

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE
Pursuant to P.A. 84 of 2015
Article V, Section 611
Electronic Monitoring Program

Section 611 of 2015 P.A. 84 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. Following a switch to a new vendor in September 2014, probationers and parolees are no longer divided by whether or not they participated in the Special Alternative Incarceration (SAI) program. 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

Report to the Legislature
 Sec. 611 of 2015 P.A. 84 - Electronic Monitoring Program
 March 2016

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. In September 2014 a conversion to a new electronic monitoring vendor required the deactivation and reactivation of all cases, rendering it impossible to calculate new participants and terminations for that month. Therefore, no numbers are available for September 2014 in Tables 1, 3, 4 and 6.

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

| | Parole* | | Probation* | | CEM | | RDSS | | Total | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 339 | 310 | 139 | 166 | 3 | 17 | 19 | 27 | 500 | 520 |
| Feb | 293 | 272 | 115 | 132 | 5 | 9 | 20 | 27 | 433 | 440 |
| Mar | 305 | 353 | 121 | 161 | 7 | 22 | 13 | 17 | 446 | 553 |
| Apr | 322 | 367 | 116 | 138 | 5 | 21 | 13 | 21 | 456 | 547 |
| May | 271 | 370 | 107 | 137 | 11 | 25 | 14 | 24 | 403 | 556 |
| Jun | 289 | 364 | 127 | 192 | 13 | 26 | 17 | 29 | 446 | 611 |
| Jul | 277 | 414 | 132 | 178 | 4 | 25 | 19 | 30 | 432 | 647 |
| Aug | 188 | 326 | 99 | 192 | 5 | 11 | 27 | 31 | 319 | 560 |
| Sep | ** | 357 | ** | 177 | ** | 38 | ** | 22 | ** | 594 |
| Oct | 332 | 380 | 185 | 179 | 7 | 29 | 52 | 31 | 576 | 619 |
| Nov | 278 | 338 | 158 | 169 | 8 | 33 | 30 | 25 | 474 | 565 |
| Dec | 317 | 334 | 141 | 192 | 5 | 44 | 26 | 37 | 489 | 607 |
| Total | 3,211 | 4,185 | 1,440 | 2,013 | 73 | 300 | 250 | 321 | 4,974 | 6,819 |
| Avg | 291.9 | 348.8 | 130.9 | 167.8 | 6.6 | 25.0 | 22.7 | 26.8 | 452.2 | 568.3 |

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

** Unavailable due to the replacement of BI monitoring equipment with 3M monitoring equipment.

Table 2 – Monthly New GPS Participants by Offender Type

| | Parole | | Probation | | Lifetime | | Total | |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|
| | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 |
| Jan | - | 290 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | 296 |
| Feb | - | 255 | - | 3 | - | 5 | - | 263 |
| Mar | - | 290 | - | 10 | - | 5 | - | 305 |
| Apr | - | 314 | - | 4 | - | 2 | - | 320 |
| May | - | 285 | - | 4 | - | 4 | - | 293 |
| Jun | - | 352 | - | 10 | - | 5 | - | 367 |
| Jul | - | 329 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 336 |
| Aug | - | 256 | - | 2 | - | 6 | - | 264 |
| Sep | - | 295 | - | 2 | - | 5 | - | 302 |
| Oct | - | 315 | - | 6 | - | 4 | - | 325 |
| Nov | - | 259 | - | 7 | - | 5 | - | 271 |
| Dec | - | 332 | - | 2 | - | 6 | - | 340 |
| Total | - | 3,572 | - | 56 | - | 54 | - | 3,682 |
| Avg | - | 297.7 | - | 4.7 | - | 4.5 | - | 306.8 |

¹ 2014 information is unavailable.

