



**FY 1995 JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT  
COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT  
( REVISED )**

Justice Center  
University of Alaska Anchorage



June 1996

**FY 1995 JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT**  
**COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT**  
**( REVISED )**

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 9503.02

June 1996

**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 ..... 18

H. DE MINIMIS REQUEST: SUBSTANTIVE ..... 21

*Appendix I*

METHOD OF ANALYSIS ..... 23

*Appendix II*

1995 VIOLATIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE AND LOCATION ..... 27

*Appendix III*

COMMON OFFENSE ACRONYMS ..... 32

**FY 1995 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) 465-3458

**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:** Fiscal year 1995

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

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>0</b>
Juvenile detention centers	5	5	0
Juvenile holdover facilities <sup>1</sup>	2	2	0
Juvenile training schools <sup>2</sup>	0	0	0
Adult jails	15	15	0
Adult correctional facilities <sup>3</sup>	1	1	0
Adult lockups <sup>4</sup>	110	110	0

<sup>1</sup> “Juvenile Holdover Facility” is a designation used to identify secure facilities used solely for the temporary detention of juveniles.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The Department of Corrections is contacted annually regarding all DOC facilities.

<sup>4</sup> Modifications to the Fy 1994 universe of adult jails and adult lockups for the Fy 1995 report include the deletion of two adult jails and the addition of two 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>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>
Juvenile detention centers	5	5	0
Juvenile holdover facilities	2	2	0
Adult jails	15	15	0
Adult correctional facilities	1	1	0
Adult lockups	47	47	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>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>
Juvenile detention centers	2	2	0
Juvenile holdover facilities	0	0	0
Adult jails	5	5	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	35	35	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>
<b>Baseline data<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>485</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>
Juvenile detention centers	12	12	0
Adult jails	1	1	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> 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 accused status offenders and nonoffenders securely detained in adult jails or lockup for less than 24 hours. This includes status offenders accused of violating a valid court order, federal wards and out-of-state runaways.**

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
<b>Baseline data<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	7	7	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups <sup>2</sup>	41	41	0

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. There were 17 reported violations in adult lockups which were weighted to reflect missing duration data (+.3840) and non-reporting sites (x 2.34). (See Appendix I for data projection method.)

**7. Total number of adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders held in any secure detention or correctional facility for any length of time excluding a judicial determination that the juvenile violated a valid court order:**

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
<b>Baseline data<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
Juvenile detention centers	3	3	0
Adult jails	0	0	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> Data for status offenders determined to have violated valid court orders were not included in the monitoring report format for the baseline year.

**8. 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>
<b>Baseline data<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	0	0	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> 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?**

N/A.

**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)?**

N/A.

**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
13	+	51
		64

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

187,351 juveniles.

(Source: *Alaska Population Estimates by Age, Race and Sex*, Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, Demographics Unit, September 1995.)

**If the data were 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:**

$$64/1.87351 = 34 \text{ per } 100,000$$

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

26 of the unweighted detention events were in violation of existing state statutes.

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

N/A

**4. Out of state runaways:** 0

**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.

AS 47.10.130 went into effect in August 1994. It describes which minors can be incarcerated, under what conditions, and for what lengths of time. 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 report, it is sporadically. 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.

On September 13, 1995 violations of the state law regarding possession, control, or consumption of alcohol by persons under the age of 21, AS 04.16.050, ceased to be classified as misdemeanors and became classified as violations. The significance of this change is that a person cannot be securely detained for a violation of this statute; it thus removed the legal sanction by which many juveniles have been detained during fiscal year 1995 in noncompliance with the revised elements Section 223(a)(12)(B).

**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):**

In recent years Alaska's progress in achieving the removal of status offenders and nonoffenders from secure detention had been excellent. Over the course of several years, Alaska had 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 64 instances of noncompliance recorded in fiscal 1995. This year's large increase in violations is due principally to the changes made in the JJDP legislation. Many of this year's violations would not have constituted violations under the previous language of the act.

