

**Idaho Criminal Justice Commission**  
**Missing and Murdered Indigenous Persons (MMIP) Subcommittee**  
**Minutes**

January 24, 2022

**Location:** Zoom Call    **Time:** 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

**Mission Statement:** Research and identify current systems and resources dedicated to addressing and combating significant and unacceptable rates of missing & murdered Indigenous persons in the State of Idaho, and among members of Idaho tribes in neighboring states. Identify and seek to implement evidence-based strategies and community-centered practices not currently utilized in the state. Evaluate Idaho’s statutory scheme related to MMIP and, if necessary, propose legislation to address and support efforts to curb the current trend.

**Members Present:**

Daniel Chadwick, Chair, ICJC Public Member	Heather Cunningham, Idaho Council on Domestic Violence
Audrey Jim, Shoshone Bannock Tribe	Bernie LaSarte, Coeur d’Alene Tribe
Rafael Gonzales, Acting U.S. Attorney	Karee Pickard, Nez Perce Tribe
Scott Sergeant, Kootenai County	Tai Simpson, Idaho Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Tanea Parmenter, ISP	

**Members Not Present:**

Kevin Dunton, Retired FBI  
Peggy Maas, Kootenai Tribe  
Jim Woodward, State Senator, District 1  
Samuel Abrahamson, Coeur d’Alene Tribe  
Greg Chaney, State Representative, District 10

**Observers:** Willeena George ([willeenageorge@yahoo.com](mailto:willeenageorge@yahoo.com)), Carrying the Message; Paul Frank, Carrying the Message; Jessica Marshall, Idaho Council on Domestic Violence

Staffed by Kelli Brassfield, Idaho Association of Counties

Agenda		Due Date
3:30 p.m.	Call to Order	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome and Roll Call</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve Minutes for December 2021 Meeting</li> </ul>	<p>There was a motion to approve the minutes from December 2021 by Heather Cunningham and was seconded by Tanea Parmenter seconded. Motion carried.</p> <p>Conference is May 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>, in Coeur d'Alene. Work on MOU plus many other presentations.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MMIP definition/stakeholder survey</li> <li>Missing person clearinghouse contractor bid follow-up</li> </ul>	<p>There is a draft/proposed survey to get a better understanding of stakeholder involvement and to propose a definition. There is consensus that there should be a shared definition across the state and this should lend to a shared response.</p> <p>The survey has the mission statement and a statement of purpose. The main question is whether individuals are in favor or opposed to responding to such questions. It also to people to list what individual concerns are. There is a placeholder for endangerment factors. Contact information (optional).</p> <p>Maybe we could ask if someone would like to see the survey revised.</p> <p>Clearinghouse: When an agency enters a missing person, ISP has to manually enter data at this time. When a new person is entered as missing, it takes 24-48 hours for that information to be transferred. Tanea reached out to ISP vendor to see if they could help ease the manual entry portion of this process and try to automate it. If the information in one system changes, ISP has to wait for the update and then change the data on the website and social media. This could be done automatically with an upgrade. ISP touched ~9,000 cases last year.</p> <p>Quote: requested estimate for some customization. The main cost is programming/building. Secondly would be costs for displaying the</p>

Agenda		Due Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Endangerment discussion – what factors should be used?</li> </ul>	<p>information on the website and search ability (many different filters). The last cost is project management, design, and documentation. Total cost would be ~\$1.2M and then annual cost of \$83,500.</p> <p>There would be the ability to fully customize it and then ISP can maintain it. It will also have the ability to run reports. Could this be phased in? Yes, we can. New infrastructure/build and documentation (training for employees) would be first phases. This would alleviate the bottleneck of only one person working on missing persons by upgrading the system.</p> <p>How to proceed? How much time would this save and what could be done with the increased capacity? Takes about 15-20 to initially enter information and another 20 minutes to do a poster and post on social media. Other services it could provide, we would have a better ability to do comprehensive searches. Other agencies would be able to use the services as well. Quicker cases analysis and increase case speed by ~50%.</p> <p>Would there be interim steps leading up to the next session as it is too late for this year? Maybe there could be non-legislative (agency/grant) funds to get this project started. Maybe there could get a one-time appropriation through the legislature.</p> <p>What does it mean to move forward without buy in from the tribes? While implementing a new system, how are we going to build buy in and working collaboration/training for law enforcement and tribes? Maybe for a future meeting and discussion.</p> <p>Dan and Heather will move forward with discussions with the Governor's office. Follow-up in a future meeting.</p> <p>ENPA (endangered person alert) We asked if we could do something similar to an ember alert for missing indigenous persons? We need to review endangerment factors and then we may be able to have an alert based on endangerment factors. There is a fear</p>

Agenda		Due Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collection for MMIP cases</li> <li>• Next meeting date? – due to President’s Day</li> </ul>	<p>that we could do more harm by issuing an alert for all missing indigenous persons. We will also need an advisory board to review these. We don’t want one person left hanging by making these decisions.</p> <p>There could be a higher awareness with these factors. This will help to determine what level of engagement needs to be. If it’s not overly complex, the public will not become desensitized to these alerts. We want to keep the integrity of the system. Also, if we are not specific, LE may get more vague tips that could harm the case.</p> <p>What would the group like to consider? What kind of protocol do we want with these factors? Examples: involvement of drugs, development/impairment disabilities, suicidal ideations (harm to self or others), dementia/Alzheimer’s, Ashanti alert (boyfriend abducted her and murdered her). We will need a resource document with a plan on it will help move this forward. Criteria for endangerment. We need legislation to allow for using the blue alert system.</p> <p>Domestic violence: recorded DV case, protection orders,</p> <p>Future meeting</p> <p>February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue(s) for the Next Meeting</li> <li>• Potential walkthrough in March</li> </ul>	<p>Example case walk through.</p>
5:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjourn</li> </ul>	<p>There was a motion to adjourn the meeting by Heather Cunningham and was seconded by Tanea Parmenter. Motion carried.</p>

Next Scheduled Meeting: February 14, 2022 Via Zoom