Report to the Legislature
 Sec. 611 of 2015 P.A. 84 - Electronic Monitoring Program
 March 2016

Table 3 – Monthly New Participant Totals by Monitoring Technology

| | Curfew | | GPS | | SCRAM | | Remote Breath ² | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 500 | 520 | - | 296 | 298 | 293 | - | - |
| Feb | 433 | 440 | - | 263 | 277 | 278 | - | - |
| Mar | 446 | 553 | - | 305 | 259 | 295 | - | - |
| Apr | 456 | 547 | - | 320 | 269 | 319 | - | - |
| May | 403 | 556 | - | 293 | 314 | 332 | - | - |
| Jun | 446 | 611 | - | 367 | 300 | 328 | - | - |
| Jul | 432 | 647 | - | 336 | 303 | 350 | - | - |
| Aug | 319 | 560 | - | 264 | 304 | 309 | - | - |
| Sep | ** | 594 | - | 302 | 276 | 326 | - | 5 |
| Oct | 576 | 619 | - | 325 | 375 | 318 | - | 11 |
| Nov | 474 | 565 | - | 271 | 302 | 304 | - | 9 |
| Dec | 489 | 607 | - | 340 | 335 | 303 | - | 4 |
| Total | 4,974 | 6,819 | - | 3,682 | 3,612 | 3,755 | - | 29 |
| Avg | 452.2 | 568.3 | - | 306.8 | 301.0 | 312.9 | - | 7.3 |

** Unavailable due to the replacement of BI monitoring equipment with 3M monitoring equipment.

¹ 2014 information is unavailable.

² Remote Breath was 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

| | Parole* | | Probation* | | CEM | | RDSS | | Total | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 333 | 298 | 156 | 144 | 4 | 5 | 32 | 31 | 525 | 478 |
| Feb | 314 | 291 | 133 | 142 | 7 | 9 | 14 | 31 | 468 | 473 |
| Mar | 292 | 328 | 149 | 143 | 4 | 13 | 17 | 22 | 462 | 506 |
| Apr | 327 | 314 | 134 | 172 | 6 | 14 | 15 | 24 | 482 | 524 |
| May | 357 | 276 | 138 | 142 | 4 | 16 | 20 | 15 | 519 | 449 |
| Jun | 334 | 393 | 131 | 156 | 12 | 16 | 25 | 26 | 502 | 591 |
| Jul | 339 | 401 | 133 | 146 | 10 | 26 | 18 | 31 | 500 | 604 |
| Aug | 320 | 333 | 131 | 147 | 9 | 17 | 17 | 24 | 477 | 521 |
| Sep | ** | 347 | ** | 177 | ** | 18 | ** | 29 | ** | 571 |
| Oct | 311 | 370 | 18 | 184 | 2 | 35 | 20 | 32 | 351 | 621 |
| Nov | 275 | 395 | 24 | 167 | 8 | 30 | 31 | 25 | 338 | 617 |
| Dec | 352 | 394 | 71 | 177 | 8 | 34 | 35 | 24 | 466 | 629 |
| Total | 3,554 | 4,140 | 1,218 | 1,897 | 74 | 233 | 244 | 314 | 5,090 | 6,584 |
| Avg | 323.1 | 345.0 | 110.7 | 158.1 | 6.7 | 19.4 | 22.2 | 26.2 | 462.7 | 548.7 |

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

** Unavailable due to the replacement of BI monitoring equipment with 3M monitoring equipment.

Table 5 - Monthly GPS Terminations by Offender Type

| | Parole | | Probation | | Lifetime | | Total | |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------|
| | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 |
| Jan | - | 283 | - | 7 | - | 1 | - | 291 |
| Feb | - | 252 | - | 1 | - | 2 | - | 255 |
| Mar | - | 308 | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | 313 |
| Apr | - | 319 | - | 4 | - | 2 | - | 325 |
| May | - | 278 | - | 3 | - | 1 | - | 282 |
| Jun | - | 299 | - | 5 | - | 1 | - | 305 |
| Jul | - | 317 | - | 8 | - | 0 | - | 325 |
| Aug | - | 285 | - | 2 | - | 0 | - | 287 |
| Sep | - | 275 | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | 280 |
| Oct | - | 309 | - | 6 | - | 0 | - | 315 |
| Nov | - | 282 | - | 1 | - | 0 | - | 283 |
| Dec | - | 292 | - | 4 | - | 0 | - | 296 |
| Total | - | 3,499 | - | 49 | - | 9 | - | 3,557 |
| Avg | - | 291.6 | - | 4.1 | - | 1.3 | - | 296.4 |

¹ 2014 information is unavailable.

