



A Publication of the
Justice Center

ALASKA JUSTICE FORUM

Alaska Justice
Statistical Analysis Unit

Spring 1992

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Vol. 9, No. 1

Parole Violators: A Glance

Samuel Trivette

It has been suggested that many probation and parole violators who have been returned to prison because of their violations might instead be better served by other sanctions, thus relieving somewhat the overcrowding within the Alaska prison system. In 1991 the Alaska Parole Board compiled a profile of offenders appearing before the board at parole revocation hearings. It was hoped that the information assembled in the profile could contribute to the overall discussion of sentencing issues. The following article presents the results of this research on the characteristics of probation and parole violators.

The analysis involved the 67 revocation cases heard by the Alaska Parole Board during summer quarter 1990. Overall, the board conducted 284 revocation hearings throughout 1990. A match of several data items with the total data base for recent years revealed that the 1990 summer quarter data were typical of other revocation data.

Background data on offenders in the 67 revocation hearings were taken from the Parole Board's risk

score sheets for the parole violators. The risk score sheet has been used for all parole applicants for over a decade, and the board has been using the same instrument on a trial basis on revocation cases for the last year. Recently the board began to use the score sheets on all prisoners being released on mandatory parole; as a result, scores will be available for all future revocation hearings.

Summer 1990 Revocation Cases

The risk score sheets include a variety of offenses and offender characteristics, including prior criminal history. Information on prior convictions, offense history and offense severity is included. Among the 67 Summer 1990 cases examined, fourteen (21%) offenders had only one felony conviction. Fifty-three (79%) offenders had two or more felony convictions. In only four cases (6%) did the offenders have no misdemeanor convictions. In 15 cases (22%), offenders had one to three misdemeanors and in 48 (72%) cases the offenders had four or more misdemeanor convictions.

Type of prior offense is also important in risk assessment. In 44 cases (66%) the offender had at least one conviction for burglary, criminal trespass, forgery, checks or credit card crime; in 23 (34%) the offender had no such conviction. In 19 cases (28%) the offender had a conviction for a sexual assault crime, while in 48 cases (72%) the offender had not been convicted of a sexual assault crime. Of those with a sexual assault conviction, none had completed an institutional sexual offender program.

Substance abuse history plays a role in risk assessment. In 52 cases

(78%) the offender had an alcohol abuse history, while in 15 cases (22%) there was no alcohol abuse history. In 32 cases (48%) the offender exhibited no significant drug abuse, while in 35 cases (52%) the offender did. In three cases (5%) the offender had no probation or parole revocation.

A majority of the offenders examined had already incurred at least one probation or parole revocation. In 19 cases (28%) the offender had one revocation; in 45 cases (67%) the offender had two or more revocations.

Of the violators reviewed, 30 (45%) committed their violations before completing three months of supervision; 49 (73%) of the violations were committed before the offender had completed six months of supervision; and only five (7%) completed more than a year of supervision before committing the violation. Overall, the range of time on supervision before the violation was committed was 0 months (1 to 29 days) to 16 months.

The average length of the jail sentence for which the offenders were on mandatory supervision was 4.4 years. If these offenders lost no good time, they would be on mandatory parole about 18 months. The shortest supervision length was four months and the longest supervision length was 35 months. Forty per cent of the offenders had supervision lengths of less than a year. Fifty-one per cent had supervision lengths of one year to 25 months. Only nine per cent of the offenders had supervision lengths of 25 months or longer. More offenders had supervision lengths of

HIGHLIGHTS INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports on a nationwide survey of prosecutors in state courts (page 2).
- Research to explore the relationship of Yupik culture and the American legal system (page 4).
- A further look at the nonenforcement activities of Village Public Safety Officers (page 5).

Please see Parole Violators, page 3

A BJS Report

Prosecutors in State Courts, 1990

Recent BJS Reports

In addition to the report summarized in the accompanying article, the following recent studies and reports from the Bureau of Justice Statistics are available from the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit:

"Women in Jail 1989," a detailed analysis of women in locally operated jails throughout the country, NCJ-134732.

"State and Local Police Departments, 1990," results of a national survey of law enforcement agencies, NCJ-133284.

