

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE JUDICIARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

January 30, 2009

1:44 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jay Ramras, Chair
Representative Nancy Dahlstrom, Vice Chair
Representative John Coghill
Representative Carl Gatto
Representative Bob Lynn
Representative Max Gruenberg
Representative Lindsey Holmes

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

OVERVIEW(S): DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

- HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

No previous action to record

WITNESS REGISTER

SAMUEL EDWARDS, Deputy Commissioner
Office of the Commissioner - Anchorage
Department of Corrections (DOC)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided an overview of the Department of Corrections (DOC).

BRYAN BRANDENBURG, Deputy Director
Division of Institutions
Department of Corrections (DOC)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During overview of the Department of Corrections, answered questions.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[1:44:24 PM](#)

CHAIR JAY RAMRAS called the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:44 p.m. Representatives Ramras, Gatto, Holmes, and Coghill were present at the call to order. Representatives Lynn, Gruenberg, and Dahlstrom arrived as the meeting was in progress.

OVERVIEW(S): DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

[1:44:46 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS indicated that the only order of business would be the overview by the Department of Corrections (DOC). He then made note of the decline in the incarcerated population and applauded all arms of DOC, law enforcement, and the court system for that decline.

[1:45:50 PM](#)

SAMUEL EDWARDS, Deputy Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner - Anchorage, Department of Corrections (DOC), relayed that his overview will compare where DOC was in the past to where it is today. In January 2007, the mission statement for DOC was to protect the public by incarcerating and supervising prisoners. However, that mission statement has since been altered to specify that DOC seeks to enhance the safety of Alaska's communities, provide secure confinement, reformative programs, and a process of supervised community reintegration. The aforementioned change in the mission statement was an attempt to address the department's largest problem, recidivism. He related that DOC has been a relatively stable department, staff wise, in the first two years [of the Palin Administration].

MR. EDWARDS highlighted that Alaska is one of only six states that is unified, which means that DOC operates the jails and the prisons. Nationwide, most corrections departments deal with sentenced felons in a prison environment. In state there are 12 correctional institutions with a total population capacity of 3,604 general beds and 3,715 maximum capacity beds. The aforementioned represents actual beds and is an increase of 500 beds from what was reported to the committee [in the prior administration]. Approximately, 130 of those beds are located in the gymnasium in Fairbanks and the Anchorage Complex West.

[1:50:02 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS clarified that when [the Palin Administration] arrived the population in the institutions was at 108 percent of capacity and was as high as 117 percent at one point. Using the old [bed] numbers, today [the population] would be at 102 percent [of capacity]. However, under the new numbers [the population] is at 93 percent of capacity. Although it might sound as though there are extra beds in the institutions, that's not the case. He acknowledged that there are a few beds available in all the facilities.

[1:51:14 PM](#)

[Members briefly listed the DOC facilities they've had an opportunity to tour.]

CHAIR RAMRAS inquired as to how DOC counts beds and heads in a typical correctional facility, such as the Fairbanks gymnasium that has 90 temporary beds, "boats."

[1:53:41 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS explained that prior to January 2007, in Fairbanks, the department counted the design-capacity beds in the institution without counting the beds in the gymnasium for a total of 226 beds. Under the [Palin Administration] the existing 90 beds in the gymnasium were counted as over the operational capacity of the institution. He explained that DOC then counted all real beds, not "boats," but that still included two gymnasiums. One of those gymnasiums was in Fairbanks and accounted for 90 beds, which was added to the aforementioned capacity. When those 90 beds are removed from the count, which is the intention within the next couple of months, the capacity in Fairbanks will be reduced by 90. Mr. Edwards specified that every real bed in any of the 12 facilities was added and is part of the capacity of the institution. Therefore, when department staff say, "We're at 100 percent departmentally." that means there is a real bed for every person in those institutions without those people being placed in a "boat."

[1:55:37 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS, in response to Chair Ramras, clarified that the 108 percent was departmentwide, and therefore Fairbanks would have to be reviewed individually with regard to its excess capacity.

CHAIR RAMRAS surmised, then, that the current 93 percent doesn't include the temporary bed facilities. Therefore, it's been a significant real reduction.

MR. EDWARDS replied yes.

