

Alaska Justice Forum

IN THIS ISSUE:

- Prison Industries
- Text of Huston Speech
- More on Miranda

Vol. 2, No. 3

March 1978

What About Prison Industries?

by Roger Endell,
Criminal Justice Center

It would appear that everyone—citizens, judges, prosecutors, legislators, police, academicians, prisoners and correctional administrators—is exceedingly disillusioned with America's prison system. Illustrating this disillusionment is the report of the 1973 National Advisory Commission of Criminal Justice Standards and Goals which stated: "The American correctional system today appears to offer minimum protection for the public and maximum harm to the offender... corrections are plainly in need of substantial and rapid change."

Just as there is discussion about the inadequacies of today's correctional institutions, so there appears to be interest in our work-oriented society that prisoner vocational skills and productivity might be significantly improved. The President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation (1970) considered that goal to be central.

The study of prison industries completed by Econ, Inc. (Sept. 1976) sought to identify short-term and long-term strategies for changing prison industry systems into self-supporting labor systems while simultaneously promoting the rehabilitation of inmates. The Econ study offers the most definitive analysis of prison industry programs and their problems and potential.

In Alaska there is no specific prison industry program which must be considered for modernization or changing. The potential of prison industry can be examined and designed from start to

finish if Alaskans choose to develop such an alternative.

An industries concept might be tied to a full-scale restitution program. The possibilities include the sentencing of offenders to a financial penalty as well as imprisonment.

Most of those within the prisoner populations are now serving time for property offenses. They might instead be sentenced to repay the victim and/or the state, through involvement in an industry program while incarcerated. Prison industries would provide opportunities for offenders to earn money through their own labors, earning their way out of jail in economic terms rather than length of time served. Both the taxpayer and the offender might receive more worthwhile benefits from this alternative to the high cost of incarceration.

Eligible offenders, primarily those who have committed property offenses, on a voluntary basis, could provide services to the state, the community, to volunteer organizations and other institutions through industrylike programs. These services could include: printing; furniture (finishing, refinishing, upholstery); dental (plates); optical (lenses); small engine repair; small appliance and business machine repair; farming (vegetable crops, greenhouses); auto mechanical and body repair; sign shop; heavy equipment maintenance and operation; keypunch; sewing; laundry; license plates; service franchises for the private sector; trail and campground construction and improvements; road construction (clearing); fire fighting and fire support services.

As these programs are developed, consideration should be given to the potential for certification by the Department of Labor as apprenticeship programs with union cooperation. Programs should receive full recognition by the Department of Education. It is not essential, however, that the purpose of establishing prison industry programs be for vocational or educational training or advancement.

The major objectives could be unrelated to rehabilitation except incidentally. That is, prison industries may be developed solely to allow prisoners to work their way out of jail or prison while supplying services to the state and community. From his earnings the offender might at least partially reimburse the state for the high cost of incarceration. The victim can be reimbursed for losses. Whether we consider the victim to be the specific person affected directly by a specific criminal act, or the citizenry of the state whose taxes pay for the high costs of incarceration, we can consider prison industry programs as an alternative for the return of the tax dollar investment.

Potential contributions of prison industries may include savings to the state in terms of reduced state agency expenditures, reduced criminal justice costs, prison industry wages and profits, benefits for the prison in terms of a reduced rate of disciplinary infractions and a more normal, social atmosphere and finally benefits to the inmate worker in terms of his ability to provide family support, and the possibility of participating in industrial training and job placement.

Alaska Must Learn From History:

The following is the text of a speech delivered by William H. Huston, director of the Division of Corrections, before the Statewide Conference on Incarceration and Re-Entry Alternatives in Anchorage Jan. 20. He entitled the speech, "Learning From History," and dealt primarily with adult corrections, which he said was the most controversial subject prior to and subsequent to his appointment as director of the Division of Corrections.

LEARNING FROM HISTORY

William H. Huston
Dir., Division of Corrections

In October 1975, a rash of serious incidents were committed by offenders who escaped from institutions, furlough programs or while being transported to appointments in the community. As a result of these incidents the governor appointed a special task force commission to evaluate security in our institutions, and the management within the system.

