

157017

TECHNOLOGY ISSUES IN CORRECTIONS AGENCIES: RESULTS OF A 1995 SURVEY



Special Issues in Corrections

July 1995

LIS, Inc.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
Information Center
Longmont, Colorado

TECHNOLOGY ISSUES IN CORRECTIONS AGENCIES: RESULTS OF A 1995 SURVEY

Special Issues in Corrections

July 1995

157017

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

LIS, Inc.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
Information Center
Longmont, Colorado

Special Issues in Corrections is prepared by staff of LIS, Inc., in cooperation with the Prisons Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, under contract no. J100C0017DQ9. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the National Institute of Corrections. To submit questions or comments, please write to the NIC Information Center, 1860 Industrial Circle, Suite A, Longmont, Colorado, 80501, or call (800) 877-1461.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
PROJECT OVERVIEW	3
Purpose	3
Project Method	3
SECTION I: CURRENT USE OF TECHNOLOGY	5
Use and Evaluation Data: Security Technologies	6
Perimeter Security	6
Identification/Access Control	7
Internal Monitoring/Surveillance	8
Drug Use Detection	9
Contraband Detection	10
Security Communications	11
Less-than-Lethal Weapons	12
Other Security Technologies	13
Use and Evaluation Data: Non-Security Technologies	14
Electronic Monitoring of Offenders in the Community	14
Non-Emergency Communications within the Agency	15
Information Linkage with Sources Outside the Agency	16
Staff Development	17
Offender Education and Training	18
Other Technologies for Non-Security Purposes	19
SECTION II: ISSUES RELATED TO THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY	20
How Agencies Evaluate Proposed Technologies	20
Obstacles to Adopting New Technologies	20
Technologies Dropped by Corrections Agencies	21
New Technologies Being Tested	22
Recommendations for Improvements to Existing Technologies	23
Unmet Needs in Corrections Technology	24
Agency Preferences in Accessing NIJ Technology Clearinghouse	25
Appendix A. Technology Tables	
Appendix B. Agency Contacts	
Appendix C. Survey Instrument	

TECHNOLOGY ISSUES IN CORRECTIONS AGENCIES: RESULTS OF A 1995 SURVEY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) in 1994 expanded the focus of its work in technology certification and technology transfer to specifically address the needs of corrections agencies. NIJ has formed the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center (NLECTC) network, comprising several regional offices from which agencies can obtain equipment performance reports and the results of standards testing. Though much of the information now available is specific to law enforcement needs, NLECTC's Corrections Council will be assisting in the identification of real-world needs and priorities for corrections agencies.

To further assist NIJ in delineating corrections agency needs and priorities, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) initiated a project to gather basic data that would assess current utilization of technology by corrections agencies and identify their unmet technology needs. The NIC Information Center in March 1995 began a project to gather this information from corrections agencies, surveying the nation's largest local jails and jail systems, federal and state adult prison systems, and state and local agencies that provide adult probation and/or parole supervision.

Aims of the research were several:

- To gather together information on specific technologies being used or tested for adoption;
- To obtain data on how agencies evaluate particular technologies they are using or have used;
- To identify areas of corrections practice for which technologies could be developed or improved; and
- To identify issues in the technology adoption process that could be an opportunity to further target the assistance that NIJ will offer corrections agencies.

The report is intended to assist not only NIJ project staff, but also correctional agency personnel who would like to know more about other agencies' use of and experiences with specific technologies.

Project Method

A survey instrument was distributed in March 1995 to 218 federal, state, and local correctional agencies. Responses were received from 148 of the agencies surveyed. Data were obtained in security-related and non-security related categories:

- **Security Technologies:** Perimeter security; internal monitoring/surveillance; identification/access control; drug interdiction; contraband detection; security communications; and less-than-lethal weapons.
- **Non-Security Technologies:** Electronic monitoring of offenders in the community; non-security communications; information linkage with sources outside the agency; staff development; and offender education/training.

Project staff separately analyzed the data for each of the major segments of the corrections field: adult prison systems, jails, and community-based corrections. Preliminary results were compiled for use at NIJ's June 1995 technology conference in Charleston, South Carolina. The final report includes data from 48 adult prison systems, 44 large jails and jail systems, and 56 community-based corrections agencies.

Research Findings

Study data indicate which technologies are in the widest use and how agencies evaluate them, identify innovative technologies, and outline technology needs as identified by respondents.

■ **Technologies with the highest user evaluations.** Nine technologies received the highest possible rating from at least half of the agencies that use them, within an analysis group. Examples include magnetic card systems for identification/access control in jails, X-ray systems for contraband detection in jails, automatic personal distress alarms in adult prison systems, and distance technology for offender education/training in adult prison systems.

■ **Technologies dropped from use.** Several technologies with high overall ratings have, paradoxically, been dropped from use by other agencies. Examples include video surveillance, electronic monitoring, self-contained urinalysis drug detection, X-ray contraband detection, and perimeter microwave. In many cases, technologies were found to have limited benefits or did not perform adequately. Systems gave frequent false alarms, were difficult to maintain, or were incompatible with other systems being used. Others were not cost-effective.

■ **Agency suggestions for improving technologies.** The report includes many observations on the strengths and weaknesses of particular technologies as well as agencies' recommendations for overall technology improvement, such as increased durability, serviceability, and capacity to interface with other systems. Recommended improvements for specific technologies include the establishment of a uniform design for automated offender data systems, an upgrade to 24-hour location tracking of offenders under community supervision, and changes in fixed closed-circuit television cameras to permit their manipulation by remote control.

■ **Unmet technology needs.** Survey data indicate that many of the technological needs identified by respondents are already being addressed in other agencies, either on a trial basis or in standard operations. Examples of reported needs are information storage and retrieval technology, weapons detection technology, and voice technology that would allow probationers with limited literacy skills to interact more effectively with computers.

Issues In Technology Evaluation/Implementation

Three main obstacles were cited by corrections agency respondents as inhibiting their exploration and adoption of new technologies:

- A lack of available funds;
- Insufficient staff resources to explore technology options; and
- A lack of information on available technologies.

By providing a networking point for data on new technological applications, the NLECTC initiative shows promise for helping to address the latter two of these obstacles. Though the technology centers are still in a developmental stage, interested persons can contact the national center located in Rockville, Maryland, by calling (800) 248-2742.

TECHNOLOGY ISSUES IN CORRECTIONS AGENCIES: RESULTS OF A 1995 SURVEY

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Purpose

This document reports the results of a survey conducted by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Information Center beginning in March 1995. The survey is part of a collaborative NIC-National Institute of Justice (NIJ) effort to encourage technology transfer in areas that will be useful in improving corrections operations.

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) in 1994 expanded the focus of its work in technology certification and technology transfer to specifically address the needs of corrections agencies. NIJ has formed the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center (NLECTC) network, comprising several regional offices from which agencies can obtain equipment performance reports and the results of standards testing. Though much of the information now available is specific to law enforcement needs, NLECTC's Corrections Council will be assisting in the identification of real-world needs and priorities for corrections agencies.

To further assist NIJ in delineating corrections agency needs and priorities, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) initiated the present project to gather data on current utilization of technology by corrections agencies and to identify agencies' unmet technology needs.

Specific aims of the research were:

- To gather together information on specific technologies being used or tested for adoption;
- To obtain data on how agencies evaluate particular technologies they are using or have used;
- To identify areas of corrections practice for which technologies could be developed or improved; and
- To identify issues in the technology adoption process that could be an opportunity for further targeting the assistance that NIJ would offer corrections agencies.

Project Method

The survey instrument was distributed to a total of 218 federal, state, and local corrections agencies:

- 54 state and federal agencies responsible for the administration of adult prisons, including 50 state departments of corrections (DOCs), the District of Columbia DOC, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Correctional Service of Canada, and the Puerto Rico Department of Corrections;
- 80 large jails and jail systems; and
- 84 community corrections agencies, including state and local agencies with responsibility for probation and/or parole supervision.

State corrections agencies that provide both institutional and community-based services were asked to complete a separate survey for each of these functions.

Project staff made follow-up calls to the state DOCs, to solicit as many responses as possible from these agencies. No follow-up calls were made to large jails or community corrections agencies, and a smaller proportion of these agencies responded to the survey. Data were obtained from 148 agencies, including 48 adult prison systems, 44 large jails/jail systems, and 56 community corrections agencies.

Tables in Appendix A list the agencies that use specific technologies in each category. Appendix B lists the contact in each responding agency for information on technological applications.

SECTION I: AGENCIES' CURRENT USE OF TECHNOLOGY

Section I provides a overview of the technologies currently being used by corrections agencies and the agencies' levels of satisfaction with the technologies most commonly used. Tabulated data summarize survey responses by analysis group—adult prison systems, large jails/jail systems, and community corrections agencies—and by category of application. The comments listed under each table are those of individual survey respondents and may or may not represent the views of others.

Corrections agencies' current applications of technology are characterized in this report as "security technologies" and "non-security technologies." After covering specific technologies within each of several application categories, the report includes data on additional technologies for security and non-security purposes.

Security technologies include those used for the following categories:

- Perimeter security;
- Identification/access control;
- Internal monitoring/surveillance;
- Drug use detection;
- Contraband detection;
- Security communications; and
- Less-than-lethal weapons.

Non-security technologies include those used for the following applications:

- Electronic monitoring of offenders in the community;
- Non-emergency communications within the agency;
- Information linkages with sources outside the agency;
- Staff development; and
- Offender education and training.

The data cover only the ways agencies use technological approaches in their operations. Therefore, reports of non-technological approaches to performing a function were not included in the study. Examples include staff patrols for security purposes, ID cards reviewed by security staff, batons used by staff, and training delivered by staff.

On some tables, the total number of agencies ranking a particular technology does not agree with the number of agencies actually using it. The reasons for the discrepancy vary. Some responding agencies chose not to make an evaluation, some gave more than one ranking, and in some cases—apparently drawing on past experience or general knowledge—an agency indicated a level of satisfaction with a technology it is not currently using. The data are simply reported as given.

Use and Evaluation Data: Security Technologies

Perimeter Security

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
22	Video camera motion detectors	3	16	3	—
32	Microwave sensors	11	20	2	1
13	Infrared sensors	3	9	1	2
23	Taut wire	5	15	3	—
13	Buried cable	4	6	3	—
	Other: Fence vibration alarm; microphones; fiber optic net; ultrasonic; fence-mounted cable				

Comments:

- Cameras don't adjust automatically for light/sun/darkness and need continual adjusting.
- Vibration-type sensors cause too many nuisance alarms, and maintenance costs are too high.
- Buried cable has maintenance problems, and false alarms are caused by pressure changes in the ground.
- Microphone monitoring didn't work well; the agency is switching to fiber optics.
- Video and infrared are both working well.
- One agency has multiple subsystems (video, microwave, taut wire, buried cable, fence detection) integrated with CCTV to provide full electronic detection and surveillance at major sites.

Large jails (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
21	Video camera motion detectors	4	13	2	—
6	Microwave sensors	2	3	1	—
4	Infrared sensors	1	3	—	—
14	Taut wire	5	6	1	—
4	Buried cable	2	2	—	—
	Other: Video w/o motion detection; fence vibration alarm; ultrasonic				

Comments:

- Older video cameras give poor picture quality.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
6	Video camera motion detectors	—	5	—	—
0	Microwave sensors	—	—	—	—
0	Infrared sensors	—	—	—	—
0	Taut wire	—	—	—	—
0	Buried cable	—	—	—	—

Identification/Access Control

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
7	Key pad	2	5	1	–
14	Card (magnetic strip)	2	8	1	1
3	Bar code	–	3	1	1
1	Voice recognition	–	–	1	–
8	Fingerprint recognition	1	6	–	1
	Other: Hand geometry reader; digitized mug shot				

Comments:

- Agency has experienced too many failures with barcode readers.
- Some software problems have surfaced with the biometric hand measurement device, but the technology is still regarded as having good potential.
- Cards used for building entry are often inoperative, and manual operation is required for entry
- No technologies are accurate enough.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
12	Key pad	3	9	–	–
12	Card (magnetic strip)	6	6	–	–
8	Bar code	2	5	1	–
0	Voice recognition	–	–	–	–
6	Fingerprint recognition	1	4	–	1
	Other: Video imaging; electronic locks with video; weigand card for staff; proximity card; wristbands				

Comments:

- There have been problems with proximity card readers that the manufacturer cannot explain.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
10	Key pad	3	8	–	–
6	Card (magnetic strip)	2	2	1	–
0	Bar code	–	–	–	–
1	Voice recognition	1	1	–	–
2	Fingerprint recognition	–	2	–	–
	Other: anklets				

Comments:

- Agency is getting hand geometry readers, which worked well in a pilot last year to identify probationers.

Internal Monitoring/Surveillance

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
34	Video camera motion detectors	5	22	2	1
5	Infrared sensors	1	3	-	1
5	Volumetric sensors	-	4	1	1
6	Noise sensors	-	5	-	1

Comments:

- Quality of cameras could be improved, as could the picture.
- Video cameras are used at several locations, with varying success.
- Color monitors are very desirable in security cells.
- Cameras don't adjust automatically for light, sun, or darkness; they need constant manual adjustments.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

Technologies in use		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
32	Video camera motion detectors	6	17	1	-
5	Infrared sensors	2	3	-	-
0	Volumetric sensors	-	-	-	-
5	Noise sensors	2	4	2	-
	Other: Ultrasonic ID; video w/o motion detection; magnetic contact				

Comments:

- Color monitors are much better than black and white.
- Audio monitors in inmate housing unit fail frequently and can't be monitored appropriately.
- Monitors with sound are needed in some areas.
- These technologies are not needed in a direct supervision facility.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
8	Video camera motion detectors	1	6	-	-
2	Infrared sensors	-	2	-	-
1	Volumetric sensors	-	1	-	-
4	Noise sensors	-	4	-	-

Drug Use Detection

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
27	Urinalysis (self-contained unit)	9	19	-	-
37	Urinalysis (laboratory processing)	14	20	3	-
0	Retinal scan (involuntary eye motion)	-	-	-	-
0	Air sensors	-	1	-	-
25	Breath analyzer	5	17	2	-
	Other: Ion scanner				

Comments:

- With self-contained UA units, the short shelf life of reagents drives costs up.
- The portable breath analyzer is too temperature-sensitive for field work.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
16	Urinalysis (self-contained unit)	8	8	-	-
24	Urinalysis (laboratory processing)	9	18	-	-
1	Retinal scan (involuntary eye motion)	-	1	-	-
0	Air sensors	-	-	-	-
27	Breath analyzer	12	15	-	-

Comments:

- A urinalysis vendor promised more than he could deliver.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
31	Urinalysis (self-contained unit)	10	20	1	-
51	Urinalysis (laboratory processing)	18	33	1	-
1	Retinal scan (involuntary eye motion)	-	1	-	-
0	Air sensors	-	-	-	-
33	Breath analyzer	12	20	1	-

Comments:

- Urinalysis cannot differentiate between over-the-counter drugs and amphetamines/methamphetamines.

Contraband Detection

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
42	Hand-held metal detector	7	34	1	—
41	Walk-through metal detector	7	30	2	1
32	X-ray	9	10	1	—
0	Infrared sensor	—	—	—	2
35	Agency uses "drug dogs"	9	23	3	1
	Other: Ion scanner; carbon dioxide detector				

Comments:

- Drug dogs are too aggressive when used on people.
- X-ray units are very expensive.
- Drug dogs are very effective.
- Electronic scanners have been used successfully.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
40	Hand-held metal detector	8	28	4	—
40	Walk-through metal detector	10	26	5	—
12	X-ray	6	6	—	—
1	Infrared sensor	1	—	—	—
22	Agency uses "drug dogs"	10	12	1	—

Comments:

- Hand-held metal detector doesn't work properly in facility built with too much steel; lots of rebar in facility creates many false readings.
- Walk-through scanner is not durable; lights and computer monitors create interference problems.
- The devices are outstanding; however, if the operator is not trained and motivated, effectiveness diminishes.
- X-ray technology is used for inmate clothing and property, and hand-held and walk-through metal detectors are used to check visitors.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
22	Hand-held metal detector	2	16	2	—
21	Walk-through metal detector	4	12	3	—
2	X-ray	—	2	—	—
0	Infrared sensor	—	—	—	—
10	Agency uses "drug dogs"	4	5	—	—

Comments:

- Hand-held metal detector is more effective when used in concert with walk-through detectors.
- Drug dogs are rarely used but are very effective.
- Metal detector is available only at the agency's largest office.

