17	belief, is that correct?
18	(Chorus of yes.)
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, great. Thanks.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Mr. House, you have the
21	floor.
22	MR. HOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for
23	having me to speak today.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You're welcome.
25	MR. HOUSE: My name is Josh House,

1	attorney at the Institute for Justice, and the
2	Institute for Justice is a nationwide civil liberties
3	law firm, for those of you haven't heard of us, and
4	we recently filed a federal class action in the city
5	of Pagedale, Missouri, which is just a few miles down
6	the road from Ferguson.
7	We represent residents challenging the
8	city's unconstitutional ticketing scheme and my goal
9	today will just be to give you kind of a ground-level
10	view of what this challenge looks like and kind of
11	our experience in the Pagedale area.
12	In Pagedale over the past five years
13	municipal ticketing for non-traffic code violations
14	has increased nearly 500 percent.
15	Now that term "non-traffic" is key
16	because Missouri law already caps income that
17	municipalities can receive from traffic tickets, but
18	non-traffic tickets are not capped.
19	Municipalities can keep as much as they
20	want from property code violations or misdemeanors.
21	After investigating we found that Pagedale was
22	ticketing people for completely frivolous violations.
23	The city demanded that residents paint
24	the foundations of their home and their fences a
25	certain color. The city ticketed people for not

having screen doors on the rear doors to their homes.
One resident was even ticketed for not having matching
curtains.
The Pagedale code is so byzantine that
completely normal neighborhood activities are
illegal. It is illegal to have a basketball hoop or
a wading pool or other children's toys in your front
yard.
Pagedale residents can only walk on the
left side of crosswalks. Young people may not have
saggy pants and residents can't have a barbeque in
their front yard unless it's a national holiday and
you can't have more than two people or any alcohol
around that grill.
Now many towns might have archaic codes,
but what sets Pagedale apart is its willingness to
ticket, fine, and even jail residents for these
violations, or at least threaten jail.
What also sets Pagedale apart is its
utter dependence on raising revenue through code
enforcement. Pagedale is a city of only about 3300
people, yet it receives over \$350,000 every year from
code enforcement, nearly 20 percent of its annual
budget.

1	Court lines would extend out the door. One of our
2	clients tells us that Pagedale looks like a ghost
3	town on certain Thursday nights because that's when
4	Pagedale holds municipal court.
5	And once trapped inside the municipal
6	court system the residents are caught with a Catch
7	22, because many of them are ticketed because of the
8	condition of their homes but are unable to afford to
9	make the fixes demanded by the city because they are
10	too busy paying off tickets or, more likely, paying
11	off the fees stacked upon other court fees that are
12	attached to these tickets.
13	Our clients experiences are pretty
14	typical, and I'm going to kind of detail some of them
15	for you today. Our first two clients are a couple,
16	Valerie and Vincent, and they have accumulated over
17	\$2500 in fines.
18	Vincent has also spent time in Pagedale
19	Jail as a result of the fines, fees, as well as
20	failure to appear. Vincent lost his job from missing
21	work due to municipal court dates.
22	He and Valerie both work evenings.
23	Valerie works all evening, or all night, at a
24	children's hospital, and Vincent worked evenings at
25	a plastic manufacturing plants.

1	But because of having to make that
2	constant choice between work and attending court he,
3	eventually after choosing court too many times, lost
4	his job, and after losing the job making payments is
5	pretty difficult.
6	He and Valerie took out payday loans with
7	an interest rate of about 100 percent in order to pay
8	some of these fines, but Valerie, touchingly, refer
9	to these loans as her Pagedale money.
10	Our third client, Mildred Bryant, is 84
11	years old and received a notice threatening legal
12	action if she didn't make a mess of modifications to
13	her home, including repainting the entire thing.
14	Some of the demands were absolutely
15	ridiculous. They wanted her to seal small, very
16	small cracks in the front cement walk leading up to
17	her house, and they also demanded that she have
18	"matching curtains or blinds."
19	Now our lawsuit against the city alleges
20	three main claims, and I'm going to just quickly
21	breeze through these, but I am happy to take any
22	questions on them.
23	First is basically what we call a TUMI
24	award claim based on two Supreme Court cases, and
25	that's that Pagedale is financially dependent on this

1	municipal fines and that makes the entire municipal
2	ticketing scheme unconstitutional.
3	The Supreme Court has said over and over
4	again that courts may not have a financial interest
5	in convicting those who come before them.
6	Second, Pagedale's ticketing for
7	frivolous violations violates the 8th Amendment. We
8	have heard a lot this morning about excessive fines
9	and no fine, especially one of about \$500, is
10	proportional to the crime of having non-matching
11	curtains.
12	And, third, Pagedale simply can't
13	regulate these harmless activities and conditions.
14	We don't believe that it's within the legitimate
15	police powers of the State to regulate aesthetic non-
16	safety-related features of one's home.
17	Unfortunately, Pagedale is not a road
18	municipality on the margins. We heard about the DOJ
19	letter going out to courts across the country asking
20	for reform.
21	The Missouri legislature is aware of not
22	just Pagedale but other Missouri municipal courts and
23	has begun clamping down on raising revenue.
24	There is a bill making its way through
25	the Missouri House right now that would cap non-

1	traffic tickets, it would cap all tickets, the revenue
2	at least that is received from these tickets.
3	This bill, although it's stalling
4	slightly in the House, has support from both Civil
5	Rights leaders as well as local police.
6	Civil Rights leaders want to avoid the
7	repeated, unnecessary, and dangerous confrontations
8	between residents and police and local police want to
9	be able to concentrate on their jobs and not act
10	basically, as we heard this morning, as tax
11	collectors.
12	Municipal ticketing abuse is not just a
13	problem in Missouri. In Mountain View, Colorado, a
14	town of about 500 residents, 43 percent of the town's
15	income comes from municipal fines and fees.
16	Indeed, upon a public records request,
17	the town admitted to us that in the past five years
18	this town of only 500 people has issued tens of
19	thousands of tickets.
20	Many municipalities in St. Louis County
21	and elsewhere have systemically abused their power in
22	order to generate revenue.
23	The question posed by today's panel,
24	which was is it for, is municipal ticketing for
25	justice or for revenue, I think has been clearly

1	answered. It's clearly for revenue, at least in some
2	circumstances.
3	The remaining question is just to what
4	extent this problem exists. Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
6	MS. MCCABE: All right, thank you. My
7	name is Janene McCabe and I am a proud public
8	defender.
9	I am so happy to be here today because
10	too many times public defenders are not invited when
11	it comes to criminal justice reform. We are a voice
12	that is often unheard from, so I appreciate this
13	opportunity to be here today.
14	I also find it more significant so today
15	because it's the 53rd anniversary of Gideon vs.
16	Wainwright, the right to counsel, and as a proud
17	member of the National Association of Public Defense,
18	the steering committee, a volunteer organization of
19	public defenders across the country, we are very happy
20	that this Commission is addressing this issue because
21	quite frankly we first became involved when Thomas
22	Harvey reached out to us an organization and said car
23	you help.
24	We are trying They were in the midst
25	of trying to get some changes in the Missouri Supreme

1	Court. They asked us to write a letter in support,
2	and we did, and then following that we also wrote
3	some op eds and we started to reach out to our members
4	to talk about this issue and what we found is the
5	striking prevalence across the country.
6	It is everywhere and we have known it for
7	years and we have brought it to the attention of the
8	courts for years and, frankly, maybe it is because we
9	are public defenders, because we are bleeding hearts
10	so many times for each and every client that we
11	represent, that too many times courts stopped
12	listening.
13	They stopped hearing the stories of pain
14	and heartache and what they were actually doing to
15	our clients and because they stopped listening we
16	felt like no matter what we did it wasn't going to
17	have an impact.
18	So we are grateful that this now such an
19	issue that it has reached a level of scrutiny so that
20	we can go back to the courts and say this is a national
21	issue, this isn't just about this person that's
22	standing here right in front of you, but they are
23	person who is going to be most affected, but it's
24	happening everywhere.

As public defenders we are in a unique

position to see the effects on each client that we represent, but I will tell you too many times we are not there.

