

# Alaska Criminal Justice Commission

## Meeting Summary

Thursday, May 28, 2020

9:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Via Zoom

Commissioners Present: Joel Bolger, Sean Case, Samantha Cherot, Matt Claman, Alex Cleghorn, Shelley Hughes, Stephanie Rhoades, Brenda Stanfill, Steve Williams

Commissioners Absent: Kevin Clarkson (Deputy Attorney General John Skidmore served as proxy for Attorney General Clarkson), Adam Crum (Deputy Commissioner Al Wall served as proxy for Commissioner Crum), Nancy Dahlstrom, Amanda Price, Trevor Stephens

Participants: Greg Razo, Pauline Henriques-Perry, Kelly Cunningham, Don Habeger, Alysa Wooden, Tony Piper, Nancy Meade, Angela Hall, Talia Eames, Brad Myrstol, Troy Payne, Lizzie Kubitz, Travis Welch, Triada Stampas, Jon Woodard, James Stinson

Staff: Teri Carns, Staci Corey, Susanne DiPietro, Brian Brossmer, Barbara Dunham

## Meeting Agenda

Commissioner Razo moved to approve the meeting agenda and Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed without opposition.

## Updates from Workgroups

### *Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Recidivism Reduction Workgroup*

Judge Stephanie Rhoades explained that she was the new chair of the Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Recidivism Reduction Workgroup given that previous workgroup chair Greg Razo was leaving the Commission. The group's next meeting was set for June 25, and she planned to work with Commission staff attorney Barbara Dunham to chart the workgroup's work plan. She anticipated the group would meet monthly, and she was hopeful the group could develop recommendations by the next plenary meeting.

Commissioner Greg Razo thanked Judge Rhoades for taking over. He confirmed that he was stepping down and would be replaced as the Alaska Native Justice Center (ANJC) designee by Alex Cleghorn. He thought most of the Commissioners had had the chance to meet Mr. Cleghorn already. ANJC has been growing in recent years, and now has a great set of attorneys. Mr. Cleghorn is their lead attorney and has been an attorney practicing in Alaska for a number of years. So he asked Mr. Cleghorn to consider stepping in, and he agreed to do so. Today would be Commissioner Razo's last meeting. He was thankful for his years of service and the great work the Commission has accomplished. He said he would continue to be in touch with Mr. Cleghorn and the Commission as necessary.

### *Youth Justice Workgroup*

Commissioner Samantha Cherot said that the Youth Justice Workgroup met recently and heard from a national and Alaska-based groups on youth justice issues. One of those groups was Human Rights for Kids, which has developed and championed a number of reforms that have received bipartisan support in state legislatures. Based on the discussion at the last meeting and some of the materials the workgroup has gathered, the workgroup will work on developing recommendations, and she also hoped to have those recommendations ready for the next meeting.

### *Victims' Rights and Services Workgroup*

Commissioner Brenda Stanfill, chair of the Victims' Rights and Services Workgroup, said that the workgroup had been meeting for quite a while and had developed four recommendations. The group still needed to work out the details but it should also be ready by the next plenary meeting.

### *Domestic Violence Workgroup*

Ms. Dunham explained that the chair of the Domestic Violence Workgroup, Commissioner Sean Case, would be arriving late to the meeting and offered to give an update in his stead. The DV workgroup had identified two areas for recommendations at its last meeting: ensuring bail conditions are accessible to law enforcement, and coordinated community response teams.

## **Updates re: CIT Training Standards and Title 12/Competency**

### *CIT Training Standards*

Commissioner Steve Williams explained that in March the Alaska Police Standards Council (APSC) met to standardize the Crisis Intervention Training (CIT). Travis Welch, program officer with the Alaska Mental Health Trust, worked with the APSC to come up with a standard curriculum for CIT, which was adopted in March. The curriculum consists of a weeklong training based on the Memphis model of de-escalation.

