

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1991-1992 8672

6796 HOUSE HEALTH EDUCATION & SOCIAL SERVICES

Addendum B (cont.)

- Additional avenue for rehabilitation and to weed out those who should be placed in jail;
- Would decrease bed usage by a few;
- Should be considered, could be very useful;
- Off-times a placement is needed until something else, (job corp, Avtec, training, mental health services) is set;
- Yes, if PO and Judge in agreement;
- Yes, if you provide more POs. Its cheap and has a good track record;
- Yes, these offenders could benefit from increased structure in their lives or treatment and thereby possibly be diverted from incarceration;

Institutions

- No, should spend some amount of time in institutions;
- Yes, as a last resort short of re-incarceration;
- Sounds reasonable, low risk and cost effective alternative;
- They should be placed on intensive supervision with added conditions. If they fail under the increased supervision they should be returned to jail;
- Yes, with some flexibility (substance abuse is the violation and criminal history is alcohol/drug related);
- Yes, particularly with short time offenders who will be returning quickly to the community;
- Yes, lack of institutional bedspace. Hard beds not needed or warranted;
- Possibly, should look at on a case-by-case basis;
- Yes, because it would free up hard beds;
- Yes, if that is the treatment they need;
- No, too costly to the State. Unless the offender is willing to pay for it himself, he could be monitored there by DOC;
- Yes. These people are readjusting to Community life. They tripped-not failed. In prison they will not qualify for reentry via furlough;
- Yes, they are low risk;
- Yes, available housing;
- Yes, to relieve institutional overcrowding;

17. Some states require parole officers to refer, screen and monitor offenders placed in transitional facility programs. If Alaska implemented such a program, should probation/parole officers be involved in the referral, screening and monitoring of offenders placed in halfway houses or residential drug programs (yes/no)? Why?

Other

- It gives accountability to the programs;
- If the offender is on Probation/Parole the P/P officer should participate. If on furlough, a question of responsibility arises & the institution must stay involved. AK. must work out what works for the geography, small population & needs of the people;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Yes, should monitor all community based programs. Should be involved in screening only if offender placed in program from the community, not from institutions. Institutional P.O.'s are better able to do that;
- Not completely - P.O.'s could refer such individuals and help screen them with DOC/CRC staff, but monitoring should be consistent with the rest of CRC residents;

Central Office

- If offender is on P/P. Otherwise, Inst. PO & classification already do this. You will need more community POs;
- Institutional staff have the most direct knowledge of offender. DOC's responsibility is very different with regard to furlougee than with probation/parolee;
- Field staff presently have enough to do. Additionally, the geographic factor would weigh against such a procedure here;

Community Corrections

- Yes, if PO's responsible for supervision & P/P staff is increased;
- Yes, but not for furlougees and, if housed with furlougees, monitoring of P/P is lessened;
- Would have more say in screening and referrals, but would require expanded job descriptions;
- They currently are, by the PO putting up offenders for classification process;
- Yes, if sufficient new positions were created for that function and not from existing forces;
- Yes, I think they should but again turns into manpower problem. A large caseload makes committee meetings a low priority. Something needs to be done;
- Better community knowledge and rapport with local justice agencies;
- Not nearly enough POs. Also, duplicates services. CRCs have staff to screen and monitor. That's what they get paid to do. PO's should just refer;
- If you are referring to P/P, the system is already in place and operational. If for furlougees, it would require additional resources, complete authority on violations, and credit for supervising furlougees;

Institutions

- Yes, someone has to monitor these placements. If not PO's, who?;
- worth considering. POs know the community behavior of offenders, we (institution) don't. However, what about conflict between institution and field as is common in many states?;
- No, leave this to the institutional staff and CRC personnel;
- Yes, because of departmental liability;
- I do not feel that this plan would work as the probation department is already working with extremely high caseloads. They would not be able to have sufficient contact with the prisoners, during incarceration to make any worthwhile judgements about their suitability for furlough;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Depends on the working relationship between institutional and field PO's. shouldn't need field PO's involvement in this process, tho they will be to some extent responsible;
- Yes, perhaps a special group. Better tracking and positive adjustments to programming;
- Yes, I thought they already were, through the court process;
- No, cost;
- Yes, but you will need more staff;
- Yes, no one else is qualified;
- No, furloughing officers and furlough officer should do it. These offenders are still in custody, not yet released from completing their sentencing;
- Although I have no direct knowledge here, I do feel that POs should be involved. Some of the staff at these transitional facilities are inadequately trained and inexperienced;
- yes, the institutional Pos are appropriately used as referral, screening and monitoring;
- Yes, if they are still responsible for supervision;
- No, creates a very large caseload;
- No, CRC case managers;
- Yes, if more are hired;
- Yes, far more immediate DOC observation;

18. How can Community Residential Centers be better utilized for probationers/parolees convicted of nonviolent technical violations?

Other

- Put more of these folks in CRCs. Consider putting them there pending disposition also rather than in hard beds;
- Can provide stability while getting back on their feet and opportunity to "kick start" programming again;

Central Office

- Need to prioritize probationers, not just "dump" probationers by frustrated PO;

Community Corrections

- It is a better environment for rehabilitation by allowing offender to maintain self-esteem, employment, etc.
- By offering programs and resources not otherwise available;
- Alternative in lieu of incarceration;
- hard to say as each situation is different. Hard to create blanket policy. We need \$ to get violators from Kotzebue, Barrow, Dillingham, Bethel, Kodiak, Sitka, etc. to a CRC;
- Need to be of more assistance in helping offenders find employment;

Addendum B (cont.)

Institutions

- Combine the restitution centers and CRC centers to provide more available beds;
- It appears to be working fairly well at this point;
- They can provide an intermediate control mechanism that increases the monitoring of offenders while enabling them to maintain their employment/reintegration into the community without the need to put them in jail and start over again;
- Won't tie up hard beds. Special case load for these cases. Alternative action to standard procedures;
- Will provide more institutional bedspace;
- Use them. Set up procedures for placement there;
- Improving CRCs monitoring of probationers;
- Provides a structured environment;
- It offers an opportunity to reform without being isolated from society;
- Should be used as screening area before going to over-crowded maximum institutions;
- Expansion. remote work camps;

19. Will placement of probation/parolees convicted of nonviolent technical violations in CRC's have an effect on overcrowding conditions in correctional centers statewide?

Other

- Does the DOC have data to answer this?
- Hard to tell. Will help relieve crowding if utilize CRCs rather than hard beds;
- It may - depending on how many of these folks are presently being returned to custody by the courts and parole board;

Central Office

- Not sure data exists to support this, they could be leaving them in the community;
- Substantially reduce current population;
- It would soften overcrowding;

Community Corrections

- Every empty beds helps;
- Unsure - who is class of offender? Are they awaiting disposition on petition to revoke? Has court ordered CRC in lieu of jail?
- Yes, except for repeat violations incarceration is not beneficial;
- It can if it reduces the number of beds available for furloughs;
- The institutions are overcrowded and, in the southeast, so are the CRCs;
- Lets do it and see!
- I don't think so. The P/P which I pursue in having incarcerated have had a tremendous amount of time/effort to divert them and would not be a good candidate for a CRC;

Addendum B (cont.)

Institutions

- Could fill all vacancies in CRC and may give a false impression of furlough usage;
- Analyze the data and find out;
- It has already limited the space we can use at Glennwood and Corcoran Center for our designated misdemeanants;
- Should lessen overcrowding initially. Some of these people will still end up back in jail but some will correct their behavior and stay out;
- Certainly the number in prison will decline at the cost of funding more CRC beds;
- Yes, relieve some of the pressure;
- Yes, would reduce overcrowding if drug offenders are considered non-violent;
- Yes, there are some 400 in the system;
- I think CRC's should be utilized more fully;
- Should relieve overcrowding temporarily;

20. **New York utilizes Transitional Facilities in which an offender convicted of nonviolent technical violations voluntarily agrees to enter the program in lieu of incarceration. Should such a program be implemented in Alaska (yes/no)?**

Other

- It could be. The task force & sentencing commission needs to examine many options & recommend those most appropriate;
- Sounds like a good idea;
- Yes, it would give us another tool in supervision and would legitimize present practice;

Central Office

- Several states have transitional facilities which allow short-term return for "refresher" treatment and then return to community;
- Not voluntary in lieu of incarceration is not really voluntary;

Community Corrections

- Should be considered;
- Definitely, especially for first time offenders or for those needing continued treatment;
- Not unless we have more of the facilities;
- I have insufficient knowledge, but the theory makes sense;
- Yes, but where are you going to put them?;
- Yes, informally happens all the time in AK.;
- In my area, many of the diverted offenders are because of additional treatment requirements which are not available in a CRC;

Institutions

- I don't have enough information;
- This would be a viable alternative to immediate incarceration;

Addendum B (cont.)

- How is it working in N.Y.?
- Yes, it would save money, especially if they pay for it;
- Yes, provided confinement has strict parameters and sanctions and plays a part in improving the community without the "country club" aura;

21. Maricopa County, Arizona implemented a diversion program for first time felony offenders arrested for possession of drugs. To be eligible for the program, the offender is required to sign a diversion agreement in which the offender admits his/her guilt and agrees to enroll in and successfully complete a residential drug/alcohol program. The offender is required to reside at the facility for a minimum of 30 days to a maximum of two years, and is required to pay a fee of \$ 2,485.00. The offender is prosecuted if he/she is discharged from the program unsuccessfully. Should a similar program be implemented in Alaska (yes/no)? Why?

Other

- The offender is made accountable because of fee and working on issues;
- There are many front-end diversion programs & I personally think that controlling the numbers going into prison is better than controlling population in the prison;
- Not sure. Such a program was tried by Dept. of Law and found to be expensive. Maybe it could work with DOC staff supervising rather than DOL;
- Yes, a very large number of violent crimes are committed by persons abusing alcohol and drugs and impact on this group will over time reduce violent crime and hopefully impact institutional numbers;

Central Office

- Frees up hard beds, appropriated tx. strategy, responsibility put on offender, and court has greater leverage;
- Incarcerating non-violent drug offenders is not best use of hard beds - residential substance abuse tx. is probably more effective;
- Diversion would be more effective with the types of CRCs we have now (especially alcohol related crimes);
- May be appropriate and effective, however not advisable to expand current contract operations (with both facility and program contracted in single contract);
- No we already have the rule II program but it could be improved by probation officer participation in selecting candidates;

Community Corrections

- Do we have a large enough population to justify?
- Great Idea Mere possession of drugs doesn't mandate treatment need and need must be determined prior to signing agreement;
- Diversion programs can be highly successful as they emphasize treatment rather than punitive measures. Drug offenders should have chance for rehabilitation first;

Addendum B (cont.)

- There is not enough drug/alcohol treatment beds available currently in AK.;
- Further study should be done to evaluate this practice. Alaska has unique social and economic problems;
- the residential treatment centers that are short term are usually not beneficial, the long (max. 2 years) should work good. I think problems will arise about placement;
- Yes, but cost causes serious inequity for subsistence dependent offenders;
- Many, many middle class cocaine addicts can be rehabilitated short of prison, not cost effective to lock them up.
- I don't trust the DA's to prosecute offenders if they fail such a program. Also, it would be discriminatory toward indigent offenders. I would support a program for sentenced offenders that spend their entire sentence in CRC;

Institutions

- Yes, cheaper to house in a diversion program than in jail;
- I don't have enough data. Similar ideas have been used in Alaska;
- It would depend on what the failure rate is for this type of program and time/man hours devoted to prosecution for unsuccessful completion. May become a management nightmare;
- If it has some success rate in Arizona, it may work here as well;
- No, the number of drug related arrests is increasing. For the most part their crimes involve more than simple possession;
- What is Arizona's experience with this program?;
- Yes, perhaps treatment will also be initiated and positive gains will be accomplished;
- Yes, great program for prison overcrowding and society in general;
- No, sends the wrong message;
- Yes, but based on ability to pay;
- Yes, would be cost effective. A chance like this may rehabilitate the 1st time offender;
- Yes, we need to try alternatives;
- Perhaps. But 30 days is not enough time. Folks have been at 6th Ave.. 6 months - dry, sober, clean, and reverted back to their old ways on release. We must create a distinct option to chemical dependency;
- Yes, it would decrease jail overcrowding;
- Yes, but is that punishment severe enough to deter them again;
- No, this is contrary to progress made in anti-drug legislation;
- The preponderance of young drug offenders cannot raise \$ 2,485.00 and that burden falls to offenders family or no one;

In general, do you favor the establishment of a diversion program where non-violent offenders are sentenced directly to CRC's in lieu of incarceration? Please explain.

Other

- Public safety a must. Must be careful not to become a tool for manipulation;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Sentencing Commission will examine sentencing options & make recommendations based on data analysis & experience as well as political realities;
- Makes sense, but only if resources to pay for this don't come from DOCs programs and there is a screening done by CRC first to make sure placement is acceptable to program prior to sentencing;
- It would have to be voluntary with expulsion of record upon successful completion. Courts should not be given ability to by pass DOC regarding treatment or incarceration - the Courts will overflow such treatment options and violate the rules regarding eligibility for diversion;

Central Office

- Gives court too much discretion unless court establishes the program (& it is not DOC responsibility);
- Should be held at lowest feasible level of custody (both for cost and for humane treatment);
- Should not be established for drug offenders. Would need more staff and computers to keep up with paperwork;
- No. Property offenses are pretty damned serious. Anyone who doesn't think so should try being a victim and see how it feels.

Community Corrections

- Department should maintain control of placement decisions;
- Idea that person can go to jail for offenses deters some who might offend;
- Jails could be used for purpose of protecting community from violent offenders. Non-violent offenders should be separated from violent and given choice of treatment;
- Favor for first time offenders;
- No, rule II's are already being used & not particularly effective with drug cases;
- Yes, if an accurate assessment of the offender is made;
- Yes, if first time offenders;
- Yes, non-violent first time offenders only. Second timers and burglars go to jail;
- Sentenced offenders belong to the DOC, we can do that now. Unsentenced can be diverted by the court;
- Don't know. Good and bad points equally balanced. Probably better to let well enough alone;
- If you are talking about prior to sentencing, no!

Institutions

- Its more cost effective;
- Many do not require concrete walls, CRC's are a form of incarceration;
- No, at least not very often. This would change the nature of the CRCs. Inmates from the jail feel saved by CRC, those going directly to CRC feel punished;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Yes, the individuals should be placed on a fee basis - free up hard beds in the institutions;
- No, our current system is too soft as it is;
- No, this would lessen the deterrent value of incarceration and possibly place offenders in a position to continue victimizing the public;
- What about non-violent first offenders?;
- Yes, first time drug offenders may never wind up in jail;
- Yes, this takes a skilled PSI staff;
- Yes, for the same reason as above. Monitoring of close adherence to program expectations should be a strict requirement;
- Yes, provided a meaningful program of alternatives is developed. A program based on desire, responsibility and service. "Not another crutch";
- Yes, if the program adequately supervises the participant. If in CRC, the use public transportation, are not well monitored, and commit property crimes, the community will not tolerate it;
- Yes, it would alleviate the overcrowding in Alaska;
- Yes, we have too many short term non violent inmates lumped with long term major violence inmates. This is not good for either category, but particularly for young first offenders;

22. Should Probation/Parole Officers be solely responsible for the case management of CRC placements, instead of CRC case managers, while those placements are in residence? Why?

Other

- Needs to be a team approach between CRC & P&P; (2)
- Not necessarily. Perhaps yes, with CRC case managers involved only if need to revoke a furlough or other institutional placement to the CRC;
- No, PO's are not necessarily trained to deal with the daily treatment aspects and are more useful in supervising those outside a structured program;

Central Office

- P.O.s are responsible, although room for both. P.O.s should remain involved and not "dump" problem cases on CRC;
- Not necessarily P/P officers, but should be professionally managed;
- CRC employees do not have the education, experience, and all around ability that POs do;
- No, but there should be general oversight of the CRC case managers by a DOC staff person;

Community Corrections

- Would need more staff, but would cut down on problems with contract staff;
- Should maintain ultimate responsibility, but not day-to-day case management;
- No, case loads are too high;

Addendum B (cont.)

