

Court Security Projects**FY2014 Request: \$1,300,000****Reference No: 47151****AP/AL:** Appropriation**Project Type:** Life / Health / Safety**Category:** Law and Justice**Location:** Statewide**House District:** Statewide (HD 1-40)**Impact House District:** Statewide (HD 1-40)**Contact:** Rhonda McLeod**Estimated Project Dates:** 07/01/2013 - 06/30/2018**Contact Phone:** (907)264-8215**Brief Summary and Statement of Need:**

This is an on-going multi-year project to provide for physical security for the public, judges, staff, jurors, and other users in court facilities statewide.

| Funding: | FY2014 | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 | Total |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|
| Gen Fund | \$1,300,000 | \$5,957,600 | | | | | \$7,257,600 |
| Total: | \$1,300,000 | \$5,957,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,257,600 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Match Required | <input type="checkbox"/> One-Time Project | <input type="checkbox"/> Phased - new | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phased - underway | <input type="checkbox"/> On-Going |
| 0% = Minimum State Match % Required | | <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health Bill | |

Operating & Maintenance Costs:

| | <u>Amount</u> | <u>Staff</u> |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Project Development: | 0 | 0 |
| Ongoing Operating: | 0 | 0 |
| One-Time Startup: | 0 | 0 |
| Totals: | 0 | 0 |

Prior Funding History / Additional Information:

Sec1 Ch17 SLA2012 P152 L18 SB160 \$1,700,000
 Sec1 Ch15 SLA2009 P37 L17 SB75 \$1,190,000
 Sec13 Ch29 SLA2008 P174 L15 SB221 \$150,000
 Sec1 Ch82 SLA2006 P110 L3 SB231 \$750,000
 Sec1 Ch159 SLA2004 P50 L6 SB283 \$500,000
 Sec1 Ch82 SLA2003 P55 L27 SB100 \$500,000

Project Description/Justification:

Recent and on-going national events and state incidents highlight the need to protect the public and court staff in both rural and urban locations. Government facilities have increasingly become targets of acts of violence and terror. The increases in domestic violence, domestic relations, and criminal cases, as a percentage of overall caseload, have left the court system with concerns for security of litigants, jurors, victims, witnesses, attorneys, and staff. These concerns are further complicated by the fact that many court facilities also share quarters with other governmental agencies whose risk of threat is higher, thereby increasing concerns about physical safety for those who enter court buildings. It is important that each courthouse maintain effective security, which simultaneously ensures fair, safe, and orderly trials while creating a public atmosphere of respect for judicial proceedings.

Securing a court facility should be comprehensive and integrate security operations and technology with the architecture. The facilities that house courts vary in age from new to nearly 40 years old. The older facilities have significant constraints, both in physical design and in building systems, which limit

the applicability of a single solution for all courts. Courthouse security generally incorporates physical components such as duress alarms, card access systems, fencing, entry screening, and surveillance of high risk areas. Some court locations lack these basic physical components, and several also lack sufficient court security officers. The Department of Public Safety is aware of this and is working to address it.

The court system has requested funding for security annually since FY2004. In FY2013, the court system received \$1,700,000 towards this project for a critical building expansion to the Palmer Courthouse to provide a functional, safe, and secure space for the Judicial Services Officers. This renovation included construction of adequate holding cells, officer work areas, prisoner transport areas and a sallyport (prisoner entrance to the building from the transport vehicles).

The following sections describe the physical elements of an integrated security system for the courts that lack the basic components of a secure facility.

A. *Access Control.* Nationally, many courts rely on entry control at all exterior access points to provide a large measure of security. Exterior access control consists of two components: a badging system or keypad locking system to control entry at exterior doors, and metal detection equipment installed at a single public entry to screen people and objects entering the buildings. Additionally, access must often be controlled at interior points - entry to secure areas (corridors, chambers, clerk's offices, etc.) or segregated circulation areas (prisoner holding) using badge readers and often intercoms with cameras for assessing those who desire entry. Badging and intercom systems for access control has been funded or partially funded previously for Anchorage, Ketchikan, Nome, Kenai, and Palmer; the court system is now requesting \$473,400 for access systems and \$50,000 for screening equipment for the courthouses in Anchorage, Bethel, Juneau, Kotzebue, Palmer, Valdez, and Fairbanks. For screening security, portable detection units are a viable alternative to a permanent, in-place security system in many court locations that have limited space and needs. Portable units can also be used in urban areas to provide additional security for high-risk situations or cases. The units, which consist of a portable metal detector and handheld wand, cost approximately \$6,500 each plus installation of power estimated to cost approximately \$6,000 per installation site. These portable units are recommended for fifteen court locations (Craig, Petersburg, Sitka, Wrangell, Barrow, Nome, Kotzebue, Dillingham, Glennallen, Homer, Palmer, Valdez, Unalaska, Bethel, and Nenana). The court system's total funding request for these units is \$187,500.