Commissioner Stanfill asked if there in-state trainers. Mr. Welch said that there were now four certified trainers in the state; any new trainers will have to meet certain criteria. Commissioner Stanfill said she thought CIT was critical, and wondered if there was a plan in place to get more trainers. Mr. Welch said that the APSC had grant funding available to send people to become certified trainers.

Commission Chair Matt Claman wondered how this model would interface with the crisis intervention centers that were being developed. Commissioner Williams said that officers will be receiving training on how to divert people to the centers if they are available in their location.

Mr. Cleghorn wondered whether, now that VPO training is provided by tribal entities, there was any plan to provide VPOs with CIT. Commissioner Williams said that local law enforcement agencies who are doing CIT will often extend those training opportunities to other law enforcement agencies. Mr. Welch

added that with the APSC grant, agencies can request funds for CIT, which will cover the officer's training, travel, and covering the officer's regular shifts while the officer is gone.

Commissioner Williams said he could circulate the new CIT policy to the Commission, as well as information on the funding Mr. Welch mentioned.

### *Title 12/Competency*

Commissioner Williams said that there had been two bills to amend Title 12 that were introduced by the governor during the last legislative session. Neither bill moved, and both bills will die since this year is the end of the 2-year legislative session. He will keep an eye out whether there are any similar bills introduced next year. One bill was about psychiatric commitments, using DOC as a temporary holding spot. The other was related to competency issues and qualifications of evaluators. He thought that with the advent of Crisis Now, there will be discussions as to how API can hold forensic patients.

DC Al Wall noted that there was a new CEO at API, Noel Rea. DHSS was looking at the spectrum of treatment in the psychiatric response system. New DHSS deputy commissioner Clinton Lasley will replace him as contact for that, and DC Wall suggested including DC Lasley in future discussions.

Ms. Dunham noted that the topic of Title 12 and competency was something the Commission had flagged last year for discussion at some point this year. She wondered whether the Commission wanted to take any action on this topic.

Commissioner Williams said he missed the last meeting of the Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Recidivism Reduction Workgroup, which he saw as a successor group to the Behavioral Health Standing Committee, and he wondered if this was something the Rehabilitation Workgroup could look at. He noted that these issues can't be looked at in isolation— they relate to the work being done with Crisis Now.

Judge Rhoades thought it would be good for the Commission to decide what the workgroup's tasks are. She thought the Rehabilitation Workgroup was focused on rehabilitation behind the walls, reentry planning, and back end intercepts—what happens after people are incarcerated and models of incarceration. She was not sure that group was geared toward Title 12, which more related to "front door issues" and people who have not been convicted of a crime, and about insufficient resources to evaluate people for competency and restore them. She considered it a wholly different set of issues. They were very closely looked at before, and essentially stem from the issue of not having a fully functional psychiatric hospital. The Behavioral Health Standing Committee and other groups have looked at it and there were also recommendations. She thought the work has fundamentally been done. She thought the Commission could either jump back in and update the existing recommendations, or decide that it can't achieve that within the year that is left of the Commission.

Chair Claman thought Judge Rhoades was correct that revisiting these issues is a big task, and had been the subject of a lot of thought and consideration. Given that the Commission will sunset next year, he wondered whether the Commission was interested in going so far as to start a workgroup to look at these issues, or wait to see if there is more legislation introduced next year, possibly pulling together something at the last minute.

Judge Rhoades thought it would be nice to get an update on where things stand; there have been lawsuits on this topic, and some participants on the Commission were parties. Chair Claman thought that might be an appropriate topic, even just an update on the various lawsuits for the August meeting.

Commissioner Williams agreed on getting an update on lawsuits regarding API and related issues, and also an update on what is going on with Crisis Now and how that relates. Chair Claman said that made sense, and also thought it would be good to learn more about SB 120, related to authority to use Crisis Now centers as an alternative to arrest, and administering psychotropic medications. Getting updates on these issues would put the Commission in good shape when the Legislature is back in session.