**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 fiscal 1995.

**SECTION 223(a)(13)**

**E. SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND ADULTS**

1. **Baseline reporting period:** Calendar year 1976  
**Current reporting period:** Fiscal year 1995
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>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	10	10	0
Adult correctional facilities	2	2	0
Adult lockups <sup>1</sup>	61	61	0

<sup>1</sup> Includes projection for facilities not submitting data. There were 26 reporting sites and a weighting factor of 2.34 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>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	5	5	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	35	35	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>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	0	0	0
Adult correctional facilities	2	2	0
Adult lockups <sup>1</sup>	12	12	0

<sup>1</sup> Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. There were 5 adult lockups reporting violations and a weighting factor of 2.34 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>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<b>824</b>	<b>824</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	0	0	0
Adult correctional facilities	2	2	0
Adult lockups <sup>1</sup>	21	21	0

<sup>1</sup> Includes projection for lockups not submitting data. There were 5 adult lockups reporting 9 violations with a weighting factor of 2.34 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. Eleven separation violations were recorded in Alaska during fiscal 1995 (23 when adjusted for non-reporting sites). Since the 1976 baseline, when 824 cases of noncompliance were recorded, Alaska has achieved a 97.3 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.

Twenty-two of the fiscal 1995 separation violations occurred in adult lockups, which represent 80 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 fiscal 1995, there were no separation violations reported in adult jails. Adult jails accounted for 12 percent of the separation violations in Alaska during fiscal 1994, down from 51 percent in calendar year 1991 and 27 percent in 1992.

The Department of Corrections Mat-Su, Wildwood Pretrial, and Ketchikan Facilities each had one separation violation in fiscal 1995. These were the only juveniles held in a Department of Corrections facility in fiscal 1995. 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 had been improved and implemented, reducing 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, and in September of 1994 all Superintendents in the Department of Corrections were notified by the Director of Institutions that "No juveniles will be accepted in our facilities unless they are waived to adult status."

Over the course of fiscal 1995, significant gains achieved during previous years in complying with the separation mandate in corrections facilities were sustained. While the number of separation violations increased from 17 fiscal 1994 to 23 in fiscal 1995, this does represent a 24% increase in projected violations in a year when juvenile detentions increased 21% from the previous year's level.

**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 continues to educate law enforcement and

the public to the dangers in jailing juveniles and to the laws restricting such detention. The Division has nonsecure attendant care shelters in eleven 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.

Senate Bill 45 was signed into law by the Governor in May 1994. AS 47.10.130 addresses the detention of minors and 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:** Fiscal year 1995

**2. Number of adult jails:**

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data	15	15	0
Current data <sup>1</sup>	16	16	0

<sup>1</sup> This total includes one facility classified as an adult correctional center. Two adult jails were removed from the universe in fiscal 1995.

**3. Number of adult lockups:**

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public</i>	<i>Private</i>
Baseline data <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data <sup>2</sup>	110	110	0

<sup>1</sup> Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

<sup>2</sup> Three adult lockups were added to the universe in fiscal 1995

**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>
<b>Current data</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
Adult jails	5	5	0
Adult correctional facilities	0	0	0
Adult lockups	35	35	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 <sup>1</sup>	14	14	0
Current data <sup>2</sup>	12	12	0

<sup>1</sup> Includes data for two facilities classified as adult correctional facilities.

<sup>2</sup> Includes data for two facilities classified as an adult correctional facility. Fewer than 11 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 <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data <sup>2</sup>	61	61	0

<sup>1</sup> Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

<sup>2</sup> Includes projection for facilities not submitting data. There were 26 known facilities holding juveniles, and a weighting factor of 2.34 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 <sup>1</sup>	766	766	0
Current data <sup>2</sup>	20	20	0

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Includes data for one facility classified as an adult correctional facility.



**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 <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data <sup>2</sup>	38	38	0

<sup>1</sup> Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

<sup>2</sup> There were **16 known violations** which were weighted to reflect missing data (+.3333 - the Kiana violation was adjusted to reflect a missing 1/4 year of data), and non-reporting sites (x 2.34). (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 <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data <sup>2</sup>	8	8	0

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data <sup>2</sup>	9	9	0

<sup>1</sup> Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

<sup>2</sup> There were **4 known violations** which were weighted to reflect non-reporting sites (x 2.34). (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 <sup>1</sup>	98	98	0
Current data	7	7	0

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**12. Total number of accused and adjudicated status offenders and nonoffenders 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 <sup>1</sup>	n/a	n/a	n/a
Current data <sup>2</sup>	33	33	0

<sup>1</sup> Adult lockups were not included in the monitoring universe for the baseline year.

