



- **S.A.M. Program**  
Substance Abuse Monitoring Program
- **SCRAM®**  
Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring
- **Electronic Monitoring**  
G.P.S. Tracking & House Arrest
- **V.I.P. Program**  
Vehicle Ignition Interlock Program

**"Information You Need! Service You Trust!"™**

---

**William L. Parker**  
**House Bill 365 – GPS Guidelines**  
**Proponent Testimony**  
**House Criminal Justice Committee**  
**December 15, 2017**

Chairman Manning, Vice-Chair Rezabek, Ranking Member Celebreeze and members of the House Criminal Justice Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today in support of House Bill 365, a bill to establish reasonable guidelines for monitoring and / or tracking criminal defendants placed on GPS and other electronic home incarceration devices.

I am here today as a veteran of the electronic monitoring industry in support of House Bill 365 and hope to bring important insight to the discussion about how to effectively monitor and / or track criminal defendants placed on these tools of the criminal justice system. My remarks today will primarily address Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) tracking devices. While these tools provide many advantages to pretrial, probation and parole agencies, they are essentially meaningless without specific guidelines and restrictive behavior protocols put in place by judges or supervising officers.

GPS devices utilize three separate technologies; global positioning by communicating with commercially available satellites, cellular telephone service and an on-board computer chip designed to translate and communicate GPS trace points to an Internet-based application used to display a defendant's movements and location. Criminal defendants are monitored in one of two ways; most often by probation and parole officers who monitor ankle bracelets provided by one of almost a dozen manufacturers and by for-profit companies who contract with courts to monitor defendants and report infractions. The fundamental misconception about GPS devices is that once attached to a defendant's ankle, the people tasked with monitoring the individual will know the defendant's location at every moment and what the defendant is doing. Put another way, there is a wide-spread belief that some authority is continuously watching the whereabouts and movements of a defendant wearing a GPS ankle monitor. Nothing could be farther from the truth. It is not the practice, nor is it practical for a probation or parole officer to continuously "watch" with eyes glued to a computer screen 24-hours a day, seven days a week every defendant placed on an ankle monitor.

The effective monitoring of a criminal defendant is accomplished through a set of restrictive behavior protocols referred to as (1) curfews, (2) inclusion zones, (3) exclusion zones and (4) schedules. Without these protocols, the only thing that a GPS ankle monitor can offer is the defendant's location via a query to the web application, and the trace points will be one to 10 minutes old at the time of the query. Only with the proper restrictive behavior protocols in place can probation and parole officers or others effectively monitor a defendant wearing a GPS device. The curfews, inclusion and exclusion zones and schedules, combined with the technology of the bracelet send automated alerts to those "watching" the defendant when a violation is detected.

The practice of placing a defendant on a GPS bracelet without restrictive protocols is commonly referred to as simply "tracking, and while this practice may be sufficient for some low-risk offenders, the critical challenges faced by those of us behind the computer screen are attempting to monitor someone who is homeless and monitoring offenders for whom the court has not put restrictive protocols in place. Without a curfew, a verifiable work or school schedule and / or exclusion zones, defendants can travel at will wherever and whenever they choose. A GPS ankle monitor will not alert authorities unless it detects a curfew violation, non-compliance with a work or school schedule or that the defendant has traveled into a geographical area from which he or she been ordered to avoid. It is my belief that when courts impose appropriate restrictive behaviors it enhances our ability to effectively monitor defendants placed on electronic devices.

Thank you, again, for the privilege of appearing before you. I have attached examples of Inclusion and Exclusion zones and welcome your questions.