



**Alaska Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD) Partnership**  
431 N. Franklin St. Suite 203, Juneau, Alaska 99801 • (907) 465-8920  
Webpage: [www.hss.state.ak.us/fasd.htm](http://www.hss.state.ak.us/fasd.htm)  
Email: [akfasdpartnership@alaska.gov](mailto:akfasdpartnership@alaska.gov)

## **SB 151/HB 367 - Inclusion of FASD as a Mitigating Factor**

### **The Need for SB 151/HB 367**

Individuals diagnosed with a fetal alcohol spectrum disorder (FASD) are disproportionately represented within Alaska's criminal justice system. The intent underlying Alaska's sentencing structure – that people will modify their behaviors based on the criminal justice system's response to their crimes – is not met when applied to individuals with FASD. These disabilities manifest as deficits in executive function, resulting in impaired adaptive behavior, memory difficulties, an inability to plan, and a failure to recognize the consequences of actions. In the interest of justice, it is important to take these deficits into account during sentencing. Neither the offender nor society benefits from holding individuals with FASD to community standards that they cannot possibly attain given their impairments.

SB 151/HB 367 fulfills a recommendation adopted by the Alaska Criminal Justice Assessment Commission: "The legislature should create a statutory mitigating factor for use at criminal sentencing, recognizing when the wrongful conduct was substantially affected by an organic brain disorder."<sup>1</sup>

A draft resolution being proposed by the Commission on Youth At Risk of the American Bar Association for consideration at this year's annual ABA meeting states: "... the American Bar Association urges lawyers and judges, as well as bar associations and law school clinical programs, to support training that includes law school law enforcement, and legal/judicial education curricula on enhanced awareness of the child and adult disability of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD) and its impact on individuals in the child welfare, juvenile justice, and adult criminal justice systems, and that they work with medical, mental health, and FASD disability experts to promote: ... (d) applying FASD as a mitigating factor in the mitigation of juvenile justice and criminal sentencing ... and consideration of alternatives to incarceration that reduce recidivism."

### **Overview of the changes proposed in SB 151/HB 367**

SB 151/HB 367 proposes to allow FASD as a mitigating factor for sentencing in certain cases where there is *clear and convincing* evidence that a "defendant committed [an] offense while suffering from a condition diagnosed as a fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, the fetal alcohol spectrum disorder substantially impaired the defendant's judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or ability to cope with the ordinary demands of life, and the fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, though insufficient to constitute a complete defense, significantly affected the defendant's conduct."

SB 151/HB 367 would, for the purposes of the subsection on mitigating factors, define fetal alcohol spectrum disorder as any "a condition of impaired brain function in the range of permanent birth defects caused by maternal consumption of alcohol during pregnancy."

---

<sup>1</sup> Alaska Criminal Justice Assessment Commission (2000). *Final Report*. Retrieved October 12, 2010 from [www.hss.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/CJAC\\_Final\\_2004.pdf](http://www.hss.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/CJAC_Final_2004.pdf), at p.71.

The legislation **DOES NOT**:

- 1) *require* a judge to use the mitigating factor;
- 2) *automatically* adjust a presumptive sentence; the defendant would have to prove by *clear and convincing evidence* 1) that he or she has a fetal alcohol spectrum disorder and 2) that the condition “significantly affected the defendant’s conduct” before the judicial officer can consider the possibility of adjusting the presumptive sentence; or
- 3) the goal is not a “get out of jail free” card, but an attempt to be “smarter” within the justice system to better direct people who have impaired brain function to services both within and after release from the criminal justice system.

### **What are mitigating factors?**

The Legislature has decided in the presumptive sentencing law that judges should give jail time within certain ranges in all felonies (with the exception of “class C felonies” where the minimum presumptive term is 0 years). The amount of the presumptive term depends on the severity of the crime and whether or not a defendant has prior felonies. There are 34 statutory aggravating factors that could result in a sentence above the presumptive range, if proved by clear and convincing evidence. A judge must sentence a person to at least the minimum presumptive term unless a “mitigating factor” is shown by clear and convincing evidence. There are 19 statutory mitigating factors. With the current mental disease or defect mitigating factor, the defendant must *also* show by clear and convincing evidence that the condition “significantly affected the defendant’s conduct.” The proposed fetal alcohol spectrum disorder mitigating factor also requires proof by clear and convincing evidence that the condition “significantly affected the defendant’s conduct” before a judge could consider it. If the required showing has been made for any mitigating factor, it is legally possible for the judge to sentence below the minimum term (but if the minimum term is more than 4 years, the lower limit is half the minimum presumptive term).