And the reason that we are not there is there is no national mandate to require public defenders to be present in municipal courts and too happens is the courts and many times what prosecutors use the case law, and they use Alabama Shelton which specifically states that if the court or the prosecution is not seeking sentence you don't have the right to a public defender. It doesn't exist.

reason it doesn't And the exist is because it's not taking away your liberty, it's only the possibility of the imposition of a fine, and so too many times clients will come in front of a municipal court and they will say can I have a lawyer, and I have provided transcripts in my materials that I provided of some exchanges between a court and a client who said to the judge can I get a lawyer and the judge specifically says you are not entitled to a lawyer because we are not seeking jail.

And then what happens? They say here is your fine and the client can't pay the fine and then they are arrested because they didn't pay the fine,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	and when they are arrested now the court has the
2	ability to put them in jail.
3	Well, why? Because it's no longer a
4	criminal offense, and when it's not a criminal offense
5	it's a quasi-civil offense because it's contempt of
6	court, and when it is a contempt of court issue then
7	you do not have the right to a lawyer.
8	So you are denied a lawyer when you are
9	entering the plea and then you are not eligible for
10	a lawyer when the court has you back in front of them
11	again and says you didn't pay.
12	This is something that happens across the
13	country and day in and day out we have judges who are
14	specifically humiliating our clients, saying things
15	to them like that's a nice pair of earrings, did you
16	try and pawn them, and if you didn't that demonstrates
17	an ability to pay.
18	Saying to other clients that's a nice
19	pair of Nike shoes, they look new, hand them over.
20	And that has actually happened, where clients have
21	been forced to remove their shoes to give it to the
22	court.
23	It is intentionally humiliating and
24	brutalizing our clients and this is done in a court
25	of law by a judge.

1	This is what we are up against and this
2	is what we are facing and I echo the frustration of
3	Thomas Harvey when he says we keep talking about this
4	and no one listens, or more importantly, people keep
5	passing the buck and say I can't do anything about
6	that, that is not my responsibility.
7	I think that Thomas Harvey is right when
8	he says that it is important that we establish some
9	sort of safeguard on judges to say if you violate a
10	person's rights there will be repercussions.
11	And as a public defender I never advocate
12	bringing charges against people because, quite
13	frankly, that's not in the line of work that I do.
14	But there are times where, you know, my clients time
15	and again are faced with challenges because they are
16	told well, ignorance of the law is no excuse.
17	Well the same is true with a judge,
18	ignorance is not excuse and you cannot intentionally
19	deprive people of their constitutional rights when
20	you are supposed to be the very person enforcing them.
21	So as public defenders what do we want
22	and what do we think this Commission can do? Well
23	number one we think that first of all there should be
24	a mandate that public defenders should be required at
25	the first appearance in all municipal court cases all

1 the time.

Why at the first appearance? Because at the very first appearance sometimes these clients are in jail and the court will say well, I'm not sure yet whether we're going to seek jail sentence or not so you may not be entitled to representation, but that person is in custody, and if that person is in custody they should be entitled to a lawyer.

Also, lawyers have the ability to tell the client about how they can demonstrate an inability to pay, because the onus is on the defendant to tell the court I can't pay.

And too many times our clients don't understand how that works, what they should actually demonstrate to the court, what kind of proof should they give, where a lawyer can help them, walk through what a financial plan looks like and tell them this is how you demonstrate to the court what your inability to pay looks like and the courts need to have a specific determination of what does it mean to have an inability to pay.

Under Bearden the Supreme Court said look, you cannot jail people simply because they don't have an inability to pay, but they never defined what that meant, and so day in and day out courts make it

1	up as they go as to what it actually means on a case-
2	by-case basis.
3	We need a definition so that we car
4	actually say this client has met that definition and,
5	therefore, they cannot pay and they should not be
6	jailed. Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you, Ms. McCabe.
8	Professor Harris.
9	MS. HARRIS: Hi. Thank you for the
10	opportunity to be here. I am a very literal person
11	so I chose to use my seven minutes to directly answer
12	some of the questions and subset of the questions
13	that were posed in the letter.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
15	MS. HARRIS: So will you please advance
16	then?
17	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Sure.
18	MS. HARRIS: And I am smiling because a
19	lot of what I am saying will piggyback very nicely
20	with what Ms. McCabe just spoke about.
21	Very briefly Could you advance,
22	please? Thank you. In terms of the set of what
23	we've been talking about in terms of monetary
24	sanctions, we have been talking about all of these
25	different things, the fines, the user fees, the

1	surcharges.
2	Collection costs and interests are one
3	thing that we haven't been talking about. Washington
4	State imposes a 12 percent interest on the day that
5	the amount of money is sentenced, even if someone is
6	going to be incarcerated.
7	We also impose \$100 annual collection
8	surcharge fee per open account, and then there is
9	restitution. The fine is the only piece of monetary
10	sanction that is imposed to be a punishment, the rest
11	are for except for restitution are for user
12	fees or some things related to the court and sometimes
13	not related to the court.
14	Arizona has an 83 percent surcharge. Ten
15	percent of that surcharge goes to a Clean Elections
16	Fund. So if you want to run for elections in Arizona
17	you can tap into that fund.
18	Ironically, if someone has a felony
19	conviction they pay for that money and they can't
20	vote for you. So there are hosts of, as everyone has
21	been saying, a host of these different types of fees
22	attached onto the initial fines for a conviction.
23	For example Could you advance? There
24	are several Oops, I took the one out that I wanted.
25	There are several layers of legal debt that we also

1	talked about.
2	Today we have talked mostly about
3	misdemeanor, and I get that that's the focus, but
4	there are also the This is an example of the
5	misdemeanor cases that we've been talking about.
6	Actually a \$40 traffic fine turns into a
7	\$240 bill in California with all of the different
8	types of assessments and the fees that are added on
9	top of that, a night court fee, a DNA identification
10	fee, this is for a traffic fine.
11	And this is an example or an illustration
12	of what's happening nationally with different types
13	of penalties. Go to the next one. And there are
14	layers of this debt.
15	So we are focusing today on the
16	misdemeanor debt. There are juvenile monetary
17	sanctions that in some jurisdictions, Washington
18	State, we have mandatory juvenile fees upon
19	conviction and many times if the juvenile can't pay
20	the parents are assessed as having to pay those fees
21	and fines as well.
22	Felony monetary sanctions was, the bulk
23	of my research is at the felony level, and then there
24	are federal monetary sanctions that Professor Martin
25	will talk about. So there are several layers of this

1	debt that are important for us to notice.
2	One question that you asked is if debtors
3	prisons is unconstitutional why does it happen in
4	some jurisdictions? Don't we have protections
5	against incarcerating?
6	And I'd like to just sort of explain how
7	this happens. Someone is assessed a fine or a fee,
8	they do not make a payment, they are issued a court
9	summons via mail, and many times people are homeless
10	or don't have a regular housing address and don't
11	receive those court summons.
12	Many time they are afraid that they are
13	going to be incarcerated so they don't have a
14	response. Warrants are then issued and then when
15	they make contact either if they are riding a bicycle
16	or they are walking the street they are picked up on
17	those warrants.
18	They go to the plea hearing, or the first
19	appearance hearing, and are assessed as willfully not
20	paying and are incarcerated. So that's sort of the
21	path.
22	Legally debtors can be held in contempt
23	of court. Williams vs. Illinois established this.
24	Incarceration is permitted if a person can be labeled
25	as a willful non-payer and then Bearden vs. Georgia

1	established the precedent for willfulness.
2	But as Ms. McCabe pointed out there are
3	two sort of major points, problems, the first is at
4	sentencing, that there is really a lack of assessment
5	of the current ability to pay for individuals.
6	Most courts, I studied five counties in
7	Washington State, I did observations and interviews
8	and looked at statistical data as well, and many
9	courts don't determine whether or not, they don't do
10	an individualized assessment of each person's ability
11	to pay before the court.
12	They just have this normal culture of say
13	I'm going to give you the mandatory minimum of \$600
14	or \$1200. We do \$450 for the court-appointed
15	attorney, we do \$200 for court costs, we do, you know,
16	\$100 for collections.
17	They just have their normal amount that
18	they impose someone without doing an individualized
19	assessment.
20	Many times judges also, in our State
21	statute we have current or future ability to pay, so
22	many times judges will assess future ability to pay,
23	and I say that in interviews I have had judges tell
24	me I don't know if this guy's going to win the
25	lottery, or I don't know if they're going to get a

