



**1993 JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT
COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT**

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage



September 1994

1993 JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT

STATE OF ALASKA
Department of Health and Social Services
Division of Family and Youth Services

Report Prepared by:

Richard W. Curtis
Cassie Atwell
Project Managers

N.E. Schafer
Principal Investigator

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

JC 9420

September 1994

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 5

SECTION 223(a)(12)(B)

D. PROGRESS MADE IN ACHIEVING REMOVAL OF STATUS OFFENDERS AND
NONOFFENDERS FROM SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES
..... 7

SECTION 223(a)(13)

E. SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULTS 8

SECTION 223(A)(14)

F. REMOVAL OF JUVENILES FROM ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS 12

G. DE MINIMIS REQUEST: NUMERICAL 19

H. DE MINIMIS REQUEST: SUBSTANTIVE 22

Appendix I

METHOD OF ANALYSIS 25

Appendix II

1993 VIOLATIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE AND LOCATION 29

Appendix III

COMMON OFFENSE ACRONYMS 31

**1993 JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT
COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT**

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name and address of state monitoring agency:

Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services
P.O. Box 110630
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0630

2. Contact person regarding state report:

Name: Donna Schultz Phone #: (907) 465-2112

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 1993

2. Number of public and private secure detention and correctional facilities:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	14	13	0
Current data	122	122	0
Juvenile detention centers	5	5	0
Juvenile holdover facilities ¹	2	2	0
Juvenile training schools ²	0	0	0
Adult jails	16	16	0
Adult correctional facilities	1	1	0
Adult lockups ³	98	98	0

¹ "Juvenile Holdover Facility" is a designation used to identify secure facilities used solely for the temporary detention of juveniles.

² Three 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 1992 universe of adult jails and adult lockups for the 1993 report include the deletion of three adult lockups, the transition of three adult jails into adult lockups, and the addition of four adult lockups.

3. Number of facilities in each category reporting admission and release data for juveniles to the state monitoring agency:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	14	13	1
Current data	74	74	0
Juvenile detention centers	5	5	0
Juvenile holdover facilities	2	2	0
Adult jails	16	16	0
Adult correctional facilities	1	1	0
Adult lockups	50	50	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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Current data	35	35	0
Juvenile detention centers	1	1	0
Juvenile holdover facilities	0	0	0
Adult jails	5	5	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	29	29	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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	485	485	0
Current data	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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data	0	0	0

¹ The monitoring report format for the baseline year did not distinguish between accused and adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders.

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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data	3	3	0
Juvenile detention centers	3	3	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)?

In the three instances of detention in which the valid court order exception was applied, photocopies of the Order(s) for Temporary Detention or Placement were obtained from the youth facility where the juvenile was detained.

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:

Accused	Adjudicated	Total
0 +	0	= 0

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

178,349 juveniles.

(Source: *Alaska Population Estimates by Age, Race and Sex*, Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, Demographics Unit, July 1991.)

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:

Please refer to the “Data Projection” section of Appendix I, “Method of Analysis.”

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

$$0/1.78349 = 0 \text{ per } 100,000$$

2. Criterion B—The extent to which the instances of noncompliance were in apparent violation of state law or established executive or judicial policy:

0

3. Criterion C—The extent to which an acceptable plan has been developed:

N/A

4. Out of state runaways: 2

5. Federal wards: 0

6. Recently enacted change in state law:

A law (AS 47.10.141) specifying the conditions under which runaway juveniles may be detained became effective in October 1988, and provided a statutory basis for compliance with the deinstitutionalization requirement of the JJDP Act. 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.

The statute prohibits detention of runaway juveniles “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.

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. Effective in September 1990, the 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. The statute requires that 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.

Implementation of the juvenile detention report program was initiated in February 1991, when a set of forms and instructions was mailed to secure detention facilities throughout the state. The first month of the reporting program was July 1991. A second mailing was made on July 1, 1991, as a reminder to the facilities that the reporting program had commenced. To date, while many of the larger facilities have participated in the program, there are still many rural lockup facilities that do not report, or if they do it is sporadic. This may be due in part to the frequent turnover of Village Public Safety Officers (VPSOs). It is not uncommon for a village to be without a VPSO for several months.