<sup>2</sup> There were **13 known violations** which were weighted to reflect missing data (+.8333 - the Kiana violation was adjusted to reflect a missing 1/4 year of data), missing duration data (+.3846), and non-reporting sites (x 2.34). (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 fiscal 1995 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 126 adult jails, correctional centers and lockups, 115 jail removal violations were projected for Alaska during fiscal 1995. This count represents an 86% percent reduction in the overall number of juveniles held in violation of the jail removal mandate since the baseline year 1980. From a total of 53 projected violations in the fiscal 1994 report, the fiscal 1995 count of 115 noncompliant instances represents a substantial increase in the number of juveniles held in adult facilities in violation of Section 223(a)(14).

In fiscal 1994, there were 7 violations in adult jails involving accused and adjudicated status and nonoffenders, while in fiscal 1995 there were also 7. In the adult lockups, the level went from 18 projected (8 actual) in fiscal 1994 to 33 (13 actual) in fiscal 1995. There were also increases in both types of facilities for accused and adjudicated criminal-type offenders, except for a slight decrease in the violations involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders in adult lockups. The level of violations involving accused criminal-type offenders in adult jails went from 11 in fiscal 1994 to 20 in fiscal 1995, and in the adult lockups the level went from 2 projected (1 actual) in fiscal 1994 to 38 (16 actual) in fiscal 1995. The level of violations involving adjudicated criminal-type offenders in adult jails went from 5 in fiscal 1994 to 8 in fiscal 1995, and in the adult lockups the level went down from 10 projected (5 actual) in fiscal 1994 to 9 (4 actual) in fiscal 1995.

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.

Overall gains Alaska has made in reducing violations of Section 223(A)(14) are 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 fiscal 1995 detention data have proven more accurate than that of 1994. Even so, some questions remained in analysis of the fiscal 1995 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.

Although there have been efforts to refine juvenile detention data, barriers to full compliance with the jail removal requirement remain in Alaska. However, the state has made great progress in reducing the 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 eleven communities.

**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 = 115

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

187,351 juveniles

(Source: *Alaska Population Estimates by Age, Race and Sex*, Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis, Demographics Unit, September 1995)

**If the data were 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:**

Adjustment was necessary for 63 adult lockups which failed to report data and projected for two facilities reporting fewer than 12 months of data. (See Appendix I)

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

Total instances of noncompliance	=	115
Population under 18	=	187,351
$115/1.87351$	=	61.4 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 nine locations, serving eleven 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 fiscal 1995 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 through 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 71 actual jail removal violations reported for fiscal 1995, 12, or 17 percent, occurred in facilities that allow for sight and sound separation. As a result, 83 percent of the jail removal violations from fiscal 1995 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 fiscal 1995, there was no instance of secure detention of an accused 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 12 adult jails, 2 correctional center, and at 30 (13 x 2.34 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 not to securely detain juvenile offenders.

The actual fiscal 1995 data on jail removal violations indicate that 35 violations occurred in 14 (13%) of the 110 adult rural lockups statewide. Given that the larger, busier lockups tend to be more likely to provide data, the projection that 13% percent of the non-reporting rural lockups violated Section 223(A)(14) at the same rate results in an over-estimate.

Two facilities tied for largest number of noncompliant detentions from a single institution in fiscal 1995, each with 8 (1 adult jail); the second largest number was 6 (1 adult jail and 1 adult lockup); and the third largest was 4 (1 adult lockup and 3 adult lockups). There were 3 facilities with 3 violations each (1 adult jail and 1 adult lockup). 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 fiscal year 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 eleven alternative nonsecure shelters, will effectively curtail jail removal violations in Alaska.

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 86% percent in the eighth year 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.

Each of these is in place and each has had an impact in reducing noncompliance since the base year.

*Appendix I*

**METHOD OF ANALYSIS**

All aspects of data analysis for the fiscal 1995 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.

