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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project is to examine the status of electronic monitoring in the Riverside County and San Bernardino County Probation Departments. A description of the electronic monitoring programs in Riverside and San Bernardino counties is incorporated in this study. A summary and analysis determines what the alternatives were before electronic monitoring and the similarities and differences of each program. Included are the strengths, weaknesses, and changes in the programs.

Interviews with key personnel directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the Riverside and San Bernardino counties' electronic monitoring programs were conducted and are described in this study. A review of the literature about electronic monitoring includes the history of electronic monitoring, current programs, and future trends.

This project concludes by hypothesizing upon the future role of electronic monitoring in Riverside and San Bernardino counties and making recommendations to Riverside and San Bernardino County probation department electronic monitoring administrators.
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INTRODUCTION

Crime is a serious social problem and one of the major issues facing contemporary society today. A major issue is confidence in the criminal justice system. In 1994, 84% of the people polled had some or very little or no confidence in our criminal justice system (MacGuire and Pastore, 1994 p.154 Table 2.1).

In 1981, 59% of those polled thought the most important problem facing society was the high cost of living and only 5% thought crime was an important problem. In 1994, only 4% thought the high cost of living was an important problem and 37% now think crime is the most important issue facing the country (MacGuire and Pastore, 1994 p.154 Table 2.1). The country has a serious problem since a large percentage of people believe crime is the most important problem today and the only system designed to solve the problem has a vote of no confidence from a majority of people. Part of the problem is that incarceration and ordinary probation are the only choices for a majority of sentenced offenders. The general public views sentencing as too severe and probation as too lenient for the type of crime. Attitudes and opinions of people have changed, yet we continue to sentence offenders to prison cells that under court order do not exist and are too costly to build.

In 1990 the state and federal prison facilities had
715,649 inmates which is 123% of capacity and the daily population of jail inmates was 408,075 which is 104% of capacity (MacGuire and Pastore, 1994 p. 591 Table 6.17 and p. 610 Table 6.39). Prisons and jails are dangerously overcrowded. Also, in 1990 a total of 323 state facilities were under a court order or consent degree to either limit population or specific conditions or confinement or both (MacGuire and Pastore, 1994 p. 113 Table 1.91). Prisons are very expensive to build and operate. Nationally, prisons cost about $60,000 per cell to build and $14,000 per year to house each inmate (Lurigio and Petersilia, 1992 p. 5).

By 1994 California was targeted to spend $5.2 billion to construct facilities for an additional 39,000 inmates, and estimated a $4 billion operating budget to decrease the capacity from 170% to 130% (California Blue Ribbon Commission, 1990 p. 5). After this massive building effort and expenditure of billions of dollars, the prison population, is still over capacity. Eighteen California county jails, which account for 73% of the jail population are under court order to reduce the inmate population (California Blue Ribbon Commission, 1990 p. 5).

While searching for solutions, many jurisdictions began to experiment with intermediate sanctions. Intermediate sanctions are the penalties that exist between incarceration and ordinary probation (McCarthy, 1987 p. 1). The main goals of intermediate sanctions are to relieve prison and
jail overcrowding, to protect the citizens while saving the taxpayer money and to deter and rehabilitate offenders (Byrne, Lurigio and Petersilia, 1992).

Before describing several intermediate sanction programs a general discussion of electronic monitoring systems will be necessary. Electronic monitoring is defined as the use of telemetry devices to verify that an offender is at a specified location during specified times (Champion, 1990 p. 102).

Schmidt and Curtis (1987) describe four basic electronic monitoring systems. The first system is used by San Bernardino County and Riverside County Juvenile Probation Departments and is the most commonly used system. The system is a continuously signalling miniaturized transmitter secured by a tamper-proof strap to the offender's body. The signal is encoded and the transmitter can only broadcast over a certain distance, usually about 150 feet. A telephone-connected receiver dialer is placed in the offender's home and receives signals from the transmitter. The receiver dials the central computer and via the telephone, reports when it starts and stops receiving a signal from the transmitter. A central computer receives the reports from the receiver dialer and compares reports with the offender's pre-programmed, curfew schedule. The computer notifies the officials of any unauthorized absences, usually by printing out all of the violations. The second system is similar to
the first, with one exception. A locator unit in the offender's home receives the signal from the transmitter attached to the offender and the locator unit relays the information by radio signals instead of phone lines.

The third system is a telephone-connected verifier box and a module secured to the offender's arm with a tamper-proof strap. During the hours the offender is being monitored, a computer has been programmed to call the offender randomly or at specified times. The offender responds to the phone call by inserting the module into the verifier box. Some systems have voice-verifier technology to insure that the phone is being answered by the offender. Then the computer prepares a report of the results of the calls.

The fourth system is a continuous signalling transmitter secured to the offender with a tamper-proof strap. An officer in the area can tune a portable receiver to receive a specific transmitter's frequency. This system does not use a phone and the range is restricted to about five hundred feet. The officer then reacts to the signal or lack of a signal from the transmitter.

Several intermediate sanctions are the most popular and have the ability of being enhanced by electronic monitoring. Intensive supervised probation is one of the most widely used intermediate sanctions, and is more severe than ordinary probation. Usually, intensive supervised probation offenders have to contact probation officers many times per
week and they are typically subject to curfew and random drug tests. Electronic monitoring provides probation officers with the ability to document an offender's contacts and location (Petersilia, Turner, Kahan and Peterson, 1985 p. 64).

**Shock incarceration** programs are similar to military boot camps. Participants spend between 90 and 180 days following a daily schedule of activities with strictly enforced rules and discipline. Those who do not complete the program must serve longer terms in a traditional prison or jail. Electronic monitoring furnishes officials with the capability of establishing a participant's completion of the program (MacKenzie and Parent, 1992 p. 103).

**Community Service Orders** are court orders of unpaid community service instead of incarceration. Offenders are required to perform a specific service to enhance the community and are not compensated monetarily for their service. Electronic monitoring could prove that the offender was at a certain location to perform that service (Morris and Tonry, 1990 p. 150).

**Daily Reporting Centers** require an offender to report to a facility at a predetermined time for a designated period. Electronic monitoring allows the officials the opportunity to monitor a subject's movement in and out of the facility (Gowdy, 1994).

**Community correctional programs** are commonly known as
residential half-way houses traditionally designed to assist in the release and relocation of a prisoner from prison to the community. These programs are now used as an alternative to incarceration. Electronic monitoring gives the ability to monitor the movements and confirm a subject’s whereabouts at specific times (McCarthy and McCarthy, 1991 p. 207).

**Home incarceration** is one of the most extensively used intermediate sanctions. Home incarceration is the restriction of movement of an offender to within the confines of the offender’s residence or other pre-determined area during pre-designated times. The majority of electronic monitoring programs are used in combination with home incarceration. Electronic monitoring will verify that a subject is at a specified location at a specified time (Ball, Huff, and Lilly, 1988 p. 29).

Electronic monitoring is not a punishment, per se, but electronic monitoring is adaptable to the majority of intermediate sanctions and enhances the punitive nature of those intermediate sanctions.

**Milestones**

In 1964, Dr. Ralph K. Schwitzgebel at Harvard University was the first to discuss using an electronic monitoring program with probationers in the community (Schmidt and Curtis, 1987 p. 137). Dr. Schwitzgebel used a two-pound, belt-worn, transceiver; repeater stations in Cambridge and
Boston, Massachusetts, and a central monitoring station that could track the subject over several blocks (Renzema, 1992 p. 43). After this initial discovery and testing, electronic monitoring programs remained dormant for more than a decade.