[1:56:23 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO questioned whether a facility can "cap out" its space because there isn't enough kitchen space or is capacity always defined by where a bed can be placed.

MR. EDWARDS confirmed that facilities can "cap out" because the kitchen, medical, maintenance, or laundry facility isn't able to support more people not because there isn't more space for beds.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO interjected that the capacity of fire exits could also be a limitation.

MR. EDWARDS concurred, adding that there are also limits related to personal space as well as ratios at which it isn't efficient or safe to operate. In further response to Representative Gatto, Mr. Edwards explained that the American Correctional Association accreditation process specifies how much space is necessary for various things such as per prisoner, plumbing fixtures, day room space, and etcetera.

[1:58:51 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS turned attention to the Anchorage Complex, which has a design capacity of 852, although it has consistently reached to 1,000 in the past. However, today the Anchorage Complex is 15 beds under its capacity. The aforementioned was a major accomplishment as it evaluated that situation and moved people to balance institutions.

[2:00:02 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS asked Mr. Edwards to comment about what occurs to those who are incarcerated and the corrections officers when the facility populations are better managed.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL then asked to hear about the movement of prisoners, noting that a pre-trial facility has a very different movement of prisoners than do other facilities.

[2:01:14 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS surmised that in any correctional facility, regardless of whether it is a pre-trial or sentence facility, as long as there is sufficient room for prisoners to [have adequate personal space] and common space for various activities, the more relaxed the population. The more crowded a facility, the more tense the atmosphere. The aforementioned applies to the staff as well. Mr. Edwards explained that DOC has attempted to gain more space by moving people from the Anchorage Complex who are pre-trial and place them in an in-take facility. However, when capacity in an in-take facility is exceeded, those who are of less risk or have court dates in the future are identified and moved to another facility in order to not overcrowd the Anchorage Complex. Mr. Edwards then mentioned that more correctional officers, a total of 769, are on staff plus 11 staff with start dates in the first part of February, which will then bring the total to 780.

[2:04:12 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS, in response to Chair Ramras, clarified that correctional officers and probation officers are not included in the hiring freeze announced by the administration. He confirmed that the aforementioned means that if employees are lost, the department can recruit and replace those employees.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL noted that one issue that has arisen in the past is in regard to how to allow prisons that don't have pre-trial [capabilities] to continue a contiguous program of recovery. He surmised that when capacity is reached and pre-trial individuals are brought in another morale issue with the inmates and the officers occurs. He asked if the aforementioned is a correct assumption. He also asked if there is some way to work with the aforementioned situation.

MR. EDWARDS concurred that when a short-term person is moved into a long-term sentence facility, that pre-trial person isn't settled. Therefore, pre-trial individuals aren't able to get involved in any long-term program that may be available. For the long-term prisoners in the facility, they have to become accustomed to those who are coming and going. That's certainly disruptive, he remarked.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL related his understanding that long-term prisoners would be bumped throughout the state due to crowding related to pre-trial individuals. He recalled hearing complaints that those [long-term prisoners who are bumped

throughout the state] aren't able to complete programs that would've provided them credit on their sentence for good time.

[2:06:47 PM](#)

BRYAN BRANDENBURG, Deputy Director, Division of Institutions, Department of Corrections (DOC), said Representative Coghill's understanding has been true in the past. However, due to the current administration, and in part thanks to legislative funding, there will be five different short-term three-month long intensive outpatient substance abuse programs in place by the end of February. The aforementioned programs are level two programs, which meet court requirements. He noted that within [the aforementioned programs] there is a court-approved anger management program. Those programs along with existing long-term level three programs would seem to allow the opportunity for more of the state's inmates to complete and obtain [good time] credit from those programs.

CHAIR RAMRAS recalled reading in a Fairbanks newspaper that because of overcrowding the prison chapel had been moved, made smaller. He expressed the importance of the option of a faith-based program for inmates. Chair Ramras then recalled a meeting in Fairbanks with some Alaska Natives who were very concerned with regard to cultural events and the ability to receive unique cultural foods in the prisons, particularly in the Arizona prison. He requested that Mr. Edwards address the aforementioned at the appropriate time.

[2:10:13 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES requested an update on the use of electronic monitoring devices and whether that's helping with the overcrowding issue.