**A. Data collection and data entry**

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

1. Certified photocopies of original *client billing sheets* (booking logs) for the fifteen 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. Received were certified photocopies of the jails' booking logs which covered all twelve months of 1994, and another set which covered the first six months of 1995. In addition, the logs were requested from the Kodiak facility, after it was learned that facility had been used to detain juveniles.
2. Photocopies of *original booking logs* for 1994 were obtained from the youth center in Fairbanks, and from fourteen adult lockups in Akaichak, Aniak, Delta Junction, Fort Yukon, Glennallen, Holy Cross, King Cove, Russian Mission, Saint Mary's, Skagway, Togiak, Tok, Unalakleet and Yakutat. Logs for 1995 were also obtained from the youth center in Fairbanks, and from seventeen adult lockups in Akiachak, Aniak, Cantwell, Chevak, Delta Junction, Fort Yukon, Galena, Glennallen, Holy Cross, King Cove, Russian Mission, Saint Mary's, Skagway, Togiak, Tok, Unalakleet and Yakutat.
3. Certified or signed *detention data reports* for 1994 were received from the youth centers and holdovers in Anchorage, Bethel, Juneau, and Nome, and from twenty-seven adult lockups in Anaktuvuk Pass, Atqasuk, Cold Bay, Deadhorse, Eek, Elim, Emmonak, Galena, Golovin, Hoonah, Kaktovik, Kiana, Kipnuk, Kivalina, Marshall, McGrath, Nenana, Nondalton, Noorvik, Nuiqsut, Old Harbor, Point Hope, Point Lay, Saint Michael, Saint Paul, Sand Point, Seldovia and Wainwright. Reports were received for 1995 from youth centers and holdovers in Anchorage, Bethel, Juneau, and Nome, and from twenty-eight adult lockups in Anaktuvuk Pass, Atqasuk, Cold Bay, Deadhorse, Eek, Elim, Emmonak, Golovin, Hoonah, Kaktovik, Kaltag, Kiana, Kipnuk, Kivalina, Marshall, McGrath, Nenana, Nondalton, Nuiqsut, Old Harbor, Pelican, Point Hope, Point Lay, Saint Michael, Saint Paul, Sand Point, Seldovia and Wainwright.

4. Judged to be inadequate for monitoring purposes were adult lockup data received from the villages of Nulato and Tanana.
5. 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.
6. Complete detention data from the two juvenile holdover facilities in Kenai and Kodiak were received from the supervising Youth Probation Officer at that office.
7. Complete and Certified Juvenile Confinement and Admission forms for fiscal 1995 submitted to the state's Division of Family and Youth Services by adult lockups in the villages of Alakanuk and Shaktoolik were used as a primary source of data. These forms were used as a secondary source of data from the villages of Anaktuvak Pass, Atqusak, Cantwell, Chevak, Cold Bay, Deadhorse, Delta Junction, Fort Yukon, Glennallen, Golovin, Kaktovik, Kiana, Marshall, McGrath, Nondalton, Nuiqsut, Point Hope, Point Lay, Russian Mission, Saint Mary's, Saint Paul, Sand Point, Togiak, Tok, Unalakleet and Wainwright. They were also used as a secondary source for all of the adult jails with the exception of Homer.

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.

## **B. 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:

1. 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.
2. 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.

3. 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.
4. 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 fiscal 1995 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.

### C. Data projection

Four methods of statistical projection for missing and unknown detention data were employed in the analysis of fiscal 1995 juvenile detention data. These were: 1) projection of data for the purpose of covering twelve months of time in thirty-one instances for which only six months of data were received; 2) projection of juvenile detention data from non-reporting adult lockups

#### 1. Projection for complete calendar year

Complete detention data for fiscal year 1995 were available for all of the juvenile detention and holdover facilities, the adult jails, the correctional center and thirty adult lockups in Alaska. Projection of data to cover the full fiscal year 1995 for adult lockups which reported only six months of data was accomplished by computing the proportion of the year for which data from these facilities were received ( $180 \text{ days}/365 \text{ days} = .50$ ), 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 these facilities would be weighted by a factor of 2.00. This weighting procedure assumes that instances of

noncompliance at the jail during the six months reported of fiscal 1995 occurred at the same rate demonstrated in the data for the non-reported six months.