- It would again determine on resources, so that officers are not taken away from traditional duties;
- P&P officers are court appointed and must live/die by court orders. Case managers are hired by CRC. P&P should have final say on what happens;
- Should supervise compliance with conditions of release only;
- POs are responsible. CRC managers are just PO helpers;
- Case managers can provide details to the PO which would otherwise be unavailable;

Institutions

- Not necessarily PO's but, would recommend that the monitor be a state employee;
- CRC case managers are more than capable of handling CRC placements;
- Probation placements only (no);
- No. what are we paying the CRCs for? Institutions should maintain some involvement in the cases;
- No, allow the CRC case managers to supervise, thus freeing up the P/P officers;
- Yes, they would provide greater supervision and compliance with the departments needs than is currently provided;
- Yes, makes sense especially for CRC placements who are off lock-down;
- This would work best, however, there must be someone at the centers to solve day to day problems;
- No, CRC case managers are on-site and more involved with the furloughees;
- No, cost and staff availability;
- Yes, paid, trained, accountable professionals;
- Yes, it would be more effective. Public would receive better protection. In the long run, we may have less recidivism;
- No, but CRC case managers should be accountable to PO's;
- No, these units must coordinate;
- Yes, if placement is on probation/parole - not furlough status;
- No, the CRC case managers should report to the probation officer;
- Yes, if more POs are hired. Cannot handle current load properly;
- Yes. Closer supervision by DOC in interest of community welfare;

23. **Should Probation/Parole Officers have the sole authority to screen and place probation violations in contract CRC's? Why?**

Other

- Both PO and CRC need to report or coordinate violations so offenders can be dealt with and not slip through cracks;
- I think so, at lease before the violator is incarcerated. Obviously courts have a say if violator won't voluntarily go to CRC;
- No, variances in criteria between PO's would result in unfairness - let the Parole Board or institutional classification committee do that;

Addendum B (cont.)

Central Office

- Should have procedure in place for supervisor review/approval;
- Save time and money for DOC and courts;
- Judges should have to take some responsibility for such decisions. In-house should have Director-level review for consistency in standards;
- No, although a limited authority to do so would be a good management tool for PO's;

Community Corrections

- Should occur in conjunction with institutional PO who will supervise;
- Supervision authority from court/condition allowing placement/ if revocation in progress, placement in CRC could be condition of release;
- No - in conjunction with others;
- There needs to be checks and balances;
- They would seem the appropriate person but others could be involved in the process. More consideration of this is needed.
- P&P officers are court appointed and must live/die by court orders. Case managers are hired by CRC. P&P should have final say on what happens;
- Yes, if prior to court involvement in the violation;
- Who else would you recommend?;
- No, should be in conjunction with CRC so that they have the right to refuse a placement which may not be appropriate for the program;

Institutions

- Should be a committee established for that purpose;
- No - placement is tantamount to re-incarceration and some review is needed;
- Probably, but there would need to be legal/judicial basis for approval;
- Yes, due to limited contacts and education and training received by the P/P officers;
- Yes, the person is on their caseload;
- Yes, but for technical violations only;
- No, there needs to be checks and balances in all systems;
- Yes, would eliminate working between 2 or 3 bureaucracies;
- No, make the courts take some responsibility;
- No, the court should have input;
- No, oversight by judge (probation) and parole board (parole);
- No, their heavy case loads, and the percentage of recidivists preempts them from making totally unbiased assessments. They are human beings with tremendous burdens;
- No, CRCs may refuse any client. They know their limitations (i.e. arson, conflicts between individual placements, etc.);
- No, should be joint effort by PO's and CRC case managers;
- No, need judicial involvement;
- Yes, as officers of court, not as program representatives;

Addendum B (cont.)

24. Do you favor a special halfway-in CRC for non-violent technical probation violations?

Other

- Too complicated. They again need to have consequences for their behavior;
- Yes, it would separate these offenders from furlougees and other populations and may promote a better milieu for successful completion and peer support;
- No, can go to regular CRC. Could only afford such a facility in Anchorage (maybe OK just for Anch.);

Central Office

- May be able to use day reporting/electronic monitoring instead of CRC bed;
- Should be various levels/types of CRCs for specific types/needs of offenders;
- Valuable consideration;
- No, but I am not sure if I understand the question. The whole CRC concept seems to be a half-way in or half-way out process;

Community Corrections

- No, most problem probation violations were in custody before and will know CRCs anyway;
- Yes, should save \$!;
- They need to be separated from the furlough population.

Institutions

- Probably don't have enough candidates for CRC placement to justify specialization;
- It would be a good idea;
- Yes, this program would have significant potential;
- No need for anything "special";
- Not necessarily, I think P/P officer use enough discretion to know when to place these to a 1/2 way house. This placement is a good deterrent;
- No, we cannot be all things to all men. In addition an offender is an offender is an offender! This system could lead to a sanctimonious hierarchy;
- Yes, for low infraction cases;

What impact would such a program have on overcrowding in the institutions?

Other

- Positive, but can be accomplished by greater use of all CRC's, not just a special one;
- Hopefully these folks would not go back to an institution and thus over time would reduce institutional numbers due to fewer violations;

Addendum B (cont.)

Community Corrections

- Statistics should reveal impact;
- Should have impact by reserving jail for those who need it;
- Should tend to reduce populations;
- Hopefully lessen overcrowding;
- Might reduce somewhat;
- I not sure of the impact, but would think that it would be small if any;

Institutions

- Should reduce population;
- CRC failures would be placed into institutions;
- We could fill the beds in the CRC which are not available due to designation to P/P;
- It would lessen the overcrowding caused by the numerous technical violation which are, in part, attributable to the liability held by the field PO;
- Reduce numbers, leave longer term prisoners to work with;
- Help relieve overcrowding;
- I am sure it would help;
- Favorable;
- Overcrowding happens because more crime is happening for a number of reasons. Still the public's safety cannot be ignored. Public needs to support jails as well as halfway houses (well managed) in order to feel safer;
- Not familiar, don't know;
- Should relieve some placements;
- Helpful;
- Hopefully alleviate crowding;
- Tremendous positive affect, it would help eliminate overcrowding;
- Possible reduction;
- Beneficial impact;

25. Should DOC offer a Boot Camp (Shock Incarceration) program (yes/no)?

Other

- No, not until the true value of such a program is determined;
- Not at this time;

Central Office

- Not proven effective. Serves to widen the net which could otherwise be addressed through probation. Climate would require indoor activity space for much of year. Gives "license" to abuse. (2)
- Its been done in other places and I don't think the results are impressive;

Community Corrections

- May be of some use for non-violent offenders;
- Its workable in other jurisdictions, unknown how cost effective it would be or how effective;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Stats are not that good;
- Most P/P have been rejected by the military. Some have been discharged as unfit. Most are too rebellious and anti-authoritarian to accept boot camp. Also, boot camp teaches nothing of value like reading, math, english, or a vocation;

Institutions

- No, I am not convinced they have any special merit;
- I believe this type of program may only be successful to the juvenile delinquent or first time prisoner (age 18-25) who hasn't been in the military or isn't associated with a gang;
- No, not proven to work. Because of the privileges offered in jail, few would volunteer and complete program;
- I am not knowledgeable enough to answer this question. I like it, but I would target juvenile if possible;
- Maybe, probably just to non-violent offenders;
- No, I'm not sure if this type of program will work with our judges;
- All offenders should spend time in a jail. When direct CRC placement is made, too many offenders do not understand that what they have done is an offense against society;

- a. **If so, what population of offender should be targeted? What eligibility criteria should be utilized?**

Central Office

- Should be for offenders with no court ordered tx. requirements;
- Eliminate serious violent offenders. Youth detention(s) would count as previous incarceration;

Community Corrections

- Consider modified program for young offenders in conjunction with Fish & Game;
- Use for 18-25 year olds who make stupid mistakes, are non-violent and need sense of direction and supervision;
- Depends on structure of boot camp (probably non-violent offenders);
- Should target young, impressionable, non-hardcore offenders;
- Probably young drug offenders who are treatment oriented;
- 18-22 year olds, 1st felony conviction (even some sex offenders i.e. statutory rape), with voluntary or court ordered treatment, sentence 2 years or less);
- 18-25, property and drug offenders, satisfactory institutional record, motivated, first and second time offenders, no less than medium custody;

Institutions

- Age, health, type of crime, first time offenders, possible success considered;

Addendum B (cont.)

- No criteria should be established. Everybody should be exposed if some punitive component is to be experienced;
- First time offenders up to 32. No sex offenders or crimes where death occurs. Screen out those needing residential substance abuse or mental health treatment;
- First time offenders under thirty. Less than two years to serve and more than 6 months;
- Minimum - community custody;
- Young first time offenders with no prior history. POs should screen for appropriate candidates;
- First offenders, young, and must pass health screening. Healthy under 25 years old, motivated according to judicial interpretation;

26. Should DOC establish Day Reporting Centers in major population centers in the State (yes/no)?

Other

- Task force & sentencing commission should consider;

Central Office

- This seems to be a retrain job on New Start;
- What is a Day Reporting Center?;

Institutions

- Negative - unnecessary and costly;
- Not familiar totally. However, what would be its justification, other than convenience? reduction in population? Are there options circumventing the letter of the law which state "x days in jail"? How are these people repaying a debt to society. Are we making it easier?

a. What should be the mission/function of such programs?

Central Office

- Should provide medication dispensing (where necessary), UA's, reality check, job search reports, contact;
- Tracking of offenders, oversight of compliance with conditions, could also do UA testing;
- Graduation from CRC to DRC to live @ home and report daily to center for employment, social services and community work service, UA's, etc.;

Community Corrections

- Intensive supervision/surveillance/services;
- Newly sentenced/released offenders report daily for treatment screening (i.e. mental health, job placement, substance abuse, education, etc.) as well as monitoring, UA's, etc.;
- Monitoring drug/employment/residential condition compliance;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Help offenders with social services, job training and placement, check-in, treatment referrals, monitoring CWS, interface with PO;

Institutions

- Non-violent, first offenders;
- Increase supervision/reporting level for community placements;
- Referral for job placement and UA testing;
- Would help with high risk cases;
- Monitor whereabouts and sobriety;
- Monitoring progress, UA's, BA's confirming employment, confirming domicile;
- Logical transition from prison to halfway house to probation;

b. Should Day Reporting Centers be operated contractually or by DOC?

Other

- DOC is trained to deal with criminal behavior;
- Probably cheaper if contracted for;

Central Office

- DOC through P/P (new start);
- CRC employees performing duties with DOC oversight;
- To the extent that it is a critical surveillance function, it should not be delegated to non-professional, untrained staff;

Community Corrections

- DOC, or if not, DOC supervised. Too easy to get friends to put down individual reports;
- At least initially DOC (on trial basis) but eventually may be contract for cost-effectiveness;

c. Should Day Reporting Centers be located in CRC's or elsewhere?

Other

- They have staff, programs and contact with offenders making offenders accountable;
- Elsewhere when possible. But could be in CRC in some locations;

Central Office

- CRC if new start not appropriate;
- Where possible it could allow effective use of group/meeting rooms, etc.;
- Probation Office or New Start;

Community Corrections

- If resources and expertise is available, CRC;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Pushing luck if forcing non-CRC's to go to CRC's. Could probably screw up both programs;
- Elsewhere, as not all CRCs are easily accessible. CRC would be an advantage for back-up staff availability in evenings;

Institutions

- Location in CRC's would be practical;

- d. **Should furloughees graduate from CRC's to Day Reporting Centers (i.e. live at home, reporting daily to the center for purposes of employment seeking, social services, community work service, UA's, etc.)?**

Other

- Furloughees daily reporting should be to PO office or other office so as not to contaminate CRC resident if starting drugs again;
- Yes, it may be a valuable last step to going solo;
- Good possibility;

Central Office

- Furloughees should be ready for regular supervision;
- Seems reasonable in some cases;
- Should employ a spectrum of available supervision levels of CRC, like Georgia;

Community Corrections

- Could be one use for CRCs (would be more strict than CRC alone);
- Makes sense as continuing vehicle for supervision;
- This whole area needs to be carefully studied and experimented with;
- Yes, sounds good;
- System needs to be progressive, not DOC's dump;
- Yes, the furloughees to be considered for graduation from a CRC to day reporting would have proven themselves as good risks (less liability);

Institutions

- Possibly - could also be simultaneous or in lieu of CRC;
- For those who need it, poor CRC record, etc.;
- No, too much risk to DOC;
- Yes, specially those of violent crimes and long term sentencing
- There is value on a gradient scale;

27. **Should DOC offer electronic monitoring to offenders (yes/no)?**

Other

- Task Force & sentencing commission should make recommendation;
- Its new. Not sure of effects;
- Yes, if feasible financially.

Addendum B (cont.)

Central Office

- Some, and in combination with other devices;

Community Corrections

- Should be offered by private contractor for "house detentions" or court ordered conditions of release; offenders requiring electronic monitoring shouldn't be furloughed;

Institutions

- Undecided. This needs a lot of study;
- Not enough known about the success and failure rate;
- Yes, if there is a proviso that somehow there is a debt to be repaid and a definite service to the community is a proviso. No, if they merely continue their lives out of jail;

a. **If so, what population should be targeted?**

Other

- Home detention, ISSP types with curfews;
- Low risk, non-violent offender in conjunction with community service and Day Reporting;

Community Corrections

- (1) P/P violators, (2) high risk parolee, and (3) furloughers placed in a DRG program who have proven good risks;

Institutions

- Non-violent, first offenders;
- Misdemeanants, community custody, tech violators, ISSP's
- High risk, M/P ISSP type Parole;
- High risk MR/ISSP type parole;
- Non-violent first offenders;

b. **What eligibility criteria should be utilized?**

Other

- If incarceration or other sanction would be counter productive and would seriously impact offender or family (eg. result in loss of job);

Central Office

- Should review current offense, offense & supervision history, living & employment situation, and offender assume all costs for monitoring;

Community Corrections

- Someone who is to go to limited number of places in fairly controlled area;
- All unclassified and Class a felons, most presumptive for crimes against persons and burglary;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Have a job, or get a job within 2 weeks and have a residence approved by PO (Not an empty refrigerator box);
- Three years of release according to specific criteria set forth in advance;

Institutions

- Several things should be considered, resident, family, employment;
- The offender can pay for it. Low risk offenders;
- Offense, supervision experience, program needs;
- The misdemeanant or non-violent felon population could be targeted and carefully screened as to intent, family consideration, treatment and education, if necessary. Ability to pay should not be the predominant criterion;
- Public need to close monitoring, and participation does not place community at increased risk for violence;
- Untreated sex offenders, violent conviction or background and court ordered but untreated offenders;
- Should also have judicial approval;

c. Should electronic monitoring of furlougees and/or parolees be:

- 1 Based at local correctional ctr. with surveillance performed by correctional officers or contracted security?
- 2 Based @ CRC with surveillance performed by CRC staff?
- 3 Performed by probation officers as an enhancement of the present ISSP?

Other

- Decision should be made according to what works for geography, population, etc.;
- Number 2 or 3 depending on group being supervised;

Central Office

- See Maricopa City, Arizona program, should be accomplished by DOC;
- A community function best handled by community staff (definitely not CRC staff/CRC location);

Community Corrections

- Contracted security guards don't get paid enough to be totally honest. ISSP would be great if we were talking money here;
- As part of ISSP and contract for central monitoring;
- ISSP program, these are the people who know most about field supervision. Also, statute gives this job to probation;
- If responsibility for furlougees is with community corrections, #3. Best bet would be DOC run with own staff and leased equipment (at least initially);

Institutions

- If P/P can do it, it would be a better choice, but due to lack of manpower, probably at institution;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Any of the above;
- Part of ISSP program sounds the most feasible, if indeed the idea makes sense in the first place;
- Sub-contractor such as "Fred's Bail Bond";
- (3), but only if there are more PO's hired. I think it's more appropriate for the PO who files PTRP or decides to return offender to CRC to directly get the data on such violations;
- #2 is ideal nationally;
- CRC staff is adequate as these are low profile prisoners;
- Furloughs by correctional officers (1) however, pretrial by contract security guards would be preferable;
- Make use of POs with police backgrounds;
- Surveillance should be done by police authority empowered, trained personnel;

28. Do you favor the utilization of Specialized Community Residential Centers (i.e. substance abuse, female, mentally ill, etc.) yes/no? If yes, which of the following do you feel has the greatest need in Alaska? (10-greatest need; 1 least need)

Other

- Should explore female offenders with children &/or pregnant;
- Should explore geriatric offenders (for future);
- Difficult to rank in such a manner, I believe that they all rate a 10 in terms of client group & individual need. Obviously priorities are shaped by other factors as well. Clearly mandates a CRC for mentally ill offenders, for example;

Central Office

- Employment skills should be part of all CRCs;
- Native offender/female offender could be considered if treatment oriented. Although need exists of #9, there are too few in any one area to warrant special program;
- Substance abuse, native, sex offender, and mentally ill only. All others combined;

Institutions

- Developmentally disabled is a great need for the Department;
- Numbers 1,5,7,9 will be more expensive than current CRCs due to additional security and therapeutic training for staff. Women will behave better in coed CRC. P/P violations will be better served if they see other residents free (i.e. employment, treatment, vocational education, etc.);
- Specialized would be great, but utilizing what we have would also work with specialized assistance for client (transport to work, treatment in house, etc.);
- All things considered, I don't believe our CRC's can specialize, as we don't have the numbers;
- No, too expensive;

Addendum B (cont.)