Security Communications

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
27	Personal duress alarms (manual)	7	13	7	—
12	Personal duress alarms (automatic)	7	4	2	1
43	Portable two-way radio	13	26	1	—
37	Pagers	10	23	2	—
36	Mobile telephones	13	21	1	1
	Other: phone alarms; satellite tracking				

Comments:

- Radios, pagers, and mobile telephones all have restrictions related to buildings, specific geography, and range.
- Two-way radios cannot get adequate, statewide access to local law enforcement channels.
- Pagers have FLSA implications.
- Radio communications tend to be too expensive.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
26	Personal duress alarms (manual)	8	17	1	—
11	Personal duress alarms (automatic)	4	8	—	—
41	Portable two-way radio	14	29	1	—
26	Pagers	10	18	1	—
25	Mobile telephones	11	14	—	—
	Other: Scan pen alarms; CCTV and telephone intercoms; hotlines				

Comments:

- Scan pen alarm devices are effective in transmitting a signal to central control in an emergency.
- An antenna system built into the facility would improve two-way radio transmission.
- Personal duress alarms have had too many false alarms when the device is on automatic mode.
- Pagers should be digital rather than via voice.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
15	Personal duress alarms (manual)	3	10	2	—
3	Personal duress alarms (automatic)	2	—	—	—
43	Portable two-way radio	6	30	7	—
38	Pagers	11	27	—	—
44	Mobile telephones	16	25	—	—
	Other: law enforcement dispatch				

Comments:

- Hand-held portable radios do not have good reception.
- Populated metro areas make it impossible to have a dedicated frequency on low-priced radios.
- Mobile phones are used only by intensive supervision agents.
- Personal security alarms are used in the drinking driver monitoring program; two-way radios are used for home detention and warrant apprehension units.

Less-than-Lethal Weapons

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
37	OC pepper spray	19	19	1	-
9	Bean bag gun	-	6	1	1
11	Taser	1	5	-	1
	Other: Sting ball; electric shield; electronic immobilizer; aqueous foam, stun baton				

Comments:

- The taser is not legal in Rhode Island.
- It is difficult to maintain training on the various types of batons.
- One agency is adopting new policies to authorize use of OC pepper spray and the electronic capture shield.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
28	OC pepper spray	13	13	-	-
2	Bean bag gun	-	2	-	-
6	Taser	2	4	-	-
	Other: CN gas; electric shields; stinger guns; Arwen rifle; gas cannon; react belts; flash bang				

Comments:

- One respondent commented that all the listed technologies are in violation of ACA standards.
- OC spray has greatly reduced injuries among staff and inmates.
- CN gas has not been used in the eight years it's been available in the facility.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
44	OC pepper spray	14	24	2	-
0	Bean bag gun	-	-	-	-
0	Taser	-	-	-	-
	Other: stun baton				

Comments:

- OC spray is only for use on animals.
- Spray is hard to control, especially in wind and when a large number of people are involved.

Other Security Technologies

Survey respondents were asked to identify other unique or emerging technologies their agencies currently use for security purposes. The resulting lists of technologies, below, do not include those listed under "Other" on the preceding technology tables. Where the agency provided a 1-to-4 ranking of a technology, that ranking is indicated in parentheses.

Adult prison systems

- Night visor scopes (1)
- Hostage telephones (2)
- Specialized firearms (2)
- Sticky foam (3)
- Gang offender and investigative database to track security-related incidents
- Electronic security belt
- Inmate telephone system to control, monitor, and administer inmate wage
- In-house photo imaging system for inmate, staff, and visitor photos
- ID cards to replace antiquated and costly 35mm camera equipment
- System for transmitting inmate photos to police and parole authorities via fax or A-1 mail
- V&C monitoring equipment.

Large jails/jail systems

- Nova shields
- System for storing still videos of inmates on-line; videos are accessible from the jail and various police departments' terminals. Black and white and color photos, wanted posters, and montages can be generated instantly.
- MUGIS system stores images on optical disk
- Fire alarm (3, because of software)
- NCS access control (2)
- Peschel lighting control (2)
- Restraint chair (2)
- Two-way radios with "tilt" alarms
- Electronic restraint devices
- Electroshock transport belt
- Integrated touch-scan technology (2)
- Bar coding for automated head count, involving arm bands and portable readers (4—agency is dissatisfied with system 16 months after installation).

Community-based corrections

- CCTV used for specific rooms, e.g., for facilities holding minors at high risk of suicide
- Bullet-proof vests
- One agency has armed all officers with deadly force capability at great cost, but the officers have never yet had to use deadly force.

Use and Evaluation Data: Non-Security Technologies

Electronic monitoring

The following table indicates the number of agencies under each corrections category that reported using electronic monitoring of offenders in the community and, on a 1-to-4 scale, the average level of satisfaction with electronic monitoring reported by each type of agency.

The large number of state adult DOCs reporting the electronic monitoring of offenders in the community may be explained in part by the use of electronic monitoring in work release or other similar programs operated by these agencies. However, because some DOCs provide both institutional and community-based correctional services, the categories of community corrections and adult prisons in this table may not be mutually exclusive.

	No. of agencies using active EM	No. of agencies using passive EM	Total agencies using EM	Average satisfaction level (1 to 4 scale, 1 = highest)
Adult prison systems (N=48)	22	7	29	1.9
Large jails/jail systems (N=44)	19	8	27	2.4
Community-based corrections (N=56)	37	12	49	2.3

Prison respondents' comments:

- One agency that ranked electronic monitoring at (1) noted that they "understand the limitations of this type of equipment."
- It is expensive to fund phone bills and overtime related to the use of electronic monitoring.

Jail respondents' comments:

- There are problems with vendor equipment and maintenance.
- One agency was dissatisfied and quit using electronic monitoring.
- There is a need for more outside assistance from police agencies and more in-house staff for monitoring.
- Current equipment is old and has problems related to short battery life. Newer technology will have longer battery life, built-in phones, and built-in breath analyzers.

Community corrections respondents' comments:

- The current system is expensive to maintain and implement.
- One agency would prefer a satellite tracking system.
- The passive system is used to back up the active system and has provided a viable option to the continuum of sanctions.
- Voice recognition is a part of the agency's home detention technology.

Non-Emergency Communications Within the Agency

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
37	Computer local area network (LAN) with e-mail capability	7	27	2	-
24	Computer wide area network (WAN) with e-mail capability	6	17	2	-
2	Video conferencing (satellite link)	-	4	-	-
8	Video conferencing (non-satellite)	1	3	1	-
	Other: Photo imaging; offender records information and operations network; mid-range computer network; fax				

Comments:

- Agency is working toward video conferencing, but funding is a problem, as is re-wiring the prison complex.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
25	Computer local area network (LAN) with e-mail capability	9	11	4	-
13	Computer wide area network (WAN) with e-mail capability	5	5	2	-
3	Video conferencing (satellite link)	2	2	-	-
5	Video conferencing (non-satellite)	2	3	-	-
	Other: Jail management system; computer network w/o e-mail; fax				

Comments

- A LAN in initial stages of development has been troublesome and frequently delayed for technical reasons.
- The in-house offender management information system is too slow to keep up with the inmate population; a new upgraded system is scheduled to be implemented this year.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
38	Computer local area network (LAN) with e-mail capability	12	24	1	-
26	Computer wide area network (WAN) with e-mail capability	11	13	3	-
6	Video conferencing (satellite link)	2	5	-	-
8	Video conferencing (non-satellite)	3	3	1	-
	Other: PC remote dial-in; Internet; LAN w/o e-mail; fax				

Comments:

- A mainframe-based WAN is minimally adequate, but slow and cumbersome.
- Because LAN and WAN technology are not available in all offices, statewide efficiency is limited.

Information Linkage with Sources Outside the Agency

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
34	Federal online offender information system (NCIC)	12	22	–	–
34	Local or state online offender information system	8	24	2	–
19	Local or state government information system (not for offender data)	4	12	3	–
11	Other online systems	3	7	1	–
14	Internet	2	12	–	–
8	CD-ROM	3	5	–	–

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
42	Federal online offender information system (NCIC)	13	27	–	–
42	Local or state online offender information system	15	26	2	–
19	Local or state government information system (not for offender data)	7	12	–	–
11	Other online systems	1	9	1	–
3	Internet	1	2	–	–
4	CD-ROM	2	2	–	–

Comments:

- Having a state online system but no local system creates a significant problem with lack of access to large numbers of local warrants from multiple jurisdictions in the metro area.
- The inability of county agencies (courts, sheriff, police) to share data has been frustrating.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
40	Federal online offender information system (NCIC)	14	22	3	–
50	Local or state online offender information system	13	31	4	–
24	Local or state government information system (not for offender data)	5	14	3	–
13	Other online systems	2	11	–	–
6	Internet	1	4	–	–
9	CD-ROM	1	4	–	–

Individual respondents' comments:

- The state-wide (LEDS) system is the only comprehensive offender information system. It is inadequate, needs to be expanded.
- The system connected to other agencies is hard to use; it needs to be more user-friendly.

Staff Development

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
43	Video tapes	14	31	–	–
11	Closed circuit television	2	9	1	–
17	Distance technology (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)	3	13	1	–
1	Interactive computer labs, simulations	–	–	–	–

Comments:

- Videotapes need to incorporate local situations and cultural cues.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
42	Video tapes	9	33	–	–
11	Closed circuit television	3	8	–	–
12	Distance technology (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)	4	8	–	–
11	Interactive computer labs, simulations	3	8	–	–

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
50	Video tapes	11	33	4	–
6	Closed circuit television	1	4	1	–
14	Distance technology (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)	1	13	1	–
13	Interactive computer labs, simulations	3	8	–	–

Comments:

- Staff are not always aware that videotapes are available.
- Videoconferencing is available on a limited basis through another agency (state police and corrections training academy). It is used for NIC training events.

Offender Education and Training

Adult prison systems (N=48)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
42	Video tapes	10	30	-	-
19	Closed circuit television	7	12	-	-
12	Distance technologies (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)	6	4	2	-
37	Computer labs	14	21	1	-

Comments:

- Results with computer assisted instruction are mixed, but the DOC expects improvement in the next year.
- One DOC provides instructional delivery through cooperation with public access cable TV. Programming is available to inmates and their families, as well as probationers and parolees.
- Any inmate access to computers can be problematic; respondent would prefer CD-ROM technology with no disk drives for floppy disk.

Large jails/jail systems (N=44)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
32	Video tapes	6	25	1	-
10	Closed circuit television	2	7	1	-
6	Distance technologies (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)	2	4	-	-
25	Computer labs	8	17	-	-

Comments:

- Because of the high signal level of broadcast TV, it is impossible to force inmates to watch educational TV.
- Many inmates find the computer labs insufficiently user-friendly.
- Videotapes receive minimal use in a jail setting.
- One agency is now installing a computer lab and expects that it will be very satisfactory.
- An agency is starting an automated computer learning program that will provide self-paced work in learning to read and write.

Community-based corrections (N=56)

No. of agencies using technology		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
35	Video tapes	-	27	1	-
2	Closed circuit television	-	1	-	-
4	Distance technologies (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)	-	2	1	-
14	Computer labs	3	11	-	-

Other Technologies Used for Non-Security Purposes

Survey respondents were asked to list other unique or emerging technologies their agencies are currently using for non-security purposes. These technologies, identified below, are in addition to those listed under "Other" on the preceding tables. Where the agency provided a 1-to-4 ranking of a technology, that ranking is indicated in parentheses.

Adult prison systems

- Satellite link for inmate programs
- Cloud technologies (SMDS, frame relay, ATM)
- An Internet Home Page linked to staff development
- Video conferencing/satellite link
- Non-satellite video conferencing for delivery of medical care
- Videoconferencing, as part of a statewide service for all public and non-profit agencies
- FATS (1)
- Computer-generated graphics used instead of overheads for staff development
- Intelligent video learning system (IVLS)
- Automotive diagnostic system from Ford Motor Company.

Large jails/jail systems

- Fiber optic data lines (working well)
- On-line jail management system, dumb terminal, and VAX
- On-line intake and release tied to a mainframe
- Automatic fingerprint system (2)
- Telematic prisoner phone
- Video conferencing between court, inmates, probation, attorneys, etc.
- Computer system to identify and select inmate property

Community-based corrections agencies

- Document imaging system
- Notebook computer project to allow community corrections officers in the field to connect to the offender database in real time. The system, which will include notebook computer, for every three officers, will also provide e-mail access, using both switched cellular and CDPD transmission formats.
- Voice mail network
- System for entering offender data in the field and transferring the data on a weekly basis to all sites in the state
- An automated system in a county probation agency, which will make the Board a central repository for county probation and parole data.

SECTION II: ISSUES RELATED TO THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY

This section summarizes survey responses on issues related to agencies' use of technology and their suggestions for how technology might better meet corrections' needs. Information is provided on:

- How agencies evaluate new technologies before they are adopted;
- The obstacles that have limited agencies' adoption of new technologies;
- Technologies that have been dropped from use because they failed to meet agencies' needs;
- Some technologies currently being evaluated or tested;
- Survey respondents' suggestions for making existing technologies more effective for corrections use;
- Aspects of corrections that respondents believe technology might help to address; and
- Agencies' preferred methods of accessing NIJ's technology information.

How Agencies Evaluate Proposed Technologies

Agencies may evaluate proposed technologies through a designated person, a standing committee, or ad hoc committees. Although some agencies have not established any formal approach for considering new technologies, most corrections agencies use a combination of evaluation methods to select proposed technologies. Often, the selection process has several steps, with a designated person or small group making an initial decision, which is then taken to a standing or ad hoc committee for a final determination. For all types of corrections agencies, the most common single approach to evaluating proposed technologies is to establish an ad hoc committee, presumably comprised of those with the most expertise or need for a particular type of technology.

Several respondents indicated that their agency relies on outside consultants, seminars, and site visits, along with the work of established or ad hoc committees, in making technology decisions. A few agencies, especially state departments of corrections, conduct pilot tests or demonstrations projects prior to adopting a particular technology.

Obstacles to Adopting New Technologies

Across all three corrections sectors, respondents ranked the lack of funding as the primary obstacle to an agency's adoption of new technologies. A lack of staff resources to explore options was ranked second by all groups. For jails and DOCs, the third most important element in limiting the agency's use of technology is a lack of information on available technologies. Community corrections respondents ranked as third in importance the need to work with or through another agency to acquire technology. Six DOCs and one jail respondent indicated that their agency had experienced no obstacles in adopting technologies.

Technologies Dropped by Corrections Agencies

Ten large jails, twelve community corrections agencies, and seventeen DOCs have stopped using particular technologies because they failed to meet the agency's needs. The technologies dropped and, where identified, the reasons for the agency's dissatisfaction, are as follows.

Adult prison systems (DOCs)	Perimeter microwave	Too many false alarms; high maintenance costs.
	Taser	Litigation; limited benefits.
	Personal body alarm	(Not described.)
	Vibration sensor	Unreliable.
	Metal detectors	(Not described.)
	X-ray equipment	(Not described.)
	Perimeter motion detector	False alarms.
	Microwave/infrared perimeter security	Didn't work.
	Electronic monitoring	Cost of lease agreement.
	Taut wire	Too much maintenance.
	Biometric devices	Inability to integrate with current system.
	CN gas	Limited benefits.
	Automatic distress alarms	Too many false alarms.
	Batch drug testing	Needed immediate results of drug tests.
	Drug detection dogs	(Not described.)
Large jails/jail systems	Taser	Liability; tendency to over-use.
	Personal distress alarms	Initial problems with system.
	X-ray package scanner	Too small a video monitor; not kept in good repair.
	Video	Equipment failed and was never repaired.
	Live print scan system	Incompatible with other systems.
	Bean bag guns	(Not described.)
	Automated fingerprinting	Equipment failures; inaccuracy.
	Mainframe computers	Replaced with personal computers.
	Magnetic strip card	Found to be ineffective in 1988 trial.
Retinal eye scan	Too time-consuming for booking and release processing.	
Breath analyzer	Service problems (foreign maker).	
Community-based corrections	Tasers	Litigation.
	Urinalysis, laboratory	Now used only to confirm onsite test if offender doesn't admit use.
	Urinalysis, onsite	Officers opposed handling the samples; unreliable.
	Video phones	Problems with linkage and system.
	EMIT urinalysis	Inaccurate.
	Electronic monitoring	High cost; ineffective.
	Passive EM	(Not described.)
	UNIX	Incompatible with agency goals.
	Unisys	Not cost effective; unreliable; not versatile; poor network capabilities; high maintenance costs.
Immunoanalysis	Unsuccessful application.	

New Technologies Currently Being Tested

Corrections agencies are currently testing a number of technologies for possible full-scale implementation. The following table lists new technologies currently being tested that are apparently unusual and/or not commonly used by other agencies.

Adult prison systems (DOCs)	Pen-based clipboard computers
	Multimedia
	Wireless networking
	Digital video access control
	Forced cell entry helmets
	Infrared strips for observation cells
	Ion scan for heroin and cocaine trace detection
	CO ₂ detector for "brew" detection
Large jails/jail systems	Magnetic contact guard tour
	Telemedicine
	Touch screens
	Laser fiche imaging
	Fiber optic modems
	Self-paced automated literacy tutorial program
Community-based corrections	Multi-media kiosk/biometric access controls for reporting by lower risk probationers.
	Document imaging
	Document processing packages
	Virtual office technologies
	Cascade switches
	Body armor
	Sweat patch technology
	Video imaging
Pen-based units	

Recommendations for Improvements to Existing Technologies

Survey respondents pointed to a number of ways in which technology could be improved to make it better serve their agencies' needs.