## **2. Projection for non-reporting adult lockups**

Data for the 63 adult lockups whose records were inadequate for monitoring purposes were projected by assigning a weight of **2.34** (the reciprocal of the proportion of all adult lockups represented by those included in the analysis) to each case of juvenile detention in the 47 adult lockups from which data were obtained. To the extent that lockups from which 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 estimated number of noncompliant cases than actually occurred in these facilities.

## **3. Projection for unknown duration of detention**

Projection for an unknown duration of detention was necessary for one case involving the detention of a nonoffender for a protective custody involving alcohol at the Unalakleet adult lockup. The weighting procedure established the likelihood of a case being a violation (both DSO and Jail Removal) by dividing the number of violations resulting from protective custody involving alcohol by the total number of reported detention events resulting from protective custody involving alcohol ( $5/13 = .3846$ ). The product was then added to the number of known violations in the applicable categories.

**Appendix II**

**FISCAL YEAR 1995 VIOLATIONS BY OFFENSE TYPE AND LOCATION**

For offense codes, see Appendix III.

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

<b>Location</b>	<b>Offense</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Offender Type</b>
<b>Juvenile detention centers:</b>			
Bethel Y.F.	T47: Alcohol	35.80	Nonoffender
	T47: Alcohol	58.13	Nonoffender
	T47: Alcohol	35.88	Nonoffender
Fairbanks Y.F.	MCA	30.67	Accused Status
	T47: Alcohol	27.00	Nonoffender
	MCA	35.33	Accused Status
	PV	28.33	Adjudicated Status
Johnson Y.C.	MCA	181.38	Accused Status
	T47: Alcohol	203.42	Nonoffender
	PV	586.42	Adjudicated Status
	PV	854.50	Adjudicated Status
Nome Y.F.	Runaway	521.50	Accused Status
<b>Adult jails:</b>			
Cordova	MCA	10.75	Accused Status
Dillingham	MCA	11.17	Accused Status
Emmonak	MCA	7.60	Accused Status
	Runaway	6.16	Accused Status
Homer	MCA	2.12	Accused Status
	MCA	2.33	Accused Status
	MCA	1.00	Accused Status
<b>Adult lockups (Weight = 2.34):</b>			
Alakanuk	MCA	Unknown	Accused Status

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

<b>Location</b>	<b>Offense</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Offender Type</b>
<b>Adult lockups (Weight = 2.34) (continued):</b>			
Ft. Yukon	T47: Alcohol	23.16	Nonoffender
	T47: Alcohol	19.50	Nonoffender
Galena	MCA	3.00	Accused Status
	MCA	8.75	Accused Status
Glennallen	MCA	2.75	Accused Status
	MCA	7.45	Accused Status
Hoonah	MCA	1.82	Accused Status
Kiana	MCA	8.38	Accused Status
Marshall	T47: Alcohol	14.17	Nonoffender
Russian Mission	MCA	3.50	Accused Status
St. Paul	MCA	8.60	Accused Status
Sand Point	T47: Alcohol	20.75	Nonoffender
	T47: Alcohol	21.00	Nonoffender
Togiak	MCA	9.78	Accused Status
Unalakleet	T47: Alcohol	Unknown	Nonoffender

*Separation Violations / Section 223 (a)(13)*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Offense</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Offender Type</b>
<b>Adult correctional facilities:</b>			
Mat-Su Pretrial	Traffic	1.75	Accused Criminal
Ketchikan	Serve Time (DWI)	71.98	Adjudicated Criminal
<b>Adult lockups (Weight = 2.34):</b>			
Galena	PV	5.50	Adjudicated Criminal
Glennallen	DWI	12.00	Accused Criminal
	MCA	3.75	Accused Status
	MCA	5.45	Accused Status

*Separation Violations / Section 223 (a)(13) (continued)*

<u>Location</u>	<u>Offense</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Offender Type</u>
<b>Adult lockups (Weight = 2.34) (continued):</b>			
St. Paul	DC	8.75	Accused Criminal
	MCA	8.36	Accused Status
Unalakleet	T47: Alcohol	Unknown	Nonoffender
Wainwright	Crim. Mischief	9.50	Accused Criminal