"Probation and Parole 1990," an examination of the national population of offenders serving time under supervision in the community, NCJ-133285.

"Recidivism of Felons on Probation, 1986-89," an examination of subsequent arrests and levels of compliance with court-ordered requirements of the probation population in seventeen states, NCJ-134177.

"Sheriffs' Departments 1990," a portrait of sheriffs' agencies throughout the nation, NCJ-133283.

During the year ending June 30, 1990, approximately 2,300 chief prosecutors employed about 23,000 deputy attorneys for the prosecution of felony cases in state courts. The prosecutors served the nation's 3,109 counties and independent cities, obtaining convictions on about 668,000 felonies, according to an estimate from a nationwide survey of felony cases in 1988.

Chief prosecutors employed on average 10 assistant prosecutors and served districts with an average population of about 111,000 people. Their offices obtained about 300 felony convictions a year. One in five chief prosecutors had responsibility for more than one county.

These findings are from the National Prosecutor Survey Program (NPSP) of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the first national survey of prosecutors since 1974.

Among the items covered by both the 1990 and 1974 surveys were the following:

- In 1990, 86 per cent of the chief prosecutors had a four-year term of office, an increase from 79 per cent in 1974. In the earlier survey 16 per cent of the chief prosecutors were serving a two-year term; by 1990, that percentage had fallen to about five per cent.

- In 1990 over half (53%) the prosecutors worked at their position full-time. In 1974, 44 per cent of the prosecutors were full-time.

- In 1990 half of the full-time

chief prosecutors had at least one assistant. Thirty-seven per cent had more than two assistants. Of these assistants 87 per cent were full-time. In 1974, 37 per cent of the full-time chief prosecutors had at least one assistant and 21 per cent had more than two; of the assistants 77 per cent were employed full-time.

- In 1990, 36 per cent of the chief prosecutors maintained formal control over plea bargaining, a decrease from 80 per cent in 1974.

- Prosecutors had more extensive contact in 1990 than in 1974 with interested parties in felony cases—witnesses, testifying police officers, and victims. In 1990, 95 per cent of the chief prosecutors routinely notified witnesses when to appear, and 93 per cent usually told the police and victims about the results of a case. In 1974, 77 per cent routinely notified witnesses, 44 per cent routinely reported the case outcome to the police, and 35 per cent routinely notified the victim.

- Comparing responses in 1974 and 1990, no significant differences separated the percentages of prosecutors reporting the responsibilities of citizen complaints (87%), traffic infractions (86%), and juveniles (84%).

- Almost all prosecutors (97%) in 1990 handled extradition, a nonfelony matter. In 1974, 88 per cent of prosecutors had responsibility for extraditions.

- In both 1990 and 1974, about two-thirds of the chief prosecutors

1993-94 Judicial Fellows Program

The Judicial Fellows Commission is now accepting applications for the 1993-94 Judicial Fellows Program.

The program, established in 1972 and patterned after the White House and Congressional Fellowships, seeks outstanding individuals from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds who have an interest in judicial administration and who show promise of making a contribution to the judiciary.

Four Fellows will be chosen to spend a calendar year, beginning in late August or early September,

1993, in Washington, D.C.—at the Supreme Court of the United States, the Federal Judicial Center, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, or the United States Sentencing Commission.

Candidates must be familiar with the federal judicial system, have at least one postgraduate degree and two or more years of successful professional experience.

Fellowship stipends are based on salaries for comparable government work and individual salary histories, but will not exceed the GS 15, step 3

level, presently \$68,515.

Information about the Judicial Fellows Program and application procedure is available from:

Vanessa M. Yarnall
Administrative Director
Judicial Fellows Program
Supreme Court of the United States
Room 5
Washington, D.C. 20543
(202) 479-3374

The application deadline is November 13, 1992.