### **Update re: Prisoner Access to Medicaid Enrollment**

Ms. Dunham explained that the Commission requested some follow up on this topic at the last plenary meeting. She had circulated a memo from Mr. Welch. She noted that there are two issues to accessing Medicaid enrollment while incarcerated: one is that people may not know they need to renew their enrollment or are eligible to enroll; the other is that because people who are incarcerated are not allowed access to computers for the purpose of Medicaid enrollment, they have to fill out applications on paper, and there is a backlog in processing the paper applications.

Regarding the latter issue, there had been a bill introduced in the recent legislative session that would have granted access to computers for people who are incarcerated, and while the bill did see some movement, it failed to make it out of committee before the legislature left. Regarding the former, there are service providers who help people get enrolled, but right now all services are being conducted via telephone if at all. The people who have reentry plans or reentry case managers will often receive help, but it is difficult to identify who will be released soon, and many people with shorter sentences will not be eligible for reentry planning or reentry case management.

Mr. Welch agreed, noting that it was very difficult to do inreach into DOC facilities right now, so service providers can't go in and help people with the physical application. Once someone is released, providers like Partners for Progress can help people fill out the application online, although the person will need state ID—and anyone who has done a reentry simulation knows how difficult that can be. Unfortunately we won't really know how to proceed until the COVID crisis is resolved, and until people who are incarcerated have access to computers, efficiency in getting people processed will be low.

Commissioner Stanfill said that at the last Rehabilitation Reentry and Recidivism Reduction Workgroup meeting, the workgroup heard about the "no frills bill" that restricted internet access for people who are incarcerated. She wondered if the law meant that people who are incarcerated can't access the internet at all even without a PO. Mr. Welch said that was DOC's interpretation, that they can't access the internet unless it's for employment, education, or vocational training. So other purposes will need legislation amending or replacing that statute.

Chair Claman said that the House Judiciary committee heard the bill that would amend the statute, and recalled that DOC's position was that they don't have regulatory authority to change internet access, and that they needed a statutory change.

Senator Hughes said that the Senate also had conversations about this during session, and they were looking for ways to amend the statute; she was disappointed it didn't get done in time.

### **Data: Follow-up from Previous Meetings, Prison Population**

Ms. Dunham explained that in previous meetings, Commissioners had asked for additional information following staff data presentations. She had prepared that information for today's meeting.

The first subject for follow-up was the data on race and ethnicity presented at the December 2019 meeting. The data presented at that meeting showed an increase in the proportion of Alaska Natives held in prison compared to the proportion of Caucasians over the last five years. Alaska Natives were disproportionately overrepresented in the prison when compared to the percentage of Alaska Natives in the general population while Caucasians were underrepresented. Black people were also overrepresented in the prison population although the share of Black people in Alaska's prison population had remained steady.

Commissioners had asked to see this data broken down by violent and nonviolent offenses. The data showed a slight increase in the number of Alaska Natives and Black people incarcerated for violent crimes over the last five years (with a sharp uptick for Alaska Natives in the two most recent quarters.) The number of Caucasians incarcerated for violent crimes varied but the overall trend stayed steady over the last five years, with a slight uptick in the two most recent quarters.

Conversely, the data showed a significant decrease in the number of Caucasians incarcerated for nonviolent offenses over the last five years, with rates holding roughly steady since 2017. There was a moderate decrease in the number of Alaska Natives incarcerated for nonviolent offenses, followed by a slight increase in 2017. The number of Black people incarcerated for nonviolent offenses decreased slightly. Ms. Dunham observed that the data seemed to indicate that the reforms of 2016 benefitted Caucasians more than other groups.

In response to a question regarding race effects of the pretrial risk assessment tool. Dr. Troy Payne of the UAA Justice Center explained that the tools worked to predict pretrial failure equally among Caucasians and people of color; however, people of color are more likely to be held pretrial, controlling for other factors.

