

ALASKA JUSTICE FORUM

A PUBLICATION OF THE JUSTICE CENTER

Summer/Fall 2011

UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Vol. 28, No. 2-3

Immigrants in Alaska—Authorized and Unauthorized

Antonia Moras

As is true throughout the country, most foreign-born residents of Alaska are here with appropriate documentation; that is, their immigration has occurred legally under established laws and regulations. The picture of immigration in Alaska, however—both authorized and unauthorized—differs in some details from that of the country as a whole. The most important difference is that unauthorized immigrants are comparatively few in number, forming a very low percentage of the state's population.

According to the best figures available from the U.S. Census Bureau, which are an average drawn over the five-year period 2005–2009—around 45,000 Alaska residents were foreign born—slightly less than 7 percent of the total population. Of this number, about 13,000 had entered the country since 2000. In the nation as a whole for the same period, about 37 million people—12 percent of the total population—

were foreign born. (See Table 1 and “Note on Data Sources for Immigration Articles” on page 3.)

Slightly more than half of the state's foreign-born residents were naturalized U.S. citizens, while in the country overall, about 44 percent of the immigrant population had acquired citizenship.

Immigrants from Asian countries formed a greater proportion of the foreign-born population in Alaska than they did in the U.S. overall. (See Tables 1 and 2.) According to the Census Bureau figures, almost half of the immigrant population in Alaska had come from Asia, with the Philippines being the country of origin for the largest number of immigrants in Alaska. Fewer than a third came from countries in the Americas. In contrast, in the country as a whole, the largest proportion of immigrants—over 55 percent—had come from the Americas, with Mexico being by far the most common country of origin.

Unauthorized Immigration

Over the last two decades there has been a substantial increase in the number of people in the country without authorization. The precise numbers for the country as a whole and for Alaska in particular are obviously impossible to pinpoint, but there are some commonly accepted broad estimates.

According to figures published earlier this year by the Pew Research Center, in March 2010 there were 11.2 million unauthorized immigrants in the United States. (See Table 3.) In Alaska, there were fewer than 10,000—possibly substantially fewer. Pew estimates that the number was less than 1 percent of the state's population. In the country as a whole, the unauthorized immigrant population was around 3.7 percent of the total population. In some states, the percentages were much higher—6.8 percent in California, 6.7 percent in Texas, and 6

Please see Immigrants in Alaska, page 2

Table 1. Place of Birth for Alaska Foreign-Born Population, 2005–2009

Place of birth	N	Percent of total	Margin of error
Total	45,028	100.0 %	± 1,609
Europe	8,022	17.8 %	± 773
Germany	1,753	3.9	± 296
Russia	1,293	2.9	± 286
United Kingdom	1,165	2.6	± 254
Asia	22,408	49.8 %	± 785
Philippines	13,156	29.2	± 929
Korea	3,427	7.6	± 475
China	1,061	2.4	± 282
Thailand	979	2.2	± 270
Africa	1,373	3.0 %	± 428
Oceania	1,074	2.4 %	± 217
Americas	12,151	27.0 %	± 1,005
Mexico	3,670	8.2	± 616
Canada	2,661	5.9	± 390
Dominican Republic	1,152	2.6	± 381

Source of data: 2005–2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau

Table 2. Place of Birth for U.S. Foreign-Born Population, 2005–2009

Place of birth	N	Percent of total	Margin of error
Total	37,342,597	100.0 %	± 105,671
Europe	4,951,980	13.3 %	± 25,182
Asia	10,066,515	27.0 %	± 34,225
China	3,258,145	8.7	± 12,739
Philippines	1,647,777	4.4	± 14,461
India	1,535,972	4.1	± 12,419
Vietnam	1,101,816	3.0	± 11,862
Korea	1,007,221	2.7	± 9,334
Africa	1,394,088	3.7 %	± 14,048
Oceania	203,721	0.5 %	± 4,471
Americas	20,726,293	55.5 %	± 61,440
Mexico	11,300,199	30.3	± 50,807
El Salvador	1,066,619	2.9	± 11,538
Cuba	954,546	2.6	± 9,558
Canada	832,975	2.2	± 6,762
Dominican Republic	748,729	2.0	± 10,191

Source of data: 2005–2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau

Immigrants in Alaska (continued from page 1)

percent in Arizona.

Since 1990 the number of unauthorized immigrants in the state may have as much as doubled. In other states, however, the increase has been much more precipitous. According to the Pew March 2010 estimates, there had been an increase of more than 340 percent in Florida, more than 360 percent in Texas, and over 440 percent in Arizona. In the nation as a whole, the number of unauthorized immigrants had more than tripled since 1990.

In general, however, the 2010 figures showed a slight decline since 2007, when the national total of unauthorized immigrants was estimated to be 12,000,000—the highest number reached. The figures for some individual states also showed declines, but it was impossible to determine from the data available if this was true for Alaska. (The Alaska total was simply too small to report any change with confidence, since the change would fall within the

given margin of error.)

Labor Force Participation of Unauthorized Immigrants

Pew estimates that, in March 2010, there were approximately eight million unauthorized immigrants in the nation's workforce—5.2 percent of the total labor force. In some states this percentage was much higher. In California, for instance, unauthorized immigrants may have been as much as 10 percent of the work force; in Texas, 9 percent. In Alaska the number

was much lower; unauthorized immigrants are estimated to be only 1.5 percent of the total Alaska workforce of approximately 358,000 people.

The figures presented above are the most recent available on immigration. Since their compilation, there will have been some fluctuation, but for Alaska where the numbers have consistently been low, the change—either up or down—has probably not been large.

Antonia Moras is the former editor of the Alaska Justice Forum.

Table 3. Estimates of Unauthorized Immigrant Populations in Selected States and Years, 1990–2010

	1990	2000	2005	2007	2010	% of total population
U.S.	3,525,000	8,375,000	11,100,000	12,000,000	11,200,000	3.7 %
Alaska	< 5,000	< 10,000	< 10,000	< 10,000	< 10,000	< 1.0 %
California	1,500,000	2,300,000	2,650,000	2,750,000	2,550,000	6.8
Texas	450,000	1,100,000	1,400,000	1,450,000	1,650,000	6.7
Florida	240,000	575,000	925,000	1,050,000	825,000	4.5
New York	350,000	725,000	675,000	825,000	625,000	3.2
Arizona	90,000	300,000	450,000	500,000	400,000	6.0

Source of data: "Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010," Pew Research Center, Pew Hispanic Center, 2011. <http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=133>

Enforcement of Immigration Laws

Antonia Moras

Although in recent years there has been more involvement by state and local law enforcement—and more politicization of immigration issues at state and local levels—the federal government still has primary responsibility for enforcement of the nation's immigration laws. The formation of the Department of Homeland Security has resulted in changes in how the laws are enforced, although the changes may have affected Alaska less than other states because the number of Alaska cases involving immigration law violations continues to be very low. Despite the relatively few cases, however, the adjudication of immigration cases in Alaska has slowed dramatically over the last decade as it has elsewhere.

After the 2001 terrorist attacks, the functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service were subsumed within the newly-formed Department of Homeland Security (DHS)—with the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) taking on the responsibility for apprehending and removing unauthorized immigrants. In Alaska the reorganization has meant that the center for decision-making in ICE activities in Alaska is Seattle, rather than Anchorage as it was under the old Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). ICE does have an

office in Anchorage, but Alaska is no longer a separate district for administration of enforcement actions. Decisions about certain aspects of enforcement now ultimately rest with the Seattle office.