Prosecutorial Responsibility for Nonfelony Matters, 1974 and 1990		
Type of nonfelony matter	Per cent of chief prosecutors	
	1974	1990
Increase		
Extradition	88	97
Family and domestic relations	45	54
Decrease		
Nonsupport	89	73
Uniform Reciprocal Support Act	93	69
Public nuisance	77	69
Consumer protection	71	52
Suits for collection of taxes	62	46
Condemnation	54	42
Noncriminal cases (injunctions and suits for damages)	48	37
Other than listed	21	10
No change		
Citizen complaints	87	87
Traffic	86	86
Juveniles	84	84
Paternity	67	67
Mental commitments	65	65
Environmental protection	62	62

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics

were notified of a felony arrest within 24 hours.

This article was based on the Bureau of Justice Statistics report "Prosecutors in State Courts, 1990," NCJ-134500. Copies of the entire report are available through the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit of the Justice Center.

Parole Violators

(continued from page 1)

eight months than any other length.

The Parole Board's risk score sheet has a range of 0 to 49 points. The best possible risk score is 0, and 49 is the worst. The following are the ranges of the four groups, from best to worst risk:

- Group A = 0-6 points
- Group B = 7-14 points
- Group C = 15-29 points
- Group D = 30-49 points

The 67 parole violators studied had risk scores ranging from a low of 15 to a high of 47. The average for all offenders was a risk score of 27.36—almost at the top of Group C.

None of the offenders had a risk score of 0 to 14, i.e., within the two best risk groups. Sixty-six per cent of the offenders had risk score of 15

to 29, and 34 per cent had risk scores of 30 to 49.

The offenders committed the following parole violations: five per cent were convicted of a new felony; 22 per cent were convicted of a new misdemeanor; and 73 per cent were "condition violators."

For those found guilty of parole violations, the board "revoked and denied" 70 per cent of the offenders, thus requiring them to serve the remainder of their sentences. The board "revoked and reparaoled" 15 per cent of the offenders—in essence not putting them back in jail but extending their periods of supervision. The board "reprimanded and warned" 13 per cent of the offenders, neither returning them to jail nor extending their periods of supervision. The board "revoked and continued" two per cent of the offenders, essentially returning them to jail for a short time before again considering the offender for parole. Overall, 70 per cent of the offenders were returned to custody to serve the remainder of their sentences, and the other 30 per cent were not.

A further scrutiny of those offenders "revoked and denied" shows that six per cent had committed new felonies, 26 per cent had committed new misdemeanors and 68 per cent had condition violations. Of those offenders "revoked and reparaoled," 100 per cent were for conditions violations. Of those offenders "reprimanded and warned," 22 per cent had new misdemeanor convictions and 78 per cent had condition violations. Of those offenders "revoked and continued," 100 per cent had a new felony conviction.

"Revoked and Denied" Violators

During the 1990 summer quarter the board revoked and denied further consideration to 47 violators—70 per cent of the 67 violation cases. These 47 "revoked and denied" violators had an average risk score of 29.26. The risk score for all violators in the quarter, including those revoked and denied, was 27.36. Over 85 per cent of the "revoked and denied" violators had risk scores between 23 and 40.

Over 35 per cent of the 47 violators had four months or less to serve at the time of the revocation

hearing; 63 per cent had eight months or less to serve. The average length of time still to be served was about eight months. In 32 per cent of the cases, the parolees signed waivers of appearance at the final revocation hearing and requested full revocation.

Many of these violators had substance abuse problems. Although some violators were serving time on new sentences and therefore would not in any case be eligible for other non-incarceration options, the Parole Board examined how many violators indicated a willingness to try additional programming. However, information was not readily available in many of the files on a violator's willingness or unwillingness to become involved in relevant programming. It should be noted, though, that in 28 per cent of the cases the violators clearly refused additional programming.

Specific Cases

The Parole Board makes individual case decisions based upon the specific case information. They have no quotas or targets. In order to understand why so many violators were revoked and denied, we need to look past the numbers to specific cases for a few examples:

1. L.P.'s current parole violations were for refusing to go to mental health counseling and violating the community residential center rules and being removed. This violation was the third parole violation on this release. L.P. had just been reparaoled at the previous hearing. This risk score was 24.

2. A.D.'s risk score was 36. He is an untreated sex offender. He sold and gave alcohol to minors and had sexual contact with a minor. He agreed he needed sex offender treatment and agreed to go to the Hiland Mountain sex offender program if his parole was revoked.