The members of the task force were cabinet officers who held public hearings throughout the state with the aid of a special technical assistance team provided by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This team was given instructions to evaluate security, and classification and management of adult institutions in the state from a highly professional perspective.

The task force commission was further aided by a special grand jury convened to conduct an independent investigation.

The report of the commission and its recommendations, and those of other advisors to the commission, became well known on Dec. 12, 1975, when Gov. Hammond gave a major policy address to the people of Alaska setting forth a plan of action to correct deficiencies as outlined in the task force report.

Of the 29 major recommendations for change and improvement, 22 have been completed, three are currently in various stages of completion, and four requiring construction and renovation still require funding.

Incidents which previously brought public condemnation upon the system and its managers are practically nonexistent—and obviously the public is well aware of this. For today we are embarking on a forum to explore many areas of the justice system, particularly adult corrections, with the possibility of expanding existing correctional alternatives to incarceration through community-based corrections such as: work furlough, educational and vocational release of convicted offenders, pretrial diversion, probation and parole service and other dispositional programs. All undertakings which would have received little public support in 1975 and 1976.

It was reported in Anchorage at the January 6th meeting of the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice that approximately \$700-\$800 thousand are being expended this year for research on matters concerning the Division of Corrections. Aside from the extravagance of the amount (which is closer to \$500 thousand), this remarkable figure suggests that a great many persons are interested in corrections. I might add, in emphasis, this is, to my knowledge, the first time since statehood that such positive public and governmental attention has been focused on the correction system.

Phase Two of Master Plan

I see this forum on alternatives to corrections as a forerunner to the Phase Two development of the master plan. This will get underway in the near future and will be a 9- to 12-month effort. On completion it will provide a systematic and logical planning approach for the entire state correctional system, recognizing changing concepts and priorities, and will include development of the methods for planning more effective programs and facilities and more efficient administration of the correctional system.

The public entertains many hypotheses and preconceptions about the nature and needs of our agency. I suspect that many who are looking closely at corrections will be interested in the following information.

We are not yet able to speak with certainty and we may never have more than a reasonable guess, but I believe the

general requirements are fairly clear, more precise planning will be possible when we have completed the second phase of our master plan. Even so, we are reasonably certain that prison populations will continue to rise. I am also certain that our present facilities will not permit a large population inflow.

As other segments of government grow and require expansion through construction, so it is with corrections. The exception being, however, that corrections must be in a state of emergency before its needs are addressed at all. Nothing points out this problem more dramatically than what is happening in states such as Alabama, Oklahoma, Florida and Arizona where the courts have ordered depopulation of their facilities in vast numbers because of overcrowding.

Incidentally, 84 per cent of all states are presently engaged in some prison construction at this time and an estimated \$1.42 billion will be spent on prison construction in the United States over the next six years.

I am aware that there are many advocates for prison alternatives. I also recognize the appeal these alternatives have and, in spite of what some may believe, I am more than just sensitive to these views.

In our recent facilities need study, which was conducted by the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, we selected a diversion alternative suggested by the consultant firm of Gruzen and Partners as a prudent model for the basis of our projections and building request. Incorporated in this model is a premise which commits the system to divert additional numbers (approximately 20 per cent) of all future offenders into alternative programs which do not require high levels of security and surveillance.

Please note that this group is in addition to those who would have been released from close custody under present practices.

Huston Pleads

Upward Prison Population Trend

But first we should consider the upward trend of prison population in this country which has risen from less than 130,000 since 1930, to nearly 290,000 in 1976. The most startling aspect of this trend, however, is the nearly 80,000 increase in prison population in the three years from 1973 to 1976.

I am unable to see how a reasonable person, viewing this record, can avoid the pessimistic conclusion which the trend suggests. This is not to say that I believe that the rising rate will go on forever, but it is asking too much to expect that it will immediately reverse itself.

In anticipation of these increasing needs the capacity of all state and federal prisons in the United States will be increased 24 per cent by 1982.

I also call your attention to the fact that on June 30, 1977 the number of prisoners on a nationwide basis exceeded the rated capacity of the nation's institutions by 20,655—and of this total shortage of capacity, 34.7 per cent is in the federal system where we now house 104 Alaskan prisoners.

