



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INDETERMINATE SENTENCE REVIEW BOARD
P.O. BOX 40907, OLYMPIA, WA 98504-0907

DECISION AND REASONS

NAME: STOUDAMIRE, Roderick
DOC #: 287492
FACILITY: MCC-WSR
DATE OF HEARING: January 8, 2019
TYPE OF HEARING: .100
PANEL MEMBERS: Kecia Rongen & Elyse Balmert
FINAL DECISION DATE: January 28, 2019

This matter came before the above named Board Members of the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB or the Board) for a .100 hearing in accordance with RCW 9.95.100. In preparation for the hearing, the Board reviewed Mr. Stoudamire's ISRB file. Mr. Stoudamire appeared in person and was represented by Attorney Darrell Lahtinen. Testimony was provided by Department of Corrections (DOC) Classification Counselor (CC) Scott Leaf.

The original prosecutor recommendation was that Counts I, II and III be served consecutively. In addition, a minimum term of 120 months was recommended on Count II.

LAST BOARD DECISION:

At the September 16, 2015 hearing, the Board found Mr. Stoudamire not parolable and added 60 months to his minimum term.

CURRENT BOARD DECISION:

Based on the requirements of RCW 9.95.009(3) and RCW 9.95.100 and the totality of evidence and information considered by the Board, the Board finds that Mr. Stoudamire is not parolable and adds 60 months to his minimum term.

NEXT ACTION:

Schedule a .100 hearing 120 days prior to his PERD.

REASONS FOR DECISION:

This was a deferred decision following a full Board discussion, using a structured decision-making framework that takes into consideration; the statistical estimate of risk, criminal history, parole history, ability to control behavior, responsivity to programming, demonstrated offender change, release planning, discordant information, and other case specific factors. Based on the requirements of RCW 9.95.100, the Board finds Mr. Stoudamire not parolable for the following reasons:

- **Mr. Stoudamire’s version of his index murder and associated behavior does not match file material and is simply not believable. This calls into question his motivations for offending and as such whether or not he has received appropriate treatment programs.**
- **Mr. Stoudamire has limited insight into the murder and attacks on two other women provoking doubt about his ability to understand his criminogenic treatment needs.**
- **Assessed as a Moderate-High risk to reoffend on the VRAG-R**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Mr. Stoudamire would benefit from additional treatment such as Thinking for a Change and re-entry planning and employment skills. The Board also recommends that Mr. Stoudamire work on his transparency with the Board. If he has trouble speaking in front of the Board, perhaps Toastmasters would be beneficial. If it is related to shame around the offense, Mr. Stoudamire may benefit from assistance with mental health on working through those issues.

JURISDICTION:

Roderick Stoudamire is under the jurisdiction of the Board on a Murder in the First Degree, Count II, conviction under King County Cause #87618. His time start is February 8, 1992. His minimum term was set at 320 months on a Sentencing Reform Act (SRA) range of 240 to 320 months. The Judge had no recommendation and the prosecutor recommended 20 years. Mr. Stoudamire's maximum term is Life. He has served approximately 323 months on this count. He has been continuously confined for 473 months.

At the time of sentencing under King County Cause #87618, Mr. Stoudamire was also sentenced on Counts I and III – Assault in the First Degree. The minimum term was set at 156 months on Counts I and III, to be served concurrently with each other, but consecutive with Count II. The maximum term on each count was 20 years. Mr. Stoudamire was “paroled” on these counts to begin serving confinement on Count II on February 8, 1992.

OFFENSE DESCRIPTION:

File materials describe the underlying conviction involving three separate victims, all female joggers in Seward Park in Seattle, over a period of August 7th through August 9th when Mr. Stoudamire was arrested at Seward Park. Two of the victims were attacked from behind and assaulted but managed to escape. The second victim in this case was stabbed multiple times. She had footprint marks over her neck and back, and her body was found clothed only in her bra and shoes. At the time of the attack on the third victim, the police were in the area to respond to her complaint of being viciously attacked, when a birdwatcher came out of the woods and stated that they had found a body. According to the prosecutor's memorandum to the sentencing Judge and the Board, the third victim identified her attacker as a young Negro man wearing maroon checkered pants, a white sweatshirt, and white hat. Mr. Stoudamire was arrested at the park that afternoon, and while he had stripped to the waist, he was wearing maroon checkered pants. His clothes were placed into evidence, and the crime laboratory found blood on the defendant's undershirts, one sock, and one shoe. Footprints matching his shoes were found on the victim's back and legs. The sweatshirt and hat described by the third victim

were found in an area of the park close to where Mr. Stoudamire was arrested. The murder victim's car was found some distance from the park, and Mr. Stoudamire's fingerprints were found in numerous locations in the car.

PRIOR CRIMINAL / RISK RELATED CONDUCT:

There were two companion convictions for Assault in the First Degree, Counts I & III, as described above. Mr. Stoudamire received 20 year sentences to run concurrently on each count and both have since expired.