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. Over the course of several years, Alaska has achieved full compliance with the deinstitutionalization goal of the JJDP Act. In comparison with the 1976 baseline, when 485 status offenders were securely detained, there were no instances of noncompliance recorded in 1993. All status offenders and nonoffenders held in secure confinement in Alaska's institutions were released within the 24-hour allowable grace period.

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:

There were no apparent violations of these conditions recorded in Alaska during 1993.

SECTION 223(a)(13)

E. SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULTS

1. **Baseline reporting period:** Calendar year 1976
Current reporting period: Calendar year 1993

2. **What date had been designated by the state for achieving compliance with the separation requirements of Section 223(a)(13)?**

December 31, 1991

3. **Total number of facilities used to detain or confine both juvenile offenders and adult criminal offenders during the past twelve (12) months:**

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	12	12	0
Current data	43	43	0
Adult jails	9	9	0
Adult correctional facilities	1	1	0
Adult lockups ¹	33	33	0

¹ Includes projection for facilities not submitting data. There were 17 reporting sites and a weighting factor of 1.96 for non-reporting sites. (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:**

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data	34	34	0
Adult jails	5	5	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	29	29	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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	5	5	0
Current data	5	5	0
Adult jails	0	0	0
Adult correctional facilities	1	1	0
Adult lockups ¹	4	4	0

¹ Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. There were 2 adult lockups reporting violations and a weighting factor of 1.96 for non-reporting sites. (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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	824	824	0
Current data	16	16	0
Adult jails	0	0	0
Adult correctional facilities	12	12	0
Adult lockups ¹	4	4	0

¹ Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. There were 2 adult lockups reporting violations and a weighting factor of 1.96 for non-reporting sites. (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. Sixteen separation violations were recorded in Alaska during 1993. Since the 1976 baseline, when 824 cases of noncompliance were recorded, Alaska has achieved a 98.1 percent reduction in separation violations.

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). Detention officers throughout the state have not only indicated awareness of this statute, but have embraced the concerns of the legislation and have taken a variety of innovative

measures in order to comply with the separation mandate. 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.

Four of the 1993 separation violations occurred in adult lockups, which represent 79 percent of all secure facilities in the state. With few exceptions, lockups in Alaska's monitoring universe are located in geographically remote areas which lack the alternatives necessary for achieving success with separation requirements. In remote areas, transfer of juveniles to appropriate facilities has frequently been impossible due to unavailability of air transportation and inclement weather.

In 1993, there were no separation violations reported in adult jails. Adult jails accounted for 27 percent of the separation violations in Alaska during 1992, down from 51 percent the year before.

The Department of Corrections Mat-Su Pretrial Facility had twelve separation violations in 1993. These were the only juveniles held in a Department of Corrections facility in 1993. In August 1990, Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) and Department of Corrections (DOC) terminated a 1986 Memorandum of Agreement which had allowed for the detention of juveniles at the Ketchikan Correctional Center. DOC ceased the practice of detaining juveniles at the Ketchikan facility on August 15, 1990. This left Mat-Su Pretrial Facility as the single Department of Corrections facility permitted by policy to detain juveniles. At this facility, through a combination of site visits by DHSS staff to the Mat-Su Pretrial Facility and meetings with the Alaska State Troopers, transportation mechanisms have been improved and implemented which have reduced the number of separation violations in that facility. In June 1993, staff of the Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) again met with Mat-Su Pretrial Facility staff and Alaska State Troopers about the sight and sound separation. DFYS is currently exploring additional strategies that would result in the Mat-Su Pretrial Facility ceasing to accept juveniles.

Over the course of 1993, significant gains continued in complying with the separation mandate in all facilities. The number of separation violations increased from 11 in 1992 to 16 in 1993. That figure is still the second lowest level achieved since monitoring began in the state.