29. How can Community Residential Centers be better utilized for furloughees/restitution/confined misdemeanant placements?

Other

- Better surveillance/training for staff;
- Make them available to all offenders within 90 days of release to aid in making it on the street (transition);

Community Corrections

- Help furloughees get reintegrated into community. Restitution paid and caught up. All need to be assisted and most assistance can be done within CRC's;
- Make more placements and spend money to transport rural placements to empty urban soft-beds;
- Stress job training and/or placement for furloughees. I have no experience with restitution placements and little experience with confined misdemeanants;

Institutions

- The employees need to be trained in classification and disciplinary processes;
- We basically need more beds; Right now we have to turn away court ordered reports to report later;
- Confined misdemeanants should be separated from the others as their short time attitude is disruptive to the other offenders;
- More programs, communication with DOC, specialized care, etc.
- First DOC needs to ensure contractual monies are going to where they are supposed to be going;
- Need more CRCs to reduce prison pressure;

Do you favor removing the prohibition against violent offenders being placed in restitution centers? Please explain.

Other

- Violent offenders are a serious threat to the community with reoccurring offenses. The rights of the community at risk should be considered;
- Yes, seems an artificial distinction;
- Yes, violent offenders who are near the end of their sentence and who have reduced their classification level by good institutional behavior should be allowed to work and pay off restitution while their needs are being provided for;

Central Office

- They're mixed in general population in institutions. (violent offenders are in restitution centers now);
- No reason to put community at any higher risk than present;
- No for domestic violence/batters. "Resisting arrest" offenders should not be classified as violent offenders;

Addendum B (cont.)

- The prohibition is an artificial one that is based upon a municipality requirement;
- Some violent offenders have large amounts of restitution to pay, and could benefit from getting started while on furlough;

Community Corrections

- On case-by-case basis accounting for prior record, program, etc.
- They belong in highly structured/supervised placement. Not with "money crimes";
- Yes, if offenders are carefully screened and depending on treatment status;
- No - risk too great;
- Too broad a statement. No. Individual cases most certainly should go to restitution center;
- Yes, if committing offense is the only violent crime;
- Violent offenders have been placed at glacier manor for years without ill effect;

Institutions

- No, risk too great;
- Yes, they function in our other CRCs;
- Violent offenders can be placed in CRC's;
- No, protection of the public shall remain a first priority;
- No - they need to be incarcerated to protect the public. Present guidelines are adequate;
- No, not as a blanket policy (i.e. not for violent offender who has been a predatory aggressive inmate). Though some violent offenders who have been "model" prisoners and whose crimes were committed only while intoxicated might be worth trying on furloughs;
- Yes, they eventually have to be released onto the public. It is better to monitor this in a controlled manner;
- Yes, expand for better use;
- Our CRC's & restitution centers are the same place, so I have no problem with this;
- It doesn't matter, they can still be eligible for furlough;
- Yes, many violent offenders were 1 time crime of passion and very unlikely to re-offend;
- No, violent offenders should be kept separate;
- Yes, on a case-by-case basis;
- This would not make a significant change;
- These people interface outside of jail. why not at a CRC;
- Yes, high risk;
- I recommended placement in CRC 6 months before release to society;
- No, the assurance of lengthy incarceration for violent crime is the only meaningful deterrent;

Addendum B (cont.)

30. Do you feel that the current utilization of Community Residential Centers is meeting the needs of the Department of Corrections?

Other

- Under utilized and not meeting needs;
- No, not enough beds are being utilized due to combination of DOC reluctance to furlough and contractors reluctance to accept certain offenders;

Central Office

- Have too many beds (population projections don't support this number of beds);
- Not enough substance abuse beds;
- CRC staff not qualified, professional, or providing sufficient security and/or monitoring of offenders;

Community Corrections

- Should be expanded;
- Unsure, would like one in Ketchikan as alternative to jail;
- Only a small part or state needs more of them;
- Under utilized. More access by P/P is needed;

Institutions

- No, under utilized;
- No, but the answer is not to simply place more offenders in them. They could be restructured to handle more long term (3/4 house) and very short term;
- Yes, but more referrals of misdemeanants should be made as well as property crimes;
- No, the beds should be increased so that more nonviolent manageable offenders can be placed there;
- No, not enough beds;
- No, but it could;
- No, under utilized;
- No, our contract exceeds those who meet current criteria;
- Yes, it is vacating the beds of the sentenced offender to make room for the unsentenced, but can we say that it is fulfilling the mission of the Department;

Do you feel that the current utilization of Community Residential Centers is meeting the needs of the offenders?

Other

- Too short stays to achieve rehabilitation goals;
- Some seem to have benefitted, better assistance with job and housing issues might help;

Addendum B (cont.)

Central Office

- Could use more treatment beds (substance abuse);
- CRC staff not qualified, professional, or providing sufficient security and/or monitoring of offenders;
- Lack of trust in CRC's leads to non-recommendation for those who probably need transitional period;
- Not enough info to form an opinion;

Community Corrections

- Not available in all communities;
- Need more specific (specialized) CRCs for some people;
- No, no access for rural P/P violations;
- Need to really expand in area of employment. Relying on job service does not provide the types of jobs needed for success;

Institutions

- No, under utilized;
- Probably not;
- No, job training and the virility to save any real money are real detriments;
- Yes, of those that are referred/furloughed;
- Yes, for the most part;
- It makes life more pleasant for them, however, I don't know any lessons are being learned. They are rarely inconvenienced. I think we are doing them a disservice by not imposing some debt to society that must be repaid and we are circumventing the educational component. We are merely using another kind of warehouse;
- No. I feel more supervision and more programming is needed;
- Yes, although we need more, bigger, and better staffed CRC's;

Do you feel that the current utilization of Community Residential Centers is meeting the needs of the community?

Other

- Yes, but could be better. Regarding overcrowding it is not meeting the needs of the community;
- No, community is still subjected to alcohol related crimes due to lack of adequate treatment and/or supervision of those offenders who are alcohol/drug dependent;

Central Office

- Have had in use for 10 years with no major problems and they provide CWS;
- To the extent that they are only serving offenders with minimal needs (leaving others non-placed);
- Not enough info to form an opinion;

Community Corrections

- Could make more placements
- Not available in all areas so use more costly jail beds;
- No. CRCs are an excellent alternative to jail;
- No, community is the entire state, not just where CRCs are presently located;
- Community would never allow a CRC if they could prevent it;
- They provide CWS and reduce risk of re-offense by supervision and surveillance;

Institutions

- Yes, very safe;
- Yes, to the degree allowed;
- Yes, for the most part people in CRCs are not victimizing the public;
- Undecided, there is always room for improvement;
- No, we still release offenders with no transition time or proper supervision;
- Yes, for the most part;
- Not entirely, could be handled more efficiently, improvements need to be made and should not be at a greater expense to DOC or marginal treatment of inmates;
- I cannot truthfully answer this;
- No, identified unmet needs;
- No, too little, too late;

31. Do you favor the concept of State owned and operated Community Residential Centers? Please explain.

Other

- The skill of personnel involved in centers, the uniformity of procedures, programs, rules and regulations;
- Yes, if money is there. Better trained staff and less risk to public;
- Yes, contractors do not give us the stability and quality of service necessary and cost are too high for what we get in return;

Central Office

- Could meet security and compliance requirements with DOC staff;
- Necessary to develop range and quality of services needed;
- For attitude, professionalism, DOC personnel have ability to make better judgements;
- Yes!!! We have done so in the past, and I have a higher level of confidence in our own staff;

Community Corrections

- State would have more control but may be more expensive;
- More control over the monitoring of the offender;
- Unsure - open to question whether the private sector can do job cheaper and better;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Yes, We could use for our short termers to live and continue on with jobs;
- Yes, staff turnover large in private operations;
- Yes, better control, although perhaps increased liability;
- No, vendors seem to be doing ok. They are cheaper;
- Overall, the CRC's are doing a good job, although expanded job services are needed.

Institutions

- Yes, better control;
- Yes, for mandatory furloughs (those that are medium and close custody) have been incarcerated for a long time and need a structured pre-release program;
- Yes, some programs are not cost-effective - privates are unlikely to do them;
- Yes. I am disenchanted with private vendor "corrections". the vendors are too political and end up trying to make policy for the department. Not Good!
- No - too costly;
- Yes, better accountability and quicker response to changing departmental needs;
- Yes, the state would provide a more secure setting although the expense would be greater. It would be a good idea for the violent offender;
- Not as they are presently utilized. i would if more "risky" offenders are to be furloughed since the same or similar staff training in security, etc. might be needed and hence the cost would far surpass the current CRC structure;
- Yes, it would be great. DOC trained employees would understand clientele. good for offenders and staff.
- Yes, if fiscally sound;
- Possibly, might be better quality and responsibility, but what about cost?;
- I believe they should be DOC facilities;
- Yes, as a general rule state employees performance work behavior is better monitored, they must show professionalism, they are in a career field, they will ensure more safety and security towards the community and at the same time inmates can be treated fairly;
- Yes. There should be some way that the offender should earn his keep, work at some useful community enterprize and that the State should reap the benefit from some of these benefits. A portion of the permanent fund dividend could be used to offset these costs;
- An acceptable alternative when and where contracts are not available;
- Yes, there must be accountability;
- Yes, for probation and parole purposes;
- Yes, uniformity;

Addendum B (cont.)

Do you favor the concept of State owned Community Residential Centers, with operations provided by Independent Contractors? Please explain.

Other

- If appropriate training is provided to staff. Then we have the facility at least and can't be held over barrel as much regarding the service provided;
- Since this option would be subject to more oversight and stability, it would be better than present - still would cost too much;

Central Office

- Could be more cost effective (allowing CRC's in any community without elaborate procedures);
- Preferable over current system. May increase competition and quality of services;
- Not unless more control is obtained on contractors services, methods, and policies;
- If we can afford to own it, we can afford to operate it.

Community Corrections

- Depends on cost and level of accountability;
- More feasible as DOC retains management;
- State would have all the expense. Contractor would have little motivation to limit expenses;
- No, should be all DOC or nothing;
- No, why get into the real estate business?;
- Yes, if it would allow CRC's to be more centrally located and accessible. Otherwise, why fix what isn't broken?;

Institutions

- No, lack of control;
- No, we should run our own;
- No - once again too costly. We have run-down institutions (6th Ave. Annex) that need to be demolished and replaced with ACA standards for living conditions in mind fast;
- Yes, guidelines easier to enforce;
- No, why add the expense to the state with no added benefit;
- Yes, if fiscally sound;
- No, all staff should be DOC personnel;
- Not all operations. Main supervision should come from DOC employees (key positions within CRC) they can supervise lesser paid non-state employees but DOC standards should always be met;
- No, the state is paying for the care of the offender instead of vice-versa;
- Where acceptable facilities are not available;
- No, if run by independent contractor they may not hire and pay competent persons;

Addendum B (cont.)

Do you favor the concept of Contractor owned and operated Community Residential Centers (current practice)? Please explain.

Other

- Not especially given lack of training and turnover in staff;
- No, too costly and quality is low;

Central Office

- Some loss of control and facilities frequently below par;
- Too small a market. Wealth & ownership of buildings does not qualify someone to perform the program/monitoring services. Puts DOC in a bind;

Community Corrections

- Probably cheaper and better received by community, but DOC has less control of program;
- CRC's can be run where State gets good deal and Contractor profits;
- Prefer DOC, but private ran CRCs have place in continuum;
- It's ok, but state operated and owned is best alternative;
- It seems to be working well, except for the problem of gaining access to more centrally located facilities (FBKS);

Institutions

- No. State owned and operated;
- Yes, the costs accrued are less than those that would accumulate if State owned or operated;
- No, inadequate supervision of residents;
- Yes, they would maintain their buildings and equipment better if they owned them;
- Undecided, more cost effective but not as good quality;
- No, I still feel that this should be a function of DOC;

32. Is there is a Community Residential Center operating in your area? Are you aware of any problems with the community's acceptance of the center? Please explain.

Other

- Centers doing very good job, based on limited exposure;
- Yes, not aware of any problems;
- Yes, no problems as it is located in poor part of town near LCCC;

Community Corrections

- Too long a waiting list at Clitheroe Center;

Institutions

- No problem. Half-way house has been at the same location for 10 years with no problems;

Addendum B (cont.)

33. Do you feel that, should Contractor owned and operated Community Residential Centers continue to be utilized in the State of Alaska, contracting procedures and practices as currently provided allow for the securing of the most cost-effective and efficient services available within the State? Please explain.

Other

- Since there is little or no competition cost containment will always be a problem. Also, quality control will remain to be a headache for the State. We'd be better off owning and operating our own;
- Perhaps too cost effective regarding not assuring an adequately trained staff;

Central Office

- Very little competition. Providers dictate market. Maybe should be looked at as other than professional services;
- More DOC supervision is needed;
- Uncertain. I am told that our contracts are very inexpensive compared to other states. We probably do no demand enough in our contracts;
- I think DOC and offenders are being shortchanged. Lack of experience, consistency in rule application (or knowledge of rules) and staff attitude make monitoring difficult;
- Otherwise we would not be paying for unused bed space as we presently do;

Community Corrections

- So long as the focus is to make money, it will provide the minimum service for the most money;
- they have a real place in corrections;
- Yes, because of the savings in cost for staff;

Institutions

- No, we pay for empty beds;
- No, paying for unused beds doesn't seem cost effective. We should pay daily fees on only those man-days used;
- Yes, if the CRC standards are enforced and evaluated on a quarterly basis;
- No, would really like to see state facilities. However, Contractor type could be successful with proper DOC relationship;
- Yes, I'm not qualified to address the fiscal aspect of CRC's;
- Most cost effective - yes, most efficient - no (undecided);
- After considerable review, I believe the current situation is adequate, but could be improved;
- No, not unless DOC starts utilizing these CRC strictly for work pre-releases, less violent type of offenders. At the same time Alaska introduces state owned and state operated, at least by key staff, for longer term more violent and untreated offenders;
- No, there is little competition and little structure to motivate efficient services or cost effectiveness;
- No, do they employ the most competent persons?;

Addendum B (cont.)

- Yes, for first offenders, non-violent and young offenders;
- No, it is my understanding that beds are paid for whether used or not. This is a strange concept at best. Pay for services used and that all. With the academy turning out classes of 20 at a time, CRC's could be staffed with state personnel. There would be greater control and consistency.

34. Do you favor the provision of "in-house" programming for sex offender treatment, drug and alcohol treatment, etc. in community residential centers? Please explain.

Other

- No, for sex offenders this should be a criteria for placement (completion of a program);
- Yes, need more after-care type of treatment;
- Yes, could be provided by outpatient providers from community however;

Central Office

- Could be explored in DOC operated facilities. CRCs operate best as community brokers for services;
- Programs which directly address problems related to offense are more important than generic services;
- Especially important at entry level, but only by DOC sanctioned providers;
- If "in-house" treatment is appropriate, it can be provided without DOC involvement;
- No! I don't even favor the sex offender treatment program in our institutions;

Community Corrections

- Follow-up services only;
- Would favor any additional programs for sex offender (even short term). A specialized CRC for sex offender would be ideal;
- Favor for drug/alcohol only (not sex offender tx.);
- No - need to complete while in jail;
- Yes, if electronic monitoring is done at the same time. Sex offenders are going to be publicly damned and so they need treatment before total release to CRC;
- Yes, otherwise many are released without any rehabilitation effort;
- solves security problems, solves "I forgot, I got lost, My Counselor was out" etc. kind of excuses;
- No, in-house programming for sex offenders is best left to professionals. Substance abuse would be a possibility in the form of educational classes;

Institutions

- No, lack of control;
- Yes, but not as an alternative to treatment during incarceration;
- No, only for the obvious reasons;
- No, I do not feel they have the funds to provide adequate thorough treatment following. these programs are already available through the Dept.;

Addendum B (cont.)