Commissioner Sean Case asked about the recent spike in the number of Alaska Natives incarcerated for violent crimes, wondering if any specific crime was driving that increase. Ms. Dunham said she did not know but staff could examine that. She added that the race data should be viewed with caution for a number of reasons, including the fact that assignment of race to an individual by DOC personnel is not foolproof, and it is difficult to assign causation to trends in criminal justice data.

Ms. Dunham explained that staff had also compiled follow-up data for people in custody pretrial. In March, the Commission looked at data showing that sentenced individuals are decreasing, while the pretrial population has been increasing since an initial decline in 2015. The increase has been significant over the past few quarters.

Nonviolent misdemeanor admissions have been increasing, following an initial decrease. The question at the March meeting was whether these could be related to charges of Violation of Conditions of Release (VCOR). The Commission's data show that admissions for VCORs did contribute to the increase in nonviolent misdemeanor admissions after the Pretrial Enforcement Division came on line at the beginning of 2018. The data show an increase in admissions of about 300 people. VCORs account for some but not the majority of the increase. However, the data presented only includes admissions for VCOR when that was the most serious charge, potentially undercounting the effect of VCORs. Dr. Payne pointed out that VCOR combined with another crime should be examined because it might have an additive effect, though that would be a complex analysis. Ms. Dunham agreed it would be very complex, noting that PED also monitors defendants for new crimes as well as VCORs, which could affect the trend.

The next topic was supervision. At the January meeting, the Commission asked for the most common supervision violations. Violations related to drugs and alcohol and absconding were the two most common. The top ten violations were fairly constant over 2017 – 2019. Chair Claman asked about the drop between 2017 and 2018 in the total number of individuals violated for drugs and alcohol. Ms. Dunham said that the total number of individuals under supervision had dropped significantly during those years, resulting in fewer violators overall. Violations per person fluctuated a small amount, but were roughly around 5. The data do not show which violations resulted in confinement, but Ms. Dunham offered to ask DOC.

The Commission also wanted to know more about earned compliance credits. The number of individuals receiving earned compliance credits was significant in 2017, then decreased slightly in 2018. There was a large drop between June and July of 2019, which is when HB49 changed the earned compliance formula to ten days for every thirty days of compliance. Senator Hughes said she would like to see the ability to give credits for individuals who take steps to improve themselves such as signing up for a class, either within DOC or while on supervision. She thought that earned credits could be an effective way to incentivize them. Commissioner Rhoades said that the RRRR group had discussed about how to incentivize participation in any program, and expected that work group to bring forward proposals.

In January, the Commission had asked about remands in Anchorage, specifically how many remands were accounted for by the same group of high utilizers ("friendly faces"), and by misdemeanants. Data provided by DOC showed that the average stay at Anchorage Correctional Complex of misdemeanants decreased from 2017 to 2018. However, the average number of remands per person increased slightly between 2017 to 2018. Dr. Payne commented that the data probably reflects a small number of individuals who are being remanded numerous times. He noted that a distribution chart would help illuminate the data. Judge Rhoades agreed that a relatively small number of people are very high utilizers of DOC, and other social services. She noted if those individuals could be identified, they could be targeted with better programming.

DOC data was used to show a profile of a high utilizer/friendly face given the pseudonym "Fred." This individual had an average of 25 remands per year, and was remanded over a 16.5 year period 414 times for a total of 5.86 years in prison. Many of the remands were for Title 47 holds. The estimated cost of this incarceration was nearly \$350,000. Ms. Stanfill said in her experience an individual such as "Fred" would be homeless some or most of the year. She noted that the cost estimate put forward by DOC did

not include the costs to law enforcement, the courts, and service providers. Ms. Rhoades asked what number of individuals across the state fall into the “friendly faces” category. Are there any common features of these individuals that could be targeted with specific resources for programming or incentives?

Dr. Payne noted that the Municipality of Anchorage has a project that attempts to estimate the costs to public resources of small numbers of individuals with large problems (Pay for Success). Chair Claman reminded that the example of “Fred” was an extreme case, and we do not know how common that profile is. A similar example provided by DOC of a person with the pseudonym of “Nancy” showed a large number of Title 47 holds. Commissioner Rhoades wondered whether the Title 47 holds were drug or mental illness holds.