Adult prison systems

- All technologies should be more durable and should be easier to monitor and service.
- Fixed CCTV cameras should be changed so that they can be manipulated via remote control.
- More widely available large bandwidth lines are needed for automated fingerprints and digitized video.
- OBIS programming language should be updated.
- A multi-media approach should be used to integrate technologies.
- Identification/access control equipment should be used to facilitate record-keeping—e.g., bar coding could be used to track the completion of mandatory training.
- Expand telephone lines to serve program needs as well as institutional communication needs.
- Photo imaging package that would allow input from a digital scanner as well as a digital camera and would allow for morphing and printing of "wanted" posters.

Large jails/jail systems

- Non-lethal weapons should be made easier, safer, and more economical to use.
- Magnetic strip and bar-code IDS should be made more durable and less expensive.
- All video cameras used in corrections should be color cameras.
- Computer software should be faster and more user-friendly.
- Video training systems should include training systems for equipment and software, with beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels.
- Testing is needed to develop an adequate combination unit for personal duress alarm with locator capabilities, 2 way voice communications, and 2-way radio.

Community-based corrections agencies

- Technologies should interface better with other management systems.
- Electronic monitoring equipment should be available at a lower cost.
- Automated offender data should have a uniform design.
- NCIC technology should allow law enforcement agencies to send and receive electronically offender fingerprints, images, and related information.
- Electronic monitoring equipment needs to be able to track real-time location of offenders on a 24-hour basis; it also needs to be made more tamper-resistant.
- An on-line offender information system is needed for interstate compact clients.
- Radio technology is needed that provides for communication with multiple law enforcement agencies.

Unmet Needs In Corrections Technology

Many of the technological needs identified by respondents in this section are already being addressed in other agencies, either on a trial or permanent basis.

Adult prison systems

- Computerization/imaging of paper processes
- More audio/video technologies for automation of sight/hearing functions
- Micro-transmitters/receivers for tracking inmates
- PC-based program to hold inmates' complete records (medical, security, ID, mug shot, etc.)
- Simulator assessment centers
- Less cumbersome means of substance abuse testing
- Robotics for court
- Computer chip ID for perimeter
- Electronic fingerprint scanner with interface to a database of fingerprints, to be used for inmates and staff
- Automated computerized medical record system
- System for tracking inmate/staff training
- Telemedicine
- System for tracking inmates' daily activities to gauge program/activity needs of offenders
- Contraband detection on large parcels
- A central sourcebook of technologies used successfully, with pros and cons of use, cost of implementation and maintenance.

Large jails/jail systems

- Protection from lightning
- Protection from blood- and airborne pathogens in property and clothing storage
- Electronic systems to track offender movement and to identify offenders
- Early warning systems for employees
- Better methods for detecting weapons and controlled substances;
- Holographic training decks
- Improved visitor control
- Faster prisoner release via inkless fingerprint scan
- More aesthetic perimeter security; e.g., taser force fence
- Scanning technology for file access and storage
- Data sharing systems between agencies in a county.

Community-based corrections agencies

- Verification of offender identification
- Offender reporting systems
- Staff safety technologies
- Security and escape prevention methods in an open, residential setting
- Tracking system for 24-hour monitoring of offenders in community settings
- Early warning and alert for domestic abuse situations
- Voice technology to allow probationers with learning disabilities and/or limited literacy to interact more effectively with computers (Currently, such systems require a minimum of fourth-grade literacy.)
- Better communications between field officers and agency office
- New and better less-than-lethal weapons
- Computer links to make it possible to obtain fugitive information immediately—through credit reports, credit applications, welfare, food stamps, unemployment, etc
- Less intrusive drug monitoring

- National warrant database
- Systems for inmate and offender tracking
- Systems for collection of fees from offenders
- Cellular data communications.

Agency Preferences in Accessing NIJ Technology Clearinghouse

Agency respondents were asked to rank their three top preferences for methods to access NLECTC data on correctional technology. Results were as follows:

DOCs' preferences:

- #1—800 telephone line to clearinghouse staff
- #2—Online access to searchable technology database
- #3—Fax

Jails' preferences:

- #1—800 telephone line to clearinghouse staff
- #2—Fax
- #3—Online access to searchable technology database

Community corrections agencies' preferences:

- #1—Online access to searchable technology database
- #2—800 telephone line to clearinghouse staff
- #3—Fax

Online access to bulletin board postings was ranked fourth by respondents from each of the three analysis groups, and mail correspondence was the least favored option.

Appendix A Technology Tables

The following tables present data on technologies in use as reported by agency respondents. Responses are presented alphabetically by state for state adult corrections agencies, large jails, and community corrections agencies. Readers interested in further information on agency experiences with these technologies can refer to Appendix B for agency contact names, addresses, and phone numbers.

Some agency naming conventions were used to develop the tables on technologies used by community-based corrections agencies. Abbreviated agency names were used in place of formal agency names to permit comparison by function as well as to save space. Responding agencies are listed by state or local jurisdiction and function, e.g., "AZ parole" and "Maricopa Co. (AZ) probation."

SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES

1. Perimeter Security

Adult prison systems

	Video	Micro-wave	Infrared Sensors	Taut Wire	Buried Cable	Other*
Alabama		✓				
Alaska		✓				
Arizona	✓					
Arkansas					✓	
California	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Colorado		✓				✓
Connecticut	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Delaware	✓	✓	✓	✓		
D.C.	✓					
Florida		✓				✓
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois		✓				
Indiana	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Iowa						
Kansas	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Kentucky		✓		✓		
Louisiana				✓		
Maine				✓		
Maryland	✓	✓			✓	
Massachusetts				✓		
Michigan						
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Mississippi						
Missouri	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Montana						
Nebraska	✓	✓				✓
Nevada		✓	✓			
New Hampshire	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

	Video	Micro-wave	Infrared Sensors	Taut Wire	Buried Cable	Other*
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
New York						
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓		
North Dakota	✓	✓		✓		
Ohio						
Oklahoma	✓	✓				
Oregon				✓	✓	
Pennsylvania		✓	✓		✓	
Rhode Island	✓	✓		✓	✓	
South Carolina		✓				✓
South Dakota		✓		✓		
Tennessee						
Texas				✓		✓
Utah	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Vermont				✓		
Virginia		✓				
Washington	✓	✓		✓	✓	
West Virginia						
Wisconsin		✓				
Wyoming				✓		
Canada		✓		✓	✓	✓
Federal BOP	✓	✓	✓			✓
Puerto Rico	✓					

* Other technologies reported:

- Fence mounted sensors—California, Nebraska, Canada
- Shaker system—Colorado, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina
- Microphone wire—Florida, Federal Bureau of Prisons
- Fiber optic net—Texas

Large jails

	Video	Micro-wave	Infrared Sensors	Taut Wire	Buried Cable	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓		✓		✓
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓				
Alameda Co., CA	✓	✓				
Los Angeles Co., CA						
Sacramento Co., CA						✓
San Diego Co., CA				✓	✓	
San Joaquin Co., CA				✓		
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓			✓		✓
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓					
Denver Co., CO						
Broward Co., FL				✓		
Dade Co., FL	✓		✓			
Escambia Co., FL	✓			✓		
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓		✓			
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓					
Orange Co., FL	✓					
Pinellas Co., FL						
Volusia Co., FL	✓					
DeKalb Co., GA						
Jefferson Co., KY						
MD pretrial				✓		✓
Prince George's Co., MD		✓		✓	✓	
Hampden Co., MA				✓	✓	
Oakland Co., MI	✓					
Wayne Co., MI						✓
Jackson Co., MO	✓					
City of St. Louis, MO						
St. Louis Co., MO				✓		
Clark Co., NV	✓					
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓		✓	✓		
Bernalillo Co., NM						
New York City, NY	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Mecklenberg Co., NC						
Franklin Co., OH						✓
Philadelphia Prison System, PA						
Davidson Co., TN				✓		

	Video	Micro-wave	Infrared Sensors	Taut Wire	Buried Cable	Other *
Shelby Co., TN	✓					
El Paso Co., TX	✓					
Tarrant Co., TX	✓					
Arlington Co., VA	✓					
King Co., WA						✓
Pierce Co., WA	✓	✓	✓			
Milwaukee Co., WI				✓		

* Other technologies reported:

- Video camera without motion detection—Maricopa Co., AZ, Sacramento Co., CA, Wayne Co., MI
- Fence shaker alarm—Santa Clara Co., CA
- Ultrasonic—King Co., WA
- CCD-TV—Franklin Co., OH
- Tower—MD pretrial

Community-based corrections

	Video	Other Technologies	None
AK probation/parole			✓
AZ parole			✓
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓		
Pima Co. (AZ) probation			✓
CA parole			✓
CA youth authority parole		Motion detector	
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓		
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation		CCTV, razor wire	
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓		
CO probation			✓
CO parole			✓
CT probation			✓
FL probation/parole			✓
GA parole			✓
GA comm.corr/ probation			✓
HI parole			✓
HI 1st circuit probation			✓

	Video	Other Technologies	None
ID probation/parole			✓
IL parole			✓
Cook Co. (IL) probation			✓
LA probation/parole			✓
ME probation/parole			✓
MD probation/parole	✓		
MA parole			✓
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓		
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation /parole-juvenile			✓
MN probation/parole			✓
MS probation/parole			✓
MO probation/parole			✓
MT probation/parole			✓
NE parole			✓
NV probation/parole			✓
NH probation/parole			✓
NJ parole			✓
NJ probation	✓		
NM probation/parole			✓
New York City probation			✓
NC probation/parole			✓
ND probation/parole			✓
OH parole/probation			✓
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.			✓
OR probation/parole			✓
Marion Co. (OR) prob.			✓
Philadelphia probation			✓
PA probation/parole			✓
RI probation/parole			✓
SC probation/parole			✓
SD parole			✓
SD probation			✓
TN probation			✓
TN parole			✓
Dallas Co. (TX) probation			✓
WA probation/parole			✓
WI probation/parole			✓
Federal probation			✓

2. Identification/Access Control

Adult prison systems

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Bar Code	Voice Recognition	Fingerprint	Other *
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arizona		✓				
Arkansas						
California	✓	✓			✓	
Colorado						✓
Connecticut		✓				
Delaware						
D.C.						
Florida						✓
Georgia						
Hawaii					✓	
Idaho						
Illinois		✓	✓			
Indiana					✓	
Iowa						
Kansas		✓	✓			
Kentucky		✓				
Louisiana	✓				✓	
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts					✓	
Michigan						
Minnesota						✓
Mississippi						
Missouri						
Montana						
Nebraska	✓					
Nevada	✓					
New Hampshire	✓					
New Jersey					✓	
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Bar Code	Voice Recognition	Finger-print	Other *
North Dakota		✓				
Ohio						
Oklahoma	✓	✓			✓	
Oregon						
Pennsylvania		✓				
Rhode Island						
South Carolina		✓				
South Dakota						
Tennessee						
Texas		✓				
Utah					✓	
Vermont						
Virginia		✓				
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin						
Wyoming						
Canada						
Federal BOP		✓				✓
Puerto Rico	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Other technologies reported:

- Hand geometry—Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Large jails

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Bar Code	Voice Recognition	Finger-print	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓				
Pima Co., AZ						
Alameda Co., CA						
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓	✓	✓			
Sacramento Co., CA	✓	✓				✓
San Diego Co., CA	✓				✓	
San Joaquin Co., CA		✓				
Santa Clara Co., CA						
Arapahoe Co., CO			✓			
Denver Co., CO	✓		✓			
Broward Co., FL				✓		
Dade Co., FL						
Escambia Co., FL					✓	✓
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓					
Jacksonville Co., FL						✓
Orange Co., FL		✓				
Pinellas Co., FL						
Volusia Co., FL						
DeKalb Co., GA	✓	✓	✓			
Jefferson Co., KY			✓		✓	
MD pretrial						
Prince George's Co., MD						✓
Hampden Co., MA		✓	✓			
Oakland Co., MI		✓			✓	
Wayne Co., MI	✓	✓				
Jackson Co., MO						
City of St. Louis, MO						
St. Louis Co., MO	✓					
Clark Co., NV						
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓	✓				
Bernalillo Co., NM						
New York City, NY			✓			
Mecklenberg Co., NC		✓				
Franklin Co., OH						✓
Philadelphia Prison System						

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Bar Code	Voice Recognition	Finger-print	Other*
Davidson Co., TN	✓	✓				
Shelby Co., TN					✓	
El Paso Co., TX						
Tarrant Co., TX	✓					
Arlington Co., VA						✓
King Co., WA						
Pierce Co., WA						
Milwaukee Co., WI			✓			

* Other technologies reported:

- Inmate arm band—Escambia Co., FL
- Video monitor—Jacksonville Co., FL, Sacramento Co., CA
- Proximity card reader—Arlington Co., VA, Prince George's Co., MD
- Direct control—Franklin Co., OH

Community-based corrections

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Voice Recognition	Finger-print	Other*	None
AK probation/parole		✓				
AZ parole						✓
Maricopa Co. (AZ) probation		✓				
Pima Co. (AZ) probation						✓
CA parole			✓			
CA youth parole						✓
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓					
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓				
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓					
CO probation		✓				
CO parole						✓
CT probation						✓
FL probation/parole	✓					
GA parole						✓

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Voice Recognition	Finger-print	Other*	None
GA comm.corr./ prob.						✓
HI parole						✓
HI 1st circuit probation						✓
ID probation/parole		✓				
IL parole						✓
Cook Co. (IL) probation				✓		
LA probation/parole					✓	
ME probation/parole						✓
MD probation/parole			✓			
MA parole	✓					
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓					
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile						✓
MN probation/parole						✓
MS probation/parole						✓
MO probation/parole						✓
MT probation/parole						✓
NE parole						✓
NV probation/parole						✓
NH probation/parole						✓
NJ parole						✓
NJ probation		✓				
NM probation/parole						✓
New York City probation						✓
NC probation/parole	✓					
ND probation/parole						✓
OH parole/probation				✓		
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.						✓
OR probation/parole	✓					
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓					
Philadelphia probation						✓
PA probation/parole				✓		
RI probation/parole						✓
SC probation/parole						✓
SD parole						✓
SD probation						✓
TN probation			✓		✓	
TN parole						✓

	Key Pad	Magnetic Card	Voice Recognition	Fingerprint	Other *	None
Dallas Co. (TX) probation	✓					
WA probation/parole	✓					
WI probation/parole						✓
Federal probation						✓

* Other technologies reported:

- Anklets—Tennessee probation
- Buzzer—Louisiana probation/parole

3. Monitoring/surveillance

Adult prison systems

	Video cameras	Infrared sensors	Volumetric sensors	Noise sensors	Other *
Alabama	✓				
Alaska					✓
Arizona	✓				
Arkansas					
California	✓				
Colorado		✓			
Connecticut	✓				
Delaware	✓				
D.C.	✓				
Florida	✓				
Georgia					
Hawaii	✓				
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana	✓	✓			
Iowa					
Kansas	✓				
Kentucky	✓				
Louisiana					
Maine	✓				✓
Maryland	✓				
Massachusetts	✓				

	Video cameras	Infrared sensors	Volumetric sensors	Noise sensors	Other *
Michigan					
Minnesota	✓	✓		✓	
Mississippi					
Missouri				✓	
Montana					
Nebraska	✓				
Nevada					
New Hampshire	✓	✓			
New Jersey	✓		✓		
New Mexico	✓		✓		
New York					
North Carolina					✓
North Dakota	✓				
Ohio					
Oklahoma	✓		✓	✓	
Oregon	✓				
Pennsylvania	✓				
Rhode Island	✓				
South Carolina	✓				
South Dakota	✓				
Tennessee					
Texas	✓				
Utah	✓				
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington	✓				
West Virginia	✓				
Wisconsin				✓	
Wyoming					
*Federal BOP					
*Canada					
Puerto Rico	✓	✓	✓	✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Video microphone—Alaska
- Audio monitoring—Maine
- CCTV—North Carolina

Large jails

	Video cameras	Infrared sensor	Volumetric sensors	Noise sensors	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓		✓	
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓			
Alameda Co., CA	✓				
Los Angeles Co., CA					✓
Sacramento Co., CA	✓			✓	✓
San Diego Co., CA	✓				
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓				
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓				
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓				
Denver Co., CO	✓	✓			
Broward Co., FL	✓				
Dade Co., FL	✓			✓	
Escambia Co., FL	✓				
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓	✓			
Jacksonville Co., FL					
Orange Co., FL	✓				
Pinellas Co., FL	✓				
Volusia Co., FL	✓				
DeKalb Co., GA	✓				
Jefferson Co., KY					
MD pretrial					
Prince George's Co., MD					✓
Hampden Co., MA	✓				
Oakland Co., MI	✓			✓	
Wayne Co., MI	✓				
Jackson Co., MO	✓				
City of St. Louis, MO	✓				
St. Louis Co., MO					✓
Clark Co., NV	✓				
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓				
Bernalillo Co., NM					
New York City, NY	✓				
Mecklenberg Co., NC	✓				
Franklin Co., OH				✓	✓
Philadelphia Prison System					
Davidson Co., TN	✓			✓	