8. Describe the mechanism for enforcing the state's separation law:

Alaska has employed a number of mechanisms for enforcing its separation laws, AS 47.10.130 and AS 47.10.190, and has substantially reduced instances of noncompliance with Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act. DFYS has instituted a program of public education designed 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 currently has established nonsecure attendant care shelters in twelve communities throughout the state.

The Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS) has amended its contracts with adult jails and has removed any language which could be construed as authorizing admission of juveniles or providing for the purchase of such services by DPS.

Proposed Senate Bill 45 was introduced during the 1993 legislative session and continues to be lobbied by the Alaska Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee. This legislation seeks to end separation violations by specifying that

the minor shall be assigned to quarters in the correctional facility that are separate from quarters used to house adult prisoners so that the minor cannot communicate with or view adults who are in official detention. . . .

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 1993

2. Number of adult jails:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	15	15	0
Current data ¹	17	17	0

¹ This total includes one facility classified as an adult correctional center.

3. Number of adult lockups:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data ²	98	98	0

¹ Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

² Three adult lockups were removed from the universe in 1993, and seven were added.

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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Current data	34	34	0
Adult jails	5	5	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	29	29	0

5. Total number of adult jails holding juveniles during the last twelve months:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	14	14	0
Current data ²	10	10	0

¹ Includes data for two facilities classified as adult correctional facilities.

² Includes data for one facility classified as an adult correctional facility. Fewer than 10 facilities held juveniles in violation of Section 223(A)(14).

6. Total number of adult lockups holding juveniles during the past twelve months:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data ²	35	35	0

¹ Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

² Includes projection for facilities not submitting data. There were 18 known facilities holding juveniles, and a weighting factor of 1.96 for non-reporting facilities. (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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	766	766	0
Current data ²	20	20	0

¹ 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.

² Includes data for one facility classified as an adult correctional facility. There were 16 known violations which were weighted to reflect missing times (+3.55). (See Appendix I for data projection method.)

8. Total number of accused juvenile criminal-type offenders held in adult lockups in excess of six (6) hours:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data ²	13	13	0

¹ Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

² There were 6 known violations which were weighted to reflect missing times (+.316), missing offenses (+.42), and non-reporting sites (x 1.96). (See Appendix I for data projection method.)

9. Total number of adjudicated criminal-type offenders held in adult jails for any length of time:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data ²	3	3	0

¹ 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.

² Includes data for one facility classified as an adult correctional facility.

10. Total number of adjudicated criminal-type offenders held in adult lockups for any length of time:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data ²	7	7	0

¹ Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

² There were 4 known violations which were weighted to reflect missing offenses (+.09) and non-reporting sites (x 1.96). (See Appendix I for data projection method.)

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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	98	98	0
Current data ²	7	7	0

¹ 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.

² Includes data for one facility classified as an adult correctional facility. Current data for juveniles accused of or adjudicated delinquent for minor consuming alcohol are included here (see Appendix II for detailed list of violations).

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:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data ¹	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data ²	9	9	0

¹ Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

² There were 4 known violations which were weighted to reflect missing offenses (+.385) and non-reporting sites (x 1.96). (See Appendix I for data projection method.)

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 1992 monitoring universe are outside the state's only Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, but only a handful 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 (n/a)
Current data:	0 (n/a)

15. Provide a brief summary of the progress made in achieving the requirements of Section 223(a)(14):

From a base of 117 adult jails, correctional centers and lockups, 59 jail removal violations were projected for in Alaska during 1993. This count represents a 94 percent reduction in the overall number of juveniles held in violation of the jail removal mandate since the baseline year 1980. From the levels of last year, the 1993 count of 59 noncompliant instances represents a 25 percent increase in the number of juveniles held in adult facilities in violation of Section 223(a)(14).