Chair Claman suggested asking DOC what would be feasible in terms of putting together additional information, and this discussion could be scheduled for the August meeting. Ms. Stanfill asked also whether LSI-R scores would be reasonably available for these individuals. Dr. Payne offered to work on this data question for the August meeting. Mr. Williams noted that Crisis Now is also undertaking a similar analysis and it may be that the information requested could be gleaned from several sources.

Ms. Dunham said is sounded like the research questions were what number of people fall into this category, the extent to which they use public services, and whether there is any correlation with LSI-R scores. She was not sure there would be scores for this group since the LSI-R is typically done for people who are staying 90 days or more at a DOC facility. Judge Rhoades added that it should involve looking at where in the state this population is located and whether there are any common features of individuals in this group—to the extent that might shine a light on how to incentivize treatment.

Commissioner Williams recommended that the Commission change its nomenclature/labeling from “High Utilizer” to “Friendly Faces”. This change in language is happening in other locales nationally; particularly, as it relates to individuals experiencing behavioral health issues as well as other social determinants of health (employment, housing, access to health care, transportation, family and other community supports that if absent, increase the likelihood of criminal justice involvement).

Finally, Ms. Dunham presented some information about the prison population. She noted that there were several ways to get information on the prison population directly; one was AJIC’s interactive prison population dashboard; the other was the daily count sheet sent out by DOC. In recent months, the prison population has decreased from 97% of max capacity on 2/28/20 to 86% on 5/27/20. However, pretrial facilities are still at maximum or over maximum, during the last two weeks especially. Also, the data show shifts in sentenced versus unsentenced percentages. The change in the bail schedule adopted by the court system due to COVID is probably driving the unsentenced changes, but it is not clear what is driving the decreases to the sentenced population. Senator Hughes asked whether the decreases to the population are affecting DOC’s plans for reopening the Palmer Correctional Facility.

### **Marijuana Taxes + Recidivism Reduction Fund**

Chair Claman noted that in recent meetings the Commission wanted to know more about how money from the Recidivism Reduction Fund was being spent. He had circulated a memo about where the

funding is going, which he believed was fairly self-explanatory. Marijuana revenues have increased steadily. One question was why some of the Recidivism Reduction funds for DHSS went to the Pioneer Homes last fiscal year. He did not find out why but it appears that was a one-time allocation. Going forward, funding is targeted, and he didn't think it would happen again. This memo was just intended as an update from the last meeting.

Commissioner Stanfill noted that half of the marijuana tax receipts go to the Recidivism Reduction Fund, and wondered whether the programming for the Boys and Girls Club was part of the Fund. Chair Claman said that 50% of the marijuana tax receipts went to the Recidivism Reduction Fund, and 25% went to the Marijuana Education and Treatment fund. The latter fund is what funded the Boys and Girls Club programming Commissioner Stanfill was referring to.

Kelly Cunningham from legislative finance explained that both funding sources could be tapped for a grant to the Boys and Girls Club; it would be up to the grant office within DOC. The Marijuana Education and Treatment fund is intended for after school programs. She noted that the Marijuana Education and Treatment fund was administered through the public health division while the Recidivism Reduction Fund was administered through the Behavioral Health Division.

Senator Hughes recalled that Senator Giessel was behind the Marijuana Education and Treatment Fund. She wondered whether that Fund had to be specifically for talking to kids about marijuana use. Ms. Cunningham said that would be a question for the grant administrator. Chair Claman said to clarify that the Fund had issued grants and that the Boys and Girls Club was one organization that had applied for the grants. Ms. Cunningham said that was correct.

