



**Domestic Extremism and Mass Violence Task Force
Draft Recommendations Public Comment Period
July 15 – August 7, 2026**

Comments are listed by individual/entity submission.

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Marc Lein

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	Violence is violence and there are already laws on the books for violators. Its apparent and blatant this group is ideologically skewed and would be an outright threat to those they ideologically oppose.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	N/A
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Would an overall sense of inclusion and belonging be extended to Christians? Conservatives? 2A Supporters?
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	N/A
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Will these be used to end campus centric Anti-semitism? What about AntiFa and other Black Bloc entities
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	What is to prevent this from targeting those of opposing ideologies?
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	I have zero faith this will be used to target AntiFa extremism
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	OSPI needs it so called leadership gutted and re-placed. Parents need to be recognized by the State as the supreme authority over their children
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	No more funding, the State already spends like a drunken sailor. How much did State Commerce give to anti 2A groups again?!?!?!?
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	I have no faith in your ability to be impartial in even defining mass violence. Where were you when AntiFa came to my hometown of Hazel Dell WA in October 2020 and CCSO and WSP went and hid behind their drone? It wasnt law enforcement that chased them out it was citizens. AntiFa fled to downtown Vancouver and caused property damage to private property, the county jail and the county courthouse because they were allowed to rampage freely by people with political power who have like minded brethren on this very panel.
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	No. Reign the budget in. Stop the nanny state spending.
Additional Comments or Suggestions	Disband this entire Task Force. Its a sad pathetic joke only the citizens of WA are the ones that have to suffer because of it.

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: edwd

Name: wrw

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	N/A
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	N/A
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	N/A
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	N/A
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	N/A
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	N/A
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	N/A
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	N/A
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	N/A
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	N/A
Additional Comments or Suggestions	N/A

Organization: Informed Choice Washington

Name: Lisa Templeton

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	We appreciate the stated goal of addressing violence and protecting communities. At the same time, we encourage careful consideration of whether creating a new statewide program within DOH or the Attorney General’s Office is the most effective and appropriate approach. A program with authority to develop trainings, educational campaigns, grant programs, policy recommendations, and risk-assessment partnerships raises important questions about scope, accountability, and unintended consequences. Terms such as “hate-fueled,” “targeted violence,” and “risk factors” should be narrowly defined so that lawful speech, political disagreement, religious beliefs, criticism of government, or unpopular viewpoints are not inadvertently treated as indicators of dangerousness. Before committing ongoing taxpayer resources, any such program should have clear objectives, measurable outcomes, independent evaluation, transparency, and meaningful oversight. Strong due-process protections, privacy safeguards, and viewpoint-neutral standards are essential to maintaining public trust. Violence prevention should remain focused on actual threats and harmful actions, not on identifying or intervening with individuals based on their beliefs, opinions, or protected speech. The distinction between dangerous conduct and controversial ideas must remain clear in any government program of this kind.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Strong communities and positive relationships can play an important role in youth development. However, we encourage careful consideration of whether creating a new state-funded grant program is the best approach, particularly given Washington’s ongoing fiscal challenges and the need to prioritize existing resources. Programs that support youth connection, mentorship, and leadership are ideally locally driven and responsive to the needs of nearby families and communities. We encourage caution when expanding state involvement in youth development, particularly when programs may extend beyond basic mentorship and skill-building into areas involving values, beliefs, or social frameworks that may not reflect the views of all families. We encourage the Task Force to prioritize approaches that strengthen families, voluntary community partnerships, and opportunities for youth while recognizing parents as essential partners in decisions affecting their children. Any new investment should include accountability for how taxpayer dollars are spent and whether programs are achieving meaningful outcomes for youth and families.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Strong communities are often built through voluntary relationships, local organizations, families, faith communities, and civic groups. However, we encourage careful consideration of whether expanding state grant programs is the best way to foster these connections, particularly as the state faces difficult budget decisions and must carefully evaluate new spending commitments. Government-funded programs intended to promote “social cohesion,” “belonging,” or reduced “polarization” require careful boundaries to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to advance particular viewpoints, social frameworks, or definitions of acceptable participation. Communities are strongest when people with differing beliefs can engage freely and respectfully, not when government attempts to shape attitudes or perspectives. We encourage the Task Force to prioritize approaches that support voluntary community engagement while preserving viewpoint neutrality, freedom of