This increase from the 1992 count represents a trend in both types of facilities, the total removal violations in adult jails and the correctional facility increased by 11 percent, and the violations in adult lockups increased by 47 percent. By offense category however, there were some mixed trends. In handling accused criminals, adult jails had 25 percent more violations than in 1992, while the adult lockups were unchanged at 11 violations. For adjudicated criminals, adult jails had a 57 percent decrease in violations from the 1992 levels, while the adult lockups level went from 2 in 1992 to 7 in 1993. Violations involving status offenders and nonoffenders increased 75 percent from the 1992 levels in both adult jails and adult lockups.

Differences in the number of violations can be attributed to a number of factors, including: modification of practices and policies toward the handling of juveniles on the part of rural jails and lockups, the further refinement in the accuracy of the detention logs of state-contracted jails and adult lockups, and improved data gathering techniques. It is also likely that the current “get tough on crime” sentiment is being reflected in the way Alaskan communities are handling some juvenile offenders. Since most of the violations in the status offender category resulted from cases where the offense was specified as MCA or MC (minor consuming alcohol), it appears that frequently the actual reason for the detention involved protective custody which, if properly recorded, would not have resulted in a removal violation.

The courts have determined that AS 47.37.170 imposes a duty upon peace officers to take inebriates into custody for their own protection. The statute directs that they may be held in a detention facility if no other facility is available.

In recent years gains have been made in reducing the number of violations in the state-contracted jails, as ten adult jails located in Barrow, Cordova, Dillingham, Kotzebue, Naknek, Petersburg, Seldovia, Sitka, Valdez and Wrangell, reported no jail removal violations during 1993 (down from 11 last year, but the state lost 3 jails in 1993). The state correctional facility in Ketchikan also no longer detains juveniles.

Further explanation of the overall gains Alaska has made in reducing violations of Section 223(A)(14) is found in the increased accuracy of the data itself. Prior efforts at monitoring Alaska's compliance with JJDP had been characterized by an apparent over-counting of incidents of noncompliant juvenile detention in adult contract jails. Whereas previous jail logs (the primary source of information used in monitoring) did not distinguish individuals who were booked and released from those who were placed in secure detention, the revised jail log format allows for this critical distinction.

By mid-1989 each contract jail had begun use of revised billing sheets ("logs") which allowed for clear distinction between those juveniles held in secure confinement and those who were not. As the contract jail personnel have become more familiar with this new billing form, the 1993 detention data have proven more accurate than that of 1992. Even so, some questions remained in analysis of the 1993 jail data either because individual jails did not properly use the revised log format or because even when a juvenile was noted as securely detained, the combination of offense and time held indicated that he/she was *probably* booked and released contrary to the official record. In those instances where questions remained, the contract jails were contacted by phone in an attempt to clarify the circumstances regarding those detention episodes. If no further information was obtained, those cases for which the duration of detention was recorded as 45 minutes or less, and for which the records gave no indication that the juvenile was ever securely detained, have been classified as having been booked and released.

Examination of the records of those facilities which were inspected, indicates that the jail logs used in monitoring are largely reliable as records of juvenile traffic through community jails and police departments, but there may remain some issues of accuracy.

Apart from efforts at refining juvenile detention data, barriers to full compliance with the jail removal requirement remain in Alaska. However, the state has made great progress in reducing incidence of noncompliance and in offering alternatives to secure detention in adult facilities. Geographic distance between smaller communities and the five secure youth detention centers has been bridged by the creation and operation of nonsecure attendant care shelters, which serve twelve rural communities.

In 1991 DFYS distributed copies of the OJJDP-produced educational video *Law Enforcement Custody of Juveniles* to each adult lockup and jail in the 1989 monitoring universe. This tape explains the constraints of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act on the handling of juvenile offenders and nonoffenders, and specifies exact prohibitions. Local and municipal law enforcement personnel, including police, dispatchers,

guards, village police officers and village public safety officers, were asked to review the video tape and to mail lists of who had reviewed the tape to DFYS. DFYS plans to further utilize this educational video by working with the law enforcement training academies in Alaska. These education processes appear to be having an impact, as many of the personnel contacted during the data collection process were well-informed about legal constraints regarding the detention of juveniles. During 1993 training on the mandates of the Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Act was provided to Village Public Safety Officers at the Public Safety Academy in Sitka.