In Alaska the number of individuals who are apprehended under immigration laws continues to be very low. Although state-level figures for Alaska are very difficult to obtain—also as a result of the reorganization—and are not necessarily directly comparable with those from the old INS, there has been little or no increase in the use of detention as an immigration enforcement tool in the state. The number of people detained remains low. Nationally, there has been a significant increase in the use of detention since the establishment of DHS and ICE, with many more people subject to mandatory detention. (Despite the use of detention most immigration law violations are not criminal offenses.) Why this has not occurred in Alaska may be related to staffing levels and budgetary allocations, but that cannot be ascertained with the available information. ICE will not provide information on staff numbers in Alaska.

Also—as of September 2011, no communities in Alaska had signed a 287 (g) program memorandum of agreement. Under a 287 (g) agreement, a local law enforcement

agency receives delegated authority for immigration law enforcement in its jurisdiction. Only 69 law enforcement agencies in 24 states have signed these agreements.

Nor were any Alaska agencies formally participating in the Secure Communities program. Under this program, the fingerprints of someone who has been arrested for a criminal offense are sent to the FBI for cross-checking with ICE on immigration status. While this cross-checking does occur with some arrestees in Alaska, the state is not a formal participant in this program—according to information published on the ICE website. Nationally, 47 percent of over 3,000 jurisdictions are part of the program.

The following discussion provides snapshots of the work in Alaska of the two main federal entities involved in the apprehension and removal of unauthorized immigrants—ICE and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), which is the formal title for the country's network of immigration courts. The data available cover different time periods—and different cases—and must be viewed separately for each agency.

Immigrant Detention in Alaska

According to information obtained from ICE, an unauthorized immigrant in Alaska

Note on Data Sources for Immigration Articles

A number of articles in previous issues of the *Alaska Justice Forum* have also dealt with immigration issues (see list on page 4). A note of caution: the figures given in the articles in this issue cannot be compared precisely with those in previous issues that covered similar topics because the sources for the data are different.

* * *

Beginning with the 2010 general U.S. Census, the decennial census no longer uses the long form which elicited detailed demographic data. The American Community Survey (ACS) now assembles such information. In these articles, the figures on the general immigrant population and the place of birth are from the 2005–2009 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates. These estimates are based on sampling surveys conducted over the 5-year period. The ACS also generates 1-year estimates, with the 2010 figures having been released this September. However, because of the small sample size used and the small numbers for Alaska in general, the 5-year estimates are considered a better focus for analysis than the 2010 1-year estimates. Further explanation of the methodology used in the American Community Survey and of the relation of the survey to the general census is available from the Alaska Department

of Labor and Workforce Development (<http://labor.alaska.gov/research/census/>).

The source for the estimates of the unauthorized immigrant population is “Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010,” Jeffrey S. Passell and D’Vera Cohn, Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, February, 2011. The estimates use a multistage estimation process based on the March supplement to the Current Population Survey conducted monthly by the Bureau of the Census. Further information on the methodology can be found at <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1876/unauthorized-immigrant-population-united-states-national-state-trends-2010>.

Figures on the detention of unauthorized immigrants have been derived from Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) data compiled by the Transactional Records Analysis Clearinghouse (TRAC) at Syracuse University (<http://trac.syr.edu>) through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. They are based on transfers among facilities where ICE detainees are held. At the current time it is not possible to obtain state level figures for Alaska directly from ICE except through a FOIA request.

The figures for immigration court—Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR)—have also come from TRAC.

usually comes to the attention of ICE after the individual has been picked up by a law enforcement agency for a matter other than an immigration violation. ICE will then ask the agency to put the individual on immigration hold—detention—for a short period during which the bureau establishes whether the person should be detained formally on an immigration violation. This occurs throughout the state. Between April 2007 and March 2008—the latest period for which data were available when this article was written—facilities in seven communities held one or more ICE detainees for a period of time: Anchorage, Eagle River (Hiland Mountain), Dutch Harbor, Kodiak, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, and Juneau.

If someone is formally detained by ICE in a facility outside the Anchorage area, the individual is usually transferred to an Anchorage Department of Corrections (DOC) facility, although sometimes—particularly from locations in southeast Alaska—the person may be transferred directly to the ICE detention facility in Tacoma. (ICE does not have detention facilities in Alaska. It has interagency service agreements with city jails and DOC facilities around the state that allow for short-term immigration detention. The detention facility in Tacoma is a contract facility operated by a for-profit corporation.)

The transfer to Anchorage is followed in most cases by a transfer to the Seattle area, although at all points of detention, an individual may request to have the detention re-

viewed by an immigration judge. The judge can terminate the case immediately, continue the detention, or release the individual under one of a variety of arrangements, pending disposition of the case in court.

The available data on immigration detention in Alaska are derived from ICE transfer records, which do not track individuals but rather incidents of transfer and nationalities. (See “Note on Data Sources for Immigration Articles.”) Because many detainees are held in more than one facility—resulting in multiple incidents of transfer for one person—it can only be said that the total number of people detained by ICE from April 2007 through March 2008 was no higher than 175 and may have been lower. Most of these individuals passed through Anchorage while in ICE custody and most were eventually transferred to the Seattle area for further processing of their cases. Almost all were men; very few women were detained. (A similar process of transfer to Seattle also used to occur under the INS.) Of the individuals in these 2007–2008 cases, only 58 left ICE detention in Alaska; that is, only 58 of the detainees from this group moved from the custody of ICE while still in Alaska.

Of the 58 detainees, 21 were released on bond pending appearance in immigration court; 13 were deported directly from Alaska; 2 agreed to voluntary departure; 9 were released on orders of recognizance or community supervision; 3 cases were terminated; and 10 were transferred to the custody of the U.S. Marshals Service or another law

enforcement agency. The individuals who received bond or were released on recognizance or under community supervision would have later appeared in immigration court in Anchorage. Those transferred to the custody of a U.S. Marshal or other law enforcement agency may also have eventually appeared before an immigration judge but not necessarily in Alaska. The final disposition of these 2007–2008 cases cannot be determined from the available data.

Immigration Court Proceedings

Immigration cases are heard by judges within the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR), a judicial branch within the Department of Justice—not the Department of Homeland Security. There are around fifty immigration court districts in the country as a whole. The Alaska court is in the Oregon district. A judge travels to Anchorage on a regular schedule to hear Alaska cases.

A respondent in an immigration case is entitled to an attorney, but not at government expense. The government arranges for translation and interpretation. None of the respondents whose cases are heard in Anchorage is in detention at the time the case is heard, although some may have been detained briefly at an earlier point when first apprehended by ICE.

According to current EOIR case data, at the end of July 2011, there were 181 cases

Please see **Enforcement** page 4

Enforcement

(continued from page 3)

pending for the Anchorage court. (Note: EOIR case data cannot be matched with ICE data. The EOIR cases enumerated here are not the ICE cases discussed in the first part of this article. Also, the cases reflect different time periods.) From the beginning of FY 2011 through the end of July, 61 cases had been resolved. (None of these cases involved respondents with a criminal conviction.) Of these, 9 were removals—or deportations; and 11 were voluntary departures. With an official deportation, an individual is barred from returning to the country for a period of years or in some cases, permanently. With a voluntary departure, an individual is required to leave, but is not barred from returning. In 20 cases the judge found no cause for removal and terminated the case. In 18 relief was granted; that is, although there were grounds for removal, the judge found reason under immigration law to permit the individual to remain in the U.S. The decision in three cases was not available, probably due to a lag time in entering data.

