

Idaho Criminal Justice Commission
Regular Meeting
January 30, 2026

Location: Hybrid – Idaho Supreme Court Building – [Zoom Link](#)

Time: 9:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.

Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Members Present:

Ashley Dowell, Chair, IDJC
Tracy Basterrechea, Chiefs of Police Association
Monty Prow, Health & Welfare
Bill Gardiner, Idaho State Police
Russ Wheatley Sr., Public Member
Erik Lehtinen, SAPD
Thomas Sullivan, Judge, Magistrate Court*
Bart Davis, U.S. Attorney, District of Idaho*
Jeff Nye, Idaho Attorney General’s Office

Carson Tester, Office of the Governor
Denton Darrington, Public Member
Eric Fredericksen, State Public Defender
Christine Starr, Comm of Pardons & Parole
Bree Derrick, Department of Correction
Bernadette LaSarte, Public Member
Sara Omundson, Idaho Supreme Court*
Grant Loeb, Prosecuting Attorneys Assoc.
Jonathon Brody, Judge, District Court*

Comprising a quorum of Idaho Criminal Justice Commission (Commission)

*Non-voting members

Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Members Absent:

Kieran Donahue, Vice Chair, ISA
Melissa Wintrow, Senate Judiciary & Rules
Darren Simpson, Judge, District Court*
Seth Grigg, Idaho Association of Counties

Joe Alfieri, House Jud, Rules & Admin
Bruce Skaug, House Jud & Rules Admin
Ross Edmunds, Office of Drug Policy

Todd Lakey, Senate Judiciary & Rules Chairman
Greg Wilson, Department of Education

Others Present:

Jen Rupe, AG’s Office
Jens Pattis, ISP
Danielle Chandler, IDJC
Kelli D. Brassfield, IAC

	Agenda <i>Who's Responsible</i>	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
9:00 am	Call to Order— <i>Chair Ashley Dowell</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Welcome and Roll Call— <i>Chair Ashley Dowell</i> ● Review Commission's Vision and Mission Statement and Values— <i>Commission Members</i> 		
Commission Management			
	Action Item – Approve November 14, 2025, Minutes	<i>Bill Gardiner made a motion to approve the minutes from November 14, 2025; Christine Starr seconded. Motion carried.</i>	
Promote Well-Informed Policy Decisions			
	Human Trafficking Presentation - Jen Rupe, Deputy Attorney General; Major Jens Pattis, ISP	<p>Jen Rupe explained that their role, created by House Bill 494, is solely focused on human trafficking, specifically developing training and producing a biannual report.</p> <p>Jen clarified that the report was not intended to be a "mono vision" from the Attorney General, but rather a consensus built on consultations with diverse stakeholders across the state over the last year. The recommendations in this initial report emphasized education and awareness, while considering external constraints like budget. The index of the report covers Idaho and federal law, different types of trafficking, and current anti-trafficking efforts.</p> <p>A key finding of the report is that the official number of human trafficking victims does not accurately reflect the actual prevalence, noting a significant intersection between drug trafficking and human trafficking. Traffickers often use substances to exert control and move from selling drugs to trafficking humans, driven by an economic factor referred to as "power, control, and profit". Data is challenging nationally, but in Idaho over the last five years, thousands of victims</p>	