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	association, and the ability of diverse communities to build connection in ways that reflect their own values and priorities.
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	Critical thinking and online safety skills are valuable, and many existing resources already provide media literacy education through schools, libraries, community colleges, and other community-based organizations. Before creating a new state-developed curriculum, we encourage the Task Force to evaluate whether additional government involvement is necessary and how it would complement, rather than duplicate, existing efforts. We have particular concerns about the inclusion of broad categories such as “misinformation,” “disinformation,” “conspiracy theories,” “propaganda,” and “extreme rhetoric” within a state-sponsored media literacy framework. While helping people identify scams, protect personal information, and evaluate sources can be beneficial, government-created standards for determining what information is “harmful” or unreliable could discourage legitimate inquiry, debate, and disagreement. Any efforts in this area should remain viewpoint neutral and focused on teaching critical thinking skills rather than directing individuals toward preferred conclusions. Washington should be careful not to create a system where skepticism of institutions, disagreement with government policies, or unpopular viewpoints are treated as indicators of risk of violent activity. Given the significant public resources already devoted to education and community programs, any expansion of state involvement should demonstrate a clear public benefit and avoid replacing locally developed approaches with a one-size-fits-all framework.
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Training that helps individuals recognize and respond to credible threats of violence may have value. At the same time, programs in this area must take great care to distinguish between dangerous conduct and constitutionally protected speech, beliefs, and viewpoints. The effectiveness and fairness of such programs will depend heavily on how terms such as “early warning signs,” “violent extremism,” and “pathways to violence” are defined and applied. Broad or subjective standards could lead to lawful beliefs, political disagreement, or unpopular viewpoints being treated as indicators of risk rather than focusing on actual behaviors and credible threats. Expanding these trainings into workplaces raises additional concerns. Employers are already navigating significant regulatory and compliance burdens, and new state-developed training requirements or even just expectations regarding identifying individuals as potential risks could create new liabilities, administrative costs, and workplace tensions. Employers and co-workers should not be placed in the position of evaluating employees’ beliefs or speech under broadly defined standards. We encourage the Task Force to focus on narrowly tailored training related to clear threats, safety concerns, and appropriate responses to actual concerning behavior. Any publicly funded training should prioritize objective criteria, viewpoint neutrality, and voluntary participation wherever possible, while ensuring that limited taxpayer resources are directed toward approaches with demonstrated effectiveness.
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	Public awareness campaigns funded and developed by government agencies require careful consideration, particularly when they address broad concepts such as “specific ideologies,” “movements,” and “trends.” The concern is not with efforts to prevent violence or help people recognize credible threats. The concern is ensuring that government messaging remains focused on behaviors and actions rather than shaping attitudes toward contested ideas, beliefs, or viewpoints. When campaigns address specific ideologies or movements, clear

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	safeguards are needed to ensure that political disagreement, religious beliefs, criticism of government, or unpopular viewpoints are not treated as indicators of risk. A campaign perceived as promoting a preferred worldview rather than providing objective safety information risks creating division rather than addressing the concerns it seeks to address. Before investing public funds in statewide awareness campaigns, the Task Force should consider whether existing community organizations, educational institutions, and private resources already address these needs. Any government-funded messaging should include transparency regarding who develops the materials, what evidence supports the approach, and what safeguards ensure neutrality and respect for constitutional rights.
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	Before recommending that the Legislature “restore funding” for HearMeWA, the Task Force should clarify the basis for that recommendation. Please identify the specific legislative action, budget decision, or funding reduction that resulted in decreased funding, including the amount and timing of any reduction. Without that information, it is difficult to evaluate whether additional funding is addressing an actual resource gap or expanding an existing program. Washington already has numerous avenues for youth support, including crisis hotlines, school counselors, college counseling services, community organizations, and other mental health resources. Before creating additional funding commitments, the Task Force should evaluate how HearMeWA complements existing services and whether additional state investment provides a meaningful benefit beyond resources already available. HearMeWA’s expansion into training and response protocols related to concepts such as “nihilistic violence,” “radicalization,” “extremism,” and “pathways to violence” also raises important questions about scope and application. These terms can be interpreted broadly, and responses should remain focused on identifiable threats and behaviors rather than beliefs, viewpoints, or lawful expressions of opinion. Any additional funding should be accompanied by clear information about program outcomes, effectiveness, costs, and oversight. Washington taxpayers deserve confidence that expanded programs are addressing demonstrated needs and producing measurable benefits.
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	While ensuring school safety is an important responsibility, expanding school-based threat assessment programs requires careful attention to scope, definitions, procedures, and the rights of students and families. We appreciate the recognition that parents, caregivers, and guardians should have awareness and understanding of how these programs operate. If these programs expand, it is important that existing and additional safeguards preserve appropriate parental involvement, privacy protections, and due process. Parents should have a clear understanding of the purpose of threat assessments, the circumstances that may trigger one, what information is considered, when families are notified, and what opportunities exist for parents to provide context or respond to concerns. A system that assesses children for potential risk should include clear criteria and procedures to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings, false positives, unnecessary labeling, or unintended consequences. Threat assessment programs should focus on credible threats and concerning behaviors, not protected speech, political viewpoints, religious beliefs, disabilities, or personality differences. Expanding reporting requirements and statewide protocols should also be weighed carefully against increased administrative burdens on schools and the cost to taxpayers. We also encourage careful consideration of the proposed expansion of threat assessment protocols to include non-student individuals who frequently interact with the school, such as