1	settlement.
2	So even if they are homeless and sleeping
3	in their care or they are mentally ill they assess
4	based on future ability to pay the normal amount of
5	fines and fees that are available to assess those
6	individuals.
7	And there is a real lack of judicial
8	understanding of what indigence means, right, as Ms.
9	McCabe said, and this often happens in the assessment
10	of willfulness, if someone has tattoos, for example,
11	I've seen judges ask people how much did your tattoo
12	cost, that's money that could have been used.
13	They ask women about their manicures, how
14	much did you spend on your manicure. They ask people
15	about how much, many packs of cigarettes is a common
16	way to assess how much money they are wasting each
17	month that could be used towards their legal financial
18	obligations.
19	So in terms of the determination of
20	willful some jurisdictions are not holding hearings
21	at all, so people go directly go to jail if they are
22	found in violation of non-payment.
23	Many people do not have attorneys present
24	in these hearings and there is an assessment of
25	available income for payments, includes examination

1	of conspicuous spending.
2	So whatever judges can assess that a
3	defendant has been spending their money on they judge
4	should be spent on their LFOs. So the practices
5	leading to incarceration vary across jurisdictions
6	that I studied in Washington State, although we have
7	seen examples of these nationally.
8	In Washington we had a practice called
9	Auto Jail where people would be picked up on non-
10	payment-related warrants, they would go to jail and
11	await a hearing.
12	What would happen is that the clerks who
13	in Washington are in charge of collecting the money
14	they would go to the courthouse and visit the person
15	without an attorney and ask them to sign an affidavit
16	agreeing to or stipulating that they would pay \$50 a
17	month on their legal financial obligation.
18	Even if they knew they couldn't pay it
19	they'd sign it. And I asked the public defender why
20	the heck would they sign this knowing that they would
21	have to automatically report to jail if they failed
22	to make a payment and she said that the clerks would
23	say well we're going to argue for a 60-day sanction
24	in jail.

So people want to get out of jail, they

1	would sign these affidavits and then they'd have these
2	Auto Jail practices where they automatically are
3	supposed to report to jail.
4	There was a Washington vs. Masor
5	established that it was unconstitutional only because
6	it did not hold a hearing prior to incarceration.
7	There is pay or stay practices that
8	judges will pick up people and you'll see them or
9	their first appearance, they'll say do you have \$300?
10	You pay it now or someone come down and pay it. What
11	do you have in your wallet? Or you're going to stay
12	in jail for 60 days.
13	Pay and sit practices are wher
14	jurisdictions are tired of people not making payments
15	and they'll give them a daily credit toward their
16	debt, so you'll sit in jail If I owe \$1000 I'll
17	get \$50 a day for sitting out my fines and fees.
18	It's ineffective in that the State or the
19	county is not receiving money and I am missing
20	employment and time with my kids. There are a lot
21	of different types of practices.
22	In terms of the next set questions were
23	about data availability and there is not a lot. One
24	question you asked are what data are being collected
25	to monitor whether communities of color are

1	disproportionately incarcerated because of their
2	inability to pay court fines and fees.
3	It's really, really hard to find data at
4	the State level or nationally that allows us to answer
5	this question. We do know in a study I published in
6	2011 that individuals in Washington State at least
7	who had prior convictions, holding all convictions
8	statistically, controlling all prior convictions and
9	legal histories, Latinos were sentenced higher fines
10	and fees.
11	So being Latino, regardless of the types
12	of charges you had or the prior convictions, you
13	received higher fines and fees in Washington State.
14	Also, we know the racial and ethnic and
15	class disparities context nationally. We have over
16	2.25 million people living behind bars, we have over
17	7 million people on supervision, and we have this
18	occurring with a great amount of racial and ethnic
19	disproportionality.
20	One out of 87 white men is incarcerated,
21	one out of 36 Latino men is incarcerated, and one out
22	every 12 black men are incarcerated. Becky Pettit
23	and Bruce Western calculated a lifetime risk to
24	incarceration, so if you were born in this cohort,
25	1975 to 1979, and you are black man who dropped out

1	you had a 68 percent chance of going to prison.
2	So if you know anyone born between 1975
3	and 1979 and they are a black man who dropped out, 68
4	percent chance that they are going to be incarcerated,
5	28 percent chance for white men, 20 percent chance
6	for Latinos.
7	It's a huge amount of disproportionality.
8	So given this context it's not hard to make that leap
9	to say that there is racial and ethnic
10	disproportionality in the ways, not just the ways
11	that the fines and fees are assessed, but in the ways
12	that they are experienced disproportionately by
13	communities of color.
14	And then we also have class
15	disproportionality. Between 30 to 36 percent of
16	people were unemployed prior to their arrest, these
17	are old data, we don't have new data on this, but of
18	those working 23 percent reported monthly earnings
19	of \$600 and 50 percent reported \$1200 or less.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor, I'm going
21	to have to
22	MS. HARRIS: Oh, okay.
23	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: get a wrap-up, just
24	a little
25	MS. HARRIS: Okay, wrap-up. And, you

1	know, I can save the rest. You can kind of scroll
2	through. The rest are actually questions that we
3	just don't know.
4	There's questions, we don't know how much
5	is spent on monitoring and collecting, we don't know
6	how much is recouped. If you want to talk about some
7	recoupment in Washington we can do that next. We
8	also don't understand how the money is being
9	allocated. So I look forward to answering questions.
10	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We'll definitely ask
11	you some questions.
12	MS. HARRIS: All right, thank you. Thank
13	you.
	700.
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin.
	-
14	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin.
14 15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for
14 15 16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points
14151617	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points that I think will do, I hope will do a good service
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points that I think will do, I hope will do a good service in time trying to summarize everything since I do
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points that I think will do, I hope will do a good service in time trying to summarize everything since I do believe I am last.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points that I think will do, I hope will do a good service in time trying to summarize everything since I do believe I am last. One of my first points is that I think
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points that I think will do, I hope will do a good service in time trying to summarize everything since I do believe I am last. One of my first points is that I think criminal justice debt has become itself a de facto
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Professor Martin. MS. MARTIN: Thank you very much for having me. I am going to focus on three main points that I think will do, I hope will do a good service in time trying to summarize everything since I do believe I am last. One of my first points is that I think criminal justice debt has become itself a de facto form of punishment, so I am actually pausing that we

of criminal justice financial obligations, fines,
fees, surcharges, is actually compelling law
enforcement to behave as debt collectors, and I want
to talk about the systemic pressure on them to do so.
And then, finally, that we need policy
and innovation to essentially stop it. If you just
look at the, we've talked a little bit about
increasing severity and I just have a few statistics.
So in California the fine statistics,
fines for things like red lights and stop signs and
speeding have gone up five fold since 1994 to 2012.
In Nevada the surcharge revenue has
doubled and it's interesting if you look at a graph
the anticipated versus received actually cross, so
it's like in the early 2000s Nevada realized hey,
we're getting money from this and decided they should
start budgeting for that money, so that just indicates
to you how a State can become dependent on these
surcharges.
And in the federal system we are now up
to the point where we assess \$14 billion a year in
monetary penalties. And I won't dwell too long, but
I am thinking of the criminal justice debt coming
from fines, surcharges, and restitution.

And I do want to say that restitution I $\,$

1	think kind of stands out morally, ethically,
2	intuitively, because it's supposed to go to an
3	identifiable victim for a specific bodily or property
4	harm.
5	Nevertheless, it is a part of people's
6	criminal justice debt and so it contributes to the
7	burden, so I don't want to completely exclude it,
8	it's still a factor but it is somewhat different.
9	An example of how complex this world is,
10	in California, in Curran County, California, a base
11	fine immediately becomes 260 percent. So this
12	happens because a penalty assessment is implemented,
13	\$29 for every \$10 in the fine.
14	This is already confusing, right? So if
15	you have a \$100 fine that's ten increments of \$29
16	plus a 20 percent state surcharge. So if you start
17	with a base fine of \$100 it's immediately \$410.
18	And where this penalty assessment goes is
19	also quite complex. So \$10 goes to a State Penalty
20	Fund, \$7 goes to a County Penalty Fund, \$5 goes to a
21	State Court Facilities Penalty, \$5 penalty for DNA
22	fingerprint, unsolved crime, Innocence Protection
23	Act, and a \$2 penalty for a Maddy Medical Emergency
24	Services Fund.

