

**STATE OF ALASKA
COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT**

**MINUTES OF THIRD QUARTER FY08 MEETING
March 13, 2008**

**333 Willoughby Avenue, 10th Floor
DOA Commissioner's Conference Room
Juneau, Alaska**

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Acting Chair Rick Svobodny called the meeting of the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault to order at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 13, 2008. All seven Council members were present at roll call.

Council members present: **Richard Svobodny**, Department of Law (vice chair); **Colonel Audie Holloway**, Department of Public Safety, AST; **Ann House**, Public Member; **Bill Hogan**, Department of Health & Social Services; **Barbara Thompson**, Department of Education & Early Development; **Stephanie McFadden**, Public Member; **Yvonne Sarren**, Public Member

Council staff present: **Chris Ashenbrenner**, Executive Director; **Jo Griggs**, Administrative Manager; **Lauree Morton**, Program Specialist; **Paul McCarthy**, Associate Coordinator; **Ella Nierra**, Administrative Assistant

Others present (in person or by telephone): **Grace Danborn** and **Peggy Brown**, Alaska Network on Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault; **Tom Schultz**, WISH Board (Ketchikan); **Naomi Michaelsen**, WISH (Ketchikan); **Representative Anna Fairclough**

COUNCIL CONFLICT INQUIRY

Chair Svobodny inquired if Council members had a potential conflict of interest with any items on this meeting's agenda that they wished to disclose.

There were no conflict of interest disclosures.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

Yvonne Sarren of Unalakleet and Stephanie McFadden of Anchorage, the two new public members on the Council, were introduced and invited to say a few words about themselves.

APPROVE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2007 MEETING

BILL HOGAN MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2007 MEETING AS WRITTEN. ANN HOUSE SECONDED.

The motion passed unanimously.

CDVSA Executive Director Chris Ashenbrenner explained that she scheduled a working lunch today because that is when Representative Anna Fairclough is able to attend and address the Council.

DISCUSSION OF CHAIR ELECTION

Chair Svobodny said the bylaws state that a chair and vice chair are to be elected at the first meeting of each year. He suggested tabling this until the next meeting, given that there are two new members on the Council, and that people have not had time to think about nominations.

After a brief exchange, Council members concurred with taking up the election of officers at the next meeting. The Chair asked anyone interested in serving as chair to contact the executive director.

Ms. Ashenbrenner noted that a recommendation in the CDVSA Task Force report is that terms on the Council should be three years rather than the current two-year terms.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Annual Report:

Ms. Ashenbrenner first distributed copies of the CDVSA annual report and the cover letter to the Governor, noting that the annual report was produced entirely in-house. She credited staff for doing a great job.

Ms. Ashenbrenner also handed out her three-page summary report to the Council (*on file at the CVDSA offices*) and reviewed its highlights.

Victim Service Programs Quarterly Reports:

The FY08 second quarter victim service programs performance report summaries were included in the meeting packet. Ms. Ashenbrenner noted that staff made the report summaries shorter than they have been, and she asked for any feedback from the Council on this change. She said some of the CDVSA Task Force members thought the Council meetings were not as meaningful as they could be and questioned the efficacy of having all the victim services quarterly reports in the packets. On the other hand, Council members have said that they value the reports for keeping them in tune with what is going on with the victim service programs.

Colonel Holloway stated that he reads the quarterly report summaries to see what is going on and what particular problems there are.

Ms. Sarren said the reports were very informational for her.

Ms. Thompson said the new format was easy to follow and made more sense.

Ms. House stated that the performance report summaries were very well done.

Mr. Hogan said it was good to have the individual program reports, but he asked if staff could highlight items that the Council should take note of, or comment on any trends to be aware of. That way, Council members would see the reports in the broader context of what is really going on in the system.

Colonel Holloway suggested an executive summary of the highlighted items in the individual reports, to draw some conclusions for the Council to think about. He noted that some of the information may not be in the quarterly reports but could be something that staff hears about or observes through other contacts with the programs.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she asks the coordinators to keep her informed of trends they notice as they talk to the program people on a daily basis. Her summary report notes that programs continue to be challenged with staff turnover. She said the programs do not get enough funding to pay their advocates and staff well enough to keep them. The Cordova program lost two advocates to jobs paying them twice as much. In some cases, programs cannot find people to fill vacant positions. It is very expensive to recruit, hire, and train new people. That is the challenge that staff continues to see this quarter.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said the other trend that she is always so impressed with is the amount of community organizing and community interaction going on - leading the marches, leading the fundraising, educating, raising awareness, etc. These people run the day-to-day activities of a victim services program and do an impressive level of community work as well.

Chair Svobodny mentioned that he heard it was a big problem for shelter programs to pay for facility expenses, like fuel and utilities. Ms. Ashenbrenner said it is a huge challenge: in addition to what the Chair mentioned, there is Worker's Compensation Insurance, freight costs in rural areas, and the price of airline tickets to transport victims from outlying areas. It was the reason the CDVSA put an increment into the FY09 budget, to try and get a little more funding to programs. The House did not include the increment in their budget, and the Senate Finance Subcommittee cut it by \$100,000, so the outcome is unknown at this point. Even so, that 5.2% increase over what the programs got last year is barely going to keep up with things. Staff is also anticipating a fairly large cut in the VOCA grant (Victims Of Crime Act) — maybe as much as \$178,000 — and almost every shelter gets those funds. She also heard that there is a smaller cut to the FVPSA Grant (Family Violence Prevention Services Act) that funds shelters. Lastly, there is a report that VAWA (Violence Against Women Act) will be cut again. She is hoping to hold on to at least flat funding from the State, given the federal grant cuts expected.

Regarding higher shelter expenses, Chair Svobodny asked if the services being provided are declining, and if there is not a decline, how are the programs doing it. Ms. Ashenbrenner invited Peggy Brown, executive director of the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, to answer that.

Ms. Brown said it is a real problem. At a recent Network meeting, they did an exercise with the Bethel program, trying to cost out core services, although it is difficult to put a price tag on the different services. They also looked at collaborative services, which are also difficult to cost out. The Network, at its next meeting, is going to examine how much funding has been eaten away. With fuel costs skyrocketing and positions declining, people are getting squeezed. There was even talk this year about what it would be like if a shelter program closed down. Programs really are at the bare minimum, and they do not know how to get people to see that. As part of the CDVSA Task Force, legislators and commissioners saw that in several places. When programs are asked about doing prevention work, they say they do what they can, but it is very difficult when they are doing crisis intervention without enough staff. Their staff are leaving to work at places that pay quite a bit more and include health insurance.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that most shelters try to find a way to continue offering the core services, which are safety and crisis intervention. The shelters get full and put mattresses on the floor and put people in safe homes. In Anchorage they talk about doing triage to make sure that those with the highest safety needs are able to stay in shelter and then find other shelter for those people whose safety is not quite as compromised. So programs focus on crisis intervention and safety services, and then the essential work of community education and prevention are compromised — and the programs are the only ones really doing much of that. Education and prevention have to happen in order to stem the tide of violence, and it is unfortunate that shrinking budgets are compromising that piece.

On-Site Audits Completed:

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that five audits were completed:

- Maniilaq Family Crisis Center in Kotzebue - January 2008.
- Tundra Women's Coalition in Bethel - February 2008.
- Bering Sea Women's Group in Nome - February 2008.
- Women in Safe Homes in Ketchikan - February 2008.
- Ketchikan Indian Corporation Batterers Intervention Program - March 2008.

Her written summary report to the Council contained the important points about each of these on-site audits. Lauree Morton had a special report later in the agenda on the WISH program in Ketchikan.

Ms. Sarren asked about visiting the BSWG program in Nome, since it is in her area of the state. Ms. Ashenbrenner said she would talk to Ms. Sarren later about making the arrangements. She added that Council members are encouraged, whenever possible, to visit shelters if they happen to be in an area, just to spend 15-20 minutes with the program people and let them know the Council supports them, and to hear from these people directly. She said CDVSA staff would try

to notify Council members when trainings are available in communities they live in so they can attend all or part of the trainings.

Chair Svobodny mentioned that he has to go to Nome and could possibly arrange to go at the same time that Ms. Sarren was planning to visit the shelter program there.

Ms. McFadden inquired about the consequences to a program that does not do well in an on-site audit and then does not come up to standards. Ms. Ashenbrenner said the CDVSA regulations do not address remedial actions; for example, there are no provisions for putting a program on probation, although the Council has done it in the past. She added that a condition of grant awards is that a program must follow CDVSA regulations. So at present, the Council can withhold funding, which is a drastic measure.

Ms. Thompson stated that the Council has withheld funding in the past. The Council has put stringent grant award conditions upfront for the release of funds if a program is not complying or until they come into compliance. She said the Council uses that approach judicially and works with the programs so they return to compliance with the standards.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said staff has to look at what the most important elements are that the Council wants to see functioning at a shelter, and the technical areas necessary for that process, before getting to the crucial point of recommending withholding funds.

Chair Svobodny asked if the grant award agreements have a provision that programs not in compliance have to pay back the CDVSA. Jo Griggs explained that there are provisions that if a program does not spend the funds according to the grant award agreement, the program has to pay back that portion. She added that, with limited funding, staff works hard to make sure that programs abide by the conditions. In the past, the Council has discussed when to stop the funding if a program in trouble has reached the point of being terminated, although this situation has never happened. The CDVSA has received money back from programs that have not spent it according to their grant award agreements.

Program Highlight of the Quarter:

Juneau's AWARE (Aiding Women In Abuse and Rape Emergencies) has a teen program called TRAIN, a crisis line and peer training. It is a great example of community outreach and community responsiveness. The program is now in its second year.

