

1989 JUVENILE JUSTICE  
AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT  
COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Health and Social Services

Russell E. Webb, Director  
Division of Family and Youth Services

Report Prepared by:

Emily E. Read  
Project Manager

Nancy Schafer, Principal Investigator  
Justice Center,  
University of Alaska Anchorage

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. General Information.....1

Section 223(a)(12)(A)

B. Removal of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders from  
Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities.....2

C. De Minimis Request.....7

Section 223(a)(12)(B)

D. Progress Made in Achieving Removal of Status Offenders  
and Nonoffenders from Secure Detention and Correctional  
Facilities.....15

Section 223(a)(13)

E. Separation of Juveniles and Adults.....16

Section 223(a)(14)

F. Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups.....22

G. De Minimis Request: Numerical.....30

H. De Minimis Request: Substantive.....33

Appendix One: Methodology.....36

Appendix Two: Jail Removal Violations by Offense Type and  
Location.....42

## STATE MONITORING REPORT

### A. GENERAL INFORMATION.

#### 1. NAME AND ADDRESS OF STATE MONITORING AGENCY.

Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services  
P.O. Box H-05  
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0630

#### 2. CONTACT PERSON REGARDING STATE REPORT.

Name: Donna Schultz Phone #: (907) 465-2113

#### 3. DOES THE STATE'S LEGISLATIVE DEFINITION OF CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENDER, STATUS OFFENDER, OR NONOFFENDER DIFFER WITH THE OJJDP DEFINITION CONTAINED IN THE CURRENT OJJDP FORMULA GRANT REGULATION?

Alaska's definition of "delinquent minor" is congruent with the OJJDP definition of "criminal-type offender" contained in 28 CFR Part 31.304(g). Alaska's definition of "child in need of aid" encompasses both "status offenders" and "nonoffenders" as defined in 28 CFR Part 31.304(h) and (i). The relevant Alaska definitions are contained in AS 47.10.010 and AS 47.10.290.

Although Alaska's legislative definitions are consistent with those contained in the OJJDP Formula Grant Regulation, the OJJDP Office of General Counsel issued a Legal Opinion Letter dated August 30, 1979 interpreting Section 223(a)(12)(A) of the JJDP Act to require "that an alcohol offense that would be a crime only for a limited class of young adult persons must be classified as a status offense if committed by a juvenile." Because Alaska law defines possession or consumption of alcohol by persons under 21 years of age as a criminal offense (AS 04.16.050), on this point the state's definitions of "criminal-type offender" and "status offender" are inconsistent with the OJJDP interpretation.

Pursuant to OJJDP's interpretation of Section 223(a)(12)(A), juveniles accused of, or adjudicated delinquent for, possession or consumption of alcohol ("minor consuming alcohol" or "minor in possession of alcohol") have been defined as status offenders.

#### 4. DURING THE STATE MONITORING EFFORT WAS THE FEDERAL DEFINITION OR STATE DEFINITION FOR CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENDER, STATUS OFFENDER AND NONOFFENDER USED?

The federal definitions for criminal-type offender, status offender and nonoffender were used.

SECTION 223(a)(12)(A)

**B. REMOVAL OF STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS FROM SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.**

1. **BASELINE REPORTING PERIOD:** Calendar year 1976

**CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:** Calendar year 1989

2. **NUMBER OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data	14	13	1
Current Data	111	111	0
Juvenile Detention Centers	5	5	0
Juvenile Holdover Facilities [1]	1	1	0
Juvenile Training Schools [2]	0	0	0
Adult Jails	17	17	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	2	2	0
Adult Lockups [3]	86	86	0

[1] For the 1989 monitoring report "Juvenile Holdover Facility" is a new designation used to identify a single secure facility used solely for the temporary detention of juveniles.

[2] Two facilities serve as both juvenile detention centers and juvenile training schools. Because all juveniles admitted to these facilities must be processed through the respective detention centers, separate monitoring of the training schools is unnecessary.

[3] Modifications to the 1988 universe of adult lockups for the 1989 report include four deletions, thirteen additions, and one facility placed on "hold" for 1989 monitoring, as it burned down and was re-built during the year.

3. NUMBER OF FACILITIES IN EACH CATEGORY REPORTING ADMISSION AND RELEASE DATA FOR JUVENILES TO THE STATE MONITORING AGENCY.

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data	14	13	1
Current Data	63	63	0
Juvenile Detention Centers	5	5	0
Juvenile Holdover Facilities	1	1	0
Adult Jails	17	17	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	2	2	0
Adult Lockups	38	38	0

4. NUMBER OF FACILITIES IN EACH CATEGORY RECEIVING AN ON-SITE INSPECTION DURING THE CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD FOR THE PURPOSE OF VERIFYING SECTION 223(a)(12)(A) DATA.

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Current Data	46	46	0
Juvenile Detention Centers	2	2	0
Juvenile Holdover Facilities	1	1	0
Adult Jails	8	8	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	1	1	0
Adult Lockups	34	34	0

5. **TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCUSED STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS HELD FOR LONGER THAN 24 HOURS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES DURING THE REPORT PERIOD, EXCLUDING THOSE HELD PURSUANT TO A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT THE JUVENILE VIOLATED A VALID COURT ORDER.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data [1]	485	485	0
Current Data	2	2	0
Juvenile Detention Centers	2	2	0
Adult Jails	0	0	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	0	0	0
Adult Lockups	0	0	0

[1] The monitoring report format for the baseline year did not distinguish between accused and adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders. Baseline data for both accused and adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders are included here.

6. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADJUDICATED STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS HELD IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME DURING THE REPORT PERIOD, EXCLUDING THOSE HELD PURSUANT TO A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT THE JUVENILE VIOLATED A VALID COURT ORDER.

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data [1]	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data	1	1	0
Juvenile Detention Centers	0	0	0
Adult Jails	1	1	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	0	0	0
Adult Lockups	0	0	0

[1] The monitoring report format for the baseline year did not distinguish between accused and adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders. Baseline data for both accused and adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders are included in item B5.

**7. TOTAL NUMBER OF STATUS OFFENDERS HELD IN ANY SECURE DETENTION OR CORRECTIONAL FACILITY PURSUANT TO A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT THE JUVENILE VIOLATED A VALID COURT ORDER.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data [1]	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data	2	2	0
Juvenile Detention Centers	2	2	0
Adult Jails	0	0	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	0	0	0
Adult Lockups	0	0	0

[1] Data for status offenders determined to have violated valid court orders were not included in the monitoring report format for the baseline year.

**Has the State monitoring agency verified that the criteria for using this exclusion have been satisfied pursuant to the current OJJDP regulation?**

Yes.

**If yes, how was this verified (State law and/or judicial rules match the OJJDP regulatory criteria, or each case was individually verified through a check of court records)?**

During 1989 in Alaska, two juvenile status offenders were securely detained pursuant to a judicial determination that the juveniles had violated valid court orders. For these two instances, photocopies of pertinent court records were obtained with the assistance of the Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) office handling each case. The documents were examined to ensure that the criteria for use of the valid court order exception were satisfied.



C. DE MINIMIS REQUEST.

1. CRITERION A -- THE EXTENT THAT NONCOMPLIANCE IS INSIGNIFICANT OR OF SLIGHT CONSEQUENCE.

Number of accused status offenders and nonoffenders held in excess of 24 hours and the number of adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders held for any length of time in secure detention or secure correctional facilities.

<u>Accused</u>		<u>Adjudicated</u>		<u>Total</u>
2	+	1	=	3

Total juvenile population of the State under age 18 according to the most recent available U.S. Bureau of Census data or census projection.

166,294 juveniles

(Source: Alaska Population Overview: 1986 and Provisional 1987 Estimates, Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, August 1989)

If the data was projected to cover a 12-month period, provide the specific data used in making the projection and the statistical method used to project the data.

<u>Accused</u>		<u>Adjudicated</u>		<u>Total</u>
8	+	2	=	10

**Statistical Method of Projection:**

Four methods of statistical projection for missing and unknown detention data were employed in the analysis of 1989 juvenile detention data. These were: 1) projection of data for the purpose of covering twelve months of time in an instance when only six months of data were received; 2) projection of juvenile detention data from non-reporting adult lockups; 3) projection for length of detention for cases with missing time and/or date information; and 4) projection of the reason for detention for cases with unknown offense.