In 1990 the Alaska Legislature passed AS 4710.160(b), requiring the Department of Health and Social Services to develop a standardized form for use by all agencies operating a jail or lockup. Its purpose was to report the admission and secure confinement of all minors. In accordance with this statute, in May 1991 DFYS initiated a new system by which all incidents of secure confinement of juveniles would be recorded. Each adult lockup and jail in the 1990 monitoring universe was sent information on Alaska's new statutory requirement, instructions on how the new reporting system would operate, and supplies of the Juvenile Confinement Admission and Release Form and the Juvenile Confinement Admission and Release Log. It was instructed that the form was to be completed on every juvenile admitted to secure confinement in each facility. The log was to be maintained on a monthly basis and sent to DFYS/Facility Compliance office, even in the event no juveniles were confined in the facility. This system was in place by the beginning of the State Fiscal Year, July 1991.

In the spring of 1991, the Alaska Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (AJJAC) introduced legislation concerning the confinement of juveniles that would bring State law closer to conformity with federal standards and the JJDP Act. This legislation specifies the criteria for detaining juveniles in adult facilities and limits detention to a maximum of six hours. While not passed by the Seventeenth Legislature, this legislation was reintroduced during the first session of the Eighteenth Legislature and continues to be lobbied for by the Alaska Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee.

During the fall of 1992, Governor Walter J. Hickel issued an Executive Proclamation supporting the elimination of the practice of placing juveniles in adult lockup facilities and jails.

Finally, during the fall of 1992, DFYS staff, Non-Secure Attendant Care Shelter staff and representatives from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention met with the Chief of Police of Homer to discuss appropriate procedures for handling juveniles in the Homer jail which would meet the requirements of the jail removal mandate.

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 = 59

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

178,349 juveniles

(Source: *Alaska Population Estimates by Age, Race and Sex*, Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, Demographics Unit, July 1991)

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 projection was not required for missing months; however adjustment was necessary for adult lockups which failed to report data. (See Appendix I)

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

Total instances of noncompliance	=	59
Population under 18	=	178,349
59/1.783491	=	33.1 per 100,000

2. Acceptable plan:

The Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) of the Department of Health and Social Services has broad authority under AS 47.10.150 and AS 47.10.180 for oversight of facilities used for detention of juveniles. In its attempts to reduce the numbers of noncompliant instances of juvenile detention in Alaska, DFYS has developed a network of nonsecure attendant care shelters—currently in ten locations, serving twelve communities which have historically experienced high levels of noncompliant juvenile detention.

DFYS has been successful in curtailing the practice of securely detaining status offenders and intoxicated juveniles at its own detention centers as well as in many adult facilities. The 1993 data show that juveniles who were charged with minor consuming alcohol continue to pose problems to the state's compliance with Section 223(A)(14). While the DFYS

policy extends only to the five juvenile detention centers, it has had a significant educative effect on the policies of local law enforcement agencies, and the Division continues to educate law enforcement personnel, both through the distribution of the OJJDP videotape, *Law Enforcement Custody of Juveniles*, appearances at state training academies, annual data collection contacts, and tri-annual monitoring visits.

It is anticipated that the implementation of the new record keeping system involving all adult facilities in the state, because it requires periodic attention by law enforcement departments to the issue of juvenile admissions, will also work to increase awareness of and compliance with the mandates of the JJDP Act.

With the submission of monthly logs from the adult facilities, DFYS is able to identify problems much sooner. In cases where a violation appears to have occurred the Juvenile Justice Specialist contacts the facility to discuss the potential violation.

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.

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. The new system has been implemented and it is anticipated that its positive effects on Alaska's compliance will be evident in coming monitoring cycles.

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 40 reported jail removal violations reported for 1993, 23, or 58 percent, occurred in facilities that allow for sight and sound separation. As a result, 42 percent of the jail removal violations from 1993 could have also constituted violations of Section 223(a)(13).