- No, these people are at a high risk to re-offend and need treatment out of a community setting first;
- Yes, keep the prisoners productively busy;
- Yes, at least some form. Adds structure and continues process started in institutions;
- Yes, if qualified people provide the treatment;
- Yes, most sex offenders could be safely housed in less secure environments;
- Not unless it is the primary purpose of the facility, not an adjunct to work release, etc.;
- Yes, if they were owned and partially operated by DOC;
- Yes, in house provides accessibility and reduces potential dangers to the community in travel to and from.
- No, this specialization will be too costly;
- No. There are distinct limitation as to the professional component in the CRC's. Therefore, I am questioning the validity of these in-house programs;
- Yes, failure of many sex offenders to participate;

35. What general observations or suggestions can you make that would help assure the more effective use of, or better programming of, CRC's?

- Decisions should be based on type of offender permitted to participate. Violent offenders should be the last considered for CRC regardless of the "savings" it may create.
- We should appreciate low number of current problems in CRC's before making too many changes. CRCs for non-violent/misdemeanants should be available with courts taking responsibility for sentencing offenders to CRC (to preserve truth in sentencing). Should not subvert "prison sentence" simply to save money. Public & judges should be made aware of actual cost of incarceration vs. CRC and be responsible for this kind of decision.
- Would like to see offenders be able to work toward release from first classification. This ensures progression with an individualized goal. Each should have individualized plan upon release. I believe that we could have more successes if Probation/Parole (institutional and field) operated with social work philosophy rather than "Cop" mode. Need more staff to provide program oversight. Need to place offenders in most appropriate type of CRC & program. We need to act as if reintegration was really a part of DOC's job and not someone else's.
- Need a residential center in Kenai to house light-weight offenders who work in area. Would benefit State in that it could be run with minimal staff and benefit offender who can work, contact with family, treatment for alcohol/drug problems, etc.
- We need a CRC in Kenai, State run and operated;
- I believe we should have a more unified coordinated and reliable system if we operated them ourselves. It is my opinion that there are some things in this world that should not be driven by a profit motive. This is one.

Addendum B (cont.)

- The CRCs are an excellent step in reintegration of offenders and also as a first offender, non-violent placement alteration Should not be utilized as "place of habitation" only.
- Give me some money to get my indigent clients (nearly all) to Cordova House or Northstar Center;
- I am concerned that any program expansion is not limited to Anchorage. Needs exist statewide. Any program changes should take into consideration the individual geographical differences of Alaska communities.
- You need to be ever mindful that CRCs are a potentially dangerous solution to crowded prisons. We have, relatively speaking, a small number of sentenced prisoners. Finding good prospects in sufficient numbers for the variety of alternative discussed is unlikely. Be conservative and careful in your efforts to increase the number of inmates in CRCs. The last number I looked at had approximately 60% of our inmates qualify as violent. One "bad" furlough could end a good program;
- More DOC monitoring and interaction with vendors;
- I am very satisfied with the current operations of our CRC;
- Need more bed space;
- Those who need the most help adjusting to the community (long term/high custody) are the least likely to get it and therefore re-offend;
- I feel smaller facilities located in more areas of the State with access to certain types of "core" programming/treatment would help the parole system be more effective. Also, offender should continue to pay for the services they have received after release;

Attachment B

COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Prepared and Distributed
by
Task Force on Community Residential Centers

Introduction

Purpose: The Community Questionnaire was developed in an attempt to determine the knowledge of specific groups about current Department of Corrections Community Residential Center (CRC) programs. The questionnaire also presented some possible "special needs" programs which are sometimes built into CRC programs for the purpose of determining the possible acceptance of these specialized programs.

The Task Force on Community Residential Programs developed all recommendations independent of the following results. These results, however, are included in justifications and/or implications of recommendations in an effort to present a complete picture of each problem area identified and/or the impact of the proposed recommendation presented by the Task Force.

Methodology: The questionnaire was designed for distribution to individuals and/or organizations who either were associated with Community Residential Centers or departmental furlough policies and programs or were community members with an active interest in programs which could have direct impact on their community.

To facilitate the distribution and subsequent summarization of the results of the questionnaire, the major group identified for distribution were members of the Federation of Community Councils, Anchorage (1396 questionnaires). In addition, specific groups were identified for limited distribution. Groups identified for distribution (and number of questionnaires distributed to each group) were as follows: (1) Alaska Sentencing Commission (20), (2) Alaska State Troopers (20), (3) New Start Center (20), (4) Community Residential Centers (60), (5) Prison ministries volunteers (130), (6) Victims for Justice (20), (7) Alliance for the Mentally Ill (20), (8) Mothers against Drunk Driving (20), (9) Anchorage Chamber of Commerce (20) (10) Alaska Federation of Natives (11) and (11) Alaska State Legislature (60).

Following is an analysis of the number of questionnaires distributed (by distribution category), the number of responses received for each distribution category, and the response percentage for each:

Distribution Category	Questionnaires Distributed	Responses Received	Response Percentage
Fed. of Community Councils	1396	377	0.27
Alaska Sentencing Commission	20	3	0.15
Alaska State Troopers	20	11	0.55
New Start Center	20	6	0.30
Community Residential Ctrs.	60	14	0.23
Prison Ministries	130	43	0.33
Victims For Justice	20	4	0.20
Alliance for Mentally Ill	20	6	0.30
Mothers Against Drunk Driving	20	1	0.05
Anchorage Chamber of Comm.	20	6	0.30
AK. Federation of Natives	11	2	0.18
AK. State Legislature	60	5	0.08
Totals	1,797.00	478.00	0.27

Qualification: As stated above, the survey instrument was distributed to a very select and limited audience. As such, the following analysis only represents the opinions and knowledge of those respondents who returned questionnaires for review.

Because the return of questionnaires were very small for many specific groups, the presentation of responses will compare the Federation of Community Councils responses with those of all other groups combined. A specific breakdown of each individual group is attached as Addendum A of this Questionnaire Summary. In addition, many comments were received which further defined the basis for the response. These comments have been included as Addendum B of this Questionnaire Summary.

SUMMARY

1. Do you think it makes sense to allow inmates, who are close to the end of their sentence, to get out of prison a few months early by letting them go to a Community Residential Center (CRC) where they are required to get a job (or job training) and begin the transition for when they are finally released?

Response	Good Idea	Bad Idea	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	293 (77.7%)	52 (13.8%)	32 (8.5%)
Other Responses	94 (93.1%)	4 (4.0%)	3 (2.9%)
Total	387 (81.0%)	56 (11.7%)	35 (7.3%)

Although over eighty-one percent of respondents indicated that this was a good idea, the positive response of community members (as indicated by the Federation of Community Council response) was significantly less than the total overall response. Numerous comments were included which indicated that this was a good idea only for specific offenders (i.e. first time offenders and/or non-violent offenders). Of the 387 positive responses to this question, 167 (43.2%) also indicated that they agreed with the statement that "I feel that prisoners should complete their sentences in jail and CRC's be used for misdemeanants and non-violent first offenders only" (Question 8b). Only 44.7% (173 of 387) of positive responses for question #1 also stated that they agreed with the statement: "I feel that the use of CRC's should be expanded to alleviate overcrowding in state correctional institutions" (Question 8A) while 40.1% (155 of 387) stated that they agreed with the statement: "I feel that the state should look for alternatives to prison and CRC's such as electronic monitoring and/or expanded use of parole and probation" (Question 8C).

Of the 387 positive responses, 25.6% felt that CRC's should be staffed with contract staff only (99), 4.1% favored staffing by Department of Corrections staff (16), and 54.3% favored a combination of both contract and DOC staff (210). The remaining 16.0% had no opinion or did not respond to question #5. Although only 11.7% responded that they felt CRC's were a bad idea, the responses were generally unqualified (and often emphatic). Of the 56 negative responses to Question #1, 85.7% indicated that they agreed with the statement: "I feel that prisoners should complete their sentences in jail and CRC's be used for misdemeanants and non-violent first offenders only" (Question 8b). Only 3.6% (2 of 56) agreed with the statement: "I feel that the use of CRC's should be expanded to alleviate overcrowding in state correctional institutions" (Question 8A) and 14.3% (8 of 56) agreed with the statement: "I feel that the state should look for alternatives to prison and CRC's such as electronic monitoring and/or expanded use of parole and probation" (Question 8C).

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

2. Are you aware of any CRC's operating in your neighborhood?

Response	Yes	No	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	43 (11.4%)	328 (87.0%)	6 (1.6%)
Other Responses	35 (34.6%)	66 (65.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	78 (16.3%)	394 (82.4%)	6 (1.3%)

Only 16.3% of all respondents indicated that they were aware of a CRC operating in their neighborhood. Although over one of every three respondents from the specialized groups identified for distribution indicated that they were aware of a CRC in their neighborhood, only slightly more than ten percent of respondents from the Federation of Community Councils indicated an awareness of a CRC in their neighborhood.

It is significant to note that some respondents who indicated an awareness of a CRC in their neighborhood included comments like "Yes, Jack's Place" or "Yes, Bean's Cafe" (see Addendum B of this summary). It is also significant to note the small percentage of "Yes" responses, given that the majority of the respondents live in the Anchorage area (where the two largest Community Residential Centers and one substance abuse treatment center is located).

3. If you answered "Yes" to question #2, how has that facility impacted your neighborhood?"

Response	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Unknown Impact	No Impact	No Response
Federation of Community Councils	9 (20.9%)	3 (7.1%)	13 (30.2%)	13 (30.2%)	5 (11.6%)
Other Responses	16 (45.7%)	1 (2.9%)	6 (17.1%)	10 (28.6%)	2 (5.7%)
Total	25 (32.1%)	4 (5.1%)	19 (24.4%)	23 (29.5%)	7 (8.9%)

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

Nearly one-third of all respondents who indicated an awareness of a Community Residential Center operating in their neighborhood (25 of 78) reported a positive impact as a result of the CRC. However, only slightly more than two of every ten respondents from the Federation of Community Councils reported a similar impact, whereas nearly one-half of all other respondents reported a positive impact.

A total of 61.6% reported no impact and/or positive impact, with an additional 24.4% reporting an unknown impact. Only 5.1% of all respondents (7.1% of Federation of Community Council respondents) reported a negative impact as a result of the operation of a Community Residential Center.

4. CRC's in Alaska are currently owned and operated by private, for-profit or nonprofit corporations under contract to the Department of Corrections. Please circle the letter of the answer that most accurately reflects your opinion regarding cost.
- A. Contracting privately owned and operated CRC's cost the state less money.
 - B. State owned and operated CRC's cost the state less money.
 - C. I have no opinion regarding the cost of CRC's.

Response	Contracting Costs Less	State Costs Less	No Opinion	No Response
Federation of Community Councils	161 (42.7%)	24 (6.4%)	158 (41.9%)	34 (9.0%)
Other Responses	58 (57.4%)	3 (3.0%)	31 (30.7%)	9 (8.9%)
Total	219 (45.8%)	27 (5.7%)	189 (39.5%)	43 (9.0%)

The highest percentage of responses (45.8%) felt that contracting costs the State of Alaska less than State owned and operated Community Residential Centers. Only slightly more than 5 of every 100 responses felt that State owned and operated facilities costs the State less money.

It is significant that almost 4 of every 10 respondents did not have an opinion concerning the costs of Community Residential Centers, and 48.5% of all respondents had no opinion or did not respond to this question.

Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)

5. Please indicate below how you think CRC's should be staffed.

Response	Contract Staff	DOC Staff	DOC & Contract	No Opinion	No Response
Federation of Community Councils	76 (20.2%)	29 (7.7%)	202 (53.6%)	53 (14.0%)	17 (4.5%)
Other Responses	38 (37.6%)	2 (2.0%)	42 (41.6%)	12 (11.9%)	7 (6.9%)
Total	114 (23.8%)	31 (6.5%)	244 (51.1%)	65 (13.6%)	24 (5.0%)

The majority of respondents to this questions felt that Community Residential Centers should be staffed by a combination of Department of Corrections and Contract staff. Federation of Community Council respondents responded at a rate of 53.6% compared to only 41.6% of all other respondents. Only two of every ten respondents from the Federation of Community Councils felt that Community Residential Centers should be staff with Contract staff only, and only 7.5% felt that they should be staffed with Department of Corrections staff only. All other respondents were about equally divided between Contract staff only (37.6%) and a combination of DOC and Contract staff (41.6%). Only two of the one hundred and one (101) "other responses" which were received felt that staffing should be by Department of Corrections staff only.

6. The following criteria is always considered to determine the acceptable levels of risk with CRC placement. Please rate each criteria from 1-10 (10 being the most important).

CRITERIA	FCC Avg.	Total Avg.	CRITERIA	FCC Avg.	Total Avg.
A. Custody/Security Level	7.16	7.10	F. Length of Sentence	5.99	6.07
B. Institutional Record	7.51	7.54	G. Nature of Offense	8.56	8.44
C. Treatment Status	6.27	6.35	H. Past CRC/P&P Record	7.55	7.62
D. Court Orders	6.12	6.11	I. Victim's Comments	5.40	5.64
E. Release Needs	4.70	4.89	J. Other	3.66	3.94

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

The above data indicates the total average number of points for each criteria. Based on responses to the questionnaire, the most important criteria considered to determine the acceptable level of risk was "Nature of the Offense (i.e. violent vs. non-violent), receiving an average of 8.44 from all respondents and 8.56 from Federation of Community Council respondents. Two hundred fifty one (251) respondents rated this criteria a "10" (representing 52.5% of all respondents). The relative order (or ranking) of all criteria was as follows:

	<u>FCC</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
(1) Nature of Offense	8.56	8.44
(2) Past CRC/P&P Record	7.55	7.62
(3) Institutional Record	7.51	7.54
(4) Custody/Security Level	7.16	7.10
(5) Treatment Program Status	6.27	6.35
(6) Court Orders or Recommendations	6.12	6.11
(7) Length of Sentence Remaining	5.99	6.07
(8) Victim's Comments	5.40	5.64
(9) Release Needs (family, job, etc.)	4.70	4.89
(10) Other	3.66	3.94

7. Some CRC's are used for offenders with special problems or needs. Listed below are several types of treatment programs and special needs offenders. Please indicate your feelings on a scale of 1 to 10 (with 1 being the least acceptable) regarding your acceptance for each type of program in your neighborhood. Also indicate how you feel the level of acceptance would be by your neighborhood as a whole in the block provided.

Specialized Utilization	FCC		Total	
	Community	Respondent	Community	Respondent
Substance Abuse	4.04	4.98	4.61	5.50
Employment/Vocation	6.41	7.32	6.70	7.49
Native Offender	4.38	5.32	4.79	5.71
Sex Offender Treatment	2.21	2.85	2.56	3.35
Female Offender	4.24	4.91	4.72	5.35
Mentally Ill Offender	3.54	4.35	3.81	4.76
Non-Violent P&P	5.15	5.87	5.58	6.25
Housing Only	3.06	3.45	3.26	3.59

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

The above data indicates the average number of points assigned for acceptability for each specialized utilization criteria. The criteria receiving the highest level of acceptability was Employment/Vocation Training Programs receiving an average of 7.49 from all respondents and 7.32 from Federation of Community Council respondents. One hundred fifty nine (159) respondents rated this criteria a "10" (representing 33.3% of all respondents). The relative order (or ranking) of all criteria was as follows:

	<u>FCC</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
(1) Employment/Vocation	7.32	7.49
(2) Non-Violent P&P Violations	5.87	6.25
(3) Native Offender	5.32	5.71
(4) Substance Abuse	4.98	5.50
(5) Female Offender	4.91	5.35
(6) Mentally Ill Offenders	4.35	4.76
(7) Housing <u>Only</u> Programs	3.45	3.59
(8) Sex Offender Treatment	2.85	3.35

A total of 209 (43.7%) of all respondents rated Sex Offender Treatment a "1" or "0", while another 180 (37.6%) of all respondents rated Housing only programs a "1" or "0".