1. **Projection for Complete Calendar Year:**

Complete data for Calendar Year 1989 were available for all but one of the sixty-three secure facilities in Alaska reporting detention information. Projection of data to cover the full calendar year 1989 for the adult lockup in King Cove was accomplished by computing the proportion of the year for which data

from this facility were received (185 days/365 days = .5068), and weighting each instance of juvenile detention at King Cove by a factor equal to the reciprocal of that proportion. Thus, the 3 instances of juvenile detention at this facility were weighted by a factor of 1.973, providing an overall number of juvenile detentions equal to 5.92 at the King Cove facility. This weighting procedure assumes that instances of noncompliance at the King Cove lockup during the last six months of 1989 occurred at the same rate demonstrated in the data for the first six months.

## **2. Projection for Non-reporting Adult Lockups:**

Data for the 48 adult lockups whose records were inadequate for monitoring purposes were projected by assigning a weight of 2.263 (the reciprocal of the proportion of all adult lockups represented by those included in the analysis) to each case of juvenile detention in the 38 adult lockups from which adequate data were obtained. To the extent that lockups from which adequate data were obtained are representative of all lockups in the monitoring universe, this method of projection is statistically valid.

Since all adult lockups which submitted adequate data were included in the analysis, random sampling of this group was not performed. It is believed that lockups which do not maintain adequate records are unlikely to detain more juveniles than those which do. Facilities which do not maintain adequate records probably fail to do so because they, in fact, detain very few individuals, either adults or juveniles. Any error in this method of projecting data for non-reporting lockups should therefore result in a higher number of noncompliant cases than actually occurred in these facilities.

## **3. Projection for Unknown Duration of Detention:**

For a number of cases for which time information was inadequate, it was necessary to project data regarding the duration of detention. This projection affected twenty three instances with incomplete time data. Each projection was contingent on the type of offender status associated with each instance. Duration was unknown in four cases involving accused criminal-type offenders, in fifteen cases with adjudicated criminal-type offenders, in three instances involving accused status offenders, and in one case involving a nonoffender.

In projecting the length of detention for the three cases involving accused status offenders, the goal was to determine whether the 24-hour grace period had been exceeded. This was accomplished as follows: the proportion of cases in which detention extended beyond the 24-hour grace period was computed for all cases involving detention of status offenders and for which duration of detention was known. The three cases for which duration of detention could not be determined were each assigned

a weight of .0217, the overall known proportion of noncompliant instances involving the detention of accused status offenders.

In determining the appropriate weight to assign each of the four cases involving accused criminal-type offenders with insufficient time data, the proportions of cases in which detention extended beyond the 6-hour grace period was computed for all cases involving the detention of an accused criminal-type offender in adult jails, adult correctional centers, and adult lockups. The four cases were then alternately assigned weights of .508, .630, and .444, depending upon the type of adult facility in which they were recorded. Respectively, then, these weights represented the proportions of noncompliant instances among all cases involving detention of juveniles accused of criminal-type offenses for which sufficient data were available in adult jails, adult correctional facilities, and adult lockups.

The fifteen cases involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders for which duration of detention data were insufficient were all recorded in juvenile detention centers, where time limits are not imposed upon the handling of this category of adjudicated juveniles. Since length of detention was irrelevant in these cases, projections were not performed.

#### **4. Projection for Unknown Offender Type:**

It was also necessary to project type of offender information (i.e. criminal-type offender, status offender, nonoffender) for ten instances of juvenile detention in which the reason for detention was not adequately specified. In this situation several series of computations were required, contingent upon the type of facility from which the data were received. One of the instances of juvenile detention with insufficient offense information was recorded in a juvenile center, four were recorded in adult jails, and the remaining five were recorded in adult lockups.

First, in determining the total number of accused status offenders held over 24 hours (item B5), these cases were alternately assigned weights of .3263, .1039, and .3704, the respective proportions of status offenders among all instances of juvenile detention in adult jails, juvenile centers, and adult lockups for which type of offender was known. Second, in determining the number of adjudicated status offenders held for any length of time (item b6), these ten unknown offense cases were each alternately assigned weights of .0212, .0078, and .000, the respective proportions of known adjudicated status offenders among all juveniles detained in adult jails, juvenile centers, and adult lockups.

The cases with insufficient offense information were also weighted for the purposes of projecting the incidence of jail removal infractions. These calculations excluded the single

unknown case recorded at a juvenile center, since this type of facility is not affected by jail removal considerations. The remaining nine unknown offense cases were each alternately weighted three times - as accused criminal-type offenders, as adjudicated criminal-type offenders, and as status offenders. When the nine cases were projected to be detentions of accused criminal-type offenders, those recorded at adult jails were weighted at .5085 (the proportion of accused criminal-type offenders detained in adult jails for more than 6 hours among all known juvenile criminal-type offenders held) and those recorded at adult lockups were weighted at .4444 (likewise, the proportion of jail removal violations of this type that occurred in adult lockups).

Finally, in the same fashion, the nine cases with unknown offenses were also weighted for the purposes of projecting jail removal infractions involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders and status offenders. For each of these two offender classes, the nine cases were alternately weighted by the overall proportions of noncompliance in adult jails and adult lockups. For the purpose of projecting the number of adjudicated criminal-types held in adult jails, the missing cases originating in jails were assigned the weight of .1059. Since there were no jail removal violations involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders in village lockups, the five offense missing cases reported in lockups were projected to have a value of 0.00.

This weighting procedure - involving the four types of data projection described above - was implemented by assigning a weight equivalent to the product of the four weights to each case of juvenile detention. Because the product of the four weights was less than 1.00 for the majority of weighted cases, the projected number of noncompliant cases is smaller than the number of unweighted cases upon which it is based.

**Calculation of status offender and nonoffender detention and correctional institutionalization rate per 100,000 population under age 18.**

Status offenders and nonoffenders held (total) = 3 (a)

Population under age 18 = 166,294 (b)

(a)/(b) = rate :  $3/166,294 = 1.8$  per 100,000

**2. CRITERION B -- THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE INSTANCES OF NONCOMPLIANCE WERE IN APPARENT VIOLATION OF STATE LAW OR ESTABLISHED EXECUTIVE OR JUDICIAL POLICY.**

Despite efforts to eliminate detention of status offenders in Alaska, three noncompliant instances occurred in Alaska during 1989. Each of the noncompliant instances involved juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for the possession or consumption of alcohol - a criminal offense when committed by any person under 21 years of age in Alaska. Additionally, the noncompliant case involving an adjudicated status offender occurred in an adult jail which did not provide adequate separation of juvenile and adult inmates. This case was therefore in violation of AS 47.10.130, which requires full separation.

Detention of children accused of minor consuming alcohol is now prohibited in DFYS facilities, except in accordance with AS 47.37.170, which provides for protective custody of persons who are incapacitated by alcohol. The two instances of noncompliant detention involving accused status offenders during 1989 occurred in DFYS juvenile detention centers, and both instances clearly violated the Division's policies.

**3. CRITERION C -- THE EXTENT TO WHICH AN ACCEPTABLE PLAN HAS BEEN DEVELOPED.**

**a. Do the instances of noncompliance indicate a pattern or practice?**

No. On three separate occasions at two juvenile centers and at one adult jail juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol were securely detained in violation of the deinstitutionalization requirement. Each of these juveniles was detained on the charge of minor consuming alcohol. The two cases reported in juvenile centers also involved the enforcement of Alaska's protective custody statute; both juveniles "sobered up" over the course of their detention.

These instances of noncompliance were isolated occurrences and, in one case, it was questioned whether the instance of noncompliance reported in the adult jail was truly a secure detention. In this case, because the juvenile was reported on the adult jail's booking log, the instance was assumed to represent a secure detention. However, jail officials claimed to have placed the juvenile in the booking area awaiting the juvenile probation officer's arrival, not in a secure cell.