And this is just in one county in one

1	State, and so I just want you to imagine we have
2	thousands of counties, 50 States, so multiply this
3	times a large number.
4	All that being said I think that it is
5	important to keep in mind that there is a basic
6	rationale for using money in punishment. Sally
7	Hillsman outlined this back in 1990 that, you know,
8	it does serve a purpose if you can use a fine to
9	punish, it's definitely punitive.
10	It can be tailored, and we don't
11	necessarily to a good job at that, but it can be. It
12	can be coupled with other things, it can produce
13	revenue.
14	It does have these benefits that are
15	there. We are just not doing a very good job of
16	getting the benefits without also getting a lot of
17	harm.
18	So to talk about criminal justice debt as
19	punishment I think there is a few factors that brought
20	us here.
21	So one is that we have a massive amount
22	of criminal justice debt at the moment, and I'll give
23	you some statistics in just a second, but you have to
24	consider the inability of most to pay and then the
25	harm from the debt and the consequences for failure

1	to pay are chormous.
2	So taking all of that together I am
3	pausing that criminal justice is a form of punishment.
4	To give you an example, so in the federal system right
5	now there is more than \$100 billion in outstanding
6	criminal debt.
7	The federal government collects less than
8	\$4 billion a year and as I already mentioned we are
9	still implementing \$14 billion each year in new
10	monetary penalties.
11	In just one federal district in New York
12	there is \$300 million outstanding for criminal debt,
13	criminal justice debt. A study of 11 States found
14	an average of about \$200 million in outstanding debt
15	and a recent study by a group of advocacy groups found
16	that the average debt for just correlated fines and
17	fees is about \$13,000.
18	So they went to various States, asked
19	people what their experience was and found an average
20	of \$13,000 in just court fees. Across the country
21	this is happening.
22	So in California there is more than \$10
23	billion in outstanding court-ordered debt. In
24	Florida people convicted of felonies owe more than
25	\$700 million.

1	In Arizona it's \$830 million. In Iowa
2	it's \$533 million. In New Jersey there more than
3	half a million cases that are eligible for collection
4	representing \$250 million.
5	So these are huge numbers and so this is
6	why I am saying that the debt itself is a punishment.
7	It is not working in terms of bringing in money, what
8	we are doing is putting people in this position of
9	permanently owing the State money.
10	And the disproportionate harm has been
11	talked about. Briefly, imprisonment, if you are on
12	probation it can be extended or revoked. If you get
13	arrest warrants you can also be subject to liens,
14	wage garnishing, tax rebate interception.
15	Because a lot of these debts become a
16	civil judgment, it's then public information, which
17	then is available to credit agencies, which then can
18	affect your ability to get housing, transportation,
19	credit cards, loans, leases, et cetera, and, of
20	course, there is the issue of driver's license
21	suspension.
22	The question of how and whether law
23	enforcement are becoming debt collectors I think is
24	very important and in the larger context I want to
25	say is that the GAO had a recent report saying that

1	State and Local Governments are currently operating
2	a negative balance that is equal to 2 percent of the
3	GDP, and that this trend is expected to persist for
4	the next 50 years, the gap between revenue and income.
5	And so given that context, of course,
6	public institutions are going to be in the position
7	of being both the originator and the recipient of
8	fines, fees, and surcharges.
9	This means the police are more likely to
10	pursue warrants for non-payment, to pursue fineable
11	infractions, and at stake is community policing
12	relationships, just generally complaining the
13	purposes of punishment, sorry, the purposes of
14	policing.
15	And I just want to tell, I'll give a brief
16	example, which is in Texas there is something called
17	a warrant redemption program.
18	House Bill 121 in 2015 allows credit card
19	readers to be put directly into patrol cars and at
20	the same time the government partnered with a company
21	called Vigilant Solutions, which is an automatic
22	license plate reading company, and so cruisers can
23	now cruise around and scan license plates
24	automatically.
25	If they get a hit, meaning somebody who

1	owes money, they can stop that person. The company
2	gives the license plate readers to the city for free
3	and the company collects a 25 percent surcharge on
4	anything the collect.
5	It is defended by saying that people have
6	a choice, so they can either pay on the spot, you
7	know, a fine, \$500 plus the \$125 fee, they can pay
8	that on the spot with their credit card, or they can
9	be arrested, go to jail, daily impound fees, any lost
10	wages, and still have to pay the fine.
11	This is the "choice" that we are giving
12	people. Of course, this is a model based on debt.
13	There is zero incentive to reduce the number of
14	warrants and so this is the situation we are in.
15	Just a few quotes from people that I am
16	interviewing who have criminal justice debt. One
17	person, I mentioned this is my testimony, said stop
18	charging me for the sheets I am laying on, that I
19	laid on five years ago, and he meant literally the
20	bed sheets on which he laid in jail five years ago,
21	he is still paying that debt.
22	One person says I feel like I'm being
23	extorted by the system. You know, another person
24	says the criminal justice system is making money off
25	of dirt poor people.

1	And then very quickly I'll conclude by
2	saying for policy, first of all, full stop, no
3	incarceration for unpaid debt period. End of story.
4	I don't think we need to go down the
5	complicated roads of determining ability to pay, just
6	if it is not a custodial offense, if it's not a
7	custodial offense ever period.
8	I do think there is something to be said
9	for proportionality. The European system does take
10	into account ability to pay and it's literally a
11	multiplication times the severity of the offense.
12	There is a way to do that in a revenue-
13	neutral way. I do think it's important to realize
14	we don't need to criminalize everything, we don't
15	need surcharges and fees for everything.
16	But, given that, we are in that
17	situation. We must have proportionality and,
18	finally, amnesty. I think we are It's high time
19	for just say across the board for certain types of
20	offenses, certain types of people, certain places,
21	amnesty, you don't owe any money, let's move on.
22	Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thank you. I'll start
24	with an opening question then I'll ask my colleagues
25	to signal if they want to ask.

1	You know, we talked about St. Louis
2	County having 90 municipalities, probably I think
3	most of them have this issue.
4	In your experience how many
5	municipalities across the country may be involved in
6	this sort of process with their citizenry? Is it
7	half of them? Is it a quarter? Do we have any
8	estimate as to how many of our municipalities are
9	engaging in this conduct?
10	MS. HARRIS: It would have to be an
11	educated guess, but I would say probably most of them.
12	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Really?
13	MS. HARRIS: I mean this is how
14	municipalities generate money to function for
15	government.
16	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Right.
17	MS. HARRIS: And so every municipality,
18	every county, has a system in which they can fine
19	individuals, traffic, for instance.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes, but I am talking
21	about the extreme, the excessive situation
22	MS. HARRIS: Extreme, we don't know. We
23	don't know the extent of it.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: where, you know,
25	where folks are being put in debtors prisons and

1	MS. HARRIS: Right.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: as we said earlier
3	we're not going to eliminate fines, nor do we want
4	to, it's the excessive nature of them and the
5	excessive consequences.
6	MS. HARRIS: Right. Right, so the system
7	exists everywhere.
8	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes.
9	MS. HARRIS: The extent to which it's
10	excessive we don't know where Right now the Arnold
11	Foundation funded and means to lead an 8-State study,
12	so where Karen is doing New York, we're in other
13	States trying to study this at the municipal and the
14	county level, so a couple years we'll have some data.
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Understood.
16	MS. HARRIS: But, yes, we don't know the
17	extent right now.
18	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes. I don't know if
19	you were here earlier, any of you, but after the first
20	panel I asked about a situation in Chicago with the
21	red light cameras, I don't know if any of you are
22	familiar with that and if so if you would like to
23	share some thoughts with how that fits in here, if at
24	all.
25	MS MARTIN. I mean I think it certainly

1	dovetails well with law enforcement being seen as,
2	functioning as debt collectors, and not just debt
3	collectors, but revenue producers, and I think that
4	it is, it's disturbing to the extent that it's
5	becoming an automated system so that people aren't
6	actually involved at all.
7	It's just the State, a computer, and a
8	person now is in debt.
9	MR. HOUSE: And to chime in on the kind
10	of number of municipalities, there are certain risk
11	factors that we have identified and we are trying to
12	come up with some way to quantify, you know, how many,
13	or what are the risk factors for where we can tell
14	these things are happening.
15	Home Rule States, so States that accord
16	basically the ability for municipalities to sometimes
17	even conflict with State statute within their
18	municipal codes, that seems to be a risk factor.
19	It gives the municipalities a lot of
20	leeway and it also, you know, if there is no cap or
21	if they can keep it, all the money goes directly to
22	the municipality instead of going straight to the
23	State Government, that also seems to be a risk factor.
24	Again, we don't know for sure, but this
25	is data that we are actually crunching at the moment.