3. L.P.2's risk score was 23. He had received numerous chances at probation and parole in the past. His current violations included several drinking incidents, only two days after his release from jail. He has an extensive history of alcohol abuse and violence.

4. A.J.'s risk score was 40. His

Please see Parole Violators, page 4

Table 1. Parole Revocation Cases, Summer 1990

N = 67

OFFENDER CHARACTERISTICS	N	Per cent	CURRENT CASE	N	Per cent
Felony convictions			Length of supervision under current sentence		
One	14	21%	Less than one year	27	40%
Two or more	53	79%	One year to 25 months	34	51%
Misdemeanor convictions			25 months or more	6	9%
None	4	6%	Time under supervision before current violation		
One to three	15	22%	Less than three months	30	45%
Four or more	48	72%	Three months to less than six months	19	28%
Convictions for burglary, criminal trespass, forgery, checks or credit card crime			Six months to one year	13	20%
None	23	34%	Over one year	5	7%
One or more	44	66%	Type of parole violation		
Convictions for sexual assault			Convicted of new felony	3	5%
No	48	72%	Convicted of new misdemeanor	15	22%
Yes	19	28%	Condition violation	49	73%
History of alcohol abuse			Absconding	0	0%
No	15	22%	Parole Board action		
Yes	52	78%	Revoked and denied	47	70%
History of drug abuse			Revoked and reparaoled	10	15%
No	32	48%	Reprimanded and warned	9	13%
Yes	35	52%	Revoked and continued	1	2%
Prior probation or parole revocations					
None	3	5%			
One	19	28%			
Two or more	45	67%			
Risk scores					
Group A = 0-6 points	0	0%			
Group B = 7-14 points	0	0%			
Group C = 15-29 points	44	66%			
Group D = 30-49 points	23	34%			

Percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding.

Source of data: "Alaska Parole Violators," Parole Board, Alaska Department of Corrections.

Parole Violators (continued from page 3)

current conviction is for sexual abuse of a minor. He has a prior rape. The current violations included possessing guns, using and possessing alcohol, having alcohol in his house and car and possessing a drug pipe. He failed to tell people in his household of his crime and was around and "grooming" a nine-month-old child and a twelve-year-old child.

5. L.G.'s risk score was 39. He has a serious drinking problem. He was involved in two separate drinking incidents and, during the last one, threatened to kill the Village Public Safety Officer. He did not report the police contact to his parole officer.

6. D.R.'s risk score was 37. He committed three new misdemeanor convictions, used drugs, left the area of the state where he was being supervised, moved without telling his parole officer, failed to go to sex offender programming and substance abuse programming, failed to notify his parole officer of police contact and consumed alcohol.

7. A.B.'s risk score was 29. While

on supervision he absconded for seven months and committed a new theft.

All the "revoked and denied" parole violators were moderate to very high risks. Most of them have alcohol and/or drug abuse problems and again need substance abuse programming, usually in a residential program. There is usually a three-to-four-month waiting list for this programming. Many of the violators refused programming to deal with their problems. Over a third of the

violators had four months or less to serve at the time of the hearing, and almost two-thirds had eight months or less to serve.

There is little doubt some of these violators could be diverted from prison if residential substance abuse treatment programs or other intermediate sanctions were available. However, the profile of the violators does not suggest the numbers diverted would be large.

Samuel Trivette is Executive Director of the Alaska Parole Board.

Language and Justice

Three Alaska researchers have received a National Science Foundation grant to examine cultural communicative and ethnographic factors in legal institutions and structures. Phyllis Morrow, a cultural anthropologist at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, Galen Paine, an attorney, and Betty Harmun, a legal interpreter, will explore the interaction of Yupi'k Eskimo culture and the American legal system through interviews and

observation of court proceedings conducted in Bethel. The study will also examine confessions of criminal defendants to test anecdotal evidence that native Yupi'k speakers confess to crimes more readily than non-Yupi'ks and confess more completely. In addition, the researchers will analyze the impact upon case outcome of the almost exclusive use of lay and legal English in the justice system, particularly in the courtroom.