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	parents, guardians, caretakers, school staff, and visitors. Schools already have established screening and safety procedures for many individuals who regularly access school environments, including background checks and fingerprinting requirements where applicable. Before expanding these systems further, the Task Force or Legislature should clearly identify the specific problem being addressed and ensure that any additional requirements provide a meaningful improvement in safety without creating unnecessary administrative burdens. Before expanding these programs, the Legislature should ensure that they are evidence-based, appropriately limited in scope, and designed to protect both school safety and the rights of students, families, and community members.
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	Before creating or expanding a state-supported system for specialized counseling and coaching services, the Task Force or Legislature should clearly define the problem being addressed, the population served, and how the proposed services differ from existing mental health, crisis intervention, and community-based resources already available throughout Washington. This recommendation would place DOH in the role of convening partners, standardizing training, contracting with subject-matter experts, and expanding counseling and coaching services specific to “violent extremism” and “targeted violence.” That raises important questions about scope, definitions, privacy, accountability, and whether a new state-coordinated system is necessary or whether existing services could better or already address these needs. Any training or protocol developed under this recommendation should make clear that services are focused on individuals who present identifiable safety concerns or who voluntarily seek assistance, not on people flagged primarily because of beliefs, associations, political viewpoints, religious views, or controversial opinions. Terms such as “pathways to violent extremism” and “targeted violence” should be applied with great care so that counseling and referral systems do not become a means of labeling or managing individuals based on lawful speech or dissenting views. The recommendation also appears to create a new funding structure involving DOH, nonprofits, community organizations, contractors, and providers. Before expanding taxpayer-funded services in this area, the Task Force or Legislature should demonstrate a clear unmet need, explain how this approach improves upon existing resources, and consider the potential for unnecessary duplication and administrative burden. Any additional funding should be accompanied by appropriate protections for confidentiality, informed consent, and individual rights. Programs involving mental health and perceived risk must be carefully limited so that they do not create stigma, inappropriate records, or lasting consequences for individuals who have not committed a crime or made a credible threat.
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	Washington already has established emergency management systems, comprehensive emergency planning requirements, mutual aid structures, and established response/recovery frameworks designed to coordinate preparation, response, and recovery efforts following major incidents. Before developing an additional statewide plan, the Task Force should clearly identify the specific gap or unmet need this recommendation is intended to address and explain how the proposed plan would improve upon existing emergency management structures. Any new planning framework should complement, rather than duplicate, the work already performed by emergency management agencies, local jurisdictions, first responders, and community partners. Clear roles, responsibilities, and coordination pathways are essential to ensure that additional planning

DEMIV Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	requirements do not create unnecessary complexity or administrative burden. Before committing additional public resources, the Task Force or Legislature should demonstrate that the proposed plan provides a meaningful improvement in preparedness, response, or recovery outcomes and represents an effective use of limited taxpayer resources.
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	Prior to creating or expanding a state-supported training and funding structure for violence “off-ramping” services, the Task Force or Legislature should clearly identify the specific gap or unmet need being addressed and explain how the proposed approach differs from existing re-entry, rehabilitation, mental health, and community support programs. This recommendation would expand training, funding, and service expectations for community-based organizations, nonprofits, Department of Corrections staff, and mental health providers. Any additional state framework should complement, rather than duplicate, existing efforts and include clear roles, responsibilities, and expectations. Training related to “pathways to violence,” “risk factors,” “protective factors,” and “violence off-ramping” should be carefully defined and applied so individuals are assessed based on current behaviors and identifiable concerns, not solely on past incarceration, associations, beliefs, or lawful expressions. Any new funding or training structure should demonstrate a meaningful improvement over existing resources, represent an effective use of limited taxpayer funds, and include protections against unnecessary stigma, labeling, or long-term consequences for individuals seeking to successfully reintegrate into their communities.
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	Before prioritizing continued funding and support for programs serving incarcerated individuals, the Task Force or Legislature should clearly identify which programs are currently operating, the outcomes they have demonstrated, and how they address specific reentry needs. Continued public funding should be conditioned on demonstrated effectiveness, clearly defined goals, and measurable results, with appropriations decisions reflecting responsible stewardship of limited taxpayer funds.
Additional Comments or Suggestions	Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We encourage careful consideration of whether the recommendations’ proposed programs address a demonstrated need, how they complement existing resources, whether they duplicate services already available, and whether they provide sufficient benefit to justify the investment of public funds. Efforts to prevent violence should remain focused on identifiable threats and behaviors while protecting constitutional rights—including freedom of speech, privacy, and family involvement. Any programs involving education, counseling, risk assessment, or public messaging should include clear definitions, appropriate boundaries, and protections against unintended consequences such as unnecessary labeling or viewpoint-based application. Continued or expanded public funding should be conditioned on demonstrated effectiveness, clear outcomes, and a clear justification for the use of taxpayer resources.

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: Dylan Jude Harrell Community Center

Name: Claire Bruncke

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	N/A
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	The Youth Development Fund is the most critical component of these recommendations. Research shows that for every \$1 spent on Youth Development programs, the government saves \$3. This is because YD works as prevention! It helps kids feel connected, gives them access to positive adult role models, and supports them in finding passions. The YD Fund is a vital step in WA making a long term impact on the youth of the state. Over the past few years, it seems that many of the budget cuts have been on the backs of vulnerable youth. This would be a forward step for youth and families that would have long term impact on the State's Budget, keeping youth out of the criminal justice system and investing in their wellbeing.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	N/A
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	N/A
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	N/A
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	N/A
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	N/A
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	N/A
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	N/A
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	N/A
Additional Comments or Suggestions	N/A

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Annie Vela

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	N/A
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Dedicated Youth Development Funds are a tangible way to support youths of Washington State and invest in our future.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	N/A
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	N/A
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	N/A
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	N/A
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	N/A
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	N/A
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	N/A
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	N/A
Additional Comments or Suggestions	N/A