8. Please circle the letter of the following statement(s) that you agree with:

RESPONSE	GROUP	AGREE	DIS-AGREE
Expanded utilization of CRC's to relieve institutional over-crowding;	FCC	115 (30.5%)	262 (69.5%)
	TOTAL	179 (37.4%)	299 (62.6%)
Prisoners complete sentences in jail and utilize CRC's for misdemeanants and first time non-violent offenders;	FCC	203 (53.8%)	174 (46.2%)
	TOTAL	235 (49.2%)	243 (50.8%)
Alternative such as electronic monitoring and/or expanded use of P&P;	FCC	124 (32.9%)	253 (67.1%)
	TOTAL	172 (36.0%)	306 (64.0%)
Other;	FCC	34 (9.0%)	343 (91.0%)
	TOTAL	44 (9.2%)	434 (90.8%)

The largest number of all respondents (49.2%) agreed with the statement that

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

prisoners should complete their sentences in jail and CRC's should be utilized for misdemeanants and first time non-violent offenders only. This is particularly evident in responses received from the Federation of Community Councils, where 53.8% of all respondents agreed with this statement. The responses to "Expanded utilization of CRC's" and "Alternatives to prison and CRC's were approximately equal, with 37.4% in favor of the former and 36.0% in favor of the latter.

Thirty-six (36) respondents agreed with both statement A & B (7.5%), 97 respondents agreed with both statement A & C (20.3%), 55 respondents agreed with both statement B & C (11.5%), and 17 respondents agreed with all three statements (3.6%). A total of 44 respondents proposed other alternatives (9.2%). A listing of other proposed alternatives is included as Addendum B of this questionnaire summary.

9. Should each CRC be required to have a Community Advisory Board made up of citizens from the community and neighborhood?

Response	Yes	No	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	321 (85.1%)	41 (10.9%)	15 (4.0%)
Other Responses	87 (86.2%)	8 (7.9%)	6 (5.9%)
Total	408 (85.3%)	49 (10.3%)	21 (4.4%)

A total of 408 responses (85.3%) were in favor of the establishment of Community Advisory Boards. The percentage of responses from the Federation of Community Councils (85.1%) and all other respondents (86.2%) were consistent. Only 49 responses (10.3%) were not in favor of mandatory Community Advisory Boards.

10. Should Community Advisory Boards have the authority to reject a particular referral?

Response	Yes	No	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	267 (70.8%)	85 (22.5%)	25 (6.7%)
Other Responses	64 (63.4%)	30 (29.7%)	7 (6.9%)
Total	331 (69.2%)	115 (24.1%)	32 (6.7%)

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

A total of 331 responses (69.2%) were in favor of Community Advisory Boards having the authority to reject specific referrals. The percentage of positive responses from the Federation of Community Councils was significantly higher (70.8%) than other respondents (63.4%). A total of 115 (24.1%) of all respondents were against the authority to reject specific referrals by Community Advisory Boards.

11. Should the Department of Corrections fund travel for an annual statewide meeting or Community Advisory Board members to discuss and review community Residential Center policies and procedures?

Response	Yes	No	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	184 (48.8%)	160 (42.4%)	33 (8.8%)
Other Responses	50 (49.5%)	38 (37.6%)	13 (12.9%)
Total	234 (49.0%)	198 (41.4%)	46 (9.6%)

The largest number of respondents were in favor of the State (Department of Corrections) funding travel for a statewide meeting each year (49.0%). The number of responses who were not in favor of the idea represented 41.4% of the total responses received. The responses in favor of the idea between the Federation of Community Councils (48.8%) and "other responses" (49.5%) were consistent. A higher percentage of Federation of Community Council responses (42.4%) were opposed to the idea than "other responses" (37.6%)

12. Are you in any way associated with any individual, group or organization that has an interest in CRC policies or the Department of Corrections?

Response	Yes	No	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	53 (14.1%)	315 (83.6%)	9 (2.3%)
Other Responses	59 (58.4%)	35 (34.7%)	7 (6.9%)
Total	112 (23.4%)	350 (73.2%)	16 (3.4%)

Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)

Over twenty three percent of all respondents indicated an affiliation with a group or organization which has an interest in CRC policies or the Department of Corrections. Only 14.1% of FCC respondents indicated an affiliation with such an organization compared to 58.4% of all "other respondents". This high percentage of other respondents would be expected, since these groups were chosen for distribution based on their knowledge and/or affiliation with such a group.

13. How long have you lived in Alaska?

Response	< 1 year	1-5 years	5-10 years	10 < years	No response
Federation of Community Councils	0 (0.0%)	17 (4.5%)	32 (8.5%)	323 (85.7%)	5 (1.3%)
Other Responses	1 (1.0%)	8 (7.9%)	16 (15.8%)	72 (71.3%)	4 (4.0%)
Total	1 (0.2%)	25 (5.2%)	48 (10.1%)	395 (82.6%)	9 (1.9%)

In excess of 80% of all respondents indicated that they have resided in Alaska in excess of 10 years. Only 26 respondents (5.4%) have lived in Alaska less than five years and another 48 respondents (10.1%) have lived in Alaska between 5 and 10 years. As indicated above, the majority of respondents were long-time Alaskans, which could possibly be explained by their active involvement in groups and/or organizations interested in CRC's (or their membership in the Federation of Community Councils).

14. What is your sex?

Response	Male	Female	No Response
Fed. of Community Councils	208 (55.2%)	162 (43.0%)	7 (1.8%)
Other Responses	64 (63.4%)	32 (31.7%)	5 (4.9%)
Total	272 (56.9%)	194 (40.6%)	12 (2.5%)

**Community Questionnaire
Summary (cont.)**

Slightly more than half of the total respondents (56.9%) were male while 40.6% were female. Respondents who indicated that responses were "joint responses" between husband and wife were recorded as a single response and the sex of the response was recorded as "male" or "Female" alternately.

15. What is your age?

Response	< 18	18-25	25-35	35-45	45-55	55 <	N/A
Federation of Community Councils	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	37 9.8%	117 31.0%	112 29.7%	105 27.9%	5 1.3%
Other Responses	0 0.0%	2 2.0%	4 4.0%	29 28.7%	35 34.6%	26 25.7%	5 5.0%
Total	0 0.0%	3 0.6%	40 8.6%	146 30.5%	147 30.8%	131 27.4%	10 2.1%

Almost nine of ten respondents (88.7%) were over 35 years of age, with approximately an equal amount from the group 35-45 (30.5%), the group 45-55 (30.8%) and the group 55 or over (27.4%).

RESPONSE KEY

Alphabetical:	A - F	Response as indicated on Questionnaire
	N	No Response
Numerical:	0 - 10	Response as indicated on Questionnaire
	99	No Response
Respondent:	ACC	Anchorage Chamber of Commerce
	AFI	Alaska Federation of Natives
	AMI	Alliance for the Mentally Ill
	AOG	Prison Ministeries
	ASC	Alaska Sentencing Commission
	AST	Alaska State Troopers
	CRC	Community Residential Centers
	FCC	Federation of Community Councils
	LR	Legislative Responses
	MDR	Mothers Against Drunk Driving
	NSR	New Start Center
	VJR	Victim's For Justice

Addendum A

	# 1			# 2			# 3				
	A	B	N	A	B	N	A	B	C	D	N
ACC	5	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5
AFI	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
AMI	5	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
AOG	43	0	0	16	27	0	7	1	3	3	29
ASC	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2
AST	8	2	1	1	10	0	0	0	1	0	10
CRC	14	0	0	10	4	0	6	0	0	4	4
FCC	293	52	32	43	328	6	9	3	14	13	338
LR	5	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	3
MDR	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
NSR	6	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	2	1	3
VJR	2	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Total	387	56	35	78	394	6	25	4	20	23	406
%	81.0%	11.7%	7.3%	16.3%	82.4%	1.3%	5.2%	0.8%	4.3%	4.8%	84.9%

	# 4				# 5				
	A	B	C	N	A	B	C	D	N
ACC	3	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	1
AFI	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
AMI	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	0
AOG	20	2	15	6	12	1	22	4	4
ASC	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
AST	6	0	5	0	1	0	7	3	0
CRC	14	0	0	0	12	0	2	0	0
FCC	161	24	158	34	76	29	202	53	17
LR	3	1	1	0	3	0	2	0	0
MDR	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
NSR	4	0	2	0	3	0	2	1	0
VJR	2	0	2	0	1	0	2	1	0
Total	219	27	189	43	114	31	244	65	24
%	45.8%	5.7%	39.5%	9.0%	23.8%	6.5%	51.1%	13.6%	5.0%

Question # 6

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
99	50	38	58	39	39	42	35	42	47	339
10	129	123	69	60	41	64	251	137	78	30
9	41	69	31	33	23	34	65	71	37	2
8	54	83	64	65	45	58	36	61	50	5
7	43	42	46	36	36	44	20	44	22	4
6	30	29	42	43	19	45	10	32	25	3
5	48	35	64	88	63	67	15	36	50	6
4	24	18	43	40	33	36	5	20	25	2
3	26	17	35	31	65	28	6	13	32	6
2	20	15	19	23	53	36	12	6	60	10
1	13	9	10	20	58	24	23	15	48	69
0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	4	2
Total Avg.	7.10	7.54	6.35	6.11	4.89	6.07	8.44	7.62	5.64	3.94
FCC Avg.	7.16	7.51	6.27	6.12	4.70	5.99	8.56	7.55	5.40	3.66

Question # 7								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
99	101-52	101-52	123-78	101-53	104-59	101-56	105-57	113-66
10	38-75	102-159	22-57	13-37	30-53	22-42	42-74	16-35
9	15-21	33-46	14-22	5-13	17-32	5-14	22-37	5-9
8	30-44	55-63	28-50	10-20	35-45	16-41	48-57	23-25
7	20-29	37-38	36-40	7-12	24-37	17-32	40-55	16-20
6	23-25	21-20	35-37	9-17	30-31	21-25	27-29	14-11
5	68-77	45-33	73-78	26-31	74-66	70-73	72-60	47-46
4	31-22	9-10	27-15	15-18	23-21	32-40	30-20	20-23
3	27-32	14-9	29-23	35-29	31-26	45-29	21-22	23-27
2	31-26	14-11	17-13	44-39	22-21	36-26	18-26	33-36
1	94-75	47-37	73-64	208-199	84-82	110-96	53-41	153-165
0	0-0	0-0	1-1	5-10	4-5	3-4	0-0	15-15
Total Avg.	4.61-5.50	6.70-7.49	4.79-5.71	2.56-3.35	4.72-5.35	3.81-4.76	5.58-6.25	3.26-3.59
FCC Avg.	4.04-4.98	6.41-7.32	4.38-5.32	2.21-2.85	4.24-4.91	3.54-4.35	5.15-5.87	3.06-3.45

(Note: Community Acceptance - Respondent's Acceptance)

		# 8			# 9			# 10		
	A	B	C	D	A	B	N	A	B	N
ACC	0	4	4	0	5	1	0	5	0	1
AFI	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	0
AMI	4	3	1	2	6	0	0	6	0	0
AOC	34	5	24	3	35	4	4	26	14	3
ASC	3	0	3	0	2	0	1	1	1	1
AST	2	9	1	3	9	2	0	8	3	0
CRC	11	2	6	1	13	0	1	8	5	1
FCC	115	203	124	34	321	41	15	267	85	25
LR	4	2	4	0	5	0	0	1	3	1
MDR	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
NSR	3	3	2	0	5	1	0	3	3	0
VJR	1	3	2	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
Total	179	235	172	44	408	49	21	331	115	32
%	37.4%	49.2%	36.0%	9.2%	85.3%	10.3%	4.4%	69.2%	24.1%	6.7%

	# 11			# 12			# 13				
	A	B	N	A	B	N	A	B	C	D	N
ACC	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	4	0
AFI	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
AMI	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	0
AOG	23	14	6	23	16	4	1	5	10	25	2
ASC	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	0
AST	6	4	1	4	6	1	0	0	0	10	1
CRC	8	4	2	7	6	1	0	0	2	11	1
FCC	184	160	33	53	315	9	0	17	32	323	5
LR	0	4	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	0
MDR	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
NSR	3	3	0	4	2	0	0	0	1	5	0
VJR	2	2	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	3	0
Total	234	198	46	112	350	16	1	25	48	395	9
%	49.0%	41.4%	9.6%	23.4%	73.2%	3.4%	0.2%	5.2%	10.1%	82.6%	1.9%

	# 14			# 15						
	A	B	N	A	B	C	D	E	F	N
ACC	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	0
AFI	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
AMI	2	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	0
AOG	34	7	2	0	0	1	8	13	19	2
ASC	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
AST	9	1	1	0	0	0	4	6	0	1
CRC	6	6	2	0	1	1	3	5	2	2
FCC	208	162	7	0	1	37	117	112	105	5
LR	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0
MDR	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
NSR	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0
VJR	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0
Total	272	194	12	0	3	41	146	147	131	10
%	56.9%	40.6%	2.5%	0.0%	0.5%	8.6%	30.5%	30.8%	27.4%	2.1%

ADDENDUM B

1. Do you think it makes sense to allow inmates, who are close to the end of their sentence, to get out of prison a few months early by letting them go to a Community Residential Center (CRC) where they are required to get a job (or job training) and begin the transition for when they are finally released?
 - A. Not in all cases. Screening is necessary to determine those inmates this program will benefit.
 - A. Exceptions: 1. Sex offenders, 2. History of violence, 3. Violent prison history
 - A. For certain types of offenders and under certain circumstances.
 - A. Under strict supervision. Reduces cost - makes more space available for crowded prisons.
 - A. The thought of having a prisoner released directly from jail scares me. If he has no job or no money and he's not prepared, what is he going to do?--RE-OFFEND!
 - A. I believe that the CRC gives them a chance to get acquainted with society. It also gives them a chance to establish a foundation in which they may live, i.e. job, housing and financial stability. This way they have a start in life upon their release and just don't go to the streets with nothing.
 - A. It would be good for inmates who have proven they have changed also not violent.
 - A. However, I do not have a high level of confidence regarding just who is being released back into the community--I do not favor such a program for sex offenders, rapists, and murderers.
 - A. They need the extra support so they do not become isolated and discouraged and so they learn to live with rules outside.
 - A. Please see enclosed article from Anch Times sent to me by Bill Weimar. [11/17/91 Sec. F4, "I've Been There: Jail is Cushy Compared to Halfway House Life".]
 - A. They should be monitored to provide self-direction.
 - A. but I think program should be tailored to the prisoner. For example, I would think a person who has been imprisoned for 2 years would have different requirements than one in for 10 years.
 - A. High percentage of these people would not be in jail if they had saleable job skills. It is only humane to give them training, counseling and support on the job--besides it makes economic sense.
 - A. No more than six [months]. Only if inmates are closely monitored via electronic anklets/devices used to verify the inmates' whereabouts 24 hrs. a day.
 - A. A few more weeks or months in prison will not likely improve their chances of success. Participation in a CRC will help many achieve success.
 - A. This would be wonderful; however, having visited "a" CRC recently, I think you should check your staffing proceed. Bad attitudes create more problems.
 - A. The only way to do it! But they should be getting life skills training in prison too.
 - A. It gave the inmates a positive role.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. I trust training is already going on inside prisons even before release.
- A. As long as the re-training services & educational component is significant & quality.
- A. The state should take 35% of their earnings so they understand no one can live for free.
- A. With NO people who have a history of vicious or repeated violent crimes.
- A. This should be essential to a prisoner's rehabilitation.
- A. Site selection and management are critical.
- A. Yes, but I feel that currently inmates are not supervised adequately. I am alarmed that prisoners who need medication are unable to afford it on release and get caught on the "system".
- A. But in a centralized minimum security facility. Capacity determined by the size of the community. Instead of spread all over the city.
- A. For some offenders all or a large part of a sentence should be served in a CRC.
- A. So long as it is no earlier than 3-6 months prior to release. I think more could be done to assist them in obtaining work, especially where they have no real employable skills.
- A. I feel it is a must for anyone who has been incarcerated for more than a few months.
- A. Most inmates can't just walk out the door of jail and walk into a job.
- A. I feel its the only hope we have Without it, we only create problems.
- A. I believe it would be helpful to have a transitional facility for the inmates, because many of them have no idea where to go or what to do when they get out.
- A. Keeping most non-violent prisoners in hard jails is a waste of taxpayers money. Only most violent criminals should be kept in hard jails for full non-probationary sentence.
- A. Good idea because most recently released inmates have too little money and training for a job to sustain themselves and are, therefore, subject to crime again.
- A. I think the longer they have been in the sooner they should go to a CRC to help in the transition to society.
- A. EXTREME care must be taken in the selection process of who gets to go into the program. It shouldn't be routine. Charles Meach was on work release from API when he murdered 4 teenagers.
- A. Especially if job or job training is mandatory for discharge!
- A. Active pursuit of employment should be a requirement for staying in a CRC.
- A. This will lessen the feeling of displacement and produce fewer repeat offenders.
- A. But must require treatment to be allowed to go.
- A. For those whose history suggest rehab is possible
- A. Requires active participation of community and businesses
- A. Be sure they understand this is a gift--and they are completing a sentence required of them.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. Only for non-violent offenders such as white collar crime, burglars, we need the death penalty for the others.
- A. Seems fine, but never having been in prison, it seems better to ask prisoners who are in prison; in half-way house now; were in half-way and now clean or back in prison.
- A. Have personal knowledge of prisoner who requested, with urgency, to go first to half-way house before being released.
- A. Only if their behavior and prison records indicate they would participate. violent, non-motivated, and/or disrupting inmates would torpedo this effort.
- A. State needs true rehab program
- A. A good location would be Bootleggers Cove or Geneva Woods.
- A. But I feel a lot of safeguards should be built in--like supervision to and from work. Also I feel the inmate should contribute financially to the program while he is in it from job earnings, etc.
- A. "Get out early" is bad wording--I assume you mean 90-120 days of sentence to be served in half-way house.
- A. Where are the Training funds to come from? There is no indication an early release would be earned.
- A. But not for violent crimes; ie. murder, rape, child abuse.
- A. When they are ready;not dictated by lack of space in prison.
- A. I would rather a judge add two months to service time to (illegible)
- A. The CRC might be regulated by percentages of time sentenced--perhaps 5-8% of the time assigned.
- A. With the exception of repeat offenders, "hardened" inmates that are difficult or impossible to train.
- A. If they are to get out early
- A. This presupposes adequate supervision and training.
- A. No more than 3 months before end of sentence. Additional training at/on their release.
- A. For 6 mo-2 yrs.
- A. Depends upon the crime and ability to rehabilitate
- A. In someone else's neighborhood or industrial areas.
- A. If they are otherwise socially responsible.
- A. Lack of transition is big part of recidivism; it's why McLaughlin Youth Center is a sad failure--no follow up. State Corrections is at fault.
- A. Advisable to do so to allow for transition and adjustment period. Those who will return to society need to be as prepared as possible for success and transitional period. A. Requires availability to Public transportation
- A. Depends on what the crime is. Maximum level offenders should do their time.
- A. Especially if they have a good record in prison.
- A. Depending on the severity or nature of the crime. Sex offenders should never be released!