Village Public Safety Officers: A Further Look

Lawrence C. Trostle

The Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO) program was designed to meet the public safety needs of indigenous rural Alaska communities by employing people within their own communities to work in conjunction with the Department of Public Safety. The VPSOs are trained by the Alaska State Troopers at their academy in Sitka. VPSO training focuses on five basic public safety areas: fire suppression, law enforcement, search and rescue, water safety and emergency medical services.

An article in the last edition of the *Alaska Justice Forum*, "The Nonenforcement Role of the VPSO"

(Winter 1992), examined data related to VPSO activity in enforcement and nonenforcement areas from thirteen Bristol Bay villages. This article will present parallel statewide data on enforcement and nonenforcement activities, regional data from the Bethel area and, again, from Bristol Bay.

Since 1980 the VPSO program has grown from a small pilot program of approximately 19 officers to 125 positions. Although the terms *problem-oriented policing* and *community-oriented policing* had not yet been coined at the time that the VPSO program was designed, in many ways it appears to have been a forerunner of this type of policing. Community-oriented policing encompasses: (1) involvement of the community to accomplish police responsibilities; (2) permanent geographical assignment of officers to a neighborhood to facilitate better relations; (3) establishment of police priorities based on community needs and desires; and (4) allocation of police resources. Although the VPSO program does not include all these aspects precisely, it has nonetheless been an innovative approach to policing in Alaska.

The VPSO Program in the 1990s

Over the years modifications in the VPSO training agenda have resulted in more attention being devoted to community-oriented activities and less to law enforcement. Did these modifications in training result from the reality of VPSO activity in the villages? Were they predicated on supposition or based on some other variables within the village and/or nonprofit corporation power structure? What bearing do they have on any desire to abandon or revise the current VPSO program?

Recently some questions have been raised about the program's viability in its current form. If modifications in the VPSO program are proposed they should be based at least partially on quantitative data reflecting how the program meets contemporary community needs. One of the first issues that must be

addressed in answering these questions is the proportional division of VPSO activity in rural Alaska.

One of the habitual problems immediately confronting anyone who looks at public safety activity in rural Alaska is the lack of precise documentation. Record-keeping has always been problematic in rural Alaska. A problem associated with the data that do exist is that there are no consistent reporting standards throughout the state, no consistent tabulation of data by categories and time frames and no standard for reporting rates of activities. (It should be noted that the Department of Public Safety, Alaska State Troopers—Rural Enforcement, is currently making a concentrated effort, with a noticeable degree of success, to correct some of these difficulties. It is also incumbent upon the academic community to address these problems in use of the data. In the future it might be productive to examine data in light of the five categories covered in training, if the documentation permits.)

The data presented in this article cover two different time frames: (1) the calendar year 1990 and (2) the fiscal year 1991 (July 1, 1990 - June 30, 1991). Data from the Bristol Bay area and the Bethel region will be compared with statewide data.

In examining aggregate village data it can be difficult to classify a reported incident. For example, does drinking in public require law enforcement-related activity, or is any action on the part of an officer more a social and/or civil activity? One must know if the village is statutorily dry or not to make the proper distinction between an enforcement and nonenforcement activity, and this distinction is impossible to make if one is looking at aggregate state or regional data. Therefore, some activities in the data under discussion may inadvertently be misclassified. In order to address concerns that some categories may contain both criminal and noncriminal activities, the categories themselves have been given the

Please see VPSO, page 6



Alaska Justice Forum

Editor: Antonia Moras

Editorial Board: John Angell, Allan Barnes, Robert Congdon, Richard Curtis, Roger Miller, Lisa Rieger, Nancy Schafer, Lawrence Trostle

Typesetting and Layout:
Melissa S. Green

Justice Center, John Angell, Director

Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit,
Allan Barnes, Director

Published quarterly by the Justice Center, and the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit, at the University of Alaska Anchorage, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508; (907) 786-1810; fax 786-7777.

© 1992 Justice Center,
University of Alaska Anchorage

ISSN 0893-8903

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, provides approximately thirty-five per cent of the funding for this publication.

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

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

VPSO
(continued from page 5)

much broader designations *enforcement-related activity* and *nonenforcement-related activity* rather than criminal and noncriminal. While this will not alleviate all of the ambiguity, it is hoped that incorrect or inadvertent classifications will be minimized.