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Trish Nilsen

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	Using terms like "hate-fueled" are subjective; how do you determine that any act is "hate fueled" as opposed to motivated by other forces, where the outcome to the victim remains the same? Many of the task force's objectives use very subjective terms, which in and of themselves could be construed as targeting certain groups, which is in direct opposition to your objectives! Examples of this can be found among the lack of true diversity of your membership and their often-times partisan leanings. Many other states have attempted to approach civil unrest/incidents in a more non-biased fashion with better results than in WA, where the driving force has been the clearly biased leadership (Governor/AG/legislators) who function often in a "uni party" mode and are not truly representative of ALL the citizens of WA state. I think this Task Force can do better at selecting members from other sectors who experience violence and hate from the "other side" (ie initiative signature gatherers who have been targeted, journalists who are attacked at LGBTQIA rallies, etc). The mainstream media is a reflection of your task force, rather than a reflection of what is really happening in our state.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Again, the concern is a biased platform that promotes certain agendas to our youth (ie transgenderism, political ideologies, etc) rather than youth support in its purest form. The exodus from our public schools is a reflection of the failing social agenda that I fear this task force continues to promote/support/protect and is often in opposition to parental rights as the primary shaping force for healthy youth (when the family structure is intact/healthy). Overall, this Task Force need to stop politicizing the agenda in opposition to better, non-partisan functions for all the citizens of the state. I also oppose state-driven efforts to promote digital ID for all, under the guise of "protecting the children" so any work of this task force on that front should be discouraged, as it can never supplant parental control over digital content for their children, which should be paramount over governmental controls. The control needs to be on the companies, not on the consumers.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Agee, as long as not partisan or focused on promoting only one group/faction, which is the opposite of what this task force should be about; so far, the task force makeup/agendas/minutes show partisanship and is not inclusive/representative of other groups of citizens that should be represented.
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	see prior comments. The digital safety controls should be on the companies that promote their products, not on the consumer. I DO NOT support digital ID for all, under the guise of "protecting the children" in any form because it is not effective and sets up all citizens for negative consequences of such control.
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	This can be easily biased, again because your task force is under-represented and not inclusive by its nature, some groups and their agendas are being promoted while others are being excluded and even erroneously identified as subjectively "violent" or "hateful". The use of subjective inflammatory adjectives in your task force materials/agenda/conversations are divisive and in themselves in opposition to your entire purpose (effectively "gaslighting").
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	I question the use of govt-funded materials such as these, especially given the purported budget crises facing our state, brought on by "pet projects" of the uni-party rather than representative of the will of the people. If

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	you listen to the majority of the people of this state, there are better ways to achieve the aims of this task force than what you are promoting at tax payers' expense
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	We already have state crisis line so don't feel we need more tax \$ spent on this targeted effort.
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	Again, I do not support state-funded govt entities trying to replace or interfere with parents/family rights/responsibilities. Many times, families ask for help and do not get the right kind of help at the right time; those root causes need to be addressed; reporting out concerns is too late, in my opinion. We should be better supporting/strengthening families rather than acting after it is too late. One example is that the state needs to revise/rescind the "Keeping Families Together" act which has harmed more children than it has helped. I also have little faith in the leadership/entity of OSPI after the failing quality school metrics despite increased funding....the # of families fleeing the public school system over the past several years clearly proves this. Giving Superintendent Reykdal and his administration more power and funding is not going to solve the problems you are striving to solve.
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	There are already enough tax-payer funded NGOs that are under-utilized. We don't need any more task forces to address this. The systems in place that are already funded need to be better utilized.
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	Isn't this already in place?
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	Again, these trainers should be non-biased and need to address violence on both sides of the political divide, not just so-called "progressive"/"leftist" agendas against the "right"/"Conservatives". Why can't your task force unit citizens instead of continuing to target and divide them? You can do better!
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	Enough of state funded programs and NGOs-our state is wrought with fraud and the leadership continues to ignore funding issues and continues to spend instead of looking at ways to run programs more cost-effectively.
Additional Comments or Suggestions	N/A

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: Does being a normal citizen count?

Name: Yes

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	N/A
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Who develops curriculum for trauma informed?
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	Who writes the curriculum?
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Who defines an expert? Which SME?
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	Who determines which facts are included? and what review process exists?
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	Why not model the Step Up Program in King Co?
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	N/A
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	N/A
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	N/A
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	N/A
Additional Comments or Suggestions	I will need to come back and spend more time reviewing. Thank you.

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Laurie Layne

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	I believe that addressing genuine harm and injury will get you much further! Your citizens will not freely seek to be on streets if they are randomly attacked for no good cause such as what happened during the bite of Seattle recently. Citizens have a reasonable right to feel safe while attending a nearby eating establishment or attending a street fair. It really is that simple!
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	N/A
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	N/A
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	N/A
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	N/A
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	N/A
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	N/A
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	N/A
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	N/A
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	N/A
Additional Comments or Suggestions	N/A

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: N/A

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	This looks great!
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Looks great
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Looks great
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	Please consider adding partnerships with scholars and current or former industry experts who may be able to assist with the creation of disruptive algorithms to thwart the reach of manipulative, harmful content or those intended to incite or escalate violence.
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Please consider adding training on civil protection orders, including extreme risk protection orders that an intimate partner, family or household member (or LE) can apply for if they fear that the individual is at risk of harm to self or others if they have access to firearms, based on what they are seeing or hearing. According to USSS research on mass attacks, people close to the individual who attacked were concerned about the person acting out violently in almost 80% of the cases but they didn't know what to do to try to stop it. An ERPO is a civil order intended to intervene to prevent the tragedy and has been effective in preventing suicides and promising in situations of mass violence.
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	Please consider specifically listing "incel" or misogynistic violence as a distinct category of the proposed public awareness campaigns. We know this is ubiquitous in online platforms and reaches both young people at impressionable ages, and those who are already engaged in or on the pathway to violence against women, girls and/or gender-nonconforming individuals.
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	100 percent agree.
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	Please consider adding language that specifically addresses or identifies the need for services and supports to any students who were targeted or harmed by an individual who is subject to a school-based threat assessment to mitigate the risk of retaliation, safety plan and ensure that child/children can be supported in a trauma-informed way.
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	Please consider monitoring and oversight to ensure providers who have been training in the evidence supported training model are implementing with fidelity to the model. Please also consider an early partnership with a local academic institution or foundation to evaluate the program and its effectiveness over time.
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	looks great!
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	Similar to recommendation 9, please consider adding an emphasis on consistent application and fidelity to evidence-based training models, implementation and evaluation.
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	looks good
Additional Comments or Suggestions	Thank you for offering an opportunity to provide input in this important process.