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

<u>Location</u>	<u>Offense</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Offender Type</u>
<b>Adult jails:</b>			
Cordova	Assault	24.15	Accused Criminal
	Court Order	166.62	Accused Criminal
	MCA	10.75	Accused Status
Craig	Burglary	43.98	Accused Criminal
	Crim. Mischief	69.66	Accused Criminal
	Assault	7.45	Accused Criminal
Dillingham	VCR	12.16	Adjudicated Criminal
	Assault	21.80	Accused Criminal
	MCA	11.16	Accused Status
Emmonak	Assault	28.75	Accused Criminal
	Resist. Arrest	6.75	Accused Criminal
	Burglary	7.45	Accused Criminal
	MCA	8.60	Accused Status
	Runaway	6.26	Accused Status
	Prob. Violation	6.75	Adjudicated Criminal
Haines	Assault	18.75	Accused Criminal
Homer	Crim. Mischief	14.18	Accused Criminal
	Concealment	12.83	Accused Criminal
	Prob. Violation	23.42	Adjudicated Criminal
	Det. Order	24.33	Adjudicated Criminal
	MCA	2.12	Accused Status
	MCA	2.33	Accused Status
	Det. Order	3.58	Adjudicated Criminal
MCA	1.00	Accused Status	



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

<b>Location</b>	<b>Offense</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Offender Type</b>
<b>Adult jails (continued):</b>			
Kodiak	Warrant: FTA	156.20	Accused Criminal
Petersburg	Reck. Endangerment	14.12	Accused Criminal
	Assault	40.45	Accused Criminal
	Warrant: FTA	24.00	Accused Criminal
Seward	Warrant: Criminal	17.00	Adjudicated Criminal
	Warrant: Criminal	15.50	Adjudicated Criminal
Sitka	Crim. Trespass	23.75	Accused Criminal
	Burglary	29.15	Accused Criminal
Wrangell	Assault	36.97	Accused Criminal

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

<b>Location</b>	<b>Offense</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Offender Type</b>
<b>Adult correctional facilities:</b>			
Ketchikan	Serve Time (DWI)	71.98	Adjudicated Criminal
Mat-Su Pretrial	DWLS	9.83	Accused Criminal
<b>Adult lockups (Weight = 2.34):</b>			
Alakanuk	Assault	31.16	Accused Criminal
	Assault	29.66	Accused Criminal
	Resist. Arrest	6.08	Accused Criminal
	Det. Order	1.48	Adjudicated Criminal
	MCA	Unknown	Accused Status
Fort Yukon	DWOL	6.50	Accused Criminal
	Assault	9.50	Accused Criminal
	T47: Alcohol	23.17	Nonoffender
	T47: Alcohol	19.50	Nonoffender
Galena	MCA	3.00	Accused Status
	MCA	8.75	Accused Status
	Prob. Violation	5.50	Adjudicated Criminal

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

<b>Location</b>	<b>Offense</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Offender Type</b>
<b>Adult lockups (continued):</b>			
Glennallen	DWI	12.00	Accused Criminal
	Burglary	22.40	Accused Criminal
	Det. Order	9.58	Adjudicated Criminal
	MCA	3.75	Accused Status
	MCA	5.45	Accused Status
	Warrant	14.75	Adjudicated Criminal
Hoonah	MCA	1.82	Accused Status
Kiana	Assault	12.35	Accused Criminal
	MCA	8.38	Accused Status
Marshall	T47	14.16	Nonoffender
Russian Mission	MCA	3.50	Accused Status
St. Paul	Disord. Conduct	8.66	Accused Criminal
	MCA	8.60	Accused Status
Sand Point	Crim. Mischief	10.21	Accused Criminal
	MICS	10.00	Accused Criminal
	T47	20.75	Nonoffender
	T47	21.00	Nonoffender
Togiak	Crim. Mischief	23.30	Accused Criminal
	MCA	9.78	Accused Criminal
Unalakleet	T47	Unknown	Nonoffender
Wainwright	Crim. Mischief	9.50	Accused Criminal
Yakutat	Warrant: Criminal	15.00	Accused Criminal

**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	Warrant
WA:FTA	Warrant: Failure to appear
WA:PV	Warrant: Probation Violation
WA:TRAFFIC	Warrant: Traffic
WEAPONS	Weapons misconduct