Ms. Ashenbrenner noted that April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month, and she encouraged people to show support for activities in the various communities.

Chair Svobodny asked for a list of the acronyms used at meetings and in materials that Council members could keep with them for easy reference.

Data System Implementation:

Ms. Ashenbrenner reported that CDVSA is still struggling with implementation of the database.

The Network implemented its distributed database so programs can input and gather data and get information out at their local sites. That information is not sent out of the local sites because of victim confidentiality. The CDVSA office has been working with its contractors to develop a system that will extract meaningful data that can be put into the Department of Public Safety server for use there. It is one of staff's top priorities to get the database system fully functioning.

New Reporting Requirements:

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that the Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) grant is implementing new reporting requirements effective October 1, 2008. FVPSA has developed some true outcome measures for shelter services. The two primary outcome measures they are going to require all states to have are based on exit interviews of program participants, both shelter occupants and people who have attended groups run by shelters. The outcome measures are the number of survivors who have increased their strategies for enhancing their safety because of the services they received, and the number of survivors who have increased their knowledge of community resources.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said that some people think that victim service programs and the CDVSA should be measured by how much they reduce the rates of domestic violence and sexual assault. That is certainly a worthy goal and what everyone strives for, but it is not the way to measure the effectiveness of shelters. CDVSA staff will be working with the Network over the summer to develop a fuller set of outcome questions that will gather more information than the two measures required by FVPSA. Ginger Baim in Dillingham has already done a lot of work on this.

Mr. Hogan inquired if all the victim service programs receive FVPSA funding. Ms. Griggs replied that three out of the 19 CDVSA-funded shelters do not. Mr. Hogan asked if all 19 programs would be required to report on the FVPSA outcome measures plus whatever additional questions CDVSA staff and the Network develop.

Ms. Brown, who was a member of the national work group that developed the outcome measures, stated that the two primary measures were envisioned for all programs that receive FVPSA funding. She said the Network had not had any discussion on whether the Council would want those measures to apply to all programs.

Regarding the second FVPSA outcome measure, Ms. Thompson commented that as a victim she could learn about a whole lot of resources but never take advantage of them. Ms. Ashenbrenner said staff might have a fuller answer to that after the work with the Network. She thought it would be about what the CDVSA expects the shelter programs to be doing, because shelters cannot make people do something. What is known about the dynamics of domestic violence is that it can take a number of visits to a shelter or a program before a person has the information, resources, support, and safety plan in place in order for them to leave. So it would be very hard to measure whether or not a visit to a shelter actually meant a person accessed a service.

Ms. Brown said that the work group chose the words "specifically increase their strategies,"

which implies not just a checklist of available resources in the community, but that the advocates are constantly working with the victims to make sure that they are availing themselves of the various services that they need, as opposed to referrals.

Ms. Thompson stated that the FVPSA outcome measures are big deal things for the programs to measure. It will add a whole new layer of data to collect pre and post to measure them. Ms. Brown agreed that it is an extra layer of work, but the Network has been preparing the programs for it for about a year and a half. She added that the measures have been piloted in several states, and once they started doing it, the states got outcome measures they could use.

Grant Applications Submitted:

Ms. Ashenbrenner reviewed a list of grant applications [submitted to federal agencies during](#) the quarter:

- Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) STOP grant formula funding application.
- Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA) formula grant.
- VAWA Grants to Encourage Arrest competitive grant application for enhanced court-based legal advocacy services. This is a follow-up grant that has been used for Tribal-State Forums in the past.
- Safe Havens grant for Interior Alaska Center for Non-Violent Living (IAC) in Fairbanks to provide supervised visitation and exchange services for families with children that have experienced domestic violence. IAC wrote the grant, and CDVSA staff partnered with IAC when they asked for help after their local governmental agency partner fell through.

Ms. Ashenbrenner reported that the Office of Violence Against Women approved the VAWA STOP grant three-year plan.

Batterers Intervention Program Issues:

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that staff is restarting an initiative to improve measurement of batterers intervention programs. This is a separate agenda item later in the day.

Other Projects:

- Assisted Living Training and Regulations (ALTR) - Mr. Hogan will give a full report later in the meeting.
- VAWA Victim Services and Discretionary grant funding Request For Proposal (RFP) development and release.
- Sexual Assault Anonymous Reporting protocols, etc. A project with the Network and Department of Public Safety - there will be a full report at the June meeting.
- Sexual Assault Prevention - survey and integration with the Centers For Disease Control (CDC) Delta Grant.
- CDVSA web site improvements.
- Grants to Encourage Arrest 2008 - six Tribal-State Forums scheduled May through September around the state.
- Recommendations of the CDVSA Task Force. A full report later in the meeting.

Chair Svobodny called a scheduled break at this point, and the meeting came back to order at 10:25 a.m.

Ms. Ashenbrenner handed out invitations to the Network's continuing legal education conference to be held March 31 and April 1. She also apprised the Council of a conference in Anchorage starting April 28 put on by the Alaska Native Justice Center in partnership with the U.S. Department of Justice Violence Against Women Office.

REPORT ON WISH (KETCHIKAN) PROGRAM AUDIT

CDVSA Program Specialist Lauree Morton conducted a full on-site audit of Women In Safe Homes (WISH) in Ketchikan on February 18-22, 2008.

Tom Schultz, chairman of the WISH board, joined the meeting by teleconference for this agenda item. Naomi Michaelson, the interim executive director of WISH, was also on line.

Ms. Morton reported that in Ketchikan she spoke to several community partners and various staff members, and also attended a board meeting where seven board members were present. She conducted an exit interview with the interim executive director, the board chair, and the secretary. The new board members have good, fresh energy, and the board is moving in a positive direction. The chair is meeting with the interim director on a weekly basis to keep informed of shelter activities. There is a plan to go to some of the outlying villages to rebuild relationships. A board member is volunteering her time at the shelter to work on re-entering missing information on the computer system. Another board member and a secretary are working on the membership roll and reconnecting with members. The community partners indicated their willingness to work with WISH and are happy about the new direction it is heading in. They particularly commented on WISH's increased involvement in community projects and tasks.

Ms. Morton stated that one of the critical improvements for the CDVSA is that victims are coming back to the shelter. Since late October or early November, WISH has had at least 10 people, and upwards of 20, in the shelter. The shelter capacity is 25. Prior to that, not many people had been accessing residential services. WISH staff are working hard to provide good services and reorganize administrative functions, and they deserve a lot of credit for the efforts they are making.

Ms. Morton said that while a lot of improvements have been made, the program is still significantly out of compliance with most of the Council's regulations. She is currently drafting an on-site report. This is normally sent to the program so they have an opportunity to look at it and indicate whether they agree with or dispute anything in the draft report. Those comments are returned to Ms. Morton, and she will produce a final report with timelines for WISH to come into compliance.

Ms. Morton stated that Ms. Ashenbrenner had requested that she give the Council an overview

of areas at WISH that need to be addressed. One of the most critical is the financial and accounting system. WISH was operating under a for-profit accounting system, which is very different from non-profit fund accounting. There was also a period of time when they were not able to access any of the computerized financial records. So a serious recommendation that WISH agrees with, and wants to start working on, is to get a non-profit fund accounting system. The final audit report's recommendation will be to have a system up and running before the beginning of the next fiscal year, which is July 1.

Ms. Morton said there was also an issue of whether or not the bonuses that were paid to WISH staff in FY07 came out of CDVSA funds. If that proved to be correct, then that money would have to be repaid. There is now documentation that at least one of the bonuses was paid with CDVSA funds, close to \$14,000. She is waiting for confirmation in the records on the first bonus payout, which is believed to have been paid with CDVSA funds. So there will need to be a repayment schedule for that.

Ms. Morton stated that there was also some concern with in-kind documentation in FY07 and whether there was an accurate accounting for donated goods and services, and the volunteer hours being accrued. During FY07, WISH staff were instructed not to put a value on any goods or services that came in the agency. The previous executive director assigned some time to volunteer services that were not in fact volunteer services. So the concern is about the policies and procedures for in-kind documentation up and through the first quarter of FY08. When she visited the shelter in November 2007 and made a recommendation about what needed to change, the staff were very quick to develop a form that they are now using to appropriately record in-kind services and donations. The next step is to tie that into their financial records, so the CDVSA can confirm that WISH is accurately reporting match and meeting match requirements.

Ms. Morton said there were delays in getting the financial audit under way. It is a statutory requirement that non-profits that are required to get a single audit must provide a copy of it to the State within nine months of the fiscal year end. The end of the nine months would be March 31 for WISH. Yesterday WISH received a copy of their independent audit and tried to fax it to the CDVSA this morning, but several pages were missing. She will pursue getting the remaining pages this afternoon so she can see what the auditor has found as financial costs in question.

Ms. Morton said it would be helpful for WISH to hire an executive director as soon as possible. In the transition, they are hesitant to move forward on some issues, but implementing a new accounting system is an example of something that can't wait. WISH's policies and procedures need to be revised. The administrative policies for interacting with program participants, personnel, volunteer and staff training manuals, the bylaws, and the board's orientation manual all have significant areas that are out of compliance with the CDVSA regulations. There are also areas that may look correct on paper but that are not implemented in practice. So they need to conform the practices to what is written policy. Board member training is also important, and they have had some training. However, they would benefit from some financial responsibility of non-profit boards training, as well as specifics on how to recognize areas to question when reviewing financial reports, what to look for when gauging expenditures throughout the year,

board ethics, board interaction with staff, etc.

