



STATE OF HAWAII
HAWAII CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
E HUIKALA A MA'EMA'E NŌ
235 S. Beretania Street, 16th Floor
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
(808) 587-4160

Maui Community Correctional Center (MCCC)
June 2026 Site Visit Observations Report
Date of Report: July 3, 2026

On Thursday, June 18, 2026, the Hawaii Correctional System Oversight Commission (the Commission, HCSOC) toured the Maui Community Correctional Center (MCCC) collectively as a group. The tour included four of the five Commissioners—Mark Patterson (Chair), Mark Browning, Ronald Ibarra, and Martha Torney—in addition to staff. The Commission was granted access to all areas of the facility and was able to communicate with all people in custody who wanted to speak with the Commission.

Warden Liane Endo and Chief of Security Major Manuel Labasan were attending the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (DCR) annual Incentive Awards Ceremony in Honolulu. The Commissioners was ably escorted by Lt. Hedges who provided access to all areas we requested to visit, with inmates and staff having unfettered access to speak with us. We appreciate his time and openness during our visit.

During our visit, several operational observations were made regarding housing utilization, offender management, construction impacts, and custody placement practices. The following summary reflects key findings and concerns.

MCCC's bed capacity is 301, the head count on June 18 was 211 (183 males, 28 females). Although the count is significantly below capacity, it must be noted that Dorms 6 and 7, a minimum secure building with a bed capacity of 100, was closed due to the construction of a new secure wing for women. The area around Dorms 6 and 7 is being used as the staging area for the construction. As a result of the closure, other living units are overcrowded with the assigned population exceeding the rated capacity.

The Commission did not visit all living units or programming spaces due to time constraints.

Lt. Hedges and other staff noted that the Maui courts are actively monitoring cases at the facility to consider those who could be safely released to the community. Not only are pretrial misdemeanants and felons reviewed for release, but also those sentenced short-term and probation violators. The efforts are much appreciated by the facility staff.

General Observations

Based on our observations, the relationship between staff and inmates continues to be cordial. As noted in the past, overall, the facility is clean and well-maintained. Given the age of the facility,

there is a never ending list of maintenance jobs needing attention. For example, in more than one living unit the shower ceilings clearly have mold.

Due to the closing of Dorms 6 and 7, the reduction in the number of available beds resulted in many living units housing inmates beyond their rated bed capacity. Dorms 6 and 7 previously housed inmates assigned to facility work lines and those on work furlough. These men have now been reassigned to Dorms 4 and 5, another minimum custody living unit located well within the secure perimeter at the very back of the facility grounds. We are concerned that this shift has created a mismatch between custody classification and housing environment, contributing to frustration among the offenders and limiting their reentry preparation.

Lt. Hedges noted that all inmate work lines are assigned within the facility (kitchen, laundry, janitors, etc.), as there are no active off-campus community service work lines such as agreements with the State Department of Transportation for roadside clean-up. Also, there are no Correctional Industries programs currently available at the facility.

We were informed by Lt. Hedges that six males and three females are currently on work furlough, with one female on extended furlough. One complaint made by an inmate was that those on work furlough are required to return to the facility once a week during their work hours to meet with their case manager. The person we spoke with said his employer would drive him back to the facility and wait while he met with the case manager. Not every employer could accommodate this weekly meeting resulting in the inmate not attending work that day, losing pay and jeopardizing their employment. This practice is not conducive with successful reentry into the community. It is recommended that the facility consider alternative work hours for the case manager one day a week to meet with the furloughees once they return from work. As the case management staff grows, a case manager can be assigned to meet the work furloughees at their worksite.

Many inmates noted that there is only one case manager (CM), Chase Decoite, currently available to assist the male population. It was clear the inmates did not blame Chase for the lack of additional case managers and believe he does his best under these trying circumstances. This situation is quickly being rectified. Warden Liane Endo informed us there are six case manager positions on the books, of which five are currently filled. Until April of this year, only three were filled with one CM currently on maternity leave (to return in August). Through a new Department of Human Resources Development pilot program, Wikiwiki Hire, certain positions can be filled directly by the facility. This includes DCR social workers/human service professionals. By utilizing Wikiwiki Hire, Warden Endo has hired two new human service professionals, one in May and a second in June. We commend Warden Endo for her success in filling vacant positions.

MCCC reinstated contact visits in April 2025. Placement in administration segregation and being classified maximum/close may result in non-contact visits, utilizing secure visiting settings with glass partitions or video visits instead. Number of visits per week is reduced for those in administrative segregation.