MR. EDWARDS recalled that in January 2007, electronic monitoring numbers statewide totaled about 194. Within the first year of the administration, the staff involved in the electronic monitoring program was evaluated, specifically in the Anchorage area. He further recalled that there were five correctional officers in addition to the compliment of probation officers who staffed that unit. The correctional officers were on loan, so to speak, from the [Anchorage] Correctional Complex. At the time the [Anchorage] Correctional Complex was understaffed and using a lot of overtime. The [five correctional officers on loan] were returned to the [Anchorage Correctional Complex], after which there was a corresponding drop in the use of

electronic monitoring for months. The department sought answers from the electronic monitoring staff with regard to why there was a drop in use and how use could be increased.

MR. EDWARDS then reminded members that House Bill 90 also had an impact on the use of electronic monitoring because those [not using electronic monitoring] who serve time in a halfway house or some other 24-hour facility receive good time for the time served. However, those who used electronic monitoring would not receive good time for the time served. Still, some were willing to use electronic monitoring because they could live at home, and there was practically no disruption of work and family life. The use of electronic monitoring today totals 184-200, which is close to the level prior to the aforementioned two occurrences.

2:14:15 PM

CHAIR RAMRAS questioned whether gang activity is occurring in DOC facilities. He then requested that Mr. Edwards discuss drugs and contraband inside the facilities as well as what it would mean to offer death row accommodations. Chair Ramras informed everyone that the House Judiciary Standing Committee would introduce legislation regarding obscuring personal information, including correctional officers' home address, in an attempt to provide an additional layer of safety for correctional officers.

2:15:58 PM

REPRESENTATIVE DAHLSTROM inquired as to whether the accreditation standards, space and activities, are different depending upon the prisoner's sentence.

CHAIR RAMRAS relayed that the committee is mainly interested in the policies held by DOC rather than a statistical inventory. The committee, he said, is interested in what it can do to enhance the department's policy initiatives.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNN interjected interest in hearing any change in policy suggestions that might help the department address any problems.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO asked whether the Arizona prison population is included in Mr. Edward's statistics.

MR. EDWARDS said that Arizona's population figures are included in the overall counts of things such as furlough, halfway house

participation, and recidivism. However, Arizona's population figures wouldn't be included in the capacity percentages. Any statistics regarding programming or supervision once [inmates are] released is the same for Arizona's population as that for the population in Alaska.

[2:19:12 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS, continuing his presentation, informed the committee that DOC has received authority and funding for three temporary houses in the Palmer Correctional Center. Those were to have 19 beds each. All are completed and the third house will come on line February 1, 2009. The aforementioned provides an additional 57 [beds]. In Fairbanks, space was reconfigured and ultimately will provide 38 more beds that should be on line within the next two months. He highlighted that the additional beds in Anchorage will be permanent beds that won't be removed at a later date.

MR. EDWARDS remarked that the institutions receive most of the attention because those are the 24-hour facilities to which the majority of the budget is directed. He then noted that there has been significant interest in the Division of Probation and Parole, which has historically experienced difficulty filling all the probation officer vacancies. However, at this point every probation officer position in the division has been filled with the funding available.

[2:21:28 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS relayed that there were 240 fewer revocations on the streets in 2008 than in 2007, due in part to the increased number of probation officers. [More staff] allow officers the ability to deal with their caseloads versus when there were vacancies in their offices. Mr. Edwards also attributed the reduction to education of the officers that one way to protect the public is to work [offenders] through [the system] so as not to have to re-incarcerate individuals. He then turned to the benefit of transitioning a prisoner from a prison/jail setting through a community residential center prior to that prisoner's release. Prior to the [Palin Administration] there were 614 residential community residential beds throughout the state whereas today there are 753 such beds. He highlighted the ability to fill those beds on any given day whereas at [the onset of the current administration] there were empty beds, even at the reduced numbers of beds.

[2:23:33 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS moved on to the facility in Arizona. He related that when [the Palin Administration] began there were 1,060 prisoners in the Red Rock facility in Arizona. Today, there are a bit over 880 prisoners in that facility, with funding for 900.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO asked whether Arizona is still receptive to receiving Alaskan inmates.