Findings

Table 1 displays the top twenty nonenforcement-related activities for VPSOs in 1990 for the entire state of Alaska, for the Bethel region and for thirteen villages in the Bristol Bay area. The state and Bristol Bay data are based on figures for the 1990 calendar year, and the Bethel region data are based on FY 1990 figures.

Table 1 displays the top twenty categories of nonenforcement activities engaged in by all VPSOs in calendar year 1990. The data in Table 1 indicate that the top five statewide nonenforcement activity

categories (security check, patrol request, assist inside Alaska, public assist and public appearance) are identical to the top five categories reported for VPSOs in the Bethel region (patrol request, security check, public appearance, public assist and assist inside Alaska), although the rank ordering of the activities is not the same. However, in the Bristol Bay area villages only two of the top five categories (assist inside Alaska (n=33, 4.13%) and public assist (n=31, 3.88%)) are the same. The remaining three activity categories for the Bristol Bay region (subpoena/summons served, provide transportation and welfare check) are rank ordered 7, 10 and 14 respectively in the statewide data.

Within the twenty categories of activities the Bethel region parallels overall statewide VPSO activity in seven of the top ten categories (70%), and in 13 of the top 20 (65%). The Bristol Bay area reflects similarities in seven of the top ten categories (70%), and in 14 of the top 20 (70%).

It is interesting to note that on a statewide basis the actual number of the top five nonenforcement activities far exceeds the number of VPSO enforcement activities. In fact, the number of the fifth-ranked non-enforcement activity alone—public appearance (n=645, 4.6%)—is more than double that of the highest-ranked enforcement activity, assault (n=316, 2.26%). Table 2 provides statewide data for both nonenforcement and enforcement activities.

The data in Table 1 further indicate that statewide VPSO activity in 1990 was strongly skewed towards nonenforcement activity (89.84%). In addition, Table 1 reflects that VPSO activity in the Bethel region was strongly skewed towards nonenforcement activity as well (77%). However, the 1990 data for the Bristol Bay area indicate a much more equal division of activity, with enforcement activity exceeding nonenforcement duties by approximately 5.4 per cent (52.69% and

Please see VPSO, page 8

Table 1. Twenty Most Frequently Reported Nonenforcement Activities of Village Public Safety Officers
Statewide 1990; Bethel Region FY1991; 13 Bristol Bay Area Villages 1990

Statewide, 1990			Bethel Region, FY1991 (July 1, 1990—June 30, 1991)			Thirteen Villages in the Bristol Bay Region, 1990		
Activity	N	% of total service calls	Activity	N	% of total service calls	Activity	N	% of total service calls
Security check	2958	21.11	Patrol request	329	12.02	Welfare check—person	38	4.76
Patrol request	2388	17.04	Security check	316	11.55	Assist inside Alaska	33	4.13
Assistance inside Alaska	1178	8.41	Public appearance	177	6.47	Provide transportation	32	4.01
Public assistance	991	7.07	Public assist	168	6.14	Public assist	31	3.88
Public appearance	645	4.60	Assist inside Alaska	154	5.63	Subpoena/Summons served	27	3.38
Fire services	629	4.49	Subpoena/summons	144	5.26	Animal-related offense/complaint	25	3.13
Subpoena/Summons served	425	3.03	Animal-related offense/complaint	136	4.97	Suspicious circumstances	23	2.88
Animal-related offense/complaint	356	2.54	Protective custody	71	2.59	Inspection	20	2.50
Disturbance	332	2.37	Fire services	52	1.90	Fire services	19	2.38
Provide transportation	258	1.84	Suspicious circumstances	52	1.90	Public appearance	19	2.38
Medical assist	223	1.59	Prisoner transport	46	1.68	Security check	15	1.88
Water safety	206	1.47	Welfare check	36	1.32	Transport prisoner	12	1.50
Suspicious circumstances	201	1.43	Drunk in public	29	1.06	Patrol request	9	1.13
Welfare check	190	1.36	Provide transportation	29	1.06	Court appearance	9	1.13
Training	168	1.20	Background investigation	25	0.91	Medical assist	8	1.00
Protective custody	152	1.08	Voided dispatch	24	0.88	Search and rescue	6	0.75
Transport — prisoner	146	1.04	Search and rescue	18	0.66	Civil problem	5	0.63
Court appearance	122	0.87	Water safety	18	0.66	Overdue motorist	4	0.50
Transport — medical	109	0.78	*Court appearance	17	0.62	*Dirt bike, other ATV complaint	3	0.38
Safety hazard — health	89	0.64	*Alcohol information	17	0.62	*MVA—Injury	3	0.38
			*Family offense	17	0.62	*Accident—firearm—other	3	0.38
			*Civil problem	17	0.62			
Total nonenforcement-related	12586	89.84	Total nonenforcement-related	2100	76.73	Total nonenforcement-related	378	47.31
Total enforcement-related	1424	10.16	Total enforcement-related	637	23.27	Total enforcement-related	421	52.69
TOTAL SERVICE CALLS	14010	100.00	TOTAL SERVICE CALLS	2737	100.00	TOTAL SERVICE CALLS	799	100.00