One aspect of the immigration law enforcement process that has changed both nationally and for Alaska is the time involved in bringing cases to completion. Immigra-

tion courts face an enormous backlog of cases. Over the last decade there has been a very marked increase in the average number of days from the filing of a case to its final adjudication. In FY 2000, the average time in the Anchorage court was 188 days. (See “Immigration Court in Alaska 1993–2002,” *Alaska Justice Forum*, Spring 2003.) The average number of days to completion for these 61 FY 2011 cases in Anchorage court was 646. This length is undoubtedly at least somewhat related to the fact that the Alaska court is not hearing cases all the time. (One case, with a respondent from Senegal, took 1,300 days; another, with a respondent from Gambia, took 967.) The average for the Seattle court for the same time period in FY 2011 was 484 days, but for the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma, where hearings are also conducted, it was 53 days—one of the lowest averages in the country. Nationally in July 2011, for all EOIR courts, the average time was 490 days and close to 286,000 cases were pending.

The lengths of time from filing with the immigration court to disposition are most troubling for those respondents who are being detained by ICE. As noted above, none of the respondents appearing in immigration court in Anchorage are in detention, but some of those apprehended and detained in Alaska and transferred to Seattle do

continue to be held in detention while their cases make their way through immigration court. Again: it isn’t possible to follow the progress of Alaska cases between ICE data and EOIR, so nothing specific can be stated regarding the length of time in court for Alaska detainees.

The snapshots provided here of ICE and EOIR seem to indicate that the number of unauthorized immigrants who come to the attention of ICE in Alaska continues to be low. There has been no dramatic increase in the number of people detained or the number transferred out of state, although the adjudication of cases has slowed, possibly affecting the lengths of detention for some of those apprehended.

Finally, it should be noted that apprehension and removal of unauthorized immigrants is not the only ICE effort that focuses on foreign nationals within Alaska. As the principal investigative arm of DHS and the second largest investigative agency in the federal government, the agency is also involved with border security efforts, smuggling prevention, human and drug trafficking, and other areas which may be relevant to Alaska but are not discussed in this article.

Antonia Moras is the former editor of the Alaska Justice Forum.

Previous Alaska Justice Forum articles on immigration issues

- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (Winter 1997). “Noncitizens in the Federal Criminal Justice System.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 13(4): 2–6. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/13/4winter1997/b_noncit.html).
- Robin Bronen. (Summer 2003.) “Visa Protections for Immigrant Victims of Crime.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(2): 4–5. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/2summer2003/c_visas.html).
- . (Spring 2003). “Immigration Consequences of Criminal Convictions.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 4–5. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/c_immigcrim.html).
- Antonia Moras. (Fall 2006). “A Look at Immigration Numbers.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 23(3): 3–4. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/23/3fall2006/b_immigration.html).
- . (Fall 1999). “Immigration Court in Alaska: An Overview.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 16(3): 5–7. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/16/3fall1999/b_immig.html).
- Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage. (Summer 2010). “Pro Bono Programs in Alaska.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 27(2): 6–7. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/27/2summer2010/c_probono.html).
- . (Winter 2008). “Non–Citizens in the Alaska Correctional System.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 24(4): 8. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/24/4winter2008/f_noncitizens-akdoc.htm).
- . (Winter 2008). “Immigrants, Refugees and Asylees over the Last Century.” *Alaska Justice Forum* (24)4:6–7. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/24/4winter2008/e_immigration.html).
- . (Spring 2007). “Current Guest Worker Programs.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 24(1): 2–5. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/24/1spring2007/c_guestworkers.html).
- . (Spring 2003). “Reorganization of INS.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 6. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/d_in-sreorg.html).
- . (Spring 2003). “Immigration Court in Alaska 1993–2002.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 2–4. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/b_immigcourt.html).
- . (Spring 2003). “Immigration and Naturalization Operations in Alaska.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 1, 10–12. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/a_immigration.html).
- . (Spring 2003). “Description of an Asylum Case.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 3. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/a_immigration.html).
- . (Spring 2003). “International Students in Alaska.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 11. (<http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/201.spring2003.pdf>).
- . (Spring 2003). “Deportation Cases Involving Criminal Convictions.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 5. (<http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/201.spring2003.pdf>).
- . (Winter 1997). “Noncitizens in Alaska.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 13(4): 6. (<http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/13/4winter1997/134.winter1997.pdf>).
- Myrstol, Brad A. (Spring 2003). “Non–Citizens Among Anchorage Arrestees.” *Alaska Justice Forum* 20(1): 7–10. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/20/1spring2003/e_noncitarest.html).

PACE: A Pilot Project for Probation Violators in Anchorage

PACE—Probation Accountability and Certain Enforcement—is a pilot project for probation violators that was introduced in July 2010 in the Anchorage Superior Court to deal with the more than 100 technical probation violations filed monthly. Probation officers had reported that the current process was not effective and required large amounts of time from the court, probation officers, and defense and prosecution attorneys.

The PACE Project and HOPE Model

The Alaska Judicial Council examined the PACE project and recently released the report, *Anchorage PACE: Probation Accountability with Certain Enforcement: A Preliminary Evaluation of the Anchorage Pilot PACE Project*, which looks at outcomes from July 2010 to June 2011. The Anchorage program is modeled after the Hawaii court probation violation project HOPE—Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Enforcement—instituted in 2004, which has been shown to be effective in reducing recidivism. The goal of the HOPE model is to *deal with each violation quickly and immediately impose a sanction*.

In Anchorage, from July 2010 through February 2011, a total of 79 probationers were assigned to the pilot project. Probationers were required to comply with all conditions of their probation and could not opt out of the program. In PACE, an offender who violated one of the three targeted conditions—a positive drug or alcohol test, failure to appear for a scheduled test, or failure to appear for a meeting with the probation officer—was immediately arrested or had a warrant issued for arrest. A court hearing with a judge, defense and prosecution attorneys, and a probation officer was held within 72 hours, and the offender was typically sentenced to a jail term of two to three days. If there was another violation, the same process was followed. In the case of offenders with multiple violations, the court typically took some additional action. Under normal probation procedure, a petition to revoke probation might not be filed or a hearing held until after several violations were reported. Under PACE, any violation of one of the targeted probation conditions resulted in immediate action by the court.

Focus of the Study

Probationers selected for the pilot program were those identified as being at risk for violating probation, and as having drug or alcohol testing as a probation condition. In addition, selected participants were not on parole or on specialized probation, and did not have any active probation revocation

petitions outstanding. There were 63 PACE participants in the final study: 42 males and 21 females. Of this group, 66 percent were Caucasian, 15 percent were Alaska Native/American Indian, and 19 percent were either Asian-American or Black. The study noted problems with inconsistencies in the reporting of control group data, and lack of data in some instances, and the analysis was done without reference to a control group. Analysis focused on outcomes for the variables listed below during the period three months prior to participation in PACE and during the first three months after entry into the program.

Outcome measurements looked at changes in:

- Number of positive or refused drug tests;
- Number of missed drug tests;
- Number of missed appointments with drug probation officers;
- Number of probation revocations;
- Number of new arrests/charges;
- Number of incarceration days served; and
- Number of positive or failed alcohol tests.