	Video cameras	Infrared sensor	Volumetric sensors	Noise sensors	Other *
Shelby Co., TN	✓			✓	
El Paso Co., TX	✓				
Tarrant Co., TX	✓				
Arlington Co., VA					
King Co., WA		✓			✓
Pierce Co., WA	✓			✓	
Milwaukee Co., WI					✓

* Other technologies cited:

- Ultrasonic—King Co., WA
- CCTV—St. Louis Co., MO, Milwaukee Co., WI, Franklin Co., OH
- Video camera without motion detector—Sacramento Co., CA, Los Angeles Co., CA, Prince George's Co., MD

Community-based corrections

	Video cameras	Other technologies	None
AK probation/parole			✓
* AZ parole			✓
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.			✓
Pima Co. (AZ) probation			✓
CA parole		Infrared; noise sensor	
CA youth parole	✓	Volumetric and noise sensors	
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓		
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation		CCTV	
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓		
CO probation	✓		
CO parole			✓
CT probation			✓
FL probation/parole	✓		
GA parole			✓
GA comm.corr./probation			✓
HI parole			✓
HI 1st circuit probation		Noise sensor	

	Video cameras	Other technologies	None
ID probation/parole			✓
IL parole			✓
Cook Co. (IL) probation			✓
LA probation/parole			✓
ME probation/parole			✓
MD probation/parole			✓
MA parole			✓
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓		
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile		Infrared sensors	
MN probation/parole			✓
MS probation/parole			✓
MO probation/parole			✓
MT probation/parole			✓
NE parole			✓
NV probation/parole			✓
NH probation/parole			✓
NJ parole			✓
NJ probation	✓		
NM probation/parole			✓
New York City probation			✓
NC probation/parole			✓
ND probation/parole			✓
OH parole/probation			✓
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.			✓
OR probation/parole			✓
Marion Co. (OR) prob.			✓
Philadelphia probation			✓
PA probation/parole		Noise sensor	
RI probation/parole			✓
SC probation/parole			✓
SD parole			✓
SD probation			✓
TN probation			✓
TN parole			✓
Dallas Co. (TX) probation			✓
WA probation/parole	✓		
WI probation/parole			✓
Federal probation			✓

4. Drug Use Detection

Adult prison systems

	UA (self-contained)	UA (lab)	Retinal Scan	Air sensors	Breath analyzer	Other*
Alabama		✓				
Alaska	✓				✓	
Arizona	✓	✓				
Arkansas	✓	✓			✓	
California	✓	✓				
Colorado	✓					
Connecticut		✓				
Delaware	✓	✓			✓	
D.C.	✓					
Florida		✓			✓	✓
Georgia						
Hawaii	✓	✓				
Idaho						
Illinois		✓			✓	
Indiana	✓	✓				
Iowa						
Kansas	✓	✓			✓	
Kentucky		✓				
Louisiana	✓	✓				
Maine	✓	✓				
Maryland	✓	✓			✓	
Massachusetts	✓	✓				
Michigan						
Minnesota	✓	✓			✓	
Mississippi						
Missouri		✓			✓	
Montana						
Nebraska		✓			✓	
Nevada	✓	✓			✓	
New Hampshire		✓			✓	
New Jersey	✓	✓			✓	
New Mexico	✓	✓			✓	
New York						

	UA (self-contained)	UA (lab)	Retinal Scan	Air sensors	Breath analyzer	Other *
North Carolina		✓			✓	
North Dakota	✓	✓			✓	
Ohio						
Oklahoma	✓	✓			✓	
Oregon		✓			✓	
Pennsylvania		✓			✓	
Rhode Island		✓			✓	
South Carolina	✓				✓	
South Dakota	✓				✓	
Tennessee						
Texas						
Utah	✓				✓	
Vermont	✓	✓			✓	
Virginia	✓	✓			✓	
Washington	✓	✓			✓	
West Virginia	✓				✓	
Wisconsin		✓				
Wyoming		✓				
Canada	✓	✓			✓	
Federal BOP		✓			✓	
Puerto Rico		✓				

* Other technologies cited:

- ION scanner—Florida

Large jails

	UA (self-contained)	UA (lab)	Retinal scan	Air sensors	Breath analyzer	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓			✓	✓
Alameda Co., CA		✓			✓	
Los Angeles Co., CA		✓			✓	
Sacramento Co., CA		✓			✓	
San Diego Co., CA						
San Joaquin Co., CA						
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓					
Arapahoe Co., CO		✓			✓	

	UA (self-contained)	UA (lab)	Retinal scan	Air sensors	Breath analyzer	Other *
Denver Co., CO	✓	✓			✓	
Broward Co., FL		✓			✓	
Dade Co., FL		✓			✓	
Escambia Co., FL		✓			✓	
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓				✓	
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓				✓	
Orange Co., FL	✓					
Pinellas Co., FL					✓	
Volusia Co., FL						
DeKalb Co., GA		✓			✓	
Jefferson Co., KY	✓	✓			✓	
MD pretrial	✓				✓	
P.G. Co., MD		✓			✓	
Hampden Co., MA		✓			✓	
Oakland Co., MI	✓	✓			✓	
Wayne Co., MI	✓				✓	
Jackson Co., MO		✓			✓	
City of St. Louis, MO	✓	✓				
St. Louis Co., MO		✓			✓	
Clark Co., NV	✓				✓	
Middlesex Co., NJ		✓			✓	
Bernalillo Co., NM		✓			✓	
New York City, NY	✓					
Mecklenberg Co., NC		✓				
Franklin Co., OH		✓				
Philadelphia Prison System, PA		✓				
Davidson Co., TN	✓					
Shelby Co., TN						
El Paso Co., TX						
Tarrant Co., TX						
Arlington Co., VA	✓	✓				
King Co., WA		✓				
Pierce Co., WA		✓			✓	
Milwaukee Co., WI	✓				✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Blue light—Pima Co., AZ

Community-based corrections

	UA(self-contained)	UA (lab)	Breath analyzer	Other *
AK probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
AZ parole		✓	✓	
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.		✓	✓	
Pima Co. (AZ) probation		✓	✓	
CA parole		✓		
CA youth parole	✓	✓		
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.		✓		
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation		✓	✓	
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓		
CO probation	✓	✓	✓	✓
CO parole		✓	✓	
CT probation	✓	✓	✓	
FL probation/parole	✓	✓		
GA parole	✓			
GA comm.corr./probation	✓	✓	✓	
HI parole	✓	✓	✓	
HI 1st circuit probation	✓	✓		
ID probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
IL parole	✓	✓	✓	
Cook Co. (IL) probation		✓		
LA probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
ME probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
MD probation/parole		✓	✓	
MA parole	✓	✓		
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole		✓	✓	
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile		✓	✓	
MN probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
MS probation/parole		✓		
MO probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
MT probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
NE parole		✓	✓	
NV probation/parole	✓	✓		
NH probation/parole		✓	✓	
NJ parole		✓	✓	

	UA(self-contained)	UA (lab)	Breath analyzer	Other *
NJ probation	✓	✓	✓	
NM probation/parole		✓		
New York City probation		✓		
NC probation/parole		✓		
ND probation/parole	✓		✓	
OH parole/probation	✓	✓		
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.	✓		✓	
OR probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓	✓	✓	
Philadelphia probation	✓	✓		
PA probation/parole		✓		
RI probation/parole		✓		
SC probation/parole	✓	✓		
SD parole	✓	✓	✓	
SD probation		✓		
TN probation		✓		
TN parole	✓	✓		
Dallas Co. (TX) probation		✓	✓	
WA probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
WI probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
Federal probation	✓	✓	✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Retinal scan—Colorado probation

5. Contraband Detection

Adult prison systems

	Hand-held metal detector	Walk-through metal detector	X-Ray	Infrared sensors	Canines	Other *
Alabama						
Alaska	✓	✓	✓			
Arizona	✓	✓			✓	
Arkansas	✓	✓			✓	
California	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Colorado	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Connecticut	✓	✓			✓	
Delaware	✓	✓			✓	
D.C.	✓	✓			✓	
Florida	✓	✓			✓	✓
Georgia						
Hawaii	✓	✓			✓	
Idaho						
Illinois		✓	✓		✓	
Indiana	✓	✓			✓	
Iowa						
Kansas	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Kentucky	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Louisiana	✓					
Maine	✓	✓			✓	
Maryland	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Michigan						
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Mississippi						
Missouri	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Montana						
Nebraska	✓	✓			✓	
Nevada	✓	✓	✓		✓	
New Hampshire	✓	✓			✓	
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓		✓	
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓		✓	
New York						
North Carolina	✓	✓			✓	

	Hand-held metal detector	Walk-through metal detector	X-Ray	Infrared sensors	Canines	Other *
North Dakota	✓	✓			✓	
Ohio						
Oklahoma	✓	✓			✓	
Oregon	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Pennsylvania	✓	✓				
Rhode Island	✓	✓			✓	
South Carolina	✓	✓	✓		✓	
South Dakota	✓	✓			✓	
Tennessee						
Texas					✓	
Utah	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Vermont	✓	✓			✓	
Virginia	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Washington	✓	✓	✓		✓	
West Virginia	✓	✓			✓	
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓			
Wyoming	✓	✓			✓	
Canada	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Federal BOP	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Puerto Rico	✓	✓	✓			

* Other technologies cited:

- ION scanner—Florida, Canada

Large jails

	Hand-held metal detector	Walk-through metal detector	X-Ray	Infrared sensors	Canines	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Alameda Co., CA	✓	✓				
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Sacramento Co., CA	✓	✓	✓			
San Diego Co., CA	✓					
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓	✓			✓	
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓	✓				

	Hand-held metal detector	Walk-through metal detector	X-Ray	Infrared sensors	Canines	Other *
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓	✓			✓	
Denver Co., CO	✓	✓				
Broward Co., FL	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Dade Co., FL	✓	✓	✓			
Escambia Co., FL	✓	✓			✓	
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓	✓				
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Orange Co., FL	✓	✓				
Pinellas Co., FL	✓	✓	✓			
Volusia Co., FL	✓	✓				
DeKalb Co., GA	✓	✓	✓			
Jefferson Co., KY	✓				✓	
MD pretrial	✓	✓			✓	
Prince George's Co., MD	✓	✓			✓	
Hampden Co., MA	✓	✓				
Oakland Co., MI	✓	✓			✓	
Wayne Co., MI	✓	✓			✓	
Jackson Co., MO	✓	✓				
City of St. Louis, MO	✓	✓			✓	
St. Louis Co., MO	✓	✓				
Clark Co., NV	✓	✓				
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓	✓	✓			
Bernalillo Co., NM	✓	✓				
New York City, NY	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Mecklenberg Co., NC	✓	✓			✓	
Franklin Co., OH	✓	✓			✓	✓
Philadelphia Prison System, PA	✓	✓				
Davidson Co., TN	✓	✓			✓	
Shelby Co., TN		✓				
El Paso Co., TX	✓	✓			✓	
Tarrant Co., TX	✓	✓			✓	
Arlington Co., VA	✓	✓	✓		✓	
King Co., WA	✓	✓				
Pierce Co., WA	✓	✓			✓	
Milwaukee Co., WI	✓	✓	✓		✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Physical search—Franklin Co., OH

Community-based corrections

	Hand-held metal detector	Walk-through metal detector	X-Ray	Infrared sensors	Canines	Other *
AK probation/parole	✓	✓				
AZ parole						
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓				✓	
Pima Co. (AZ) prob.	✓	✓	✓			
CA parole					✓	
CA youth parole	✓	✓			✓	
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓	✓				
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓				
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓			✓	
CO probation		✓				
CO parole						
CT probation	✓	✓				
FL probation/parole	✓	✓				
GA parole	✓					
GA comm.corr/probation	✓	✓			✓	
HI parole						
HI 1st circuit probation		✓				
ID probation/parole					✓	
IL parole					✓	
Cook Co. (IL) probation	✓	✓	✓			
LA probation/parole	✓	✓				
ME probation/parole						
MD probation/parole		✓				
MA parole	✓					
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓				✓	
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓	✓				
MN probation/parole						
MS probation/parole	✓				✓	
MO probation/parole						

	Hand-held metal detector	Walk-through metal detector	X-Ray	Infrared sensors	Canines	Other *
MT probation/parole						
NE parole						
NV probation/parole						
NH probation/parole						
NJ parole						
NJ probation						
NM probation/parole						
New York City probation		✓				
NC probation/parole						
ND probation/parole						
OH parole/probation	✓	✓				
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.						
OR probation/parole	✓	✓			✓	
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓	✓			✓	
Philadelphia probation						
PA probation/parole	✓	✓				
RI probation/parole						
SC probation/parole						
SD parole						
SD probation						
TN probation						
TN parole						
Dallas Co. (TX) probation		✓				
WA probation/parole	✓					
WI probation/parole	✓	✓				
Federal probation						

6. Security Communications

Adult prison systems

	Manual distress alarm	Automatic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other *
Alabama						
Alaska			✓			
Arizona			✓	✓	✓	

	Manual distress alarm	Automatic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other *
Arkansas			✓	✓	✓	
California	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Colorado	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Connecticut	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Delaware	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
D.C.	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Florida	✓		✓		✓	
Georgia						
Hawaii			✓	✓		
Idaho						
Illinois	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Indiana			✓		✓	
Iowa						
Kansas	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Kentucky			✓		✓	
Louisiana	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Maine	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Maryland	✓		✓	✓		
Massachusetts	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Michigan						
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Mississippi						
Missouri			✓	✓	✓	
Montana						
Nebraska	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Nevada		✓	✓	✓		
New Hampshire	✓		✓	✓	✓	
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
New Mexico			✓	✓	✓	✓
New York						
North Carolina	✓		✓	✓	✓	
North Dakota			✓	✓	✓	
Ohio						
Oklahoma			✓	✓	✓	
Oregon			✓	✓	✓	
Pennsylvania		✓	✓	✓		
Rhode Island	✓		✓	✓	✓	
South Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
South Dakota			✓	✓	✓	

	Manual distress alarm	Automatic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other *
Tennessee						
Texas			✓	✓	✓	
Utah			✓	✓	✓	
Vermont	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Washington	✓		✓			
West Virginia	✓	✓	✓			
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Wyoming			✓	✓	✓	
Canada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Federal BOP	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Puerto Rico	✓		✓	✓		

* Other technologies cited:

- Computer—New Mexico
- Satellite tracking—Canada

Large jails

	Manual distress alarm	Automatic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Alameda Co., CA	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Los Angeles Co., CA			✓	✓	✓	
Sacramento Co., CA	✓		✓			
San Diego Co., CA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
San Joaquin Co., CA			✓			
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Denver Co., CO	✓	✓	✓			✓
Broward Co., FL			✓	✓	✓	
Dade Co., FL	✓	✓	✓			✓
Escambia Co., FL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Jacksonville Co., FL			✓	✓		
Orange Co., FL			✓			

	Manual distress alarm	Automatic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other *
Pinellas Co., FL	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Volusia Co., FL	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
DeKalb Co., GA	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Jefferson Co., KY			✓	✓	✓	
MD pretrial			✓	✓		
Prince George's Co., MD	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Hampden Co., MA	✓		✓			
Oakland Co., MI			✓			
Wayne Co., MI	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Jackson Co., MO			✓	✓		
City of St. Louis, MO			✓			
St. Louis Co., MO			✓	✓		
Clark Co., NV	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓		✓			
Bernalillo Co., NM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
New York City, NY	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Mecklenberg Co., NC	✓		✓			
Franklin Co., OH	✓		✓			✓
Philadelphia Prison System, PA			✓	✓	✓	
Davidson Co., TN	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Shelby Co., TN				✓	✓	
El Paso Co., TX			✓	✓	✓	
Tarrant Co., TX			✓			
Arlington Co., VA		✓	✓			✓
King Co., WA			✓	✓	✓	
Pierce Co., WA	✓		✓		✓	
Milwaukee Co., WI	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Panic alarm system—Volusia Co., FL, Arlington Co., Virginia
- Telephone intercom system—Denver Co., CO, Franklin Co., OH
- Emergency telephone "hotlines"—Dade Co., FL