Ms. McFadden inquired about staff training. Ms. Morton explained that staff is required to receive 40 hours of training, in order to meet the state's confidentiality statutes. The Network has a model training curriculum that it sends out to programs, and the Network also holds trainings throughout the year that staff can attend. There is also a lot of in-service training, and many programs have their own training manuals. Training must be documented in personnel files, which is another area that WISH needs to work on.

Ms. Ashenbrenner mentioned that the victim service programs also receive money through federal grants and must comply with certain federal requirements.

Mr. Hogan asked what Ms. Morton meant by "members" at WISH. Ms. Morton said individual community members can participate in the activities of the organization through formal membership and paying annual dues. This is the pool of people that the board of directors comes from. There are state statutes that govern members, usually deferring to a program's bylaws regarding how they will attract and retain members and what level of interaction members can have with the organization. In WISH's case, their bylaws provide for individual members who pay annual dues and who must be in good standing in order to vote for board members or serve on the board. A list of those members is supposed to be kept up to date on the premises, but WISH staff were unable to find all the lists from previous years. The 2006 list had 149 members but many of those were businesses, which is not a class that their bylaws allow them to have. In 2007, the membership dropped to 33. So WISH is having difficulty in determining who their current members are.

Mr. Hogan commented that a membership association is a 501(c)6, whereas most non-profits are 501(c)3. He wondered if that was part of the problem, as least as far as where WISH draws their board members from. Regarding the financial audit, he asked if Ms. Morton was suggesting that the CDVSA did not get a complete audit report on purpose. Ms. Morton said no, that she meant that WISH has been receiving information piecemeal and is struggling, even with the auditor they hired, to get all the information at one time.

Mr. Hogan asked if WISH has worked with the Foraker Group around board training related to finances, ethics, responsibilities, etc. Ms. Morton said she knew that WISH had worked with Foraker but did not know the full extent of the training content.

Tom Schultz explained that when he first joined the board of WISH last fall they had a one-day training with Foraker in December that covered all the topics. There is another training scheduled in April to cover the same topics because there are several new board members.

Mr. Hogan said it sounded like there needed to be some ongoing, mentoring type of training over time, and there are good resources available through Foraker.

Regarding WISH's accounting system, Mr. Schultz said they are in the process of upgrading that

to a regular non-profit accounting system. The upgrade will also include all new hardware. He expected that later in March or early April some of the new system would be in place. He added that the board met with the auditor a couple of days after Ms. Morton left, and the auditor went over a lot of the things that Ms. Morton discussed with the board. He said he was confident that WISH had the audit report pages that CDVSA did not receive with the fax. The auditor is providing the board with a list of auditors that regularly do non-profit audits, because this is not his expertise.

Colonel Holloway asked about the board's timeline for hiring an executive director. Mr. Schultz said he received the hiring committee's unanimous recommendation this morning, and the board might have a special meeting in the next couple of days.

Chair Svobodny said he appreciated Mr. Schultz's willingness to take a position on the WISH board at a difficult time.

Ms. Morton indicated that she probably would do a follow-up on-site in Ketchikan in about six months.

Ms. Brown stated that as WISH is rebuilding its inner structure the program is flooded with people accessing their services. The community has been very supportive of the program during this rebuilding time.

Mr. Schultz mentioned that he and Christine Pate from Sitka would be doing a training for the advocates in late March or early April, which he thought would be helpful. [*He and Ms. Michaelsen excused themselves from the teleconference at this point.*]

ALASKA NETWORK ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE & SEXUAL ASSAULT REPORT

Network Executive Director Peggy Brown distributed a newsletter and the Network's annual report [*on file at the CDVSA offices*]. She reported on the following items:

- The Network applied for a grant of about \$30,000 from the Allstate Foundation to hold a mini summit in September to work on prevention efforts. Also for prevention, there is a Robert Wood Johnson grant for \$250,000 a year for four years, and there are eight slots across the nation. The Network is going to apply and has invited the CDVSA to join the grant application. The grant requires match money in each year.
- The Legal Assistance for Victims grant was capped at \$120,000 less for the coming year. The Network works with the Alaska Immigration Justice Project and the Alaska Legal Services Corporation, and each has taken a cut of \$40,000. That grant goes to the statewide Pro Bono Program that is based in Sitka, where shelter programs recommend people for direct representation. The CLE (continuing legal education) conference is where attorneys are recruited to be in the Pro Bono Program.
- The next Network meeting is July 7-11, 2008. People have been invited in to talk to the program directors about community organizing and media training. There also will be a

- whole day to discuss funding and needs, ahead of the CDVSA FY10 budget request.
- Ms. Brown served on the CDVSA Task Force. She praised Ms. Ashenbrenner for her gracious interaction with the Task Force while the CDVSA was under the microscope and being criticized.
 - There was a speaker on disabilities at the Legal Advocacy Project conference recently. The Network is involved with the Governor's Council on Disabilities, and the Center for Human Development and a couple of other players on a grant that looks at victims of domestic and sexual violence and how disabilities advocates and providers can better work together to provide services to that population. There is a series of planning groups going on, and Grace Danborn, the Network's policy person, is part of that group.
 - The Rasmusen Foundation is working with four pilot shelter programs, providing a codes and conditions report. A Rasmusen person visits a shelter program and assesses the entire building; for example, could the program be doing something different to reduce heating costs. The goal is to have an accurate facility management plan that is phased out five to ten years. Rasmusen plans to extend the project to the remaining programs after the pilot is done. There may be a very large capital project that will come from this undertaking.
 - There is a lot of energy and things happening on the prevention front. The Network hired a new Delta coordinator, Laurie Grassgreen (for the domestic violence prevention grant through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention).
 - The Network's biennial conference will be in Anchorage in September. The CDVSA contributes some funding for that.
 - The Network is tracking several bills in the Legislature. The two most pressing are HB 307 (two DV convictions, and the third one becomes a felony), and SB 273 (making certain provisions of animal cruelty a felony).

Ms. Brown stated that she has been doing this type of work for 12 years in Alaska, and the trend she sees is that victim service programs are approaching the breaking point. Programs are doing amazing things in their communities, and they avail themselves of so many resources. It was an eye-opener for legislators to visit program shelters in four selected communities as part of the CDVSA Task Force.

Ms. Brown expressed appreciation for the staffs of the Network and the CDVSA working together so well, because things move faster and get done more efficiently. Two really good groups are pushing the agenda of crisis intervention and prevention of domestic and sexual violence in Alaska.

Ms. House inquired about the issue of homelessness that came up at the last meeting. Grace Danborn, who does policy work at the Network, reported that about half the program directors attended part of the Homelessness Coalition meeting. She said that domestic violence shelters in isolated communities are often called upon to provide service for homeless individuals who may or may not have domestic violence or sexual assault issues. The Network has been talking to the CDVSA about that: for programs to not provide shelter potentially puts a homeless person into a dangerous situation.

Ms. McFadden asked if shelters are reimbursed for providing shelter to homeless people, if they document it. Ms. Danborn said not at this point. She added that a couple of programs have housing assistance program grants that run somewhat independently.

Ms. Brown stated that the Network is seeing a very large increase in requests for legal assistance, through the Pro Bono Program and through Alaska Legal Services. It is not a surprise that legal advocacy and housing are the top two pressing needs in the state. Victims have child custody issues, they need help with protective orders, or they may want a name change or to request a new social security number.

Mr. Hogan said that the Department of Health & Social Services is hearing in various finance committees not to ask for X amount of dollars for one year unless they can put it in a broader context or show what they might be asking for over the next five years or so. He said it sounded like Rasmusen has the same view with some of its capital project planning. So if the Network is preparing to ask for a budget increase next year, it might be good to show it in the context of how the Network sees the need growing over the next five-plus years.

Ms. Brown acknowledged that it was a good suggestion. She said the Network would show how funding has eroded, and then how that would come back up, and then project out the needs for the future. She said "the big ask" would be over time.

Mr. Hogan said the Legislature might be more willing to fund something on an incremental approach. So the Network might want to show that over a couple of years or so the programs would get to what they ultimately need.

Ms. Ashenbrenner mentioned that the Administration is really looking to keep the growth of state expenditures down and will be scrutinizing budget request increases. The Administration will also be looking at whether other sources of revenue have been fully explored.

Ms. Sarren requested Suzi Pearson's report on the Homelessness Coalition so she could learn what the Bering Sea Women's Group is doing in that regard. She mentioned that if she were a resident at the shelter in Nome and a homeless person were admitted, she would be terrified. In Nome, usually a homeless person is an alcoholic with other problems. It would be terrifying to have them in the same building as other victims.

Ms. Brown mentioned that at IAC's new building in Fairbanks 50% of the victims who come there for shelter are low to middle income, and the other 50% are middle income. That is a change from being predominantly low income.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present in Juneau or on the telephone who wished to address the Council.

The Chair re-ordered the agenda to take up staff's financial report next.

FINANCIAL REPORT & DENALI COMMISSION CIP FUNDING

As background, CDVSA Administrative Manager Jo Griggs stated that the budget for fiscal year 2008 is \$10.9 million. There are four major revenue sources: the General Fund \$2,894,000; the Permanent Fund criminal money \$3,789,6000; inter-agency funds \$824,000; and federal funding \$3,467,900. The federal budget is made up of formula grants: the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA); Victims of Crime Act (VOCA); and Family Violence Prevention Services Act (FVPSA). Another part of the federal funding is two competitive grants — Grants to Encourage Arrest (GTEA), and the Rural Domestic Violence & Child Victimization grant (RDV&CV). The CDVSA's subgrantees are awarded funds out of general fund money, PFD money, federal funding, and inter-agency money. The majority of the CDVSA office's administrative money comes from General Fund or PFD, plus a small percentage of federal grants and inter-agency money.