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Cynthia Stang

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	Stop wasting our hard earned money on this stupidity.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	N/A
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Stop creating more government programs which never solve anything and waste our money
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	Stop wasting our money
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	Stop wasting our money
Additional Comments or Suggestions	Stop wasting our money

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Debra Morrison

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	I don't see a clear definition of what Hate-Fueled or Targeted Violence actually mean. It seems like a challenge to design a program for a fairly nebulous and perhaps confusing concept that clearly overlaps with a variety of criminal activity.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Don't we already have a variety of state-funded and private not-for-profit Youth Development Programs? Is this a new fund, or is the funding designed to be a supplement to existing programs? I would need more clarity about the unique aspects of this new fund to feel positive about supporting the fund.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Again, do we just need more funding for current programs or is this a new funding stream? What programs already provide some of these things, and do we have good data about their effectiveness?? Seems wise to assess what is and isn't working before allocating new funding.
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	Are these services not already available to parents, students, employers, etc?
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Sounds like good training for professionals working with youth. Do we know if this is effective or is it too new??
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	Again, who is expected to define what specific behaviors constitute the Hate-Fueled and Targeted Violence that is the topic of this new program??
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	Sounds reasonable to me, if we have evidence that it is effective in preventing violence.
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	I support this effort. We need good data to be able to measure effectiveness.
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	With a current shortage of professionals in the kinds of services mentioned it seems challenging to add more training and expectations of additional services to their already over-full plates. Of course it sounds like a good idea to work to find the best of this sort of training, but again we need a clearer definition of what we are talking about when we use the HF/TV vocabulary.
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	Yes, of course, this should be done, although I am surprised that it's not already happening.
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	Sounds reasonable, with all the caveats that came before about more precise definitions.
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	Yes.
Additional Comments or Suggestions	It would be good to have some kind of budget attached to these proposals along with a more concise definition of the kinds of behaviors being targeted for prevention programs.

DEMV Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: I am an individual Washington state resident.

Name: M.L. Openshaw

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	I agree with ICWA Director Lisa Templeton feedback to the DEMV Task: Terms such as “hate-fueled,” “targeted violence,” and “risk factors” should be narrowly defined so that lawful speech, political disagreement, religious beliefs, criticism of government, or unpopular viewpoints are not inadvertently treated as indicators of dangerousness. Before committing ongoing taxpayer resources, any such program should have clear objectives, measurable outcomes, independent evaluation, transparency, meaningful oversight, and strong due-process protections.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	I agree with Lisa Templeton: Strong communities and positive relationships can play an important role in youth development. However, I encourage careful consideration of whether creating a new state-funded grant program is the best approach, particularly given Washington’s ongoing fiscal challenges and the need to prioritize existing resources. Programs that support youth connection, mentorship, and leadership are ideally locally driven and responsive to the needs of nearby families and communities. I encourage caution when expanding state involvement in youth development, particularly when programs may extend beyond basic mentorship and skill-building into areas involving values, beliefs, or social frameworks that may not reflect the views of all families. I encourage the Task Force to prioritize approaches that strengthen families, voluntary community partnerships, and opportunities for youth while recognizing parents as essential partners in decisions affecting their children. Any new investment should include accountability for how taxpayer dollars are spent and whether programs are achieving meaningful outcomes for youth and families.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	I agree with Lisa Templeton: Critical thinking and online safety skills are valuable, and many existing resources already provide media literacy education through schools, libraries, community colleges, and other community-based organizations. Before creating a new state-developed curriculum, I encourage the Task Force to evaluate whether additional government involvement is necessary and how it would complement, rather than duplicate, existing efforts. I have particular concerns about the inclusion of broad categories such as “misinformation,” “disinformation,” “conspiracy theories,” “propaganda,” and “extreme rhetoric” within a state-sponsored media literacy framework. While helping people identify scams, protect personal information, and evaluate sources can be beneficial, government-created standards for determining what information is “harmful” or unreliable could discourage legitimate inquiry, debate, and disagreement. Any efforts in this area should remain viewpoint neutral and focused on teaching critical thinking skills rather than directing individuals toward preferred conclusions. Washington should be careful not to create a system where skepticism of institutions, disagreement with government policies, or unpopular viewpoints are treated as indicators of risk of violent activity. Given the significant public resources already devoted to education and community programs, any expansion of state involvement should demonstrate a clear public benefit and avoid replacing locally developed approaches with a one-size-fits-all framework.