In 1982, with the 1980 Santa Fe Prison riots still vivid in his mind, New Mexico District Court Judge Jack Love told a computer salesman, Michael Goss, about the frustration of being forced to sentence people to overcrowded jails and prisons who did not really need incarceration, but who could not succeed on probation (Ball, Huff, Lilly, 1988 p. 35). The New Mexico Supreme Court approved the electronic monitoring program as long as the offender's consent in the program was voluntary, and as a condition of probation, the privacy, dignity, and family was protected (Champion, 1990 p. 103). In 1983, for the first time, Judge Love sentenced an offender to "Gosslink," an electronic monitoring home incarceration program invented by Michael Goss (Corrections Today 52:4 p. 80 July 90). The Gosslink was a continuous signalling device. The equipment was a small radio transmitter attached to the offender's ankle by a plastic strap. A field monitoring device was used to detect the transmitter's signals (Byrne, Lurigio and Petersilia, 1992 p. 44). The cost of electronic monitoring in 1983 in Albuquerque, New Mexico, was $100,000 per year for 25 Gosslink monitoring sets; additional sets leased for $1,000 per year (Ball and

In an effort to relieve jail overcrowding, Florida enacted new legislation authorizing the use of electronic monitoring with intermediate sanctions. In late 1984, Sheriff Richard P. Willie of Palm Beach County, Florida, was the first law enforcement officer to use electronic monitoring with home incarceration (Crime and Delinquency 36, 4 p. 521 October 1992). The initial system cost $49,275 and a daily charge per participating offender of $9 per day, totaled $42,885. Due to the 87% return on the initial involvement, Sheriff Willie termed the program a success (Palm Beach County Florida Sheriff’s Department 1987).

Florida’s electronic monitoring program was a non-continuous signalling system. Telephone "robots" were used in Florida’s Community Control Program. The robots would randomly telephone offenders’ homes with a pre-recorded message. The robots made offender status inquiries to verify compliance in the program. Within a year, the program was modified and included a non-removable wristlet attached to the offender’s wrist. A transmitter unit was installed in the offender’s home. The robot randomly called the offender’s home and instructed the offender to place the wristlet into the transmitter. An electronic connection between the wristlet and the transmitter is made. A signal
is sent via the telephone to a central computer for verification. If the first connection is not made, the robot makes a second attempt. If the second connection fails, the computer notifies the community control officials (Papy and Numer, 1991 p.31).

The Florida Community Control Program has grown into the largest electronic monitoring program in the country. More than 40,000 offenders have been through the program since its conception in 1983. The Florida program is used as a model for other agencies desiring to implement a cost-effective electronic monitoring program (Wagner and Bair, 1993).

In 1985, to comply with a court order to reduce jail overcrowding, Kenton County, Kentucky began a low-risk, voluntary electronic monitoring, home incarceration program modeled after the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Department program (Champion, 1990 p. 104). Initial costs of $42,568 were required for 35 participants; this was $2,152 less than jail incarceration of these offenders. Since the equipment was paid for with the initial participants, the next participants' costs would be reduced (Lilly, Ball, Wright, 1987 p. 192).

With the success of New Mexico, Florida, and Kentucky programs came a rapid rise in the use of electronic monitoring. By 1989, a census identified programs in 39 states, with over 5,500 participants being monitored (Maxfield and
Baumer, 1990 p. 521). Nationwide, by 1990, 65,000 criminal offenders had been placed on electronic monitoring home incarceration with an estimated savings of $86,190,000 (Goss, 1990 p. 80).

In summary, citizen needs refocused to crime as a major issue, while confidence in the criminal justice system dropped dramatically. Offenders were either incarcerated or granted probation. Court orders capped inmate population and then offenders were released into the community with little or no supervision. A vacuum between incarceration and probation was created and needed to be filled. Justification and public confidence arose with intermediate sanctions. Early experiments with electronic monitoring showed great adaptability to intermediate sanctions and enhancement of intermediate sanctions' punitive qualities. The phenomenal, nationwide growth of electronic monitoring in such a short period of time would indicate that electronic monitoring in conjunction with the intermediate sanctions is a success and should be continued.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The focus of this project is criminal justice electronic monitoring. The literature on electronic monitoring is reviewed in this chapter.


The author reports on the U.S. Parole Commission's interest in home confinement and electronic monitoring of Federal inmates. The program is described as low-need offenders are released directly into the community 180 days before the original release date. The program is experimental and offenders have a curfew that is monitored by electronic surveillance. The article compares half-way houses that cost $30-35 per day to electronic monitoring which can run $12-15 per day with the same risk to the public. The article continues with statistics of the offenders participating in the program. Approximately 50% were drug dealers, 13% were robbery or serious assault, and 6% were technical parole violators. Ninety-nine participants of the program completed the program and 31 participants did not. Out of the 31 who did not complete the program, 26 were revoked on their parole and two are currently being sought by Federal authorities. Finally, the authors justify the program as being less costly than a half-way house and also state that
home confinement is labor intensive with no more than 25 offenders per each supervising officer. In closing, the authors state that the results of the project have been encouraging and broader application of the technology and procedures appear to be feasible.
Baird, S. Christopher and Wagner, Dennis. "Measuring Diver-
sion: The Florida Community Control Program." Crime and
Delinquency. 36:1 p. 112 January 1990.

The authors state that prison crowding has caused the
implementation of intensive community supervision programs.
In 1978, California incarcerated 21,325 inmates in prison.
In 1980, more than 71,000 inmates were incarcerated in
California's prisons. This is 157% of the prisons' operat-
ing capacity. California's response to prison overcrowding
was to build new prisons. California opened 15 new prisons
between 1984 and 1988 at a cost of $2.6 billion.

Florida's prison overcrowding is seriously affecting
the state's criminal justice system. The Florida Community
Control Program is an attempt to divert convicted offenders
from prison. The program is the largest and best-estab-
lished in the United States. In the past six years, Florida
courts have sentenced 25,000 offenders to the program. The
article compares the offenders' characteristics before and
after implementation of the program.
The book focuses on house arrests and correctional policy.

The authors begin with a history of home confinement as an alternative to incarceration. They define electronic monitoring as verifying a subject is at a specified location at a specified time. They state that the increased interest in home confinement is directly related to the advancement of technology of the electronic monitoring devices. The book has a brief description of the Palm Beach County, Florida, project and the Kenton County, Kentucky, project.

The book is a compilation of essays about controversial issues in criminal justice.

The authors examine home confinement or home incarceration as an alternative to prison. They cite their prior publications proposing home incarceration as a sentencing alternative for convicted drunk drivers. A brief description of several electronic monitoring systems is included. The authors state that as of 1983, Albuquerque, New Mexico, was paying $100,000 per year for 25 Gosslink monitoring bracelet sets with additional sets leasing at $1,000 per year.

The authors compared three electronic monitoring programs. The first program was designed for adults charged with a crime and unable to obtain a regular pre-trial release. The second program was designed as an alternative to incarcerating adults convicted of a crime. The third program was designed for juvenile burglars who had already been sentenced.

The program used the same equipment and operated in the same jurisdictions and had similar rules and regulations. The authors focused on the differences of the programs and the participants' performance.

The article identifies Ralph Schwitzgebel as the originator of the electronic monitoring concept. Mike Goss's electronic monitoring devices are described and their use in the 1983 Albuquerque, New Mexico, program.

The authors' main focus is on an evaluation of a Federal initiative. The initiative is a feasibility study of electronic monitoring of Federal parolees. They cite a few technical problems with the equipment, such as equipment that could not be serviced by the contracting vendor.

The author concludes that electronic monitoring would detect unauthorized absence from the home. Electronic monitoring is cost effective—only 13% of 357 participating offenders were returned to prison. Personal involvement must accompany the use of electronic monitoring. There still needs to be a transitional program from prison to release within the community.