There was no statutory authorization for detaining status offenders and nonoffenders in any adult facility other than those accused of minor consuming alcohol. During 1993, there was no instance of secure detention of a status offender not charged with an alcohol offense.

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

Violations of Section 223(A)(14) occurred in 8 adult jails, 1 correctional center, and at 9 (5 x 1.84 weight) 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. It is the practice of most law enforcement officials at the village level and at the municipal level to not securely detain juvenile offenders.

The projected 1993 data on jail removal violations indicate that 27 violations occurred in 20 (20%) of the 98 adult rural lockups statewide. Given that the larger, busier lockups tend to be more likely to provide data, this projection that 20 percent of the rural lockups violated Section 223(A)(14) is probably high.

The largest number of noncompliant detentions from a single institution in 1993 was 10 (1 adult jail); the second largest was 7 (1 adult jail); and the third largest was 3 (1 adult jail). There were 5 facilities with 2 violations each (2 adult jails and 3 adult lockups). This number is down from 4 facilities, each with a high of 15 incidents of noncompliance during 1989, and 1 facility showing 15 violations in 1990.

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, which restrict the detention of juveniles in adult facilities, and AS 47.10.160(b), which requires state and municipal agencies to report incidents of secure detention of juveniles. Collectively, these mechanisms have proven effective in substantially reducing instances of noncompliance with Section 223(a)(14) of the JJDP Act. Enforcement of these statutes, along with continued operation of the dozen alternative nonsecure shelters, will effectively curtail jail removal violations in Alaska.

DFYS has sought to maximize enforcement of these laws 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.

Additionally, admission records of adult jails are examined each year by DFYS, and facilities are notified of the instances of noncompliant detention of juveniles.

In combination, the above enforcement mechanisms have been effective in reducing the number of instances of noncompliance by 94 percent in the four years since implementation of the state's revised Jail Removal Plan in December, 1987.

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.

Each of these goals is currently in operation and, as anticipated, their effect has been to consistently and dramatically lower the number of incidents of noncompliance.

Appendix I

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

All aspects of data analysis for the 1993 monitoring report were performed on the DEC/VAX 8800 mainframe computer at the University of Alaska Anchorage, using the SPSS Data Analysis System, Release 4.0.

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 sixteen adult jails were obtained from the Contract Jail Administrator of the Alaska Department of Public Safety (DPS). DPS contracts for services with each Alaska facility that meets the definition of adult jail as defined in the Formula Grant Regulation. The certified photocopies of the jails' booking logs covered all twelve months of 1993.
- B. Photocopies of *original booking logs* were obtained from the youth center in Fairbanks, and from nine adult lockups in Alakanuk, Delta Junction, Fort Yukon, Glennallen, King Cove, Kobuk, Kotlik, Russian Mission, and Tok.
- C. Certified or signed *detention data reports* were received from the youth centers and holdovers in Anchorage, Bethel, Juneau, and Nome, and from forty-two adult lockups in Akutan, Ambler, Anaktuvuk Pass, Atkasuk, Brevig Mission, Cantwell, Chignik, Cold Bay, Deadhorse, Deering, Eek, Ekwook, Elim, Goodnews Bay, Grayling, Holy Cross, Hoonah, Kaktovik, Kaltag, Kiana, Kivalina, Koyuk, Kwigillingok, Manokotak, Marshall, McGrath, Mekoryuk, Mountain Village, Noorvik, Nuiqsut, Pelican, Pilot Point, Point Hope, Point Lay, Port Heiden, Ruby, Saint Mary's, Sand Point, Skagway, Stevens, Togiak, and Wainwright.
- D. Judged to be inadequate for monitoring purposes was adult lockup data received from the village of Selawik.
- E. Juvenile booking data were received from the Department of Corrections adult correctional center at Mat-Su Pretrial. The Department of Corrections also provided a computer listing of juvenile bookings in all of the department's facilities.
- F. Complete detention data from the two juvenile holdover facilities in Kenai and Kodiak were received from the supervising Youth Probation Officer at that office.