Alternatives Offer Little Relief

Now, insofar as relief is hoped to come from community-based and other alternatives to incarceration, it may be worth a moment to consider these cautious statements contained in the recent, highly respected preliminary report on prison population and policy choices submitted to the U. S. Congress by ABT Associates of Cambridge, Mass.:

"...Despite the considerable attention devoted to community-based corrections in professional journals and the media, the survey results dramatically confirm that in terms of absolute numbers, and in percentage of prisoners involved, these residential programs are in a very embryonic state of development.

"...Of particular significance to this study is the finding that most of the centers directly operated by corrections departments are well below their rated capacity.

"...There are a number of ironies concerning the data. First, at a time of prison crowding, such centers are underutilized. Second, in several jurisdictions where the crowding problem is especially severe, there are few if any programs of this sort. Finally, even if existing centers were fully occupied they would have very little impact on the overall prison population.

"... (While) primary motivation for community corrections is a sharp reduction in the imprisoned population, comparative cost advantages are also cited by its proponents. These areas are difficult to assess... for the community corrections facility providing comprehensive in-house services, the current national mean annual cost is approximately \$8,000 per inmate. This can be compared with a \$7,000 annual operating cost for a jail inmate, and approximately \$8,000 for a prison inmate. Thus it is clearly no less expensive to maintain offenders in half-way houses than in prisons."

In addition the report states, "... It is entirely plausible that these new spaces would be filled with people who would not have otherwise gone to prison or jail... This seems to be happening in Iowa, and the California experience indicates similar lags."

And, finally, "... Diverting part of the prison demand to a different market (prison alternatives). The important point about this policy option is that the scenario makes assumptions which are, at best, controversial, and, at worst, implausible. The case study and existing literature suggest that instead of being a replacement to prison, community corrections may expand rather than contract the net of incarceration."

And, incidentally, present practices of the Alaska Criminal Justice System have some critics who insist that even now the doctrine is very liberal. One member of

the Governor's Commission on Criminal Justice commented during the recent meeting in Anchorage that Alaska has a "very liberal pretrial release policy." He went on to state, "In respect to sentencing, I see the sentencing guidelines in this state as also relatively very liberal." He concluded, "I don't see this state loosening up very much more than it is now on pretrial release policy... unless, of course, we are perhaps willing to take more risks."

Risk Management

I would like to add a few final, cautious, yet well-meaning remarks about risks. In my opinion corrections cannot continue to undergo investigations every few years such as the one which occurred in 1975 without a damaging effect upon the staff, offender morale, and the system as a whole.

Therefore, if the determination is made to release more offenders into the community at all levels of the justice system, we must seek proven methods for developing risk profiles, and a classification screening process that will ensure a high level of success. If this cannot be accomplished, then certainly, as it was in 1975, public tolerance will again determine the level of risk.

As philosopher George Wilhelm Hegel stated in his philosophy of history, "What experience and history teach is this... that people and government never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it."

I would like to think that this will not be the case in corrections in Alaska.

In closing, the correctional system throughout the United States is becoming more and more of an ever-changing process—which in my opinion is a good thing—however, we must not expect simple solutions to very complex problems that are associated with crime and rehabilitation. After all, no one has been too successful in the United States for the past two hundred years. But we should continue to be enthusiastic in our efforts to find positive answers to these problems.

Third in a Series

The Law on Confessions: Who,

By Peter S. Ring

To this point in our analysis of the law relating to interrogations we have focused exclusively on the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. We shall now turn our attention to Alaska and undertake an analysis of the decisions of the state's Supreme Court in this area of the criminal law.

This analysis will explore the following issues:

- (1) What kinds of persons are governed by the *Miranda* decision;
- (2) How must the warnings required by that decision be worded;
- (3) What constitutes a volunteered statement and therefore is not governed by the decision;
- (4) What constitutes "custody";
- (5) What is required to obtain a valid waiver of a suspect's rights;
- (6) When is a statement voluntarily given;
- (7) What is the effect of nonexistent or incomplete warnings on subsequent "warned" statements; and
- (8) What limits exist to the collateral use of a suspect's statements which are obtained in violation of his constitutional rights.