**b. Do the instances of noncompliance appear to be sanctioned or allowable by State law, established executive policy, or established judicial policy?**

No. The noncompliant detention of an adjudicated status offender in an adult jail was inconsistent with AS 47.10.130, which requires adequate separation of juvenile and adult inmates. Both instances of noncompliant detention in the juvenile facilities were violative of an administrative policy implemented in December 1987 by the Youth Corrections Administrator. This policy restricts detention in DFYS facilities of juveniles charged with minor consuming alcohol.

**c. Describe the State's plan to eliminate the noncompliant incidents within a reasonable time.**

In December, 1987, the Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) instituted a policy change in its youth corrections facilities which nearly eliminated noncompliant detention in these facilities in its first year of implementation. The policy prohibits admission of youth charged solely with possession or consumption of alcohol except when they meet the conditions for protective custody as outlined in the state's Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act (AS 47.36.170). Detention for protective custody under AS 47.37.170 is permitted only when all other viable options are unavailable. A physician's statement certifying the need for protective custody must also be obtained

prior to admittance. While the DFYS policy only pertains to the five facilities operated by the agency, this is the most effective means of accomplishing compliance with the JJDP mandate. These five facilities accounted for an estimated 82 percent of detentions of youth in 1989.

In addition to the change in executive policy, DFYS has reduced deinstitutionalization violations by establishing non-secure attendant care shelters in communities where noncompliant instances were historically most frequent. Development of the alternatives is a central component of Alaska's strategy to eliminate instances of noncompliance with the deinstitutionalization requirement of the JJDP Act. Thirteen such shelters are now in operation.

Another aspect of Alaska's plan entails an effort to change the legislative provisions which permit secure detention of juveniles charged with minor consuming alcohol. Reclassification of this offense as a violation or, alternatively, as a summons-only offense would remove any basis in state law for detention of juveniles accused of consuming alcohol except where it is consistent with the protective custody provisions of AS 47.37.170.

Finally, DFYS is working with all secure facilities to curtail record keeping practices which artificially inflate the number of reported noncompliant instances. Some facilities create a booking record for each person brought in by law enforcement officials, even if the person is not admitted into secure confinement. Because non-secure detention in an office or reception area is not in violation of the deinstitutionalization mandate, records which fail to distinguish between persons who are confined securely and those who are not contribute to faulty measurement.

There is also evidence to suggest that improper recording of offense information has produced over-counting of deinstitutionalization violations. At some facilities, only the most serious of multiple criminal charges is entered into the booking forms. When a juvenile is charged with minor consuming alcohol (a class A misdemeanor under Alaska law) in addition to disorderly conduct or some other class B misdemeanor, only the alcohol charge - the legally more serious offense - is recorded. This practice has resulted in erroneous classification of some juveniles as status offenders when they are, in fact, accused of other criminal behavior.

4. OUT OF STATE RUNAWAYS. 0

5. FEDERAL WARDS. 0

6. RECENTLY ENACTED CHANGE IN STATE LAW.

In May, 1988, the Alaska Legislature passed a bill specifying the conditions under which runaway juveniles may be detained. This legislation became effective in October, 1988, and was explicitly designed to comply with the deinstitutionalization requirement. The law specified that

"[a] minor may be taken into emergency protective custody by a peace officer and placed into temporary detention in a juvenile detention home in the local community if there has been an order issued by a court under a finding of probable cause that (1) the minor is a runaway in willful violation of a valid court order..., (2) the minor's current situation poses a severe and imminent risk to the minor's life or safety, and (3) no reasonable placement alternative exists within the community." (AS 47.10.141)

The statute clearly forbids detention of a runaway juvenile "in a jail or secure facility other than a juvenile detention home" and limits the duration of any detention to 24 hours if no criminal-type offense is charged. This change has had a positive impact on the state's ability to achieve full compliance within a reasonable time.

A more recently enacted amendment to AS 47.10.160 requires that jails and other secure detention facilities operated by state and local agencies record and report to the Department of Health and Social Services all instances of juvenile detention. Enacted in June, 1990, and effective September, 1990, this statute requires facilities to use a standardized format in reporting juvenile admissions, and to report name, date of birth, the offense for which the minor was admitted, date and time admitted, date and time released, gender, and ethnic origin. In an effort to further reduce errors in record keeping, the statute also requires that - with the exception of release date and time - the records be prepared at the time of admission into secure confinement. Because this statute standardizes the report format and requires full reporting of juvenile detention, it is anticipated that its enactment will have a significant and positive impact on Alaska's deinstitutionalization efforts.



SECTION 223(a)(12)(B)

**D. PROGRESS MADE IN ACHIEVING REMOVAL OF STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS FROM SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.**

**1. PROVIDE A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PROGRESS MADE IN ACHIEVING THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 223(a)(12)(A).**

Alaska's progress in achieving the removal of status offenders and nonoffenders from secure detention has been excellent. In comparison with the 1976 baseline, when 485 status offenders were securely detained, there were no instances of noncompliance in 1989 involving juveniles who had not been accused of or adjudicated delinquent for possession or consumption of alcohol. This is a particularly remarkable achievement considering that the baseline number of noncompliant detentions excluded alcohol possession and consumption detentions.

Because Alaska's baseline data did not include violations involving minor consuming alcohol, it is impossible to accurately measure the state's progress in achieving the total removal from secure confinement of status offenders. It is noteworthy, however, that despite inclusion of these cases among deinstitutionalization violations and the addition of 97 secure detention and correctional facilities to the monitoring universe, the overall incidence of noncompliant detention of status offenders has been reduced by 99.4 percent since 1976. Noncompliant detention of status offenders has been reduced by 92.7 percent from 1987 levels and by 67 percent from 1988 levels.

**2. NUMBER OF ACCUSED AND ADJUDICATED STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS WHO ARE PLACED IN FACILITIES WHICH (A) ARE NOT NEAR THEIR HOME COMMUNITY; (B) ARE NOT THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE APPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVE; AND, (C) DO NOT PROVIDE THE SERVICES DESCRIBED IN THE DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY-BASED.**

All 1989 violations of Section 223(a)(12)(A) involved placement in secure facilities. Because "community-based" refers to "a small, open group home or other suitable place..." (Section 103(1)), all three of status offenders were placed in facilities fitting the above criteria.

SECTION 223(a)(13)

**E. SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULTS.**

1. **BASELINE REPORTING PERIOD:** Calendar Year 1976  
**CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:** Calendar Year 1989
  
2. **WHAT DATE HAD BEEN DESIGNATED BY THE STATE FOR ACHIEVING COMPLIANCE WITH THE SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 223(a)(13)?**

December 31, 1988

3. **TOTAL NUMBER OF FACILITIES USED TO DETAIN OR CONFINED BOTH JUVENILE OFFENDERS AND ADULT CRIMINAL OFFENDERS DURING THE PAST TWELVE (12) MONTHS.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data	12	12	0
Current Data	47	47	0
Adult Jails	13	13	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	2	2	0
Adult Lockups*	32	32	0

\* Includes projection for facilities not submitting data. (See Appendix I for data projection method).

**4. NUMBER OF FACILITIES IN EACH CATEGORY RECEIVING AN ON-SITE INSPECTION DURING THE CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD TO CHECK THE PHYSICAL PLANT TO ENSURE ADEQUATE SEPARATION.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data	43	43	0
Adult Jails	8	8	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	1	1	0
Adult Lockups	34	34	0

**5. TOTAL NUMBER OF FACILITIES USED FOR THE SECURE DETENTION AND CONFINEMENT OF BOTH JUVENILE AND ADULT OFFENDERS WHICH DID NOT PROVIDE ADEQUATE SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULTS.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data	5	5	0
Current Data	45	45	0
Adult Jails	11	11	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	2	2	0
Adult Lockups*	32	32	0

\* Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. (See Appendix I for data projection method).

6. TOTAL NUMBER OF JUVENILES NOT ADEQUATELY SEPARATED IN FACILITIES USED FOR THE SECURE DETENTION AND CONFINEMENT OF BOTH JUVENILE OFFENDERS AND ADULT CRIMINAL OFFENDERS DURING THE REPORT PERIOD.

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Baseline Data	824	824	0
Current Data	336	336	0
Adult Jails	211	211	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	46	46	0
Adult Lockups*	79	79	0

\* Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. (See Appendix I for data projection method).