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 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 Bethel Youth Center, Johnson Youth Center, 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 1993 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 1993 juvenile detention data. These were: 1) projection of data for the purpose of covering twelve months of time in two instances when only six months of data were received; 2) projection of juvenile detention data from non-reporting adult lockups; 3) projection of data for the purpose of estimating duration of detention in eleven cases with insufficient time information; and 4) projection of data for the purposes of including cases which had insufficient offense data.

A. Projection for complete calendar year

Complete data for calendar year 1993 were available for all but one of the secure facilities in Alaska reporting detention information. Projection of data to cover the full calendar year 1993 for the adult lockup in Mekoryuk was accomplished by computing the proportion of the year for which data from this facility were received ($90 \text{ days} / 365 \text{ days} = .25$), and weighting each instance of juvenile detention recorded at the lockup by a factor equal to the reciprocal of that proportion. Thus, any instances of juvenile detention at this facility would be weighted by a factor of 4.00. This weighting procedure assumes that instances of noncompliance at the jail during the first nine months of 1993 occurred at the same rate demonstrated in the data for the last three months.

B. 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 **1.96** (the reciprocal of the proportion of all adult lockups represented by those included in the analysis) to each case of juvenile detention in the 50 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 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.

C. Projection for unknown duration of detention

Projection for an unknown duration of detention was necessary for nine cases involving accused criminal offenders. Two cases involving status offenders were automatically counted as jail removal violations. The cases requiring weighting consisted of eight accused criminal offenders held in adult jails, and one held in an adult lockup. The weighting procedure established the likelihood of a case being a jail removal violation by dividing the number of violations involving accused criminals by the number of accused criminals, with a separate calculation made for the two types of facilities (jails = .444 and lockups = .316). Once that likelihood was established, it was multiplied by the number of cases involved (jails: $8 \times .444$ and lockups: $1 \times .316$), and the product was added to the number of reported violations in that category.

D. Projection for unknown offense

Projection for an unknown offense was necessary for five cases which occurred in adult lockups. The calculation required to establish the weighting for these cases required first establishing the likelihood that these cases involved an accused criminal and then establishing the likelihood that it would be a violation, and second, following the same procedure for adjudicated criminal cases, and finally for accused and adjudicated status offender and nonoffender cases. These weights were then added to the number of reported violations in the appropriate categories.

For example, the calculation used for establishing the weighting factor to be added to the accused criminal case violations in adult lockups consisted of taking the likelihood of the case being an accused criminal case (number of accused criminal cases in lockups divided by the number of cases in lockups — $19/42 = .452$), and multiplying that probability by the likelihood of an accused criminal case being a jail removal violation (number of accused criminal violation cases in lockups divided by the number of accused criminal cases in lockups — $6/19 = .315$). The product ($.452 \times .315 = .14$) was the weighting factor added to the three cases missing offense data and which were detained longer than 6 hours. The sum of these weights ($3 \times .14$) was then added to the reported number of accused criminal case jail removal violations in adult lockups.

Appendix II**1993 VIOLATIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE AND LOCATION**

For offense codes, see Appendix III.

Deinstitutionalization Violations / Section 223 (a)(12)(A)

Location	Offense	Time	Offender Type
-----------------	----------------	-------------	----------------------

None in 1993

Separation Violations / Section 223 (a)(13)

Location	Offense	Time	Offender Type
-----------------	----------------	-------------	----------------------

Adult correctional facilities:

Mat-Su Pretrial	TRAFFIC	18.45	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	.92	Accused Criminal
	FTA	8.58	Accused Criminal
	DWI	1.55	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	3.07	Accused Criminal
	DWI	5.12	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	19.90	Accused Criminal
	FTA	12.60	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	10.50	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	13.42	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	11.38	Accused Criminal
	DWLR	2.83	Accused Criminal

Adult lockups (Weight = 1.96):

Tok	MCA/MIP	7.42	Accused Status
Noorvik	T47: Alcohol	.92	Non-offender

Jail Removal Violations / Section 223 (a)(14)