The book is a collection of essays on criminal justice trends in sentencing. The authors describe the type of electronic monitoring device that an offender wears and inserts into a receiver. The offender inserts the device when the authorities call on the telephone. The rapid growth of electronic monitoring is noted, but the author states the electronic monitoring potential is overrated. They further state that the viable available evidence suggests that 25% of home confinement participants were unnecessarily added on to an existing probation order.
The authors comment on the efficiency of the Florida House Arrest Program for sexual offenders. The Circuit Court in the First Judicial District of Florida refers the offenders to the program who serve two years on community control. They wear an electronic device for a minimum of one year that monitors their geographic location. The offenders also must attend a sexual offenders' treatment program. The authors discuss two cases in point of sexual offenders who were put on electronic monitors. They also state that the drawbacks of the program are the public resistance to the community-based approaches of sexual offenders. The benefit of the program allows for employment and treatment of therapy outside of the prison for sexual offenders.

The book is generally about intermediate punishments and has several essays about electronic monitoring. The essay addresses the development of the new trend in probation called home confinement and electronic monitoring and identifies some of the ways the programs are operated and the effects of the programs. A brief history of home confinement and electronic monitoring with statistics from 1983 are listed. Florida's non-electronic monitoring, home confinement program is outlined and includes the basic conditions for home confinement cases.

The essay implies that most successful programs of home confinement are monitored electronically. Then the authors implied that electronic monitoring will not stop with home confinement. They suggest that it might be implemented in society to monitor employee productivity or curfew checks by a coach on players.
The book is a collection of essays relating to intermediate sanctions.

In the introduction the authors list the following goals of intermediate sanctions:

"to save the taxpayers monies by providing cost-effective alternatives to incarceration for prison and jail-bound offenders."

"to deter offenders (specifically) and the public (generally) from crime."

"to protect the community by exerting more control (than does traditional probation) over offender behavior."

"to rehabilitate offenders by using mandatory treatment requirements which are then reinforced by mandatory substance abuse testing and the swift revocation of violators."

The author discusses how to establish an electronic monitoring program. This includes selecting a contractor, training supervision issues and defining the violations. The author also has recommendations on the types of equipment to be used.

The author focuses on the federal pre-trial release programs and includes the demographic data about Federal defendants on electronic monitoring programs. Finally, the author examines the failure to appear and rearrest rates as additional measures of the effectiveness of electronic monitoring in Federal pre-trial arrest programs.

The report deals with jail population and options for criminal punishment.

The report gives the reason for jail overcrowding in California including probation underfunding, jail underfunding and court order population caps. Court order population caps on 18 California jails (accounting for 73% of the jail population) are contributing to state prison overcrowding. County jails are no longer housing state parole violators. The recommendations are to adopt a community corrections act to provide state funds in the form of grants for community-based intermediate sanctions. The examples given are electronic monitoring, house arrests and other programs. The report gives suggestions as to the class of offenders eligible and not eligible to participate in intermediate sanctions programs. The report defines the different intermediate sanctions programs and states that the sanctions will be on a continuum and will provide judges and parole authorities with options for dealing with offenders.
Champion, Dean J. *Probation and Parole in the United States.* Columbus, Ohio: Merrill 1990.

The main topic of the book is probation and parole. One section has some brief information on electronic monitoring. The book defines electronic monitoring as the use of telemetry devices to verify that an offender is at a special place during a pre-designated time. A brief history states that the New Mexico Supreme Court approved a voluntary electronic monitoring program in 1983 and that Second Judicial Judge Jack Love began sentencing offenders with electronic monitoring. Table 36, Pages 104-105, describes the electronic monitoring devices and lists the names and addresses of the manufacturers and distributors of electronic monitoring equipment.

The author states that the future of probation and parole is tied to technological developments that have occurred within the past fifteen years. The author states that nothing else shows similar economic promise or potential.
The author reports on the Allen Superior Court Family Relations Division, Fort Wayne, Indiana, Juvenile Electronic Monitoring Program. The article reviews the planning and implementation of the program, the pre-planning and organization of the program, the importance of administrative support, some of the politics and managerial issues of the program, development and implementation and then the role of the officers involved.

The overriding goal of the program was financial savings for the county. However, officers would not admit every juvenile who was eligible for the program if they felt the juvenile would not do well in the program or would not succeed. So, despite the stated goals, personnel could change the goals of the entire program at any level. Finally, the author states that four factors are imperative to a good electronic monitoring program: good equipment, selection of participants who meet the qualifications, clear expectations and instructions to the participants and, finally, daily visits of officers to the participants.
The article describes a pre-trial bond release supervision. Pre-trial bond release supervision involves the supervising of defendants who have been released from jail on a personal recognizance bond. A bond for release is the amount of money posted by a defendant to obtain a release and secure a promise to appear. A personal recognizance bond is a bond where no money is posted and still the defendant promises to appear. The author implies that firm establishment of rules and regulations with face-to-face contact is far superior to less restrictive non face-to-face electronic monitoring programs.

The author cites data that when electronic monitoring is used as a condition of the bond, the violation rate increases. The use of electronic monitoring contributes to a higher technical violation rate. Finally, the author concludes that any policy that increases the use of electronic monitoring could have an effect of increasing the violation rate.

The authors describe the development in corporations and operations of a pre-trial services program in Lake County, Illinois. Pre-trial services programs supervise the defendants and monitor their compliance with the court order conditions of release. The local criminal justice system relies on the program to provide supplemental information to the courts for bail purposes and other forms of release from incarceration. Finally, the authors suggest that the level of supervision should be directly related to the type of violation committed as well as the frequency of the violation.

The author states his concerns that electronic monitoring will change probation departments' goals. Electronic monitoring takes the place of face-to-face contact with probation officers. As a result, probation officers do not need the people skills to perform the jobs effectively. The author continues by stating that probation officers only have to be technicians and know how to operate the electronic monitoring equipment. The author further states that electronic monitoring punishes but does not rehabilitate and it is not the best we can do, but it is the cheapest. Finally, the author closes by expressing concerns about the house being used as a prison.
The authors describe the Los Angeles County electronic monitoring program of drug offenders on probation. The authors state that electronic monitoring provides an economical method of house arrest supervision. Electronic monitoring is cost effective for Los Angeles County. The cost of electronic monitoring house arrest is $3 to $8 a day compared to $40 a day for each inmate in jail and $15 per day per probationer on intensive supervised probation. In conclusion, the authors state that most drug abusers with poor employment records and not extremely serious offense histories are best sentenced to electronic monitoring with drug testing. The primary purpose of these sentences will not be for deterrents but to change personal habits that impair the drug offender's employability.

The author supports electronic monitoring and states that most electronic monitoring house arrestees are employed and paying taxes. The author states common key factors for a successful program. The key factors are as follows:

- A survey to determine if the eligible participants' population would justify the expense.
- A definition of the goals of the program, so that success can be measured.
- Sufficient management and legislative support for funding.
- Must have sufficient officers to handle the case load.
- The equipment provided must meet the needs of the program.
- The personnel involved in the program must meet qualifications.
- The first two weeks of the program are the most important and each violation or transaction should be scrutinized for a possible pattern.
- The equipment providers, personnel must be available and ready on a daily basis to answer questions on the program.
- Curfew violations of even one minute have to be addressed to the offenders initially, to show that the program is working and should not be tested.
- Statistics should be kept to show progress in an attempt to meet the goals and all records should be kept for further debate and possible use in court.

