REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Pursuant to P.A. 268 of 2016

Section 611

Electronic Monitoring Program

Section 611 of 2016 P.A. 268 requires that the Department of Corrections provide individual reports for the community reentry program, the electronic monitoring program, and the special alternative to incarceration program, including information on:

- Monthly new participants by type of offender. Community reentry program participants shall be categorized by reason for placement. For technical rule violators, the report shall sort offenders by length of time since release from prison, by the most recent violation, and by number of violations occurring since release from prison.
- Monthly participant unsuccessful terminations, including cause.
- Number of successful terminations.
- End month population by facility/program.
- Average length of placement.
- Return to prison statistics.
- Description of each program location or locations, capacity, and staffing.
- Sentencing guideline scores and actual sentence statistics for participants, if applicable.
- Comparison with prior year statistics.
- Analysis of the impact on prison admissions and jail utilization and the cost effectiveness of the program.

This report will focus on the electronic monitoring program, which includes Curfew Monitoring, Global Position System (GPS) monitoring, Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM) and Remote Breath.

The Electronic Monitoring Center is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Monitored probationers and parolees are assigned to and supervised by field agents throughout the State, but all monitoring of the equipment, alert processing and notification, and inventory control is managed through the Monitoring Center. The Center handles all Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) notification activity in the Department, due to their alert processing and notification responsibilities. The Center also contracts to provide monitoring services for Community Electronic Monitoring (CEM) and for the Regional Detention Services System (RDSS).

There are four broad offender types on Curfew Monitoring: probationers, parolees, CEM and RDSS. Curfew Monitoring may have been imposed as an initial condition of sentencing or release; alternatively, Curfew Monitoring may have been imposed as a sanction for violation behavior.

The use of GPS monitoring allows for the tracking of offender movement in order to determine compliance with supervision plans. The Department only uses active GPS monitoring which constantly monitors offender movements and provides agents with dynamic alerts of boundary violations. Passive GPS monitoring, which stores offender movement information for later review, is no longer used by the Department. Offenders on GPS consist of parolees, probationers, and specified sex offenders sentenced to lifetime GPS upon completion of a term of incarceration and subsequent parole.

SCRAM provides 24/7 alcohol testing for probationers, parolees and CEM.

Remote Breath is a handheld, portable breath alcohol device which includes automated facial recognition technology. It was not used by the Department prior to September 2015. The Remote Breath population includes parolees, probationers and CEM.

The offender counts in this report come from the monitoring vendor's database.

Tables 1 and 2 break down the new Curfew Monitoring and GPS participants by month and type of offender. Table 3 shows the monthly new participant totals by monitoring technology.

Table 1 – Monthly New Curfew Monitoring Participants by Offender Type

					oru Door					
	Parc	ole*	Probation*		CEI	M	RDS	is	Tot	al
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Jan	310	324	166	198	17	33	27	21	520	576
Feb	272	334	132	196	9	19	27	24	440	573
Mar	353	383	161	218	22	26	17	37	553	664
Apr	367	369	138	220	21	36	21	33	547	658
May	370	365	137	212	25	34	24	25	556	636
Jun	364	399	192	238	26	38	29	38	611	713
Jul	414	355	178	205	25	22	30	38	647	620
Aug	326	351	192	239	11	35	31	31	560	656
Sep	357	352	177	245	38	36	22	38	594	671
Oct	380	355	179	205	29	38	31	36	619	634
Nov	338	361	169	214	33	37	25	43	565	655
Dec	334	357	192	168	44	35	37	28	607	588
Total	4,185	4,305	2,013	2,558	300	389	321	392	6,819	7,644
Avg	348.8	358.8	167.8	213.2	25.0	32.4	26.8	32.7	568.3	637.0

^{*} Parole SAI and Probation SAI statistics were included in the traditional Parole and Probation statistics.