Who Must Give A Warning?

In *Tarnef v. State*, 512 P.2d 923, (Alaska 1973), the court addressed the issue of whether the prohibitions of *Miranda* applied to private investigators. They concluded that this issue, must, in the final analysis, be answered on a case-by-case basis. In *Tarnef's* case, he had been interrogated by a private arson investigator who had promised to turn over to the police any statements which he obtained from *Tarnef* and had been able to interview *Tarnef* only with the assistance of the police and the district attorney.

In that case the court had few problems in finding that the circumstances of the case mandated that the warnings be given to *Tarnef* prior to any interrogation. As the court noted, the investigator himself thought he was obligated to warn *Tarnef* prior to questioning because of his prior law enforcement background and the nature of the position he was holding. In fact, the investigator did warn *Tarnef* in the case.

In a footnote (number 22, page 934) the court indicated that "private persons, private security officers, private police or private detectives" might fall within the prohibitions set down in *Miranda*. As mentioned above, whether this will be the case will depend upon the facts and circumstances of the case. The issue has not been raised since *Tarnef* and there is little in the *Tarnef* decision in the way of guidance.

On the other hand, it may be possible to get a sense of possible direction from the holdings of the court in the area of searches and seizures undertaken by private persons. In the leading case of *Bell v. State*, 519 P.2d 804 (Alaska 1974), the court observed:

A search by a private citizen not acting in conjunction with or at the direction of the police does not violate the constitutional prohibitions against unreasonable search and seizure. (519 P.2d at 807, emphasis added, footnote omitted.)

In considering the role of a state employee who was not a peace officer, the court observed that the conduct of such individuals might be governed by the requirements of the Fourth Amendment depending upon the "nature of the duties performed and the part the officer may have played in the court of events leading to . . . [the arrest]." (519 P.2d at 808)

We shall have to wait further decisions of the court before this area of the law is clarified. However, it does seem more likely than not that the need for a decision or two in this area will arise out of the conduct of either private security personnel who routinely enforce the laws of the state or municipality, or out of the conduct of other types of state employees who do not possess peace officer status but nonetheless are engaged in the investigation of potentially criminal conduct.

What Must the Warning Say?

As we have noted in an earlier installment of this analysis (see *Forum*, Vol. 2, No. 1), *Miranda* required that a person about to be subjected to a custodial

interrogation had to be advised of a number of constitutional rights which he or she possessed. While discussing what those rights were, the United States Supreme Court never required that they be presented to a suspect in any particular wording.

In point of fact, most police agencies simply lifted the language of the court and used it as the warning. This was not always the case, however, and it was inevitable that disputes would arise over what actually had to be told to the suspect to adequately convey the warnings required by the decision. Alaska proved to be no exception.

Five cases have dealt with this issue in some detail. Most recently, in *Peterson v. State*, 562 P.2d 1350 (Alaska 1976), the court held that it was not necessary that the police tell a suspect that his statements "can and will" be used against him. (562 P.2d at 1361.)

In *Schade v. State*, 512 P.2d 907 (Alaska 1973), the court was confronted with a problem of a different sort. There, the Kodiak police in the course of informing the suspect of his rights used the following language:

Department of Police Kodiak, Alaska Your Rights

Before we ask you any questions, you must understand your rights. You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can be used against you in court. You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advice before we ask you any questions, and to have him with you during questioning. You have this right to the advice and presence of a lawyer even if you cannot afford to hire one. We have no way of giving you a lawyer, but one will be appointed for you, if you wish, if and when you go to court. If you wish to answer questions now without a lawyer present, you have the right to stop answering questions at any time. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer." (Emphasis added.) (512 P.2d at 915)

When And Where of Miranda

Schade alleged that the emphasized portion of the warning was "contradictory and confusing," thus rendering the entire warning invalid. The court did not agree.

While recognizing that there is always a risk that additional language might cause confusion, the court concluded that in this case it did not "dilute the meaning of the rights set forth in the balance of the opinion."