Ms. Griggs reported that 17 victim service programs have requested their third quarter funding. Six of the batterers intervention programs and quite a few of the programs getting RDV&CV and GTEA have made their third quarter funding requests. All the money for the remainder of the fiscal year is encumbered, so everything is on track. This is the first year the CDVSA office has been fully staffed in a long time, so not as much money is being moved from General Fund to the programs.

Ms. Griggs referred to a spreadsheet of the VAWA grant status, saying that three years of funding from the federal grant are still active: federal fiscal years 2005, 2006 and 2007. Almost all of VAWA FFY05 has been expended, and that grant's expiration date is May 2008. The Court System still has remaining VAWA FFY05 money left to spend, but they have indicated their project will be done in March. She said staff would request an extension on spending VAWA FFY06 funds. The Department of Law has a fairly large balance of FFY06 money unspent, however, they have quite a few trainings scheduled that will use the funds.

Ms. Griggs also explained a VAWA earmark grant that is not part of the CDVSA operating budget. She said the money can be spent until 2010, with a possible extension until 2011. The grant is allocated the same way the regular VAWA formula grants are: 25% to Law, 25% to Alaska State Troopers, 30% to Victim Services, 15% to Discretionary, and 5% to Court System and administration.

Ms. House asked the size of the CDVSA budget for grants to programs starting July 1. Ms. Griggs replied that it would be at least as much as the \$8.5 million in FY08 and possibly a bit more. Ms. Ashenbrenner clarified that the Legislature has not passed the FY09 budget yet. She added that any extra in the budget would not be enough to require the grantees to reapply in a proposal process. She would recommend that any increase be allocated across the board instead. If the Council accepts that recommendation, there would not be a funding meeting in June like last year.

Ms. Griggs handed out a one-page report on how another \$116,300 award from the Denali Commission was spent for improvements at seven domestic violence shelters. The programs were required to have 50% cash match. The CDVSA had received and distributed \$882,000 from the Denali Commission in 2006.

The Chair called a brief break at 11:40 a.m. The Council reconvened at 11:45 a.m. to continue working through the lunch hour.

CDVSA TASK FORCE REPORT

Chair Svobodny stated that last year the Legislature passed a bill creating the CDVSA Task Force to review the CDVSA and issue a report of findings and recommendations. The bill was in response to an audit of the CDVSA done by Legislative Audit a few years ago. The Task Force completed its work by March 1, 2008 and issued a report. He introduced the chair of the Task Force, Representative Anna Fairclough, who was present to talk to the Council about the findings and recommendations in the report (copies were distributed).

Rep. Fairclough said some of the goals were to help the legislative body understand the issues and challenges that face the Council, and to address the discussions that continue to happen outside of the House floor during the reauthorization process for the CDVSA when it comes before the Legislature.

Rep. Fairclough said the Task Force recognized that the Council's task is very broad throughout the state and next to impossible to implement without collaborative efforts with other departments. The biggest thing that the Legislature would ask the Council to do is come up with a strategic plan. The Task Force recognizes that the CDVSA is a funding agency that needs to focus those dollars on crisis intervention, and it tried not to speak to having the money reallocated. But the bottom line is that if prevention and intervention are not carried out, it is difficult not to see the victim numbers climb.

Rep. Fairclough reviewed the six strategies the CDVSA Task Force was mandated to examine:

- (1) **The Council's relationship and consultation with other state agencies.** This arose from the 2001 and 2005 audits, and the auditor had specific reasons why she felt that needed to be there. The Task Force is recommending for consideration that the Council direct the executive director to create memorandums of understanding with other agencies so the Council could pull them together — and not have a silo approach — to try to implement some of the challenges and hurdles in the CDVSA statutory requirements. Formalizing those agreements or understandings would meet the auditor's expectations that the Council was working with those agencies. The Task Force thought that representatives of other agencies coming together as members of the Council was part of meeting that requirement, but the auditor believed that it should have extended further. The Task Force also thought that inside of current state statute in the Department of Education (14.30.360) there was an existing health education specialist position that

would help school districts across the state, through curriculum development, address domestic violence, sexual assault and interpersonal violence. The Task Force report recommends funding that position, but they recognize it is not the end all, and they are not trying to take any money from the CDVSA. Developing memorandums to work with other agencies would prevent the audit findings of the past. The Task Force also thought the CDVSA should do some outreach to the Alaska Native Women's Coalition in Fairbanks, which was very active in feeling they were disenfranchised from the process. Also, in Bethel another women's community group thought that individual community plans would be good for individual areas, and that they were pulling up their bootstraps and ready to take on that issue. That group wanted to see interaction from the Council on a more regionalized basis, and possibly to form small councils in communities with high incidences of violence.

- (2) **The statutory responsibilities and priorities of the Council.** The Task Force made a whole list of findings that are meant to show they had a thoughtful process and that there were reasons for the recommendations to the Council. The Task Force is recommending to the Legislature that in next legislative session or the following one it should expand the Council to include a representative from the Department of Corrections and another rural community representative. The Task Force wanted to highlight that the public seats on the Council really need to be representative of Alaska communities. It means the Governor has to reach out and search for people who are willing to invest time and energy to domestic violence and sexual assault issues. It was noted that a previous member of the Administration was also classified as a public member on the Council; the Task Force thought the perception to the public was that the Administration was taking over and that everything that was done at the Council was beholden to the Administration, without proper balance and public input.

The Task Force heard, from both audits and from previous executive directors, that staff retention in the past had been an issue. The Council should consider whether some of the positions should be classified in a non-exempt status. The executive director should be an exempt position so the Governor has appropriate control in working with the people that they want in place. But the CDVSA needs continuity inside the agency to be able to organize and operate efficiently to meet the grant requirements.

Rep. Fairclough said she would be happy to be the conduit if anyone on the Council wanted to work with her on legislation for the next year. She added that the largest recommendation is a strategic plan so that the CDVSA has a mission to accomplish and measures that the Legislature can measure how the executive director is accomplishing that, and how the CDVSA is addressing the categories of prevention, intervention, crisis response, and accountability. The Task Force understood that the executive director could not do accountability on her/his own.

- (3) **The appointment process for members of the Council.** Both the 2001 and 2005 audits had pointed out a belief that there was a potential conflict of interest because the Network

on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, which represents 19 agencies in the state, was submitting candidate names to the Governor. The statute states that the Governor has to consult (with the Network), but he/she makes the final selection. It means that Network providers across the state work with people who might be interested in this issue, and the Network goes through a process where they decide whether to submit names to the Governor. The audit finding in every audit about whether there is an actual conflict of interest has caused great confusion at the Legislature. The Task Force believes that the bottom line was confusion inside the legislative halls about what the Network was and what the CDVSA was. New Council members may also be confused in not understanding who they are representing. All people serving as public members want to help the victims, but the Council members still have to have a higher-level statewide perspective.

The auditor wants to make sure that the Council is looking at things equitably across the state. The auditor had noted that she thought a change in the Council requirements for grant writing was done because there was somebody serving as a public member who was recommended by the Network. The Task Force did not agree with that, and it has never happened again. The Network continues to submit names, and the Governor continues to either accept those names or not accept them. The Task Force recommendation is that the executive director develop an orientation training on ethics and responsibilities for Council members, for review and approval by the Council. The training would benefit the public members in understanding the enormous role of taking a higher level look at the issues, instead of looking at individual programs that they might know better or individual regions they might be more familiar with. While public members may have that knowledge to bring to the table, the Task Force wants them to understand both rural and urban issues when they make their decisions, and that they are not on the Council to represent the Network.

Rep. Fairclough stated that she previously was executive director of Standing Together Against Rape (STAR) in Anchorage that was a recipient of grant awards through the CDVSA. She made grant presentations to the Council and experienced first-hand Council members who possibly had been a member for less than one funding cycle and did not fully understand the process and the criteria for a grant. The Task Force is recommending, through statutory change, that a term on the Council should be expanded to at least three years from the current two years. That way, a member would serve through two funding cycles and provide continuity in that process.

- (4) **The location of the Council within the state administrative structure.** This becomes an issue every time the price per barrel of oil drops. There is a tendency for legislators to believe that the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) can write grants better, and those who have not been through this before want to move CDVSA over into Health and Social Services. Rep. Fairclough said her personal fear, as a former program executive director, is that when budget cuts happen in critical areas, the cuts often go to DHSS because its budget is so big. CDVSA would really get lost in that shuffle. The Task Force acknowledged that CDVSA traditionally has been housed in the Department

of Public Safety (DPS), but they also want people to know that domestic violence and sexual assault are not social services, they are crimes. Solving a crime requires evidence collection, interviews and investigations. Investigations require interaction with medical communities, law enforcement, and court systems. Victims of domestic violence and sexual assault need to be acknowledged and validated that they have experienced a crime. And perpetrators need to know that they are going to be held accountable. It is appropriate because of culture that the Council remain in DPS, where there are resources to help implement accountability and enforcement. The relevant agencies, through their representation on the Task Force, agree that the Council is appropriately located. When the Task Force visited four communities around the state, no one suggested that CDVSA should be located anywhere but in Public Safety. Hopefully, the argument for moving it can be laid to rest at the Legislature.

- (5) **The Council's compliance with grant management requirements.** The Council made a decision to change a reporting requirement for programs receiving a grant award. The Network did not want to disclose victim information, and the Council respected that, but the federal government was demanding information that was specific to a grant. The auditor made a finding that said "you will report this." So while the Network and the Council came together with an understanding of what the victim agencies were asked for, it was not in compliance with what the grant stated was required.