Commissioner Stanfill noted that in FY2020, receipts from marijuana taxes were projected to be \$23.3 million. It looked like the state would not be spending all 50% of those receipts through the Recidivism Reduction Fund for FY20, and she wondered if that would roll over. Ms. Cunningham said it would, anything that remains in fund at the end of the year stays there and is available to spend, subject to appropriation. Chair Claman said that it was his reading that appropriations this year were actually over what was anticipated to be collected. Brenda suggested connecting with Ms. Cunningham offline for more questions about where money going.

### **Commission Sunset: Ideas for the Future**

Susanne DiPietro, executive director of the Alaska Judicial Council and staff to the Commission, said she thought everyone was aware that the Commission was scheduled to sunset next June. The Commission was working on the sunset audit with legislative audit right now. The question for the group going forward was whether any of the work the Commission has been doing should be picked up or continued.

Ms. DiPietro had been thinking about data function a lot. The Commission's ability to receive data from the three departments has been very useful. Commission staff get quarterly data from each of the agencies and knit it together, and there has not previously been one entity that can do that to provide the big picture of what's happening in the criminal justice system.

The data collected is listed in statute at AS 44.19.645. Before the Commission, AJiC and the Judicial Council have both done studies on the criminal justice system, but what is new and improved with the Commission is the ability to get the data on an ongoing basis and be able to work with the data all the time in order to respond to questions from Commissioners, legislators, and others quickly without having to ask for data for each request.

Chair Claman said his general sense was that there was not a lot of support to extend the Commission as is, but the research and data functions have become helpful at various levels of policy and he thought that was important. He thought the Commission needed to make a recommendation for the legislature as to how to move forward. That was also a secondary question: how did the Commission want to approach this in terms of making a recommendation; should it be discussed in the next few meetings, and if so how detailed should the recommendation be?

Commissioner Stanfill said that she thought the Commission has done a lot of amazing work and she was sad that it doesn't have the support to go on. Hearing many voices at the table today was an example of how helpful and powerful it was to bring different perspectives together; she heard things from individuals on the Commission that she wouldn't have thought of otherwise. The Commission has done more than just analyze data. She was happy to have that part continue, but wanted to be vocal about the power of this group coming together to work on these topics. The Commission has done hours and hours of well-researched work. She thought the legislature did a good thing putting the Commission together.

Commissioner Williams wondered what might be driving the lack of support for the Commission. Chair Claman said that his impression was that most folks perceived that SB 91 came from the Commission, so different perspectives on the changes made by SB 91 and its subsequent repeal colored people's impression of the Commission. For that reason Commission recommendations don't carry much weight, and legislators don't think of the Commission as a resource to the extent it could. The research from national data and trends in Alaska's data, etc. has enormous value but he didn't get the sense that others in the legislature necessarily agree.

Senator Hughes agreed that SB 91 was viewed as a Commission thing. She thought that turning the Commission's focus this year to things like recidivism reduction and DV would generate more interest, as things that could be useful. She wondered whether the audit was also looking at the work of the workgroups too. Ms. DiPietro said it was yes. Senator Hughes thought that maybe the audit could be pivotal, and could resonate with the legislature, and it was possible that the Commission could be continued. She thought that with the fiscal crisis and COVID there was really more of a need for looking at cost-benefit analysis. She was not going to throw in the towel at this point.

Commissioner Williams said that the work of Commission was focused on very complex issues. If it was going to be effective, it needs to be some kind of inter-departmental, community-connected body that can hear diverse perspectives. Otherwise decisions are made without that broad input. It was unfortunate that the people were that latching on to one product from the Commission; there was another whole body of work to look at in terms of recommendations. There was also the benefit of bringing people together; things are resolved at meetings that might not be identified or discussed otherwise. Any organization needs to think about its mission and how to move forward in positive way.

He thought there needed to be an entity to do this work, whether through the Commission extending the sunset date, or some other way—it would be good to keep talking about these issues.