Table 6 – Monthly Termination Totals by Monitoring Technology

| | Curfew | | GPS | | SCRAM | | Remote Breath ² | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 ¹ | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 525 | 478 | - | 291 | 328 | 342 | - | - |
| Feb | 468 | 473 | - | 255 | 253 | 280 | - | - |
| Mar | 462 | 506 | - | 313 | 297 | 312 | - | - |
| Apr | 482 | 524 | - | 325 | 264 | 338 | - | - |
| May | 519 | 449 | - | 282 | 292 | 283 | - | - |
| Jun | 502 | 591 | - | 305 | 267 | 334 | - | - |
| Jul | 500 | 604 | - | 325 | 295 | 319 | - | - |
| Aug | 477 | 521 | - | 287 | 319 | 350 | - | - |
| Sep | ** | 571 | - | 280 | 324 | 323 | - | 0 |
| Oct | 351 | 621 | - | 315 | 302 | 310 | - | 3 |
| Nov | 338 | 617 | - | 283 | 260 | 341 | - | 6 |
| Dec | 466 | 629 | - | 296 | 324 | 373 | - | 4 |
| Total | 5,090 | 6,584 | - | 3,557 | 3,525 | 3,905 | - | 13 |
| Avg | 462.7 | 548.7 | - | 296.4 | 293.8 | 325.4 | - | 4.3 |

** Unavailable due to the replacement of BI monitoring equipment with 3M monitoring equipment.

¹ 2014 information is unavailable.

² Remote Breath was 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

Report to the Legislature
 Sec. 611 of 2015 P.A. 84 - Electronic Monitoring Program
 March 2016

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

| | Parole* | | Probation* | | CEM | | RDSS | | Total | |
|------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 1,010 | 1,178 | 452 | 515 | 8 | 21 | 38 | 62 | 1,508 | 1,776 |
| Feb | 993 | 1,193 | 434 | 507 | 6 | 22 | 48 | 57 | 1,481 | 1,779 |
| Mar | 1,015 | 1,226 | 414 | 524 | 7 | 24 | 43 | 53 | 1,479 | 1,827 |
| Apr | 1,003 | 1,257 | 392 | 490 | 8 | 30 | 40 | 48 | 1,443 | 1,825 |
| May | 941 | 1,357 | 371 | 498 | 12 | 36 | 38 | 58 | 1,362 | 1,949 |
| Jun | 903 | 1,339 | 367 | 528 | 14 | 43 | 30 | 59 | 1,314 | 1,969 |
| Jul | 835 | 1,364 | 366 | 567 | 10 | 44 | 34 | 57 | 1,245 | 2,032 |
| Aug | 827 | 1,357 | 368 | 613 | 7 | 40 | 42 | 65 | 1,244 | 2,075 |
| Sep | 946 | 1,359 | 409 | 613 | 4 | 50 | 9 | 66 | 1,368 | 2,088 |
| Oct | 1,070 | 1,381 | 472 | 610 | 8 | 52 | 82 | 63 | 1,632 | 2,106 |
| Nov | 1,113 | 1,331 | 514 | 614 | 8 | 54 | 80 | 60 | 1,715 | 2,059 |
| Dec | 1,126 | 1,313 | 494 | 639 | 8 | 63 | 72 | 76 | 1,700 | 2,091 |
| Avg | 981.8 | 1,304.6 | 421.1 | 559.8 | 8.3 | 39.9 | 46.3 | 60.3 | 1,457.6 | 1,964.7 |