The article describes the research conducted to justify an electronic monitoring program. The author outlines new procedures to set up an electronic monitoring program and includes available options for a program. The biggest concern for administrators considering electronic monitoring programs are the amount of time and money an agency is willing to spend.

The decision of New Mexico District Court Judge Jack Love to sentence an offender to electronic monitoring for the first time is included in this article. Finally, the author states that 65,000 offenders have been placed on electronic monitoring programs nationwide, for a cost savings of $86,190,000.

The author addresses all forms of intermediate sanctions and electronic monitoring programs used in conjunction with intermediate sanctions. Of special interest is a brief description of day reporting centers. Several electronic monitoring programs are described, including the Florida Community Control Program (FCCP).

The article describes the electronic monitoring programs used by the United States probation officers in the southern district of Mississippi. The program began in 1994 to meet Federal sentencing guidelines. The author describes the first year of the program and includes selection criteria, type of cases, supervision model and offender demographics.

The author and other officials involved in the program were skeptical. They recall incidences from other electronic monitoring programs about escapes and crime sprees by the electronic monitoring offenders. They became familiar with the program and the equipment. The benefits were recognized by judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys and the program expanded.

The article examines the electronic monitoring with house arrest program in Jackson County, Oregon. The author describes a four-year program that uses electronic monitoring, polygraph examinations, urinalysis and surprise visits to ensure that the offenders are meeting the conditions of their probation. Jackson County Jail is limited by federal court order to 190 inmates. This mandate requires the early release of about ten inmates a day. There is a description of the program. Finally, the author states that local conditions determined by the community's needs, political forces, judicial philosophy, and local economics will affect the development and the success of the electronic monitoring home detention program.

The book is mainly about the issues surrounding corrections, but it does contain an essay about electronic monitoring. The essay was written about twenty years ago and describes developments of electronic monitoring equipment during the 1960's. The description includes external and internal devices that have been developed. A subject within the essay deals with electronic stimulation of the brain with the intent of controlling emotions, thought and behavior. The essay tries to justify further research on controlling emotions and thought by dismissing some of the claims as fearful overexaggerations. The essay discusses some of the conditions under which electronic monitoring might be used and shows how valuable electronic monitoring could become. The value can be monetary or in the form of an individual's freedom and privacy. The authors are critical of any ethical reservations that might delay the research and implementation of electronic monitoring.

The majority of the bulletin deals with probation and parole statistics. The bulletin lists 46 states and gives statistics reported by the states on the number of persons on electronic monitoring. The statistics confirm the estimates from other readings that Florida and Michigan make up approximately 40% of all the people in the country that are electronically monitored. California did not report their statistics of people being electronically monitored.

The article identifies a program termed Intensive Drug Program. The program combines electronic monitoring house arrest with a mandatory drug treatment program. It is designed to lower drug use and eliminate criminal behavior. The program is similar to intensive supervised probation in conjunction with an out-patient drug treatment program.

The author cites statistics of recidivism rates and drug test results to imply that the program is a success. Finally, the authors do warn of the difficulty of reducing drug use and eliminating crime with drug abusers.

The book in general is about alternative sentencing and is directed towards attorneys and practitioners in the field. The types of crimes and offenders that an attorney will deal with are identified. The book does give numerous case references relating to alternative sentencing. The author provides a checklist of questions used for designing an alternative sentencing program. The questions address the history of the offender and the danger to the community. Finally, the book has a table of statutes from different states in the nation relating to alternative sentencing.

The author expresses fear of big brotherisms when used with electronic monitoring equipment and fears that the rapid rise in technology of electronic monitoring will outpace the new laws to control the intrusion of electronic monitoring. The author states that current technology would allow for the use of breath analyzers, motion detectors, polygraphs, electronic anklets, continuous monitoring devices, bugs, wire taps, light amplifiers, voice stress and brain wave analysis, computer matching and video surveillance—all that can be done in the home. The author states that all of this would be a violation of the rights to privacy of the offender. Finally, the author states that electronic monitoring will continue to grow into the distant future not because it is the best system, but because it is an economically viable solution to a growing problem of prison and jail overcrowding.

The authors conducted a seven-year study on the effectiveness of electronic monitoring with home confinement on sentenced driving-while-intoxicated offenders and driving under-a-suspended license offenders. The offenders were electronically monitored at the beginning of their probation with few equipment problems. A majority of all participants successfully completed the program.

The results imply that electronic monitoring home confinement is a money-savings alternative for driving-while-intoxicated offenders and driving-under-suspended license offenders. Data is provided that shows incarceration of driving-while-intoxicated offenders and driving-under-suspended license offenders is ineffective as a deterrent. Data shows that electronic monitoring home confinement is ranked as a "quite severe" form of punishment.
The article provides information on the Pride, Inc. electronic monitoring program of West Palm Beach, Florida. The Pride, Inc. is a non-profit corporation that began in 1984 and set up the first continuously operating monitoring program. The study evaluates 415 cases in The Pride, Inc., program. One of the main goals of the program is reintegration of the offenders. The authors caution that overuse would cause the program to become adversarial to the offenders.

Probation officers are moving away from face-to-face contact of a counseling perspective to probation officers who are now compliance monitors, electronic surveillance gadget readers, urine and money collectors, and law enforcers.

Initially, the average program participant was a male convicted or driving while intoxicated. In 1989, driving while intoxicated offenders made up only 18% of program participants in the United States. Drug offenders made up 22% and burglars and petite larceny offenders made up 20% of the program participants. Violent crime offenders made up 12% of the program participants. Finally, the authors caution that the 97% success rate of The Pride, Inc. program
would not continue if electronic monitoring is expanded to include all offender populations.

The book concentrates on intermediate punishments and does have a few essays on electronic monitoring.

The essay appraises the home confinement electronic monitoring program in Kenton County, Kentucky. The essay begins with the history and politics involved with trying to pass a bill that would support electronic monitoring. Data is shown in tables for an 18-month period in 1985 and 1986. The results of the pilot study showed that the program did not substantially reduce the overcrowding of the jails. However, other expectations were met. Overall the program was a modest success and is used as a model for other programs.

The conclusions were that home confinement is more cost effective than incarceration in jail and it did help ease jail overcrowding. Equipment for monitoring worked better at the end of the program as staff became better adept at using the equipment.
The authors state that we should determine if inmates prefer electronic monitoring to incarceration. Their study alluded to the fact that most offenders rated house arrest as far more positive than jail. Quotations from inmates interviewed were "I learned to budget my time, it made me more happy about my home environment and now I find myself staying home more and enjoying it." The article addresses several cases of offenders who successfully completed the program and have completely changed their life around.

The book is generally about intermediate sanctions and has several essays about electronic monitoring.

The author describes prison overcrowding and the need for alternatives. Probation is discussed and the need for alternatives for offenders who could not manage on ordinary probation. Current intensive probation supervision models in use are described as multiple offender and probation officer contacts per week. Finally, the realistic future intensive probation supervision is discussed.

The book is generally about intermediate sanctions and has several essays about electronic monitoring.

The author describes the typical boot camp as 90 to 180 days of military-style basic training with strict rules and discipline. Offenders that drop out must serve longer terms in traditional prison.

The authors state that to relieve prison overcrowding and save money, electronic monitoring home detention programs are being used at nearly every level of the criminal justice process. The article notes differences between the pre-trial electronic monitoring programs and a similar program for sentenced offenders. The programs are both conducted by the same agency and in the same jurisdiction. The results of the study indicate that the type of client population does significantly affect the design, delivery, and the impact of the programs. The authors do identify a census that was conducted in 1988 that identified electronic monitoring programs in 39 states with over 5,500 individuals being monitored.