Findings

The evaluation of PACE noted four major findings and compared these to findings of the effectiveness of the HOPE program. The report cautions that the HOPE program data are for a 12-month period while the PACE data are for a 3-month period.

Drug use appeared to drop after beginning PACE. Participants failed 25 percent of 157 drug tests three months prior to enrollment in PACE, and 9 percent of 587 tests during the three months after program enrollment. The HOPE program showed a similar decrease: from 53 percent failed tests prior to program enrollment to 9 percent failed tests after program enrollment.

The majority of PACE participants had no drug test failures during the first three months. After admission to PACE, 59 participants with drug use conditions had no drug test failures—68 percent, while during the three months prior to PACE, 20 percent had no drug test failures.

PACE participants had more recorded probation violations after starting the program—an expected result of PACE. During the three-month period prior to enrollment in PACE, the 63 participants had 40 petitions to revoke probation filed, while during the three-month period after, there were 67 probation filings. Under the PACE program, each violation requires an immediate sanc-

tion. However, under the usual procedure, a petition for revocation of probation would not be filed until there were several violations noted. Therefore, it was anticipated that the number of recorded probation violations would increase.

Not enough data were available to measure other outcomes. The report discussed the difficulties in gathering data to measure other outcomes, including inconsistent recording of information.

The evaluation of PACE was prepared by Teresa W. Carns of the Alaska Judicial Council and Dr. Stephanie Martin of the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER). Their report includes recommendations for:

- Continuing follow-up and more rigorous evaluations of the project;
- Assigning the participant and control groups to selected probation officers able to meticulously record required information;
- Limiting outcome variables to clearly defined, unambiguous measures;
- Providing electronic means to record data rather than dependence on paper files;
- Evaluating the program over a longer period of time that includes follow-up after completion of probation; and
- Including a unique offender identification number common to other state justice information systems to ensure the availability of data on each offender across agencies.

The evaluation also highlighted the way in which all agencies involved worked cooperatively and without additional resources to test the viability of PACE. The full report is on the Alaska Judicial Council website at <http://www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/pace2011.pdf>. An article in the Summer 2010 27(2) issue of the *Alaska Justice Forum* discussed the introduction of the PACE Project at http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/27/2summer2010/e_pilotprojects.html.

Information on the Hawaii State Judiciary's HOPE Probation Program is at <http://www.hopeprobation.org/>.

Faculty Notes

Dr. Marny Rivera has been awarded tenure and promoted to Associate Professor effective July 1, 2011. She has been a member of the Justice faculty since 2007 and teaches courses in research methods, crime and delinquency, and biobehavioral criminology. Her research areas include substance abuse and violence against women. Dr. Rivera holds a Ph.D. in Criminology from Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Alaska's Five-Year Prisoner Reentry Strategic Plan, 2011–2016

The *Five-year Prisoner Reentry Strategic Plan, 2011–2016* released by the Alaska Prisoner Reentry Task Force earlier this year presents a comprehensive overview of the issues surrounding successful prisoner reentry in our state, and makes twelve recommendations for implementation of the plan. The plan is the result of efforts of the Alaska Prisoner Reentry Task Force of the Alaska Criminal Justice Working Group (CJWG) which has the mandate to collaborate on ways to improve Alaska's justice system. The CJWG is co-chaired by Alaska Supreme Court Justice Walter Carpeneti and Attorney General John Burns. The Alaska Judicial Council received funding in 2007 to staff the CJWG which has representatives from executive branch departments, the courts, state agencies, and law enforcement.

Concerns and Statistics

Part I of the report provides information about the Alaska Department of Corrections (DOC) and the work currently being done by DOC and its state and community partners to improve prisoner reentry outcomes. It further outlines the problems and the statistics impacting Alaska and puts the need for prisoner reentry into context. Similar issues are facing all of the states in the country to varying degrees. Alaska is one of eight states in 2009 with the highest prison population growth: one out of 36 Alaskans was incarcerated—versus one out of 90 in 1982—and two out of three prisoners were back in custody within three years of their release. The price of housing prisoners is high, both in money and in human costs. Incarceration in 2009 cost \$136 per day per prisoner or \$49,800 per year. (Note: Total Alaska offender incarcerated population in 2008 was 4,274, and 4,490 in 2009; these figures represent one day end-of-year counts. The recently released DOC 2010

Alaska Offender Profile indicates a total of 4,671 offenders in all state facilities, in-state and out-of-state, plus 5,797 probationers and parolees under state supervision. As of this writing, over 6,000 individuals were in prison, in a community residential center, or on electronic monitoring. The total 2010 Alaska population was 710,231 according to the U.S. Census Bureau population estimates. See Table 1 for 2006–2010 DOC population figures.) There are currently twelve in-state correctional facilities, with Goose Creek Correctional Center scheduled for opening in 2013.

Moreover, prisoners in Alaska have a constitutional and statutory right to rehabilitation, and the state is actively involved in promoting the “principle of reformation [which is] consistent with the public's embrace of community-based rehabilitation over incarceration in the case of nonviolent offenses, and of prison-based rehabilitation over idleness” (page 9 of plan). A number of states are currently examining their justice programs in light of the recent shift from “tough on crime” to “smart on crime.” The plan refers to “Right on Crime,” a conservative initiative that was introduced in 2010, which encourages criminal justice reforms to reduce both crime and costs.

Other major concerns include the high number of misdemeanants who are incarcerated, recidivism, disproportionate minority confinement, and the housing and treatment of mentally-ill and addicted offenders. Ultimately, the plan notes, 95 percent of offenders are released back into their communities. A 2007 Alaska Judicial Council study, *Criminal Recidivism in Alaska*, reported that 66 percent of released prisoners re-offend within 3 years. Offenders cycle in and out of the system. And of the offenders incarcerated, a disproportionate number are Alaska Natives. According to 2008 figures

from the report, although Alaska Natives make up 18 percent of the state population, they represent 36 percent of the prison population. In 2010 that number rose to 37 percent while U.S. Census figures showed Alaska Natives were 15 percent of the state population in that same year. In addition to this disproportionality, there is the issue of Alaska Natives from remote rural communities who are in custody far from their communities, and whose communities lack rehabilitative and reentry services. Another major concern is the housing and treatment of mentally ill and addicted offenders (individuals who are beneficiaries of the Alaska Mental Health Trust). According to a 2006 study sponsored by the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority, 42 percent of individuals in custody were Trust beneficiaries.

Summary of Recommendations

Part II looks at the major issues that need to be addressed, including reentry data and evaluation, housing for newly released prisoners, post-release employment, behavioral health needs, the misdemeanor population, the sex offender population, collateral consequences of conviction, and faith-based prison and reentry support. However, the report clearly states that DOC's mandate does not include reentry support such as housing, employment, or substance abuse treatment; therefore, these necessary services must be provided from other resources.