The Task Force recommends that if the Council goes through a strategic planning process, it should work with the Rasmusen Foundation in an effort to streamline the grant-writing process. The programs spend weeks to prepare a report that Council members read, but quite a bit of the same information is already there. Likewise, programs report the same things over and over again, and they push back slightly on how valuable it is for them to spend the time on it, and how valuable it is for staff to have to regenerate reports. The Task Force is looking for a good use of time and money in doing that.

The Task Force is asking that if a grant is for four years, that when RFPs are put together the re-upping could be an abbreviated reporting requirement. The Task Force left that to the Council to explore renewal periods if programs have complied with all the required grant reporting.

Because of the inconsistency from the programs' perspective when they speak before the Council at the funding meeting, the Task Force suggests that the CDVSA develop criteria and guidelines so that the programs understand exactly what they are measured against to get money. For example, if the Council wants something new in prevention, that may have a different model than that for crisis intervention. There is so much energy to turn shelter lights on, depending on the community, and all program costs are not created equal because of their location. The Task Force leaves it to the Council to try to discern what that number is. But levels of service need to be established and then criteria so that programs, when they compete, understand what the Council is really looking for and how

the Council is scoring their grant proposals.

- (6) **The Council's mission, and the focus of the Council's mission on prevention, intervention, crisis response, and perpetrator accountability.** The statutory mission is much different than the Council mission. So if the Council takes up the Task Force's recommendation to develop a strategic plan, it would be good to carry forward a new mission that included the prevention and intervention. The Council's mission is better than the statutory responsibilities, which are to plan and coordinate services to victims and their families. It is a new age, with a need to focus on prevention if there is going to be change. Rep. Fairclough said that as a legislator she would much rather invest in some proactive behavior that she could see long-term benefit in reducing violence. Without addressing prevention, society will not change how it looks at violence, and the numbers will never go down.

The Task Force discussed whether to mandate what the Council should look at inside the strategic plan. In the end, they voted to reiterate that if the Council goes into a strategic planning process, that the Council would read the report because some initial groundwork has been done. Each individual point will require dialogue throughout the state of Alaska. The Task Force wants the CDVSA to expand from just funding shelters to looking at the realm of what legislators think is their responsibility to constituents of the state.

Rep. Fairclough stated that the Task Force voted to bring forward legislation to reauthorize the CDVSA to 2014, while the makeup of this Legislature understands the issue. She said that the Task Force heard in Fairbanks and Anchorage that advocates are willing and able to train and provide information to the Court System. But the Task Force thought the Court System might be more receptive to a peer-to-peer education group versus an advocacy group providing that training. Because of how overworked the Court System is, it is difficult for the people to take the time for training that is not mandated.

Rep. Fairclough said the Task Force felt that all 14 of the CDVSA mandates were wonderful and did not make a recommendation to remove any one of them. Some people might think the mandates were achievable, while others might think they were too broad and pie-in-the-sky. When the Council considers a strategic plan, the Task Force hopes that it looks to the Centers for Disease Control for a health model in prevention and education so the CDVSA can possibly get some foundation and federal support. For 27 out of the last 27 years, Alaska has been in the top five states for sexual assault, and Alaska has been number one 20 out of those 27 years.

Rep. Fairclough stated that there were some issues that were not under the Task Force's mandate but that they thought were important. Violence Against Women Act shortly is going to require the state to maintain evidence specific to sexual assault from people who choose not to report. When that happens, the requirement for evidence storage will increase significantly. The Council might want to support legislation for construction of a new state crime lab. Rep. Fairclough said there was discussion in several communities about societal change and how people could be

good role models in their communities for being the best that they can be. There was talk about an effective media campaign to promote less violence in the homes and that would make it popular to be a role model for good behavior. If the Council considers a statewide media campaign, the Task Force suggests focusing on different groups — rural and small communities, urban communities and locker rooms, church members and pastor involvement, etc. — with a peer message that would be meaningful to each type of group.

Rep. Fairclough said there is apparently a low incidence of law enforcement referrals of reports of prosecution. The Task Force heard in the four communities that it visited that hundreds of people were reporting domestic violence or sexual assault but only five to ten people were actually followed through in prosecution. Law enforcement and the Court System had a good response for educated individuals who have not been victims of domestic violence to hear. But the victims who have been brutalized are disenfranchised by that answer; they want the Court System and law enforcement to make the bad guys accountable and to make the violence stop — whether that is by incarceration or education. The Task Force believes that has to be a separate subcommittee subject, to be able to articulate at a victim's level why some cases cannot go forward. That subcommittee should include the Court System and law enforcement, so that advocates can deliver a message that is respectful to those systems but is accountable to those systems too.

Regarding batterers intervention programs, Rep. Fairclough referred to a July 2007 letter from Rep. Ralph Samuels that the Task Force did not receive until January 2008. The Task Force did not have a lot of time to discuss the letter, but every voting member at the table signed off on the recommendations. The CDVSA executive director, a non-voting member of the Task Force, had concern about a particular point, which she can explain to the Council later. But the short message from legislators is that if the state is going to invest money in batterers intervention programs, there have to be outcome measures that can be counted. If there aren't measurable outcomes of success, then how those programs are funded will continue in limbo. Rep. Fairclough said that as a former executive director she questions the validity of any kind of batterers intervention program when it comes to sexual assault, but she is just one voice with one point of view — and there are many others.

Ms. Thompson stated that in the mid 1990s the Council struggled with what to do about funding batterers intervention programs, and at one point took a position to focus on crisis intervention and victim safety because there simply was no proof that batterers intervention was effective. The Legislature then created a batterers intervention component and funded it and was quite angry with the Council for not wanting to direct funding that way.

Mr. Hogan said that he is part of a criminal justice working group, and one of their committees deals with recidivism. This is an issue that is much broader than batterers intervention programs. For all the money that the state puts into its many systems, the recidivism rates are still very high. The CDVSA does not have sole responsibility for reducing recidivism regarding batterers, but the Council can play an important role in that. He thought that was what the CDVSA Task Force was saying.

Rep. Fairclough responded that the Legislature is probably torn on the issue, too. There are people who believe in always having hope and extending a helping hand to provide an opportunity for someone to change their behavior. There are others who believe that some people cannot be rehabilitated and that the extended hand will only be bit time and time again. She said she would suggest investing the money in a measurement tool, if one could be found. The Task Force heard in Fairbanks from several batterers intervention programs that thought they had a way to provide the missions and measures and successful outcomes. The Task Force also had a conversation about the Court System and the lack of funding to hold people who were actually sentenced to a batterers intervention program or anger management program, and no one was following through. Also, people will start a batterers intervention program within the Corrections system and not be finished when they leave. They then may not have access to a program to complete it, or they may be unable to afford it.

Rep. Fairclough said the Council might want to outline a rural distinction for batterers intervention or anger management and have something on line for people coming out of the system. Or change the system inside Corrections so that the program meets the sentencing requirement. Another idea is to provide grants so that people can finish their program. No one on the Task Force wanted families to be separated if they wanted to be together but wanted them to live safely and peacefully together. The Task Force heard in rural communities about it being impossible for people to comply with the court stipulation. So people would struggle financially because they were trying to take care of their family at home. They had done something wrong for which they were accountable, but they could not fix it except by being away from their family, and they could not afford that fix anymore because they had been incarcerated. So there are challenges, and the Task Force believes that it is another thing that needs to be drilled down in much greater detail than they had an opportunity to do.

Ms. Ashenbrenner clarified that she totally agreed with the Task Force's recommendation that the Council should establish measures for batterers intervention programs, and that the CDVSA should be able to tell if the money being spent on these programs is exactly for the purposes set forth. She said she disagreed with the level of detail being prescribed in the recommendations, because there are a lot of higher-level considerations — what is recidivism? what is the definition for these programs? — before you can decide what it is you are going to count to get to that outcome.

Chair Svobodny said it was interesting to him that the questions that were asked dealt with the whole issue of measures and means for batterers intervention programs. He said it is easy for a legislative auditor to say there ought to be measures, but did she have any suggestions for those measures. If the CDVSA measures recidivism as whether somebody commits a crime and then commits another crime, that is easy to do because the data is captured through Corrections. But the batterers intervention program may be a videoconference program to the Metlakatla Indian Reservation that the Council does not have control over. The Council could require them to keep records as a condition of the grant, but there is no way of marrying up their records with police records in the future without really saying we're going to give all police records to anybody in

the state who wants to look.

Rep. Fairclough stated that the Uniform Crime Reporting Code requires the state to submit on two different levels. Right now, Alaska has an antiquated method: each silo has its own reports. The urban areas can "cross-pollinate" the information via computers, should they choose to share it.

Chair Svobodny said that in the example he used Metlakatla is a private entity. It is never law enforcement that is doing the batterers intervention programs, but it may be Corrections. That would be easy because at least there are two databases that can talk to each other. So CDVSA may be funding a batterers intervention program in Metlakatla and requiring them to gather information, but how is the CDVSA going to check with Metlakatla a year from now to see if a person reoffended.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that a key piece of measuring a batterers intervention program is not really based on whether they reoffended; the best measure of effectiveness is based on the statement of the victims, or the perpetrator's current partner, or the perpetrator's former partner - especially if they have children. Everyone knows that batterers get away with their behavior far more often than they are arrested. So the measurements really involve the victims telling the programs whether there has been a return to previous behavior, and there are models for doing that.

Ms. Brown asked if the CDVSA Task Force would be reconvening to look at a strategic plan, or if the recommendations were being turned over to the Council to carry on.