By telling Schade that the police had no way of giving Schade a lawyer, the warning was merely an expression of the truth. We hold the warnings were constitutionally adequate. (512 P.2d at 916)

The third case to deal with the issue of what language is required for a constitutionally adequate warning was **Nicholi v. State**, 451 P.2d 351 (Alaska 1969). There, prior to an interrogation at police headquarters, the defendant was apprised of his rights. However, the warning did not contain the fact that if the defendant is indigent an attorney would be appointed for him prior to questioning.

The court agreed with the state's contention that such a warning was not required in a situation in which the defendant who was about to be questioned was represented by an attorney who was, in fact, present in the police station.

Hammonds v. State, 442 P.2d 39 (Alaska 1968), provides a good example what a warning is not. In that case the state conceded that the interrogating officer's statement that the defendant did not have to make any statement, that any statement he did make could be used against him in a court of law; that he had the right to remain silent and that he also had the right to a lawyer or legal counsel, did not satisfy the requirements of **Miranda**.

Finally, the decision in **Rubey v. City of Fairbanks**, 456 P.2d 470 (Alaska 1969), demonstrates quite clearly that it is not enough to merely inform a defendant of his right to an attorney or his right to have an attorney appointed if he cannot afford to retain his own. The person about to be questioned must also be informed of his right to have the attorney present at the questioning. In **Rubey** the court concluded that the actions of the

officer in informing the suspect that he was an officer, that he intended to question her, that she had the right to an attorney, coupled with his asking her whether she wished to call an attorney, could reasonably have left the impression that had she wished to have counsel represent her the questioning would have been delayed until the arrival of counsel.

Volunteered Statements

As the United States Supreme Court clearly stated in their **Miranda** decision, "[t]here is no requirement that the police stop a person who enters a police station and states that he wishes to confess to a crime . . ." More forcefully stated, the court also held that "[v]olunteered statements of any kind are not barred by the Fifth Amendment and their admissibility is not affected by our holding today."

The issue of volunteered statements (as distinguished from voluntary statements, a subject which shall be discussed at length shortly) has arisen in a number of Alaska cases. It was present in two of the most recent pronouncements of the court on **Miranda**-related issues: **Hampton v. State**, 569 P.2d 138 (Alaska 1977), and **Ladd v. State** 568 P.2d 960 (Alaska 1977).

In **Hampton**, one of the statements made by the defendant, "[M]ove it [the gun] before I shoot somebody else," was made in response to an order from a police officer not to touch the weapon which was near the chair in which the defendant was seated. The admissibility of the statement was not challenged by the defendant, nor was it discussed by the court. It is, however, an excellent example of the kind of statement which the **Miranda** Court did not contemplate being covered by the **Miranda** decision.

In **Ladd**, the question of volunteered statements was specifically in issue. Ladd had been arrested on December 15, 1973, in connection with a federal firearms charge. He was also sought in connection with state murder charges. Between the 16th of December and the 6th of March, Ladd made a total of seven statements to the police. In each case, he had been informed of his rights but chose to ignore them and to volunteer information to the

police. The court found that the statements were, in fact, volunteered and therefore admissible.

Thus, we can observe that "volunteered" statements can be of two kinds: those which are not produced by interrogations and those which are. For the moment we shall focus on the first category.

In **Morris v. State**, 478 P.2d 603 (Alaska 1970), the court was confronted with a case in which the defendant had stated to the police, in the course of a search pursuant to a search warrant, that "[s]he [referring to a guest present during the search] didn't have anything to do with this. She knew nothing about it." The court found that the statement appeared to have been wholly volunteered and had not been solicited by any of the officers present. The court then observed: "Volunteered statements are not prohibited by the **Miranda** rule." (473 P.2d at 605)

In **Dulier v. State**, 511 P.2d 1058 (Alaska 1973), the court was presented with the classic example of the volunteered statement set forth in the **Miranda** decision itself. The defendant and others walked into the Juneau police station and gave the police an oral account of a person's death. This first statement was not used by the prosecution at trial. Two subsequent statements were, however. Dulier contended that they had been tainted by the first, which had not been accompanied by **Miranda** warnings. Because of the manner in which the court decided the case, it was not necessary for the court to resolve this issue.