Location	Offense	Time	Offender Type
-----------------	----------------	-------------	----------------------

Adult jails:

Craig	ASSAULT	34.88	Accused Criminal
	CT	16.53	Accused Criminal
Emmonak	ASSAULT	17.92	Accused Criminal
	THEFT	7.33	Accused Criminal

Jail Removal Violations / Section 223 (a)(14)

(continued)

Location	Offense	Time	Offender Type
Adult jails (continued):			
Haines	ASSAULT	19.65	Accused Criminal
	BW:	17.70	Adjudicated Criminal
Homer	ASSAULT	6.16	Accused Criminal
	THEFT	24.55	Accused Criminal
	CRIM MISCHIEF	6.97	Accused Criminal
	PV	4.25	Adjudicated Criminal
	DET ORDER	13.50	Adjudicated Criminal
	MCA/MIP	.82	Accused Status
	MCA/MIP	Missing	Accused Status
	MCA/MIP	8.40	Accused Status
	MCA/MIP	1.37	Accused Status
	MCA/MIP	1.37	Accused Status
Seward	MCA/MIP	6.58	Accused Status
	T47: Alcohol	12.38	Accused Status
Unalaska	CRIM MISCHIEF	42.50	Accused Criminal
Adult correctional facilities:			
Mat-Su Pretrial	TRAFFIC	18.45	Accused Criminal
	BW:FTA	8.58	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	19.90	Accused Criminal
	BW:FTA	12.60	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	10.50	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	13.42	Accused Criminal
	TRAFFIC	11.38	Accused Criminal
Adult lockups (Weight = 1.96):			
Alakanuk	T47: Alcohol	12.33	Accused Status
Delta Junction	MV Theft	6.42	Accused Criminal
	MV Theft	6.83	Accused Criminal
Fort Yukon	DC	8.00	Accused Criminal
Hoonah	MCA/MIP	.78	Accused Status
	BW:	1.00	Adjudicated Criminal
Mt. Village	ASSAULT	24.00	Accused Criminal
	T47: Alcohol	Missing	Accused Status
Nuiqsut	WEAPONS	8.83	Accused Criminal
Point Hope	BW:	2.30	Adjudicated Criminal
Ruby	CONCEAL	10.80	Accused Criminal
Skagway	PV	2.67	Adjudicated Criminal
	PV	2.67	Adjudicated Criminal
Tok	MCA/MIP	7.42	Accused Status

Appendix III**COMMON OFFENSE ACRONYMS**

ASLT	Assault
BURG	Burglary
BW:	Bench warrant: (original offense)
CM	Criminal mischief
CONCEAL	Concealment of merchandise
COURT HOLD	Court-ordered hold
CRIM MISCHIEF	Criminal mischief
CT	Criminal trespass
CTORDER:VCR	Court order:
DC	Disorderly conduct
DET ORDER	Detention order
DWI	Driving while intoxicated
DWLR	Driving with license revoked
DWLS	Driving with license suspended
DWOL	Driving without license
F&G VIOL	Fish & Game violation
FTA	Failure to appear
MCA/MC	Minor consuming alcohol
MICS	Misconduct involving a controlled substance
MIP	Minor in possession
MIPBC/MIPC	Minor in possession by consumption
MV THEFT	Motor vehicle theft
NON-CRIM	Non-criminal (unspecified)
PC	Protective custody
PV	Probation violation
RA	Resisting arrest
RESIST ARREST	Resisting arrest
RD	Reckless driving
RECKLSS DRIVNG	Reckless driving
ROBBERY	Robbery
RUNAWAY/RAWAY	Runaway
SA	Sexual assault
SRV TIME:DWI	Served time for DWI
T47	Title 47 protective custody
T47: Alcohol	Title 47 protective custody—alcohol
THEFT	Theft
TRAFFIC	Traffic violation
VCR	Violation of conditions of release
VCOR (OC:)	Violation of valid court order (original charge:)
WA:FTA-RD	Warrant: Failure to appear—reckless driving
WEAPONS	Weapons misconduct