

DRAFT Meeting Summary
Alaska Criminal Justice Data Analysis Commission

July 30, 2025

10:00 a.m. – 12:26 p.m.

LIO Office, Anchorage, and Zoom

Chair Matt Claman called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. Members present were Lt. Jean Achee, Sen. Matt Claman (chair), Alex Cleghorn, Tracy Dompeling (Zoom), Rep. Andrew Gray, Ret. Judge David Mannheimer (Vice Chair), Judge Kari McCrea, Lisa Purinton (for James Cockrell), John Skidmore, Brenda Stanfill, Ret. Judge Trevor Stephens (Zoom), April Wilkerson, Capt. Brian Wilson, Heather Phelps, and Mary Wilson (Zoom).

Terrence Haas was absent.

Staff present were Susanne DiPietro, Teri Carns, Brian Brossmer, and Susie Dosik.

Chair Claman called the roll and determined that a quorum was present.

Approve Agenda

Judge Mannheimer moved to approve the agenda; Ms. Purinton seconded the motion, and members approved it without objections.

Approve May 28, 2025 meeting summary

Judge Mannheimer moved to approve the May 28, 2025 meeting summary. Mr. Cleghorn seconded the motion and members approved it without objection.

Public Comment Period

Chair Claman opened the meeting to public comment at 10:10 a.m. Dr. Theresa Obermeyer provided public comments. The Chair closed the public comment period at 10:30 a.m. Chair Claman noted that the Commission receives public comment at any time on its website.

ANJC report on VAWA 2022 statutory changes

Alex Cleghorn updated DAC members on the new provisions for tribal justice in the 2022 VAWA Act. He described the scope of PL 280 jurisdiction, and the clarifications in the law that tribal jurisdiction applies to all Natives (whether citizens/members of the village tribe or not) charged under the tribal laws, and to non-Natives alleged to have committed select offenses, including assault on tribal justice personnel, DV-related

offenses (including violations of protective orders), child violence, sexual assault, stalking, obstruction of justice, and sex trafficking. The jurisdiction is concurrent with any federal or state jurisdiction. Civil jurisdiction continues to include child custody proceedings, civil protective orders, divorce proceedings, probate, and a variety of other actions.

The 2022 Act established a pilot project for which tribes can apply, to help them create a path for exercising jurisdiction over non-Natives charged with any of nine specific offenses. Tribes would first demonstrate to DOJ that they are ready to provide a range of due process protections, including defendants' rights, attorney representation, and appropriate juries. Twenty tribes are signed up for Phase 1, interested in the project. About five are on Track 2, assigned to a federal liaison to discuss requirements and begin work. None are as yet on Track 3, ready to go.

Ms. Stanfill asked about tribal capacity to begin work – do tribes have prosecutors? Codes that include the nine offenses eligible for the pilot project? Cooperation established with State Troopers for referrals of cases? Mr. Cleghorn said that tribes are currently prosecuting some violations of tribal protective orders in SE Alaska, and tribal courts are handling civil matters, but he did not know the status of the tribes' progress in begin able to handle criminal prosecutions. Chair Claman asked that Mr. Cleghorn update DAC staff on tribal capacity as needed.

DV Report

Ms. DiPietro said that the report was posted on the DAC website on the Judicial Council page. Ms. Stanfill suggested a press release. Chair Claman polled members and it was agreed to discuss at the next meeting developing a policy about issuing press releases for special reports (including the DV report) and the Annual Report.

Probation/Parole Report

Ms. DiPietro asked for members' comments on the research questions and approach. Mr. Skidmore asked whether the data and analysis would be able to show causative links between statutory changes and changes in outcomes. Ms. DiPietro said that the report would document the changes that actually occurred, and that qualitative interviews with criminal justice stakeholders could help highlight the changes that people perceived. Mr. Skidmore cautioned against suggesting causation where none could be proven.

Representative Gray said that people told him that they felt the probation/parole officers were at times trying to find supervised people doing wrong, rather than helping them succeed. Ms. Wilkerson said that some years ago, supervision had been focused more on enforcement, but since then, the emphasis has shifted to more help for supervisees. Ms. Dusty Dumont, Director of the Division of Pretrial, Probation and Parole said that

probation and parole officers are encouraged to help supervisees who want to change and succeed.

Rep. Gray mentioned issues of transportation to required appointments, especially drug tests. Ms. Dumont said that DOC was working to find solutions for those who lack transportation to attend appointments. She noted that an officer's response to a situation might vary depending on what the supervisee's main issues were. Rep. Gray said that meaningful work and housing could contribute to successes. Ms. Dumont mentioned some of the resources available, through reentry programs or otherwise. Judge McCrea and Ms. Stanfill noted that communities varied widely in their access to resources for supervised people. Judge McCrea encouraged staff to ask officers directly what resources they thought would help them do their work better.

Rep. Gray suggested asking people on supervision what they thought. Judge Mannheimer mentioned possible confidentiality issues, and Chair Claman mentioned staff resource issues. Staff said that they would look into the feasibility of this. Ms. Stanfill said ANDVSA might be able to help with volunteers. Mr. Skidmore emphasized the necessity of obtaining representative data.

It was suggested that the study examine how DOC supervises parolees/probationers who live in rural areas, and document how that supervision might differ from supervision in urban centers. Another question was about the circumstances in which supervisees are required to remain in an urban center rather than returning home to a village or rural town.

Staff will work with these suggestions, and with DOC on obtaining the needed data.

Victim Report Progress

Members discussed the current status of NIBRS (National Incident-Based Reporting System) data collection. Capt. Wilson said that it was possible that Anchorage Police Department would begin submitting NIBRS-compliant data by the beginning of 2026, but not until then. Ms. Purinton said that DPS data is available now, for some departments, but not all. She added that DPS now needs to convert the NIBRS data that it collects back to data that can be used for the annual Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) required by the FBI, and noted that the two databases do not provide comparable data.

Ms. Stanfill said the CDVSA's staff researcher, Phoebe Koenig, was working with the new Vela database, which includes data from those who seek services with CDVSA-affiliated programs. Ms. DiPietro asked whether the Vela database might contain duplicate information with NIBRS records. Ms. Stanfill said that it was possible and there is no way to identify duplicate records. Members discussed the fact that the different databases include different people – for example, NIBRS includes children who are

victims, while ANDVSA has only adults. The Victimization Survey has only women 18 and older, excluding men and children.

Members concurred that further work on victim information should wait until NIBRS data becomes available. The agencies involved will report on their progress next year.

Pretrial and Time to Disposition Study

Ms. DiPietro said that staff was continuing the data entry work. She thought that this might be a stand-alone report, not ready to be included in the 2025 Annual Report.

Sex Offenses Report Update

Members discussed the draft Sex Offenses Report update. They agreed to create a subcommittee to work on the next draft: Ms. Stanfill, Ms. Purinton, Rep. Gray, and possibly Judge Stephens [note: Judge Stephens has agreed to serve]. [Mr. Skidmore also volunteered to participate as he is able.] The group should review the omitted sections, and update and include any of them that seem important, especially information about response time and other factors in case disposition in rural areas. Staff will clarify some terms, especially “sexual violence,” and the title for Figure 8.

Next Meetings Schedule; Adjourn

Chair Claman said that the next three meetings will focus on the 2025 Annual Report. They are set for September 24, October 10, and October 23 (if needed).

The meeting adjourned at 12:26 p.m.