Agenda Who's Responsible	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
	<p>received services, 80+ reports were made, and there were 12 state prosecutions and five federal prosecutions for trafficking-related offenses.</p> <p>It was noted that most Idaho stakeholders have encountered almost all of the 25 human trafficking modalities identified, which include labor trafficking in sectors like forestry, logging, restaurant, food, and landscaping. The report specifically highlighted illicit massage businesses, labor trafficking, and familial trafficking as types receiving insufficient attention. Familial trafficking, where the victims are often zero to 12 years old and traffickers are typically mothers, is a significant issue with huge crossover with child sex abuse and domestic violence cases.</p> <p>A chart illustrated the significant reduction in numbers from actual human trafficking incidents down to prosecutions and convictions, highlighting that official victim data may only reflect 14% to 18% of the total victims. Investigation challenges include the complexity of cases, which often cross over with financial and other crimes, requiring extensive services for victims, such as language interpretation for indigenous languages. State prosecutions for human trafficking specifically began in 2023, with cases in several counties, but no state-level labor trafficking prosecutions yet.</p> <p>Current efforts include the federally funded Treasure Valley anti-trafficking task force, co-led by the Family Center and Idaho State Police. Healthcare is identified as a critical but underserved intervention point, with 88% of sex trafficking survivors reporting contact with a healthcare provider while trafficked. A strong recommendation is to close a loophole in the parental consent act that requires parental consent for medical care, including forensic exams, which is problematic in familial trafficking cases or for runaway/foster children. Other efforts include increased regulation on</p>	

	Agenda <i>Who's Responsible</i>	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
		<p>illicit massage businesses by Doppel and enhanced training by the Department of Health and Welfare.</p> <p>Law enforcement is actively enhancing its anti-trafficking training, including ISP requiring two-day training for all troopers. There are initiatives such as a juvenile screening tool used for sentencing and a pilot program in Canyon County to screen and intervene for victims of trafficking at the jail booking stage.</p> <p>It was noted that federal partners like HSI and FBI have been excellent partners, though administrative priority shifts and personnel details to other cities present constraints. There have not yet been discussions with the court about judicial education, though there is some coordinating with the Supreme Court's criminal jury instructions committee to update those instructions.</p> <p>In response to a question about the Attorney General's office prosecuting human trafficking cases, it was confirmed pending legislation on the matter, but their office is officially staying neutral. The AG's office currently takes on cases through conflict agreements when asked. It was emphasized the value of having a sole entity with statewide jurisdiction for cross-county trafficking cases. However, it was cautioned against exclusive jurisdiction for the AG's office, which would remove authority from county prosecutors. The AG's office believes county prosecutors are willing to pursue these cases, but a lack of experience is a factor due to the low number of human trafficking cases filed statewide.</p> <p>Addressing human trafficking requires a comprehensive, team effort across various sectors.</p> <p>Pending legislation, confirming that the current proposal grants local law enforcement the <i>option</i> to refer human trafficking investigations to their office, establishing concurrent, not exclusive, jurisdiction.</p>	

	Agenda <i>Who's Responsible</i>	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
		<p>Concern was expressed that the proposed legislation would only grant the Attorney General's office jurisdiction to prosecute the crime of human trafficking itself, which is inefficient, as nearly all human trafficking cases involve multiple other felonies. It was noted that taking on jurisdiction over all related crimes would require significantly more resources for the AG's office.</p> <p>The current human trafficking data was described as "messy" and insufficient to quantify the true extent of the problem in Idaho, emphasizing that they are diving into methods to gather more beneficial data. They drew a parallel to the law enforcement experience with drug interdiction (Desert Snow training), arguing that officers need to be trained to focus on behaviors and patterns to identify human trafficking, similar to how they learned to spot drug transport. It was stressed for the need for officers to improve at talking to potential victims, such as the 12-year-old on the couch, instead of focusing solely on the male subject during arrests.</p>	
	<p>Riders Presentation</p> <p>- Bree Derrick, IDOC; Judge Simpson</p>	<p>The rider subcommittee has met twice to review the program's purpose, membership, initial findings, and future plans, driven by the need to report on participant outcomes compared to other options. The program has historically shown poorer outcomes, leading the committee to investigate if it works for certain individuals or if it needs revamping or elimination. The committee consists of broad representation, including courts, prosecuting attorneys, public defenders, and representatives from the Department of Correction who provide expertise in programming and data.</p> <p>Data indicating a decline in the percentage of sentences that are retained jurisdiction sentences (riders), dropping from 52% in 2014 to 38% in 2025, even though the raw number of admissions has increased due to overall admissions rising. Roughly 36% of the population has two or more riders, with two-thirds having only one.</p>	

