

Meeting Summary
Alaska Criminal Justice Data Analysis Commission
May 28, 2026
10:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Alaska Judicial Council Conference Room, Suite 450, 510 L Street
Anchorage, Alaska
Zoom

Chair Claman called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Members present were Lt. Jean Achee, Senator Claman, Terrence Haas (Zoom), Angie Kemp (Zoom), Charlie Kidd (ANJC), Ret. Judge David Mannheimer, Judge Kari McCrea, Lisa Purinton (representing Commissioner Cockrell, Zoom), Ret. Judge Trevor Stephens (Zoom), Autumn Veal, and DOC Deputy Commissioner April Wilkerson (Zoom).

Rep. Andrew Gray, Heather Phelps (representing Dr. Mary Wilson), Brenda Stanfill, and Brian Wilson (Deputy Chief, Operations, APD) were absent.

Staff present were Susanne DiPietro, Teri Carns, Susie Dosik, and Aimee Herubin.

Chair Claman called the roll and determined a quorum was present. Ms. DiPietro introduced the Judicial Council's new Research Analyst, Dr. Aimee Herubin.

Approve Agenda

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

Approve February 27, 2026 meeting summary

Lt. Achee moved to approve the February 27, 2026 meeting summary, and Judge Mannheimer seconded the motion. Members approved the motion without objections.

Public Comment Period

Chair Claman opened the meeting to public comment at 11:00 a.m. There were no comments. The Chair closed the public comment period at 11:30 a.m. Chair Claman noted that the Commission receives public comments at any time through the Judicial Council website.

Parole Board Discussion

Parole Board Chair Leitoni Tupou invited questions about the Parole Board's work. Members discussed discretionary parole rates, and why they changed over the past ten years. Mr. Tupou mentioned the legislation that gave more opportunities for discretionary parole (SB91, 2015) and subsequent legislation that returned the chances for discretionary parole to the earlier statute (HB49, 2018). He said that not many people in the institutions qualify to apply for discretionary parole, in part because there are not enough programs to prepare them for it. He noted that some can go to community rehabilitation centers (half-way houses, or CRCs), or on electronic monitoring (EM). However some do not want to be limited by EM, so they apply for discretionary parole.

Mr. Yff (Public Defender Agency) said that many people with repeat or more serious offenses are no longer eligible for discretionary parole. Mr. Tuponi said that existing laws are the biggest restrictions on who is eligible for discretionary parole, including the provision that parole release cannot "diminish the seriousness of the offense." This applies to geriatric and medical parole as well.

Ms. Veal asked for more information about what would make people eligible for the different forms of non-mandatory parole. Ms. Wilkerson said that newly passed legislation, HB 239, broadens the Parole Board's authority. Chair Claman said he was not sure if the bill has been transmitted to the governor yet. Ms. Veal asked for data about the number of incarcerated people who were in hospice or palliative care, and the number of people aged 75 or older who have served at least 10 years of their sentence. Ms. Wilkerson said that she could provide those numbers. She noted that some information would not be available because of people's rights to privacy. She added that CRCs had strict limits on who could be in those facilities, by type of offense and other criteria because of security and liability issues.

Chair Claman asked that a discussion of the parole situation be included in the DAC 2026 Annual Report. Mr. Tuponi suggested that a group of people could be convened to consider these challenges.

Sex Offenses Report

Chair Claman said that staff were seeking feedback about the revised and updated sex offenders report. Ms. Di Pietro invited suggestions from Commission members about added analyses. Members suggested:

- Revised, more narrative executive summary, with a better description of the reasons for the report;

- More information about the reasons for the high numbers of sex offenses in NW Alaska -law enforcement? Lack of facilities and services?
- Recent drops in the numbers of reports, cases filed;
- Comparison of funneling of sex offenses with reports, filings, and dispositions/resolutions of other types of cases in the justice system;
- Coverage of effects of changes made by HB 239 in next few years; eligibility of sex offenders for types of parole;
- A survey of stakeholders to get insights about reasons for high numbers of sex offenses, as well as reasons for lower reporting and filing.
- More about recidivism of sex offenders, re-entry issues, effectiveness of treatment, effects of aging, prevention programs;
- More discussion of minors being a majority of victims;
- Explain reasons for lack of Felony Class A charges and convictions;
- Note COVID pandemic years where appropriate;
- Agency staffing issues, including numbers of sworn peace officers, number of out-of-state employees, and other factors that could be related to reporting and filing of sex offense cases.

Ms. DiPietro thanked members for their helpful comments and said that a revised version of the report would be available before the July meeting.

Chair Claman called for a ten-minute break.

Probation/Parole Study

Ms. Wilkerson said that DOC research capacity is somewhat limited as the department moves toward a paperless management system. Mr. Yff suggested that the report also look at how legislative changes in the past ten years have affected probation in particular, including the use of compliance credits, and the use of administrative sanctions by probation officers. Staff will work on the project as possible.

Pretrial/continuances Study

Ms. Herubin presented information about the status of the database, and preliminary analyses of the existing data. Members suggested that some topics receive more attention, including:

- The differences between appearance and performance bonds, if that information is available, and the extent to which different types of bonds (secured, unsecured, 100% cash, etc.) are used in each situation;
- More analysis by the severity level of the offenses (e.g., Unclassified, Class A, B);

- The association between types of bonds and other conditions of bail, including PED, Third Party, EM, etc.;
- Length of time between continuances, by variables including location, severity of offenses;
- Clarification of terms used, including information about how procedures differ by location (e.g., trial call, vs. scheduled trial week);
- Clarification that not all courts keep the same information in log notes or elsewhere.

Agency Staffing research

Ms. Di Pietro said that DAC staff do not have access to the data needed for this study. She asked members which agencies should participate and what type of data they should provide. Lisa Purinton said that DPS lists all sworn peace officers in the state for a snapshot date, in the UCR annual report.

Ms. Kemp said that Dept. of Law could provide data – they would look at the level of experience of each attorney, going back five to ten years. She mentioned that the types of evidence provided to the department for prosecution of cases had changed substantially during that period.

Ms. DiPietro asked if agencies could do snapshot days like DPS (October 30), for staffing for the past five years. Judge Stephens asked how pay increases might have affected staffing. Members discussed the question of staff for rural areas. Lt. Achee said that many officers come from out-of-state for a two-week-on, two-week-off schedule; in Whittier, they work on a one-week-on, one-week-off plan. Judge McCrea said that some of the attorney agencies staff their rural offices with people who live in the larger communities of the state. Staff agreed to pursue the topics further.

Next Meeting; Adjourn

The next meeting is set for July 23. Ms. Veal said that the Mental Health Trust space might be available if the LIO is not. The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.