One final type of "volunteered" statement must be considered. In **Pope v. State**, 478 P. 801 (Alaska 1970), the appellant alleged that a statement he made to the police about the location of a gun was the product of a custodial interrogation. The court, however, determined that the circumstances of the case fit the "on-the-scene questioning" exception set forth by the court in **Miranda**. In short, statements made in response to these kinds of questions might be considered volunteered. Or, as we are about to explore, they might be considered "non-custodial."

(To be continued)

Prison Industries

(Continued from page 1)

A prison industry concept also presents certain problems. If the purpose of sending a prisoner to jail is punishment, then one might ask why we should allow him to work and earn money. This concern points to a need for educating the public about the potential that industries programs may provide for a better return on their dollar investment, as well as the potential for reintegrating successfully a larger number of offenders.

There is a need to address the issue of competition with the private sector and at the same time to complete an analysis of market potential for products and services. Start-up costs and investments must also be evaluated.

According to the Econ, Inc. study, a quality prison industry program worthy of the investment of tax dollars should provide several essential ingredients.

The first of these is a realistic work environment including a full work day. Inmate wages should be based upon work output and productivity standards should be comparable to those of outside world businesses. Hiring and firing procedures can be developed within the limits of the due process rights of prisoners. Transferable training and job skills may be an extra benefit.

Secondly, the program should provide for partial reimbursement to the state by inmates for custody and welfare costs, as well as restitution payments to victims. The program should have a mechanism for graduated preparation of inmates for release back into the community including a well-defined and fixed responsibility of the state for job placement of inmates upon release. Financial incentives might be provided to industry for successful reintegration of offenders into the community.

Finally, self-supporting or profit-making business operations, should be developed in order to let the system attempt to pay for at least part of its own expenses.

Technical structures should include a pay scale for a range of offender workers with varying skills similar to private industry. For example, a trainee at \$1.00 per day will benefit from a promotion to

the general or unskilled worker position paid at \$.96 per hour. The semiskilled worker earning \$1.09 per hour can work to obtain a skilled position at a range of from \$1.64 per hour to \$2.47 per hour paid to the best worker.

Actual wages could be determined by shop output/profit and individual contributions to those output/profits. Workers might be paid weekly at 75% of the target wage. The shops profits should be computed quarterly, posted, and retroactive wage adjustments made to all but trainee workers.

Industry advisory committees should be formed from the ranks of young executives from private industry: one from labor; one technical shop manager; and one financial manager.

Correctional classification committees can determine the pool of inmate eligibles, from which an industrial director might freely recruit and hire. This director would also exercise sole discretion in promotion, dismissal, reduction in pay grade, temporary layoffs without pay, and determination of who is to be employed and how. All of these "real-world" concerns can be implemented and practiced in the prison industry environment.

Periodically in the past Alaskan offenders have been involved in industry-like projects for short periods. These projects ranged from clearing the Chilkoot Trail to clearing portions of the Eagle River to Anchorage freeway, and from constructing the Palmer Correctional Center to preparing and delivering 1,200 hot lunches a day to on-base school children. But no long-term, in-depth effort has been maintained within the Alaskan correctional system.

We are faced with re-examining the purposes of incarceration. If we feel that punishment should fit the crime, then we may want to provide opportunities for prisoners to work to return a portion of the costs of their criminal acts. A prison industry with a restitutional component may provide a more realistic and worthwhile environment for the offender while providing him the opportunity to earn his way back into the community with a new respect for the economic and criminal justice systems. It may also give the taxpayers a choice.

Note: for more information see: **Analysis of Prison Industries and Recommendations for Change, Study of the Economic and Rehabilitative Aspects of Prison Industry, Vol. VI, Econ, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey, September 24, 1976.**

Correction

The headline on the article in the January issue of the Forum about the Ketchikan juvenile diversionary program gave the misleading impression that the program is being conducted by the Youth Advocate Program.

This was incorrect. As the article itself explained, the diversionary program is being conducted by the Division of Social Services in cooperation with the Ketchikan Police Department. The Youth Advocate Program had undertaken a similar

project in 1972, but could not continue with it. The only current involvement of the Youth Advocate Program is assistance in a statistical evaluation of the current project.