MR. EDWARDS relayed that Arizona's Department of Corrections and governor are currently discussing what types of prisoners it's willing to accept. He acknowledged that although there aren't limitations currently, there may be in the future. In further response to Representative Gatto, Mr. Edwards said that he receives information from the company in Arizona, Corrections Corporation of America, from which the department leases beds.

[2:26:19 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES asked whether DOC has a position as to whether it would prefer to have enough beds in the state so that all of Alaska's prisoners would be housed in the state or is that uneconomic.

MR. EDWARDS reminded the committee that when [the Palin Administration] arrived there was already a plan in place to bring all the prisoners being housed out-of-state back to Alaska. Although that plan has a reduced scope, it remains in place.

[2:27:34 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS, continuing his presentation, relayed that by the end of this fiscal year DOC hopes to bring 68 more beds on line at the Wildwood Correctional Center in Kenai. He explained that it would be a minimum work release facility that would house lower risk, minimum custody prisoners while serving a furlough function for Anchorage as well. Presently, there's not the ability to furlough an individual in the Kenai area, and therefore those who are eligible to leave the facility in furlough are sent to Anchorage, which doesn't provide the opportunity for such individuals to look for housing and employment in the community in which they plan on living.

[2:29:01 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS complimented Mr. Edwards on the ability to tweak the system around the 12 facilities in a manner that provides relief. He then related his understanding that DOC is trying to keep people in Kenai so that they can find their way back to work. Furthermore, it seems that electronic monitoring is being used in a successful manner that is good for the population and the public.

MR. EDWARDS noted that DOC has an experienced team that knows the facilities and the issues in the facilities.

[2:32:37 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS related that the commissioner reviewed staff, what they were budgeted for, and that each position was located in the appropriate area. The aforementioned has been done, whereas the department is still reviewing the function and the type of person being supervised continues. He opined that the hope is for a continual positive impact on safety, re-entry, and the recidivism rate. The aforementioned is accomplished, he opined, by placing individuals in the appropriate facilities to take advantage of the appropriate programs to prepare themselves for an upcoming release.

[2:34:12 PM](#)

[Chair Ramras passed the gavel over to Vice Chair Dahlstrom.]

MR. EDWARDS recalled hearing a probation officer who spoke about probation supervision in the field. That probation officer said that the population could be broken down into thirds, one third of which will succeed regardless of what occurs in the system, while another third likely wouldn't succeed regardless of the system, and the one third in the middle is the population to which DOC should focus the majority of its resource. The third in the middle, this probation officer relayed, is the group through which the 66 percent national recidivism rate could be addressed.

[2:35:20 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES inquired as to how difficult it is to identify each third of the incarcerated population.

MR. BRANDENBURG replied that [the department] is in the process of reviewing its classification system, which is about 20 years old and tends to over classify the population. Therefore, the

desire is to find a way to review that classification system such that it allows identification of those who are at higher risk as well as those who are at lower risk. He specified that research indicates that only 11 percent of the lower third of the incarcerated population will recidivate, which is fairly low when viewed in the context of existing trends. The middle third, which is the group upon which to focus resources, recidivates at a rate of 15-45 percent, he related. The upper end population consists of the long-term inmates for which research says that resources spent on this population tend to make them better criminals. A tool that the department is reviewing for use is the level of service inventory (LSIR), which provides a risk and needs assessment for each individual. The department is performing pilot studies with LSIR in order to determine whether it would be useful as a sentence and custody tool to determine in which programs the person should be involved.

[2:38:05 PM](#)

MR. BRANDENBURG, in response to an earlier question, related that 80 percent of the [incarcerated] population will be released from prison. Only 20 percent of the population will remain incarcerated and the longer term inmates are housed at the Red Rock and Spring Creek facilities. The housing for the aforementioned inmates isn't that different than the rest of the population. Because so many of the inmates will be released, the department has begun to develop some re-entry programs within the halfway house as well as the facilities to help enhance the opportunities for the inmates once they leave the facilities. The focus is on job skills, education, treatment, housing, sobriety support groups, and reunification with families in an effort to ensure that those inmates don't return. All of the aforementioned is in its infancy, and just recently a pilot project was started at Spring Creek in which re-entry and transitions are the focus.

[2:39:39 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES expressed appreciation that DOC is placing an emphasis on re-entry and recidivism.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO questioned whether there as been a study to determine whether sending a prisoner to Arizona, compared with keeping the prisoner in Alaska, has an influence on the recidivism rates.