Chair Claman thought that in the end, the Commission needs to decide. Part of the reason it was on the agenda was that it needs to be a fairly robust discussion among the Commission. He thought that whatever the path forward was, it should be a recommendation. If the Commission decides that it wants to continue, it need to show why and also develop a focus. It could be different from what it is now. Presenting options for the legislature would probably be important. He definitely didn't want to put off this discussion to March; hopefully the Commission can come up with a path forward, and hopefully come up with legislative support. He noted that people have asked about the Criminal Justice Working Group, but that body was largely executive branch employees—less diverse, with a different mission.

Senator Hughes said that if there was support for a group like the Commission to continue, why not continue this Commission? It could be renamed; instead of the Criminal Justice Commission, which connotes SB 91, how about the Alaska Crime Reduction Commission or something similar? Something that connotes what the workgroups are focusing on. It would better define the current mission, and might fit better with what the public and governor want.

Chair Claman said he would have staff draft a framework for a path forward. The comments from today would help, and there would need to be more discussion; he thought having something to look at would help.

### **Annual Report: Funding and Policy Recommendations**

Ms. Dunham noted that for last year's annual report, the Commission had come up with plan for the work the Commission wanted to accomplish in the following year. She wondered if the Commission wanted to do that again.

Commissioner Stanfill thought that last year's process was helpful, and she would like to do it again. Senator Hughes said this year's effort could also link to the results of the audit as well as the previous discussion about making recommendations for carrying on with the Commission. Commissioner Case agreed, and thought it would be best in discussing the next version of the Commission to include a discussion on how best to get results. Justice Bolger agreed.

Chair Claman noted that during last year's process, the Commission had had a facilitated session to walk through the Commission's ideas and to come up with priorities. He wondered if the Commission wanted to do that again. Senator Hughes noted that the Commission was still working on what it came up with last year, and a lot of that work could be continued. Commissioner Case thought the process could be done without a facilitator, as that process used a lot of time. Chair Claman said it sounded like the Commission did not want a facilitated discussion. There was general agreement.

Ms. Dunham wondered if there would be any recommendations for this year's annual report in addition to what the workgroups were doing.

Senator Hughes said that because the legislature did not accomplish passing the computer access bill, she would promote that for a recommendation. Commissioner Stanfill agreed; it was a very important issue and a recommendation endorsing it would not need a lot of work.

Judge Rhoades wondered when recommendations should be completed. Ms. Dunham said ideally by the August meeting, so that the annual report final draft can be circulated in advance of the October meeting. Judge Rhoades said she expected some recommendations to come from the RRRR workgroup, and the computer access recommendation could be part of that or could be direct from the Commission.

Chair Claman said the other recommendation would be the recommendation for what to do with the Commission sunset. He reminded the Commission that the timing would be to get the recommendations done by September, then circulate a final draft of the annual report ahead of the October 15 plenary meeting.

Ms. Dunham asked the Commission whether they wanted to make recommendations for reinvestment/funding of criminal justice programming.

Senator Hughes noted that there was funding in the capital budget for a pilot project to reduce recidivism, which was partially vetoed but still moving forward. She suggested it as something the Commission may want to put on the list, as a project to potentially replicate elsewhere in the state.

Judge Rhoades said that she was unfamiliar with that project. She also noted that the RRRR work group may have funding recommendations.

Senator Hughes said the pilot project was a therapeutic campus for people leaving prison that would provide treatment, counseling, and job training before they transition into their own housing. She could give an update on the project at the August meeting. Judge Rhoades also suggested that Ms. Dunham could pass information on the project to the RRRR workgroup, which might find it useful to know about. Senator Hughes agreed and said she could have someone give an update at the next workgroup.

Commissioner Williams clarified that these new recommendations for funding/reinvestment would be for FY 22. He said it sounded like there were good ideas out there that could be discussed in workgroups as kind of an iterative process, hopefully culminating at a plenary meeting for contemplation by the Commission as a whole.

### **Public Comment**

Angela Hall with SOLO said she thought the work the Commission performs is of great importance, involving many groups working toward a common goal—the reduction of crime and the rehabilitation of human beings. She was thankful for this Commission, and if the name needed to change, she would suggest Alaska Restorative Justice Commission.