



Domestic Extremism and Mass Violence Task Force

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Friday, June 12, 2026

TVW Link: <https://tvw.org/watch/?eventID=2026061060>

Welcome, Introductions, Attendance (10:00-10:15)

Staff welcomed the Task Force members and members of the public to the June meeting of the Domestic Extremism and Mass Violence Task Force.

Staff let the Task Force and members of the public know that, due to sudden emergencies affecting speaker availability, the meeting was shortened to begin at 10:00 a.m. instead of the usual 9:00 a.m. start time. Staff is working with the Task Force's SME and additional AGO staff to determine a date and time to reschedule the presentation & moderated discussion on political violence and elections as a special meeting. The Task Force will be notified of the meeting date via email from staff, details will be posted on the DEMV Task Force's webpage, and members of the public signed up to receive email updates about the Task Force will be notified via email.

Staff announced that 3 written public comments were received by 5pm Thursday, June 11, and had been distributed to Task Force members before the meeting. Staff noted that the public comment portal will remain open for one week after the meeting, and close the following Friday, June 19. Additional comments received will be distributed to the Task Force after the portal closes and posted to the Task Force website.

Staff reviewed the agenda. **Leslie** moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by **Luis**.

Staff reviewed the meeting minutes from the last task force meeting on Friday, March 13. **Luis** moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **Adrianna**.

Presentation: Project for Civic Health (10:15-10:35)

The Task Force welcomed WA Lt. Governor Denny Heck, who provided a presentation about the Project for Civic Health. The Project for Civic Health is an initiative led by the Lt. Governor in partnership with the Henry M. Jackson Foundation, the University of Washington Evans School of Public Policy & Governance, and the William D. Ruckelshaus Center, aimed at restoring civic health and trust in Washington governance and public discourse.

The Lt Governor discussed several incidents of political violence against elected officials, noting how these incidents are not uncommon and are worth addressing before they happen in Washington. He mentioned the [Project for Civic Health](#), which created statewide focus groups, salons, etc. focused on how people can engage in healthy civic discourse.

He noted that much of our political climate now can often be attributed to social media – the business model of social media platforms is if you make people angry or afraid it releases dopamine, and they construct algorithms that cause people to continue to engage. Sometimes, that engagement causes us to hate one another and disagree in ways that are not constructive.

Three guiding principles came out of the Project for Civic Health:

1. Engage respectfully
2. Seek common ground
3. Disagree constructively

Over three years, the Ruckelshaus Center has administered a program to train city councilmembers how to collaborate better – how to work better with colleagues and engage in civic discourse. This created the joint select committee on civic health. The Lt. Governor encourages people to go to the website for the Project for Civic Health.

The Lt. Governor noted that in his experience, most people strongly believe we don't have to hate each other just because we disagree, and especially not the kind of disagreement that can lead to violence.

The Lt. Governor thanked the Task Force for their work and bringing people together from diverse perspectives to discuss our civic health and make our communities safer.

The Task Force had a short Q&A with the Lt. Governor:

Q: How can we bridge gaps with polarized groups?

A: Nothing opens a mind and a heart quite like respectful listening. Prospects for success go up if I am truly listening and responding with language that reflects curiosity. Often that can be hard but it's crucial. People from marginalized communities often ask me "How am I meant to engage with someone who delegitimizes my existence as a human being?" and my response to that is that I acknowledge that I am not from a marginalized community, and I can't understand their pain. However, as Dr. King said, "Hate does not drive out hate – only darkness cannot drive out darkness – only light can do that." I try to remind myself of that when listening and engaging with people. There is a yearning in this country for kinder, gentler politics.

Q: When this report is done, what is the next step for civic leaders to speak to these issues that motivates the public to be involved?

A: Three things: First, start with self always, as leaders how we comport ourselves is important. Second, we need to focus on community-based action. Third, there needs to be an aggressive communication plan for getting the word out for what the task force has done here.

Panel: States' Targeted Violence Prevention Plans (10:35-11:00)

The Task Force heard from representatives from Illinois, New York, and Colorado about their states' targeted violence prevention (TVP) plans, each developed in recent years in partnership with CP3. Staff moderated a panel conversation with the states.