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. Depends on their record of behavior during their custody also the court orders and recommendations should be satisfied and considered.
- A. Should be helpful to rehab efforts, cut jail crowding and likely more economical.
- A. But! There has to be qualified, competent people controlling the CRC's.
- A. Should be working for state long term as well. Work crews to clean up litter, etc. Inmates should pay their debt, instead of the state paying for their vacation.
- A. For minor non-violent offenders
- A. Providing violent crime offenders have received therapy.
- A. Charge restitution
- A. Do we have such a center?
- A. Yes, provided that the release is subject to their completing a tailored treatment program.
- A. If we ever expect to rehabilitate criminals we must get serious about the process. This is one way.
- A. Depends on what "close" means--2 yrs? 5 yrs? 6 weeks?
- A. Inmates must be good candidates for re-entry into society and work. Not all would be.
- A. If you carefully and often determine if the CRC is causing repeat offenders.
- A. For long term sentences, yes--job training; for short term sentences, no--spend the money on the longer term inmates.
- A. this time gives them a chance to adjust and get a job
- A. If for no longer than 6 months.
- A. Only for certain offenses
- A. Will it be assured they have a job and/or job training?
- A. but not released before serving their full time.
- A. if they have no history of repeat offenses or mental instability.
- A. Depends on how costly and the crime committed. Do CRC's have proven record?
- A. Unless it's for one of the violent crimes.
- A. Strict rules to follow--curfew, friends that visit; must be in a job or a training program. No drugs or alcohol.
- A. Cuts costs
- A. Depends on the attitude of the inmate.
- A. This will allow inmates to realize a more practical idea of the real world.
- A. Depends on the severity of the crime.
- A. With certain restrictions depending on nature of crime and prospects for rehabilitation
- A. For misdemeanants and non-violent first time offenders only--all other prisoners should complete sentence in jail
- A. Better transition and less costly.
- A. If it's shown to reduce repeat offenders.
- A. Assuming the cost to the state is approx. the same.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. The early release should be based on the total sentence, ex: 2-3 months of a 5 year sentence would be ok; 2-3 months of a 1 year sentence, however, may be too lenient.
- B. Inmates should be required to serve their complete sentences in jail. The first few months of probation should be in a CRC. Failure to complete a CRC program s/b grounds for revocation.
- B. The inmate does not serve his "full" sentence!! Even now the inmate gets early out on good behavior.
- B. If you do the crime, you do the time.
- B. Serve full term! Computer skills, shop, electronic repairs, etc. should be available to and paid for by prisoners through work programs in jail.
- B. Stop putting non-criminals in jail & you will not be so crowded.
- B. Release into low-income neighborhood is not in best interest of either--neighborhoods are not institutions.
- B. It is bad enough to have tax \$ pay for jail--now a CRC too--no thanks.
- B. Build more jail space, keep inmates longer.
- B. It is a bad idea if they are placed in residential areas without coming before community councils and explaining the program and who will be responsible.
- B. Every case is different and there are too many non-responsible persons in our community--Don't establish a precedent with criminals.
- B. Since most get out early on parole anyway have them put in CRC time after they serve their sentence.
- B. Preparation for transition should be handled within the prison system.
- B. A judge makes a sentence. That sentence should be served in its entirety.
- B. Let them serve their full sentence while working.
- B. Statistics show a high % of criminals repeat crime. Placing them in a residential community exposes that community to higher crime rate. Perhaps using CRC's only for criminals of "white collar" crimes might be justified.
- B. Transition should begin after sentence has been served.
- B. Residential Centers should be in industrial or isolated areas. Some inmates will target those around them for new and exciting crimes.
- B. "Not in my backyard" (or in anyone else's)!
- B. They should always finish their sentence. Few sentences are currently served in full and are too lenient to begin with--
- B. I don't need any more criminals in our neighborhood.
- B. Depends on time left remaining. I believe the release should be for no more than 2-3 months. Sentence should be served.
- B. I think that the sentences imposed by statute lose their deterrent value if the required time in jail is not served--I would support such an idea if days at a CRC are either additional days or count as a fraction of jail days.
- N. It would depend upon the type of crime and the inmates conduct while in the institution.

Addendum B (cont.)

- N. Depends on each case--usually good idea.
- N. Only if they have a job--not just job training--The folks in the communities are working.
- N. How many months is a "few" months - 2 or 9? Not sure it's a good idea to have inmates living together--they might be a bad influence on one another.
- N. Maybe - depends on type of crime and if person was paroled CRC's could potentially be used to solve overcrowding of prison system--not in best interest of community.
- N. Individual basis--depends on 1) individual 2) crime
- N. depends on offense and participation in treatment programs while incarcerated.
- N. It depends on the offense. No--for rape, murder, or child abuse. Yes, for paper-only embezzlement or others where no physical violence is involved. No--for armed robbery.
- N. you don't know until you try it.
- N. "A" --basically. It depends upon how long they've been incarcerated and for what offense.
- N. I lack expertise - likely to be a good idea.
- N. only non-violent inmates and they should pay for the privilege
- N. Only for 1st time offenders. Not for repeat offenders.
- N. Depends on the crime. How motivated the person was to get job training and self improvement.
- N. unless there is expectation that inmate has converted to normal citizen, he/she should not be in residential neighborhood.

2. Are you aware of any CRC's operating in your neighborhood?

- A. Akeela House
- A. Allvest Inc & Glennwood
- A. Corner of 9th & D
- A. Don't know name, why did I get this survey?
- A. Not Sure
- A. Cordova Center, Glennwood Center
- A. No, but here is a youth offender facility on our block
- A. Private program but not state
- A. Jack's Place - Alvest and some church operated
- A. Cordova
- A. Glennwood
- A. Alvest, inc, Cordova St.
- A. Cordova House & Glennwood (if its still in operation)
- A. Akeela House, Clitheroe Ctr Etc.
- A. Tundra Center
- A. Glacier Manor in Lemon Creek

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. North Star
 - A. Clitheroe Center
 - A. On Lk. Otis near Tudor Rd./DD offenses
 - A. Mountain View is not my immediate neighborhood.
 - A. Cordova Center "Terrible Staff Attitudes"
 - A. Northern Lights Recovery Center
 - A. Half-way house, at Esther, Alaska
 - A. North Star Center--(Allvest)
 - A. Cordova Center, Glennwood Center, New Dawn, Genesis House, TCV (Salv. Army) *It would help if you defined "neighborhood" (Achorage bowl)
 - A. Social Rehabilitation Center--No longer in operation closed by Governor's veto 6/30/91

 - B. Quite frankly I wouldn't want one in my neighborhood.
 - B. I'm sure they are not "advertised" to the neighbors they "sneak" them in!
 - B. We would fight against this.
 - N. these should be in a restricted area--by police dept.
3. If you answered "Yes" to question #2, how has that facility impacted your neighborhood?"
- A. Community participation in rehabilitation of inmates so that they will lead productive lives. Past residents of SRC participate in cultural activities in the community, hold jobs at Red Dog, become mayors of a community.
 - A. Residents from the community serve on the advisory board and actively participate in the planning process.
 - A. Inmate: released into the community who have no place to go or no \$ have supervised living situations.
 - A. As a pastor in the area I believe the impact is positive. It is better to have this transition time then to have individuals released "cold" on the streets. Usually they have no where to go except back into crime.
 - A. Not enough work for the transitioning inmates.
 - A. Tundra Center has had its share of problems (especially management--Allvest), but, in general, it is an asset to the community.
 - A. Glenwood Centers community service program has helped get projects in the community accomplished.
 - A. A number of inmates have completed their sentences there (Northern Lights Recovery Ctr) while working intensely on Alcohol/drug issues as well as other issues related to reintegration into society. Some have been successful and are now positive contributors to our community.
 - A. Keep former inmates out of trouble and as a good transition tool.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. Inmates I have met are performing community service for non-profit social service organizations. They have positive attitudes, are courteous and good workers. Most have mentioned the hard time they had finding jobs.
- A. I believe that the facilities with community work service helps non-profit organizations perform much needed work. These facilities and residents are very good assets for the community.
- A. Like all other CRC's, I can respect the work that they give back to the community--cleaning streets, etc.
- B. These do not belong in neighborhoods (residential) but should be confined only to Industrial areas, with chain industrial fencing, & locks. Industrial areas are where the jobs are located and adjacent to businesses. Residential areas are having their own problems with drugs, alcohol & crime.
- B. Neighbors of nearby employment victims of increased burglaries attributed to Akeela House residents.
- B. Most neighbors are afraid of the facility--adds a lot of extra traffic to neighborhood--seems to attract people who hang around--petty theft and car rifling stolen bikes, etc. seems prevalent.
- B. State and MOA (against our wishes) allowed home for emotionally troubled boys in my neighborhood so I was afraid to let by young daughter outside by herself.
- B. And there damn well won't be with our restrictive covenants.
- C. I hope it's been good. It would seem to me that anytime someone can find housing instead of being out in the streets is a positive step.
- C. Like the other neighbors, they have a lot of animals not being restrained on their property, as city ordinance requires.
- C. Increased Police calls.
- C. Alvest is in an area not surrounded by family-residential
- C. Some inmates like the center and others do not, according to what they tell me.
- D. The facility [North Star] appears to be well maintained and the grounds are kept free of debris.
- D. Nobody seems to know the building at 835 D St. is a halfway house. I have never heard any comments or complaints re: the location of Cordova C. Nobody seems to mind.
- D. No particular impact. The facilities look good and are visibly well kept up.
- D. Allvest has been in our neighborhood for 5 years. Because of their programs--I feel strongly that they really help inmates adjust, and therefore--no problems.
- D. Minor impacts--increased traffic, a few more "less than desirable" types walking around--but this is downtown--so they probably don't come from the CRC.
- D. Several houses in this community have "tenant-like" set ups. Absentee landlords who are not willing to make improvements to their properties. This is negative--however not recognized by the powers that be as negative. Won't a CRC be the same?
- D. Neutral impact, which is good.

Addendum B (cont.)

D. Cordova residents have provided good community service.

N. Depends on zoning if such a facility could be.

N. A facility in my neighborhood would not affect the neighborhood although you might not be able to tell for sure if you judge from the amount of howling going on should you try to put one in.

N. where such facilities, or shelters for alcohol offenders are involved, the neighborhood feels less safe. Neighbors can no longer walk freely where they once did. Rehab centers are necessary but should be well supervised. Restrictions should be with the protector of the neighborhood in mind. Neighbors and community Councils should have input prior to establishing rehab houses.

N. Jack's Place's very negative - Alvest positive. Church operated-Impact our already crowded schools, and parks. This is a high density population area and does not need any more high volume facilities.

N. Cordova Center and Glenwood Center are both in communities adjoining mine.

N. If I knew of such a facility, I feel it would be negative. No one needs or wants to live near criminals--even tho they have been rehabilitated (to what degree?)

N. Our neighborhood has been very hard hit by a severe recidivist juvenile offender who is out on frequent overnight passes and continues to terrorize the community. His widespread boasts to kill someone before his 18th birthday are taken seriously by many of us who have known him for years.

N. How could they possibly have a positive impact?

N. My house is the largest single investment I will ever make. It is also where my family and I find peace and contentment. Do not ruin this by moving in a CRC.

N. Not in my immediate neighborhood--about 6 miles out--I am well acquainted with this institution [North Star Center]--have heard no complaints.

N. every facility has both positive and negative effects--positive effects are the opportunities to facilitate back into the community in a positive way.

4. CRC's in Alaska are currently owned and operated by private, for-profit or nonprofit corporations under contract to the Department of Corrections. Please circle the letter of the answer that most accurately reflects your opinion regarding cost.

A. Contracting privately owned and operated CRC's cost the state less money.

B. State owned and operated CRC's cost the state less money.

C. I have no opinion regarding the cost of CRC's.

A. DOC or H&SS should be adequately staffed so these programs can be constantly monitored by State agencies. There should be an inspector for each center.

A. Cost per inmate is about 1/2 the cost if privately owned companies run the CRC's. Also the state receives 33 1/3 % of resident wage after they become employed.

A. Keep it to private contractors. State control creates monstrosities!

A. Please don't make these state institutions!

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. I can see private non-profit but have reservations and concern about for-profit contractor. They tend to focus less on results & clients & more on profit.
- A. Cost, however, is a poor indicator of value.
- A. I do not, however, approve of contracts for CRC's awarded to for profit corporations (as is the case w/Tundra Center.)
- A. No private firm could waste as much money as the state.
- A. Division is stretched too thin now!
- A. Depending on honesty of contractor.
- A. I am very supportive of non-profit corporations.
- A. Are you kidding?
- A. Holds down on state overhead and personnel costs.
- A. The state should contract anything possible.
- A. Anything privately owned costs the state less money.
- A. State regulations should insure that it is not run by criminals to promote criminal behavior. Religion is important but not a main criteria as this could promote "religious conversions".
- A. Privatization is always desirable
- A. But at least there must be an over-sight body to insure quality
- A. Good checks and balances
- A. It seems to me it would be more "controllable".
- A. Private sector has more wage and benefit flexibility and more competition for cost and quality.
- A. "B" could make sense if inmates were treated as criminals instead of guests.
- A. Lack of public accountability is noticeable--you get passed back and forth between municipality/state and non-profit entities.
- A. But the state still has a responsibility for quality maintenance and prevention of "sweat shops."
- A. Private contracts allow more flexibility
- A. With compassionate, caring people
- A. Many of these operations have no supervision and are poorly run
- A. A proper review process must be developed to assure the proper return is being received by the state.
- A. Other states have success with this program but should not be implemented without neighborhood involvement.
- A. If done at all, a private contract (with performance bond) should be more effective.
- A. However--I believe the state is more diligent in monitoring the inmates.
- B. private citizens "cashing in" on the misfortunes of others is almost criminal in itself.
- B. I believe the state can operate CRC's as efficiently as the private sector.
- B. Private owners tend to not care how system should work. All they care about is profit.

