REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Pursuant to P.A. 107 of 2017 Article V, Section 611 Electronic Monitoring Program

Sec. 611. The department shall prepare by March 1 individual reports for the community reentry program, the electronic monitoring program, and the special alternative to incarceration program. The reports shall be submitted to the senate and house appropriations subcommittees on corrections, the legislative corrections ombudsman, the senate and house fiscal agencies, and the state budget office. Each program's report shall include information on all of the following:

- (a) 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.
- (b) Monthly participant unsuccessful terminations, including cause.
- (c) Number of successful terminations.
- (d) End month population by facility/program.
- (e) Average length of placement.
- (f) Return to prison statistics.
- (g) Description of each program location or locations, capacity, and staffing.
- (h) Sentencing guidelines scores and actual sentence statistics for participants, if applicable.
- (i) Comparison with prior year statistics.
- (j) 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.

Report to the Legislature P.A. 107 of 2017, Sec. 611 - Electronic Monitoring Program March 2018

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. 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

	Parc	ole*	Proba	tion*	CEI	M	RDS	S	Tot	tal
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Jan	324	383	198	230	33	46	21	29	576	688
Feb	334	314	196	193	19	49	24	29	573	585
Mar	383	372	218	281	26	52	37	34	664	739
Apr	369	335	220	207	36	73	33	26	658	641
May	365	420	212	200	34	45	25	36	636	701
Jun	399	399	238	253	38	55	38	43	713	750
Jul	355	318	205	205	22	70	38	49	620	642
Aug	351	455	239	284	35	82	31	39	656	860
Sep	352	354	245	259	36	60	38	26	671	699
Oct	355	402	205	247	38	56	36	39	634	744
Nov	361	332	214	256	37	58	43	46	655	692
Dec	357	320	168	240	35	37	28	17	588	614
Total	4,305	4,404	2,558	2,855	389	683	392	413	7,644	8,355
Avg	358.8	367.0	213.2	237.9	32.4	56.9	32.7	34.4	637.0	696.3

^{*} 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	ole	Proba	tion	Lifetime		Tot	tal
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Jan	299	343	8	4	8	9	315	356
Feb	266	194	2	2	6	5	274	201
Mar	300	288	4	7	6	9	310	304
Apr	257	227	1	1	8	9	266	237
May	285	280	1	1	7	10	293	291
Jun	318	313	3	2	8	9	329	324
Jul	266	256	0	3	6	11	272	270
Aug	294	302	4	1	9	8	307	311
Sep	309	296	2	1	9	10	320	307
Oct	270	316	5	3	9	12	284	331
Nov	295	284	4	2	7	5	306	291
Dec	256	204	3	2	8	15	267	221
Total	3,415	3,303	37	29	91	112	3,543	3,444
Avg	284.6	275.3	3.1	2.4	7.6	9.3	295.3	287.0

Table 3 – Monthly New Participant Totals by Monitoring Technology

	Curf	few GPS SCRAM		AM	Remote	Breath		
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Jan	576	688	315	356	381	350	4	7
Feb	573	585	274	201	357	297	3	12
Mar	664	739	310	304	382	402	3	15
Apr	658	641	266	237	377	355	10	12
May	636	701	293	291	378	364	5	22
Jun	713	750	329	324	432	413	6	13
Jul	620	642	272	270	357	367	4	12
Aug	656	860	307	311	423	407	11	9
Sep	671	699	320	307	421	354	7	13
Oct	634	744	284	331	385	375	9	14
Nov	655	692	306	291	350	360	14	16
Dec	588	614	267	221	372	332	7	11
Total	7,644	8,355	3,543	3,444	4,615	4,376	83	156
Avg	637.0	696.3	295.3	287.0	384.6	364.7	6.9	13.0

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	ole*	Proba	tion*	CEI	VI	RDS	S	Tot	al
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Jan	366	387	139	189	38	31	19	36	562	643
Feb	351	364	215	229	28	28	30	26	624	647
Mar	251	377	191	197	22	35	26	29	490	638
Apr	336	317	195	207	25	43	24	33	580	600
May	377	359	208	235	24	48	27	39	636	681
Jun	380	389	242	253	44	48	45	46	711	736
Jul	336	371	198	223	39	51	36	26	609	671
Aug	423	394	210	239	43	53	43	33	719	719
Sep	396	395	232	249	30	62	28	40	686	746
Oct	350	373	233	244	43	63	27	35	653	715
Nov	337	403	222	243	31	38	30	41	620	725
Dec	357	395	203	224	41	46	40	31	641	696
Total	4,260	4,524	2,488	2,732	408	546	375	415	7,531	8,217
Avg	355.0	377.0	207.3	227.7	34.0	45.5	31.3	34.6	627.6	684.8

^{*} 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	Lifetime		To	tal
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Jan	260	270	1	2	2	1	263	273
Feb	255	283	3	1	2	2	260	286
Mar	295	325	2	4	2	2	299	331
Apr	266	251	4	1	1	1	271	253
May	294	291	4	2	1	2	299	295
Jun	304	313	1	3	0	2	305	318
Jul	243	273	2	2	2	1	247	276
Aug	314	301	2	5	1	0	317	306
Sep	289	297	1	2	2	2	292	301
Oct	263	287	3	1	2	3	268	291
Nov	255	241	5	1	1	2	261	244
Dec	275	240	2	2	1	0	278	242
Total	3,313	3,372	30	26	17	18	3,360	3,416
Avg	276.1	281.0	2.5	2.2	1.4	1.5	280.0	284.7