There are twelve recommendations which are summarized below:

- Continue the collaborative process with state, local agencies, non-profits, local partners and concerned citizens working toward successful prisoner reentry, the reduction of recidivism, and the slowing of the growth of prisons in Alaska.
- Expand DOC's institutional substance abuse treatment programs. Current programs can only serve 1,000 of the more than 5,600 under DOC's jurisdiction.
- Expand probationer accountability by utilizing a model with certain enforcement (PACE). Implement this model with parolees immediately upon release from custody. (See “PACE Pilot Project,” page 5.)
- Expand the electronic monitoring program (EMP) in the Mat-Su Valley. This system currently operates in seven communities in Alaska, has been cost-effective, and has shown reductions in recidivism among participants.
- Improve the state's ability to collect, analyze and disseminate criminal justice data. Recommends exploring possibility of establishing an entity responsible for

Table 1. Total Admissions to Alaska Department of Corrections by Year, 2006–2010

Year	Admissions		Offenders in institution		Probation and parole		Alaska population over 18
	N	Rate*	N	Rate*	N	Rate*	
2006	32,705	667	4,369	89	5,464	111	490,482
2007	33,599	677	4,502	91	5,674	114	496,391
2008	33,674	667	4,274	85	5,813	115	504,864
2009	34,897	680	4,490	87	5,848	114	513,202
2010	36,108	691	4,671	89	5,797	111	522,853

* Rate per 10,000 population, based on Alaska population 18 years old and older.

Source of data: Alaska Department of Corrections, 2008–2010 Offender Profile; American Community Survey population estimates and U.S. Census Bureau

aggregating data across agency lines.

- Improve former prisoners' access to affordable housing. This will include addressing the issue of the amount of affordable and available housing, as well as the need to increase subsidized housing programs.

- Promote, where appropriate, the employment of newly released prisoners and facilitate the creation of job opportunities that will benefit communities. Highlight financial incentives for employers and review institutional educational and training programs.

- Improve the DOC's ability to identify and provide for behavioral health needs of inmates. Implement an electronic medical records system, increase ability of staff to manage services with community providers for the Assess/Plan/Identify/Coordinate (APIC) program and Institutional Discharge Project Plus (IDP+).

- Reduce the number of misdemeanor offenders (misdemeanants) cycling in and

out of jails. A misdemeanant is a person convicted of a crime that carries a sentence of incarceration of one-year or less. The strategic plan refers to a 2009 ISER study that reported 78 percent of DOC's total bookings are for misdemeanor offences. The 2010 DOC Offender Profile indicates that as of December 31, 2010, just over 25 percent of offenders at any one time in institutions were incarcerated for a misdemeanor. The plan recommends examining laws, rules, policies and practices that result in incarcerating individuals who pose no substantial risk to the community; increasing prosecutorial discretion; expanding use of halfway houses; and augmenting therapeutic courts and other problem-solving courts for misdemeanants.

- Expand treatment services and housing option for sex offenders. Determine effectiveness of current sex offender programs, increase programs that are shown to be effective, create a sex offender treatment program for women, and remove counterproductive

residential restrictions on housing.

- By order of the Governor, require all state agencies to inventory and review state employment restrictions regarding criminal offenders, compile baseline data on number of persons and jobs affected and the impact of relief mechanisms.

- Expand state support for DOC chaplaincy program. Expand the mentoring program for chaplains, support development of the Healing Communities model in Alaska, support hiring state-paid chaplains, encourage continued expansion of prison Transformational Living Communities and transitional community residences.

The appendices contain information on current DOC programs and services, a report from the Alaska Court System Therapeutic Court, and a list of the members of the CJWG and the Prisoner Reentry Task Force. The strategic plan clearly outlines goals, challenges, strategies, partners/agencies

Please see *Prison reentry* page 8

Further Reading on Prisoner Reentry and Justice Reinvestment

Listed below are some additional resources related to these topics.

- Alaska Judicial Council. (2007). *Criminal Recidivism in Alaska*. (<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/1-07CriminalRecidivism.pdf>).
- . (2007). "Recidivism in Alaska's Felony Therapeutic Courts." (<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/recidtherct07.pdf>).
- Clement, Marshall; Schwarzfeld, Matthew; Thompson, Michael. (2011). *The National Summit on Justice Reinvestment and Public Safety: Addressing Recidivism, Crime, and Corrections Spending*. (Council of State Governments Justice Center. <http://justicereinvestment.org/summit/report>).
- Council of State Governments. (2011). *National Reentry Resource Center: A Project of the CSG Justice Center*. (<http://www.nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/>).
- . (2011). *Justice Reinvestment: A project of the Council of State Governments Justice Center*. (<http://justicereinvestment.org/>).
- Glaze, Lauren E.; Bonczar, Thomas P.; and Zhang, Fan. (2010). "Probation and Parole in the United States, 2009." *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin*, NCJ 231674. (<http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2233>).
- Justice Policy Institute. (2011). *Due South: Looking to the South for Criminal Justice Innovation*. (<http://www.justicepolicy.org/research/2472>).
- Lawrence, Alison and Lyons, Donna. (2011). *Principles of Effective State Sentencing and Corrections Policy: A Report of the National Conference of State Legislatures Sentencing and Corrections Work Group*. (<http://www.ncsl.org/?TabId=23325>).
- Pew Center on the States. (2008). "Putting Public Safety First: 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry." *Public Safety Policy Brief* No. 7. (http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/report_detail.aspx?id=46538).
- . (2011). *State of Recidivism: The Revolving Door of America's Prisons*. (http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/initiatives_detail.aspx?initiativeID=85899358500).
- . (2011). *Consensus Report of the Arkansas Working Group on Sentencing and Corrections*. (http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/report_detail.aspx?id=85899358042).
- Smart on Crime Coalition. (2011). *Smart on Crime: Recommendations for the Administration and Congress*. (<http://www.besmartoncrime.org/about.php>).
- Texas Public Policy Foundation. (2011). *Right on Crime—The Conservative Case for Reform: Fighting Crime, Prioritizing Victims, and Protecting Taxpayers*. (<http://www.rightoncrime.com/>).
- Urban Institute. *Publications for Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry*. (<http://www.urban.org/center/jpc/returning-home/publications.cfm>).
- Visher, Christy; Debus, Sara; and Yahner, Jennifer. (2008). *Employment after Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releasees in Three States*. Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. (<http://www.urban.org/publications/411778.html>).
- Wartna, B.S.J. and Nijssen, L.T.J. (2006). *National Studies on Recidivism: An Inventory of Large-Scale Recidivism Research in 33 European Countries*. Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Security and Justice, Netherlands. (<http://english.wodc.nl/onderzoeksdatabse/1453a-international-comparisons-of-reconviction-rates.aspx>).
- Wolf, Robert V. (2011). *Roundtable – Reentry Courts: Looking Ahead—A Conversation about Strategies for Offender Reintegration*. Center for Court Innovation and the Bureau of Justice Assistance. (<http://www.courtinnovation.org/research/reentry-courts-looking-ahead-conversation-about-strategies-offender-reintegration>).

Prisoner reentry (continued from page 7)

needed, and action steps required. (However, no fiscal note is attached to the plan.) Most importantly, the plan notes that although the Department of Corrections clearly accepts its leadership role in improving prisoner reentry outcomes, the fulfillment of this goal is a collaborative one that will require Alaska community-wide and legislative support.

Smart Justice Summit

Many of the recommendations of the *Five-Year Prisoner Reentry Strategic Plan* were a significant part of the discussion during the Smart Justice Summit: Identifying New Approaches to Promote Public Safety, Fiscal Responsibility and Criminal Justice Effectiveness hosted by Senator Johnny Ellis (D) and Representative Bryce Edgmon (D) of the Alaska State Legislature on October 3, 2011 in Anchorage. This event brought together representatives from the Alaska Court System—including Supreme Court Justice Walter Carpeneti, the Department of Law, Department of Corrections, and other agency and community stakeholders to look at some of the major issues facing the justice system: the growing number of incarcerated individuals; the rising costs of housing prisoners and building prisons; high recidivism rates; prisoner reentry programs; the incarceration of high numbers of misdemeanants; provision of medical, mental health, and substance treatment services to offenders both while incarcerated and upon reentry; the need for collaboration with all stakeholder agencies and community and

faith-based entities; and data collection and sharing among agencies.