Community-based corrections

	Manual distress alarm	Auto-matic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other*
AK probation/parole	✓		✓	✓	✓	
AZ parole			✓	✓	✓	
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Pima Co. (AZ) probation			✓	✓	✓	✓
CA parole	✓		✓	✓	✓	
CA youth parole	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation		✓	✓	✓	✓	
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓		✓		✓	
CO probation			✓	✓	✓	
CO parole			✓	✓	✓	
CT probation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
FL probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
GA parole			✓	✓	✓	
GA comm.corr./probation			✓	✓	✓	
HI parole	✓			✓	✓	
HI 1st circuit probation					✓	
ID probation/parole				✓		
IL parole			✓	✓	✓	
Cook Co. (IL) probation						
LA probation/parole			✓	✓		
ME probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
MD probation/parole	✓		✓	✓		
MA parole			✓	✓	✓	
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓		✓	✓	✓	
MN probation/parole					✓	
MS probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
MO probation/parole					✓	
MT probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
NE parole			✓	✓	✓	
NV probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
NH probation/parole			✓	✓		

	Manual distress alarm	Auto-matic distress alarm	Two-way radio	Pager	Mobile phone	Other*
NJ parole			✓	✓		
NJ probation			✓	✓	✓	
NM probation/parole			✓			
New York City probation						
NC probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
ND probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
OH parole/probation			✓		✓	
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.				✓	✓	
OR probation/parole			✓		✓	
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Philadelphia probation			✓		✓	
PA probation/parole			✓			
RI probation/parole				✓		
SC probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
SD parole			✓		✓	
SD probation						
TN probation				✓	✓	
TN parole			✓	✓	✓	
Dallas Co. (TX) probation	✓				✓	
WA probation/parole			✓		✓	
WI probation/parole			✓	✓	✓	
Federal probation	✓		✓	✓	✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Panic button—Pima Co. (AZ) probation

7. Less-than-lethal weaponry

Adult prison systems

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other*
Alabama				
Alaska	✓			
Arizona	✓			
Arkansas	✓		✓	

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other*
California	✓	✓		
Colorado	✓		✓	
Connecticut	✓			
Delaware	✓			
D.C.	✓			
Florida	✓			
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois	✓			
Indiana				
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky	✓	✓	✓	
Louisiana	✓			✓
Maine	✓			
Maryland	✓			
Massachusetts	✓			
Michigan				
Minnesota	✓		✓	
Mississippi				
Missouri	✓			
Montana				
Nebraska	✓			
Nevada	✓	✓	✓	
New Hampshire	✓			
New Jersey	✓			
New Mexico	✓			✓
New York				
North Carolina	✓			
North Dakota	✓		✓	
Ohio				
Oklahoma	✓		✓	
Oregon	✓		✓	
Pennsylvania	✓		✓	
Rhode Island	✓	✓		
South Carolina	✓		✓	
South Dakota	✓	✓		
Tennessee				

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other*
Texas				
Utah	✓			
Vermont	✓			
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	
Washington	✓			
West Virginia	✓			
Wisconsin		✓	✓	
Wyoming	✓			
Canada	✓			
Federal BOP	✓	✓		✓
Puerto Rico				

* Other technologies cited:

- Electric shield—Louisiana, New Mexico, Federal Bureau of Prisons

Large jails

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other*
Maricopa Co., AZ				
Pima Co., AZ	✓		✓	
Alameda Co., CA	✓	✓		✓
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓		✓	✓
Sacramento Co., CA	✓			✓
San Diego Co., CA	✓			✓
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓			
San'a Clara Co., CA				
Arapahoe Co., CO				
Denver Co., CO	✓			
Broward Co., FL				
Dade Co., FL				
Escambia Co., FL			✓	✓
Hillsborough Co., FL				
Jacksonville Co., FL				
Orange Co., FL				
Pinellas Co., FL				
Volusia Co., FL	✓			✓
DeKalb Co., GA				

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other *
Jefferson Co., KY				
MD pretrial	✓			
Prince George's Co., MD				✓
Hampden Co., MA				
Oakland Co., MI				
Wayne Co., MI				
Jackson Co., MO				
City of St. Louis, MO				
St. Louis Co., MO				
Clark Co., NV				
Middlesex Co., NJ				
Bernalillo Co., NM				
New York City, NY				
Mecklenberg Co., NC				
Franklin Co., OH	✓			
Philadelphia Prison System, PA				
Davidson Co., TN	✓			
Shelby Co., TN				
El Paso Co., TX				
Tarrant Co., TX	✓			
Arlington Co., VA				
King Co., WA	✓			
Pierce Co., WA				
Milwaukee Co., WI	✓			

* Other technologies cited:

- React belt—Escambia Co., FL, Volusia Co., FL, Sacramento Co., CA
- Arwen rifle—San Diego Co., CA, Los Angeles Co., CA
- CS gas—Alameda Co., CA, Prince George's Co., MD

Community-based corrections

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other *
AK probation/parole	✓			
AZ parole			✓	
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓			
Pima Co. (AZ) probation	✓			
CA parole				✓
CA youth parole	✓			
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓			
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓			
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓			
CO probation	✓			
CO parole	✓			
CT probation	✓			
FL probation/parole	✓			
GA parole	✓			
GA comm.corr./probation	✓			
HI parole	✓			
HI 1st circuit probation	✓			
ID probation/parole	✓			
IL parole	✓			
Cook Co. (IL) probation				
LA probation/parole	✓			
ME probation/parole	✓			
MD probation/parole	✓			
MA parole	✓			
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓			
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓			
MN probation/parole				
MS probation/parole				
MO probation/parole	✓			
MT probation/parole	✓			
NE parole	✓			
NV probation/parole	✓			
NH probation/parole	✓			
NJ parole	✓			

	OC Pepper Spray	Bean Bag Gun	Taser	Other *
NJ probation	✓			
NM probation/parole	✓			
New York City probation	✓			
NC probation/parole				
ND probation/parole	✓			
OH parole/probation				
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.	✓			
OR probation/parole	✓			
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓			
Philadelphia probation	✓			
PA probation/parole	✓			
RI probation/parole				
SC probation/parole	✓			
SD parole				
SD probation				
TN probation	✓			
TN parole	✓			
Dallas Co. (TX) probation	✓			
WA probation/parole	✓			
WI probation/parole				
Federal probation	✓			

* Other technologies cited:

- Mace—California parole

NON-SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES

8. Electronic monitoring of offenders

Adult prison systems

	Active system	Passive system	Number of units	No EM
Alabama				✓
Alaska				✓
Arizona	✓	✓	400	
Arkansas				✓
California	✓		25+	
Colorado		✓	N/A	
Connecticut				✓
Delaware	✓		80	✓
D.C.	✓		57	✓
Florida	✓		1,050	
Georgia				
Hawaii	✓		68	
Idaho				
Illinois	✓		1,246	
Indiana				✓
Iowa				
Kansas				✓
Kentucky		✓	N/A	
Louisiana				✓
Maine				✓
Maryland	✓		N/A	
Massachusetts	✓		50	
Michigan				
Minnesota				✓
Mississippi				
Missouri	✓		516	
Montana				
Nebraska				✓
Nevada				✓
New Hampshire	✓		8	
New Jersey				✓

	Active system	Passive system	Number of units	No EM
New Mexico	✓		200	
New York				✓
North Carolina				✓
North Dakota	✓		10	
Ohio				
Oklahoma	✓	✓	701	
Oregon				✓
Pennsylvania				✓
Rhode Island	✓		100	
South Carolina				✓
South Dakota	✓		2	
Tennessee				
Texas				✓
Utah	✓		110	
Vermont	✓	✓	300+	
Virginia	✓		85	
Washington	✓		25	
West Virginia				✓
Wisconsin	✓		1,500	
Wyoming		✓	N/A	
Canada				✓
Federal BOP	✓	✓	N/A	
Puerto Rico	✓		450	

Large jails

	Active system	Passive system	Number of units	No EM
Maricopa Co., AZ				✓
Pima Co., AZ				✓
Alameda Co., CA		✓	40-50	
Los Angeles Co., CA				✓
Sacramento Co., CA	✓		100	
San Diego Co., CA		✓	N/A	
San Joaquin Co., CA		✓	60	
Santa Clara Co., CA				✓
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓		10	
Denver Co., CO				✓
Broward Co., FL	✓		105	
Dade Co., FL		✓	200	
Escambia Co., FL				✓
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓		75	
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓		25	
Orange Co., FL	✓		200	
Pinellas Co., FL				✓
Volusia Co., FL				✓
DeKalb Co., GA				✓
Jefferson Co., KY	✓		450	
Franklin Co., OH				✓
MD pretrial	✓		120	
Prince George's Co., MD	✓		70	
Hampden Co., MA	✓		80	
Oakland Co., MI				✓
Wayne Co., MI				✓
Jackson Co., MO	✓		85-90	
City of St. Louis, MO	✓		11	
St. Louis Co., MO	✓		6	
Clark Co., NV	✓		45	
Middlesex Co., NJ				✓
Bernalillo Co., NM		✓	20-30	
New York City, NY				
Mecklenberg Co., NC		✓	N/A	
Philadelphia Prison System, PA	✓		N/A	
Davidson Co., TN	✓		8	

	Active system	Passive system	Number of units	No EM
Shelby Co., TN				✓
El Paso Co., TX				✓
Tarrant Co., TX				✓
Arlington Co., VA	✓		10+	
King Co., WA	✓		1,274	
Pierce Co., WA	✓	✓	45	
Millwaukee Co., WI		✓	100	

Community-based corrections

	Active system	Passive system	Number of units	No EM
AK probation/parole				✓
AZ parole	✓		260	
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.				✓
Pima Co. (AZ) probation	✓	✓	45-50	
CA parole	✓		5	
CA youth parole	✓		128	
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.				✓
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓		500	
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation		✓	40	
CO probation	✓		200	
CO parole		✓	400	
CT probation	✓		20	
FL probation/parole	✓		1,150	
GA parole	✓		110	
GA comm.corr./probation	✓		N/A	
HI parole	✓		12	
HI 1st circuit probator	✓		12	
ID probation/parole	✓	✓	54	
IL parole	✓		378	
Cook Co. (IL) probation				✓
LA probation/parole				✓
ME probation/parole				✓
MD probation/parole	✓		47	
MA parole				✓
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓		200	

	Active system	Passive system	Number of units	No EM
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓		40	
MN probation/parole	✓	✓	100	
MS probation/parole	✓		250	
MO probation/parole	✓		750	
MT probation/parole		✓	50	
NE parole				✓
NV probation/parole	✓		375	
NH probation/parole		✓	8	
NJ parole				✓
NJ probation	✓	✓	300	
NM probation/parole	✓		200	
New York City probation				✓
NC probation/parole	✓		1,150	
ND probation/parole	✓		15	
OH parole/probation				✓
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.	✓		35	
OR probation/parole	✓	✓	N/A	
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓		15	
Philadelphia probation	✓		200	
PA probation/parole	✓	✓	400	
RI probation/parole	✓		65	
SC probation/parole	✓		200	
SD parole		✓	N/A	
SD probation				✓
TN probation	✓	✓	113	
TN parole				✓
Dallas Co. (TX) probation	✓		250	
WA probation/parole	✓		200	
WI probation/parole	✓		250	
Federal probation	✓		2,552	

9. Non-emergency communications with the agency

Adult prison systems

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
Alabama	✓				
Alaska	✓	✓			
Arizona	✓				
Arkansas	✓				
California	✓	✓			
Colorado	✓	✓			
Connecticut					
Delaware	✓	✓			
D.C.	✓			✓	
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois	✓			✓	
Indiana	✓	✓			
Iowa					
Kansas	✓	✓		✓	
Kentucky	✓				
Louisiana		✓			
Maine	✓				
Maryland	✓	✓			
Massachusetts	✓	✓			
Michigan					
Minnesota	✓	✓		✓	
Mississippi					
Missouri		✓			
Montana					
Nebraska	✓	✓			
Nevada					
New Hampshire	✓	✓			
New Jersey	✓	✓			
New Mexico		✓			
New York		✓		✓	
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓		

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma	✓				
Oregon	✓	✓			
Pennsylvania	✓	✓			
Rhode Island	✓				
South Carolina	✓				
South Dakota	✓				
Tennessee					
Texas	✓				
Utah	✓	✓			
Vermont	✓	✓		✓	
Virginia	✓				
Washington	✓	✓	✓		
West Virginia	✓				
Wisconsin	✓	✓		✓	
Wyoming	✓				
Canada	✓	✓		✓	
Federal BOP	✓			✓	
Puerto Rico	✓				

Large jails

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓		✓	
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓		
Alameda Co., CA	✓	✓			
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓	✓		✓	
Sacramento Co., CA				✓	✓
San Diego Co., CA					
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓				
Santa Clara Co., CA					✓
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓			✓	
Denver Co., CO					✓
Broward Co., FL	✓	✓			
Dade Co., FL	✓				
Escambia Co., FL	✓		✓		
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓	✓			
Jacksonville Co., FL					
Orange Co., FL	✓				
Pinellas Co., FL		✓			
Volusia Co., FL	✓				
DeKalb Co., GA	✓				
Jefferson Co., KY		✓			
MD pretrial	✓	✓	✓		
Prince George's Co., MD	✓				
Hampden Co., MA					
Oakland Co., MI					✓
Wayne Co., MI	✓	✓			
Jackson Co., MO					
City of St. Louis, MO					
St. Louis Co., MO					
Clark Co., NV	✓				
Middlesex Co., NJ					
Bernalillo Co., NM	✓	✓			
New York City, NY		✓			
Mecklenberg Co., NC				✓	
Franklin Co., OH	✓				

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
Philadelphia Prison System, PA					
Davidson Co., TN		✓			
Shelby Co., TN	✓				
El Paso Co., TX					
Tarrant Co., TX	✓				
Arlington Co., VA	✓				
King Co., WA	✓	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	✓		✓		✓
Milwaukee Co., WI	✓				✓

* Other technologies cited:

- Two-way radio—Oakland Co., MI
- Jail management system—Pierce Co., WA
- Teletype—Milwaukee Co., WI
- LAN without e-mail—Santa Clara Co., CA, Sacramento Co., CA
- Telephone facsimile system—Denver Co., CO

Community-based corrections

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
AK probation/parole	✓	✓			
AZ parole	✓				
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓	✓			
Pima Co. (AZ) probation	✓				
CA parole	✓	✓			
CA youth parole	✓				
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓				
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓	✓	✓	
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation					
CO probation					
CO parole	✓	✓			
CT probation		✓			

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
FL probation/parole	✓	✓		✓	
GA parole	✓	✓			
GA comm.corr./probation	✓	✓	✓		
HI parole	✓				
HI 1st circuit probation	✓			✓	
ID probation/parole	✓				
IL parole	✓	✓			
Cook Co. (IL) probation					✓
LA probation/parole		✓			
ME probation/parole	✓				
MD probation/parole		✓		✓	
MA parole	✓				
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓	✓			
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓	✓			
MN probation/parole	✓	✓			
MS probation/parole					
MO probation/parole		✓			
MT probation/parole			✓	✓	
NE parole					
NV probation/parole					
NH probation/parole	✓				
NJ parole	✓				
NJ probation	✓	✓		✓	
NM probation/parole					
New York City probation					
NC probation/parole	✓				
ND probation/parole					✓
OH parole/probation	✓	✓			
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.	✓	✓			
OR probation/parole	✓	✓		✓	
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓				
Philadelphia probation	✓	✓			
PA probation/parole	✓	✓			
RI probation/parole					
SC probation/parole	✓	✓			
SD parole	✓				

	Local area network	Wide area network	Video conference (satellite)	Video conference (non-satellite)	Other *
SD probation	✓		✓		
TN probation	✓				
TN parole					
Dallas Co. (TX) prob.					✓
WA probation/parole		✓	✓		
WI probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Federal probation	✓	✓			

* Other technologies cited:

- AS400/P.C. remote dial-in—Cook Co., IL probation, Dallas Co., TX probation
- Weekly floppy download—North Dakota

10. Information linkage with sources outside the agency

Adult prison systems

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, not for offender data	Other online systems	Internet	CD-ROM
Alabama	✓					
Alaska		✓	✓	✓		
Arizona	✓	✓				
Arkansas	✓	✓	✓			
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colorado	✓	✓	✓			
Connecticut	✓	✓				
Delaware	✓	✓	✓	✓		
D.C.	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Florida	✓	✓				
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois	✓	✓				
Indiana						
Iowa						
Kansas	✓	✓				✓
Kentucky	✓	✓				
Louisiana	✓	✓	✓			
Maine						
Maryland	✓	✓	✓			
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Michigan						
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Mississippi						
Missouri		✓				
Montana						
Nebraska	✓	✓			✓	
Nevada	✓	✓				
New Hampshire	✓	✓	✓			
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓			
New Mexico	✓	✓				

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, not for offender data	Other online systems	Internet	CD-ROM
New York		✓	✓			
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
North Dakota	✓					
Ohio						
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Oregon	✓	✓				
Pennsylvania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rhode Island	✓	✓		✓		
South Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
South Dakota	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Tennessee						
Texas	✓	✓				
Utah	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vermont	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Washington		✓	✓			
West Virginia						
Wisconsin		✓		✓	✓	✓
Wyoming						
Canada						
Federal BOP	✓	✓			✓	✓
Puerto Rico	✓	✓	✓			