Rep. Fairclough said the Task Force submitted its report to the Legislature. She is elected for a two-year term, but if she were still an elected official next January, she hoped the Council would have a strategic plan done, because that is what the report says. Sixty legislators are saying, what are we investing and what are we getting. She said she believed that the current people who are seated in the Legislature would be willing to invest in prevention — right now today — if they thought there was a measurable outcome that they could get from that investment. But if 25% of the Legislature turns over in the next election, then that 25% will have to be educated again. Rep. Fairclough said she advocated behind the scenes for funding for a CDVSA strategic plan, but she did not know if that would get anywhere, and she did not know if Ms. Ashenbrenner could do it within the existing CDVSA budget.

Mr. Hogan suggested that the Council accept the CDVSA Task Force Report and in good faith commit to adopting the recommendations in the report. He said he understood that doing the strategic planning and finding the financing were details to figure out, but the Council was obligated to accept the report.

Rep. Fairclough stated that the National Sexual Violence Resource Center was coming to Alaska in 2009, including the Centers for Disease Control. She had submitted a request for funding for them to travel to other parts of the state, because the plan was just to go to Anchorage, which

would only give them an urban view and not an understanding of the vastness of Alaska.

Rep. Fairclough said she was wondering, if the Council accepts the CDVSA Task Force Report, if the Administration would support a supplemental budget request to fund the strategic planning process, or if the Finance Committee would reconsider the dollar amount that it has not considered in the Governor's budget if the money went toward a strategic plan. She added that she could not advocate for it because of her obligation to fellow legislators when she only asked the Task Force to support a bill to reauthorize the CDVSA until 2014. She said that if she were reelected, in November and December she would contact the legislators about supporting further bills in the following year.

Mr. Hogan asked what a strategic plan would cost. Ms. Ashenbrenner said the range is \$15,000 to \$50,000, but she was thinking more like \$20,000-\$25,000. Rep. Fairclough recalled that the Network went through a strategic planning process and received an award of \$25,000 from United Way. Ms. Brown said it would cost at least \$25,000 with this group because of travel.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that the best part of the process is that the Council now has some champions at the legislative level, and at the high level of a few state departments, and among some public members. These people have a much greater understanding of the issues. The public hearings in four communities were extremely beneficial but hard to listen to when people described the impact of these crimes on their lives and the lack of responsiveness from systems. She said she appreciated the leadership that brought it all about.

Colonel Holloway said the Task Force Report was very good, and he thought the recommendations were reasonable, especially the part about a strategic plan, which he supports. But his concern is that there is a lot of posturing that people are in favor of a strategic plan, which means picking priorities and working on them for several years. But there is not much support for changing anything in the Legislature because they like to have their fingers in everything immediately. The best thing that could happen is if the Legislature had to plan and vote for things four years into the future, in an altruistic way, instead of having to impact somebody's immediate plans. So he was all for the strategic plan, but with the problems that the Alaska State Troopers are having with their own strategic planning process, he wondered how much the legislators would pay attention to a CDVSA strategic plan.

Rep. Fairclough agreed with the premise of his comments, and said that the Council might not have to do the whole strategic plan if it could find a component of something that it could really get into. It is not so much about planning as doing something and doing it well. She said she understood champions for individual causes, and she suggested involving a legislator in some of the committees. Every one of the legislators that sat on the Task Force, as well as the administration representatives present at this table, said that they were more than willing to spend the time to stay involved in the process. And they would reconvene at any time to follow through on the process. They wanted to see what the Council, with its expertise, came up with so they could help. If the legislators are not partners, the Council will not get it done.

Mr. Hogan stated that the CDVSA Task Force was providing the Council with direction and guidance without trying to be too proscriptive. Some of the recommendations sound very proscriptive, but in general they were putting ideas back on the Council to consider.

Chair Svobodny commented that it was one of the most easily read reports that he has ever seen from a legislative task force.

DISCUSSION OF CDVSA TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH ACTION PLAN FOR RESPONSE

Ms. Ashenbrenner said this was an opportunity for the Council to ask questions about the recommendations and to discuss the next steps for planning and funding a strategic plan. She noted the Task Force Report is not something the Council will be able to respond to in a one-day meeting every quarter for the next year, so a schedule is part of the discussion. She said it sounded like Rep. Fairclough was suggesting that legislators be part of the strategic planning process, which she had not heard before. She asked what Council members thought about that notion, because her impression was that legislators on the Task Force wanted to keep their participation at the 30,000-foot level and let the CDVSA develop the strategic plan, and the Legislature would decide whether to fund some of the strategies. She noted that Colonel Holloway brought up a good point that an agency can do all the planning and it can all be for naught because it doesn't get legislative support.

Colonel Holloway suggested that the Council formally recognize the CDVSA Task Force Report as being constructive, without a good discussion about each point, and make a plan for looking at the report recommendations individually. If the Council accepts all the recommendations, then it would put that on the record formally at that time.

MOTION BY COLONEL HOLLOWAY THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT ARRANGE SOME TIME TO DISCUSS THE CDVSA TASK FORCE REPORT AND ITS RECOMMENDATIONS SINGLY, INCLUDING THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND ANY BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS. FOLLOWING THAT, THAT THE COUNCIL THEN VOTE FOR THE TASK FORCE REPORT AS A PACKAGE OR REMOVE ANY RECOMMENDATION THAT IT DID NOT WISH TO ADOPT.

AMENDMENT BY ANN HOUSE THAT THE COUNCIL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE CDVSA TASK FORCE AS SUBMITTED AND MOVE FORWARD TO DO A MEDIA CAMPAIGN TO REQUEST FUNDING FOR IT.

Colonel Holloway indicated that the amendment was substantially different than his motion and he did not accept it.

MS. MCFADDEN SECONDED THE ORIGINAL MOTION.

Ms. Thompson said there was nothing in the Task Force Report that she found surprising or shocking, and the report was well thought out. The report contained so many recommendations, and she was not sure that all of them would be part of a strategic plan. The Council could sit down and map out all the recommendations, but she did not think that was what a strategic plan was. Some of the recommendations were just good things the CDVSA needed to do.

Colonel Holloway stated that even though the report looks very good, there are still a lot of complications to it. The Council needs time to digest the contents and talk about it, and then decide that a strategic plan is one thing that should be done from among the recommendations — or not.

Ms. McFadden asked what benefit there would be to the Council if it accepted the CDVSA Task Force Report today. If there was no additional funding, etc. forthcoming, then there was no rush.

Chair Svobodny said there was 30 days left in the legislative session, and nothing was going to happen in this regard. He suggested that the Council direct the executive director to write to every member of the CDVSA Task Force saying that the Council met on March 13, 2008 and received the Task Force Report, that the Council believes it is constructive and intends to review it recommendation by recommendation and respond to each of them in the future. The letter should tell the Task Force members that they have done a great service to the programs that the CDVSA funds. He expressed support for Colonel Holloway's opinion, noting that some of the recommendations are legislative changes, such as whether CDVSA employees are going to be exempt, partially exempt, or members of the classified service. Another example is the Council has to find out whether the Department of Education and Early Development has a health education specialist position or not.

Ms. Thompson said that DEED does not have a health education specialist, but the department has existing staff supported by federal funds who are trying to do things for the benefit of the CDVSA. But DEED has never received funding for a state position to do what the statute now says that the position is going to do.

Ms. Brown commented that the Council members who were not part of the Task Force need to be able to have the discussions that she, Mr. Hogan, Ms. Sarren and Ms. Ashenbrenner had the benefit of listening to.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that there is nothing in the legislation that said the Council needs to accept or not accept the Task Force Report. Doing so would be a courtesy and provides an avenue for responding to anything where the Council believes the Task Force is off track. She said there are a lot of issues that need discussion so the Council is informed and understands the depth of the issues.

Chair Svobodny said one idea is to parcel out the recommendations to the Council members so each member is prepared to lead a discussion on a particular recommendation at the next meeting.

Ms. Thompson expressed hope that staff could go through all the recommendations and group them by category. For example, some things are easy to address, like having the state's ethics attorney provide an ethics training session at a meeting. Then the statutory things should be looked at all together, and program things together, etc. Each meeting could address one grouping of recommendations at a time.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said her understanding was that the Task Force's overarching recommendation was the strategic plan and that they wanted the Council to look at the recommendations as areas it might consider including in that strategic planning process.

Mr. Hogan stated that having sat through every Task Force meeting except one, what he heard regarding strategic planning was they wanted the Council to focus on the four areas of prevention, intervention, crisis response, and batterer accountability, and formulate a plan about how the CDVSA can address those areas going forward. So what are the goals, what does the Council hope to accomplish, what are certain objectives, and what sort of strategies to fund to address those problems. He said he also heard that there were other recommendations regarding the makeup of the Council, what sort of status staff should have, etc. He said he did not think a strategic plan would necessarily address those infrastructure and administrative issues that have to do with the functioning of the CDVSA.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said that was along the lines of Ms. Thompson's idea for staff to figure out which recommendations would fit into the strategic planning and which are outside that process. She added that many of the recommendations would be in one of the four areas that Mr. Hogan just listed.

Colonel Holloway reiterated that the Council has to study the recommendations first to determine if it agrees with them all or if there are some that are show-stoppers. This review has to happen before proceeding with strategic planning and making administrative changes. The studying phase does not have to take years and might be accomplished by adding some special meetings.

Other Council members voiced their agreement with his point.

After a brief exchange with the executive director about the next quarterly meeting in June, Chair Svobodny said it sounded like there would be time on that agenda to delve into the Task Force Report.

Ms. Thompson commented that she did not necessarily see legislators joining the Council at the table to discuss the strategic planning, but it would make sense to have a legislator present when the Council or a subcommittee got to the recommendations that require statutory changes.