Addendum B (cont.)

- B. The State, under proper and responsible administration, can do it better.
- B. I would hope this is correct analysis--should be.
- B. We should try to keep our city & community spending down by using state funded programs.
- B. I think that prisons and related penal functions should be handled by the state. Privatizing these functions will save little, increases the prospects of corruption or mistreatment of prisoners.
- B. The cost of CRC's should be paid by the residents.
- C. SRC was a unique program operated out of Camp Severnuguiuk (sp?). Although, DOC's conclusion is that it costs too much per inmate, we need to look at it from recidivism point of view.
- C. My primary concern is that the CRC has adequate security supervision and well trained staff.
- C. Money should not go for CRC's at all.
- C. It would seem that a non-profit corp. would be less expensive than a for-profit.
- C. Inmates & pre-releases should remain under supervision of state officers.
- C. Some are just in it for the money, not the rehabilitation of inmates.
- C. Most likely privately owned CRC's cost less money
- C. With small DOC staff insuring contractor doing the job.
- C. Public Transportation must be available
- C. Corrections should know the answer to this question and should use the least expensive option.
- C. Some sort of partnership between government and private enterprise probably would work best.
- C. Two civilian contractors plant themselves in neighborhoods resulting in security and quality of life problems.
- C. I believe facilities and contract personnel should be closely supervised by corrections staff.
- C. Except: Contracts with for-profit or non-profit CRC's should never be allowed to exceed the equivalent state service cost.
- C. Go with most effective, least costly method.
- C. I feel that it is important for treatment and rehabilitation to be included in the CRC program.
- C. I'm very surprised at this! How does the D.O.C. know what's going on?
- C. I think normally contracts costs less since government can always find a way to pay more.
- C. Could we see some actual statistics on this? They should be available.
- C. My first concern re: CRC's is quality of care, rate of recidivism, vis-a-vis private or state operated CRC's. Cost is secondary.
- C. I believe inmates participation in this program should have household assignments to offset cost of their care, regardless of whether they have a job.
- C. I think that state owned may provide a better facility.

Addendum B (cont.)

- C. However, I suspect that in the long run "B" is true, although in the short run "A" would be true.
- N. Privately owned CRC still must meet state regulations, therefore, there will be inspections, etc., another layer of bureaucracy, so in the long run, the cost is probably a wash.
- N. control & programs should be through the state. Combine work programs to reduce cost.
- N. A few owned by the state could handle all those people that nobody wants around.
- N. this is a silly question--either can be (illegible) depending on the specifics of the agency, the contractor, and the job to be done
- N. which do I Prefer? State owned and operated regardless of the cost.
- N. why not try some of both?
- N. should be state run
- N. The professional training of DOC is necessary for violent Crime off.
- N. IS THERE COMPETITION IN BIDDING?
- N. You have to give data on A & B to answer this question.
- N. I'm not sure what costs less. Non-profit may cost less than state, for profit may cost more. A & C--Could be co-owned and operated--state to own and privately run by contract.
- N. We need more information concerning costs. Once again, the people should be informed through community councils
- N. State should inform public.
- N. I would assume "A" is correct but I do not know.
- N. quality of the CRC and success rate should be factored into cost.
- N. Consider cost vs. effectiveness not just cost alone. Check stats., no opinions on cost. What is success rate of each? This is what's important.
- N. I do not know; I'd have to see the balance sheet.
- N. who evaluates and licenses? Need quarterly surprise evaluations.
- N. halfway houses who require inmates to work and contribute half of wages to institution.
- N. this question obviously slanted--but do not believe we need more CRC

5. Please indicate below how you think CRC's should be staffed.

- A. Contract Staff
- B. Department of Corrections Staff
- C. Combination of both Contract and DOC Staff
- D. No opinion

- A. Ok if accountability can be worked out, otherwise "C"
- A. NEEDS WORK!
- C. The latter as monitoring and advising personnel

Addendum B (cont.)

- C. DOC-mainly parole officers
 - C. They should operated at the greatest efficiency
 - C. Certainly not only contract staff
 - C. Depending on # of inmates being served at one facility and the education level of the owner/operator of CRC's.
 - C. I have a definite opinion.
 - C. Chaplains on call would help
 - C. Control by DOC not contract staff.
 - N. Private employees responsible to the employer.
 - N. staff from the bid winner--the contractor
 - N. Totally depends on how responsible the private contractor or the state is. Who is able to respond to community complaints faster and more efficiently? Which of the two will be involved in the community--attend council meetings etc.
 - N. More information is needed so that we can make an informed choice. What has been the experience of other cities where different staffs have been used?
 - N. if private, up to provider. If DOC, use contract and DOC staff--saves \$\$
6. The following criteria is always considered to determine the acceptable levels of risk with CRC placement. Please rate each criteria from 1 - 10 (with 1 being the least important).
- A. Custody/Security Level
 - B. Institutional Record
 - C. Treatment Program Status
 - E. Release needs
 - F. Length of sentence remaining
 - G. Nature of Offense (ie. violent vs. non-violent)
 - H. Past CRC/Probation/Parole Record (if applicable)
 - I. Victim's comments
 - J. Other
- A. In placement facility--10
 - B. Motivation--7
 - C. Don't know what this means
 - C. 0--This is a persons choice, forcing them is not the answer
 - E. everyone has these needs, They should have considered them prior to their crimes--0
 - E. What about victims family--1
 - E. NR--This is confusing. From CRC or from prison to CRC?
 - E. 1--family usually on welfare anyhow
 - F. 6 months is too long for transition.
 - F. 3 mos. at most--3
 - F. should serve full sentence--2

Addendum B (cont.)

- F. Violent repeaters should serve entire sentence!--10
- G. 5--(murder cases not accepted)
- G. Non-violent only--9
- G. 10--partnered with B and C
- H. People change, judging the past, not fair--0
- H. Must be available and used--8
- H. 9--this needs to be about a 3.
- H. NR--I don't think a "second chance" is in order here! One per customer.
- H. 1--No second offenders
- I. Victims are vindictive if person served his/her time the victim no longer should have any control of offenders life.
- J. Type of program, supervision--10
- J. Participation by screening committee--10
- J. Prior convictions; Arrests--10
- J. Who is willing to help them, outside with personal contact--8
- J. Anti-social or A-social attitude--10--should not release
- J. Contagious diseases dangerous to other prisoners & community.--3--don't release but treat.
- J. Willingness to re-educate--10
- J. Social behavior reports by previous employers, family, neighbors, etc.--10
- J. Classification status reports--3.
- J. Only 1st time offenses--10
- J. Time served--if short sentence the CRC should not be necessary--10
- J. prior criminal history--10
- J. Staff/counselor estimates of change of rehabilitation--6
- J. Space needed in prison--1
- J. Volunteer Evaluations--5
- J. Past types of crimes and frequency of offense (is inmate a repetitive criminal?)--10/10(if applicable)
- J. Mental Status--10
- J. The Scale
- J. Cost--1
- J. Cost to state--8
- J. There is no acceptable risk level if you are talking about my home!
- J. The inmates willingness to work through the program--8
- J. Proximity of support systems--5
- J. Restitution considerations--6
- J. Consider voluntary transfer to another state rather than release in some city as victim.
- J. Prison overcrowding
- J. All of these above are totally important in evaluating an individual and his past track record--court recommendations on the other hand, may not always be correct.

Addendum B (cont.)

- J. The victim has to "pay" the price of what he's done--we shouldn't be providing free room & board.
- J. Probable Future behavior--10
- J. Who will be in charge of the facility and will they be able to insure that the persons in the program will not become a liability to the neighborhood--10.
- J. Adequacy of instruction, training--7
- J. Recommendation of prison official--10
- J. 10--Assessment of risk to community by qualified & trained professionals
- J. Really these are all very important.
- J. Military veteran--8
- J. 10--Whether it will help the inmate and not just free up a prison bed.
- J. Operation costs of jail vs CRC--7
- J. Bible Study--10
- J. Interest in Program--9
- J. Person's attitude and outlook--8
- J. We are volunteers in prison, but we don't ask what the inmate's crime is. From people we have been acquainted with at CRC's, we think it is a very helpful alternative to getting them back into societies.
- J. Give crimes against children a "10"
- N. I see nothing wrong with the order you have listed
- N. No acceptance of risk.
- N. Did not understand this question. Acceptable to whom? What kind of risks? You mean placement of prisoners in CRC's?
- N. It is not possible to rate these. Each item might be critical to the placement decision.

7. Some CRC's are used for offenders with special problems or needs. Listed below are several types of treatment programs and special needs offenders. Please indicate your feelings on a scale of 1 to 10 (with 1 being the least acceptable) regarding your acceptance for each type of program in your neighborhood. Also indicate how you feel the level of acceptance would be by your neighborhood as a whole in the block provided.

- A. SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAM
- B. EMPLOYMENT/VOCATION TRAINING PROGRAM
- C. NATIVE OFFENDER PROGRAM
- D. SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAM
- E. FEMALE OFFENDER PROGRAM
- F. MENTALLY ILL OFFENDER PROGRAM
- G. OFFENDERS WHO COMMIT NON-VIOLENT PROBATION OR PAROLE VIOLATION PROGRAM
- H. HOUSING ONLY WITH NO SPECIFIC PROGRAM

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. 8--very much needed in Alaska
- B. 9--They need training or jobs to survive
- C. NR--Violent--1, non-violent 10
- C. Why is this segregated? Is a native Alaskan who committed a crime any different than a white, black or some other race?
- C. American is an American--no special treatment
- C. Don't know parameters of program
- C. Too noticeable
- C. Native or non-native, don't discriminate
- C. Be more specific--5
- C. Alcohol Treatment--8--I am a native, we do have a problem
- D. It is my general view that persons will need a substantial amount of re-orienting and redirecting of programs, policy and philosophy before they can actually help rehabilitate the inmates. At present they are holding pens that often have negative rather than positive impacts on the inmates.
- D. Depends on type of sex offender ie. rape, incest, pornography, prostitution
- D. Too many children here.
- D. Sex offender treatment programs have not proven to be effective. Child sex offenders especially do not seem to be helped and go out and escalate their violence toward children to cover their crime. Society needs to change its outlook on crimes against women and children.
- E. Depends of offense
- E. Be more specific--2
- F. Depends on illness--NR/10
- F. These guys probably need the most help--9
- G. Their violation might be non-violent but if the crime they were on probation/parole for was violent, when are they going to "get it"--the idea of norms, rules, & laws???
- G. NR--Depends on initial offense!
- N. Your opinion is as good as mine!
- N. all acceptable
- N. How can I respond. I have no information. I say NO special treatment, treat them all the same & institute capital punishment.
- N. My reply would depend on the staffing and prior record of the convict in a CRC.
- N. None acceptable. Keep these programs in non-residential areas. They could still have work release etc. to ease the transition.
- N. No programs would be accepted in our neighborhood. Why should taxpayers money be spent to make life comfortable for criminals? Perhaps these should all be 1's.

Miscellaneous Comments

- Within just a few blocks of my apartment is a church where Dr. McQueen

Addendum B (cont.)

provides sex offender group counseling. There is also "the Lodge" for mentally ill residents. The Genesis House is also in the neighborhood. It is a half-way house for alcoholics who have already received primary care. I have not heard any negative comments about these facilities--only positive ones. I have lived in the neighborhood for 15 yrs. (My neighborhood is in Spenard)

- "C & E"--The quality of each individual program offered would determine acceptance. Native programs should not be based on race or origins but should be based on problem to be treated. Manner of presentation could be oriented to individual community differences or subject.

- We feel that our neighborhood would not accept any CRC in the neighborhood no matter how socially important the concept--the NIMBY mentality.

- My neighborhood is inappropriate for a CRC because it is over a mile and a half to the nearest bus stop, even farther to the nearest store. It is rural in nature and I suspect less well patrolled than the more densely populated areas. If I were living where my mother-in-law does, in mid-town, I would be more accepting of a CRC neighbor (as long as it wasn't in my backward.)

- You have to know the type of neighborhood I live in for this to be meaningful.

- Community Acceptance unpredictable

- I do not think CRC's should be located in residential neighborhoods.

- Programs should be one of the most important parts of CRC's

- I don't believe these [Community Acceptance - Your Acceptance] can be judged separately.

- If any inmate is released, he has problems--and education and retraining is necessary in order he does not come back through the system again. Women's needs must be addressed in particular.

- If competent staffing.

- What would my neighbors think?

- My neighborhood is small, isolated and small single family dwellings with the exception of 3 churches and a Hope Cottage--a lot of small children and heavily used park.

- Really don't know [Community Acceptance]. We have housed ex-offenders and had no community comments.

- As Fairview is saturated with "houses" of one kind or another I don't think the community would accept any more and I wouldn't be too pleased about it myself.

- It really disturbs me that we have to spend all this \$ on special programs for criminals when struggling upstanding citizens can't even get financial assistance for education or if they do they have to pay it back yet we give these scum balls all the consideration you can imagine. it's a sad statement on our society.

- I am unable to speak for the community. I suspect the NIMBY principle would prevail with employment/Voc ed being the most acceptable.

- Most people do not go to jail for a first offense. By the time an offender winds up in prison he usually has a clear track record of inappropriate behavior.

Addendum B (cont.)

Many, and probably most, prisoners will not benefit from CRC. They have established a predatory way of life and have no desire to change. The "rehabilitation" efforts of the 50's, 60's and 70's failed. At present, as a society, we deal with the criminal subculture by "warehousing" them. Perhaps someday we will come to terms with the reality of lifelong assholes by putting them to sleep. That wouldn't deter anyone, but it certainly would cut our physical, emotional and economic losses.

• I'm sorry, but our neighborhood is too remote to really help people who are getting jobs--city bus 3 miles away.

8. Please circle the letter of the following statement(s) that you agree with:

- A. I feel that the use of CRC's should be expanded to alleviate overcrowding in state correctional institutions.
- B. I feel that prisoners should complete their sentences in jail and CRC's be used for misdemeanants and non-violent first offenders only.
- C. I feel that the state should look for alternatives to prison and CRC's such as electronic monitoring and/or expanded use of parole and probation.
- D. Other

A. Not necessarily for overcrowding, but for the rehabilitative purposes.

A. Realistically

A. Only if private owned & operated/not suggested, but encouraged.

A. But I don't know how it works ! Success??

A. On a limited basis

A. With safety in mind--be careful on criteria for use of CRC.

A. but need to decrease monopoly cost

A. The cost of State correctional institutions is too much to just warehouse people.

A. I feel that the use of CRC's should be expanded.

A. No No No!!! Reduce crime or build more prisons.

A. If...The community would need a lot of assurance that CRC's would be secure and not threaten anyone around them. There's not enough information given here to really make an informed decision. Theoretically they sound interesting, (but scary for the neighborhood).

B. NR--sleep and eat in CRC--shovel snow and pick up litter!

B. But not more than 3 months per prisoner.

B. I feel that prisoners should complete their sentences in jail.

B. Then based on their success CRC's expanded as appropriate.

B. CRC's be used for misdemeanants and non-violent first offenders only.

B. Somewhat agree

B. Absolutely

B. There is much need for more community service. Where possible (non-violent crimes) sentence to time helping the city of those in need!

B. Ideally

Addendum B (cont.)