	Agenda <i>Who's Responsible</i>	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
		<p>The data showed that the recidivism rate (three-year reincarceration) for first-time riders is 50%, compared to 38% for the overall prison population, and 48% for those with previous riders. Most participants (60%) are in for drug-related crimes.</p> <p>The subcommittee surveyed judges and is currently surveying prosecuting attorneys and public defenders to understand their sentiment and expectations regarding the rider program. Judges reported typically opposing riders for individuals with current substance abuse problems or those who have had previous unsuccessful opportunities like probation. Judges highly expect substance use and criminal thinking programming, and re-entry services, though it was noted that re-entry services are limited in the rider program compared to parole preparations.</p> <p>The survey confirmed that expectations are most often met for individuals with substance use or criminal thinking problems. Expectations around re-entry services might not be fully met, and some judges use the rider as a "wraparound service" when community treatment or support is lacking. One judge suggested that work centers were a better model than the current rider program.</p> <p>A discussion was held regarding a previous, seemingly effective "work center" rider model. A judge noted that the isolated facility programming for riders, often far from family and community connections, contributes to lower success rates, unlike community re-entry centers that offer reduced recidivism due to established community ties. The committee is exploring options for judges, such as more treatment options, but is not yet discussing policy fixes.</p>	

	Agenda <i>Who's Responsible</i>	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
	<p>Subcommittee Updates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sex Crimes - Tracy Basterrechea, ICOPA and Erik Lehtinen, SAPD 2. Neurocognitive Holds and Placements - Judge Sullivan, ISC and Jared Larsen, DHW 3. Support for Victims - Christine Starr, COPP and Bernie LaSarte 4. Public Safety Positions - Chief Deputy Doug Hart, CCSO and Wendi Secrist, Workforce Development Council 5. Coroner System - Kelli D. Brassfield, IAC; Senator Melissa Wintrow 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First meeting will be at the end of February. 2. Present in April – The subcommittee is reviewing the implementation of the neurocognitive crisis holds statute, which has met twice. The statute is working as intended, with 185 holds statewide in the first three quarters, a number significantly lower than mental illness commitments. Key findings include 40-50% of people on hold receiving a new diagnosis and 20-25% of cases being crisis situations driven by medical issues. Gaps remain outside hospital walls, including the need for "step downs" after a hold and expanded caregiver support to reduce future holds. 3. Present in April 4. Not present. 5. An update on the Coroner System subcommittee, noting that they meet monthly and are working on a strategic plan and outcome projections. A draft bill concerning the confidentiality of decedent photos, making them exempt from public record except for legal next of kin requests, is moving forward. They are also considering a bill to mandate autopsies for certain case types, modeled after national standards, and a fee increase on death certificates to cover the costs of these required autopsies. 	
	<p>Other Commission Business</p>	<p>A project charter document has been developed for subcommittee chairs to track their objectives, action plans, and members, which will be updated and shared with ICJC members. To ensure compliance, the subcommittee chairs were provided with an open meeting guide and checklist. Town hall postings must go through Kelli to be posted on</p>	

	Agenda <i>Who's Responsible</i>	Meeting Outcomes/Decisions Reached	Due Date
		<p>Town Hall Idaho, and meeting agendas, records, and statutory minutes must be funneled through them for a central repository.</p> <p>The policy concerning legislator requests for ICJC to review bills was reviewed, stating that ICJC will not provide formal endorsement of proposed legislation because different groups within ICJC may hold conflicting positions. New language was added to the draft policy, directing legislators seeking formal endorsement to reach out directly to the official director or executive director of the agency, office, or association, to prevent individual feedback from being construed as an official position.</p>	
12:00 pm	Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm MT.	

Regularly scheduled meeting to be held in Boise, Friday, April 3, 2026

“Collaborating for a Safer Idaho”