MR. BRANDENBURG said no such study to differentiate between the populations in Arizona versus in Alaska has been conducted. However, he pointed out that there are studies that discuss visitation and the impact it has on recidivism. The finding is that in populations in which inmates have contact with their families, there tends to be a lower recidivism rate. He offered to make a copy of the aforementioned study available to the committee.

MR. EDWARDS pointed out that due to the size of our state, the reality is that a prisoner from rural Alaska who is sent to a facility in Alaska but outside their hometown/region isn't much more likely than those prisoners sent to Arizona to receive visitation by family members. Still, the courts are reviewing the visitation aspect in relation to whether the state can send inmates to Arizona. If it's determined that consideration has to be given regarding whether an inmate has the possibility of visitation, such would impact rehabilitation as well as the ability to manage the population.

[2:42:34 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO questioned whether a certain amount of visitation from members of the clergy, the Salvation Army, or college students would count. He asked if the aforementioned visitors would be considered the same as family visitors.

MR. EDWARDS answered that the aforementioned visitation is very important in helping a person adjust. However, in the instances in which the court was reviewing visitation it was specific to family visitation.

[2:43:26 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS reminded the committee that when DOC was before it last it had a project related to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements regarding self-contained breathing apparatus in the institutions. The department decided to keep the self-contained breathing apparatus in the facilities as they are a valuable tool. However, he clarified that the department wasn't asking its staff to be firefighters, without training, or perform rescue efforts. Still, the department felt the apparatus would be important to have during the process of evacuating facilities. Mr. Edwards related his understanding that the department could proceed with the apparatus and the FIT testing process. The equipment to perform the FIT testing should be available by the

end of this month or early February and should begin in the institutions in February as well.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL inquired as to what the department is requiring of its staff and what investments the department is making in those areas in terms of workforce development.

MR. EDWARDS explained that the department went to the National Institute of Corrections to receive help in identifying leadership training programs in which the staff could become involved at mid-level, senior-level, and executive-level training. The mid-level training was completed and 23 individuals graduated from that program. Aside from creating a more valuable employee in the department and preparing employees for advancement, the department identified projects of interest to the department for the employees to research during the training. The issues staff worked on included health and diet for the institutions, the information technology program, the classification process, as well as facility expansion. While the staff performed the aforementioned research, they formed networks that should last several years and provide knowledge as to the various aspects of the department. Therefore, there would be people who would be ready to fill [higher level] positions as needed. For the first time in many years, [the department] has its own correctional academy. Mr. Edwards noted that the department has ran more correctional and probation officer academies than in the past because more staff has been hired. Even more staff will be brought on as the prison in Point Mackenzie is closer to completion.

2:50:00 PM

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL noted that there has been discussion regarding control of contagious diseases and keeping officers safe. He acknowledged that a significant portion of the incarcerated population have mental health issues. He asked therefore, whether there is good council for staff who aren't trained in mental health issues. He further asked if there is staff who helps navigate those incoming inmates who [have mental health issues].

2:51:10 PM

MR. BRANDENBURG explained that every inmate receives a screening within the first 24 hours of admission and prior to being placed in the open population. That screening includes a mental health assessment. He informed the committee that nine of the

facilities have mental health clinicians who are on staff during the week to receive referrals and perform assessments. If necessary, telecommunication with the psychiatrist at the central office can be utilized. Furthermore, the acute psychiatric unit is located at the Cook Inlet facility, which is basically an inpatient hospital for the more severe cases. There are also mental health staff and a mental health director who provide ongoing training for correctional officers in order that they can be aware of and recognize the signs and symptoms of mental illness and make referrals as appropriate.

[2:52:59 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS noted that training new correctional and probation officers is still a challenge, but has been helped with the department's own correctional academy. With regard to training and retention, Mr. Edwards opined that the management and leadership training for which the department has partnered with the National Institute of Corrections will pay dividends in the long term.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL recalled the debate over 8-hour shifts as compared to 12-hour shifts, which is a significant morale and pay issue not to mention that it's a cost issue for the department. He requested discussion on the aforementioned.