1	And, also, I just want everybody to be aware that
2	it's not sometimes simple revenue. In our own
3	research we have seen that sometimes there are other
4	kind of motivations here.
5	Sometimes they are using the police to
6	push people off their property for other reasons,
7	whether they want, they don't think that person's
8	property, you know, looks nice enough, they want to
9	take the house for development or something, and this
10	is something we have seen in our eminent domain work,
11	which we also do at the Institute for Justice.
12	So just be aware there are other
13	incentives, not just pure money straight into the
14	treasury that I think may play into a part.
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, thank you.
16	Commissioner Kladney, followed by Commissioner
17	Achtenberg.
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, Mr.
19	Chair.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: And then the Vice
21	Chair, yes.
22	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, Mr.
23	Chairman.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You're welcome.
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'd like probably

1	Ms. McCabe or anybody else who wants to respond, we
2	have talked about fines, fees, things like that all
3	day today.
4	We really haven't talked about the
5	driver's license suspension and I would like you to
6	discuss how that works and what recommendations you
7	would have in place of that or to lessen that blow to
8	the defendant.
9	MS. MCCABE: That's a great question.
10	The fact of driver's license suspensions, in fact in
11	Colorado for a period of time if you were convicted
12	of a drug offense one of the collateral consequences
13	was you would lose your license.
14	And that didn't really help the
15	individual who needed to make probation appointments
16	or needed to make it to drug treatment, that they no
17	longer had transportation to get there.
18	And in my State in Colorado, you know, we
19	are a very We have small dense, I'm sorry, we have
20	large dense cities, but we don't have great public
21	transportation, and so to get around our State most
22	people have cars.
23	And so as you take away someone's license
24	you have taken away their livelihood, because a
25	reality is if you try and take public transportation

1	in my State, in Colorado, and you are in the exact
2	same county where you have court and you live in
3	Aurora and court is in Adams County, Brighton,
4	Colorado, it's the same county, it may take you four
5	hours on the bus to get to court, and I'm not kidding.
6	You can Google that because judges get
7	upset with clients who show up to court late and then
8	the client will say I had to catch the bus at 4:00
9	a.m. this morning to try and make it to court at 8:30.
10	I mean
11	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And this also
12	applies to misdemeanors as well, is that correct?
13	MS. MCCABE: That's correct.
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I mean I think we
15	are focusing on misdemeanors, so I just
16	MS. MCCABE: That's correct, yes.
17	Misdemeanors, it can apply to so many things as many
18	States have collateral consequences and one of those
19	is losing your license.
20	Sometimes it's also just the driving
21	offense, multiple points, you know, that would be a
22	separate reason for losing your license, but the
23	collateral reasons for losing a license not related
24	to the crime that you committed, that is usually the
25	biggest problem for most of our clients in being able

1	to pay their debt, do probation, be productive members
2	of the community.
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: So would you say
4	that it should not be revoked at all or should it be
5	revoked in terms of to and from work or that kind of
6	thing or should there be no penalty at all in that
7	regard if it's unrelated to the offense?
8	MS. MCCABE: If it's unrelated to the
9	offense losing your license should never be a
10	collateral consequence.
11	If it's a driving offense then certainly
12	losing your license might be a consequence of the
13	conduct that you have done, but as a collateral
14	consequence it makes no sense.
15	And the reality is if you get a DUI, I
16	mean that is a driving offense, right, and that is
17	something that we are all very concerned about because
18	that can affect our loved ones throughout the State,
19	right, somebody being injured by a drunk driver.
20	But even if you get a DUI many times if
21	you have the money you can go to an administrative
22	judge, you can apply for a red license, right, a
23	temporary license that you can drive to and from work.
24	You can put a "blow and go," is what some people call
25	it, in your car so that you have to blow to prove

1	that you are sober so that you can drive.
2	I mean if you have the means you can do
3	all of that, but if you don't have the means you are
4	explicitly limited because of your financial
5	situation.
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Ms. Harris, yes,
7	go ahead.
8	MS. HARRIS: Well I just wanted to add
9	that one of the reasons for one of the I can't, it
10	looks red to me The reasons the vast majority of
11	people who are incarcerated in municipal jails are
12	there for a DW LS3, driving with a license suspended
13	in the third degree, and those originate from an
14	unpaid traffic ticket.
15	It could be moving or it could just be a,
16	you know, you didn't pay for the spot that you are
17	in, and what happens is if someone doesn't pay they
18	receive a summons, they don't show up, and their
19	license is suspended, right.
20	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right, FTA.
21	MS. HARRIS: Right. And then they are
22	incarcerated for essentially an inability to pay the
23	traffic ticket.
24	MS. MARTIN: Can I just
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I

25

1	MS. MARTIN: One thing on the driver's
2	license suspension. There is a
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I only have so
4	much time.
5	(Simultaneous speaking.)
6	MS. MARTIN: I'll be brief. There is a
7	report called "Not Just the Ferguson Problem" that a
8	group of lawyers in California did and they
9	essentially show that about one-sixth of drivers
10	licenses are suspended in California, a huge State
11	where everybody drives.
12	So I think I should If you don't have
13	it I'll be happy to send it.
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you. Ms.
15	Harris, I was going to ask you, you obviously have
16	studied municipal courts
17	MS. HARRIS: Superior.
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Superior Courts,
19	oh, that's
20	MS. HARRIS: Right.
21	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Okay.
22	MS. HARRIS: We're in municipal now.
23	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: But where do you
24	get your, or whoever does study municipal courts on
25	this panel, where do you get your facts and figures

1	and what facts and figures do you research, do you
2	ask the municipalities for, the courts for, the
3	municipal court and I would assume the Supreme Court
4	or whoever the court runs the whole show?
5	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: State usually, yes.
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Which specific
7	facts and figures do you look at?
8	MS. HARRIS: So the data that I have for
9	Washington State
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes, the data.
11	MS. HARRIS: or for the Administrative
12	Office of the Courts, every State has this AOC that
13	manages the data
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right.
15	MS. HARRIS: although we have found,
16	at least with our eight States that it's very hard to
17	access State-level data, that in some of our
18	jurisdictions we're going to have to go in and request
19	the data at the city level or the county level and
20	aggregate it out to the State as possible data.
21	So in Washington we are lucky, we can get
22	the data, you know, right now we are sitting on 20
23	years of data, conviction and all types of fines and
24	fees assessed.

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Can you --

1	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Last question,
2	Commissioner.
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Well this is the
4	last question.
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Perfect timing.
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Can you provide
7	us with say a list of say your top five reports on
8	different jurisdictions that you know about dealing
9	with municipal courts? Can anybody do that?
10	MS. HARRIS: Do you know?
11	MS. MARTIN: No, it's in progress.
12	MS. HARRIS: Right.
13	MS. MARTIN: It's literally the research
14	that is being done right now.
15	MS. HARRIS: Right.
16	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Okay.
17	MS. MARTIN: So nobody has That report
18	is what we are trying to do and nobody has it as far
19	as we know.
20	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And how long do
21	you think it will be before you and this is not a
22	question.
23	MS. HARRIS: We'll have the
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Sounds like one.
25	MS. HARRIS: Yes, we'll have the first

1	report that we'll issue this Summer to the Arnold
2	Foundation and it's going to be a White Paper on just
3	policies and practices of comparing statutes, case
4	law, within the eight jurisdictions this Summer.
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And you can
6	provide that to us because this report will not be
7	done by then? Are we
8	MS. HARRIS: Oh, you're Oh, okay,
9	sure, sure. And then my book it looks at the county
10	levels and that will have data in that and that will
11	be available by June.
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: By June?
13	MS. HARRIS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Does it have a
15	title?
16	MS. HARRIS: "Pound of Flesh: Monetary
17	Sanctions as a Permanent Punishment for the Poor.
18	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you very
19	much.
20	MS. HARRIS: You can get it on Amazon.
21	(Laughter.)
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)
23	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Do you have a
24	website?
25	MS. HARRIS: I do, I do. You can pre-