The need for “justice reinvestment” was stressed by guest presenters, Representative Jerry Madden (R-Texas) and Robert Coombs from the Council of State Governments Justice Center (CSGJC). “Justice reinvestment” is defined by the CSGJC as “a data-driven approach to reduce corrections spending and reinvest savings in strategies that can decrease crime and strengthen neighborhoods” (www.justicereinvestment.org). Policymakers, experts, and stakeholders involved in the process move through the following three-phase model: “1) analyze data and develop policy options, 2) adopt new policies and put reinvestment strategies into place [in the justice system], and 3) measure performance.”

Representative Madden has promoted justice reinvestment in his state and this approach has resulted in decreased recidivism and prison costs; he described details of the Texas experience and offered suggestions for implementing a justice reinvestment focus. Robert Coombs, Senior Policy Analyst and Public Affairs Manager for the Council of State Governments Justice Center, works with states in developing their policy and communications plans around these issues, and described offender risk assessment and prioritization strategies. The day-long program looked at the challenges facing the criminal justice system, and participants learned about resources for implementation of approaches to meet these challenges and about possible funding means.

One last point of particular significance: if these challenges are not met, and Alaska’s

prison population continues to grow at its current rate, by 2016 the state will have an insufficient number of prison beds despite the 2013 opening of the new Goose Creek Correctional Center.



Alaska Justice Forum

Editor: Barbara Armstrong
Editorial Board: Allan Barnes, Jason Brandeis, Sharon Chamard, Ron Everett, Cory R. Lepage, Alan McKelvie, Brad Myr Stol, Troy Payne, Deborah Periman, Marny Rivera, André Rosay
Typesetting and Layout: Melissa Green

Justice Center, André Rosay, Director

Published quarterly by the

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1810
(907) 786-7777 fax
ajjust@uaa.alaska.edu
<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/just/>

© 2011 Justice Center,
University of Alaska Anchorage
ISSN 0893-8903

The opinions expressed are those of individual authors and may not be those of the Justice Center.

The University of Alaska provides equal education and employment opportunities for all, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam-era or disabled veteran.

A BJS Report

U.S. State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies Census 2008

The most recent report from the Bureau of Justice Statistics quadrennial “Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2008” shows that there were over 1.1 million persons employed on a full-time basis by state and local law enforcement in this country in 2008. Of that number, about 765,000 were sworn personnel—which is defined as those with general arrest powers.

The report contains data from 17,985 state and local law enforcement agencies with at least one full-time officer or the equivalent in part-time officers, including:

- 12,501 local police departments
- 3,063 sheriffs’ offices
- 50 primary state law enforcement agencies
- 1,733 special jurisdiction agencies

- 683 other agencies, primarily county constable offices in Texas.

There was a slight increase in the number of full-time sworn personnel from 2004 to 2008, with local police departments adding the most officers. Local police departments accounted for 60 percent of the total number of sworn personnel in law enforcement. In 2008 the number of full-time sworn personnel per 100,000 persons in the U.S. was 251: about 1 sworn officer per 400 U.S. residents.

According to the 2008 census, Alaska had 50 state and local law enforcement agencies, with 1,298 sworn personnel—ranking 47th in total number of agencies. There were 42 local police departments with 793 sworn personnel—ranking 45th in total number of local law enforcement agencies. The

Alaska State Troopers, the primary state law enforcement agency, had 274 sworn personnel. BJS reports that in Alaska, there were 189 sworn personnel from state and local enforcement agencies, 115 sworn personnel from local law enforcement, and 40 Alaska State Troopers per 100,000 state residents. (See Table 1.)

Special jurisdiction agencies included 503 four-year education campuses with about 11,000 full-time sworn officers, and 253 two-year education campuses with more than 2,600 sworn officers. Other types of special jurisdictions are public buildings/facilities (e.g., education and medical campuses), natural resources, transportation systems/facilities, criminal investigations, and special enforcement (alcohol/tobacco, narcotics, gaming, racing, and agricultural).

Table 1. State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies and Employees, by State, 2008

	State and local law enforcement agencies			Local police departments			Primary state law enforcement agencies			
	Number of agencies	Sworn personnel		Number of agencies	Sworn personnel		Number	Sworn personnel		Agency name
		Number	Per 100,000 residents		Number	Per 100,000 residents		Per 100,000 residents		
U.S. total	17,985	765,246	251	12,501	461,063	151	60,772	20		
Alabama	417	11,631	249	309	7,314	156	763	16	Alabama Department of Public Safety	
Alaska	50	1,298	189	42	793	115	274	40	Alaska State Troopers	
Arizona	140	14,591	224	96	10,518	162	1,244	19	Arizona Department of Public Safety	
Arkansas	367	6,779	236	252	3,924	137	525	18	Arkansas State Police	
California	509	79,431	217	341	39,692	109	7,202	20	California Highway Patrol	
Colorado	246	12,069	245	165	6,881	139	742	15	Colorado State Patrol	
Connecticut	143	8,281	236	120	6,668	190	1,227	35	Connecticut State Police	
Delaware	50	2,131	243	36	1,188	136	658	75	Delaware State Police	
District of Columbia	4	4,262	722	1	3,742	634	—	—		
Florida	387	46,105	250	270	22,506	122	1,606	9	Florida Highway Patrol	
Georgia	628	26,551	274	366	12,947	134	1,048	11	Georgia Department of Public Safety	
Hawaii	7	3,234	251	4	2,807	218	290	23	Hawaii Department of Public Safety	
Idaho	117	3,146	206	71	1,498	98	264	17	Idaho State Police	
Illinois	877	41,277	321	701	28,358	221	2,105	16	Illinois State Police	
Indiana	482	13,171	206	361	7,881	123	1,315	21	Indiana State Police	
Iowa	392	5,830	195	284	3,284	110	669	22	Iowa Department of Public Safety	
Kansas	371	7,450	266	230	4,191	150	525	19	Kansas Highway Patrol	
Kentucky	389	7,833	183	243	4,713	110	882	21	Kentucky State Police	
Louisiana	348	18,050	405	250	6,318	142	1,215	27	Louisiana State Police	
Maine	146	2,569	195	117	1,592	121	334	25	Maine State Police	
Maryland	142	16,013	283	86	10,494	185	1,440	25	Maryland State Police	
Massachusetts	357	18,342	280	314	13,703	209	2,310	35	Massachusetts State Police	
Michigan	571	19,009	190	455	11,408	114	1,732	17	Michigan State Police	
Minnesota	448	9,667	185	346	5,947	114	530	10	Minnesota State Patrol	
Mississippi	342	7,707	262	220	3,960	135	594	20	Mississippi Highway Safety Patrol	
Missouri	576	14,554	244	430	9,810	165	1,028	17	Missouri State Highway Patrol	
Montana	119	1,950	201	54	802	83	218	23	Montana Highway Patrol	
Nebraska	225	3,765	211	123	2,111	118	491	28	Nebraska State Patrol	
Nevada	76	6,643	254	38	4,497	172	417	16	Nevada Highway Patrol	
New Hampshire	208	2,936	222	187	2,322	176	350	26	New Hampshire State Police	
New Jersey	550	33,704	389	476	21,875	252	3,053	35	New Jersey State Police	
New Mexico	146	5,010	252	89	2,882	145	528	27	New Mexico State Police	
New York	514	66,472	341	391	54,145	278	4,847	25	New York State Police	
North Carolina	504	23,442	254	350	11,933	129	1,827	20	North Carolina State Highway Patrol	
North Dakota	114	1,324	206	54	629	98	139	22	North Dakota Highway Patrol	
Ohio	831	25,992	225	678	16,944	147	1,560	14	Ohio State Highway Patrol	
Oklahoma	481	8,639	237	354	5,538	152	825	23	Oklahoma Department of Public Safety	
Oregon	174	6,695	177	129	3,640	96	596	16	Oregon State Police	
Pennsylvania	1,117	27,413	218	965	19,122	152	4,458	35	Pennsylvania State Police	
Rhode Island	48	2,828	268	39	2,258	214	201	19	Rhode Island State Police	
South Carolina	272	11,674	259	184	4,934	110	967	21	South Carolina Highway Patrol	
South Dakota	155	1,636	203	80	900	112	152	19	South Dakota Highway Patrol	
Tennessee	375	15,976	256	251	8,620	138	942	15	Tennessee Department of Safety	
Texas	1,913	59,219	244	788	34,610	142	3,529	15	Texas Department of Public Safety	
Utah	136	4,782	175	90	2,653	97	475	17	Utah Department of Public Safety	
Vermont	69	1,103	178	50	587	95	307	49	Vermont State Police	
Virginia	340	22,848	293	171	10,947	140	1,873	24	Virginia State Police	
Washington	260	11,411	174	204	6,635	101	1,132	17	Washington State Patrol	
West Virginia	233	3,382	186	159	1,427	79	667	37	West Virginia State Police	
Wisconsin	529	13,730	244	429	8,171	145	492	9	Wisconsin State Patrol	
Wyoming	90	1,691	317	58	744	140	204	38	Wyoming Highway Patrol	