**7. PROVIDE A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PROGRESS MADE IN ACHIEVING THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 223(a)(13).**

Alaska's efforts at reducing the number of juveniles detained in violation of the JJDP separation mandate have produced dramatic results. Since the 1976 baseline, when 824 cases of noncompliance were recorded, Alaska has achieved a 59.5 percent reduction in separation violations. Compared to Alaska's 1988 noncompliance levels, the current number of separation violations represents an additional 40.7 percent reduction.

This progress has been made in spite of the state's use of a significantly larger monitoring universe and a statewide juvenile population which is one-third higher than that in 1976. The continued effort at expanding the monitoring universe - from 14 facilities in the baseline year to 111 facilities in 1989 - has broadened the base from which noncompliance is measured, increasing the probability of measuring noncompliance.

Alaska law prohibits detention of any juvenile in a facility which also houses adult prisoners, "unless assigned to separate quarters so that the minor cannot communicate with or view adult prisoners convicted of, under arrest for, or charged with a crime" (AS 47.10.130). Despite this legislative prohibition, however, many adult facilities have continued to admit juveniles when no adequate alternative is available. Indeed, alternatives continue to be scarce except in the most populated Alaskan communities. The central - and persistent - barrier to achieving compliance with the separation mandate has been the vast geographical distances between Alaska's five youth detention centers.

Approximately 22 percent of the 1989 separation violations occurred in adult lockups, which represent 77 percent of all secure facilities in the state. The majority of lockups in Alaska's monitoring universe are located in geographically remote areas which lack the alternatives necessary for achieving success with separation requirements. In such areas, the timely transfer of juveniles to appropriate facilities has often been impossible due to unavailability of air transportation and inclement weather.

During 1989, the detention of juveniles in adult jails constituted 58 percent of the separation violations in Alaska. The fairly sizable communities that support these jails are not necessarily more accessible than those with adult lockups. Of the seventeen contract adult jails in the state, only three - in Homer, Seward, and Valdez - are located on Alaska's highway system.

Although the problem with separation remains largely attributable to adult jails, it is with this type of facility that the largest gains have been made. Compared to the number of separation violations in adult jails in 1988, the current number of jail violations represents a 53 percent decline. The same is

true for the two adult correctional facilities that held juveniles during 1989: compared to the 1988 number of separation violations, violations recorded in these centers during 1989 represent a 27 percent drop.

Evidence from the booking logs of adult jails strongly suggests that the actual incidence of noncompliant juvenile detention in adult jails is significantly lower than that recorded. An artificial inflation of noncompliant juvenile detentions results from the practice of "logging in" each person brought to the facility by law enforcement officials, even if the person is not admitted into secure confinement. A juvenile who is made to wait for her parent or probation officer in the confines of a dispatch office does not constitute a separation violation or jail removal violation. Records which fail to distinguish between persons who are confined and those who are not contribute to erroneous measurements.

Illustrative of this practice and the impact it has on the monitoring results is the adult jail located in Petersburg, a small community in Southeast Alaska. The jail was visited on-site during the 1989 monitoring effort and the accuracy of all juvenile log entries was checked and verified. The Petersburg billing sheets sent by the jail to the Department of Public Safety recorded 14 incidents of juvenile "detention." Upon inspection and cross-referencing, however, it was established that in eight of the "detentions" the juveniles were not placed in secure confinement, but were instead made to wait in the reception area. Four of the remaining juvenile entries in Petersburg were clearly situations of secure confinement in the violation of the separation requirement and two entries were such that the occurrence secure confinement could not be established independent of the log. These instances were therefore assumed to be violations.

DFYS has continued to work with facilities in an effort to curtail record keeping practices which artificially inflate the number of reported instances of noncompliance. Revised billing sheets from the Department of Public Safety now include columns on the status of each person's confinement, allowing for clear distinction between those persons securely detained and those not. There is no monetary incentive for adult facilities to house juveniles, and entering juvenile admissions on billing sheets does not result in a cost reimbursement to the jails. Data on juvenile admissions compiled on the billing sheets are collected by DPS for statistical purposes only and are not associated with the primary cost reimbursement purpose of the forms. Most adult jails began using these forms by July, 1989, and the forms have already had a significant impact on the monitoring of noncompliant detentions.

**DESCRIBE THE MECHANISM FOR ENFORCING THE STATE'S SEPARATION LAW.**

Alaska has employed several mechanisms for enforcing its separation laws, AS 47.10.130 and AS 47.10.190. Together, these mechanisms have substantially reduced instances of noncompliance with Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act.

DFYS has sought to maximize enforcement of the separation laws by instituting a program of public education to alert the law enforcement community and the public to the dangers in jailing juveniles and to the laws restricting such detention. The Division has sponsored public service announcements in print and broadcast media and has established thirteen non-secure attendant care shelter throughout the state. To date, four adult jails and an additional adult correctional facility have terminated the practice of detaining juveniles for any reason.

In addition to modifying the billing sheets used by the adult jails (previously discussed), the Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS) also amended its contracts with the jails by removing any language which could be construed as authorizing admission of juveniles or providing for the purchase of such services by DPS. The amended contracts have eliminated any ambiguity about statutory or contractual authorization for noncompliant detention of juveniles. Thus, the contractual agreements between municipal jails and DPS now have the clear purpose of supporting the strict enforcement of Alaska's separation laws.

It is recognized that existing enforcement mechanisms can be improved and a plan has been developed to establish a more formal enforcement system. Under AS 47.10.150 and AS 47.10.180, the Department of Health and Social Services has broad authority to promulgate and enforce regulations pertaining to confinement of juveniles. A staff person has been hired by the Division of Family and Youth Services to develop appropriate regulations and this person has begun the process of promulgating a set of enforceable standards designed to ensure adequate separation of juveniles and adult offenders.

SECTION 223 (A) (14)

**F. REMOVAL OF JUVENILES FROM ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS.**

**1. BASELINE REPORTING PERIOD:** Calendar Year 1980

**CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD:** Calendar year 1989

**2. NUMBER OF ADULT JAILS.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data	15	15	0
Current Data*	17	17	0

\* This total includes two facilities classified as adult correctional centers.

**3. NUMBER OF ADULT LOCKUPS.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	0	0	0
Current Data	86	86	0

\* Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

**4. NUMBER OF FACILITIES IN EACH CATEGORY RECEIVING AN ON-SITE INSPECTION DURING THE CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD FOR THE PURPOSE OF VERIFYING SECTION 223(a)(14) COMPLIANCE DATA.**

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>PUBLIC</u>	<u>PRIVATE</u>
Current Data	43	43	0
Adult Jails	8	8	0
Adult Correctional Facilities	1	1	0
Adult Lockups	34	34	0



**5. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULT JAILS HOLDING JUVENILES DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	14	14	0
Current Data**	15	15	0

\* Includes data for three facilities classified as adult correctional facilities.

\*\* Includes data for two facilities classified as adult correctional facilities. Fewer than 15 facilities held juveniles in violation of Section 223(A)(14).

**6. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULT LOCKUPS HOLDING JUVENILES DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data**	32	32	0

\* Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

\*\* Includes projection for facilities not submitting data. (See Appendix I for data projection method). Does not represent the total number of lockups detaining juveniles in violation of Section 223(A)(14).

**7. TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCUSED JUVENILE CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENDERS HELD IN ADULT JAILS IN EXCESS OF SIX (6) HOURS.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	766	766	0
Current Data**	82	82	0

\* The monitoring report format for the baseline year did not distinguish between accused and adjudicated criminal-type offenders or between adult jails and adult correctional facilities. Both accused and adjudicated criminal-type offenders held in adult jails and adult correctional facilities (including juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol) are included in the baseline data reported here.

\*\* Includes data for two facilities classified as adult correctional facilities. Current data for adjudicated criminal-type offenders are included in item F9. Current data for juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol are included in item F11.

**8. TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCUSED JUVENILE CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENDERS HELD IN ADULT LOCKUPS IN EXCESS OF SIX (6) HOURS.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data	21	21	0

\* Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

9. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENDERS HELD IN ADULT JAILS FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data**	40	40	0

\* The monitoring report format for the baseline year did not distinguish between accused and adjudicated criminal-type offenders or between adult jails and adult correctional facilities. Both accused and adjudicated criminal-type offenders held in adult jails and adult correctional facilities (including juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol) are included in the baseline data reported for item F7.