1	order it right now.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner
3	Achtenberg.
4	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Mr. Chairman,
5	my question is in two parts.
6	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: That's fine, go ahead.
7	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: And I'm going
8	to limit it to that.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
10	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Ms. Martin,
11	you, the first question is you advocated amnesty in
12	certain circumstances, could you restate that and
13	also speculate how, what other forms of revenue might
14	substitute for the forms that would be foregone in
15	the event that a jurisdiction were to institute
16	amnesty?
17	MS. MARTIN: So I'll take the second part
18	first, which is I think it's very important to realize
19	that we do not have precise data about how much it
20	costs, our current system costs, but every indication
21	is that it is quite costly.
22	So, for example, in New York it costs
23	more than \$400 a day to put somebody in jail, so if
24	you put them in jail for a \$50, \$100, even \$400, if
25	they are in jail for days that math quickly does not

1	add up.
2	And so I think it is, it's very tempting
3	to want to have an immediate short-term view that if
4	we fine somebody we will get money, but every
5	indication is that you are not getting money, as is
6	pointed to by all the statistics about the outstanding
7	debt.
8	If you do get money it is costing you a
9	lot to get that money and then you need to take into
10	account the cost of all the collateral damage of
11	having collected that money.
12	So all of that being said, amnesty, we
13	have used amnesty for things like jail fees, Governor
14	Brown is doing it in California right now for traffic,
15	so we have used amnesty for a variety of different
16	types of debt in society and I think that what I like
17	about amnesty is that it can be infinitely kind of
18	scaled and tailored to a specific situation and
19	jurisdiction.
20	So, you know, a city can decide we are
21	going to have amnesty for this type of traffic
22	violation for two months and what it does is it clears
23	the backlog, it lets people come in, it, you know, it

You can even have amnesty that people

gets people drivers licenses back.

24

1	will pay, you know, 10 percent of the fine as opposed
2	to the entire fine, so just a way to get people back
3	into the system and clear their record so that they
4	can be a functioning and legal member of society.
5	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: And it can, in
6	and of itself it can actually address the resource
7	gap that these jurisdictions are
8	MS. MARTIN: Exactly, right.
9	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: trying to
10	address in the first place
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	MS. MARTIN: Right, so if you give people
13	incentive and opportunity to actually come and pay
14	something then you at least have that. If nothing
15	else you are stopping, you are ending the costs that
16	you are using to pursue the debt endlessly.
17	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Very good.
18	Thank you very much. And the second question is we
19	heard in the first panel from a Mr. Vikrant Reddy who
20	represented the Charles Koch Institute and the thing
21	that was at least remarkable to me about his testimony
22	was how much in agreement on some of these top-level
23	issues the right and the left seem to be.
24	And there is And I am not trying to
25	overstate this as some kind of kumbava situation

1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Yes, exactly,
3	as some kind of kumbaya situation, but I do think
4	that that presents policy advocates with a kind of
5	opportunity and I am wondering if you could talk a
6	little bit about how that opportunity might be
7	pursued.
8	And the reason that I am asking is because
9	the virtue of this Commission is also its vice, which
10	is we have authority over nothing. I mean we have
11	no enforcement authority, we don't legislate, we
12	don't regulate
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Don't tell them that
14	then they're just going to get up and leave.
15	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Yes. We don't
16	legislate, we don't regulate, we don't adjudicate,
17	but we can argue and we can try to persuade to the
18	President and to the Congress that certain policies
19	might be preferable to other policies to the extent
20	that they have a salutary impact on the civil rights
21	of persons in the United States.
22	So I am wondering what kind of
23	opportunity you think that might present this
24	Commission? If anybody has thoughts on the matter
25	I'd appreciate hearing them.

1	MR. HOUSE: Well from our perspective,
2	the Institute for Justice, we are a libertarian law
3	firm, I think we definitely, I mean we have already
4	reached out with many organizations who we would
5	consider are not, they are probably perhaps not on
6	our side with every issue that we litigate.
7	So we have already taken kind of steps on
8	our activism efforts in St. Louis County to work with
9	people, you know, telling people in the local area
10	what's going in.
11	I mean it's amazing, a lot of people are
12	learning about it across the country for the first
13	time, but a lot of people are learning about it even
14	within St. Louis County for the first time, so I think
15	just kind of an awareness issue.
16	And I also think the fact-finding
17	efforts, a lot of these studies we're seeing, you
18	know, I know that we were applying for grants to do
19	research from organizations that don't support us on
20	every issue that we normally litigate in order for us
21	to do research, so I am sure that goes for other
22	people.
23	I mean you have kind of pulled resources
24	for doing the research, for doing some of the data
25	crunching, you have organizations giving that

1	wouldn't normally give to certain organizations, but
2	because we are coming together you can kind of share
3	resources and I think those are two points that
4	definitely benefitted from the kind of coming
5	together on this issue.
6	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Thanks. Ms.
7	McCabe, do you have any
8	MS. MCCABE: I agree with that. As the
9	NAPD has sought different grants in different areas
10	to try and study the issue more because we know, we
11	have a lot of anecdotal information, right, but the
12	actual hard data is frankly a lot harder to come by.
13	But the fact that there are now more
14	entities willing to study it and offering grants so
15	that we can all kind of get involved I think is a
16	great moment for us to all work together.
17	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Yes, Ms.
18	Harris?
19	MS. HARRIS: I think studying the problem
20	You know, obviously, I am a researcher and we want
21	to study the problem and we want grants, but I think
22	it's also an opportunity to broaden the conversation
23	around punishment and what does punishment mean, what
24	are our aims around punishment.

In Washington State we have had so much

1	research, we have been trying, advocates have been
2	pushing and trying to create legislation, but when it
3	comes down to it even when you have people from both
4	sides of the aisle in agreement that change needs to
5	happen the tension is about budget.
6	Last Spring we had Blazina, the
7	Washington State Supreme Court said that sentencing
8	judges must assess individualized ability to pay at
9	sentencing.
10	This was sort of a groundbreaking
11	decision and they said because poor people are being
12	assessed these monies we should not fund our justice
13	system on the backs of poor people.
14	Two months later they went into emergency
15	session, because the State Legislature did not fund
16	their Judicial Information System, JIS, they
17	effectively raised all traffic tickets by \$12.
18	Two months, right, and so they recognized
19	that this is wrong, but that we also need to generate
20	revenue. So I think that we need to have a broader
21	conversation and this is the perfect moment, like
22	what do we want for our systems of justice.
23	Can we think about how do we reduce the
24	cost of the system itself? Can we think about reentry
25	so we reduce recidivism? Can we think about

1	diversion programs? Can we even talk about
2	decriminalization and not bringing these people into
3	the criminal justice system so that we have to find
4	the means to pay for it?
5	COMMISSIONER ACHTENBERG: Yes. Ms.
6	Martin?
7	MS. MARTIN: Yes, I would just add, too,
8	I would advocate strongly for not losing the
9	complexity of this problem as we all talk about it
10	with other people.
11	I think there is kind of, for better or
12	for worse, something in it for everybody. So if you
13	care about political philosophy, if you care about
14	indigence, if you care about racial justice, this
15	issue touches on all of those things if you care about
16	the size of the criminal justice system.
17	So I would just say maintain the
18	complexity at all times.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, thank you.
20	Commissioner I mean Madam Vice Chair followed by
21	Commissioners Heriot and Narasaki.
22	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I'll let
23	Commissioner Heriot go please.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I am really

1	impressed by your unmatched curtain case. You know,
2	it seems like that's like a dead easy question on
3	just basic policy and you don't really want to have
4	rules against unmatched curtains.
5	But I am It's a constitutional case
6	though and that's what makes it really interesting
7	and I don't expect you to really be able to answer
8	this question right now.
9	In fact, if you could I would think you
10	are being too quick, it's actually a hard question.
11	My question is what's the difference for
12	constitutional purposes between a tax and a fine?
13	If this town in Missouri said it's not
14	really a fine, it's not something that's illegal or
15	we prohibit it to have unmatched curtains, we just
16	have like a \$75 tax on curtains that don't look good.
17	You know, what's the doctrine that
18	distinguishes fine from tax? Because usually the
19	answer to a tax question, you know, why did choose to
20	tax this, the answer is going to be because that's
21	where the money is, like Willie Sutton.
22	You know, why do we tax income? Because
23	that's where the money is, and it's not necessarily
24	a good match between the services that person is
25	getting and, you know, anything else.