There are special rules when there is a factor in a case that does not fit within the statutory list but which is so important in a case that it would be manifestly unjust to sentence a person without considering the factor. If the sentencing judge finds that such a “non statutory mitigating factor” exists, then the judge must refer the case to a three judge sentencing panel. If at least two judges on the panel agree, the panel can sentence with the same lower limits applicable to a statutory mitigating factor. If the panel does not agree, the case is referred back to the original judge to impose at least the minimum presumptive term. The “three judge panel” method is very cumbersome, time consuming and expensive. SB 151/HB 367 is a “statutory mitigating factor” and would not require any referral to a three judge sentencing panel.

### **What are Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders?**

FASD is not a medical diagnosis, but an umbrella term for the range of diagnoses associated with damage caused by maternal alcohol consumption during pregnancy. These medical diagnoses can include Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS), Partial Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (PFAS), Alcohol-Related Birth Defects (ARBD), and Alcohol-Related Neurodevelopmental Disorder (ARND). Note that the term, Fetal Alcohol Effects (FAE), is no longer commonly used, having been replaced by the PFAS, ARBD and ARND diagnoses.

Each diagnosis has its own symptoms and attributes, but common among all the diagnoses is permanent, life-long brain damage – often affecting decision-making, judgment and impulse control.

FASD is a brain-based disorder, similar to autism, traumatic and acquired brain injury, and other cognitive impairments.

FASDs appear in individuals differently. Some alcohol-exposed individuals may exhibit impulsivity, hyperactivity and risky behaviors. Some have difficulties with memory, while others have very good memories. Some have low IQs, while others have normal IQs.

Experts report that the different presentations are influenced by many variables, including when the mother drank, how much she drank, the genetic makeup (or genotype) of the baby, and the genotype of the mother.

Primary behavior characteristics of people with impaired brain function include: impulsiveness, memory difficulties, anger and frustration, difficulty pairing actions to consequences. Secondary behaviors that develop in reaction to or as a result of the primary disability, include substance abuse and mental health problems, anger and aggression, homelessness, involvement with the criminal justice system, and more.

Neurologist Dr. Susan Hunter-Joerns, a member of the Juneau FASD Diagnostic Team, wrote that structural brain damage “often significantly impair[s] cognitive behavior, common sense, the ability to understand right from wrong, cause-and-effect, consider consequences, ability to recognize social norm ... even though defendants may verbally seem able to talk about the issues. Making long term goals, planning appropriate actions, delaying gratification, and understanding the legal system, are often significant problems.”

#### **Who in Alaska is qualified to give a diagnosis of FAS/FASD?**

Though some physicians may be qualified to diagnose all the disorders on the FASD spectrum, the preferred method of diagnosis, according to Susan Astley, Professor of Epidemiology and Pediatrics at the University of Washington and director of the Washington State FASD Diagnostic and Prevention Network, is by an interdisciplinary diagnostic team using current, rigorous FASD diagnostic guidelines. This preferred method is also advocated for nationally by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Each diagnosis on the spectrum requires evaluation and testing related to the Central Nervous System (CNS) to detect damage that cannot be measured alone by physical attributes. Interdisciplinary diagnostic teams using the 4-Digit Diagnostic Code include evaluations by a medical professional, psychologist, occupational therapist, and speech-language pathologist. These evaluations can detect the nuances of the disability.

#### **How many diagnostic teams and/or physicians are available to give FASD diagnoses in Alaska?**

Currently, through the Division of Behavioral Health FASD Diagnostic Team Provider Agreement, Alaska has eight active FASD diagnostic teams – in Bethel, Fairbanks, Mat-Su, Kenai, Juneau, Sitka, and two in Anchorage (Southcentral Foundation and ASSETS). Alaska also has a trained diagnostic team at Alaska Psychiatric Institute (API) for children who enter the service system through that door. In the past there were teams in Dillingham and Kodiak — both locations that are interested in reviving their teams at some point, but do not have the resources to do it at this time. Alaska also has had team in Nome, Copper Center, and Ketchikan. The majority of FASD diagnoses in Alaska are determined by the diagnostic teams overseen by DHSS.