\*\* Includes data for two facilities classified as adult correctional facilities. Current data for accused criminal-type offenders are included in item F7. Current data for juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol are included in item F11.

10. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENDERS HELD IN ADULT LOCKUPS FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data	0	0	0

\* Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

**11. TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCUSED AND ADJUDICATED STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS HELD IN ADULT JAILS FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME, INCLUDING THOSE STATUS OFFENDERS ACCUSED OF OR ADJUDICATED FOR VIOLATION OF A VALID COURT ORDER.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	98	98	0
Current Data**	80	80	0

\* Includes data for three facilities classified as adult correctional facilities. Because juveniles charged with minor consuming alcohol were classified as criminal-type offenders in the baseline year, baseline data for juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for this offense are included in item F7.

\*\* Includes data for two facilities classified as adult correctional centers. Current data for juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol are included here.

**12. TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCUSED AND ADJUDICATED STATUS OFFENDERS HELD IN ADULT LOCKUPS FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME, INCLUDING THOSE STATUS OFFENDERS ACCUSED OF OR ADJUDICATED FOR VIOLATION OF A VALID COURT ORDER.**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Baseline Data*	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current Data	26	26	0

\* Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

**13. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS IN AREAS MEETING THE "REMOVAL EXCEPTION."**

Baseline Data: 0

Current Data: 0

Alaska is ineligible for the removal exception because State law requires an initial court appearance within 48 hours, rather than 24 hours, after a juvenile has been taken into custody (see AS 47.10.140). All adult jails, lockups and correctional facilities in the 1989 monitoring universe are outside the state's only Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, but only two provide adequate separation, as required in order for the removal exception to apply.

**14. TOTAL NUMBER OF JUVENILES ACCUSED OF A CRIMINAL-TYPE OFFENSE WHO WERE HELD IN EXCESS OF SIX (6) HOURS BUT LESS THAN TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOURS IN ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS IN AREAS MEETING THE "REMOVAL EXCEPTIONS."**

Baseline Data: 0

Current Data: 0

**15. PROVIDE A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PROGRESS MADE IN ACHIEVING THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 223(a)(14).**

Four adult jails in Alaska - Haines, Kake, Seldovia, and Unalaska - reported no jail removal violations during 1989. The remaining 13 adult jails and the 2 adult correctional facilities produced a wide variety of noncompliant juvenile detentions, in number and in duration, if not in offense type. A total of 249 jail removal violations were reported in Alaska during 1989. This figure represents a 71.1 percent decline in the overall number of juveniles held in violation of the jail removal mandate since the baseline year 1980. Since 1988 alone, the 1989 data show a 38.9 percent decline.

In context - that is, in Alaska - this decline is quite substantial; the progress made toward compliance has been achieved in spite of the large increase in the numbers of facilities in the monitoring universe, in spite of record-keeping practices which work to artificially inflate the number of JJDP Act violations, in spite of the state's geographical vastness, and in spite of the large and difficult problem Alaska has with alcohol and its youth.

Alaska's progress in achieving compliance with 223(A)(14) have been offset by the inclusion of a large number of additional facilities into the state's monitoring universe. With each successive year, Alaska's monitoring universe has become more refined, more accurate and broader, currently encompassing 97 more facilities than in the 1980 baseline universe. As the universe has increased, so has the accuracy of the jail monitoring measurements, and this accuracy masks otherwise significant gains in compliance.

Progress in achieving compliance with jail removal has also been hampered by the slow pace at which refined methods of record keeping have been implemented. As mentioned elsewhere, evidence from the booking logs strongly suggests that the actual incidence of noncompliant juvenile detention (in adult jails in particular) is significantly lower than that recorded. In adult jails and correctional facilities during 1989, 50 percent of the 40 cases of jail removal noncompliance involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders lasted 2 hours or less. The durations of violations involving status and nonoffenders were similar in jails and DOC facilities, with 41 percent of the 80 cases having durations of 2 hours or less. These short periods of detention correlate strongly with claims of compliant response by jail administrators.

By June and July, 1989, each contract jail had begun using revised billing sheets which allow for clear distinction between those juveniles held in secure confinement and those who are not. Thus, the operational assumption that each log entry on a juvenile represents an instance of secure confinement, has adversely affected up to six months of the data contained in this report.

For 1990 detention data, it is expected that statewide detention data will be considerably more accurate and include relatively few instances of noncompliance.

Even with this weakness, however, the data remain telling, particularly about the problems that alcohol presents to Alaska. The vast majority of 1989 jail removal violations - whether status offenses or accused criminal offenses - involved the consumption or possession of alcohol, or alcohol intoxication. The criminal offenses for which the largest number of juveniles were accused and noncompliantly detained were driving while intoxicated and driving without valid license, and a large majority of juveniles held in noncompliant detention for status offenses were arrested on minor consuming alcohol, minor in possession, minor on premises, or were held in protective custody due to intoxication. There were only six noncompliant cases during 1989 involving curfew violations and nine cases involving runaways.

While barriers to full compliance with the jail removal requirement remain, Alaska has made great progress in reducing incidence of noncompliance and in offering alternatives to secure detention in adult facilities. A juvenile detention facility was opened in Bethel in October, 1987 and, by the end of 1989, a dozen non-secure attendant care shelters had become operational in communities where large numbers of violations had occurred in 1988. Since the beginning of 1990, three additional shelters have opened in the communities of Cordova, Dillingham, and Fairbanks.

Additional components of the state's strategy to achieve full compliance with the jail removal requirement have been outlined in the revised 1987 Jail Removal Plan. Collectively, these initiatives are expected to provide an effective means for Alaska to move rapidly toward full compliance with the jail removal requirement.

**G. DE MINIMIS REQUEST: NUMERICAL**

**1. THE EXTENT THAT NONCOMPLIANCE IS INSIGNIFICANT OR OF SLIGHT CONSEQUENCE.**

Number of accused juvenile criminal-type offenders in adult jails and lockups in excess of six (6) hours, adjudicated criminal-type offenders held in adult jails and lockups for any length of time, and status offenders held in adult jails and lockups for any length of time.

TOTAL = 249

Total juvenile population of the State under 18 according to the most recent available U.S. Bureau of Census data or census projection:

166,294 juveniles.

(Source: Alaska Population Overview: 1986 and Provisional 1987 Estimates, Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, 1989)

If the data was projected to cover a 12-month period, provide the specific data used in making the projection and the statistical method used to project the data.

Data:

Accused criminal-type offenders:	87	
Adjudicated criminal-type offenders:	40	
Accused and adjudicated status offenders:		89
Cases with inadequate offense data:	9	
Cases with inadequate time data:	2	

Total:227

**Statistical Method of Projection:**

Please refer to "Statistical Method of Projection" section pages 7-10.

**Calculation of jail removal violations rate per 100,000 population under 18.**

Total instances of noncompliance = 249 (a)  
Population under 18 = 166,294 (b)

249 / 166,294 = 149.7 per 100,000



## **2. ACCEPTABLE PLAN.**

The Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) is pursuing several ways to reduce noncompliant detention. The state's revised 1987 Jail Removal Plan, submitted in December 1987, includes a 12-point strategy for bringing Alaska into full compliance with the JJDP Act. That document describes several policy initiatives designed to reduce or eliminate noncompliant detention of juveniles.

Significant among these initiatives is the development and implementation of a network of nonsecure attendant care shelters - currently in thirteen communities which have experienced high levels of noncompliant juvenile detention.

A second initiative identified in the revised 1987 Jail Removal Plan has been achieved by implementation of a policy restricting detention of intoxicated juveniles at juvenile detention centers operated by DFYS. As in previous years, a high proportion of violations of the jail removal requirement during 1989 involved juveniles who were charged with minor consuming alcohol. Although the policy extends only to the five juvenile detention centers, it is expected to have a significant educative effect and, as such, to provide added impetus to efforts to reduce detention of such children in adult facilities as well.