1	And you can respond hey, a person has
2	like a constitutional right to earn a living. In
3	fact, a lot of what the Institute for Justice does is
4	goes around saying a person has a constitutional right
5	to make a living and yet it's taxed.
6	Again, I don't expect you to answer this
7	question here, so don't look scared. But I am just
8	curious for, you know, your lawyers who I have a
9	lot of respect for the work the Institute for Justice
10	does.
11	What's the framework for analyzing this
12	as a tax and what's the framework for analyzing it as
13	a criminal prohibition? Just something to think
14	about and I guess something that I guess Chief Justice
15	Roberts has thought about when he decided that
16	Obamacare was a tax and that made a difference to
17	him.
18	MR. HOUSE: Yes. So for fear of wading
19	back into that argument, I think the simple
20	distinction is is it levied to generate revenue.
21	That's kind of the legal distinction going back and
22	then, you know, obviously, we saw how that debate
23	hashed out in the courts, but from a
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Because like you
25	are saving that this is to generate revenue and,

1	therefore, if they just rename it a tax it's still
2	there and now it's constitutional.
3	MR. HOUSE: Like many things in the law
4	it really is fuzzy, but I actually think from a
5	practical standpoint there is a huge distinction
6	between levying a sales tax or an income tax on these
7	people and taxing them by citation, taxation by
8	citation.
9	And the distinction is, just as one
10	example, is in a lot of these municipalities the mayor
11	has the kind of pardon power. So do you think the
12	mayor's friends pay these taxes? Do you think they
13	are the ones who are ticketed? No.
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, but that's a
15	whole different issue now.
16	MR. HOUSE: It is, but
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: That's true for any
18	kind of crime, anything, not just mismatched
19	curtains.
20	MR. HOUSE: Absolutely. Absolutely, but
21	I think one of the The reason this is such an
22	important distinction is that, you know, a sales tax
23	is a much, much, much fairer way than tying it to a
24	supposed punishment because it's just, it allows
25	much, much to discretion to the government officials

1	involved to levy, to
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But you don't want
3	to go there, do you, and say that now they can make
4	it a tax on mismatched curtains, you don't want to
5	say that, do you?
6	MR. HOUSE: I mean I don't want to say
7	it. I mean, look, I don't think they should tax
8	curtains I guess specifically. That's not, you know,
9	the curtain lobby is probably, you know, watching
10	here.
11	I don't think that's the issue, right. I
12	mean the issue is that there are other ways that they
13	could be generating money. So this, the tickets,
14	fines, and fees, for example, in Pagedale is the
15	second highest level of income.
16	It's nearly tied with their sales tax,
17	but the sales tax is only about 1 percent.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But it seems like
19	you are talking yourself out of the constitutional
20	question now and you don't want to do that.
21	MR. HOUSE: Like I said, I agree with you
22	the constitutional question would be really, really,
23	it would be really, really difficult to get into, but
24	from a practical standpoint there is a very clear
25	distinction even if the law gets fuzzy at the ground

1	level and how it affects these people's lives.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Narasaki.
3	(Off microphone comment.)
4	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: I think she wants to
5	pass again.
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Okay, that's
7	fine. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So I have two
8	questions, but before I do that given the fact that,
9	Mr. Chair, we know that there is some data that's
10	going to be coming out in the next few months could
11	we keep the record open for longer than the usual
12	whatever, how many days we usually do?
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Where is our general
14	counsel?
15	MS. RUDOLPH: Absolutely. You can vote
16	to extend the 30-day comment period. Yes,
17	Commissioners, you can vote to extend the 30-day
18	public comment period. You just need to do it as a
19	vote.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: All right.
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Perhaps we could
22	put that in the business meeting?
23	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: We could do it now,
24	right?
25	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: However you want

1	to do this, Chair.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Make a motion.
3	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I move that we
4	extend the time period to keep the record open for
5	this hearing for, I don't know what, how much time
6	staff needs.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: To 45 days?
8	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Sixty days.
9	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: How long? Is there a
10	particular 60 days? It's 60 days.
11	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well they were
12	saying their stuff is coming out in June.
13	MS. HARRIS: Well what we're going to
14	have, well it's September, is the White Paper
15	regarding policy. So there will be no like
16	statistical data in that.
17	And then my book is about sort of county
18	level, what's happening. There are statistics in
19	that but it's at the county in Washington State, and
20	that's in June.
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, but
22	presumably if you are actually selling it in June you
23	have the data before June because you have to print
24	it, right?
25	MS. HARRIS: Oh, ves, right. In

1	particular what type of data do you want?
2	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I think one of
3	the things that we have been, staff has been, well
4	that I am interested in is, you know, how much is
5	this actually costing, right.
6	MS. HARRIS: Oh, okay.
7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So this notion
8	of that but also what is the real extent of the
9	problem and how are the systems really working. So
10	I don't really know what your book covers, but maybe
11	we could at least say we could leave it open till the
12	end of, to June.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: To the end of June?
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: To June.
15	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Till June 1?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: And just see.
19	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: So that's your motion,
20	do we have a second?
21	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I'll
22	second, Mr. Chair.
23	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, any discussion?
24	(No audible response.)
25	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: None. All those in
	NEALK (=KU>>

1	favor say aye.
2	(Chorus of aye.)
3	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Any opposed?
4	(No audible response.)
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Any abstentions?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay, motion passes.
8	Now your two questions.
9	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. So my
10	questions are about data because our staff really
11	wants to be able to look at the data.
12	So one of the things we could be making
13	recommendations about is what kind of data should be
14	collected at the municipal level, at the State level,
15	at the federal level.
16	So what would you tell us that we should
17	be saying in terms of that question? What kind of
18	recommendation would we be making?
19	And the second is if, there may not be
20	time because we're already at time, but I know that
21	Ms. Harris didn't get a chance to go through the rest
22	of her testimony in terms of costs and recoupment and
23	I am kind of interested in hearing whatever hasn't
24	already come up through the question and answer.
25	MS HARRIS. I'm just going to I know

1	we're limited on time, but Sorry, I totally
2	There we go. So this is just an example for
3	Washington State on fiscal recoupment so you can have
4	an idea.
5	The total amount collected in 2013 was
6	about \$30 million and it ranged in counties, King
7	County is the largest county in Washington State,
8	\$4.7 million, you can see Clark, Yakima is one of our
9	smaller and poorer counties, and this is just fines,
10	fees, and restitution.
11	The average amount of new debts, the
12	accounts that are created, to open accounts, is just
13	under 19,000, so annually 19,000 new open debt
14	accounts are created on the year.
15	Washington State debtors make an average
16	of \$113 per open account. Remember, per open account
17	is charged \$100 annually for collections, so
18	essentially they are generating \$13 per open account
19	each year.
20	King County had a total amount of
21	outstanding debt just under three-quarters of a
22	billion dollars. In the same year the average amount
23	owed per case was \$4000.
24	So this basically just says that an

average amount paid was \$36.

25

1	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: But this
2	includes restitution, which I consider a slightly
3	different
4	MS. HARRIS: This does include
5	restitution in that.
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So do you have
7	data that you could submit to us
8	MS. HARRIS: That separates out the
9	restitution?
10	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
11	MS. HARRIS: Not on this because the only
12	reason why I was able to get this The big problem,
13	too, is that the Clerk's Association in Washington
14	State does not share these data.
15	So the specific King County data I was
16	able to get was from a councilmember that requested
17	the data from his staff actually.
18	We do now have recently obtained data,
19	the 20-year data that I mentioned, and we are going
20	to go through that and start seeing what's happening
21	and take out restitution, but that, we haven't
22	analyzed that as of yet.
23	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Okay.
24	MS. HARRIS: Yes.
25	MS. MARTIN: Can I just add in looking

1	at State level statistics of what is available it's
2	very low, so what I told you about Florida, people
3	who have been convicted of felonies owe \$709 million.
4	The State collects 4.5 percent of that debt.
5	I know in Vermont it's considered a very
6	high collection rate, and this is for restitution,
7	and it was in the 30 percent range, and so collection
8	rates across the country are quite low with
9	restitution and excluding restitution, so a very high
10	collection rate is 30, 40 percent.
11	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So what
12	recommendation would you say the Commission should be
13	making around that would make your jobs more
14	effective?
15	MS. HARRIS: Right. State court
16	administrators need to allow access to the data so we
17	can disaggregate it in terms of what the fines and
18	fees, breaking out restitution, the principle that
19	was assessed and the amount of interest and collection
20	charges that have accrued.
21	We need it at the individual level and be
22	able to identify the municipality and the county as
23	well.
24	MS. MARTIN: And we need to know what
25	happens to people who don't pay. We need to know how