Large jails

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, not for offender data	Other online systems	Internet	CD-ROM
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓				
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Alameda Co., CA	✓	✓		✓		
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓	✓	✓			✓
Sacramento Co., CA	✓	✓	✓	✓		
San Diego Co., CA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, not for offender data	Other online systems	Internet	CD-ROM
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓	✓	✓			
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓	✓	✓			
Denver Co., CO	✓	✓				
Broward Co., FL	✓	✓		✓		
Dade Co., FL	✓	✓				
Escambia Co., FL	✓					
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓	✓	✓			
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓	✓				
Orange Co., FL	✓	✓		✓		✓
Pinellas Co., FL	✓	✓	✓			
Volusia Co., FL	✓	✓				
DeKalb Co., GA	✓	✓	✓			
Jefferson Co., KY	✓	✓				
MD pretrial	✓	✓	✓			
Prince George's Co., MD	✓	✓		✓		
Hampden Co., MA	✓	✓				
Oakland Co., MI	✓	✓				
Wayne Co., MI	✓	✓				
Jackson Co., MO	✓	✓				
City of St. Louis, MO	✓	✓				
St. Louis Co., MO	✓	✓				
Clark Co., NV	✓	✓		✓		
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓	✓	✓			
Bernalillo Co., NM	✓					
New York City, NY		✓				✓
Mecklenberg Co., NC	✓	✓	✓			
Franklin Co., OH	✓	✓	✓			
Philadelphia Prison System, PA	✓	✓		✓		
Davidson Co., TN		✓	✓		✓	
Shelby Co., TN	✓	✓				
El Paso Co., TX	✓	✓				
Tarrant Co., TX	✓	✓				
Arlington Co., VA	✓	✓	✓			
King Co., WA	✓	✓	✓			

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, not for offender data	Other online systems	Internet	CD-ROM
Pierce Co., WA	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Waukegan Co., WI	✓	✓	✓			

* Other technologies cited:

- Automated fingerprint ID system—Jefferson Co., KY
- Court records access—Philadelphia Prison System

Community-based corrections

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, non-offender	Other online	Internet	CD-ROM
AK probation/parole	✓	✓	✓			
AZ parole	✓	✓				
Maricopa Co. (AZ) probation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pima Co. (AZ) probation	✓	✓	✓			
CA parole	✓	✓			✓	
CA youth parole		✓		✓		
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.		✓	✓			
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation		✓	✓	✓		
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓	✓	✓		
CO probation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CO parole	✓	✓				✓
CT probation	✓	✓	✓			
FL probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	✓		
GA parole	✓	✓			✓	
GA comm.corr./probation		✓				
HI parole	✓	✓	✓			
HI 1st circuit probation	✓	✓				
ID probation/parole	✓					
IL parole	✓	✓				
Cook Co. (IL) probation	✓	✓				

	Federal online system (NCIC)	Local/state online system, offender data	Local/state system, non-offender	Other online	Internet	CD-ROM
LA probation/parole	✓	✓				
ME probation/parole	✓	✓	✓			
MD probation/parole	✓	✓	✓			
MA parole	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole		✓				
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile		✓				
MN probation/parole	✓	✓				
MS probation/parole		✓	✓			
MO probation/parole		✓	✓			
MT probation/parole						
NE parole	✓	✓		✓		
NV probation/parole	✓	✓				
NH probation/parole	✓		✓			
NJ parole	✓	✓				
NJ probation	✓	✓				
NM probation/parole		✓				
New York City probation				✓		
NC probation/parole	✓	✓				
ND probation/parole	✓	✓	✓			
OH parole/probation	✓	✓				
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.	✓	✓				
OR probation/parole	✓	✓	✓			
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓	✓		✓		
Philadelphia probation	✓	✓	✓	✓		
PA probation/parole	✓		✓			
RI probation/parole	✓	✓				
SC probation/parole	✓	✓				
SD parole		✓				
SD probation	✓	✓			✓	✓
TN probation	✓	✓	✓			
TN parole		✓				
Dallas Co. (TX) probation		✓	✓			
WA probation/parole		✓		✓		
WI probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Federal probation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

11. Staff Development

Adult prison systems

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs
Alabama	✓			
Alaska	✓		✓	
Arizona	✓			
Arkansas	✓		✓	
California	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colorado	✓	✓	✓	
Connecticut	✓		✓	✓
Delaware	✓			
D.C.	✓			✓
Florida	✓			✓
Georgia				
Hawaii	✓		✓	
Idaho				
Illinois	✓			
Indiana	✓		✓	✓
Iowa				
Kansas	✓	✓	✓	
Kentucky	✓			
Louisiana	✓			
Maine	✓			
Maryland	✓			
Massachusetts	✓			✓
Michigan				
Minnesota	✓		✓	✓
Mississippi				
Missouri	✓	✓		
Montana				
Nebraska	✓			
Nevada	✓			
New Hampshire	✓			
New Jersey	✓	✓		✓
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓	
New York				
North Carolina	✓		✓	
North Dakota	✓	✓	✓	✓

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs
Ohio				
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	
Oregon	✓			
Pennsylvania	✓			
Rhode Island	✓			✓
South Carolina	✓		✓	
South Dakota	✓			
Tennessee				
Texas	✓			
Utah	✓	✓		✓
Vermont	✓		✓	
Virginia	✓			✓
Washington	✓		✓	
West Virginia	✓	✓		
Wisconsin				
Wyoming	✓			
Canada	✓			✓
Federal BOP	✓	✓	✓	✓
Puerto Rico				

Large jails

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓	✓		✓
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alameda Co., CA	✓			
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓		✓	✓
Sacramento Co., CA	✓		✓	
San Diego Co., CA	✓			
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓			✓
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓			
Arapahoe Co., CO	✓	✓	✓	
Denver Co., CO	✓			
Broward Co., FL	✓	✓		✓
Dade Co., FL	✓			
Escambia Co., FL	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓			
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓			✓

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs
Orange Co., FL	✓			✓
Pinellas Co., FL	✓		✓	
Volusia Co., FL	✓			✓
DeKalb Co., GA	✓			✓
Jefferson Co., KY	✓			
MD pretrial	✓			
Prince George's Co., MD	✓			
Hampden Co., MA	✓			✓
Oakland Co., MI	✓		✓	
Wayne Co., MI	✓	✓		
Jackson Co., MO	✓			
City of St. Louis, MO	✓			
St. Louis Co., MO	✓			
Clark Co., NV	✓	✓	✓	
Middlesex Co., NJ	✓			
Bernalillo Co., NM	✓			
New York City, NY	✓	✓		
Mecklenberg Co., NC	✓			
Franklin Co., OH	✓	✓		
Philadelphia Prison System, PA				
Davidson Co., TN	✓		✓	
Shelby Co., TN	✓		✓	
El Paso Co., TX	✓	✓	✓	
Tarrant Co., TX	✓			
Arlington Co., VA	✓			
King Co., WA	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	✓		✓	
Milwaukee Co., WI	✓			

Community-based corrections

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs
AK probation/parole	✓			
AZ parole	✓			
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓	✓	✓	
Pima Co. (AZ) probation	✓		✓	✓
CA parole	✓			✓
CA youth parole	✓		✓	✓
Alameda Co. (CA) prob.	✓		✓	
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓	✓		
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation	✓			
CO probation	✓			
CO parole	✓			✓
CT probation	✓	✓		
FL probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	✓
GA parole	✓			✓
GA comm.corr./ prob.	✓		✓	✓
HI parole	✓			
HI 1st circuit probation	✓			✓
ID probation/parole	✓			
IL parole	✓			
Cook Co. (IL) prob.	✓			
LA probation/parole	✓		✓	
ME probation/parole	✓			
MD probation/parole	✓			
MA parole	✓			
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓			
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓			
MN probation/parole				
MS probation/parole	✓			
MO probation/parole	✓			
MT probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	
NE parole	✓			
NV probation/parole	✓			
NH probation/parole	✓			

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs
NJ parole	✓			
NJ probation	✓	✓	✓	
NM probation/parole	✓			
New York City probation				
NC probation/parole	✓			✓
ND probation/parole	✓			
OH parole/probation	✓		✓	
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.				
OR probation/parole	✓		✓	
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓			
Philadelphia probation	✓			
PA probation/parole	✓			✓
RI probation/parole				
SC probation/parole	✓			✓
SD parole				
SD probation	✓		✓	
TN probation	✓			
TN parole				
Dallas Co. (TX) prob.	✓			
WA probation/parole	✓		✓	
WI probation/parole	✓		✓	✓
Federal probation	✓		✓	

12. Offender education and training

Adult prison systems

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs	Other *
Alabama	✓				
Alaska		✓	✓	✓	
Arizona	✓	✓		✓	
Arkansas	✓			✓	
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Colorado	✓	✓		✓	
Connecticut	✓			✓	
Delaware	✓			✓	
D.C.				✓	

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs	Other *
Florida	✓		✓	✓	
Georgia					
Hawaii	✓		✓	✓	
Idaho					
Illinois	✓				✓
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Iowa					
Kansas	✓	✓		✓	
Kentucky	✓			✓	
Louisiana	✓			✓	
Maine	✓			✓	
Maryland	✓				
Massachusetts	✓			✓	
Michigan					
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Mississippi					
Missouri	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Montana					
Nebraska	✓		✓	✓	
Nevada	✓	✓		✓	
New Hampshire	✓	✓		✓	
New Jersey	✓	✓		✓	
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓	✓	
New York					
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	
North Dakota	✓			✓	
Ohio					
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Oregon	✓	✓		✓	
Pennsylvania	✓				
Rhode Island	✓				
South Carolina	✓			✓	
South Dakota	✓				
Tennessee					
Texas	✓			✓	
Utah	✓	✓		✓	
Vermont	✓			✓	
Virginia	✓			✓	
Washington	✓	✓	✓	✓	

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs	Other*
West Virginia	✓	✓		✓	
Wisconsin					
Wyoming	✓				
Canada					
Federal BOP	✓	✓		✓	
Puerto Rico	✓			✓	

* Other technologies cited:

- Online information service—Illinois

Large jails

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance Technology	Interactive computer labs	Other*
Maricopa Co., AZ	✓			✓	
Pima Co., AZ	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Alameda Co., CA	✓				
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓		✓	✓	
Sacramento Co., CA	✓		✓	✓	
San Diego Co., CA	✓	✓	✓		
San Joaquin Co., CA	✓			✓	
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓			✓	
Arapahoe Co., CO		✓	✓	✓	
Denver Co., CO	✓			✓	
Broward Co., FL	✓	✓		✓	
Dade Co., FL	✓				
Escambia Co., FL	✓	✓	✓		
Hillsborough Co., FL	✓	✓		✓	
Jacksonville Co., FL	✓				
Orange Co., FL	✓			✓	
Pinellas Co., FL	✓			✓	
Volusia Co., FL				✓	
DeKalb Co., GA	✓			✓	
Jefferson Co., KY	✓			✓	
MD pretrial					
Prince George's Co., MD	✓				
Hampden Co., MA	✓			✓	

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance Technology	Interactive computer labs	Other*
Oakland Co., MI					
Wayne Co., MI	✓	✓			
Jackson Co., MO					
City of St. Louis, MO	✓			✓	
St. Louis Co., MO	✓	✓		✓	
Clark Co., NV					
Middlesex Co., NJ					
Bernalillo Co., NM	✓			✓	
New York City, NY					
Mecklenberg Co., NC	✓			✓	
Franklin Co., OH					
Philadelphia Prison System, PA					
Davidson Co., TN	✓				
Shelby Co., TN	✓				
El Paso Co., TX	✓			✓	
Tarrant Co., TX	✓	✓		✓	
Arlington Co., VA				✓	
King Co., WA	✓	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	✓			✓	
Millwaukee Co., WI	✓			✓	

Community-based corrections

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs	Other*
AK probation/parole					
AZ parole					
Maricopa Co. (AZ) prob.	✓			✓	
Pima Co. (AZ) prob.	✓			✓	
CA parole	✓			✓	
CA youth parole	✓			✓	
Alameda Co. (CA) probation	✓		✓		
Los Angeles Co. (CA) probation	✓			✓	

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	Interactive computer labs	Other*
San Bernardino Co. (CA) probation					
CO probation	✓			✓	
CO parole					
CT probation					
FL probation/parole	✓			✓	
GA parole	✓				
GA comm.corr./prob.	✓				
HI parole					
HI 1st circuit prob.			✓		
ID probation/parole	✓				
IL parole	✓				
Cook Co. (IL) prob.					
LA probation/parole					
ME probation/parole					
MD probation/parole	✓				
MA parole					
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole	✓			✓	
Hennepin Co. (MN) probation/parole-juvenile	✓			✓	
MN probation/parole	✓				
MS probation/parole	✓				
MO probation/parole	✓				
MT probation/parole					
NE parole					
NV probation/parole	✓				
NH probation/parole					
NJ parole					
NJ probation	✓				
NM probation/parole					
New York City prob.				✓	
NC probation/parole					
ND probation/parole					
OH parole/probation	✓				
Franklin Co. (OH) prob.				✓	
OR probation/parole	✓			✓	

	Video tapes	Closed-circuit TV	Distance technology	interactive computer labs	Other*
Marion Co. (OR) prob.	✓				
Philadelphia probation					
PA probation/parole					
RI probation/parole					
SC probation/parole	✓				
SD parole	✓				
SD probation					
TN probation					
TN parole	✓		✓		
Dallas Co. (TX) prob.	✓				
WA probation/parole	✓			✓	
WI probation/parole	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Federal probation					

Appendix B
Agency Contacts

TECHNOLOGY CONTACTS: ADULT PRISON SYSTEMS

ALABAMA

Chas H. Simmons
Senior Administrative Analyst
Alabama Department of Corrections
50 North Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130
PHONE: (334) 242-9400
FAX: (334) 242-9399

ALASKA

Steve Schwartz
Alaska Department of Corrections
4500 Diplomacy Dr., Suite 207
Anchorage, AK 99508
PHONE: (907) 269-7392
FAX: (907) 269-7390

Annette Smith
Alaska Department of Corrections
4500 Diplomacy Dr., Suite 207
Anchorage, AK 99508
PHONE: (907) 465-3376

ARIZONA

Daryl R. Fischer
Research Manager
Arizona Department of Corrections
1601 W. Jefferson, MC 314
Phoenix, AZ 85007
PHONE: (602) 542-3691
FAX: (602) 542-5399

ARKANSAS

Ray Hobbs
Assistant Director
Arkansas Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 8707
Pine Bluff, AR 71601
PHONE: (501) 247-6303
FAX: (501) 247-3700

CALIFORNIA

Larry Cothran
Executive Officer
Technology Transfer Committee
Planning and Construction Unit
501 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 323-2450
FAX: (916) 324-0887

COLORADO

Gene Atherton
Chief of Security
Colorado Department of Corrections
2862 South Circle Dr., Suite 400
Colorado Springs, CO 80906-4195
PHONE: (719) 540-4721
FAX: (719) 540-4805

CONNECTICUT

Charles L. Miller
Director, Research & MIS
Department of Corrections
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
PHONE: (203) 566-5606
FAX: (203) 566-7772

DELAWARE

Kathryn Pippin
Management Analyst
Delaware Department of Corrections
80 Monrovia Avenue
Smyrna, DE 19977
PHONE: 739-5601
FAX: 739-6740

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Keith Godwin
Communication Specialist
D.C. Department of Corrections
1923 Vermont Ave, NW, N-124
Washington, DC 20001
PHONE: (202) 673-7342
FAX: (202) 673-2325

FLORIDA

Mike Rathmann
Security Administrator
Florida Department of Correction
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
PHONE: (904) 487-4443
FAX: (904) 922-9277

Paula Bryant
Research Associate
Florida Department of Correction
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
PHONE: (904) 488-1801
FAX: (904) 488-4602

HAWAII

Ted Sakai
Administrator
Department of Public Safety,
Corrections Program Services
919 Ala Moana Blvd, Suite 405
Honolulu, HI 96814
PHONE: (808) 587-1278
FAX: (808) 587-1280

ILLINOIS

Stan Wolfe
1301 Concordia Court
P.O. Box 19277
Springfield, IL 62794-9277
PHONE: (217) 522-2666 ext. 2512
FAX: (217) 522-8719

INDIANA

Trish Wright
Research Analyst
Illinois Department of Corrections
302 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis, IN
PHONE: (317) 232-5782
FAX: (317) 232-6798

KANSAS

Jeff Lewis
Information Resource Manager
Kansas Department of Corrections
900 S. Jackson, 4th Floor
Topeka, KS 66612
PHONE: (913) 296-5515
FAX: (913) 296-0014