Another important element of the state's plan to eliminate noncompliant detention is the creation of a full-time staff position in the Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) with responsibility for promulgating and enforcing regulations restricting detention of juveniles in adult facilities. The Department of Health and Social Services, which embodies DFYS, has broad authority under AS 47.10.150 and AS 47.10.180 for oversight of facilities used for detention of juveniles. Because of an absence of personnel, however, this regulatory authority had, until 1989, remained an unexploited resource in the state's efforts to achieve compliance with the mandates of the JJDP Act.

### 3. RECENTLY ENACTED CHANGE IN STATE LAW.

In May, 1988, the Alaska Legislature passed a bill specifying the conditions under which runaway juveniles may be detained. This legislation, which became effective in October, 1988, was explicitly designed to comply with the deinstitutionalization requirement of the JJDP Act, but it is also expected to aid efforts to bring the state into compliance with the jail removal mandate. The law specified that

"[a] minor may be taken into emergency protective custody by a peace officer and placed into temporary detention in a juvenile detention home in the local community if there has been an order issued by a court under a finding of probable cause that (1) the minor is a runaway in willful violation of a valid court order..., (2) the minor's current situation poses a severe and imminent risk to the minor's life or safety, and (3) no reasonable placement alternative exists within the community." (AS 47.10.141)

The statute clearly forbids detention of a runaway juvenile "in a jail or secure facility other than a juvenile detention home" and limits the duration of such detention to 24 hours if no criminal-type offense is charged. This change has had a positive impact on the state's ability to achieve full compliance with the jail removal mandate.

A more recently enacted amendment to AS 47.10.160 requires that jails and other secure detention facilities operated by state and local agencies record and report to the Department of Health and Social Services all instances of juvenile detention. Enacted in June, 1990, and effective September, 1990, this statute requires facilities to use a standardized format in reporting juvenile admissions, and to report name, date of birth, the offense for which the minor was admitted, date and time admitted, date and time released, gender, and ethnic origin. In an effort to further reduce errors in record keeping, the statute also requires that - with the exception of release date and time - the records be prepared at the time of admission into secure confinement. Because this statute standardizes the report format and requires full reporting of juvenile detention, it is anticipated that its enactment will have a significant and positive impact on Alaska's compliance efforts.

**H. DE MINIMIS REQUEST: SUBSTANTIVE.**

**1. THE EXTENT THAT NONCOMPLIANCE IS INSIGNIFICANT OR OF SLIGHT CONSEQUENCE.**

- a. Were all instances of noncompliance in violation of or departures from State law, court rule, or other statewide executive or judicial policy?**

AS 47.10.130 provides that "(n)o minor under 18 years of age who is detained pending hearing may be incarcerated in a jail unless assigned to separate quarters so that the minor cannot communicate with or view adult prisoners convicted of, under arrest for, or charged with a crime." Of the 249 jail removal violations reported for 1989, only 26, or 10 percent, occurred in facilities that allow for sight and sound separation. Thus, 90 percent of the 1989 cases of juvenile detention in adult facilities - except those under circumstances consistent with the protective custody provisions of AS 47.37.170 - violated this statute.

There was no statutory authorization whatsoever for detaining status offenders and nonoffenders in any adult facility other than those accused of minor consuming alcohol. Therefore, the 15 instances of noncompliant detention of runaway juveniles and juveniles charged with curfew violations lacked any statutory authorization.

- b. Do the instances of noncompliance indicate a pattern or practice, or do they constitute isolated instances?**

Noncompliant detentions were recorded at thirteen adult jails, two correctional centers, and at just over one-third of adult lockups. At the majority of these facilities, however, instances of noncompliant detention appear to be the exception rather than the rule of juvenile handling. The projected 1989 data on jail removal violations indicate that 47 violations occurred in 32 of the 86 adult rural lockups statewide. That figure equates to an overall average number of .550 jail removal violations per lockup. Only five facilities (four jails, one correctional center) reported more than 15 instances of noncompliant detention, and, of these, only the adult jail in Barrow detained more than 30 juveniles in violation of the jail removal requirement.

**c. Are existing mechanisms for enforcement of the State law, court rule, or other statewide executive or judicial policy such that the instances of noncompliance are unlikely to recur in the future?**

Yes. The state has employed several mechanisms for enforcing AS 47.10.130, AS 47.10.141 and AS 47.10.190, all of which restrict the detention of juveniles in adult facilities. Collectively, these mechanisms have proven effective in substantially reducing instances of noncompliance with Section 223(a)(14) of the JJDP Act. The enforcement of these statutes, combined, with the operation of thirteen alternative nonsecure shelters, refined record-keeping instruments and practices, and amended service contracts between the Department of Public Safety and adult jails will effectively eliminate jail removal violations in Alaska.

To reiterate, DFYS is seeking to maximize enforcement of the laws referenced above by instituting a program of public education, including public service announcements in print and broadcast media, to alert both the law enforcement community and the public to the dangers and illegality of jailing juveniles. To date, five of the adult facilities which had accounted for high proportions of 1987 and 1988 violations terminated entirely the practice of detaining juveniles.

The amended contracts between the Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the seventeen municipal jails, now in use, further deter law enforcement officials from detaining juveniles in adult facilities by eliminating any ambiguity about compliant detention.

Enforcement of the state laws restricting juvenile detention is also enhanced by the DPS efforts to evaluate adherence by law enforcement officials to the contractual agreements and by the monitoring efforts of DFYS. Admission records for each municipal jail are scrutinized by DPS to identify any violations. These records are also examined each year by DFYS, and facilities are given notification of instances of noncompliant detention of juveniles. Further scrutiny of juvenile detention at adult jails is provided by personnel at non-secure attendant care shelters in 13 communities. Personnel at these shelters are required to notify DFYS of the number of juveniles detained in adult facilities in their communities and must therefore contact law enforcement officials to inquire about detention of juveniles. This provides another opportunity to reinforce the absence of authorization for noncompliant detention.

In combination, the above enforcement mechanisms have been effective in reducing the number of instances of noncompliance by 56 percent in the two years since implementation of the state's revised Jail Removal Plan in December, 1987. The 1990 statewide monitoring data, with few exceptions, will show the full benefit of the ten nonsecure attendant care shelters established during

1989. An additional three shelters were established in Dillingham, Fairbanks, and Cordova during 1990.

**d. Describe the State's plan to eliminate the noncompliant incidents and to monitor the existing enforcement mechanisms.**

Alaska's plan to eliminate noncompliant incidents is outlined in the revised 1987 Jail Removal Plan. Salient features of this plan include the following: (1) placing a full-time JJDP Project Coordinator in the Division's Central Administration Office; (2) development of alternatives to detention, including development of nonsecure holdover attendant care models in several rural communities and secure holdover attendant care models in others; (3) cooperative efforts with the Department of Public Safety on such issues as maintenance of appropriate booking data on juveniles, sight and sound separation requirements, the JJDP-mandated 6-hour rule and a prohibition of detention of status offenders; (4) launching an education and training campaign to inform the public of the problems inherent in inappropriate detention and jailing of youth and of the availability of effective alternatives; and (5) implementation of regulations governing detention of youth in adult jails under authority provided in Alaska Statutes 47.10.180(a), which authorizes the Department of Health and Social Services to adopt standards and regulations for the operation of juvenile detention homes and juvenile detention facilities in the state.

## APPENDIX I: METHOD OF ANALYSIS.

All aspects of data analysis for the 1989 monitoring report were performed on the DEC/VAX 8800 mainframe computer at the University of Alaska Anchorage, using the SPSSx Data Analysis System, Release 3.0.