The book is a collection of essays generally about intermediate punishments and several essays are about electronic monitoring. In the introduction, the author defines intermediate sanctions as the penalties that exist between incarceration and ordinary probation.

The book is a textbook of community based corrections and very briefly addresses electronic monitoring. The author states how community based correction programs developed, why they grew in popularity and variety, what are the statuses of the programs and how they can be effective. The book outlines the purposes of electronic monitoring and describes the two types of devices currently in use. Continuous signalling devices provide active monitoring. An example is a transmitter attached to an offender's body that sends out a signal if the offender should leave the designated area. The passive systems have the offender react to a computer-generated telephone call. Usually the offender has to place the device in a verifier box or have their voice verified. The offender is also required to pay for being in the program. The program's success varies depending on whether the program can control whom they accept in the program.

Finally, the book has a newspaper article about a doctor who is a slum lord and was sentenced to live in one of his slums. The doctor was electronically monitored while he lived in the slums.

The authors of the book discuss a plan for a wide range of intermediate punishments to be used between prison and probation. I also reviewed the community service orders used in conjunction with electronic monitoring.

The authors state that prison and probation are used excessively and that a near vacuum has been created between the two. Electronic monitoring is technology used as an enforcement tool for house arrest. House arrest is then the sanction or the punishment.

The authors state that because of overcrowding, intermediate punishments are being implemented. The downfall is that they are being implemented because of the overcrowding and not because the programs are viewed as progressive or good. The authors also confirmed my fears in their bibliography. They state that except for textbooks and practitioners' manuals, there has been very little writing in the United States on intermediate punishments as opposed to sentencing. I had already obtained the three books in their bibliography on intermediate punishments.
The article describes the three electronic monitoring programs in England and Wales. These were the only European jurisdictions to have electronic monitoring programs. Established in 1989, the first program was in Nottingham. Later, a program began in North Tyneside (New Castle) and, finally, a program began at Tower Bridge in London. The author comments that the probation service has disassociated itself from electronic monitoring and suggests that electronic monitoring be undertaken by a private agency.

The book is, for the most part, concerned with intermediate punishments. The book also has several essays about electronic monitoring. Because I am focusing on electronic monitoring, I am only reviewing the essay.

The essay was written by law enforcement officials about what law enforcement officials think about prison overcrowding and the alternatives. The sheriff of the agency who authored the essay was the first law enforcement official to approve the use of a home confinement electronic monitoring program. Sheriff Richard Willie and a judge created the program that is a transition from work release to the community as an intermediate punishment.

The essay discusses how the system works and includes definitions of the transmitter, receiver-dialer, and a host computer. There is a brief section on inmate selection criteria. One requirement is that inmates must complete a portion of their sentences in the traditional work release programs.

Components of the program are listed and defined. The components of the program are: sponsors, contract, per diem
and inspections. The benefits to the inmates are briefly explained. The highlights after the first year of the program's implementation are summarized with statistics included. The system is touted as a success with a few individual success stories.

The essay lists the Florida statutes that provide the courts with the guidelines for the future use of electronic monitoring. A section on return on the investments shows the costs of the equipment and the money paid back by program participants. This equals an 87% return on the investment. Sheriff Willie termed the program a success.

The author describes technical advances of electronic monitoring systems. Offenders without phones can participate in electronic monitoring using cellular technology. Other technological advances are tamper-proof bands and longer battery life. Officers can conduct two-way conversations or request a live picture of the offender in their home via the electronic monitoring device.

Offender selection and placement in an appropriate program is discussed. Monitoring periods should not be longer than six months. Fees for the service should be paid by the offender. Finally, the author states that electronic monitoring requires a high level of supervision.

The article describes the Florida Department of Corrections Community Control Electronic monitoring house arrest program. The program was established in 1983 as a result of the Correction Reform Act of 1983. The author describes the telephone robots that are used throughout Florida to make the random telephone calls to the offender's homes. The robots had a pre-recorded message that made inquiries as to the offender's status and to verify the offender's compliance. In 1985, the department placed a transmitter unit in the offender's home and attached a wristlet to the offender's wrist. The robot would call the offender's home and would instruct the offender to place the wristlet into the transmitter unit. If a connection is made, the transmitter, via a telephone line, sends the information to a central computer for verification. If the first attempt fails, the transmitter would try a second time; if the second attempt fails, then the community control officer was notified.
The report deals solely with granting felons probation. Statistical analysis was done to determine to whom the courts grant probation. What happens to felons after being granted probation and probation is not working? What alternatives are there? Since California's probation system is the largest in the country, the data in the study is from California. The opinion of the authors is that a serious threat to public safety is present when felons are granted probation. The report states that there are only two primary sentencing alternatives: prison or probation. The dangers to public safety are restated for felons granted probation. The report states that intermediate sanctions are needed that are an alternative to imprisonment. The report does not address electronic monitoring, but defines intensive supervision programs as a low number of offenders for probation officials to supervise. These officials then contact the offender with greater frequency for the entire period of probation.

The authors examined the effectiveness of electronic monitoring home confinement when used to bring offenders into compliance with the conditions of their probation and parole. Data was analyzed from two metropolitan areas of Texas in which electronic monitoring is used extensively as a condition for offenders who have difficulty complying with the terms of their probation or parole. The offenders are released within the community and the data indicated that electronic monitoring does reduce recidivism of participants.

The author describes two east coast electronic monitoring home confinement cases that caused public outrage. In one case, the offender was a convicted college-campus drug dealer. The drug dealer placed on electronic monitoring home confinement was John Zaccaro, Jr., the son of the 1984 Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Geraldine Ferraro. The other case was a pre-trial release on $10 million bail. The offender posted the bail and was under electronic monitoring home confinement. The parameters of his home confinement were the city limits of the city of New York.

The author defines home confinement as requiring an offender to remain at home during all times except for specified periods. Electronic monitoring is used to enhance home confinement by ensuring that an offender is at the location during the specified times. Electronic monitoring systems can also locate parolees or mental patients. Electronic monitoring with home confinement is cost effective because it saves the yearly cost of $15,000 for each inmate and the construction cost of $50,000 for each new prison bed. Finally, the author addresses the criteria for selecting offenders. A survey of probation personnel determined that six months duration should be the maximum duration for home confinement. The author briefly touches on staff requirements and training of probation officers in the
electronic monitoring home confinement program.

The book is generally about intermediate sanctions and has several essays about electronic monitoring.

The author describes the evolution of home confinement and electronic monitoring. The electronic monitoring program conducted at Harvard University in 1964, by Dr. Ralph Schwitzbegel is described. The equipment used is described as a two-pound belt worn transceiver, a network of repeater stations in Cambridge and Boston, Massachusetts, and a central monitoring station. An offender could be tracked over the range of several blocks.

The author also describes the Gosslink electronic monitoring system as a small transmitter attached to the offender’s ankle and a field monitoring device that was used to detect the transmitter’s signal. When the signals did not reach the field monitoring device, the device would report the absence over the phone to a computer. The computer would compare the absence with the pre-programmed curfew status and report the findings.

The author, Vice President of Marketing of Guardian Technologies, states that it is cost effective to use vendor-operated monitoring as opposed to having the jurisdiction monitor the offenders. The author attempts to justify his views by stating that the cost per offender can be high for jurisdictions that have a small number of offenders and cannot absorb the entire cost of the program. The author also states the hidden costs involve the number of trips that the probation officer is required to make to the offender's home during the period that they are enrolled in a home arrest program, in conjunction with the electronic monitoring.
The article described the two basic types of electronic monitoring devices. The first is a continuous signaling device that constantly monitor the presence of an offender’s particular location. The continuous signaling device has three major parts. A transmitter attached to the offender sends out a continuous signal; the signal is usually coded. A receiver-dialer located in the offender’s home attached to the offender’s telephone line can detect the encoded signal from the transmitter. The receiver-dialer reports to a central computer when it stops receiving a signal and when it starts receiving a signal again. The central computer accepts reports from the receiver-dialer over the telephone lines and then compares them with the offender’s curfew schedule. The central computer will then alert the correctional officials to any unauthorized absences.