The current project is supported by an LEAA grant and involves two intake workers hired by the Division of Social Services to provide 24-hour juvenile intake services and to provide placement for status offenders during after-hours situations.

Justice Training Calendar

WEST

- May 1-5. Field Training Officer. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 1-5. Protective Services-Meeting the Clandestine Threat. IACP. Las Vegas, Nev.
- May 1-12. Basic Correctional Academy. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 3. Juvenile Court Law. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 7-12. Civil Litigation-Graduate Course. National Judicial College. Reno, Nev.
- May 8-12. Jail Operations. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 8-26. Law Enforcement Supervision. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 10-12. Crises Intervention. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 14-19. Criminal Evidence-Graduate Course. National Judicial College. Reno, Nev.
- May 15-16. Private Patrol Arrest Function. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 15-19. Arrest and Firearms. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 15-19. Correctional Ancillary Program. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 20 and 27. Private Patrol Basic Firearms Training. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 20 and 27. Crowd and Use of Chemical Agents. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- May 21-24. Justice System Services for the Abused Child. Delinquency Control Institute. San Francisco, Calif.

- May 30-31. Community Resources Utilization in Treatment Planning. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- June 1-2. Reality Therapy. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- June 4-7. Advanced Jury Management. Institute for Court Management. Keystone, Colo.
- June 4-9. Advanced Juvenile Justice Management Institute. National College of Juvenile Justice. Reno, Nev.
- June 5-7. Weapon Selection: Body Armor, Weapons and Ammunition. IACP. Seattle, Wash.
- June 5-16. Basic Correctional Academy. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- June 8-9. Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- June 11-14. Schools, Educational Services and the Justice System. Delinquency Control Institute. Phoenix, Ariz.
- June 11-23. The Judge and the Trial-Graduate Course. National Judicial College. Reno, Nev.
- June 11-July 7. General Jurisdiction. National Judicial College. Reno, Nev.
- June 12-15. Police Labor Relations. IACP. San Francisco, Calif.
- June 12-23. Executive Prosecutor Course. National College of District Attorneys. Houston, Tex.
- June 18-23. Juvenile Justice Management. Institute for Court Management. Snowmass, Colo.
- June 18-23. Caseload Management and Juror Utilization. Institute for Court Management. Keystone, Colo.
- June 19-23. Current Problems and Solutions in Police Planning and Research. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- June 19-23. Management of the Investigative Function. IACP. Denver, Colo.
- June 19-28. Survey Research in Criminal Justice. Regional Criminal Justice Training Center. Modesto, Calif.
- June 25-July 7. Sentence/Criminal Law-Graduate Course. National Judicial College. Reno, Nev.

MIDWEST

- May 1-12. Driver Improvement for Motor Vehicle Administrators. The Traffic Institute. Evanston, Ill.
- May 1-12. On-Scene Accident Investigation. The Traffic Institute, Northwestern University. Evanston, Ill.
- May 2-5. Seminar on Legal Problems in Police Administration. The Traffic Institute. Evanston, Ill.

- May 5. Lineups/Interrogation. Center for Criminal Justice. Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- May 6. Traffic Template and Calculator Workshop. The Traffic Institute. Evanston, Ill.
- June 13. Breathalyzer-Retraining Senior Operators. Center for Criminal Justice. Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- May 15-June 2. Technical Accident Investigation. The Traffic Institute. Evanston, Ill.
- May 16-June 15. Private Investigator Training. Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- May 16-18. Bombs and Explosives. Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- May 22. Breathalyzer-Retraining Operator. Center for Criminal Justice. Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- May 22-26. Responses to Hostage-Taking Workshop. IACP. St. Louis, Mo.
- May 22-26. The Police and Social Services. IACP. Chicago, Ill.
- May 23-24. First Line Supervision. Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council. Lansing, Mich.
- May 23-24. Officer Survival. Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- May 24-26. Management Workshop, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Cincinnati, Ohio.
- May 30-31. Breathalyzer-Basic Operator. Center for Criminal Justice. Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- June 1-9. Firearms, Arrest and Search and Seizure. Center for Criminal Justice. Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- June 2. Search and Seizure. Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- June 5-9. Homicide Investigation, Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- June 5-16. Seminar for Traffic Engineering Technical Assistants. The Traffic Institute. Evanston, Ill.
- June 6-7. First Line Supervision. Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council. Lansing, Mich.
- June 13-15. Arson Investigation. Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.
- June 16. Juvenile Law. Center for Criminal Justice, Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.