### I. DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ENTRY.

Data were entered into a composite data file from the following sources:

- A. Certified photocopies of original client billing sheets (booking logs) for the seventeen adult jails were obtained from Captain Roger McCoy, Contract Jail Administrator of the Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS). DPS contracts for services with each Alaskan facility that meets the definition of adult jail as defined in the Formula Grant Regulation. Certified photocopies of booking logs from the King Cove Adult Lockup, dated July through December 1989, were also obtained from DPS.
- B. Certified photocopies of original booking records were obtained from the Youth Centers in Anchorage, Bethel, Fairbanks and Nome, and from thirteen Adult Lockups in Chevak, Chignik, Delta Junction, Fort Yukon, Galena, Koyuk, Lower Kalskag, Nenana, Nightmute, Quinahagak, Tok, and Tuntutuliak.
- C. Signed statements indicating that no individuals were detained in Adult Lockups during 1989 were obtained from the appropriate authority (Village Public Safety Officer, Village Police Officer, Alaska State Trooper, etc) in five villages, including Cold Bay, Golovin, Koyukuk, Mekoryuk, and Yakutat.
- D. Certified photocopies of pages in a VPSO personal notebook containing adequate booking data were received from the village of Ekwok.
- E. Adequate booking data were collected and verified on-site at the Adult Lockups in Anaktuvuk Pass, Angoon, Atkasuk, Deadhorse, Glennallen, Hoonah, Kaktovik (Barter Is.), Marshall, Nuiqsut, Pelican, Point Hope, Point Lay, Port Heiden, St. Marys, Selawik, Skagway, Toksook Bay, Wainwright and Whittier.
- F. Determined to be inadequate for monitoring purposes were booking data collected on-site at the Adult Lockups in Hooper Bay, Kasigluk, Pilot Station and Scammon Bay. Also judged to be inadequate for monitoring purposes were

Adult Lockup data received from the villages of Mountain Village and Unalakleet.

For each case, the following data were entered: Facility type, facility identifier, initials or first initial and last name of juvenile, date of birth, gender, race, date of admission, time of admission, reason for detention (alphabetic variable; if more than one, reasons were strung together), date of release, time of release, and lockup indicator.

## II. CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENDERS.

The likelihood of misclassifying of offenses was reduced by adopting a conservative approach. In other words, errors in coding would lead to the reporting of a higher number of violations than actually occurred. The following procedures were used in classifying juveniles as accused criminal-type offenders, adjudicated criminal-type offenders, accused status offenders and adjudicated status offenders:

- A. Juveniles who were arrested for the following were classified as accused criminal-type offenders: offenses proscribed in Alaska criminal law, traffic violations, fish and game violations, failure to appear, and contempt of court.
  
- B. Juveniles charged with probation violations or violations of conditions of release were classified as adjudicated criminal-type offenders unless conditions of probation had been imposed pursuant to an adjudication for possession or consumption of alcohol. In the latter case, the juvenile was classified as an adjudicated status offender.

Juveniles taken into custody pursuant to warrants and detention orders were also classified as adjudicated criminal-type offenders, unless additional information indicated a more appropriate classification. Where reclassification was not indicated, all instances of detention pursuant to a warrant or court order at McLaughlin Youth Center, Fairbanks Youth Center, and the Nome Youth Center were verified through a check of facility records. In this way, accuracy in the classification of these cases was checked.

Juveniles transferred from one juvenile detention facility to another were also classified, absent additional information, as adjudicated criminal-type offenders, as were a small number of juveniles for whom the offense listed in official records was one of the

following: juvenile hold, juvenile probation hold, detention hold, and delinquent minor.

- C. Juveniles detained for the following were classified as accused status offenders: possession or consumption of alcohol, minor on licensed premises, curfew violations, runaway, and protective custody in excess of the lawful duration as prescribed in AS 47.30.705 and AS 47.37.170.
- D. DFYS officials constructed a list with the names and dates of birth of juveniles adjudicated for possession or consumption of alcohol on or after January 1, 1985. The list only included juveniles adjudicated solely for the possession or consumption of alcohol and who were not subsequently adjudicated on a criminal-type offense. Juveniles appearing in the 1989 data arrested pursuant to a warrant or detention order and juveniles detained for probation violations were classified as adjudicated status offenders if their names appeared on this list. Otherwise, these juveniles were classified as adjudicated criminal-type offenders.
- E. Juveniles detained in adult facilities for protective custody under AS 47.30.705 or AS 47.37.170 (dealing with mental illness and alcohol intoxication, respectively) were counted as violations of the separation requirement. However, because juveniles and adults are accorded the same treatment under these statutes, these cases were determined to be outside the scope of the OJJDP definitions of criminal-type offender, status offender and nonoffender. Therefore, the presence of these juveniles in these facilities is not reflected in sections of this report pertaining to deinstitutionalization and jail removal requirements.

### III. DATA PROJECTION.

Four methods of statistical projection for missing and unknown detention data were employed in the analysis of 1989 juvenile detention data. These were: 1) projection of data for the purpose of covering twelve months in an instance when only six months of data were received; 2) projection of juvenile detention data from non-reporting adult lockups; 3) projection of detention duration for cases of juvenile detention with missing time and/or date information; and 4) projection of the reason for detention of juvenile detention cases for which offense was unknown.



### **1. Projection for Complete Calendar Year:**

Complete data for Calendar Year 1989 were available for all but one of the sixty-three secure facilities in Alaska reporting detention information. Projection of data to cover the full calendar year 1989 for one adult lockup facility in King Cove was accomplished by computing the proportion of the year for which data from this facility were received ( $185 \text{ days} / 365 \text{ days} = .5068$ ), and weighting each instance of juvenile detention at King Cove by a factor equal to the reciprocal of that proportion. Thus, the 3 instances of juvenile detention at this facility were weighted by a factor of 1.973, providing an overall number of juvenile detentions equal to 5.92 at the King Cove facility. This weighting procedure is based on the assumption that instances of noncompliant juvenile detention at the King Cove lockup during the last half of 1989 occurred at the same rate of noncompliant detention demonstrated in the actual data received.

### **2. Projection for Non-reporting Adult Lockups:**

Data for the 48 adult lockups whose records were inadequate for monitoring purposes were projected by assigning a weight of 2.263 (the reciprocal of the proportion of all adult lockups represented by those included in the analysis) to each case of juvenile detention in the 38 adult lockups from which adequate data were obtained.

This method of projection is statistically valid to the extent that the lockups from which adequate data were obtained are representative of all lockups in the monitoring universe. Since all adult lockups which were able to submit adequate data are included in the analysis, random sampling of this group was not performed. It is believed that lockups which do not maintain adequate records are unlikely to detain more juveniles than those which do. Facilities which do not maintain adequate records probably fail to do so because they, in fact, detain very few individuals, either adult or juveniles. Any error in this method of projecting data for non-reporting lockups should therefore result in a higher number of noncompliant cases than actually occurred in these facilities.

### **3. Projection for Unknown Duration of Detention:**

For a number of cases for which time information was inadequate, it was necessary to project data regarding the duration of detention. This projection affected twenty-three instances with incomplete time data and was contingent on the type of offender status associated with each instance. Duration was unknown in four cases involving accused criminal-type offenders, in fifteen cases with adjudicated criminal-type offenders, in three instances

involving the detention of accused status offenders, and in one case involving a non-offender.

In projecting the length of detention for the three cases involving accused status offenders, the goal was to determine whether the 24-hour grace period had been exceeded. This was accomplished as follows: The proportion of cases in which detention extended beyond the 24-hour grace period was computed for all cases involving detention of status offenders and for which duration of detention was known. The three cases for which duration of detention could not be determined were each assigned a weight of .0217, the overall known proportion of noncompliant instances involving the detention of accused status offenders.

In determining the appropriate weight to assign each of the four cases involving accused criminal-type offenders with insufficient time data, the proportions of cases in which detention extended beyond the 6-hour grace period was computed for all cases involving the detention of an accused criminal-type offender in adult jails, adult correctional centers, and adult lockups. The four cases were then alternately assigned weights of .508, .630, and .444, depending upon the type of adult facility in which they were recorded. Respectively, then, these weights represented the proportions of noncompliant instances among all cases involving detention of juveniles accused of criminal-type offenses for which sufficient data were available in adult jails, adult correctional facilities, and adult lockups.

The fifteen cases involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders for which duration of detention data were insufficient were all recorded in juvenile detention centers, where time limits are not imposed upon the handling of this category of adjudicated juveniles. Since length of detention was irrelevant in these cases, projections were not performed.

#### **4. Projection for Unknown Offender Type:**

It was also necessary to project type of offender information (i.e. criminal-type offender, status offender, nonoffender) for ten instances of juvenile detention in which the reason for detention was not adequately specified. Where the reason for detention was unknown several series of computations were required, contingent upon the type of facility from which the data were received. One of the instances of juvenile detention with insufficient offense information was recorded in a juvenile center, four were recorded in adult jails, and the remaining five were recorded in adult lockups.