Mr. Hogan said he sensed some urgency about this, because he clearly heard Rep. Fairclough say that she expected the Council to have a completed strategic plan by January 1, 2009. He did not

want to go before the Legislature and say that a strategic plan was a great recommendation but the Council was still thinking about it. He suggested building the time frame for getting things done back from the January 1, 2009 date. In that case, the Council cannot wait until the June meeting to talk about how many of the Task Force Report recommendations it concurs with. That would only leave six months to come up with the funding, hire a contractor, engage in the strategic planning process, and produce a report. The CDVSA Task Force, for example, had six months to do everything the Legislature mandated it to do, and the process was very intense. So if the Council is intent on taking the Task Force Report recommendations seriously, it has to speed up the process.

Colonel Holloway suggested holding a short meeting in April, another meeting in May, and then finalizing what to do next in a written plan at the June meeting. That would not only move things forward, but Council members could take assignments to work on between the meetings that would make the discussions more productive. He noted that the agenda stated the Council was going to develop an action plan at this meeting: the action plan would be to review the Task Force Report until June, and then in June there would be a written plan for what to do, which may include a strategic plan. The Council's letter to the Task Force should outline this course of action.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that she thought the CDVSA should do a strategic plan, that the Council had talked at the December meeting about doing one, regardless of the Task Force recommendations. With that in mind, the Council could start researching the cost of a facilitated strategic planning process and be thinking about where to find some money.

Colonel Holloway said he supported a strategic plan regardless, so the Council might be able to say that in the letter to the Task Force. But the Council could not say what would be in the strategic plan because it hasn't had time to study and discuss the Task Force Report contents.

Ms. House said she agreed with the Colonel's plan of action because it fulfilled what Rep. Fairclough indicated were the Task Force's expectations.

Chair Svobodny asked Ms. Ashenbrenner to draft a letter to the CDVSA Task Force on the Council's behalf and to circulate it to each member for review. Ms. Ashenbrenner said she understood the letter should say the Council received the Task Force Report, it would thank the Task Force members for their work, that the report was very constructive, that the Council was going to review it and discuss the recommendations, and that the Council was going to start the strategic planning process and take those recommendations into account.

Chair Svobodny said the letter should be clear that the Council is going to take action on every recommendation, whether good or bad. He suggested adding that the strategic plan will take longer to get done than most of the other recommendations the Council acts on.

A brief discussion ensued about whether to have some teleconference meetings followed by a face-to-face meeting in June, and whether to assign some tasks to subcommittees or keep

everyone together for the benefit of the two new members who need to be involved so they can learn about things. There was also comment about including CDVSA staff in organizing the meetings and subcommittees.

Ms. Brown related that the Network's strategic planning process took over a year, and it started out with general discussions and eventually broke out into committees of people who had expertise in certain areas.

Ms. House suggested that every Council member prepare an individual report on the CDVSA Task Force Report and then start meshing it together from there.

Addressing that, Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that one of the great benefits of the process for the Task Force members was working through the issues together, and the Council would lose that benefit if they worked individually. Coming together will really sharpen everyone's understanding of the issues and the job of the Council, and what people's perceptions are that came out in the Task Force Report.

Mr. Hogan suggested putting time limits on discussing the findings and recommendations in each section of the report so the Council would be assured of getting through the whole report in the time allotted at each meeting. Colonel Holloway agreed, saying it will force the Council to a conclusion on each discussion topic. Ms. Thompson also agreed, noting that some of the recommendations will be quite easy to act upon and others will take more time.

Chair Svobodny reviewed what he thought the motion on the table was: that the Council will send a letter to each member of the CDVSA Task Force thanking them for their hard work and telling them that the Council will be responding to each of the report's recommendations, including strategic planning, but that the strategic planning will probably take longer to respond to the Task Force on than the others. Further, that the Council will hold a couple of teleconference meetings to go through each one of the recommendations, with time limits put on each discussion, so probably three or four recommendations per teleconference.

Colonel Holloway added that the Council would have a written action plan ready in June.

Chair Svobodny said he thought if the June meeting was a couple of days the Council would be doing the strategic planning process. Whether the Council reaches that or not depends on how the teleconference meetings go.

Mr. Hogan mentioned his recollection that the Council intended to do the strategic planning contingent on funding.

Chair Svobodny said the letter could mention that the executive director was looking for funding, and the strategic planning was somewhat dependent upon that.

Colonel Holloway agreed that it was good to make the point that the CDVSA does not have

money falling out of its pockets.

Chair Svobodny called for the question on the motion as made by Colonel Holloway and as explained further in the discussion that followed that motion.

The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Ms. Ashenbrenner related her concern to the Council about how much staff support she could commit to the Task Force response project and the strategic planning process, given all the other projects that are going on.

Mr. Hogan stated firmly that the executive director could not provide much staff time on top of everything else, which is why the CDVSA needs additional money and somebody who can do the facilitating and report writing.

Ms. Brown referred to Rep. Fairclough's recommendation that the Council contact the Rasmuson Foundation about the grants management process. She wondered if it would be unreasonable for the Council to approach Rasmuson about a strategic planning process.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she had already made a note to that effect. She added that even with a strategic planning facilitator, there is an impact on staff in taking the lead for committees, getting meetings set up, facilitating teleconferences, and issuing correspondence and other paperwork. It is all important work, but she is concerned.

Chair Svobodny stated that it is important that at least somebody on CDVSA staff be assigned to this process so there is a record of what the Council is doing. Most of the recommendations themselves may not be that difficult, but the Council may need to ask staff members if they want to be in the classified service or partially exempt. The amount of staff involvement will probably vary from issue to issue. He said he wanted to leave it to the executive director's discretion, if she could commit a staff member to the process, how much time they could commit. Outside of that, it would be nice for staff to be involved to the extent that they have the time and they want to be part of the process.

Ms. McFadden said that one or two Council members need to step up and take charge of gathering information, and then call on CDVSA staff if they need some backup.

Chair Svobodny said that if a poll of CDVSA staff indicates that they wish to be in classified service, then the Council has to approach the Governor's Office with a request to draw up a bill to make that change. He added that if the Council gets down to strategic planning without any funding for a facilitator, one idea would be to suggest that Rep. Fairclough could be a facilitator.

Ms. Ashenbrenner stated that in her experience the Council would want a facilitator that did not have opinions about the business and the way things should be. For example, she herself could not facilitate the strategic planning process because she would want to guide the direction of it.

She thought Rep. Fairclough would be the first to say that was true of her as well. She added that there are a lot of people who could facilitate a strategic planning process, and any job costing over \$5,000 would have to go out to bid.

Colonel Holloway excused himself from the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

Ms. Sarren commented that several times during the Task Force's work she heard that they did not want to present the Council with tasks that would be too onerous for it. To hear from Ms. Brown that the Network's strategic planning process took at least a year means to her that putting a time limit of January 1, 2009 for developing the Council's strategic plan is unreasonable. She suggested asking the Task Force for more time to work on that recommendation.

Mr. Hogan said he thought the Task Force was expecting to see a plan that laid out the Council's plan to do X, Y, and Z in the area of prevention, and that in the fiscal year 2010 budget the Council was going to ask for \$500,000 for prevention to do X, Y, and Z. If that is what the Task Force is asking, and the CDVSA has to have its budget ready by October, that means the Council has to have a plan before October. He said maybe Ms. Sarren is right, that it is unrealistic to develop a plan, have a budget recommendation related to what is laid out in the plan, and have that ready for the next funding cycle.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she did not recall the Task Force ever setting a date for the Council to have a plan to the Legislature. Mr. Hogan stated that he was responding to what Rep. Fairclough said earlier, although the January 1, 2009 date is not in the Task Force Report. Ms. Sarren said that she was surprised when she heard that date.

Mr. Hogan said it was sort of a catch-22, because the Legislature would question why the CDVSA was requesting additional funding in the FY10 budget if it does not have a plan to go with it.

Ms. Thompson suggested conveying to the Task Force that the Council will have a strategic plan done by perhaps mid 2009, but in the meantime the CDVSA could request additional funding in the FY10 budget for things it is absolutely certain that programs need, such as higher energy costs, health insurance costs, etc.

Mr. Hogan said he appreciated Ms. Sarren bringing the timeline up, because he was feeling pressured about the tasks before the Council. There may be some way to take some of that pressure off and get a good plan together — and still have a chance to get an increment for the next budget.

Ms. Ashenbrenner pointed out that she has been moving forward on some projects that will be part of the strategic plan but that cannot wait until the plan is done.

Council members took a few moments to set a date for a teleconference meeting to discuss the first four recommendations in the Task Force Report: March 28, 2008, from 10:00 a.m. until

noon.

Ms. House inquired about business cards for Council members, which she recalled were discussed at one time. Ms. Griggs said she did not think it was approved because some people said they would not use the cards enough, and getting cards printed is expensive. Ms. Ashenbrenner mentioned that staff might be able to make some business cards using existing resources.

Ms. Brown offered her help with the strategic planning process but said she assumed her presence was not necessary at every one of the Council's work meetings on the Task Force recommendations.

Chair Svobodny asked Ms. Brown if she would provide Ms. Ashenbrenner with a copy of the Network's strategic plan. Ms. Brown said sure and indicated she had some governor councils on domestic violence plans from different states that could be helpful.

ASSISTED LIVING TRAINING AND REGULATIONS (ALTR) PROJECT REPORT

Mr. Hogan provided a written summary about proposed changes to Department of Health and Social Services regulations for assisted living homes, along with a copy of the draft regulations *[both documents are on file at the CDVSA offices.]* He first expressed appreciation for Paul McCarthy's help on the work group.