KENTUCKY

Louis T. Smith
Information Systems Supervisor
Kentucky Department of Corrections
State Office Building, 5th Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
PHONE: (502) 564-4360
FAX: (502) 564-5642

LOUISIANA

Baron Kaylo
Warden
Avoyelles Correctional Institute
1630 Prison Road
Cottonport, LA 71327
PHONE: (318) 876-2891
FAX: (318) 876-2891

MAINE

Ralph Nichols
Director, Corrections Inspections
Maine Department of Corrections
State House Station III
Augusta, ME 04333
PHONE: (207) 287-4391
FAX: (207) 287-4370

MARYLAND

Dr. William Sondervan
Assistant Commissioner,
Security Operations
Maryland Division of Corrections
6776 Reistertown Road, Suite 311
Baltimore, MD 21215-2342
PHONE: (410) 764-4170
FAX: (410) 764-4182

MASSACHUSETTS

Curtis M. Wood
Director of Information Resources
Massachusetts Department of Corrections
100 Cambridge St.
Boston, MA 02202
PHONE: (617) 727-2106
FAX: (617) 727-9709

MINNESOTA

Dan O'Brien
Assistant to the Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Corrections
450 N. Syndicate St., Suite 300
St. Paul, MN 55104
PHONE: (612) 642-0280
FAX: (612) 642-0414

MISSOURI

Bill M. Armontrout
Assistant Director of Adult Institutions
Missouri Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 236
Jefferson City, MO 65102
PHONE: (314) 751-2389
FAX: (314) 751-4099

NEBRASKA

Beth Schubach
Administrative Assistant
Nebraska Department of Correctional Svcs.
P.O. Box 94661
Lincoln, NE 68509-4661
PHONE: (402) 471-2654
FAX: (402) 479-5119

NEVADA

Robert Bayer
Director
Nevada Department of Prisons
P.O. Box 7011
Carson City, NV 89702
PHONE: (702) 887-3216
FAX: (702) 687-6715

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Donald A. Veno
Director, Division of Administration
New Hampshire Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 1806
Concord, NH 03302-1806
PHONE: (603) 271-5610
FAX: (603) 271-5643

NEW JERSEY

William Plantier
Superintendent
Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center
8 Probation Way
Avenel, NJ 07001
PHONE: (908) 574-2250
FAX: (908) 574-2257

NEW MEXICO

Jerry Tafoya
Executive Assistant
New Mexico Corrections Department
P.O. Box 27116
Santa Fe, NM 87502-0116
PHONE: (505) 827-8839
FAX: (505) 827-8801

NEW YORK

Paul H. Korotkin
Assistant Director of MIS/Research
New York State Department of Correctional Svcs.
State Office Campus, Bldg. #2
Albany, NY 12226
PHONE: (518) 457-3007
FAX: (518) 457-2689

NORTH CAROLINA

Bob Brinson
Information Resources
North Carolina Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 29540
Raleigh, NC 27626-0540
PHONE: (919) 733-5716

NORTH DAKOTA

Pat Foley
Program Coordinator
Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation
P.O. Box 1898
Bismarck, ND 58502-1898
PHONE: (701) 328-6390

OKLAHOMA

Bill Chown
Oklahoma Department of Corrections
3400 N. Martin Luther King Ave.
Oklahoma City, OK 73136
PHONE: (405) 425-2591

OREGON

John Grill
Deputy Assistant Director
Institutions Branch, Oregon Dept. of Corrections
2575 Center Street, NE
Salem, OR 97310
PHONE: (503) 945-0956
FAX: (503) 373-1173

PENNSYLVANIA

Andrew Keyser
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 598
Camp Hill, PA 17001-0598
PHONE: (717) 975-3303

RHODE ISLAND

Michael R. Frost
Chief of Security
Rhode Island Department of Corrections
40 Howard Avenue
Cranston, RI 02920
PHONE: (401) 464-2296
FAX: (401) 464-2630

SOUTH CAROLINA

Dr. Lorraine T. Fowler
Division Director
Resource and Information Management
South Carolina Department of Corrections
4444 Broad River Road
Columbia, SC 29210
PHONE: (803) 896-8526
FAX: (803) 896-1217

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lloyd Tooley
South Dakota Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 5911
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5911
PHONE: (605) 367-5180

TEXAS

Tim New
Chief of Security Operations
P.O. Box 99
Huntsville, TX 77342-0099
PHONE: (409) 294-2923

TEXAS

Linda Burney
Assistant Director
Data Services Division
Texas Dept. of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 99
Huntsville, TX 77342-0099
PHONE: (409) 294-2270

UTAH

Gae Lyn DeLand
Director
Bureau of Information Technology
6100 South Fashion Blvd.
Murray, UT 84107
PHONE: (801) 265-5508
FAX: (801) 265-5670
E-MAIL crdept.gdeLand@email.state.ut.us

VERMONT

Michael T. O'Malley
Director of Security and Supervision
Vermont Department of Corrections
103 S. Main St.
Waterbury, VT 05671
PHONE: (802) 241-2383
FAX: (802) 241-2565

VIRGINIA

S. Hughes, Analyst
Virginia Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 26963
Richmond, VA
PHONE: (804) 674-3268
FAX: (804) 674-3590

L. White, Certification Specialist
Virginia Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 26963
Richmond, VA

WASHINGTON

Barb Lovelace
Administrative Assistant to Deputy Director
Division of Prisons
Washington Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 41123
Mailstop 41123
Olympia, WA 98504-1123
PHONE: (360) 586-8406
FAX: (360) 586-9055

WEST VIRGINIA

William R. Whyte
Deputy Commissioner-Operations
West Virginia Division of Corrections
112 California Ave., 3rd Floor
Charleston, WV 25305

WISCONSIN

Phillip Koenig
Director
Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 7925
Madison, WI 53707
PHONE: (608) 266-3023
FAX: (608) 267-1759

WASHINGTON

Jim Mahan
Chief, Office of Security Technology
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
PHONE: (202) 307-3191
FAX: (202) 307-3071

WYOMING

John Lighty
MIS Coordinator
Wyoming Department of Corrections
Herschler Bldg., 1st Floor E
Cheyenne, WY 82002
PHONE: (307) 777-6516
FAX: (307) 777-7479
E-MAIL: wy008c@wydsprod.state.wy.05

CANADA

Jim Roberts
Manager, Security Technology
Correctional Service of Canada
340 Laurier Ave. West
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0P9
PHONE: (613) 992-8339
FAX: (613) 943-0835 or (613) 996-9421

PUERTO RICO

Reginald Ledain
Director of Information Center
Administration of Correction
P.O. Box 71308
San Juan, PR 00936
PHONE: 273-0722

TECHNOLOGY CONTACTS: LARGE JAILS

ARIZONA

Larry A. Wendt
Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
102 W. Madison Street
Phoenix, AZ 85003
PHONE: (602) 256-1821
FAX: (602) 379-0063

Chief of Security
Pima County Adult Detention
P.O. Box 910
Tucson, AZ 85702

CALIFORNIA

Sergeant D.A. Driscoll
Alameda County Sheriff's Dpt.
5325 Broder Blvd.
Dublin, CA 94568
PHONE: (510) 551-6540
FAX: (510) 551-6574

Sergeant Bob Braman
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
29300 The Old Road
B.O.Q. #2
Saugus, CA 91350
PHONE: (805) 295-8809
FAX: (805) 257-4750

Lt. Charles Lushbaugh
Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
711 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 440-7166
FAX: (916) 440-5332

Sergeant Joe Gomes
San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office
7000 Michael N. Canlis Blvd.
French Camp, CA 95231
PHONE: (209) 468-4570
FAX: (209) 468-4380

Richard Palmer
San Diego County Sheriff's Dpt.
Data Services
5555 Overland Ave., Bldg. #12
San Diego, CA 92123

Captain David Gonzales
Department of Correction Operations Commander
Santa Clara County Department of Correction
180 W. Hedding St., Administrative Division
San Jose, CA 95110
PHONE: (408) 299-4005
FAX: (408) 288-8271

COLORADO

Captain Frank W. Henn
Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office
Justice Center Detention Facility
7375 S. Potomac St.
Englewood, CO 80112-4030
PHONE: (303) 649-0903
FAX: (303) 649-0991

Sergeant Esther Marcano
Denver County Sheriff's Department
P.O. Box 1108
Denver, CO 80201
PHONE: (303) 375-5501
FAX: (303) 375-5500

FLORIDA

Sergeant Almeata Hilton
Metro Dade Department of
Correction and Rehabilitation
8660 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33144
PHONE: (305) 229-7590
FAX: (305) 229-7522

Lieutenant Timothy M. Jeffers
Pinellas County Sheriff's Office
Detention and Corrections Bureau
14400 49th Street North
Clearwater, FL 34622
PHONE: (813) 464-6415 ext. 49164
FAX: (813) 464-6466

Lester Neel
Deputy Warden
Volusia County Department of Corrections
Caller Service Box 2865
Daytona Beach, FL 32120
PHONE: (904) 254-1551
FAX: (904) 254-1560

Howard Ferguson
Assistant Director, Detention
Broward Sheriff's Office
555 S.E. 1st Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
PHONE: (305) 831-5907
FAX: (305) 761-9767

Tara H. Wildes
Administrative Lieutenant
Special Projects
Pretrial Detention Facility
Jacksonville Sheriff's Office
500 East Adams St.
Jacksonville, FL 32202
PHONE: (904) 630-5713
FAX: (904) 630-5885

Stephen Pierce
Compliance Supervisor
Orange County Corrections Division
P.O. Box 4970
Orlando, FL 32802-4970
PHONE: (407) 836-3527
FAX: (407) 836-3523

Captain Alma Cornish
Chief of Security
Escambia County Sheriff's Office
Corrections Division
P.O. Box 17789
Pensacola, FL 32522-7789
PHONE: (904) 436-9813
FAX: (904) 436-9172

Captain Thomas Hall
Falkenburg Road Jail
Tampa, FL 33619
PHONE: (813) 247-0880

GEORGIA

John T. Clower
Chief Deputy Sheriff
DeKalb County Sheriff's Office & Jail
4415 Memorial Drive
Decatur, GA 30032
PHONE: (404) 298-8143
FAX: (404) 298-8101

Vincent P. McEvoy
Assistant Chief, Division of Personnel Services
Prince George's County
13400 Dillie Drive
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
PHONE: (301) 952-7017
FAX: (301) 952-7285

KENTUCKY

Betsy Helm
Jefferson Co. Corrections
730 West Main St., Suite 300
Louisville, KY 40202

MARYLAND

Michael H. Waudby
Assistant Warden
Maryland Department of Pretrial Detention
and Services
300 East Madison
Baltimore, MD 21202

MASSACHUSETTS

Major Edward J. Weldon
Hampden County Correctional Center
627 Randall Road
Ludlow, MA 01056-1079
PHONE: (413) 547-8000
FAX: (413) 547-8357

MICHIGAN

Sheriff John F. Nichols
Oakland County Sheriff's Department
1201 N. Telegraph Road
Pontiac, MI 48341-1044
PHONE: (810) 858-5008
FAX: (810) 858-1012

Peter R. Wilson
Director of Jails
Wayne County Jails Divisions I, II, III
570 Clinton
Detroit, MI 48226
PHONE: (313) 224-0116
FAX: (313) 224-2368

MISSOURI

Charles Megerman
Director
Jackson County Dept. of Corrections
1300 Cherry St.
Kansas City, MO 64106
PHONE: (816) 881-4233
FAX: (816) 881-3199

Roy Mueller
Superintendent II/Transition Coordinator
St. Louis County Dept. of Justice Services
100 South Central
Clayton, MO 63105
PHONE: (314) 889-7250
FAX: (314) 721-8583

Phillip L. McLaurin
Commissioner of Corrections
City of St. Louis Division of Corrections
402 City Hall, 1200 Market St.
St. Louis, MO 63103
PHONE: (314) 622-4991
FAX: (314) 622-4392

NEVADA

Glade McArthur
Corrections Lieutenant
Clark County Detention Center/LVMPD
330 S. Casino Center Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89101
PHONE: (702) 455-3702
FAX: (702) 455-3934

NEW JERSEY

Captain John Tevoli
Commander-Operations Division
Middlesex County Dpt. of Corrections
P.O. Box 266
New Brunswick, NJ 08902
PHONE: (908) 297-3636
FAX: (908) 297-8835

NEW MEXICO

Chuck Rees
Deputy Chief
Bernalillo County Detention Center
415 Roma NW
Albuquerque, NM 87103
PHONE: (505) 764-3503
FAX: (505) 764-3571

NEW YORK

Natale Abruzzo
Bureau Chief of Security
NYC Department of Corrections
60 Hudson St., 6th Floor
New York, NY 10013
PHONE: (212) 266-1000

NORTH CAROLINA

Captain G.W. Bradshaw
Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Dpt.
901 Elizabeth Ave., Suite 300
Charlotte, NC 28204
PHONE: (704) 336-8196
FAX: (704) 336-8585

OHIO

Richard J. Brazik
Deputy Sheriff
Franklin County Sheriff's Office
370 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
PHONE: (614) 462-3368
FAX: (614) 462-6633

PENNSYLVANIA

David O'Shea
Correctional Lieutenant
Philadelphia Prison System
1140 Byberry Road
Philadelphia, PA 19116
PHONE: (215) 685-0360
FAX: (215) 671-0454

TENNESSEE

Ed Manker
Planning, Shelby County Sheriff's Office
201 Poplar Avenue
Memphis, TN 38103
PHONE: (901) 576-5565
FAX: (901) 576-2696

Jim Allen
Director of Technology
Davidson County Sheriff's Office
506 Second Ave., North
Nashville, TN 37201
PHONE: (615) 862-6829
FAX: (615) 862-8188

TEXAS

Ralph W. Mitchell
Captain Detention Commander
El Paso County Sheriff's Dept.
601 E. Overland
El Paso, TX 79901
PHONE: (915) 546-2228
FAX: (915) 546-2026

Richard C. Cox
Superintendent
Milwaukee County House of Correction
1004 N. 10th St.
Milwaukee, WI 53233
PHONE: (414) 427-4756
FAX: (414) 427-8017

Savala Swanson
Chief Deputy
Tarrant County Sheriff's Dept.
100 N. Lamar
Fort Worth, TX 76196-0196
PHONE: (817) 884-3162
FAX: (817) 884-3173

VIRGINIA

Karen Albert
Assistant Director of Corrections
Arlington County Sheriff's Office
1425 N. Courthouse Road, #9100
Arlington, VA 22201
PHONE: (703) 358-4484
FAX: (703) 358-7284

WASHINGTON

Julie Lord
Pierce County Sheriff's Dept.
Corrections Bureau
910 Tacoma Ave., South
Tacoma, WA 98402
PHONE: (206) 597-3430

Timothy P. Longley
Wide Area Network Administrator
King County Dept. of Adult Detention
500 5th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104
PHONE: (206) 296-1454
FAX: (206) 0570

WISCONSIN

Jeffrey S. Zens
Director, Technical and Auxiliary Svcs. Bureau
Milwaukee County Sheriff's Office
821 West State Street
Milwaukee, WI 53233
PHONE: (414) 278-4685
FAX: (414) 223-1881

TECHNOLOGY CONTACTS: COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONS

ALASKA

Steve Schwartz
Research Analyst
Alaska Dept. of Corrections
4500 Diplomacy Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
PHONE: (907) 269-7370
FAX: (907) 269-7365

ARIZONA

Carl E. Nink
Assistant Director
Arizona Dpt. of Corrections
Community Corrections Division
363 N. 1st Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85003
PHONE: (602) 255-4232
FAX: (602) 271-4722

Zachary Dalpra
Planning Supervisor
Maricopa County Adult Probation
11 W. Jefferson, Suite 425
Phoenix, AZ 85003
PHONE: (602) 506-3584
FAX: (602) 506-5952

Jim Dinniman
Coordinator
The Adult Probation Department of the
Superior Court in Pima County
110 West Congress St., 8th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701
PHONE: (520) 740-3800 or 740-3884
FAX: (520) 798-3352

CALIFORNIA

Ted Rich
Parole Agent II
Parole Service Unit
Institution Division
California Dept. of Corrections
1515 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 322-3523
FAX: (916) 324-6985

Steve Kruse
Program Administrator
California Youth Authority
4241 Williamsborough Drive, Suite 226
Sacramento, CA 95823
PHONE: (916) 262-1530
FAX: (916) 262-1381

Frederick Morawcznksi
Assistant Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County Probation Department
P.O. Box 2059
Oakland, CA 94604-2059
PHONE: (510) 268-7039
FAX: (510) 268-7274

P. Joseph Lenz
Deputy Chief Probation Officer
San Bernardino County Probation Dpt.
175 W. 5th St.
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0460
PHONE: (909) 387-5853
FAX: (907) 387-5626

COLORADO

Vern Fogg
Director
Office of Probation Services
Colorado Judicial Dept.
1301 Pennsylvania St.
Denver, CO 80203
PHONE: (303) 861-1111
FAX: (303) 861-1814