Module B

Pre-trial inmates are assigned to Module B, a two-story building with 24 cells of which four are larger cells for the handicapped. On the day of our visit, sixty-one inmates were housed in Module B which has a rated capacity of 48, resulting in thirteen cells assigned to three inmates. It is noted that the cells we visited all had two double bunks with the potential of four inmates per cell.

The facility does not allow all inmates into the dayroom at the same time, rather staggers two groups. Lack of activities besides socializing, watching TV and access to limited tablets was noted. The outdoor recreation door was open during our visit, but no inmates were outside.

According to the inmates, they are allowed out of their cells two hours in the morning, two hours in the afternoon and three meal breaks of 15 minutes each for a total of four hours forty-five minutes per day out-of-cell time. Last year, inmates informed us each meal was 45-minutes, so unsure of the change in time allowed per meal.

If it is 15-minutes per meal, four hours forty-five minutes is just shy of the definition of restrictive housing found in Section 353-41 (f) (2), HRS, “The confinement occurs in a cell...for twenty hours or more a day.” The Commission has a role to “actively monitor and review” all restrictive housing placements (see Section 353-41 (e), HRS.) This law was enacted in 2025 and is effective July 1, 2026.

A number of inmates complained that they had not been contacted by their assigned attorneys. This is most concerning among the pre-trial population.

Inmates are allowed to attend programs offered outside of the living unit, such as education. Tablets are available for use in the unit, although they must be shared. Those taking education courses may bring a tablet back to the living unit to continue their schoolwork. All tablets are collected and secured each day.

We did not visit Module A, which is the same configuration as Module B. Sixty-three inmates were assigned to Module A on the day of our visit.

Module C

Modules C and D are single story restrictive housing living units of six cells each, with Module C housing those with maximum or close custody and Module D designated for disciplinary segregation. Between the two housing units, seven inmates were housed. One floor ACO moves between the units; the secure control station watches over both units.

We only visited Module C with four inmates assigned, one of which was there temporarily due to a broken finger in a small metal cast. Once the cast is removed, he will be rehoused. While we were there, one inmate was in the dayroom playing chess on a tablet. He said he was allowed two hours out of cell time per day. Meals are taken in their cells.

There is a Zoom-access booth within Module C, allowing inmates to appear in court without being physically transported. This helps given the shortage of ACOs. Module C dayroom had a list of public defenders (PD) posted by the courts. This gives the inmates an opportunity to refresh their

memory as to which PD represents them and whom to contact. Lots of times inmates forget their attorney's name.

Two were classified as maximum, another pending classification. One of the maximum inmates is on pre-trial status and claimed he might be moved to Halawa. According to the inmate, he was involved with the March 2019 riot at the facility and as part of the adjudication process now owes \$621 in restitution.

We noted that water was pooling from the handicap shower into the dayroom area in Module C.

At the time of our visit, one of the three inmates assigned to Module D was awaiting a hearing and possible reclassification. Only two inmates were placed for post-adjudication disciplinary segregation and given 30 days or less for the infractions. Past site visits revealed Module D was used more extensively, even resulting in double celling at times. Given that segregation units typically house offenders with misconducts requiring disciplinary sanctions, the current underutilization suggests 1) decreased rule-violation related confinement, 2) improved behavioral management within residential units, and 3) strengthening of programming and staff engagement. This reflects positively on facility staff. Good job to the team.

During the Commission's June 2025 visit, we became aware that those places in Module C and D did not have direct access to the grievance or medical request system. Residents had to request forms and then be escorted by staff to drop completed forms in the respective boxes immediately outside the living unit. We recommended the forms and boxes be available within the unit which the facility complied with. Unfortunately, those housed in these units destroyed the boxes, so they are, once again, located outside the unit next to the control station. We were shown where the boxes had been located in the unit and could see the drill holes that held them to the wall. It is unfortunate that the boxes were torn off the wall.

Dorms 4 and 5

Dorms 4 and 5 is a minimum unit designed with two dorms at each end of the common dayroom and bathroom area. Located near the back of the facility grounds, those housed are classified as minimum or community and include a mix of sentenced males, facility work lines, pre-furlough and furlough. Those on furlough are in the mix with other status inmates which can result in pressure to bring back items to the facility at the request of others.