* Tied for 19th most frequently reported activity.

* Tied for 19th most frequently reported activity.

Table 2. Reported Service Calls of Village Public Safety Officers, Statewide, 1990

NONENFORCEMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES		% of total service calls		NONENFORCEMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES		% of total service calls	
	N				N		
Security check	2958	21.11		Vehicle in ditch	11	0.08	
Patrol request	2388	17.04		Family neglect	11	0.08	
Assistance inside Alaska	1178	8.41		Impound vehicle	11	0.08	
Public assistance	991	7.07		Motor vehicle -- injuries	11	0.08	
Public appearance	645	4.60		Death investigation -- natural	9	0.06	
Fire services	629	4.49		Snowmachine complaint	9	0.06	
Subpoena/Summons served	425	3.03		Vehicle inspection	8	0.06	
Animal-related offense/complaint	356	2.54		Runaway juveniles	7	0.05	
Disturbance	332	2.37		Motor vehicle -- property -- non-traffic	6	0.04	
Provide transportation	258	1.84		Field interview	5	0.04	
Medical assist	223	1.59		Motor vehicle -- aircraft accident -- property	5	0.04	
Water safety	206	1.47		Accidental firearm -- other	4	0.03	
Suspicious circumstances	201	1.43		Drowning	4	0.03	
Welfare check	190	1.36		Death -- noncriminal	4	0.03	
Training	168	1.20		Non-arson -- residence	4	0.03	
Protective custody	152	1.08		Unsafe living conditions	4	0.03	
Transport -- prisoner	146	1.04		Dignitary security	3	0.02	
Court appearance	122	0.87		Death notification	3	0.02	
Transport -- medical	109	0.78		Suspicious vehicle	3	0.02	
Safety hazard -- health	89	0.64		Traffic control	3	0.02	
Alcohol-related	84	0.60		Littering	3	0.02	
Minor in need of supervision	75	0.54		Operator's license application -- road test	2	0.01	
Overdue motorist	64	0.46		Motor vehicle -- fatalities	2	0.01	
Drunk in public	48	0.34		Unidentified human remains	2	0.01	
Search and rescue	42	0.30		Fire -- non-arson -- injury	2	0.01	
Family offense -- noncriminal	41	0.29		Suicide	2	0.01	
Motorist assist	35	0.25		Non-arson -- motor vehicle	1	0.01	
Canine patrol	26	0.19		Drinking in public	1	0.01	
Road conditions	23	0.16		Transport -- corpse	1	0.01	
Lost/found property	23	0.16		Motor vehicle -- fatality -- non-traffic	1	0.01	
Attempted suicide	22	0.16		Overdue aircraft	1	0.01	
Bike complaint	22	0.16		Crime Stoppers	1	0.01	
Drug information	21	0.15		Abandoned vehicle	1	0.01	
Background investigation	20	0.14		Fire fatality -- non-arson	1	0.01	
Missing persons	20	0.14		Motor vehicle -- wildlife damage	1	0.01	
Emergency message	17	0.12		Motor vehicle -- injury -- non-traffic	1	0.01	
Transport -- mental	16	0.11		Non-arson -- business	1	0.01	
Fire -- non-arson -- other property	16	0.11		Fire hazard -- high risk	1	0.01	
Transport paperwork	13	0.09		Fireworks	1	0.01	
False alarm	13	0.09		Fire -- self-inflicted	1	0.01	
Traffic hazard	13	0.09		Intoxicated pedestrian	1	0.01	
Motor vehicle -- property damage	13	0.09					
ENFORCEMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES		% of total service calls		ENFORCEMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES		% of total service calls	
	N				N		
Assault	316	2.26		Search warrant served	11	0.08	
Driving while intoxicated	171	1.22		Reckless driving	8	0.06	
Minor -- possession or consuming	120	0.86		Driving without license	6	0.04	
Malicious mischief	118	0.84		Possession of drugs	5	0.04	
Larceny	92	0.66		Escape	5	0.04	
Criminal trespass	79	0.56		Sexual assault	5	0.04	
Disorderly conduct	76	0.54		Negligent driving	4	0.03	
Burglary	72	0.51		Failure to report accident	3	0.02	
Civil problem	62	0.44		Refusing breathalyzer	3	0.02	
Arrest warrant served	51	0.36		Stolen property	2	0.01	
Probation violation	48	0.34		Forgery	2	0.01	
Possession of weapons	42	0.30		Bribe	1	0.01	
Resisting arrest	32	0.23		License violation	1	0.01	
Furnishing liquor to minors	29	0.21		Embezzlement	1	0.01	
Theft	15	0.11		Parole violation	1	0.01	
Domestic violence process served	14	0.10		Possession -- marijuana -- operating vehicle	1	0.01	
Conditional release violation	14	0.10		Detention order served	1	0.01	
Driving while license suspended	12	0.09		Fraud	1	0.01	
				TOTAL ACTIVITIES		% of total service calls	
				Nonenforcement related	12586	89.84	
				Enforcement related	1424	10.16	
				TOTAL SERVICE CALLS	14010	100.00	