1. Can you each tell us: when your state decided to pursue a targeted violence prevention plan, when that plan was completed or is anticipated to be completed, and where the plan is housed?
 - a. IL: The IL Commission on Discrimination and Hate Crimes is housed in the IL Division on Human Rights. We also have a targeted violence plan under IEMA-OHS. The Commission is an Advisory Commission created in statute in 1999. It was reactivated in 2021. The Commission took 14 months to study the field and come up with a set of recommendations that attempts to ensure the state thinks about prevention. Strengthen the state's response to hate, which includes all elements involved: how mayors and elected officials respond, how law enforcement responds, how the relevant laws are constructed, and how communities affected by hate are supported. We consider the strategies available for hate prevention work, and work with the local office of homeland security to do this work.
 - b. NY: In 2019, the program was around threat assessment management to develop county-wide targeted violence prevention plan rooted in social science. The approach to the program was multidisciplinary with every state agency that might touch this work, social service agencies and nonprofits. In 2022 there was a racially motivated terrorist attack in Buffalo, and that was the impetus for operationalizing the plan. Having the plan in place allowed us to have a strategy on the shelf that then allowed us to intervene and prevent an individual from moving down a pathway to an act of violence, and I'd like to note that it is important to always have a plan in those cases regardless of the political inertia.
 - c. CO: We began working on the plan in 2018, but it wasn't signed by the Governor until 2023. The program is housed both under the Governor's office and the local Fusion Center. It provides funding through community agencies to support projects that prevent targeted violence at different levels. It took a long time to get started, but it was important that we had all the voices in places in order to have the different levels of public health framework engaged.
2. Elana, Illinois has a TVP plan, but the Commission is pursuing an approach that's both complimentary and different to the existing plan. Can you talk about this approach, including why the Commission is taking it, and who you're partnering with to pursue it?

- a. IL: The Commission is an Advisory Commission that could put out a report once a year, but there is a recognition that the work is urgent, and this work then needs to be implemented – even if the state has strong laws. We found there is a lack of practitioners, and we are working on building up people who are able to respond to incidents which is something we are doing through Resilient Illinois, a program focused on expanding community capacity through a grant program that involves social services programs on a local level. We also have a helpline for people to report hate, the Help Stop Hate Helpline. Additionally, our state has mandated hate crimes training for law enforcement.
- 3. Ben & Paula, New York has implemented it's TVP plan, including a unique behavioral threat assessment program model. Can you talk a little bit about the program, including what it is and how it's been operationalized, and any lessons learned during implementation?
 - a. NY: There were 3 pilot programs in Western NY, and after the Buffalo attack and Executive Order was signed that created our unit and a grant program to address domestic terrorism and the threat assessment management program. That was \$10M equally distributed across 58 counties meant to be on a yearly basis. 56/58 counties now have plans on the BTAM level – each plan looks different and is tailored to each county. Some are more developed than others, but the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Unit is there to support BTAM teams through education and awareness through a free training suite that provides information on threat environments provides support in the way of events and regional gatherings.

BTAM doesn't exist in a vacuum, and we need to create the conditions for BTAM to flourish, meaning creating and resourcing enough mental health professionals to be able to provide appropriate interventions. We worked with these professionals on a tool that helps gauge violence risk, and that's been a way to help prepare NY mental health professionals. This has received a lot of positive feedback. Additionally, there is no one established bureaucracy for BTAM, so we need to find what organizations are attached to each one to speak their language – for example: law enforcement may not be able to know how to speak to mental health professionals and we need to find ways to de-silo. BTAM requires holistic assessment and management in order to be successful. 5000 cases were reviewed so far, and 900 of those are in the management phase. NY is often tagged as a police state, but outside of NYC, it is a very politically diverse state which means that for us to have 56/58 counties involved, it means that it is a truly bipartisan effort and has been successful despite politics, not because of it. Part of that success is finding the right champions in each region in law enforcement, legislative, and education environments. Our success has been not necessarily in counties have been the best resourced, but in counties

that have resourced the individual who is prepared to lead the program and carry it forward.