Note: Excludes agencies employing less than 1 full-time officer or the equivalent in part-time officers.

Source of data: Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2008," NCJ 233982

A Brief Look at VPSOs and Violence Against Women Cases

The Alaska Senate Judiciary Committee issued recommendations in 2009 to reduce sexual assault in Alaska. That same year, Alaska Governor Sean Parnell proposed a 10-year initiative to end the epidemic of domestic violence and sexual assault in this state. Both recommended increasing the number of Village Public Safety Officers (VPSOs) in rural Alaska to assist in dealing with domestic violence and sexual assault crimes, as well as other public safety concerns. Earlier this year, U.S. Senator Mark Begich (D) introduced the Alaska Safe Families and Villages Act of 2011 which would provide additional funding for local law enforcement personnel in rural Alaska.

This article looks at a study of sexual assault and sexual assault of a minor cases reported to Alaska State Troopers in 2003 and 2004 when the first responder was a local paraprofessional police officer—a Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO), Village Police Officer (VPO), or Tribal Police Officer (TPO).

VPSOs, VPOs And TPOs

The Village Public Safety Officer Program began formally in 1981 and provides state funding for public safety services at the local level in rural Alaskan communities. The program was established to “reduce the loss of life due to fires, drowning, lost per-

son, and the lack of immediate emergency medical assistance in rural communities” (Alaska Department of Public Safety, <http://www.dps.state.ak.us/ast/vpso/default.aspx>). Since then, Village Public Safety Officers have become essential first responders in rural Alaska, along with Village Police Officers and Tribal Police Officers. These three types of local paraprofessional police differ in the level of training they receive and their funding sources. In general, Village Public Safety Officers (VPSOs) receive more state training than the other two categories of local paraprofessional police.

The Alaska Department of Public Safety hired 27 Village Public Safety Officers in 2010 and 17 more from January through September 2011. As of August 31, 2011, there were 101 funded VPSO positions and 86 filled VPSO positions in 74 rural communities. As of that same date, there were a total of 109 Village Police Officers (VPOs) and Tribal Police Officers (TPOs) in 52 communities.


There is no law enforcement officer in the 91 communities that currently have populations of less than 50 residents. Forty-three rural communities have at least one Alaska Wildlife Trooper or Alaska State Trooper in residence while statewide 40 communities have a municipal police department. Sixty-nine communities are

patrolled by Alaska State Troopers or a municipal police department, but do not have a resident law enforcement officer. In some instances, a community may have both a municipal police department and an Alaska Wildlife Trooper or Alaska State Trooper post; these communities include Bethel, Cordova, Craig, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Galena, Haines, Juneau, Ketchikan, King Salmon, Klawock, Kodiak, Kotzebue, Nome, Palmer, Petersburg, Seward, Sitka, Soldotna, Unalaska/Dutch Harbor, Valdez, Wasilla. (These figures reflect rural law enforcement staffing as of August 31, 2011; changes in staffing may have occurred since that time.)

As first responders, Village Public Safety Officers assist Alaska State Troopers—and they make a difference. Previous Justice Center studies have found that sexual assault cases with adult victims that were originally reported to local paraprofessional police were 3.5 times more likely to be prosecuted than sexual assault cases originally reported directly to State Troopers (Wood, Rosay, Postle, and TePas, 2007). Another study by Wood and Gruenewald (2006) found that villages with a local paraprofessional police presence had rates of serious injury caused by assault that were 40 percent less than those villages without a local paraprofessional police presence.

Figure 1. Probability of Referral


Probability that cases reported to the Alaska State Troopers were referred to the Alaska Department of Law, with and without a local paraprofessional (LP) as first responder.



Note: N = 300 sexual assault cases, 338 sexual abuse of minor cases, and 1,095 assault cases involving domestic violence reported to Alaska State Troopers.

Figure 2. Probability of Acceptance

Probability that cases referred by the Alaska State Troopers to the Alaska Department of Law were accepted for prosecution, with and without a local paraprofessional (LP) as first responder.



Note: N = 194 sexual assault cases, 192 sexual abuse of minor cases, and 873 assault cases involving domestic violence referred to Alaska Department of Law by Alaska State Troopers.

Study Results

Following are key results from a study funded in 2005 by the National Institute of Justice and conducted in partnership with the Alaska State Troopers and the Alaska Department of Law. The results below apply only to offenses reported to Alaska State Troopers (and exclude all offenses reported to other local or municipal law enforcement agencies).

We examined 300 sexual assault and 338 sexual abuse of minor cases that included one victim and one adult suspect, and 1,095 assault cases involving domestic violence that included one victim and one suspect (for this analysis, cases with multiple suspects or multiple victims were excluded). The sexual assault and sexual abuse of minor cases were reported to Alaska State Troopers in 2003 and 2004. The assault cases involving domestic violence were reported to Alaska State Troopers in 2004. From the Alaska State Trooper reports, we examined whether the first responder was a local paraprofessional police officer (i.e., a Village Public Safety Officer, Village Police Officer, or Tribal Police Officer). In the vast majority of cases, a Village Public Safety Officer was the first responder. From the Alaska Department of Law records, we examined whether cases were referred for prosecution, whether cases were accepted for prosecution, and whether cases resulted in a conviction.

Figure 1 shows the probability of referral for cases reported to Alaska State Troopers. Overall, local paraprofessional police significantly increased the probability of referral for sexual assault cases, had no impact on the probability of referral for prosecution of sexual abuse of a minor cases, and decreased the probability of referral for prosecution for assault cases involving domestic violence. (Cases are referred by the Alaska State Troopers to the Alaska Department of Law.)