There is no other adult criminal history as Mr. Stoudamire was 15 years old at the time of his arrest. There appear to be three other juvenile contacts all handled informally. One of these was for Assault and Indecent Liberties. According to file materials, the case was dismissed when the 11 year old female victim moved to California.

PROGRESS/BEHAVIOR:

Attorney Darrel Lahtinen brought up a preliminary matter in regards to Mr. Stoudamire's age at the time the crime was committed. At the last hearing, Mr. Stoudamire's former attorney brought up the same issue. In 2014 a new law was passed regarding juveniles that commit crimes and get convicted as adults. These individuals have a presumption of release unless the Board feels they are more likely than not to commit a new criminal offense. Mr. Lahtinen brought up the new court decision related to juveniles and the emphasis on "presumption" of release, rather than focusing on Mr. Stoudamire's crime. The Board maintains that they must use the 9.95.100 statute that indicates the individual must be "fully rehabilitated and a fit subject for release."

CC Scott Leaf testified that Mr. Stoudamire has been doing excellent since the Board last saw him. His last violent infraction was in 1995 and last infraction was in 1999. He currently works as a data clerk in the CI Kitchen. He receives excellent evaluations. He also has previously worked as a tutor, machine operator and handler and worked for Microjet. He attends Interaction Transition, Catholic Services and has completed Bridges to Life, Global Leadership Summit and is

on the Christian Community Board. He is a facilitator for Alternatives to Violence. He has 41 approved visitors and receives regular EFV's with his wife.

Mr. Stoudamire described what was going on with him at the time and the described being caught up in "shiny things." He came up with a plan to rob people for money. He went to the park where the first victim was and when he grabbed her, she screamed and he got scared and took off. This also occurred with the third victim. Victim number two is the one who was murdered. When Mr. Stoudamire was asked why he would pick women to rob who were walking or running on the trail and likely to not have money. Mr. Stoudamire claimed that he "he didn't know what he was doing." After the murder he searched the victim's car and did not find any money. He gave the reason as killing her as being panicked and scared. On the day of the murder, Mr. Stoudamire claims that someone gave him a pill that made him disorientated and he does not remember all of the details of the day. He had the victim take off her clothes and shoes to try to find money. Mr. Stoudamire also indicated that his cousin was present for the crimes as well. When the victim struggled is when they began stabbing her. Mr. Lahtinen indicated that someone testified at the second trial and that they testified Mr. Stoudamire was "not quite right," alluding that it may be due to the pill that was given to him.

The victim was found naked, except for her shoes, Mr. Stoudamire claims that they had given her back her clothes to put back on which is why she may have had her shoes on. This statement is confusing to the Board. If in fact she was murdered, why would she be handed back her clothing? In regards to why the witnesses describing it only being one attacker, Mr. Stoudamire claims that his cousin was hiding behind some bushes. A witness testified in one of the trials that Mr. Stoudamire had a long shirt and pants on but when he was arrested, he just had pants on and the clothes were found someplace else close by. Mr. Stoudamire claims it was summer and he didn't have a shirt on which is contradictory to the reports. After the murder, they took the car and drove it to Seattle. Mr. Stoudamire denies any sexual motivation to the murder.

In regards to the allegation of Indecent Liberties which was never charged, he says they claimed he told his friend to pull the pants down of a girl that was with them. Mr. Stoudamire denies saying this and he was not charged with a crime.

Dr. Wentworth notes in her psychological evaluation dated September 14, 2018 that “it is difficult to assess Mr. Stoudamire’s insight into his life choices and crime.”

As mentioned in earlier decisions, the Board struggles with the various accounts that Mr. Stoudamire has provided in regards to the assaults and murder. During this hearing, it was difficult for Mr. Stoudamire to provide answers to the Board even when questioned by his attorney and some of his answers were conflicting from one question to another. The reason that this is significant in regards to his rehabilitation is if he is not being truthful with the Board or himself, he very likely does not understand what lead to these offenses. The Board does understand that he was fifteen at the time, however, these were three attacks on three different women on three different days. Immediately after his arrest, he provided a statement to police in which he admitted to the murder and voices inside of his head telling him to kill her even though he does not know why. This motivation for the murder seems to make the most sense, but is not what Mr. Stoudamire is providing us with at this hearing.

KR: ts

January 28, 2019

January 31, 2019

cc: MCC-WSR
Attorney
File



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INDETERMINATE SENTENCE REVIEW BOARD
P.O. BOX 40907, OLYMPIA, WA 98504-0907

TO: Full Board

FROM: Kecia Rongen (Teresa, CRT)

RE: STOUDAMIRE, Roderick DOC #287492

Panel recommends: Not parolable and add 60 months

Next action: Schedule .100 120 days prior to PERD.

Agree	Disagree
Elyse Balmert 1-28-2019 Lori Ramsdell-Gilkey 1-28-2019 Jeff Patnode 1-28-2019 Kecia Rongen 1-28-2019	