The second type of electronic monitoring device is a programmed contact device. This device contacts the offender via the telephone at random or at specified times. A voice verification system or a wristlet attached to the offender assures that the offender is the person answering the call. When the computer calls, the offender places the wristlet into a verifier box connected to the telephone.
The author cautions against replacing good person-based supervision programs with electronic monitoring programs. The author states that electronic monitoring should never be equipment in search of a program.
The author defines electronic monitoring as use of telemetry technology to monitor an offender's presence in a particular place at a particular time. A description of the available electronic monitoring devices are described as follows: A continuous signalling device that constantly monitors the presence of an offender in particular cases. The components of the continuous signalling device are a transmitter, a receiver-dialer and a central computer. A transmitter is attached to the offender's person and sends out a continuous signal. Located in the offender's home is a receiver-dialer that is attached to the phone lines and detects the signals from the transmitter. A central computer receives reports from a receiver-dialer over the phone lines. The computer compares the reports the receiver-dialer receives and does not receive signals from the transmitter. The computer compares the reports with the offender's curfew schedule and stores the information so the reports can be generated or notifies the officials of any violations. The article provides 1987 statistics from a National Institute of Justice Survey. The survey reported 53 electronic monitoring programs in 21 states. The author states that of all private agencies that conduct electronic monitoring, about half of the responding programs charge
fees to the offenders to pay for the program. The article states that about 50% of the electronic monitoring programs were run by correction agencies and 22% were private monitoring services. An interesting statement by the author is that various programs can be developed; a few examples of different programs are a pre-trial program, a small town police department that monitors city ordinance violations, a work release program and a program for those who would not manage on regular probation or parole. Finally, the author states that the future of electronic monitoring will be an expansion of all the programs in many more states and localities.

The book is mainly about all forms of intermediate punishments but has a few examples concerning electronic monitoring.

The essay defines electronic monitoring and describes the four basic technologies used on electronic monitoring. The first two use a telephone at the monitor location and continuous signalling as a transmitter attached to the offender and broadcast a coded signal to a receiver-dialer located in the offender’s home. The receiver-dialer reports that it has received the signal to a central computer or receiver.

Program contact also uses a telephone at the monitor location. A computer is programmed to call the offender during the hours being monitored. The computer can call either at a specific selected time or randomly. The offender wears an electronic device and, when the computer calls, the offender inserts the device into a verifier box connected to the telephone. The last two electronic monitoring devices do not use a telephone. With a cellular phone, the transmitter is worn by the offender. A locator unit is placed in the offender’s home or workplace and receives a
signal from the transmitter. The signal is relayed to a local area monitor and the movements of the offender are reviewed. Continuous signalling without a telephone occurs when the offender wears a transmitter that sends out a constant signal and a portable receiver is monitored by an officer. The officer must be within a certain radius to effectively monitor the offender.

The essay continues the brief history of electronic monitoring and justifications for home incarcerations with electronic monitoring. Legal and ethical issues are discussed including some possible abuses. Finally, there are some brief results of research on performance of participating offenders and effectiveness of the electronic monitoring and some opinions of criminal justice personnel.

The author justifies an electronic monitoring program used in conjunction with home detention to serve their sentences while retaining their jobs. The author describes a system that is available that uses a personal computer attached to a video monitor, video printer and a dot matrix printer that automatically calls the clients at random; the clients then have to send their picture via a video telephone. There is also another program that has a hand-held breath analyzer that can be used to measure the blood alcohol content. Finally, the author describes how cost effective home detention is with electronic monitoring.

The book's general topic is intermediate punishments but it does have one essay about electronic monitoring.

The essay is about the Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council's study of the feasibility of house arrests and electronic monitoring. The study describes existing technology, including how the systems function and the cost of the systems. Ten programs are examined and data including average length of monitoring, number currently monitored and failure rates are listed on a table for easy comparison. Legal issues and administrative concerns are addressed including employee attitudes. A brief discussion about philosophical concerns is addressed.

Finally, the author addresses the potential abuses and states electronic monitoring might be useful as a tool but is not a substitute for sound correctional policy development.

The author addresses the success of the Florida Community Control Program. This program is one of the first electronic monitoring programs in the country and is now one of the largest with more than 40,000 offenders participating in the program since its inception in 1983.

The author describes the current unknown future of electronic monitoring technology. Current electronic monitoring technology is described as a transmitter attached to an offender's body that signals a modem. The modem signals that an offender has left the home. A drive-by unit in a vehicle can track the transmitter's signal. The drive-by unit can also alert the officials when the offender is within range of the unit. A store security system can have a drive-by unit installed that would alert officials when an offender wearing a transmitter enters the store.

Within the next five years, computer-controlled radio receivers will instantly record the location of an offender. The system will track an offender instead of just reporting when an offender is out of range or within range. Any deviations from the assigned route will be reported to officials.

Finally, the author predicts the future of electronic monitoring based on technology currently being developed. Electronic monitoring transmitter and behavior altering drugs are implanted in an offender's body. The offender's undesirable, physiological information is processed and officials are alerted. Officials can transmit a signal that releases the drug and the offender is rendered unconscious.
until the officials arrive.
CHAPTER THREE

Description of Riverside County’s Electronic Monitoring Program

Riverside County Probation Department’s Juvenile Electronic Monitoring Home Confinement Program is restricted to juvenile participants only. Electronic equipment is used to monitor a juvenile at home without the need of constant parental supervision. The electronic monitor will detect a juvenile’s compliance with the probation department’s agreement. Riverside County juvenile probation has several requirements that must be completed before a juvenile can participate in the program. The court must have sentenced the juvenile to Ricardo M time. Ricardo M was the first juvenile to be sentenced by the courts to a special program. The courts specifically must order the juvenile released home after serving a set period of time in Juvenile Hall. A court order cannot prohibit a juvenile from participating in the program.

The juvenile must serve a minimum of five days in the juvenile hall facility before being eligible to begin the program. The minimum time a juvenile can participate in a program is ten days and the maximum is thirty days. Juveniles must reside in the lower western end of Riverside county with their parents or guardians. Parents or guardians must be willing to supervise in part, the juvenile participation in the program. The residence must be acces-
sible to probation officers from the public street.

The juvenile must stay within the confines of the residential structure. Guests, including relatives, are not allowed to visit the juvenile. School and other approved activities scheduled must be submitted to the probation officer prior to beginning the program. The parents or guardians and the juvenile must agree to allow day and night warrantless searches by the probation and police department.

The telephone must be in good working order within the residence. Telephone use must be restricted to less than five minutes per call. Remote or cordless phones and answering machines cannot be used. Services such as call waiting and call forwarding must be canceled.

The program's technology is a continuous signalling device consisting of a small transmitter attached to the juvenile's ankle with a tamper-proof strap. The transmitter broadcasts an encoded signal at regular intervals over a set distance. The transmitter signals when the transmitter's strap has been tampered with.

A tamper-proof field monitoring device is placed in the juvenile's home and is connected to the home's telephone lines. When the juvenile is within range, the field monitoring device picks up the encoded signal from the transmitter.

When the computer calls, the field monitoring device reports to the central computer via the date and time it
stopped receiving the signal from the transmitter and when it started receiving the signal.