* 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

| | Parole | | Probation | | Lifetime | | Total | |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 2,342 | 2,159 | 20 | 16 | 48 | 76 | 2,410 | 2,251 |
| Feb | 2,318 | 2,126 | 22 | 19 | 51 | 79 | 2,391 | 2,224 |
| Mar | 2,311 | 2,098 | 20 | 27 | 55 | 85 | 2,386 | 2,210 |
| Apr | 2,340 | 2,101 | 19 | 28 | 56 | 83 | 2,415 | 2,212 |
| May | 2,377 | 2,094 | 17 | 29 | 57 | 87 | 2,451 | 2,210 |
| Jun | 2,360 | 2,146 | 16 | 32 | 62 | 89 | 2,438 | 2,267 |
| Jul | 2,409 | 2,139 | 19 | 23 | 61 | 93 | 2,489 | 2,255 |
| Aug | 2,431 | 2,100 | 15 | 19 | 63 | 100 | 2,509 | 2,219 |
| Sep | 2,330 | 2,128 | 25 | 27 | 69 | 103 | 2,424 | 2,258 |
| Oct | 2,233 | 2,122 | 24 | 14 | 72 | 108 | 2,329 | 2,244 |
| Nov | 2,264 | 2,094 | 22 | 20 | 73 | 111 | 2,359 | 2,225 |
| Dec | 2,271 | 2,156 | 18 | 11 | 75 | 119 | 2,364 | 2,286 |
| Avg | 2,332.2 | 2,121.9 | 19.8 | 22.1 | 61.8 | 94.4 | 2,413.8 | 2,238.4 |

Table 9 - End of Month Totals by Monitoring Technology

| | Curfew | | GPS | | SCRAM | | Remote Breath ¹ | |
|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Jan | 1,508 | 1,776 | 2,410 | 2,251 | 1,269 | 1,370 | - | - |
| Feb | 1,481 | 1,779 | 2,391 | 2,224 | 1,281 | 1,352 | - | - |
| Mar | 1,479 | 1,827 | 2,386 | 2,210 | 1,272 | 1,359 | - | - |
| Apr | 1,443 | 1,825 | 2,415 | 2,212 | 1,276 | 1,338 | - | - |
| May | 1,362 | 1,949 | 2,451 | 2,210 | 1,312 | 1,380 | - | - |
| Jun | 1,314 | 1,969 | 2,438 | 2,267 | 1,339 | 1,394 | - | - |
| Jul | 1,245 | 2,032 | 2,489 | 2,255 | 1,363 | 1,427 | - | - |
| Aug | 1,244 | 2,075 | 2,509 | 2,219 | 1,330 | 1,417 | - | - |
| Sep | 1,368 | 2,088 | 2,424 | 2,258 | 1,300 | 1,416 | - | 5 |
| Oct | 1,632 | 2,106 | 2,329 | 2,244 | 1,390 | 1,448 | - | 13 |
| Nov | 1,715 | 2,059 | 2,359 | 2,225 | 1,424 | 1,437 | - | 16 |
| Dec | 1,700 | 2,091 | 2,364 | 2,286 | 1,430 | 1,418 | - | 16 |
| Avg | 1,457.6 | 1,964.7 | 2,413.8 | 2,238.4 | 1,332.2 | 1,396.3 | - | 12.5 |

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

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 and parolees from SAI. Table 10 replicates a portion of the **Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2011 by Year** table reported in the Department's 2014 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2011 had a Return to Prison Rate of 30.3% (Technical Violators 15.3% and New Sentence Violators 15.1%) after a full three-year follow up period. New electronic monitoring participants (parolees and parolees from SAI) for 2011 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 2011 and earlier. Thus, these new participants for 2011 will have a failure rate that averages the recidivism rates for paroles in 2011 and earlier.

Table 10 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2011 by Year

| Year Paroled | Total Cases | Success Total | Failure Total | Technical Violators | New Sentence | Return to Prison |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 2007 | 11,805 | 63.9% | 36.1% | 13.6% | 19.7% | 33.2% |
| 2008 | 11,044 | 66.2% | 33.8% | 13.6% | 17.9% | 31.5% |
| 2009 | 12,829 | 67.8% | 32.2% | 15.0% | 15.6% | 30.6% |
| 2010 | 11,552 | 69.6% | 30.4% | 15.5% | 13.5% | 29.0% |
| 2011 | 10,659 | 69.7% | 30.3% | 15.3% | 15.1% | 30.3% |

See 2014 Statistical Report, Table D3 at <http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,45517-119-1441---,00.html>
 Note: Section D is not yet published as of March 2016

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

| 2014 Staffing | | 2015 Staffing |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1.0 | Parole Probation Manager 3 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | Parole Probation Manager 4 | 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 |