The inmates had a number of concerns they brought to our attention, including:

1. Having to repeat programs they did in Arizona or other State facilities, resulting in stagnation instead of forward progression in the re-entry process;
2. Limited or unavailability of programs;
3. Once classified as eligible for work furlough, getting stuck for months without any progress as there is no adequate case management staff to assist (see discussion above);
4. Maui Economic Opportunity (MEO) had a contract with the facility to assist in securing employment in the community. MEO's Mr. Bishop was essential to making the process work, but he retired and no replacement has been made. Some inmates are concerned the contract was cancelled;

5. MCCC has created good working relationships with some community-based businesses and refers inmates to them, yet the jobs available often do not match the trade skills of the inmates especially in the area of construction. Many inmates want jobs that match their skills and are better suited for long-term employment once they are released from custody; and
6. Inmates do not have adequate access to recreation. While the dayroom is available, outside recreation is not available daily. The ACOs claim it is, yet many chose not to go outside. Inmates assigned to facility work lines are the least likely to access outside recreation as they are not in the unit at the time it is offered. The recreation area is asphalt with no grass.

Two of four showers in the unit are currently not working, and some tiles are cracked or missing. Repairs need to be made.

Module 2 Dayrooms and Module 3

Modules 2 and 3 house females, both pre-trial and sentenced. The populations should not be mixed but at times this does occur in the larger common dayroom area due to limited space. Inmates have access to the much larger common dayroom in the middle of Module 2 for three hours per day, plus 15 minutes per meal. While in their smaller dayroom units, the cells appear to be open during the day. Those in Module C also have open cells in the area for a good part of the day. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the impact of the new restrictive housing given their movement in the smaller units.

Module 2 is made up of four three-cell units referred to as “dayrooms.” Dayroom 3 was converted to the facility medical unit many years ago. As a result, male inmates needing to visit the medical unit must transverse the Module 2 common dayroom, requiring all females to be locked in their assigned dayrooms or corridor when this occurs.

Dayroom 4 cells are reserved for disciplinary segregation and maximum/close custody inmates. There were two women in the unit when we arrived. The third cell in Dayroom 4 is an office for the medical unit and not available for housing.

Module 3 is a corridor of six cells separated from Module 2 by a large outdoor recreation area. Both populations have staggered outdoor recreation access on a daily basis. We were informed Module 3 houses those assigned to work furlough and facility work lines.

The women did meet with various Commissioners with only limited complaints, such as commissary is only every two weeks instead of weekly—people are hungry and would like more snacks to be available. There are a limited number of tablets which sometimes end up in fights over access. Also, there is mold in the ceilings of all the showers.

The women asked that more facility work lines be open to them, such as the kitchen. Lack of work lines results in more idle time and limited opportunity to make what little money is paid.

Medical Unit

The medical unit is seriously understaffed. There are three nurses for the whole facility, one being a nurse practitioner who usually works from home and is responsible for prescribing medication.

There is no assigned doctor employed by the State. The doctor who provides limited medical care comes in on Tuesdays for several hours. The facility does not have mental health staff to meet the needs of the inmates. There is no infirmary.

The medical staff informed us they are in the process of converting to a new electronic medical records (EMR) system.

Kitchen

The kitchen was being cleaned while we were there and was in good order.

The dishwasher has been broken for some time, with a new one on order. The bidding process takes time but has been completed and a vendor selected. Paper products are used until the new dishwasher is operational, except for about 50 plates that are transported to the housing units outside the secure facility. The meals need to be kept hot during transport.

The steamer is down, with a bid put out for a new one. The steamer is used to cook rice, laulau and fish. Rice is currently put in the oven to cook resulting in rice not moist enough.

Refrigeration and freezers are operational at the correct temperatures.

System-Wide Issues

The continued lack of available housing options and empty beds at certain facilities reflects broader reentry challenges across DCR. The inability to appropriately house minimum and community custody inmates in less-restrictive settings continues to put a strain on the system. The low number of inmates actively participating in work furlough, arguably the most important step in the reentry process, impedes the movement of inmates through the system.

It is noted the two most secure units, Modules C and D, were only half full. The Commission raises the question of whether this under-utilized space has been considered as a relief option for the Halawa Correctional Facility (HCF), which is currently housing pre-trial inmates due to space and safety constraints at Oahu Community Correctional Center (OCCC). Given the availability to attend court hearings remotely, an Oahu inmate will still have access to the courts and their attorneys through video conferencing.

The Commission acknowledges that high-profile pretrial individuals require secure and controlled environments. However, HCF is not designated for pre-trial custody. Evaluation of MCCC's partially vacant segregation units may present an opportunity to alleviate overcrowding pressures on HCF (especially the holding unit), return pretrial placements to more appropriate settings, and improve statewide custody alignment.