Mr. Hogan gave a quick background about the alleged sexual assault that took place in an assisted living home in Petersburg a couple of years ago and which Peter Goll brought to the department's attention for further action. DHSS learned that there is no current requirement during orientation or training for staff of assisted living facilities to prevent or ultimately remediate a potential sexual assault or sexual abuse in an assisted living facility. A working group was formed to look at the problems and come up with solutions. Their recommendation was to move toward including language from existing Department of Public Safety regulations for victims programs in the DHSS regulations regarding assisted living homes. The group also recognized the need for an internal memorandum of understanding between Certification and Licensing and Adult Protective Services, as well as the quality assurance section in Senior Disability Services.

Mr. Hogan said in the last meeting or so there was some question about whistle-blower protection for residents or staff reporting abuse. The working group determined that there are adequate existing whistle-blower protections in statute. The working group also looked at Certification and Licensing post-incident "plan of correction" procedures and were confident that this agency is on top of these kinds of situations. The problem appears to be what to include in the plan of correction and what other steps to take so that sexual assault in an assisted living home does not happen again. That is where the post-incident remediation part comes in and where DHSS has to do a better job of integrating the different players.

Mr. Hogan stated that the working group would have one more meeting next Wednesday to hopefully finalize the draft regulations. There is an internal department process to review the draft regulations for a week, with the Department of Law also conducting its review. The draft regulations will then be posted for a 30-day public comment period. The plan is to have the new regulations adopted by July 1, 2008, but it will depend on the nature and volume of the comments.

Mr. Hogan said that even though the regulation changes may be a small thing in the grand scheme of things, it will make a difference in reducing the incidence of abuse occurring, and when they do occur, DHSS will be a lot more involved after an incident.

Ms. McFadden inquired about the correlation between Mr. Hogan's report and the role of the Council. Mr. Hogan explained that Mr. Goll had contacted not just DHSS but also CDVSA about the incident in Petersburg. The regulation changes are related to trying to prevent sexual assault, which is one of the Council's obligations, but most of the regulation is in DHSS. It is an example of working together to try to solve a problem.

Ms. Ashenbrenner added that one of the 14 statutory mandates for CDVSA is for the Council to coordinate initiatives or services between departments around the issues of domestic violence and sexual assault. So from the very first she saw the Council as having a role to perform the coordination and to bring its expertise to the table on safety planning and training requirements around sexual assault. She praised Mr. Hogan for taking the time in his very busy schedule to spearhead the regulation development process.

At this point, Chair Svobodny called a brief break and reconvened the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

2008 LEGISLATION AND 2009 BUDGET

Beginning with the FY09 budget request, Ms. Ashenbrenner said the \$436,000 increment that was in the Governor's budget for the grants line got taken out on the House side. So the budget that passed the House side last week does not include the requested 5.2% increase over last year. The Senate Finance Subcommittee backed out \$100,000 of the increment because the intent last year was that the \$200,000 put into the budget was to fund the Barrow program, and only \$100,000 of it went to Barrow. If the remainder of the increment passes through Senate Finance, then the final number for the increment will depend on what the Conference Committee decides.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she is concerned about losing the increment because of the federal grant cuts that are coming and because of everything the Council heard about the victim service programs being so challenged in just keeping up.

Ms. Ashenbrenner reported that there has been a lot of legislation in the last couple of years that somehow touches domestic violence and sexual assault issues. The bills that seem to be moving and that are of some importance are as follows:

- The bill that will extend the CDVSA until 2014. Passed the House.

- Two three-strikes bills. In 2007 there were 233 people charged with a third or more domestic violence assaults. CDVSA supports this bill. The Network has some concerns about it because the programs are worried that women victims get arrested as being the perpetrator more often than one may think. The Department of Law's crime bill also includes a three-strikes provision but is not specific to domestic violence. CDVSA also supports that bill.
- The bill that requires commercial film processors, computer repair people, and internet or cell phone providers who discover anything that looks like child pornography to report it.
- A couple of bills on the House side to add internet addresses and electronic identifiers that a person might have to the Sex Offender Registry. CDVSA supports this bill.
- A couple of bills that add an aggravating factor for sentencing in crimes that are against homeless people. Ashenbrenner testified in support because there is a history of homeless people being targets of sexual assault.
- The bill that connects compliance with registering on the Sex Offender Registry with getting the permanent fund dividend. Statistics show that 10% of sex offenders were out of compliance with registering requirements. CDVSA supports this bill.
- The bill that makes three of the most serious acts of animal abuse a class C felony. Currently, animal abuse in Alaska is a class A misdemeanor. Many crimes of domestic violence involve threats or actual harm to animals, and over 70% of women coming into shelters report that their animals have been threatened or abused in connection with abuse against them. The Department of Law has concerns about disproportionality.

Ms. Sarren commented that there is no animal enforcement in the villages, and a village public safety officer will not respond to calls about dogs. That led her to wonder about the enforceability of a bill making animal abuse a felony or a higher class of misdemeanor.

Ms. Ashenbrenner conceded that it was a good point and true for many offenses that occur in villages. She reviewed the particulars of what would constitute serious acts of animal abuse in the proposed legislation. She verified for Ms. Sarren that the bill only applied to domesticated animals and not to normal hunting, trapping or fishing.

Chair Svobodny commented that the bill currently does not apply to somebody who would shoot a moose in a way to make it suffer. Further, the bill would make it a felony to repeatedly beat a dog, but a person could starve their dog for three weeks and that would be misdemeanor. In the Administration's point of view, the word proportionality comes in because a person could beat their dog three times and it would be a felony, but they might beat their wife and it could be a misdemeanor. He said the system should not value an animal more than a human being. If the Legislature wanted to up the penalties for hurting human beings to the same level as proposed for animals, that would be okay.

Ms. Brown stated that all the Network executive directors met last year, and it was the first time they could not reach consensus on whether to support the bill where the third domestic violence conviction would be a felony. They supported the intention of it because there should be accountability for multiple offenders. The program executive directors see what the unintended

consequences would be on the ground, but the Network does not have the numbers to support it, which is a problem. But it takes a while for a prosecutor to get to a village, and particularly Native women will say they don't care, to just charge them so they can go home. The third time that happens it would be a felony under the proposed legislation, and the women would lose a lot of things. The Network also believes there are existing laws on the books that the criminal justice system could be using better.

Ms. Brown said the Network supported the animal cruelty bill because they saw it as a tool. So if the court system is not going to prosecute a domestic violence case, in those cases where a person is beating their pet — and there is such a high correlation between harming an animal and hurting a spouse and children — making it a felony offense would be a tool to get the perpetrator. Animals cannot recant, and they don't have family members that are afraid to speak up. So it is an interesting position where a coalition of programs that provide victim services supports a felony animal cruelty bill and is hesitant about a bill where a third domestic violence conviction would be a felony.

Regarding the philosophy of the correlation between abuse of animals and domestic violence, Chair Svobodny said the same argument could be made for truancy. There is a better correlation between truancy and homicide than there is between injuring a dog and domestic violence. Using the same argument, that means truancy should be upped to a felony. The same argument was made in the 1940s and 1950s about marijuana, and it is statistically true that smoking marijuana leads to heroin use: so one could argue that possessing a joint of marijuana should be a felony.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she sensed the animal abuse issue was a little too esoteric for the Council to make a decision to support the bill.

Ms. House stated that the CDVSA has a mandate to address domestic violence against two-legged people, and the Council needs to put its interest there. She said she supported legislation for harsher penalties for mistreating animals, if it was separated from what the Council does.

Ms. Ashenbrenner said she wanted to support the bill because an amendment was added to connect animal abuse to domestic violence.

Ms. Sarren expressed her support for the bill if the Network agreed it could be used as a tool to get at the most violent offenders.

Ms. Ashenbrenner reported that the CDVSA has been asked for a letter of support for a Victims For Justice Academy grant application. She indicated she would forward more information on that to Council members by email.

Chair Svobodny addressed the proposed legislation for the requirement to add internet and instant messaging addresses to the sex offender registration. He said the Administration is opposed to it because in Public Safety's view it is creating a phone book for sexual predators. Another issue is the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006: there is a lot of

debate in other states as to whether they are going to comply with it. Alaska's Administration did not take a position one way or the other. The House and Senate Judiciary Committee all received a letter explaining what the federal mandates on the state are and how state law is different. So far nobody has brought anything up, so he assumed that Alaska is not going to be complying with the Adam Walsh Act.

[The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act expands the National Sex Offender Registry by integrating with the state registries, imposes tougher mandatory minimum penalties for the most serious crimes against children, strengthens state and local law enforcement to go after sexual predators on the internet, and requires background checks of adoptive and foster parents.]

Ms. Ashenbrenner asked what the Adam Walsh Act means for CDVSA. Chair Svobodny replied that money-wise the state loses 10% of federal Byrne Grant money. But since Congress cut it by 69% nationally in December, it is not much money. The big objections in Alaska are that the two-tier system of sex offender registration (one for 15 years and one for life) would have to go to a three-tier system (15 years, 25 years, and life); and people convicted as juveniles would have to be registered and be in the public database.

NEXT MEETING DATE

A tentative date for the next quarterly meeting was set for June 25-26, 2008 in Anchorage.

~~Subsequently, the date was changed to June 11-12.~~

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m., on a motion by Barbara Thompson and seconded by Yvonne Sarren.

Note: The summary minutes are extracted from staff's tape recording of the meeting and are prepared by an outside contractor. For in-depth discussion and presentation details, please refer to tapes of the meeting and staff reports on file at the CDVSA office.

Confidential Office Services
Karen Pearce Brown
Juneau, Alaska