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	I agree with Lisa Templeton: Training that helps individuals recognize and respond to credible threats of violence may have value. At the same time, programs in this area must take great care to distinguish between dangerous conduct and constitutionally protected speech, beliefs, and viewpoints. The effectiveness and fairness of such programs will depend heavily on how terms such as “early warning signs,” “violent extremism,” and “pathways to violence” are defined and applied. Broad or subjective standards could lead to lawful beliefs, political disagreement, or unpopular viewpoints being treated as indicators of risk rather than focusing on actual behaviors and credible threats.
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	N/A
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	I agree with Lisa Templeton: Before recommending that the Legislature “restore funding” for HearMeWA, the Task Force should clarify the basis for that recommendation. Please identify the specific legislative action, budget decision, or funding reduction that resulted in decreased funding, including the amount and timing of any reduction. Without that information, it is difficult to evaluate whether additional funding is addressing an actual resource gap or expanding an existing program. Washington already has numerous avenues for youth support, including crisis hotlines, school counselors, college counseling services, community organizations, and other mental health resources. Before creating additional funding commitments, the Task Force should evaluate how HearMeWA complements existing services and whether additional state investment provides a meaningful benefit beyond resources already available. HearMeWA’s expansion into training and response protocols related to concepts such as “nihilistic violence,” “radicalization,” “extremism,” and “pathways to violence” also raises important questions about scope and application. These terms can be interpreted broadly, and responses should remain focused on identifiable threats and behaviors rather than beliefs, viewpoints, or lawful expressions of opinion. Any additional funding should be accompanied by clear information about program outcomes, effectiveness, costs, and oversight. Washington taxpayers deserve confidence that expanded programs are addressing demonstrated needs and producing measurable benefits.
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	I agree with Lisa Templeton: Before creating or expanding a state-supported system for specialized counseling and coaching services, the Task Force or Legislature should clearly define the problem being addressed, the population served, and how the proposed services differ from existing mental health, crisis intervention, and community-based resources already available throughout Washington. This recommendation would place DOH in the role of convening partners, standardizing training, contracting with subject-matter experts, and expanding counseling and coaching services specific to “violent extremism” and “targeted violence.” That raises important questions about scope, definitions, privacy, accountability, and whether a new state-coordinated system is necessary or whether existing services could better or already address these needs. Any training or protocol developed under this recommendation should make clear that services are focused on individuals who present identifiable safety concerns or who voluntarily seek assistance, not on people flagged primarily because of beliefs, associations, political viewpoints, religious views, or controversial opinions. Terms such as “pathways to violent extremism” and “targeted violence” should be applied with great care so that counseling and referral systems do not become a means of labeling or managing individuals based on lawful speech or dissenting views.

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	I agree with Lisa Templeton: I encourage careful consideration of whether the recommendations' proposed programs address a demonstrated need, how they complement existing resources, whether they duplicate services already available, and whether they provide sufficient benefit to justify the investment of public funds. Efforts to prevent violence should remain focused on identifiable threats and behaviors while protecting constitutional rights—including freedom of speech, privacy, and family involvement. Any programs involving education, counseling, risk assessment, or public messaging should include clear definitions, appropriate boundaries, and protections against unintended consequences such as unnecessary labeling or viewpoint-based application. Continued or expanded public funding should be conditioned on demonstrated effectiveness, clear outcomes, and a clear justification for the use of taxpayer resources.
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	see other comments
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	see other comments
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	see other comments
Additional Comments or Suggestions	Again, I agree with Lisa Templeton: I encourage careful consideration of whether the recommendations' proposed programs address a demonstrated need, how they complement existing resources, whether they duplicate services already available, and whether they provide sufficient benefit to justify the investment of public funds. Efforts to prevent violence should remain focused on identifiable threats and behaviors while protecting constitutional rights—including freedom of speech, privacy, and family involvement. Any programs involving education, counseling, risk assessment, or public messaging should include clear definitions, appropriate boundaries, and protections against unintended consequences such as unnecessary labeling or viewpoint-based application. Continued or expanded public funding should be conditioned on demonstrated effectiveness, clear outcomes, and a clear justification for the use of taxpayer resources.