Source of data: Alaska Department of Public Safety

VPSO*(continued from page 6)*

47.31% respectively.) However, if one examines the 1989 data and the aggregate 1989/1990 data for the Bristol Bay villages, nonenforcement activity predominates:

BRISTOL BAY VILLAGES		
	Nonenforcement- related	Enforcement- related *
1989	752	377
1990	386	413
Total	1138 (59%)	790 (41%)

[* Note that the above numbers vary slightly from the previously published material (L.C. Trostle, et al., "The Nonenforcement Role of the VPSO," *Alaska Justice Forum* 8(4), Winter 1992) due to reclassification of arrest warrants served (n=7) and domestic violence process served (n=1) from nonenforcement to enforcement.]

Although there are some similarities among regions for the levels and types of VPSO nonen-

forcement related activity reflected here, no definite conclusions should be drawn. This study cannot be assumed to apply to all villages and/or regions of the state. The author readily acknowledges problems with the data: the study looks at only two regions within the state, compares data from two different, although similar, time frames, and does not take into consideration regional or cultural differences. However, the similarities can not be ignored either. The intent of this preliminary study was to determine several things: (1) what do the VPSOs do or report that they do; (2) how is their work load divided; and (3) are there any similarities between the overall levels of statewide activity and the various regional areas? It is apparent from the data presented here that there does appear to be a collective emphasis on nonenforcement VPSO activity, but this finding should not be interpreted as denying the serious impact of crime in rural Alaska.

Another important consideration

not addressed here is the actual amount of time devoted to these various activities. For example, as noted above, there were approximately 645 public appearances made by VPSOs. This is twice the number of the most common statewide criminal activity handled by VPSOs (316 assaults). The number of activities alone does not reflect the time required to accomplish each task or the gravity of effort involved. Consequently, although it provides some information, this examination of the number of events does not tell us everything about the division of VPSO time and labor between enforcement and nonenforcement activity. What is needed before changes are considered is a more complete evaluation of the VPSO program as it exists today. The data presented here suggest that the program is doing what it was designed to do and that a continued orientation to community policing is warranted.

Lawrence C. Trostle is an assistant professor with the Justice Center.

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

Address correction requested

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