Figure 2 shows the probability of acceptance for cases that were referred for prosecution. For all three offenses (sexual assault, sexual abuse of minor, and assault involving domestic violence), local paraprofessional police significantly increased the probability that cases would be accepted for prosecution. When the first responder was a local paraprofessional police officer, the probability that a case would be accepted for prosecution increased significantly in sexual assault cases and in sexual abuse of minor cases. The probability increased less in assault cases involving domestic violence. (Cases are accepted for prosecution by the Alaska Department of Law.)

Figure 3 shows the probability of con-

viction for cases that had been accepted for prosecution. Local paraprofessional police did not impact the probability of conviction in sexual assault cases, but significantly increased the probability of conviction in sexual abuse of minor cases and in assault cases involving domestic violence. Cases that resulted in a conviction may have been plea bargained to reduce charges.


Research for this article was compiled by André Rosay, Justice Center Director; Marny Rivera, Justice Center Associate Professor; and Barbara Armstrong, Alaska Justice Forum editor.

This project was supported by Grant No. 2005-WG-BX-0011

awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this

Figure 3. Probability of Conviction

Probability that cases accepted for prosecution by the Alaska Department of Law resulted in conviction, with and without a local paraprofessional (LP) as first responder.



Note: N = 119 sexual assault cases, 109 sexual abuse of minor cases, and 748 assault cases involving domestic violence accepted by Alaska Department of Law. Convictions include guilty pleas on reduced charges.

document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

More Reading on VPSOs

- Carns, Teresa W. (Fall 1993). "A Picture of Rural Justice: Alaska Judicial Council Studies." *Alaska Justice Forum* 10(3):1, 4-5. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/10/3fall1993/103_fall1993.pdf)
- Justice Center, University of Alaska. (Summer 2000). "Alaska VPSO Program: Some Facts." *Alaska Justice Forum* 17(2):4. http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/rlinks/lawenforcement/ak_vpso.html
- Messick, James. (June 1979). "Village Safety Officer Program." *Alaska Justice Forum* 3(6): 1, 6-10. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/03/6jun1979/a_vpso.html)
- Rivera, Marny; Rosay, André B.; Wood, Darryl S.; and TePas, Katherine. (Fall 2009). "Predicting Legal Resolutions in Domestic Violence Cases." *Alaska Justice Forum* 26(3):1, 8-12. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/26/3fall2009/a_dvrez.html)
- Roberts, Justin. (Winter 2005). "Studies, Reports, and Documents Relevant to the VPSO Program." *Alaska Justice Forum* 21(4):6-7. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/21/4winter2005/d_ypsobib.html)
- Trostle, Lawrence; McShea, Darren; and Perras, Russell. (Winter 1992). "The Nonenforcement Role of the VPSO." *Alaska Justice Forum* 8(4)1, 9-12. http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/08/4winter1992/a_vpso.html
- Wood, Darryl S. (Summer 2000). "Officer Turnover in the Village Public Safety Officer Program." *Alaska Justice Forum* 17(2)1, 4-7. (http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/17/2summer2000/a_vpso.html)
- Wood, Darryl S. and Gruenewald, Paul J. (Mar 2006). "Local Alcohol Prohibition, Police Presence and Serious Injury in Isolated Alaska Native Villages." *Addiction* 101: 393-403. (<http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/research/articles/0426dsw-localalcohol.html> [abstract]).
- Wood, Darryl S.; Rosay, André; Postle, Greg; TePas, Katherine. (November, 2007). "Effect of Local Police Presence on the Prosecution of Violence Against Women." Conference paper presented at the 59th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology in Atlanta.



Alaska Justice Forum
Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508

Return service requested

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Anchorage, Alaska
Permit No. 107

Recent Justice Center Faculty Publications

Following is a list with links of recent publications by Justice faculty. Information on these publications first appeared in the Justice Center blog at <http://uaajusticecenter.blogspot.com/>.

“Police Presence, Isolation, and Sexual Assault Prosecution” (<http://cjp.sagepub.com/content/22/3/330>) by Dr. Darryl Wood, affiliate Justice faculty and Assistant Professor with Washington State University, Vancouver; Dr. André Rosay, Justice Center Director; Greg Postle, graduate student at the University of Delaware; and Katherine TePas, Special Assistant to Alaska Governor Sean Parnell, was published in *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 22(3), September 2011. The article considers the effects of geographic isolation and local police presence on the processing of 230 sexual assault cases reported to the Alaska State Troopers.

“College Student Perceptions of Criminal Justice Responses to Stalking” (<http://www.springerlink.com/content/p400884q360r8n03/fulltext.pdf>) by Dr. André Rosay, Justice Center Director, with former graduate student Dr. Amy Cass, now an Assistant Professor at California State University, Fullerton, appeared in the journal *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*. The research shows that victims’ gender and their relationship to perpetrators impact college students’ perceptions of criminal justice system responses to stalking.

The Predictive Validity of Marijuana Odor Detection (<http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/research/2010/1110.01.ast.marijua->

na/1110.01.marijuana.pdf) by Dr. Brad Myrstol and Prof. Jason Brandeis, J.D., was released in summer 2011. The report was commissioned by the Alaska State Troopers.

“In Search of Respect: Examining Arrestee Satisfaction with Police,” (<http://www.springerlink.com/content/j564230t-33p45154/fulltext.pdf>) by Dr. Brad Myrstol with Shila René Hawk-Tourtelot of Georgia State University, Department of Criminal Justice, was published online in June 2011 in the *American Journal of Criminal Justice* (<http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/criminology/journal/12103>). This version of the article is available as part of SpringerLink’s “Online First” service. The print publication will appear later in 2011.

Dr. Brad Myrstol and Dr. Kevin Fitzpatrick of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, co-authored “The Jailing of America’s Homeless: Evaluating the Rabble Management Thesis” now appears in *Crime & Delinquency* 57(2), March 2011 (<http://cad.sagepub.com/content/57/2/271.abstract>). The article was originally published online in 2008 with Sage Publications while Dr. Myrstol was a faculty member at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (<http://cad.sagepub.com/content/early/2008/08/25/0011128708322941.full.pdf>).

Dr. Brad Myrstol is also the author

of a paper “Demonstrating the Utility of ADAM’s Drug Use Calendar Data: A Group-based Trajectory Analysis of Crack Cocaine Use Among Adult Male Arrestees,” and slide presentation, “Arrestee’s Drug Use Trajectories: Using the ADAM Drug Use Calendar to Model Patterns of Illicit Drug Use,” both published on the National Institute of Justice website in early 2011 (<http://search.usa.gov/search?query=myrstol&affiliate=nationalinstituteofjustice&x=8&y=11>). The paper is part of the proceedings of National Institute of Justice 2010 planning meetings focusing on “Improving Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Data Collection.”

An article by Dr. Ron Everett and Prof. Deb Periman, J.D., “The Governor’s Court of Last ‘Resort’: An Introduction to Executive Clemency in Alaska,” appeared in the June 2011 the *Alaska Law Review* (<http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/alr/>). The article provides an overview of the history of clemency from antiquity to the present and traces the development of clemency in the United States. The major focus is the evolution of clemency in the Alaska Territory, its use since Alaska statehood, policy changes, problems related to the clemency process, and clemency’s impact on the successful reentry of offenders into society.