### **How many people are diagnosed with FAS/FASD in Alaska annually?**

In 2011, Alaska's FASD diagnostic teams diagnosed 179 individuals. The average per year number is around 153 per year, according to the Alaska Department of Health & Social Services.

### **What is Alaska's diagnostic standard based on?**

In 1999, the DHSS Office of FAS, in conjunction with the statewide FASD Steering Committee, agreed to use the 4-Digit Diagnostic Code as the standard diagnostic system for Alaska's developing Diagnostic Team Network. The 4-Digit Diagnostic Code was developed at the University of Washington's FASD Diagnostic and Prevention Network by Drs. Susan Astley and Sterling Clarren. The 4-Digit Diagnostic Code measures: 1) facial features, 2) growth deficiency, 3) central nervous system damage/dysfunction, and 4) prenatal alcohol exposure. The client's diagnosis is derived after a thorough evaluation by an interdisciplinary team of professionals, which generally includes a physician (or nurse practitioner), psychologist, occupational therapist, speech-language pathologist, social worker, and family advocate. For more information on the FASD 4-Digit Code, visit: <http://depts.washington.edu/fasdpn/htmls/4-digit-code.htm>.

The 4-Digit Diagnostic Code is considered the "gold standard" for FASD diagnosis and provides a reliable, evidence-based diagnostic process that gives detailed information about the individual client and how best to help that person work with their disability to reach their full potential. All team members are required to complete the University of Washington FASD 4-Digit Diagnostic Code Training Course.

### **The economic benefits of SB 151/HB 367**

The cost of incarceration in Alaska's prison is about \$136 per day. Over the course of five to ten years in an Alaskan prison, an inmate is expected to cost the state close to \$250,000-\$500,000 (not including medical, mental health or other specialized treatment while incarcerated).

The cost of intensive case management, including electronic monitoring and probation/parole, is about \$76 per day (\$48 for intensive case management, \$21 for electronic monitoring, \$7 for probation/parole) – for a savings of \$21,900 per person, per year.<sup>2</sup>

According to the 2009 ISER Study, *The Cost of Crime: Could the State Reduce Future Crime and Save Money by Expanding Education and Treatment Programs?*, the cost of providing services is less than the cost of incarceration. With appropriate supports, clients with FASD, T/ABI and other brain-based disabilities can live successfully in the community as contributing citizens, *and* provide jobs for Alaskan case workers, clinicians, assisted living providers, mental health and substance abuse counselors, psychologists and psychiatrists. Not only does SB 151/HB 367 further the cause of justice for a vulnerable population, it represents a better investment of our state's resources.

### **FASD in other jurisdictions**

Judges nationwide are experiencing repeat offenders diagnosed with these disorders who, as a direct result of their disabilities, are effectively unable to understand the charges against them, or comply with the conditions of their sentence. There is a growing body of research affirming that FASDs are

---

<sup>2</sup> Source for Prison, Community Residential Centers, Electronic Monitoring & Probation and Parole: [http://www.ahfc.us/iceimages/homeless/102211\\_ach\\_doc\\_discharge\\_stats.pdf](http://www.ahfc.us/iceimages/homeless/102211_ach_doc_discharge_stats.pdf). Note: Intensive Case Management estimated costs are based on the most intensive case management with a high level of education and supervision for workers. Actual costs, depending on the case mix, may be lower.

brain disorders effectively impairing “judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or ability to cope with the ordinary demands of life.”

Kate Burkhart, attorney and executive director of the Alaska Advisory Board on Alcoholism and Drug abuse, wrote that the language in SB 151/HB 367 “is commensurate with the federal sentencing guidelines and other western state laws that provide for such a mitigating factor. While none of the western states surveyed expressly include FASD in their definitions of mental defect, Utah includes a broad definition that would include FASD. The other states and federal guidelines would permit but do not mandate consideration of FASDs in sentencing unless they impair comprehension or ability to form intent.”

Burkhart noted that Utah defines “mental illness” as “a mental disease or defect that substantially impairs a person’s mental, emotional, or behavioral functioning. A mental defect may be a congenital condition, the result of an injury, or residual effect of a physical or mental disease that includes, but is not limited to, mental retardation” which is further defined to mean “significant sub-average general intellectual functioning, existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior.”

Idaho permits consideration of mental condition creating an “inability to appreciate the wrongfulness” of conduct or to conform to legal requirements at sentencing.”

Washington permits the courts to consider “the defendant’s capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his or her conduct, or to conform his or her conduct to the requirements of the law, was significantly impaired.”