4. Tiffany, in your prior role with the federal government, you worked with Colorado and Texas in developing their TVP plans. Can you share what the processes looked like for those two states, specifically the similarities and differences between those processes and plans?
 - a. CO: Colorado politically is different from TX, and can be relatively liberal – for both, we focused on the socioecological model of who we wanted to affect and who should be at the table and what level of public health the state wanted to focus on. CO focused on primary and secondary prevention – we have a statewide reporting hotline “Safe to Tell” and worked on a community awareness program to schools, personnel, community agencies, le, and any bigger venues. We focused on how to report suspicious activity and what does the path to violence look like, to know what and how to report.
 - b. TX: Texas can be relatively conservative. They focused on secondary prevention and had a high focus on building up BTAM teams across a wide geographical swath.
5. And for our last question before we open it up to the Task Force for Q&A, what is one piece of advice you’d give to other governments, whether it’s state or local, who are thinking about developing a TVP plan or are in the process of developing one?
 - a. IL: Plans are important but they’re not enough. We have a crisis of trust in government and the outreach to trusted members of local community is critical, and each community is different. That partnership is crucial.
 - b. NY: Having a plan on the shelf is important but it’s more valuable to bring stakeholders together who will implement that plan.
 - c. CO: build your plan around a broad multi-disciplinary partnership and focus on every element of the public health approach. Law enforcement has an important role to play, but we can’t arrest our way out of this problem.

Due to time constraints, the Task Force did not have time for Q&A with the panel.

Subcommittee Share Out (11:00-11:20)

Staff provided opportunity for the Task Force to share their experiences working in subcommittees to develop draft recommendations. Prompts included what subcommittee they participated in, what went well in the process, what was difficult, reflections on developing recommendations, how helpful the guest speakers were, and other thoughts. Subcommittee meeting materials can be found on the AGO’s Task Forces Website. Task Force members shared the following thoughts:

- We’ve come up with a lot of grounded ideas, and we are trying to focus on approaching this from a multi-level public health approach. Much of what we can do to improve social connectedness, better use of social media, and de-siloing different

organizations are the same tools that can help prevent diseases. One of the challenges is we are in the space where prevention activities feel less tangible than response activities, and it can be hard to make the case that the investment of prevention is better than investment in response.

- We liked the ability to focus on our tasks and how subcommittees were broken up. The diversity of each committee and our different backgrounds lent itself to what we created in terms of recommendations.

Recommendations Update & Closing (11:20-11:30)

Staff closed the meeting with updates on recommendations and upcoming meetings.

The Task Force will be convening in August, per their charter, to begin recommendation discussion due to the number of recommendations and ensure adequate time for conversation and revisions before the October voting meeting.

The AGO will have a public comment portal and comment period dedicated specifically for public comment on the recommendations available on the DEMV webpage at

<https://www.atg.wa.gov/domestic-extremism-and-mass-violence-task-force> in July. Individuals who are signed up for email updates about the Task Force will receive an email notification when the portal and comment period goes live.

The Task Force's next meeting will be on August 14, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. PST.

The Task Force adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Attendance List

Name	Organization	Present?
Adrianna S	UTOPIA Washington	Yes
Emma J	Parents 4 Peace	No
Amber W	Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction	Yes
Dyneeca V	Freedom Project	Yes
Faaluaina P	Asia Pacific Cultural Center	No
Jay G	WIDEN; Gairson Law, LLC	Yes
Juan P	Unidos of Snohomish County	Yes
Karen S	Muslims for Community Action and Support	No
Karl E	Planned Parenthood of Greater Washington and North Idaho	No
Kate B	Western States Center	No
Keara K	Jewish Family Service	Yes
Leslie C	Washington Coalition for Police Accountability	Yes
Luis M	Snohomish Citizens for Human Rights	Yes
Mark C	Walla Walla County Sheriff's Office	Yes
Mary H	Thurston County Auditor	No
Mercedes S	Cedar River Clinics	Yes
Morgan M	ADL Center on Extremism	No
Nathan W	Washington State Department of Health	Yes
Richard B: Proxy Curt Lutz	Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs	Yes
Roger K	Projects for a Civil Society	Yes
Sahej K	Khalsa Gurmat Center	No
Sarah W	CoLab for Community and Behavioral Health Policy Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences University of Washington	No
Seth L	PERIL: the Polarization & Extremism Research and Innovation Lab	Yes
Sharonne N	Equity in Education Coalition	Yes
Stacey M: Proxy Melissa Morris	WA State Emergency Management	Yes
William H	Center For Children & Youth Justice	Yes