Ralph Nolan
Parole Supervisor
Colorado Department of Corrections
3642 S. Galapago St.
Englewood, CO 80110
PHONE: (303) 761-4749
FAX: (303) 761-3703

CONNECTICUT

Terry Borjeson
Deputy Director
Office of Adult Probation
2275 Silas Deane Highway
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
PHONE: (203) 563-2454
FAX: (203) 721-9474

FLORIDA

Richard J. Nimer
Program Administrator
Probation and Parole
Florida Department of Corrections
2601 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
PHONE: (904) 487-2165
FAX: (904) 921-8195

GEORGIA

John Prevost
Assistant Director
Computer Services and Research Unit
Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles
1116 West Tower
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Dr.
Atlanta, GA 30334
PHONE: (404) 651-6744
FAX: (404) 657-4259

Fred Radford
Management Information Systems
Georgia Department of Corrections
Community Corrections Division
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Dr.
Suite 954, East Tower
Atlanta, GA 30334
PHONE: (404) 656-4747
FAX: (404) 651-6537

Beverly Wade
Telecommunications

HAWAII

Anthony C. Commendador
Parole Administrator
Hawaii Paroling Authority
250 S. King St.
Honolulu, HI 96813
PHONE: (808) 587-1290
FAX: (808) 587-1314

Ronald T. Hajime
Probation Administrator
Adult Probation, First Circuit, Judiciary
777 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813
PHONE: (808) 539-4585
FAX: (808) 539-4559

IDAHO

Rudy J. Evenson
Deputy Administrator
Field and Community Services
Idaho Dept. of Corrections
500 S. 10th St.
Boise, ID 83720-0014
PHONE: (208) 332-8257
FAX: (208) 334-3183

ILLINOIS

Stanley Wolfe, Manager
Information Services Unit
Illinois Department of Corrections
1301 Concordia Court
P.O. Box 19277
Springfield, IL 62794-9277
PHONE: (217) 522-2666
FAX: (217) 522-9791

Gilbert V. Brown, Jr.
Assistant Chief Probation Officer
Cook County Adult Probation Department
2650 S. California Ave., Lower Level
Chicago, IL 60608-5146
PHONE: (312) 890-3322
FAX: (312) 890-7352

LOUISIANA

Morris Easley
Probation and Parole Director
Louisiana Department of Public
Safety and Corrections
P.O. Box 94304, Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9304
PHONE: (504) 342-6609
FAX: (504) 342-3087

MAINE

Peter Tilton
Director, Division of Probation and Parole
State House Station #111
Augusta, ME 04333
PHONE: (207) 287-4381
FAX: (207) 287-4370

MARYLAND

Janet Q. Bacon
Assistant Director
Bureau of Administrative Services
Division of Parole and Probation
6776 Reisterstown Road, Suite 305
Baltimore, MD 21215
PHONE: (410) 764-4284
FAX: (410) 764-4091

MASSACHUSETTS

Sallyann V. Sweeney
Systems Analyst
Massachusetts Parole Board
27 - 43 Wormwood Street, Suite 300
Boston, MA 02110-1606
PHONE: (617) 727-3271
FAX: (617) 727-2756

MINNESOTA

William Guelker
Assistant Deputy Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Probation and Parole
450 North Syndicate
St. Paul, MN 55104
PHONE: (612) 642-0348
FAX: (612) 642-0414

Tom Laselle
Juvenile Corrections Administrator
Hennepin County Community Corrections
C2353 Government Center
Minneapolis, MN 55487-0237
PHONE: (612) 348-3685
FAX: (612) 348-6488

Sigmund L. Fine
Adult Corrections Administrator
Hennepin County Community Corrections
C2353 Government Center
Minneapolis, MN 55487-0237
PHONE: (612) 348-3681
FAX: (612) 348-6488

MISSISSIPPI

Jimmy McIntyre
Mississippi State Penitentiary
Parchman, MS 38737
PHONE: (601) 745-6611 ext. 2424

MISSOURI

Paul D. Herman
Chief State Supervisor
Missouri Board of Probation and Parole
117 Commerce
Jefferson City, MO 65109
PHONE: (314) 751-8488
FAX: (314) 751-8501
E-MAIL: PDHOO#PP COMPUTRB

MONTANA

Larry De France
Montana Department of Corrections
1539 11th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
PHONE: (406) 444-4913
FAX: (406) 444-4920

NEBRASKA

Marcella A. Shortt
Compact Supervisor
Adult Parole Administration
P.O. Box 94661
Statehouse Station
Lincoln, NE 68509-4661
PHONE: (402) 471-2634
FAX: (402) 479-5119

NEVADA

Tom Davis
Management Analyst
Parole and Probation Division
1995 Hot Springs Road #104
Carson City, NV 89706
PHONE: (702) 687-5040
FAX: (702) 687-5402

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Larry D. Blaisdell
Regional Administrator
New Hampshire Dpt. of Corrections
Division of Field Services
P.O. Box 1806
Concord, NH 03302-1806
PHONE: (603) 271-5652
FAX: (603) 271-5643

NEW JERSEY

Victor R. D'Ilio, Chief
NYS Bureau of Parole
CN 864 Whittlesey Road
Trenton, NJ 08625
PHONE: (609) 292-4387
FAX: (609) 292-1914

Harvey M. Goldstein
Assistant Director for Probation
Administrative Office of the Courts
Justice Complex CN 987
Trenton, NJ 08625
PHONE: (609) 292-1589
FAX: (609) 984-3630

NEW MEXICO

Leon G. Day
Deputy Director
New Mexico Corrections Dept.
Probation and Parole Division
P.O. Box 27116
Santa Fe, NM 87502-0116
PHONE: (505) 827-8678
FAX: (505) 827-8679

NEW YORK

Anna Stern
Associate Commissioner
NYC Department of Probation
115 Leonard Street
NY, NY 10013
PHONE: (212) 442-2906
FAX: (212) 442-2906

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert L. Guy
Deputy Director-DAPP
Division of Adult Probation and Parole
4000 Wake Forest Road
Raleigh, NC 27609
PHONE: (919) 850-2900
FAX: (919) 850-2818

NORTH DAKOTA

Charles R. Placek
Central Office Regional Supervisor
ND Division of Parole and Probation
P.O. Box 5521
Bismarck, ND 58506-5521
PHONE: (701) 328-6198
FAX: (701) 328-6651

OHIO

Jill D. Goldhart
Deputy Director
Division of Parole and Community Svcs.
Ohio Dept. of Rehabilitation and Correction
1050 Freeway Drive North
Columbus, OH 43229
PHONE: (614) 752-1235
FAX: (614) 752-1251

James F. Wichtman
Director/Chief Probation Officer
Franklin County Adult Probation Svcs.
373 S. High Street, 10th Floor
Columbus, OH 43125-6300
PHONE: (614) 462-5256
FAX: (614) 462-3685

OREGON

Jean Hill
Administrator, Information Systems Div.
Oregon Department of Corrections
2575 Center St. NE
Salem, OR 97310
PHONE: (503) 945-0965
FAX: (503) 378-4908

PENNSYLVANIA

Ed Quinn, Director
Information/Correction Systems
Philadelphia Adult Probation Department
121 North Broad Street, 3rd Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19107-1907
PHONE: (215) 686-7744
FAX: (215) 686-7750

RHODE ISLAND

Richard Gaskell
Assistant Administrator
Adult Probation and Parole
One Dorrance Plaza
Providence, RI 02903
PHONE: (401) 277-3496
FAX: (401) 277-6950

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ted Kelley
Administrator-Field Supervision Programs
SC Dpt. of Probation, Parole and Pardon Svcs.
2221 Devine Str., Suite 600
Columbia, SC 29250
PHONE: (803) 734-9240
FAX: (803) 734-9299

SOUTH DAKOTA

Merlyn Baldwin
East River Parole Supervisor
Parole Services
408 S. 2nd Ave., Suite 104
Sioux Falls, SD 57102-1027
PHONE: (605) 367-5782
FAX: (605) 367-5785

Jay M. Newberger
Director
Court Services, SD Judicial System
500 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501
PHONE: (605) 773-4872
FAX: (605) 773-6128
E-MAIL: Jayn@ujs.state.sd.us

TENNESSEE

Jesse Tucker
Program Manager 2
Tennessee Dept. of Correction
Community Correction Division
320 Sixth Ave., North
2nd Floor, Rachel Jackson Bldg.
Nashville, TN 37243-0465
PHONE: (615) 741-3141
FAX: (615) 532-4846

Michael Bradley
Executive Director
Tennessee Board of Pardons
404 James Robertson Pkwy., Suite 1300
Nashville, TN 37243
PHONE: (615) 741-1673
FAX: (615) 741-5337

TEXAS

Reggie Storey
Manager, Administrative Operations
Dallas Co. Community Supervision
and Corrections Department
133 N. Industrial Blvd., 9th Floor
Dallas, TX 75207
PHONE: (214) 653-5204
FAX: (214) 653-5217

Berny Schiff
Interim Deputy Director
Division Operations
Criminal Justice Assistance Division
8100 Cameron Road, Suite 600
Austin, TX 78753
PHONE: (512) 305-9392

WASHINGTON

Mike Gray
Budget/Information Tech Manager
Department of Corrections
Community Corrections Division
410 West 5th, P.O. Box 41118
Olympia, WA 98504-1118
PHONE: (360) 753-1507
E-MAIL: mgray@halcyon.com

WISCONSIN

Michael Lew
Administrative Officer
Wisconsin Dept. of Corrections
Probation and Parole
Box 7952
Madison, WI 53702
PHONE: (608) 266-5413
FAX: (608) 267-1739

FEDERAL PROBATION

Jacquelyn C. Kossin
Chief, Automation Branch
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Probation and Pretrial Services Division
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judicial Building
Room 4-300
Washington, DC 20544
PHONE: (202) 273-1630
FAX: (202) 273-1603

Appendix C
Survey Instrument

1995 Survey of Corrections Technology

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
Prisons Division and Information Center
April 1995

Survey Overview

As part of a collaborative effort with the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) is conducting this survey to gather current information on the use of technology by correctional agencies. This information will be used to create a picture of what technologies are being used, and by which agencies, as well as how highly agencies value the technologies they are using. Results will guide NIJ as that agency develops a resource center specific to corrections technology, to be located in Charleston, South Carolina.

The survey is being distributed to state institutional corrections agencies, large jails, and probation and parole agencies. Results for each of these groups will be presented separately in the survey report.

Respondent Identification

Survey respondent name _____

Title _____

Agency _____

Mailing Address _____

City/State/ZIP: _____

Phone: _____

FAX: _____

E-mail address, if available: _____

E-mail address is being requested for eventual use by NIJ and/or NIC. A list of agencies' technology contacts will also be included with the survey results to facilitate information sharing among agencies. Please check here if you prefer that your e-mail address *not* appear in the listing: _____

Please respond by May 26, 1995

Return to:

Connie Clem, Project Coordinator

NIC Information Center

1860 Industrial Circle

Longmont, CO 80501

(800) 877-1461

FAX (303) 682-0558

If the survey respondent is *not* the agency's main contact for matters related to technology, please provide the main technology contact's name, address, and phone number:

SECTION 1. AGENCY'S CURRENT APPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY

Instructions: Use checks in the left-hand column of each table to indicate which technologies are currently in use in your agency. Note any other technologies being used in the space provided. Using the right-hand columns, please check one column to characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses.

1. Perimeter security.

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use for perimeter security? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
<input type="checkbox"/>	Video camera motion detectors				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Microwave sensors				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Infrared sensors				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Taut wire				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buried cable				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	None				

Comments (optional):

2. Identification/access control.

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use for identification/access control of either staff or offenders? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
<input type="checkbox"/>	Key pad				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Card (magnetic strip)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bar code				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Voice recognition				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fingerprint recognition				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	None				

Comments (optional):

3. **Internal monitoring/surveillance.**

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use to monitor activity within facilities? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
	Video camera motion detectors				
	Infrared sensors				
	Volumetric sensors				
	Noise sensors				
	Other (specify)				
	None				

Comments (optional):

4. **Drug use detection.**

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use for drug use detection? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
	Urinalysis (self-contained unit)				
	Urinalysis (laboratory processing)				
	Retinal scan (involuntary eye motion)				
	Air sensors				
	Breath analyzer				
	Other (specify)				
	None				

Comments (optional):

5. **Contraband detection.**

Which of the following techniques does your agency currently use to detect contraband? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technique it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
	Hand-held metal detector				
	Walk-through metal detector				
	X-ray				
	Infrared sensor				
	Agency uses "drug dogs"				
	Other (specify)				
	None				

Comments (optional):

6. Security communications.

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use for security communications? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)	Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
<input type="checkbox"/> Personal duress alarms (manual)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Personal duress alarms (automatic)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Portable two-way radio				
<input type="checkbox"/> Pagers				
<input type="checkbox"/> Mobile telephones				
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)				
<input type="checkbox"/> None				

Comments (optional):

7. Less-than-lethal weaponry.

What types of less-than-lethal weaponry does your agency use? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)	Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
<input type="checkbox"/> OC pepper spray				
<input type="checkbox"/> Bean bag gun				
<input type="checkbox"/> Taser				
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)				
<input type="checkbox"/> None				

Comments (optional):

8. Other security technologies.

Please identify any other unique or emerging technologies that your agency currently uses for security purposes. Indicate the agency's overall satisfaction with each of the technologies you identify, using the 1-to-4 scale as in previous questions.

9. **Non-emergency communications within the agency.**

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use for transmission of data or for staff communications within the agency, whether these exchanges take place locally or at sites throughout a state? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
<input type="checkbox"/>	Computer local area network (LAN) with e-mail capability				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Computer wide area network (WAN) with e-mail capability				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Video conferencing (satellite link)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Video conferencing (non-satellite)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	None				

Comments (optional):

10. **Information linkage with sources outside your agency.**

Does your agency retrieve data from outside the agency via any of the following? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each system it uses?

Technologies in use (check)		Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dis-satisfied -4-
<input type="checkbox"/>	Federal online offender information system (NCIC)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or state online offender information system				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or state government information system (not for offender data)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other online systems				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internet				
<input type="checkbox"/>	CD-ROM				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)				
<input type="checkbox"/>	None				

Comments (optional):

11. **Electronic monitoring of offenders.**

Does your agency use electronic monitoring for offenders in the community?

- Yes (active system)
 Yes (passive system)
 No
 Not applicable/agency does not provide community-based services

If yes, how many offender units are now in operation? _____

What is your agency's overall satisfaction with electronic monitoring, on a 1-to-4 scale? _____

Comments (optional):

12. **Staff development.**

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use in staff training and development? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Very dissatisfied
Video tapes				
Closed circuit television				
Distance technology (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)				
Interactive computer labs, simulations				
Other (specify)				
None				

Comments (optional):

13. **Offender education and training.**

Which of the following technologies does your agency currently use for offender education and training? How would you characterize the agency's overall satisfaction with each technology it uses?

Technologies in use (check)	Very satisfied -1-	Satisfied -2-	Not satisfied -3-	Very dissatisfied -4-
Video tapes				
Closed circuit television				
Distance technologies (video-conferencing, satellite link, etc.)				
Computer labs (for skills development, e.g., for literacy education. This <i>does not</i> refer to systems that train offenders in computer skills for employment.)				
Other (specify)				
None				

Comments (optional):

14. Please identify any other unique or emerging technologies that your agency currently uses for non-security purposes.

SECTION II: ISSUES RELATED TO USE OF TECHNOLOGY

15. Please indicate which of the following methods your agency uses to evaluate technology before it is adopted:

- _____ No formal method has been established
- _____ Evaluation is conducted by a designated person
- _____ Evaluation is conducted by a standing committee
- _____ Evaluation is conducted by ad-hoc committees
- _____ Other (describe) _____

16. Please identify any technologies that are currently being tested or evaluated by your agency.

17. What obstacles have limited your agency's adoption of new technologies? (Check all that apply.)

- _____ Lack of information on available technologies
- _____ Lack of staff resources to explore technology options
- _____ Lack of funding availability
- _____ Lack of interest/perceived need
- _____ Lack of nearby product servicing capability
- _____ Requirement to work with/through another agency to acquire technology
- _____ Other (describe) _____
- _____ No major obstacles have been encountered

18. Has your agency stopped using any particular technologies because they failed to meet the agency's needs?

- _____ Yes
- _____ No

If yes, please identify the technology(ies) and briefly state why the technology was dropped.

19. Please describe improvements to existing corrections technologies that would make them more effective. (Optional)

20. What other corrections problems or functions do you believe new technologies might address? (Optional)

21. Through what methods would your agency prefer to access NIJ's planned clearinghouse for information on correctional technology? (Please rank your top three choices, with "1" being your most preferred option.)

- _____ 800 telephone line to clearinghouse staff
- _____ Fax to clearinghouse staff
- _____ Mail to clearinghouse staff
- _____ Online access to searchable technology database
- _____ Online access to bulletin board postings, e.g., on Internet