B. *Physical Barriers.* In addition to access control, interior physical barriers, segregated prisoner delivery pathways and intelligent proximity of controlled private spaces are required to keep the public, prisoners, and staff separated and to provide secure routes for staff to access courtrooms from the private areas of the courthouse, such as from judicial chambers, corridors, and clerk's offices. The interior access control typically includes installing secure doors in dividing walls and a camera/intercom system for request to enter, as well as locating secure court areas adjacent to each other. Secure prisoner delivery pathways require separate entrances, delivery elevators, stairs, corridors, and holding areas. Exterior barriers include security fencing to staff parking areas, and enclosures for building utilities. Currently the following physical barriers are needed at the courts listed:

- Ketchikan - Construct prisoner delivery elevator to existing holding cells at courtrooms: \$500,000

- Kotzebue - Relocate district court courtroom to second floor adjacent to secured staff areas; add security to second floor courtroom: \$1,345,600
- Anchorage Jail Courtroom: Provide separate exit for judge from courtroom: \$80,000
- Palmer, Kotzebue, Valdez, Nenana, Kenai, and Anchorage - Install security fencing or barriers to shield prisoner delivery or public areas from private parking at courtroom sites: \$360,000
- Valdez and Dillingham - Remodel the inefficient layout, since the judges' chambers are accessible from the public corridor and are isolated from the clerk's office and the courtroom. Remodel in both these locations would take advantage of underutilized space, and lead to significant cost savings and security benefits: \$1,196,400.
- Wrangell - Remodel to allow direct access to the jury room from the courtroom; currently, the jurors walk through the public corridor to reach the jury room: \$50,000
- Fairbanks - Create a segregated screening area for viewing of monitors away from public for better service and security: \$5,000
- Nenana - Install ballistic glazing at windows of chambers and clerk's office: \$30,000

C. *Clerk's Counter Shielding and Securing.* Another barrier that separates public and secure areas is the clerk's counter. Public counters should be protected by bulletproof shielding below the counter and high-impact safety panels or other features which dissuade breaching the barrier mounted on the counter top. This protection is still needed at Haines, Barrow, Palmer, Kotzebue, Nome, Anchorage, Valdez, and Dillingham. The cost will vary by location depending on the size and configuration of the counters, but is estimated to total \$215,500.

D. *Ballistic Shielding for Judicial Benches.* Shielding for the courtroom judicial benches is also desired in all court locations. Many of the newer courtrooms were constructed with this feature, and several judicial benches at certain locations have been fortified with shielding as remodeling projects were completed. In addition, all new lease contracts require the landlord to provide judicial bench shielding. Still, twenty-six judge and in-court benches, mostly in rural locations, still need ballistic shielding for protection; the cost to complete this is \$240,500.

E. *Duress and Surveillance.* Duress and intrusion alarms are used to notify court security officers of an emergency situation. While alarm systems are already installed in most court facilities, many of these systems are routed to a remote dispatch location as there are no enforcement officers who are stationed in the building, and most locations need addressable systems so that security officers can precisely locate the duress alarm within the building. Only the six larger urban courts in have judicial services personnel located within the building. Efforts have been made to have alarm signals sent to the closest law enforcement agency; but in many communities, response to these alarms is slow, as other duties take precedence. This security deficit cannot be solved with technology alone, but would be partially addressed by providing more reliable, functioning, and dependable duress systems at the rural courts. As an example, the cost of these alarms at the Haines court is \$7,000. The estimate for expanding existing duress systems, providing intrusion alarms, interfacing the duress alarms with the CCTV system, or upgrading them to show precise alarm locations at Nenana, Fairbanks, Palmer, Anchorage, Glennallen, Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow and Ketchikan is \$229,000; the cost to add audio to duress at Fairbanks courtrooms is \$75,000.

Essential court security also includes monitoring and surveillance of public areas, which acts as an immediate deterrent to threats and a means of alerting judicial services officers of problems, and also produces a record for forensic evidence after a security breach or issue occurs. Surveillance

cameras in entryways, clerks' counters, lobbies, corridors, and other high-risk areas will provide improved security in those locations where judicial services personnel are available to monitor the cameras and respond. A very minimal video monitoring system costs approximately \$5,000 to install at each camera location in each courthouse. Providing more advanced systems at additional superior court or high-risk locations that currently have no surveillance systems (five courts lack any surveillance system) is estimated to cost \$290,000.

Existing surveillance systems in five of the larger courts are sometimes failing, and are not sufficient for current security needs. The cost for additional or replacement equipment for new remodels and expansions is \$897,900.

F. *Judicial Services Security and Emergency Services Concerns.* Holding cells should be provided in all superior court locations, and several other court locations where criminal proceedings may be held and a local holding facility is not available. Without holding cells, the judicial services officers are required to hold prisoners in court staff areas during breaks in proceedings - a critical safety and security concern. At this time, holding cells are lacking and needed in the Nome courthouse; the estimated cost of adding a cell is \$30,000 (including specialized plumbing to construct a "secure toilet"). The current holding cells at Dillingham and Barrow have non-secure or non-functioning doors, and require replacement for a total cost of \$25,000.

G. *Emergency Power.* In Anchorage, emergency power is required in the Boney courthouse at the prisoner control and delivery areas to ensure security and safety during power outages; the cost for this upgrade is \$30,000. Additionally, the domestic violence clerical areas, courtroom, screening areas, and lobbies must be adequately lit and functioning in the case of a power outage, because the domestic violence court conducts proceedings 24/7, and must continue to be operational in an emergency. Tying these areas into the generator to provide power for several days is estimated to cost \$100,000.

H. *Holding Area Remodels, Upgrades and Expansions.* The Kenai courthouse judicial services offices, holding cells, and prisoner delivery areas are inadequate and do not provide adequate and safe space for secure intake, holding, and transport of in-custody defendants. Remodeling those areas is necessary and is estimated to cost \$160,000. In addition, the control panel layout in the control room in the Fairbanks courthouse detention area is deficient, and does not adequately or efficiently house the current equipment. It needs to be replaced at a cost of \$20,000.

Finally, project management, code review, design and engineering expenses for the numerous security projects that are necessary to ensure protection of court staff, judges, jurors, and the public is estimated to cost \$659,800.