Table 6 – Monthly Termination Totals by Monitoring Technology

	Table 0 -	withing	multip Termination Totals by Monitoring Technology						
	Curf	ew	GP	S	SCR	AM	Remote	Breath	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	
Jan	562	643	263	273	398	459	4	7	
Feb	624	647	260	286	378	340	8	9	
Mar	490	638	299	331	342	373	4	13	
Apr	580	600	271	253	354	340	3	11	
May	636	681	299	295	381	358	5	15	
Jun	711	736	305	318	389	384	6	17	
Jul	609	671	247	276	358	407	7	12	
Aug	719	719	317	306	378	387	4	16	
Sep	686	746	292	301	403	360	4	8	
Oct	653	715	268	291	397	386	6	14	
Nov	620	725	261	244	386	379	13	10	
Dec	641	696	278	242	395	304	9	16	
Total	7,531	8,217	3,360	3,416	4,559	4,477	73	148	
Avg	627.6	684.8	280.0	284.7	379.9	373.1	6.1	12.3	

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	M	RDS	SS	To	tal
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Jan	1,245	1,258	689	751	59	72	75	82	2,068	2,163
Feb	1,250	1,223	666	712	54	83	71	84	2,041	2,102
Mar	1,269	1,241	702	791	56	86	75	87	2,102	2,205
Apr	1,300	1,247	720	791	71	86	85	85	2,176	2,209
May	1,282	1,308	719	758	80	87	84	83	2,165	2,236
Jun	1,303	1,331	718	755	73	88	80	75	2,174	2,249
Jul	1,333	1,267	725	735	60	87	76	94	2,194	2,183
Aug	1,247	1,327	744	779	57	101	69	106	2,117	2,313
Sep	1,203	1,284	771	802	65	80	77	90	2,116	2,256
Oct	1,213	1,329	744	810	61	66	87	92	2,105	2,297
Nov	1,245	1,259	742	824	66	71	93	97	2,146	2,251
Dec	1,279	1,221	715	848	65	63	91	89	2,150	2,221
Avg	1,264.1	1,274.6	721.3	779.7	63.9	80.8	80.3	88.7	2,129.5	2,223.8

^{*} 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

	Tuble of End of World GIST oparations by Official Type								
	Par	ole	Proba	ation	Lifet	ime	То	tal	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	
Jan	2,174	2,228	17	13	125	198	2,316	2,439	
Feb	2,166	2,140	18	15	127	202	2,311	2,357	
Mar	2,137	2,108	16	15	132	210	2,285	2,333	
Apr	2,126	2,074	16	12	137	217	2,279	2,303	
May	2,129	2,078	12	16	145	223	2,286	2,317	
Jun	2,134	2,063	14	14	152	230	2,300	2,307	
Jul	2,159	2,046	12	12	157	242	2,328	2,300	
Aug	2,138	2,032	12	10	164	250	2,314	2,292	
Sep	2,158	2,021	12	8	167	258	2,337	2,287	
Oct	2,202	2,044	13	9	175	267	2,390	2,320	
Nov	2,228	2,072	11	10	181	270	2,420	2,352	
Dec	2,226	2,054	11	9	190	285	2,427	2,348	
Avg	2,164.8	2,080.0	13.7	11.9	154.3	237.7	2,332.8	2,329.6	

Table 9 - End of Month Totals by Monitoring Technology

	Table 9 - End of Worth Totals by Wolltoning Technology										
	Cur	few	GI	S	SCF	RAM	Remote	Breath			
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017			
Jan	2,068	2,163	2,316	2,439	1,406	1,365	15	34			
Feb	2,041	2,102	2,311	2,357	1,369	1,326	11	38			
Mar	2,102	2,205	2,285	2,333	1,422	1,347	10	40			
Apr	2,176	2,209	2,279	2,303	1,440	1,359	18	38			
May	2,165	2,236	2,286	2,317	1,442	1,367	18	46			
Jun	2,174	2,249	2,300	2,307	1,486	1,383	19	43			
Jul	2,194	2,183	2,328	2,300	1,473	1,351	15	43			
Aug	2,117	2,313	2,314	2,292	1,532	1,377	20	36			
Sep	2,116	2,256	2,337	2,287	1,540	1,355	25	43			
Oct	2,105	2,297	2,390	2,320	1,536	1,334	29	43			
Nov	2,146	2,251	2,420	2,352	1,498	1,308	31	50			
Dec	2,150	2,221	2,427	2,348	1,472	1,349	32	45			
Avg	2,129.5	2,223.8	2,332.8	2,329.6	1,468.0	1,351.8	20.3	41.6			

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 1999 to 2013 by Year** table reported in the Department's 2016 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2013 had a Return to Prison Rate of 29.8% (Technical Violators 15.0% and New Sentence Violators 14.7%) after a full three-year follow up period. New electronic monitoring participants (parolees and parolees from SAI) for 2013 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 2013 and earlier. Thus, these new participants for 2013 will have a failure rate that averages the recidivism rates for paroles in 2013 and earlier.

Table 10 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1999 to 2013 by Year

Tarolea in 1999 to 2015 by Tear								
Year	Total	Success	Failure		Technical	New	Return to	
Paroled	Cases	Total	Total	Absconds	Violators	Sentence	Prison	
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%	
2013 10,110 68.9% 31.1% 1.3% 15.0% 14.7% 29.8%								
See 2016 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.

Electronic Monitoring Center

2016 Staffing		2017 Staffing
1.0	State Administrative Manager 15	1.0
1.0	Parole Probation Manager 3	1.0
3.0	Departmental Supervisor-3	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	36.0
2.0	General Office Assistant 7	2.0
1.0	Secretary-A	1.0
56.0	Total Electronic Monitoring Center Staff	55.0