First, in determining the total number of accused status offenders held over 24 hours (item B5), these cases were alternately assigned weights of .3263, .1039, and .3704, the

respective proportions of status offenders among all instances of juvenile detention in adult jails, juvenile centers, and adult lockups for which type of offender was known. Second, in determining the number of adjudicated status offenders held for any length of time (item b6), these ten unknown offense cases were each alternately assigned weights of .0212, .0078, and .000, the respective proportions of known adjudicated status offenders among all juveniles detained in adult jails, juvenile centers, and adult lockups.

The cases with insufficient offense information were also weighted for the purposes of projecting the incidence of jail removal infractions. These calculations excluded the single unknown case recorded at a juvenile center, since this type of facility is not affected by jail removal considerations. The remaining nine unknown offense cases were each alternately weighted three times - as accused criminal-type offenders, as adjudicated criminal-type offenders, and as status offenders. When the nine cases were projected to be detentions of accused criminal-type offenders, those recorded at adult jails were weighted at .5085 (the proportion of accused criminal-type offenders detained in adult jails for more than 6 hours among all known juvenile criminal-type offenders held) and those recorded at adult lockups were weighted at .4444 (likewise, the proportion of jail removal violations of this type that occurred in adult lockups).

Finally, and in the same fashion, the nine cases with unknown offense were also weighted for the purposes of projecting jail removal infractions involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders and status offenders. For each of these two offender classes, the nine cases were alternately weighted by the overall proportions of noncompliance in adult jails and adult lockups. For the purpose of projecting the number of adjudicated criminal-types held in adult jails, the missing cases originating in jails were assigned the weight of .1059. Since there were no jail removal violations involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders in village lockups, the five offense missing cases reported in lockups were projected to have a value of 0.00.

This weighting procedure - involving the four types of data projection described above - was implemented by assigning a weight equivalent to the product of the four weights to each case of juvenile detention. With the exception of the data from adult lockups, the product of the four weights was ordinarily less than 1.00 for the majority of weighted cases. Because of this, the projected number of noncompliant cases, for any given type, may be smaller than the number of unweighted cases upon which it is based.

APPENDIX TWO:

1989 Jail Removal Violations by  
Offense Type and Location.

COMMON ACRONYMS USED TO IDENTIFY THE OFFENSES FOR WHICH  
JUVENILES WERE DETAINED DURING 1989 IN VIOLATION OF JJDP  
MANDATES.

ASLT_PO	Assault on Police Officer
ASSAULT	Assault, unspecified degree
ASSAULT1	Assault, first degree
ASSAULT3	Assault, third degree
ASSAULT4	Assault, fourth degree
BURG1	Burglary, first degree
BURG2	Burglary, second degree
BW	Bench Warrant, unspecified
CM2	Criminal Mischief, second degree
CM3	Criminal Mischief, third degree
CM4	Criminal Mischief, fourth degree
CT	Criminal Trespass, unspecified
CTORDER	Court Order
CURFEW	Curfew Violation
DC	Disorderly Conduct
DO	Detention Order
DWI	Driving While Intoxicated
DWVOL	Driving Without Valid License
FTA	Failure to Appear
MCA	Minor Consuming Alcohol
MIP	Minor In Possession
MIW2	Misconduct with Weapons, second
MOP	Minor On Premises
NEG_DRIV	Negligent Driving
PC/ALC	Protective Custody/Alcohol Detox
PC	Protective Custody
PV	Probation Violation
RESIST	Resisting Arrest
RUNAWAY	
SEX_ASLT	Sexual Assault, unspecified
T47/ALC	Title 47 Protective Custody
THEFT	Theft, unspecified
THEFT2	Theft, second degree
THEFT3	Theft, third degree
UNK_FELS	Multiple unspecified felony charges
UNKNOWN	Unknown offense
VOC	Violation of Conditions
WA	Warrant
WA:TRAF	Warrant, Traffic related

**BARROW ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS OFFENSE TYPE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASSAULT3	2
BURG1	3
CM2	1
CM3	4
DWI	1
MIW2	1
THEFT2	1
THEFT3	1

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

CTORDER	1
PV	2

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MCA	17
PC/ALC	2
RUNAWAY	2

**CORDOVA ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS OFFENSE TYPE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

DWI	1
UNKNOWN	1

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

CTORDER	1
UNKNOWN	0

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MCA	7
MIP	1
UNKNOWN	1

**CRAIG ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS OFFENSE TYPE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASSAULT4	1
THEFT	1

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

WA	1
----	---

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MOP	1
PC/ALC	1

**DILLINGHAM ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE TYPE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

DC	1
DWI	1

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MCA	17
-----	----

**HOMER ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

DWI	4
DWVOL	1
THEFT	2

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

CTORDER	1
UNKNOWN	0
WA	1
WA:TRAF	1

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MCA	10
MIP	2
UNKNOWN	0

**KODIAK ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

BW	1
----	---

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MIP	1
-----	---

**KOTZEBUE ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASSAULT	1
BURG2	3
DC	1
DWI	1
NEG_DRIV	1
THEFT	2

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

VOC	5
-----	---

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

PC/ALC	1
--------	---

**NAKNEK ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDER  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

SEX_ASLT	1
----------	---

**PETERSBURG ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDER  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

DWVOL	1
-------	---

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MIP	3
-----	---



**SEWARD ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASSAULT4	1
BURG2	1
CM3	1
CT	2
DWI	2
THEFT	1
THEFT2	1
UNK_FELS	1

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

WA:TRAF	5
---------	---

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

PC	2
PC/ALC	1

**SITKA ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASSAULT4	2
CM3	1

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

BW	2
PV	2
VOC	1

**VALDEZ ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASSAULT3	1
CM4	5

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

CURFEW	4
MIP	5

**WRANGELL ADULT JAIL: JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

DWI	2
DWVOL	7
THEFT2	1
THEFT3	1

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS

MIP	1
-----	---

**MAT-SU PRETRIAL ADULT CORRECTIONAL CENTER:  
JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

DWI	2
DWVOL	1
FTA	2

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

BW	1
PV	3

**KETCHIKAN ADULT CORRECTIONAL CENTER:  
JAIL REMOVAL VIOLATIONS, OFFENSE AND NUMBER.**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS.

ASLT_PO	1
ASSAULT4	1
BURG1	1
BURG2	2
CM2	2
RESIST	2

ADJUDICATED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS.

DO	1
----	---

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS.

MOP	1
-----	---

**ANAKTUVUK PASS ADULT LOCKUP**

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

MCA 2\*

**ANGOON ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDER  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

ASSAULT4 1

**CHEVAK ADULT LOCKUP**

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

PC/ALC 2  
UNKNOWN 1

**FORT YUKON ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

ASLT\_PO 2  
ASSAULT1 2  
ASSAULT3 2

**GALENA ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

DWI 2

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

T47/ALC 2

\* The number of violations attributed to any single adult lockup is the product of a weighting scheme. See "Methodology" section.

**GLENNALLEN ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDERS  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

ASSAULT4            1

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

RUNAWAY            5

**HOONAH ADULT LOCKUP**

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

RUNAWAY            2

**KING COVE ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDER  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

DWI                4

**POINT HOPE ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDER  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

DWI                2

**SAINT MARYS ADULT LOCKUP**

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

CURFEW            2

**SELAWIK ADULT LOCKUP**

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

MCA 7

**TOK ADULT LOCKUP**

ACCUSED CRIMINAL TYPE OFFENDER  
HELD IN EXCESS OF 6 HOURS:

UNKNOWN 4

STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS:

UNKNOWN 4



# UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

3211 Providence Drive Anchorage, Alaska 99508  
(907) 786-1810 (907) 786-7777 fax

JUSTICE CENTER

3 December 1990

Mr. Dick Illias  
Youth Corrections Administrator  
Division of Family and Youth Services  
SOA DHSS  
550 W. 8th, Suite 304  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Dear Dick:

Thank you for calling to my attention the mistakes contained in the 1989 Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Compliance Monitoring Report. I have corrected pages 14, 30, and 32, and have added a footer noting their revised status. I apologize for the errors and any inconvenience they caused. Let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Emily Read".

Emily Read  
Research Associate