Nationally, advocates within the American Bar Association are proposing a resolution urging lawyers, judges, bar associations and law school clinical programs to promote “applying FASD as a factor in the mitigation of juvenile and criminal sentencing ... and consideration of alternatives to incarceration that reduce recidivism.” The resolution also asks, “that state and federal laws and policies reflect the serious effects of prenatal alcohol exposure by a) including persons diagnosed with FASD, or suffering from the affects of prenatal alcohol exposure, within the statutory definition of developmental disabilities ... and b) enhancing identification and diagnosis of ... persons with FASD.” Their intent is that this resolution would be approved by the ABA House of Delegates at the annual meeting in Chicago in August 2012.

Internationally, Alaska is among the forerunners in awareness, diagnosis, and prevention of fetal alcohol spectrum disorders, both nationally and internationally. However, Canada and parts of Australia are leading the world in establishing laws and practices that address FASD as a brain-based disability with specific interventions and solutions.

The Canadian Bar Association passed a resolution in 2010 acknowledging that FASDs involve a range of neurological and behavioral challenges that can include “impaired mental functioning, poor executive functioning, memory problems, impaired judgment, inability to control impulse behavior, inability to understand the consequences of their actions, and inability to internally modify behavior control.”

The resolution also acknowledged that “the criminal justice system is based on normative assumptions that a person acts in a voluntary manner, makes informed choices with respect to the decision to commit crimes, and learns from their own behavior and the behavior of others” and “these normative assumptions and sentencing principals such as specific and general deterrence, are not valid for those with FASDs.

Following are other highlights addressed in the CBA’s resolution:

- sentencing options available to courts are often ineffective in changing the behavior of those with FASD and those with FASD are frequently repeat offenders

- some courts have ruled that absolutely no rehabilitative or deterrent purpose is served by incarceration of those with FASD;
- laws, programs or activities could ameliorate the disadvantages experienced by those with FASD whose behavior is judged on a standard that they are incapable of meeting because of their disability;
- the Canadian bar is resolved to urge the federal government to amend criminal sentencing laws to accommodate the disability of those with FASD.

In Heather Douglas' article, *The sentencing response to defendants with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder* (2010) published by Thomas Reuters in Australia, the author notes that "as a result of deficits in executive function resulting in memory difficulties, inability to plan and failure to recognize the consequences of actions, many of those with FASD are likely to fail to pay fines and to breach probation orders ... Suspended sentences will not be useful in a context where cause and effect is not understood. In prison, highly suggestible FASD sufferers are likely to be victimized. While FASD clients cannot be cured of all their symptoms, techniques and approaches have been identified that can be employed by professionals to help the person reach his or her potential."

## Conclusion

The state's movement toward "Smart Justice" aims to promote reduced public costs, fewer crimes, and a greater rehabilitative effect on offenders. While some offenders are clearly dangerous enough and need long-term incarceration, the research behind "Smart Justice" suggests that for certain non-violent offenders, treatment programs inside the prison, combined with adequate transition and case management services, will result in lower costs, less recidivism and a safer general public.

Chasnoff, M.D., an international expert on FASD, wrote in an article "Is Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders a Mitigating Factor in Criminal Litigation and Sentencing?" in *Psychology Today* (2011), "We are in an ethical conundrum. Children, youth and young adults with FASD are more likely than not to end up before the court on criminal or civil charges, but the legal system has not come close to resolving how their cases should be treated. Most individuals with FASD have normal IQs, and most can relate a story as to how they ended up before the judge. Most can even state they understand the charges against them. But the truth is that neurocognitive damage that inhibits executive functioning, decision-making, and emotional and behavioral regulation has tremendous bearing on the capacity of these individuals to understand the ramifications of their actions. These people look normal, they speak normally, but they often have only a superficial understanding of the charges against them."

As noted by Canadian Judge Barry Stuart in *R. v. Sam* (1993), FASD takes away someone's "... ability to act within the norms expected by society." It is "manifestly unfair to make an individual pay for their disability with their freedom. Society is failed because a sentence calculated for a 'normal' offender cannot serve the same ends when imposed on an offender with FASD," he said. "Not only can traditionally calculated sentences be hopelessly ineffective when applied to FASD offenders, but the punishment itself, calibrated for a non-disabled individual, can have a substantially more severe effect on someone with the impairments associated with FASD," Judge Stuart concluded.