The central computer obtains the information from the field monitoring device. The central computer compares the information with the offender’s curfew schedule. The central computer prints out any violations for the officers to review.

Riverside County currently owns 57 of the 6,000 electronic monitoring units. These units are about six years old. A unit consists of: a transmitter, straps, batteries and field monitoring device. The transmitter and the field monitoring device are encoded the same. Riverside pays approximately $1,700 a month maintenance fee on the equipment.

The following are the specifications of the Riverside program equipment. The transmitter is a small black square about eight ounces in weight and approximately 1" x 3" x 3" in diameter. The case of the transmitter is shock and water resistant and is curved to fit the contour of the ankle. It is attached to the ankle with a black, soft plastic tamper-proof strap. The transmitter is battery-powered, with a battery lasting up to four months. A complete circuit is formed when the strap is attached to the transmitter. A body sensor in the transmitter reports any removal of the transmitter from the ankle. The strap and fasteners are not available to the general public.
The transmitter sends a coded signal over an A.M. radio frequency. The signal is unique to the individual transmitter and field monitoring device.

The field monitoring device is a black metal box about 2" x 10" x 12" and can only receive a coded signal from one specific transmitter. The field monitoring device has a preset receiving range and records when the juvenile goes out of range or tampers with the transmitter. A signal is also randomly and regularly sent when there is no activity by the juvenile. The field monitoring device is attached to the home telephone lines and uses the standard household electrical current. The backup battery source lasts about twelve hours. Under normal conditions, the field monitoring device stores the information until the central computer calls and retrieves the data.

The program's central computer is about six years old and has not been updated. The computer is located at the Riverside County Juvenile Hall facility. The computer prints out all entries and exits for review by the officers. Officers, using proper code, can update participants information on the computer. The computer can manage 200 transmitter units.

Description of San Bernardino County's Electronic Monitoring Program

San Bernardino County Probation Department electronic monitoring program was designed and implemented for juvenile
participants. Electronic equipment is used in conjunction with home confinement to monitor a juvenile at home with strict parental supervision. The electronic monitoring devices detect a juvenile's compliance with a court-ordered home confinement program.

San Bernardino County requires a court order placing the juvenile on electronic monitoring home confinement. Parents must agree to supervise stringently the juvenile while the juvenile is participating in the program. Juveniles participating in the program may reside anywhere the sentencing court has jurisdiction. Juveniles may reside anywhere in the county of San Bernardino and some areas in Los Angeles, Riverside, Imperial and Kern counties. The juvenile must stay within range of the receiver. His schedule of authorized activities must be submitted to the probation officers prior to commencing of the program. A telephone must be in good working order within the residence; remote or cordless phones and answering machines cannot be used. Services such as call waiting and call forwarding must be canceled.

The program's technology is a continuous signalling device consisting of a small transmitter attached to the juvenile's ankle with a tamper-proof strap. The transmitter broadcasts an encoded signal at regular intervals over an adjustable distance. The transmitter signals when the transmitter or strap has been tampered with.
A tamper-proof monitor-receiver is placed in the juvenile's home and is connected to the home's telephone lines. When the juvenile is within range the monitor-receiver picks up the encoded signal from the transmitter.

When the computer calls the monitor-receiver reports to the central computer the date and time it stopped receiving a signal and when it started receiving a signal from the transmitter.

The central computer obtains the data and compares the information with the juvenile's schedule. The central computer prints out any violations for the officers to review.

San Bernardino County recently purchased 40 BI 9,000 electronic monitoring units. These units are about six months old. A unit consists of a transmitter, straps, batteries and a monitor-receiver encoded for use only with the transmitter. The equipment is still under warranty and therefore no maintenance agreement is in effect.

The following are the specifications of the electronic monitoring equipment. The transmitter is a small, black square about six ounces and about 1" x 3" x 3" in diameter. The case of the transmitter is shock and water resistant and is curved to fit the contour of the ankle. It is attached to the ankle with a black, soft-plastic, tamper-proof strap. The transmitter is battery powered with a battery lasting up to one year. A complete circuit is formed when the strap is
attached to the transmitter. A body sensor in the transmitter reports any removal of the transmitter from the juvenile’s ankle. The strap and fasteners are not available to the general public.

A transmitter sends a coded signal over a radio frequency. The signal is unique to the individual transmitter and monitor-receiver. The transmitter can be set by the central computer to three ranges: 25-50 feet, 50-100 feet and 100-200 feet.

The monitor-receiver is a black metal box about 1" x 8" x 10" and can only receive a coded signal from one specific transmitter. The monitor-receiver records when the juvenile leaves the predesignated range. Signals are constantly being sent and received randomly and at regular intervals even when a juvenile is not active.

The monitor-receiver is attached to the home telephone lines and uses the standard household electrical current. The backup battery source lasts about 12 hours and has a power source that prevents loss of data. The monitor-receiver stores the data until the central computer calls and retrieves the data.

The program’s central computer is about four years old and has been upgraded. The central computer is located at the San Bernardino County Juvenile Detention Facility. The computer prints out all entries and exits for review by the officers. Officers with a specific code can update the
juvenile's information on the computer. The computer can manage 400 transmitter units.

San Bernardino County has a hand-held or mobile monitoring unit. The portable unit can receive signals from transmitter units at a range of about 500 feet. The units run on the 12-volt automobile current and have a ten-hour backup power source that is rechargeable. The mobile monitoring unit can be programmed to the frequency of any individual transmitter unit.
CHAPTER FOUR

Interviews and Program Summary and Analysis

A review of available literature was completed prior to conducting the interviews. This is an interview study with open-ended questions so that interviewees could express their opinions about the programs. A compilation of the interviews was the primary source of data for this study (refer to Appendix A for a list of interview questions). The interviewees were administrators or probation officers with Riverside or San Bernardino counties. They operate the electronic monitoring programs in those counties.

Juvenile Hall facility population data and electronic monitoring program participation data was obtained from the interviewees and annual probation reports (refer to Appendix B for Riverside County juvenile facility and electronic monitoring program data; refer to Appendix C for San Bernardino County juvenile facility and electronic monitoring program data).

The author discovered that the probation officer administering the electronic monitoring programs were a close group that wanted to keep the electronic monitoring program confidential. They were hesitant about releasing their personal experiences about the program. Perseverance prevailed and the following is a summary of the interviews.

Riverside and San Bernardino counties Board of Supervisors and the Sheriffs Office received court orders to re-
lieve overcrowding in the county jails.

In 1988, Presiding Superior Court Judge Thomas E. Hollenhurst ordered the Riverside County probation department to develop, in cooperation with the Riverside County Sheriffs Department a pre-trial, house arrest program to relieve adult jail overcrowding and to make sure the released inmates were supervised. This was the first adult electronic monitoring home incarceration program in the state of California where the participants were not sentenced.

Despite a reported cost savings to Riverside County of $233,604 the program lasted only eight months. The court orders reducing the jail population eventually released every inmate who would have qualified for the program. Finally, Judge Patrick F. Magers ordered the program suspended.

Riverside County was eight months into a two-year purchase contract for electronic monitoring equipment. The juvenile probation division inherited the electronic monitoring equipment from the adult division. The juvenile hall facility expansion project had not been completed and juvenile hall was suffering from overcrowding. The only alternative to sentencing was home supervision. Home supervision required mandatory personal contacts three to five times a week. This was labor intensive and quickly overloaded the probation officers.
In 1988, Juvenile Hall electronic monitoring administrators adapted the existing equipment and started an electronic monitoring program for juvenile offenders.

According to Riverside County officials, the program has saved Riverside County about $844,000. These costs would normally have been spent incarcerating the juveniles. The program has assisted in relieving overcrowding in the juvenile hall facilities.