Table 2 – Monthly New GPS Participants by Offender Type

	Par		Proba		Lifeti		Tot	al
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Jan	290	299	3	8	3	8	296	315
Feb	255	266	3	2	5	6	263	274
Mar	290	300	10	4	5	6	305	310
Apr	314	257	4	1	2	8	320	266
May	285	285	4	1	4	7	293	293
Jun	352	318	10	3	5	8	367	329
Jul	329	266	3	0	4	6	336	272
Aug	256	294	2	4	6	9	264	307
Sep	295	309	2	2	5	9	302	320
Oct	315	270	6	5	4	9	325	284
Nov	259	295	7	4	5	7	271	306
Dec	332	256	2	3	6	8	340	267
Total	3,572	3,415	56	37	54	91	3,682	3,543
Avg	297.7	284.6	4.7	3.1	4.5	7.6	306.8	295.3

Table 3 - Monthly New Participant Totals by Monitoring Technology

	Curf	ew	GP	S	SCR	AM	Remote	Breath
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015 ¹	2016
Jan	520	576	296	315	293	381	-	4
Feb	440	573	263	274	278	357	-	3
Mar	553	664	305	310	295	382	-	3
Apr	547	658	320	266	319	377	-	10
May	556	636	293	293	332	378	-	5
Jun	611	713	367	329	328	432	-	6
Jul	647	620	336	272	350	357	-	4
Aug	560	656	264	307	309	423	-	11
Sep	594	671	302	320	326	421	5	7
Oct	619	634	325	284	318	385	11	9
Nov	565	655	271	306	304	350	9	14
Dec	607	588	340	267	303	372	4	7
Total	6,819	7,644	3,682	3,543	3,755	4,615	29	83
Avg	568.3	637.0	306.8	295.3	312.9	384.6	7.3	6.9

¹ Remote Breath w as not used by the MDOC prior to September 2015.

Tables 4 and 5 show the monthly Curfew Monitoring and GPS terminations by offender type. Table 6 shows the monthly termination totals by monitoring technology.

Table 4 - Monthly Curfew Monitoring Terminations by Offender Type

	Parc		Proba		CEI		RDS	Ť	Tot	al
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Jan	298	366	144	139	5	38	31	19	478	562
Feb	291	351	142	215	9	28	31	30	473	624
Mar	328	251	143	191	13	22	22	26	506	490
Apr	314	336	172	195	14	25	24	24	524	580
May	276	377	142	208	16	24	15	27	449	636
Jun	393	380	156	242	16	44	26	45	591	711
Jul	401	336	146	198	26	39	31	36	604	609
Aug	333	423	147	210	17	43	24	43	521	719
Sep	347	396	177	232	18	30	29	28	571	686
Oct	370	350	184	233	35	43	32	27	621	653
Nov	395	337	167	222	30	31	25	30	617	620
Dec	394	357	177	203	34	41	24	40	629	641
Total	4,140	4,260	1,897	2,488	233	408	314	375	6,584	7,531
Avg	345.0	355.0	158.1	207.3	19.4	34.0	26.2	31.3	548.7	627.6

^{*} Parole SAI and Probation SAI statistics were included in the traditional Parole and Probation statistics.

Table 5 - Monthly GPS Terminations by Offender Type

	Par	ole	Proba	tion	Lifeti	me	To	tal
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Jan	283	260	7	1	1	2	291	263
Feb	252	255	1	3	2	2	255	260
Mar	308	295	4	2	1	2	313	299
Apr	319	266	4	4	2	1	325	271
May	278	294	3	4	1	1	282	299
Jun	299	304	5	1	1	0	305	305
Jul	317	243	8	2	0	2	325	247
Aug	285	314	2	2	0	1	287	317
Sep	275	289	4	1	1	2	280	292
Oct	309	263	6	3	0	2	315	268
Nov	282	255	1	5	0	1	283	261
Dec	292	275	4	2	0	1	296	278
Total	3,499	3,313	49	30	9	17	3,557	3,360
Avg	291.6	276.1	4.1	2.5	0.8	1.4	296.4	280.0