Organization: The Madsen Group

Name: Sue Lani Madsen

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	The Task Force began with a commitment to a specific academically based public health protocol and is following through to suggest yet another new state program in a state without the means to fund current programs. And so we have a recommendation to set up a “Hate-Fueled and Targeted Violence Program” in either the Department of Health’s Injury and Prevention Program or the Attorney General Office’s Policy Division. The email invitations for public comment make it clear that “suggestions to alter any aspect of criminal law, create new criminal penalties, or increase criminal law enforcement” falls outside the public health focused boundaries of the Task Force. There must have been internal debate over whether violence from political extremists is best treated as a public health problem or a crime problem, and thus equivocates on who the subject matter expert should report to. Making the Attorney General Office’s Policy Division an option leaves room for British style anti-free speech policy. The UK is experimenting with policing Non-Crime Hate Incidents (NCIH) but recently scaled back its policy on arrests and prosecutions after public outcry and facing an overwhelming quantity of unpleasant, cranky, and hate-fueled comments on social media. We need to learn from their experience on what doesn’t work, in addition to protecting our American right to free speech. Precision matters in a program with legal consequences. The task force mandate on studying “domestic extremism” broadly included actions plus motives and left room for discussion of the impact of polarization on both ends of the political spectrum. But what does the term “hate-fueled” mean in the context of combatting domestic extremism? Judging the intentions behind individual actions is subjectively political, and while there is a legal definition of a hate crime, no definition is offered for the fuzzier term “hate-fueled.” Which of the following situations, if any, would you qualify as “hate-fueled?” Case 1 – Just One of the Gang: A “group of young people who appear to be at odds with each other” (as the former Seattle Police Chief described them) decide to settle their differences at the Bite of Seattle. One of the gang members is killed, as are two bystanders. Others are wounded. Was this a hate-fueled action? Territorial gang warfare over drugs and sex-trafficking? Nihilistic violence? And does it qualify as mass violence, typically defined as four or more victims, when only one person was the actual target and others were merely collateral damage? Why not in plain language define a program to interdict gang violence? Case 2 – When Love Grows Cold: A cuckolded husband arrives at his wife’s lover’s office and shoots him, then proceeds home to kill his own wife. The motive clearly seems hate-fueled, but is domestic violence a different category? If he also tracks down and kills six members of her family, does it become “hate-fueled and targeted violence” under new AG policies or just plain old first-degree murder, the oldest crime on record. Case 3 – Bewitched, Bothered and Bewildered: A despairing child who has been convinced by misinformation to believe her body is physically wrong for her mind has been prescribed powerful off-label hormones and develops a paranoid fantasy about mass killing. She is determined to carry it out. Is she fueled by hate? By drugs? By mental health confusion? By the on-line nihilistic violent extremism (NVE) swirling on-line? Case 4 – Lying in Political Speech: A group organizes to fight a citizens’ initiative. The group is determined to prevent women and girls from preserving a separate female category for sports competitions as
---	---

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	defined by Title IX. Their campaign uses misinformation and disinformation, which isn't illegal in politics according to the Washington State Supreme Court ruling in Rickert v. PDC in 2007. The group targets anyone using biologically accurate objective definitions for sex as "hate-fueled" and adopts an aura of righteousness by calling themselves "No Hate in Washington State." The NHWS group refuses admittance to two ticket-holders to an event based on religion and gender identity. Do the group's actions meet the definition of hate-fueled? It sure isn't love and inclusion. Would supporters of this group qualify for treatment under the Hate-Fueled and Targeted Violence Program to prevent actions transitioning from verbal to physical violence? No one can police the human heart Recommendation 4 notes the importance of preparing materials written in plain language. Assuming the legislature will be inclined to uncritically accept the task force recommendation, somewhere in this report there must be a plain-language definition of what is intended by "hate-fueled" and an explicit rejection of British-style thought policing. Washington state must not hand over authority to a single subject matter expert in a state office to identify the dividing line between good and evil, especially one based in the Attorney General's Office of Policy. "The line separating good and evil passes not through states, nor between classes, nor between political parties either—but right through every human heart—and through all human hearts." Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in The Gulag Archipelago
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	Before establishing a new fund, a thorough cataloging and examination of all existing funds with this or similar purposes must be completed. The state of Washington has a bad habit of starting new social enterprises without examining the impacts of old ones. "Government programs, once launched, never disappear. Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth." ---Ronald Reagan
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	Grant funding, if established, must not discriminate against faith-based initiatives providing cultural connection and a positive sense of belonging and identity. From the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health (https://hsph.harvard.edu/news/religious-upbringing-adult-health/): "The results showed that people who attended religious services at least weekly in childhood and adolescence were approximately 18% more likely to report higher happiness as young adults (ages 23–30) than those who never attended services. They were also 29% more likely to volunteer in their communities and 33% less likely to use illicit drugs."
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	Development of a digital media literacy curricula MUST be done with participation of a deliberately broad review board with an awareness of and sensitivity to how biases influence perceptions of disinformation, misinformation and propaganda. Existing resources include news sources dedicated to providing a broad spectrum of perspectives on current events (e.g. Ground.news, AllSides, Tangle) and those specifically dedicated to better media literacy (e.g. TrustingNews.org). Without deliberate and transparent balance, the result will be to sow more mistrust.
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	Good intentions but like Recommendation 2 there must first be a cataloging of what is already underway and intended to meet the same or similar goals.
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	Based on the public presentations to the DEMV Task Force and the public comments provided, there has been little work to build trust in a campaign being "based on facts." Many commenters pointed to current events not yet reflected in some of the academic data referenced. It is a fact that left wing inspired violence is spiking again