Riverside County’s program has had a few problems over the years. The BI 6,000 equipment is outdated, and the transmitter’s signal is easily interfered with by A.M. radio frequencies. The batteries only last about three months and the transmitter tamper alarm can only be manually reset. Therefore, when a tamper alarm is indicated, a probation officer has to use valuable time to personally contact the offender to reset the transmitter. The transmitter and field monitoring device make up one unit and have a preset frequency. If the transmitter is lost or damaged, the field monitoring device cannot be used with another transmitter and is therefore useless.

The field monitoring device has slots for ventilation. The slots also allows cockroaches and other insects to enter and damage the unit. If the backup power source on the field monitoring device is depleted before the central computer calls to retrieve the data, all of the stored information is lost.
The central computer is slower and therefore causes a notable increase in long distance telephone bills for Riverside County. The computer is not equipped with a remote dial and terminal that can be used for data entry. The computer does not have a modem that will signal a digital pager when a violation occurs.

The program does not have a mobile monitoring unit. This portable unit would allow the probation officers the flexibility of monitoring a juvenile from a vehicle. The unit can also be used to locate missing transmitters or runaway program participants.

The equipment requires calls in the home to be limited to five minutes or less. The home cannot have remote, cordless phones or answering machines. All call waiting and call forwarding services must be discontinued. Parents and other family members are affected by the rules. More parents are refusing to have the electronic monitoring equipment in the home than juvenile offenders refusing to participate.

Some participants have discovered ways to circumvent the electronic monitoring devices. The following are a few examples of participants who tampered with the electronic monitoring devices and were caught. A few subjects were able to slip the transmitter off their ankle. The tampering was detected, officials responded and discovered the following. A transmitter was on the family dog, a baby brother.
and a light bulb. One ingenious individual added about 300 feet of telephone cable and took the entire unit to the ballpark across the street from the residence.

Overall, Riverside County probation officers view the electronic monitoring program as a definite asset to their office. It gives them valuable time to concentrate on other programs that are more labor intensive. They advise other agencies to use electronic monitoring as soon as possible.

San Bernardino built a new state-of-the-art detention center in 1991 to alleviate the adult jail overcrowding problem. Unfortunately, the new juvenile facility was never built. Juveniles still had to be housed in the antiquated juvenile hall facility. According to San Bernardino County officials, Juvenile Hall was dangerously over capacity and the overcrowding needed to be relieved. San Bernardino’s only alternative was a home supervision program. The program was an alternative to detention and was an out-of-custody short-term program designed for juveniles to stay at home with constant supervision. The probation officers were required to visit the juveniles daily.

In 1991, supervising Superior Court Judge Betty Richli authorized the implementation of an electronic monitoring program. Juvenile Hall administrators researched and created a program that met their specific needs. They leased 40 units for three years and began San Bernardino county’s first electronic monitoring program. The Juvenile Court
would order a juvenile to be placed on electronic monitoring home confinement and the probation department would honor the court order. According to San Bernardino County officials, the program has saved San Bernardino County $755,000. This cost would have been spent incarcerating juveniles. The program also has a system for relieving overcrowding at the juvenile hall facility.

The old equipment brought similar problems to San Bernardino officers. For example, call forwarding was used by a juvenile while staying at a friend's home. A juvenile cut and manipulated the transmitter strap to continue the circuit and thereby avoiding detection.

In 1994, San Bernardino leased a state-of-the-art BI 9,000 system for three years. A transmitter and/or monitor can be programmed to the same frequency as one or more transmitters and/or monitors. If the transmitter is lost, then the monitor can be reprogrammed. Several monitors can be programmed to one transmitter. An offender can be tracked over any area that a monitor is installed within range. The transmitter will reset a tamper alarm three times. This ensures that the tamper is not a false alarm. An officer still has to respond and reset the transmitter after the third alarm.

San Bernardino officers have not had any reported problems with the new electronic monitoring system. They estimate that 80% of the participants successfully complete
the program. They do not have a minimum or maximum time limit that an offender may participate in the program. One juvenile has been electronically monitored for one year and eight months. They state this is an exception and the judge continues to order the juvenile on electronic monitoring. They feel strongly that the system works and is worth expanding. They encourage all agencies to implement an electronic monitoring program.
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Recommendation

Riverside County was the first in the state of California to implement an electronic monitoring program for pre-sentenced offenders. The program lasted only eight months because the court orders relieving jail overcrowding released all the offenders eligible for the program. Riverside County juvenile probation division inherited the electronic monitoring equipment and so they had to construct a program around the equipment.

San Bernardino started their electronic monitoring program about three years after Riverside County. San Bernardino County officers researched and designed a program to fit the needs of the county. They leased equipment appropriate for the program they would implement.

The statistics indicate the programs are a success. A high percentage of juvenile participants successfully complete the program and the program saves money. It relieves overcrowding and juveniles' home life has the possibility of improving.

The programs have not received very much public attention. Before expanding the program, this author would urge a public survey to determine the level of education and acceptance of the current and an expanded program.

The programs are not without problems. Juveniles will test every system or program. They have tested the elec-
tronic monitoring program without successfully circumventing the system.

This author recommends that parental or guardian participation always be a part of Riverside and San Bernardino County's electronic monitoring program. Frequent personal contacts by a qualified probation officer should continue. A thorough screening of participants would ensure successful completion of the program. San Bernardino and Riverside counties should expand the programs to include sentencing of adult offenders.

Incarcerated adult offenders could be screened and then given an option of remaining incarcerated or participating and paying for an electronic monitoring program. San Bernardino and Riverside counties should cross train other probation officers in electronic monitoring programs. This would provide the programs with the additional staffing needed for expansion and prevent any complications caused by a staffing shortage.

Riverside County should update the equipment using the latest technology. They should expand the length of time a juvenile is allowed to participate in a program, and expand the area of service for juveniles. The new technology would assist in the expansion of Riverside's program. Riverside County should update the computer to provide a dial-in terminal. Officers would be able to call in and retrieve information or update a participant's file from a remote
terminal. They should purchase a pager alarm modem for the computer. This would allow an officer out in the field to be notified of a violation. Finally, they should purchase a mobile monitoring unit to assist the officer in the field. The mobile monitor unit could locate lost transmitters or runaway participants.

Electronic monitoring is well established, and it will only improve with updated technology. To guarantee a successful program prospective agencies should research and design a program to fit the needs of their individual jurisdictions. Careful consideration should be given to the type of equipment, the money available for the program, and education and training of staffing. Prospective participants should be carefully screened to ensure successful completion of the program.
APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

1. What were the alternatives before electronic monitoring?

2. How did the program get started?

3. What is the history of the program?

4. Was your program modeled after any particular program? Why?

5. Why was the program started?

6. What type of participants were initially monitored? Felons or misdemeanors; males or females; adults or juveniles?

7. Over time, what type of participants were monitored?

8. How did you track the participants?

9. What was their recidivism rate while in the program?

10. Did you track the participants after completing the program?

11. What was their recidivism rate after completing the program?

12. What were the initial statistics or the yearly statistics?

13. How has the program expanded?

14. What are the future plans?

15. What lessons would you give to other agencies interested in electronic monitoring programs?
## APPENDIX B

Riverside County

Riverside County: Riverside & Indio Juvenile Hall Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Capacity</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Year in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Estimate</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From July through November, 1988

APPENDIX C

San Bernardino County

San Bernardino County Juvenile Hall Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Facility Population</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per year in Electronic Monitoring Programs</td>
<td>&quot;NI&quot;</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>+NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Program Completion Estimate</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Electronic Monitoring was not implemented (NI) until 1991
+No Statistics Available (NA)
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