Table 6 – Monthly Termination Totals by Monitoring Technology

	Table 0 – Wollding Termination Totals by Wollitoring Technology								
	Curf	ew	GP	S	SCR	AM	Remote	Breath	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015 ¹	2016	
Jan	478	562	291	263	342	398	-	4	
Feb	473	624	255	260	280	378	-	8	
Mar	506	490	313	299	312	342	-	4	
Apr	524	580	325	271	338	354	-	3	
May	449	636	282	299	283	381	-	5	
Jun	591	711	305	305	334	389	-	6	
Jul	604	609	325	247	319	358	-	7	
Aug	521	719	287	317	350	378	-	4	
Sep	571	686	280	292	323	403	0	4	
Oct	621	653	315	268	310	397	3	6	
Nov	617	620	283	261	341	386	6	13	
Dec	629	641	296	278	373	395	4	9	
Total	6,584	7,531	3,557	3,360	3,905	4,559	13	73	
Avg	548.7	627.6	296.4	280.0	325.4	379.9	3.3	6.1	

¹ Remote Breath w as not used by the MDOC prior to September 2015.

Below are typical reasons for unsuccessful terminations:

- Administrative terminations occur when the offender is unable to continue for reasons beyond their control, such as, loss of home placement, hospitalized, or commitment to a treatment program.
- Substance abuse violations
- Curfew violations
- Tampering with tether device
- Abscond violation
- New felony

The monthly new monitoring participants and monthly Curfew Monitoring terminations resulted in the end of month Curfew Monitoring and GPS populations shown in Tables 7 and 8. Table 9 shows the end of month totals by Monitoring Technology.

Table 7 - End of Month Curfew Monitoring Populations by Offender Type

	Par	ole*	Proba	tion*	CE	М	RD	SS	То	tal
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Jan	1,178	1,245	515	689	21	59	62	75	1,776	2,068
Feb	1,193	1,250	507	666	22	54	57	71	1,779	2,041
Mar	1,226	1,269	524	702	24	56	53	75	1,827	2,102
Apr	1,257	1,300	490	720	30	71	48	85	1,825	2,176
May	1,357	1,282	498	719	36	80	58	84	1,949	2,165
Jun	1,339	1,303	528	718	43	73	59	80	1,969	2,174
Jul	1,364	1,333	567	725	44	60	57	76	2,032	2,194
Aug	1,357	1,247	613	744	40	57	65	69	2,075	2,117
Sep	1,359	1,203	613	771	50	65	66	77	2,088	2,116
Oct	1,381	1,213	610	744	52	61	63	87	2,106	2,105
Nov	1,331	1,245	614	742	54	66	60	93	2,059	2,146
Dec	1,313	1,279	639	715	63	65	76	91	2,091	2,150
Avg	1,304.6	1,264.1	559.8	721.3	39.9	63.9	60.3	80.3	1,964.7	2,129.5

^{*} Parole SAI and Probation SAI statistics were included in the traditional Parole and Probation statistics.

Table 8 - End of Month GPS Populations by Offender Type

		ole	Proba	-	Lifet			tal
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Jan	2,159	2,174	16	17	76	125	2,251	2,316
Feb	2,126	2,166	19	18	79	127	2,224	2,311
Mar	2,098	2,137	27	16	85	132	2,210	2,285
Apr	2,101	2,126	28	16	83	137	2,212	2,279
May	2,094	2,129	29	12	87	145	2,210	2,286
Jun	2,146	2,134	32	14	89	152	2,267	2,300
Jul	2,139	2,159	23	12	93	157	2,255	2,328
Aug	2,100	2,138	19	12	100	164	2,219	2,314
Sep	2,128	2,158	27	12	103	167	2,258	2,337
Oct	2,122	2,202	14	13	108	175	2,244	2,390
Nov	2,094	2,228	20	11	111	181	2,225	2,420
Dec	2,156	2,226	11	11	119	190	2,286	2,427
Avg	2,121.9	2,164.8	22.1	13.7	94.4	154.3	2,238.4	2,332.8