DEMVA Public Comment Period – Comments Received

	after several decades in abeyance. It in fact feels very similar to the era in which I came of age, the era of the Weather Underground bombings of the capitol, the kidnappings/ and bank robberies of the Symbionese Liberation Army, deadly protests by the Earth Liberation Front, the violence of the Baader-Meinhof group in Germany, and the summers of fiery and definitely not peaceful protests in urban America. Campaign materials must be based on facts, recognize the need to build trust by carefully putting facts into context, and recognize how very often more than one thing can be true at a time.
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	What data exists demonstrating the effectiveness of HearMeWA in violence prevention and off-ramping youth from gangs or other pathways to violence? Does this fulfill or offset other recommendations for new programs?
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	Being unfamiliar with what OSPI is currently doing in this area, my only comment is to require information on effectiveness of currently funded programs before throwing additional funding to the same programs. Public trust in OSPI is low, given the Superintendent of Public Instruction's refusal to acknowledge Title IX protections for women's and girls' sports and opposition to parental notification proposed in the first and second Parental Bill of Rights initiatives.
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	There are efforts currently being funded for the purpose of providing off-ramping of youth on the path to gang involvement and hate-fueled violence. The question is are they working. This Facebook post from Safe Seattle after the Bite of Seattle shooting says no: "The intended victim was a young thug named Juni who belonged to a gang calling itself "Grimey Gangsta Gorillaz." And along with him, two other people were killed and another four wounded. After the shooting, I hit up one of our gang-affiliated contacts, whom I'll call Lil Dab. Dab informed me that Juni, who was just 19, had himself been a shooter in several gang confrontations over several years and that he'd already been in and out of "diversion" programs several times, as well as doing a stint in "Juvie." Dab has followed the same path: recruited into a gang at a young age, in and out of taxpayer-funded programs like Community Passageways, where gangbangers get assault and gun possession charges dropped if they agree to talk with counselors and attend drum-circle type meetings. I asked Dab what he thought the diversion program success rate for guys like Juni was, and he said, "You mean with the kids who are actual shooters and not just wannabes? It's zero." "I don't mean just cases where the program has gotten them out of gangs for good, I mean how many kids have diversion programs helped keep alive, at least for a while?" "Kept alive isn't a good standard to use," he said. "Not as long as Harborview is there." (i.e. Harborview patching them up and sending them back out on the street, physically well and still at risk) Examine existing programs for effectiveness before creating new ones.
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	Was anyone from the Washington State Military Department involved in writing this recommendation? It seems redundant with what they are already doing in terms of planning for mass casualty incidents regardless of cause. How is an MVI different from an MCI?
Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	This recommendation makes sense. Someone who has finally experienced consequences for anti-social behavior is in a teachable moment. Re-entry services are essential to future success. Once again, examine existing programs for effectiveness before creating new ones.

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	Funding should only be continued to programs demonstrating effectiveness in meeting program goals as well as able to pass financial and governance audits. Existing programs deemed effective should also be asked what bureaucratic barriers to their success need to be removed.
Additional Comments or Suggestions	Starting new programs should be proposed as a zero budget impact recommendation by taking the opportunity to close ineffective programs and merge duplicative programs. Also would like to applaud the DEMV staff for sending weekly reminder emails about the public comment period. It demonstrated a sincere interest from the Task Force in receiving feedback. Well done.

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Organization: N/A

Name: Sharon Damoff

Recommendation 1: State Subject Matter Program	Any program addressing radicalization should not be housed in the AG’s office. The AG’s office revealed itself to be extremely biased when they produced the task force’s draft report, which contained a history of domestic extremism in WA (pages 13-14) that did not list even a single instance of violence from the left. No one has acknowledged how shockingly biased and dishonest that was. No office so biased is likely to administer a program fairly. Recommendation 1 also says that the Program will develop a database of “instances of hate-fueled and targeted violence.” What will be the source of this data? Because our state laws do not acknowledge politically motivated violence as being a category of hate crime, data from official (i.e., charged) hate crimes will not include one of the broadest categories of hate-motivated violence occurring in our state. Is this program going to use data from the state’s hate crimes hotline? That data cannot be trusted, because nothing reported to the hotline is verified. Fewer than a quarter of the people who report something to the hotline want a referral to the police, so 75% of the incidents reported are either minor or not verifiably true. And again, the hotline does not collect data on hate incidents that are politically motivated, which is a significant category of hate incidents these days.
Recommendation 2: Youth Development Fund	This recommendation plus the ones that follow call for several new programs. All the programs listed seem like they will require lots of taxpayer dollars. Taxes are already too high? How will the return on investment be assessed? These recommendations will make a lot of money available for NGOs, and it has become obvious that that is an easy and repeated avenue for fraud. And even if there is no outright fraud, it will create NGOs funded by taxpayer money. As with the homeless industry and others, the NGOs thus have a financial incentive NOT to solve the problem they are purportedly fighting. If the problem gets solved, the gravy train ends—so the problem will not be solved.
Recommendation 3: Funding for Social Connectedness	N/A
Recommendation 4: Digital Media Literacy	N/A
Recommendation 5: Training & Coaching to Recognize Warning Signs	N/A
Recommendation 6: Public Awareness Campaigns	N/A
Recommendation 7: HearMeWA	N/A
Recommendation 8: School-Based Threat Assessment Program (RCW 28A.320.123)	N/A
Recommendation 9: Mental & Behavioral Health Providers Training	N/A
Recommendation 10: Mass Violence Incident Preparedness Plan	N/A

DEM V Public Comment Period – Comments Received

Recommendation 11: Re-Entry Navigator Training	N/A
Recommendation 12: Carceral Programming	N/A
Additional Comments or Suggestions	A tactic that is not even mentioned in the recommendations is to encourage political leaders to stop using over-the-top inciting rhetoric when talking about other groups. Politicians stir up fear and hate because emotionally worked-up people are easy to manipulate. For example, the governor of Minnesota (and others) call ICE the Gestapo. In reality, ICE is just enforcing the laws our democratically elected Congress duly passed. We should create a culture where over-the-top political rhetoric is called out and discouraged. At the same time, I am concerned that under the name of “fighting hate,” people (perhaps working on some of the proposed programs) will mischaracterize speech and try to censor it. For example, when people speak up in support of keeping girls’ sports for girls, opponents are quick to call that “trans hate,” even though there is nothing hateful about it. Labeling the other side "hateful" incentivizes violence against them. Will the OSPI try to silence girls who are speaking up on this issue?