- B. But not sex offenders--mentally ill
- B. (except for the last 60-90 days) Some type of transitional housing needs to be available maybe even required for all exiting prisoners to readjust to a society that they were not well adjusted with to begin with.
- B. Based on individual case study.
- C. I feel that the state should look for alternatives to prison and CRC's such as not mamby pamby BS like parole and monitoring. Try military style low cost boot camps for nonviolent offenders 30 yrs. and younger. Very successful in Georgia and elsewhere--cheap--They build their own facilities, cut the crap.
- C. NR--I do not favor expanded use of parole or probation as this negates and invalidates the efforts of police, prosecutors and judges--Also in too many instances, violates the wishes and needs of the community at large.
- C. With a stronger emphasis on restitution.
- C. For non-violent and non-sex-related offenders only.
- C. Provided probation/parole office work load is at a level they can be effective--not where it is now or above.
- C. Somewhat agree
- C. For 1st offenders, non-violent. Must go to school or have a job.
- C. NR--I think the public needs more education about electronic monitoring as far as cost and effectiveness are concerned.
- D. Inmates returning home should receive alcohol and drug treatment. Also, CRC's should be made available to all inmates for social rehabilitation before they are returned to the communities.
- D. I feel the state should also look at new alternatives such as electronic monitoring. I do not favor expanded use of parole and probation.
- D. Prisoners should complete sentences. CRC's for parolees.
- D. I think that the state should look at the records of each prob/parole officer. They will find some using their positions to support personal prejudices!!!
- D. Work programs--such as meat packing in Mat-Su. Road construction to clean up. Manufacturing, etc. etc. Get the prisoner to be productive and raise self-esteem by work values.
- D. The state correctional system must work because of the high number returning to the system for the easy life (illegible) they are important.
- D. I feel the state should look for alternatives to prison without eliminating CRCs.
- D. Keep them in prison--work them--don't spend as much money on them.
- D. People who break the law should be punished, not treated like vacationers at a resort. It is no deterrent if they have all the luxuries of home and more.
- D. Community Service Sentences!
- D. I feel that the program should be used for all inmates nearing their sentence in conjunction with working with families and environment!
- D. Used to help offenders easy back into society after they have served their sentence.

Addendum B (cont.)

D. Terminate lifers free up beds.

D. I feel that prisoners should complete their sentences in jail. Keep the Willie Hortons behind bars.

D. These should only be considered on non-violent, first offenders. A person who returns to jail on a new charge should do their time.

D. I feel that CRC is good and needs to include in all inmates programs at the end of their time in jail. However, the time needs to be separate. In the job training or getting a job while at CRC; there also needs to be counseling with christian counselors.

D. I feel use of CRC's should be expanded to alleviate overcrowding considering the types of crimes and their effects on victims.

D. All

D. I feel the state of Alaska should look at receiving monetary benefit from prisoners while imprisoned to offset the astronomical costs of housing and caring for prisoners; like long-term community service.

D. I do not believe that CRC's should be used to alleviate overcrowding; they should be used as part of a treatment program.

D. community service

D. Throw all criminals into jail to give them a taste of what is to come if they don't start taking responsibility for their actions.

D. Some combination; if possible, of all of the above would be preferable.

D. CRC's should only remain at current level, should not be used only to alleviate crowding (build more jails) and DWI's should be put in jail not CRC's.

D. It depends on the nature of the offense whether CRC's should be used. Some misdemeanants and not-violent offenders may not be acceptable to the community.

D. If CRC's are a good idea, presumably it should be because they help prisoners rejoin the community--the non-criminal community. If you want to know whether such low security facilities should be used for other purposes too, (for example, drunk drivers), why don't you say so. I think they should--but in the case of drunk drivers, for example, they do not need to be in neighborhoods because the prisoners should not be let out for work during the day. The drunk drivers could be housed somewhere on the outskirts of town or wherever land is the cheapest.

D. I think the state should seriously address treatment in prisons rather than warehousing humans. I also feel that the problem of prison overcrowding should be reviewed by reinstating the pre-trial intervention program. The CRC sounds like another way to institutionalize more people using the same antiquated "lock 'em up" philosophy which is re-active, rather than a pro-active vocational education, community action program prior to a crime being committed!

D. Look to the cause and "nip it in the bud"--and on to 1st grade and so on. Let's create habits that lead to responsible citizens--community service is a start!

D. Stricter sentences, possibly the death penalty, jailers "work" in house for their room & board, no more "free-rides" ie. music lessons, special meals, etc.

Addendum B (cont.)

- D. Death sentence is acceptable for certain crimes: Murder I; drug ringleaders--execute.
- D. A combination of "A" and "C"--also the last part of B (delete only)
- D. "A", with exception of repeat sex offenders who seem to show the least change in behavior no matter what society attempts.
- D. Computerized database sentencing standards & No plea bargaining
- D. Make more prisons out of abandoned military facilities and/or contract privately owned prisons.
- D. I feel inmates with long sentences need longer time in CRC's to adjust to society.
- D. More money into education, helping families, prevention, good day care help & support for families starting out with newborns.
- D. A combination of B & C.
- D. The state should look for alternatives to prison and CRC's such as electronic monitoring and intensive case management. They should also provide early intervention programs with children and youth to prevent the 25% of our population with a mental illness from becoming substance abusers and prisoners.
- D. I agree with B except not all inmates should have to complete all of their sentence in prison. I think C has merit also.
- D. Community service work which benefits the community e.g. highway clean up, snow removal from a public area, etc.
- N. I have worked with ex-offenders through the past six years and have seen, personally met upon release, one prisoner three successive times. I always work with hope for the best but actual results are often disheartening.
- N. Why not build more correctional institutions/JAILS. Make jails, Make jails uncomfortable to be in ie: no phone, no TV, no work out rooms, no fancy food.
- N. "A" Absolutely the wrong reason
- N. "C" No!
- N. "C" Let's not get carried away with this!
- N. Mixed feelings--for a societal sense of justice--"A" applies for me--for a well administered program "B" & "C" applies--I am no help here.
- Institutions should begin programs before CRC accepts these people. To show interest in a program acceptable to the individual and so graded by time and response as a result of being compatible.
 - Use of CRC's should be increased as an alternative to prison because they are often a superior correctional alternative.
 - I feel Bible Study programs would help some inmates, but most fake it.
 - Why should a candy thief be put in jail at the communities expense thus costing more than the original crime? Judges should consider some sort of restitution instead of punishing society with the costs.
 - We desperately need to overhaul our Judicial system to protect the rights of law abiding citizens and to hold accountable those who break the law. don't regulate

Addendum B (cont.)

a society into submission, rather encourage involvement.

- Orientation back to society 2+ months before release--Also church release with chaplain or other to compliment (illegible)

9. Should each CRC be required to have a Community Advisory Board made up of citizens from the community and neighborhood?

A. A good measure of community feelings toward the CRC.

A. Particularly when there was not neighborhood acceptance.

A. to screen applicants and also to gain community support for inmates returning to communities.

A. They can direct community service work details.

A. What, however, would be the liability of any CAB citizen for acts of violence committed by a prisoner while in CRC--if that citizen, in fact, approved of that individual prisoner being included in the CRC Program?

A. Community may be helpful in the transition by providing other opportunities and programs.

A. An successful participants of program.

A. What happens when the community does not want a CRC?

A. especially in the planning states, before CRC starts taking residents.

A. and CRC inmates and personnel.

A. This would insure that various programs are provided and religious freedom are not removed.

A. A community Board can be more responsive than an absentee Corporation (eg. Allvest)

A. If they know something specific which makes the individuals a threat to the neighborhood, eg. arsonist, child sex offender, psycho prone to do a shoot out in church or McDonalds.

A. A local CAB is a "must". It worked well a HMCC when I was in the Senate and represented the Eagle River area.

A. If these are set up in our community I would hope so.

A. TO REVIEW NOT ONLY INMATES, BUT THEIR SUPERVISORS

A. Inmates need to understand the community make-up

A. Maybe

A. This board should be set up prior to establishing the CRC.

A. Need input from the victims.

A. Citizens should also be given free fire arms, fire arms training, and counseling on the most effective way to legally kill an intruder.

A. This would require education of community. Present environment "law & order" would need to be worked on.

A. I don't feel CRC's belong in residential neighborhoods. If they are there, then "yes" to 9 & 10.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. Ownership of any program assists with it's acceptance
- A. People are concerned about community safety and decreasing property value.
- A. To reduce ignorance and public clamor, yes. Could help build political support, too.
- A. Absolutely, why many govern. efforts fail is because of lack of citizen support.
- A. Recruitment would be tough.
- A. Need to develop rapport w/your neighborhood and give people chance to react.
- A real problem in our locale is that neighbors turn over and no one knows what the facility is about.
- A. If they can find volunteers to sit on such a board!
- A. Obviously, CRC's will impact surrounding neighborhoods, so it makes sense for citizens to have some influence.
- A. Partially
- A. How could you not have this?
- A. The community council
- A. This should make reception better and provide for more appropriate interface.
- A. Just as schools are learning that community involvement is important for acceptance and needed to implement long-term change, so also does society need to learn that they need to be involved.
- A. This ought to help with Community acceptance and cooperation.
- A. partial community /partial professionals
- A. Too much shock when it is kept secret
- A. Who selects board?
- A. Purposes: for participation, acceptance, awareness, cooperation, rapport.
- A. Allvest has a advisory board. Glenwood does not.
- A. Provided state does not pay them, but only provide meeting place for them.
- A. Sounds like a good idea, if it isn't too expensive.
- A. Yes, if the program CRC to be installed is controversial in the neighborhood--some CRC's may not need advisory boards.
- A. I am very concerned here about liability issues regarding board members.
- A. W/o community involvement it won't fly. No vested interest.
- A. When you buy in a residential neighborhood you do not expect to have these types of homes there.
- A. Training must be required for each board member.
- A. The community should certainly have the opportunity to be informed/involved if they want to--but not set policy.
- A. Good idea to keep tabs on community feelings.
- A. If they have to exist at all.
- A. This is always the case in private business if not involved or needed in a community a business will fail if allowed to!
- A. All funding requests to state or local gov't should have written comments by community council attached to funding request.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. At least one for each community or neighborhood where a CRC is located.
 - B. some communities may not care to become involved
 - B. Let DOC oversee.
 - B. But neighborhood must have a say before CRC is instituted.
 - B. I think one community advisory board per city is adequate.
 - B. Not necessarily, sometimes too much talk results in just that some is sometimes necessary.
 - B. Those who operate CRC should be required to maintain community contacts.
 - B. This process would be much too cumbersome, but the CRC's should be required to participate and report at community council meetings so community members know what's going on.
 - B. I don't believe you's ever get anything done with a board.
 - B. C.A.B. a good idea if it is supported by the community.
 - B. Delegate one person and give him/her absolute authority.
 - B. I doubt enough volunteers could be found and do not feel good citizens should be responsible for continually aiding those who choose to disregard the law. Too much emphasis is on the offenders!
 - B. There must be a community comment and control vehicle but a Board does not sound useful. Better a total city board.
 - B. Community councils already in place--use them.
 - B. People would not take the time to help.
 - N. Rubish! High class neighborhoods will always dump them on some other neighborhood.
 - N. would prob help acceptance but may not be practical for each CRC.
10. Should Community Advisory Boards have the authority to reject a particular referral?
- A. Tough question--the more meaningful participation from a CAB, the greater possibility of long-term acceptance.
 - A. To insure success of all residents that are already placed in CRC's. Also, to screen out those that would not gain from social rehabilitation.
 - A. With adequate information the community Brd. can make sensible decisions.
 - A. Otherwise an entire program could fail.
 - A. Only by unanimous consent of the members.
 - A. This should be one of their major functions.
 - A. They have valuable on hand knowledge plus the CRC people would know that those who helped them are also close enough to watch their actions and also encourage them.
 - A. Power should be limited--if they can show specific good cause.
 - A. Specific criteria should be established & case by case selection.
 - A. Only after a very thorough review of records available.

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. And should have the authority to remove a CRC resident who is troubling the neighborhood.
- A. Some inmates have no intent to change.
- A. The Advisory Board needs power along with accountability.
- A. There may be some particular community-sensitive issues. Ex. A drunk-driving death of a highly visible person's child. To expect the community to be sympathetic towards such offenders recently after the incident would be useless
- A. Yes, if the referred offender is considered undesirable for the type correctional facility and type offense in the close by community.
- A. Otherwise, why have the board?
- A. Probably. That would give the community some reassurance (perhaps false) and make the whole CRC concept more acceptable.
- A. Community Advisory Boards or Community Councils--With an appeal process in place
- A. Definitely! Of course, this might involve particular "confidential" material becoming known.
- A. People who are paying the taxes should have some control.
- A. Providing they are given access to records, parole/probation reports, etc.
- A. Advisory boards have traditionally been used as rubber stamps plus veto power would seldom be used best would gage "common man" to censure in particular serious cases.
- A. Provided no one on the board has a personal grudge.
- A. Wouldn't you want that authority?
- A. With stated reasons why.
- A. Various good reasons including previous crimes in the community/neighborhood.
- A. I don't think communities would be very accepting of CRC's if they do not have some control--however, the liability in the event of a problem occurs does boggle the mind.
- A. Keep Community hostility down
- A. Absolutely, such as specific sex offenders.
- A. It's our community.
- A. The CRC staff can reject referral.
- A. But only on set criteria basis
- A. If individual has a below average in the qualifying status review, before release. Standards have to relate to individuals compliances with that program.
- B. But their input should be considered and valued.
- B. Should be decision of CRC staff together with Corrections.
- B. If there is an appeal process provided for in the decision making process.
- B. but the Board should be able to evict a CRC from the neighborhood as a result of poor operation or experience.
- B. But DOC should listen very carefully.
- B. It depends.

Addendum B (cont.)

- B. But be able to make recommendations.
- B. Parole board should have sole authority.
- B. Neighbors don't have the credentials but should have access and understanding through their CAB.
- B. Should have input--final decision comes from professional admin.
- B. Any borderline cases should not receive CRC placement.
- B. Both 10 & 11 envision boards with some background in social work and mental health and that might not always be the case.
- B. I don't see them functioning, in decision making position....only recommending.
- B. You said "advisory capacity"
- B. Should be able to express strong opinion to referral board.
- B. The responsibility rests with the other authorities.
- B. They should make recommendations which should be heavily considered.
- B. Finances are a major concern already--build more prisons!
- B. Again, the neighborhood must have a say in originally accepting the CRC and ground rules it will be run by what-- type of referrals will be accepted. But once that is done not a case specific involvement.
- B. Advisory only; not professionals in field.
- B. Depends on guidelines Advisory Bd given--I think Adv. Bd. better have authority to help set type of referrals--judging on particular referrals should be left to DOC and CRC.
- B. Members of a Community Council may not be qualified to make decisions such as this.
- B. Infringes on constitutional rights
- N. I lean toward "A" yes.
- N. Corrections should screen
- N. I'm not sure. I think that it is important to have community agreement--but sometimes they need a gently "push" to try.
- N. depends on the referral.
- N. if cause is established.
- N. Depends upon criteria used to select Board and role/definition of purpose.

Sometimes--There may be an occasion where the community knows best and does not want a particular person.

11. Should the Department of Corrections fund travel for an annual statewide meeting or Community Advisory Board members to discuss and review community Residential Center policies and procedures?
- A. Keep Board out of the political arena--Member should not serve at pleasure of admin.
 - A. For initial Board and no less than a local orientation

Addendum B (cont.)

- A. With food & lodging provided free by the communities holding meetings.
- A. But issue is training and understanding their jobs--statewide meeting is not the only way to do this. You must train these people so they know what to do and how to do it! You don't have to do it through statewide meeting.
- A. They (illegible) to make a commitment to (illegible) volunteers.
- A. The thrust of our prison system should be to protect the public and punish the guilty! Don't forget this!
- A. It should be held where most of the people could drive to and be required to fly.
- A. Interaction helps with the sharing of ideas experience and new concepts.
- A. Statewide isn't necessary. A regional approach would do, w/sharing on an urban basis and then rural's together too--Any statewide should be limited to small sample of representatives.
- A. On a limited basis.
- A. One per year--structured agenda--strong leadership to promote good outcomes.
- A. A statewide effort to help its citizens get back into society would be very beneficial.
- A. Bi-annual--every 2-3 years
- A. You must make sure the contracts are being lived up to
- A. Or have a team of two or three from DOC go to three or more central locations to cut down on overall expenses
- A. Depends on cost VS value ratio.
- A. One member only.
- A. Until said time members do not produce meaningful results upon return to respected areas.
- A. If this is a public input process--that's more than the usual lip service.
- A. Tight controls to insure participation.
- B. Correctional employees rarely have the privilege of being able to travel at the Dept's expense.
- B. I would not object to partial (or shared funding.) ie.50%
- B. We need less bureaucracy.
- B. Use teleconference and monthly meetings by phone.
- B. I think more funding should be towards seeking full-time chaplains in our institution. Maybe you could have keynote speakers address the board twice annually.
- B. DOC staff personnel should be assigned the duty of periodically conferring with CAB's. It should be a primary staff official duty. This would be more economical.
- B. Inmates should cover expenses--make them accountable for their actions!
- B. No need for any travel--let DOC provide statewide interface.
- B. Sounds like a "boon-doggle"
- B. staff should attend statewide meetings and inform board members.
- B. Charge criminals or family
- B. Fund training for 1 or 2 reps. from each board.