1	often it's failure to appear, how often it's an
2	inability, not paying, how often probation is revoked
3	and extended, because all of things cost money, and
4	so we need to know that as well.
5	MS. HARRIS: And we're trying to figure
6	out, we'd love to be able to say, I had a funder come
7	to me and they wanted to know what the payoff would
8	be if they invested in some of this research, which
9	I get, but we don't know, right.
10	I mean she wanted to be able to say what
11	percentage of people are sitting in jail right now
12	because of non-payment. And so we've started to do,
13	it was preliminary, but we are scraping the internet
14	of jail rosters to try and figure out reasons for why
15	people are sitting in jail. As far as I know it's
16	legal.
17	It is. That was a joke. But we are
18	looking at the daily rosters and the reasons why
19	people are incarcerated, but they don't say why they
20	are incarcerated.
21	MS. MARTIN: Right.
22	MS. HARRIS: Sometimes it will be for
23	non-payment of child support, but usually it's just
24	for a violation of court order. So we're trying to
25	figure out how we can specifically identify people

1	who are sitting behind bars.
2	There is an estimate in one report for
3	Benton County, Washington, that it's 20 percent of
4	their daily jail roster are people who are there for
5	non-payment-related reasons.
6	MS. MCCABE: I think you want to know
7	specifically the fines that are assessed, what those
8	fines are for, how many fines are actually related to
9	the crime that is being charged and how many are not,
10	how many are there just to support the system itself.
11	I think you want to know how many times
12	a court determines that someone is indigent and
13	assesses no fine, because the reality is there is no
14	statistics on that.
15	We know that we have a population in this
16	country that is poor, we know we have a population
17	that is working poor, and there is no assessment, no
18	data collected about how often judges actually waive
19	fines and fees and determine that this person was
20	unable to pay.
21	In addition, you want to know if there
22	are in fact specific statutes that give monetary
23	incentive requiring courts to collect.
24	Specifically in North Carolina a judge
25	actually has to make a record every time they make a

1	finding and determination of indigency as to why they
2	did, which doesn't really make any sense if really
3	the point is this person can't afford to pay.
4	And then there is also in Texas municipal
5	courts my understanding is that they actually get
6	incentive from the State that if they collect a
7	certain portion of their revenue from fines and fees
8	that they assessed that they will actually get
9	reimbursed some of that money from the State.
10	So there is an actual incentive by the
11	courts to do whatever it takes to collect, and I think
12	you need to know that.
13	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Thanks.
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you so
15	much.
16	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Okay. Madame Vice
17	Chair?
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: No, thank
19	you.
20	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Commissioner Kirsanow
21	you'll have the last question. Commissioner
22	Kirsanow, you're
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Oh, I'm sorry.
24	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Yes, you're up.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. NEAL R. GROSS

1	Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the panelists.
2	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You're welcome.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: As with
4	Commissioner Narasaki I am also interested in data
5	and I am also interested in jurisdiction also.
6	I am persuaded that a lot of these things
7	that are going on are, to put it bluntly, stupid,
8	especially with respect to non-safety violations, and
9	I am not sure why we would see it authority to any
10	jurisdiction to hit us with, you know, the blinds
11	issue and things of that nature.
12	Many of these fines appear to me to be
13	excessive, ridiculous, punitive, but by the same
14	token we have certain jurisdictional issues here and
15	we are charged with trying to determine whether or
16	not they are, for example, denials of equal protection
17	based on race or any other protected class or there
18	is some type of discrimination.
19	There seems to be at least a superficial
20	disparity and it may be a legitimate disparity based
21	on Dr. Harris's data. I think I saw that the
22	incarceration rates, for example, for black males,
23	the probability versus white males, and when I did
24	the quick math it looked like black males are seven
25	times more likely to be incarcerated than white males.

1	But to the extent we have jurisdiction
2	we've got to observe the similarly situated protocols
3	that you see in Hazelwood vs. United States or
4	Washington vs. Davis and it's not really just We
5	have to be comparing apples to apples.
6	In Ferguson, for example, blacks are 17
7	times more likely to commit capital offenses and five
8	times more likely to commit property crimes. So is
9	there really Do we know of any stats that show
10	that we are truly comparing apples to apples in terms
11	of the disparity of these fines being levied on the
12	basis of race?
13	MS. MCCABE: Well I want to speak to that
	MS. MCCABE: Well I want to speak to that on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a
13	
13 14	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a
13 14 15	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of
13 14 15 16	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of their own police department to determine are they
13 14 15 16 17	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of their own police department to determine are they racially profiling, are they using inappropriate race
13 14 15 16 17 18	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of their own police department to determine are they racially profiling, are they using inappropriate race in determinations of ticketing, right, for municipal
13 14 15 16 17 18	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of their own police department to determine are they racially profiling, are they using inappropriate race in determinations of ticketing, right, for municipal offenses.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of their own police department to determine are they racially profiling, are they using inappropriate race in determinations of ticketing, right, for municipal offenses. And what they found is in Boulder,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on You know, Boulder County, Colorado, which is a very liberal jurisdiction, commissioned a study of their own police department to determine are they racially profiling, are they using inappropriate race in determinations of ticketing, right, for municipal offenses. And what they found is in Boulder, Colorado, where black people make up 1 percent of the

And if you looked at Hispanics, Latinos,

25

1	that was a little bit harder for them to make the
2	determination because quite frankly police officers
3	when they write down on a ticket what race a person
4	is they found that with Hispanics or Latinos unless
5	they had a Hispanic or a Latino surname they didn't
6	always check the right box, right, sometimes they
7	checked white as opposed to Hispanic.
8	But even accounting for that Hispanics
9	were more likely to be ticketed for these traffic
10	tickets. Now there is no evidence that black people
11	in Boulder, Colorado, drive at a higher speed, but
12	yet they were ticketed at more than twice what their
13	racial makeup was in the community.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Anybody else
15	know of any studies? For example, New Jersey and
16	Florida both have studies that show that actually
17	blacks do speed at twice the rate of whites and not
18	only just speed, but they speed even faster. I plead
19	guilty. You didn't hear that from me.
20	But are there any studies that can show
21	we are comparing apples to apples here for purposes
22	of the Commission's jurisdiction?
23	MS. HARRIS: Right. It's been firmly
24	established in criminological and sociological
25	literature that African Americans are

1	disproportionately arrested, prosecuted, convicted,
2	and incarcerated compared to their counterparts, and
3	in many jurisdictions Latinos as well, so in that
4	realm.
5	When we are talking about monetary
6	sanctions the only study that I know of that's been
7	published is my study in 2011 in the American
8	Sociological Review that showed that Latinos in
9	Washington State, holding all prior legal
10	characteristics constant, statistically Latinos
11	received higher fines and fees in Washington State.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is that
13	available on Amazon also?
14	MS. HARRIS: JSTOR.org.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is there any
16	possible way you could forward that to me?
17	MS. HARRIS: I can, I can forward that
18	to you. And I wanted to make one more point, so
19	there are the racial disparities, but there is clearly
20	class-based disparities within the system.
21	The system is a two-tiered system of
22	justice that disproportionately treats poor people
23	very different than people with means.
24	It's very clear and that's been
25	established and we don't need any statistical

1	analysis to understand that if you are poor and you
2	encounter the criminal justice system you are going
3	to be treated very differently than someone with
4	means.
5	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: You done?
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN CASTRO: Great. Well, thank
8	you, that brings us to the conclusion of our Briefing.
9	I appreciate your insights and look forward to the
10	additional information that you are going send.
11	I want to thank our Commissioners, our
12	staff, for putting this together, and remind the
13	public, as you know we just voted that we will keep
14	the record of this Briefing open until June 1st.
15	If the public would like to submit or
16	anyone else would like to submit materials they can
17	do so by mailing them to the U.S. Commission on Civil
18	Rights, Office of the General Counsel, 1331
19	Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1150, Washington, DC
20	20425, or via email to municipalfees@usccr.gov.
21	It is now 1:28 and we're going to break
22	for one hour for lunch and be back here at 2:28.
23	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
24	went off the record at 1:28 p.m.)