June 18-23. Graduate Session. National College of Juvenile Justice. Lake of the Ozarks, Mo.
June 19-23. 25th Science in Law Enforcement Institute. Center for Criminal Justice. Case Western Reserve University. Cleveland, Ohio.

EAST

April 24-29 Police Executive Development Institute. Pennsylvania State University. University Park, Pa.
May 1-5. Basic Photography. University of Maryland. College Park, Md.
May 1-12. Traffic Management. Regional Criminal Justice Education and Training Center, Rochester, N. Y.
May 1-July 21. Administrative Management Institute for Public Officials. Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
May 8-12. Advanced Photography. University of Maryland. College Park, Md.
May 16-19. Annual Meeting of American Law Institute. Washington, D. C.
May 22-24. Police Executive Management. Regional Criminal Justice Education and Training Center, Rochester, N.Y.
May 22-June 2. Alcohol and Chemical Testing. University of Maryland. College Park, Md.
June 5-9. Law Enforcement Training Managers. University of Maryland. College Park, Md.

June 5-16. Mid-Level Management. Regional Criminal Justice Education and Training Center. Rochester, N. Y.
June 5-16. Traffic Management (advanced/technical). Regional Criminal Justice Education and Training Center. Rochester, N. Y.
June 5-23. Spring Program. Institute of Law Enforcement Management. Babson College, Wellesley, Mass.
June 19-23. Specialty Academy. American Academy of Judicial Education. Cambridge, Mass.

SOUTH

May 2-3. Identikit. Florida Institute for Law Enforcement. St. Petersburg, Fla.
May 8-12. Physical Fitness Programs for Police. IACP. Atlanta, Ga.
May 15-19. Specialized Crime Prevention Course-Evaluation and Assessment Techniques. National Crime Prevention Institute. Louisville, Ky.
May 22-25. Crime Prevention for Community Policy-Makers. National Crime Prevention Institute. Louisville, Ky.
May 22-26. Burglary Investigation Seminar. Florida Institute for Law Enforcement. St. Petersburg, Fla.
May 28-June 1. Appellate Judges Seminar. Appellate Judges Conference. Williamsburg, Va.
June 5-8. Vice and Organized Crime Seminar. Florida Institute for Law Enforcement. St. Petersburg, Fla.

June 12-23. Command Seminar. Institute on Organized Crime. Miami, Fla.
June 18-21. 25th National Institute on Crime and Delinquency. Bal Harbour, Fla.
June 19-21. Police Fleet Management: Selection and Maintenance of the Police Vehicle and Auxiliary Equipment. IACP. Jackson, Miss.
June 20-22. Executive Development. Florida Institute for Law Enforcement. St. Petersburg, Fla.
June 25-30. Juvenile Justice Management, Institute for Court Management, Reston, Va.
June 25-30. Caseflow Management and Juror Utilization. Institute for Court Management. Reston, Va.

INTERNATIONAL

May 14-17. Justice System Services for the Abused Child. Delinquency Control Institute. Vancouver, B. C., Canada.
May 16-20. Conference on the International Perspective of the Resolution of Family Disputes. Association of Conciliation Courts. Vancouver, B. C., Canada
June 5-9. Protective Services: Meeting the Clandestine Threat. IACP. Brussels, Belgium.
June 20-23. Annual Conference of National Association of College and University Attorneys. San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Alaska Justice Forum
Criminal Justice Center
University of Alaska, Anchorage
3211 Providence Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

Editors: Roger Endell
Peter S. Ring

Managing Editor: Paul L. Edscorn

The Alaska Justice Forum is financed under Grant 77-A-006 of the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice.

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 253
ANCHORAGE, AK.
99502