Table 9 - End of Month Totals by Monitoring Technology

	I unic				withing recimology				
	Cur	few	GI	PS	SCF	RAM	Remote	Breath	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015 ¹	2016	
Jan	1,776	2,068	2,251	2,316	1,370	1,406	-	15	
Feb	1,779	2,041	2,224	2,311	1,352	1,369	-	11	
Mar	1,827	2,102	2,210	2,285	1,359	1,422	-	10	
Apr	1,825	2,176	2,212	2,279	1,338	1,440	-	18	
May	1,949	2,165	2,210	2,286	1,380	1,442	-	18	
Jun	1,969	2,174	2,267	2,300	1,394	1,486	-	19	
Jul	2,032	2,194	2,255	2,328	1,427	1,473	-	15	
Aug	2,075	2,117	2,219	2,314	1,417	1,532	-	20	
Sep	2,088	2,116	2,258	2,337	1,416	1,540	5	25	
Oct	2,106	2,105	2,244	2,390	1,448	1,536	13	29	
Nov	2,059	2,146	2,225	2,420	1,437	1,498	16	31	
Dec	2,091	2,150	2,286	2,427	1,418	1,472	16	32	
Avg	1,964.7	2,129.5	2,238.4	2,332.8	1,396.3	1,468.0	12.5	20.3	

¹ Remote Breath was not used by the MDOC prior to September 2015.

Report to the Legislature Sec. 611 of 2016 P.A. 268 - Electronic Monitoring Program March 2017

Return to prison statistics measure an offender's outcome at the conclusion of a standard follow-up period, however, this is not a relevant measure for most electronic monitoring participants as return to prison is only relevant for parolees. Table 10 replicates a portion of the **Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2012 by Year** table reported in the Department's 2015 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2012 had a Return to Prison Rate of 31.0% (Technical Violators 15.9% and New Sentence Violators 15.0%) after a full three-year follow up period. New electronic monitoring participants (parolees and parolees from SAI) for 2012 are the most recent participants that can have a three year follow-up period, however, they would have paroled from a mixture of years from 2012 and earlier. Thus, these new participants for 2012 will have a failure rate that averages the recidivism rates for paroles in 2012 and earlier.

Table 10 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2012 by Year

		1 41	orea m 1	0 to 2012 bj	1 001				
Year	Total	Success	Failure		Technical	New	Return to		
Paroled	Cases	Total	Total	Absconds	Violators	Sentence	Prison		
2008	11,044	66.2%	33.8%	2.2%	13.6%	17.9%	31.5%		
2009	12,829	67.8%	32.2%	1.6%	15.0%	15.6%	30.6%		
2010	11,552	69.6%	30.4%	1.4%	15.5%	13.5%	29.0%		
2011	10,642	68.2%	31.8%	1.5%	15.2%	15.1%	30.3%		
2012	8,960	67.2%	32.8%	1.8%	15.9%	15.0%	31.0%		
See 2015 Statis	See 2015 Statistical Report, Table D3 at http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,4551,7-119-1441,00.html								

Electronic monitoring of offenders impacts jail utilization by preserving jail beds for offenders that pose a more serious risk to the public. Electronic monitoring provides the Courts with an option that falls between probation and jail and additionally provides a sanction for noncompliant probationers. Electronic monitoring impacts prison admissions by diverting eligible parole violators who would otherwise be returned to prison as technical violators.

Report to the Legislature Sec. 611 of 2016 P.A. 268 - Electronic Monitoring Program March 2017

Electronic Monitoring Center

2015 Staffing		2016 Staffing
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 3	1.0
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 4	0.0
0.0	State Administrative Manager 15	1.0
3.0	Departmental Supervisor-2	3.0
4.0	Parole Probation Officer-A	4.0
1.0	Departmental Specialist-2	1.0
6.0	Departmental Technician-A	6.0
37.0	Departmental Technician-E	37.0
2.0	General Office Assistant 7	2.0
1.0	Secretary-A	1.0
56.0	Total Electronic Monitoring Center Staff	56.0