[2:54:05 PM](#)

MR. BRANDENBURG opined that the last thing a correctional officer would ever willingly give up is the 12-hour shift, especially due to the week off aspect. Officers plan their lives around the week on week off schedule, which allows them to do more. Furthermore, he recalled comments that two days aren't enough to recover from an eight-hour work week whereas the week off is.

[2:55:51 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS reminded the committee that when he came on staff the desire was to protect the public and maintain safe environments in the correctional facilities. One of the primary ways to achieve the aforementioned, aside from hiring and retaining staff, was to focus on preparing those in the institution dealing with any treatment issues to be ready to enter halfway houses. Two of the primary things one must have in order to be successful upon release are a place to live and a way to earn a living. He noted that once the inmate is released

from custody and is under the supervision of probation and parole, those individuals are supervised so that they have the best opportunity to succeed. While it can be easy to catch someone doing something wrong, it's a bit more difficult to get to know a person in order to work with him/her to reenter society.

MR. EDWARDS said he wasn't prepared to specify legislation that would benefit the department. However, having an understanding of the department's goals and being aware of any new legislation that will impact DOC is important. With regard to an earlier reference to the lack of chapel space and overcrowding, Mr. Edwards didn't recall converting any faith-based space into something not available to inmates nor would that be the department's intention. On the issue of cultural foods and traditions, such as potlatches, those are allowed in the Arizona facility, although there are always complaints about the ability to get into the Arizona facility after traveling there and about the ability to receive cultural foods. Of course, security is always of concern in regard to allowing cultural foods without allowing contraband to enter the facility.

[2:59:48 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS asked DOC to provide the committee with a status report addressing the inmates' cultural connection in the Arizona facility, which he characterized as a significant matter.

REPRESENTATIVE DAHLSTROM suggested that the Alaska Rural Justice System may be able to provide the committee with many of the answers.

CHAIR RAMRAS indicated that the committee will provide DOC with a written request on the aforementioned specific issue.

[3:02:41 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS raised the issue of the proposed death penalty legislation, and inquired as to what would be required were that legislation to pass. He opined that it would likely require a certain portion of a facility to be designated as a "death row" as well as the cost of execution.

MR. EDWARDS answered that DOC is reviewing what the proposed death penalty legislation would entail. However, he said that the department doesn't have much information with regard to the

cost or required number of staff. The obvious requirements would be housing for the executions. He suggested that the department would either convert an existing facility or construct a new facility. With regard to housing for death row inmates, he informed the committee that there is some housing that would be sufficient for that. However, death row inmates wouldn't be mixed with the general prison population. The staff to prisoner ratio would be higher in the death row facilities, which he opined would place greater stress on that staff than the average correctional officer experiences, particularly as an execution date approaches.

[3:06:37 PM](#)

MR. EDWARDS, in response to Chair Ramras, specified that there are relatively small numbers of gangs in Alaska's correctional facilities. He acknowledged that it appears that on the streets and news there is more gang activity and more of that activity is more outrageous and with less regard for consequences. However, the department hasn't noticed such widespread and visible outrageous gang activity in Alaska's correctional facilities. In further response to Chair Ramras, Mr. Edwards said he didn't believe there had been any increase in drugs or contraband in Alaska's correctional facilities. However, he surmised that as long as individuals are incarcerated, there will always be some level of contraband in the facilities. Furthermore, there are those visitors whose sole intention is to bring in contraband to the facilities, and therefore there is a balance that is sought in regard to how intrusive to be with the public entering the correctional facilities.

CHAIR RAMRAS asked whether protecting the addresses of correctional offices and management would be recommended as an additional safety precaution.

MR. EDWARDS said that's been an issue for as long as he could remember. He recalled that it has been a problem when the paperwork for an officer who was called as a witness listed the officer's home address rather than his/her work address. Correctional [and law enforcement] staff will always have concern about their personal information being made public, particularly to the prison population.

CHAIR RAMRAS surmised that as recidivism is reduced, fewer crimes are committed. He applauded the strides the department is making [in terms of lowering recidivism].

REPRESENTATIVE DAHLSTROM thanked the department for its work, and acknowledged that they have 24-hour jobs.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNN also thanked the department for its work. He then noted that at one time he worked as a jailer in Tucson, Arizona, for a couple of years, and characterized it as a tough job.

[3:15:01 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.