

Committee Meeting

103
10
p959
19926
v.2

before

SENATE LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

"To review and discuss the May 18, 1992 independent consultant's report on the Electronic Monitoring and Home Confinement Program administered by the Department of Corrections"

LOCATION: Committee Room 6
Legislative Office Building
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: June 11, 1992
10:20 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Senator Louis F. Kosco, Chairman
Senator John J. Matheussen, Vice-Chairman
Senator John P. Scott
Senator Bradford S. Smith
Senator Thomas F. Cowan
Senator John A. Girgenti



ALSO PRESENT:

Aggie Szilagyi
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Senate Law and Public Safety Committee

Hearing Recorded and Transcribed by

The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,
Hearing Unit, 162 W. State St., CN 068, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0068

New Jersey State Library



LOUIS F. KOSCO
Chairman
JOHN J. MATHEUSSEN
Vice-Chairman
JOHN P. SCOTT
BRADFORD S. SMITH
THOMAS F. COWAN
JOHN A. GIRGENTI

New Jersey State Legislature

SENATE LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, CN-068
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0068
(609) 984-0231

COMMITTEE NOTICE

TO: MEMBERS OF THE SENATE LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY
COMMITTEE

FROM: SENATOR LOUIS F. KOSCO, CHAIRMAN

SUBJECT: COMMITTEE MEETING - June 11, 1992

The public may address comments and questions to Aggie Szilagyi, Committee Aide, or make bill status and scheduling inquiries to Norma Morales, secretary, at (609) 984-0231.

The Senate Law and Public Safety Committee will meet on Thursday, June 11, 1992 at 10:00 a.m. in Committee Room 6, Legislative Office Building, Trenton.

The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the May 18, 1992, independent consultant's report on the Electronic Monitoring and Home Confinement Program administered by the Department of Corrections.




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
William H. Fauver Commissioner New Jersey Department of Corrections	8
Richard Angulo Director Marketing and Sales Digital Products Corporation	29
Mario Paporozzi Electronic Monitoring Program New Jersey Department of Corrections	34

APPENDIX:

"Evaluation of the Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program" by Dr. Joseph B. Vaughn Criminal Justice Department Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093	1x
--	----

mjz: 1-49

* * * * *



SENATOR LOUIS F. KOSCO (Chairman): We are going to call this meeting to order, and address the issue in the report we received. I will ask for a quorum call.

MS. SZILAGYI (Committee Aide): Senator Smith?

SENATOR SMITH: Here.

MS. SZILAGYI: Senator Matheussen?

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Here.

MS. SZILAGYI: Senator Girgenti?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Here.

MS. SZILAGYI: Senator Cowan?

SENATOR COWAN: Here.

MS. SZILAGYI: We have a quorum, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR KOSCO: Is there anyone who needs the report who does not have a copy of the report yet, because they are available? The Commissioner has made them available. (no response)

Please note that Senator Scott has come in. It was nice of you to come.

SENATOR SMITH: Nice of you to invite me.

SENATOR KOSCO: The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the May 18, 1992 independent consultant's report on the Electronic Monitoring and Home Confinement Program administered by the Department of Corrections. Let me open today's proceedings by thanking the Department of Corrections' Commissioner, Mr. William Fauver, and his staff, for appearing for this special meeting of the Senate Law and Public Safety Committee.

Given the urgency of the problems with the DOC-operated Electronic Monitoring and Home Confinement Program, we must begin today to review the report and its findings in a careful and deliberate manner. It is my opinion that the review of the independent consultant's report on the New Jersey electrically monitored Home Confinement Program and the implementation of major departmental changes will help the

people of New Jersey begin again to have confidence in the management and the operations of the program.

Our goal is a simple one: New Jersey must have confidence in the Department of Corrections' program. People want to know what went wrong. Whether it was simply a failure of the equipment or human error, people want to know that these mistakes will never happen again. Our commitment in our Committee is to find the answers to these concerns. After people read the consultant's report, they will find that there are serious problems with both the equipment and the management of the DOC program. In my opinion, no electronic monitoring program of this magnitude, as was identified in the national consultant's report, should be run by interoffice memos, without a policy and without a procedures manual. These practices are wrong; wrong as management practices, wrong for the people of New Jersey, who want accountability for programs that safeguards the public well-being.

Frankly, I don't understand how the Governor and the Commissioner could have implemented and made plans for the rapid expansion of the Electronic Monitoring Program without a well-coordinated management plan. Therefore, given these misguided priorities, let me send out a directive: We have no choice. The Electronic Monitoring Program must be made shipshape, with all the major reforms we will agree on, by October 1. The Committee feels that is plenty of time to give to the Department to make these changes and get the program back on course, so we can continue with the program.

On behalf of the Committee, I have asked the Commissioner to provide me with written updates every two weeks as to the changes that are being made and how they address the problems in the report. I expect specific references regarding how the 20 report recommendations are being satisfied through major policy changes. The crimes allegedly committed on April 2, 25, and 29 by inmates in the Electronic Program should, in

my opinion, not have happened. Furthermore, I am outraged by the apparent lack of coordination between Digital Products Corporation, the electronic bracelet company, and the Department of Corrections. How such confusion, misinformation, lack of information, and possible contract renewal could all have occurred without the public or the Legislature being informed of the problems, is unbelievable. It is a shame that major public policies, which should have been in place prior to the expansion of the plan, were not.

How could the New Jersey Parole Board be granted permission from the Attorney General in 1991 to place parolees in the electronic bracelet program? This practice is especially troublesome, as the following passage from the consultant's report indicates:

"Program administrators report the Parole Board has since sought an opinion of the Attorney General, who advised that they have the authority to place parolees in the program, and are not bound by Corrections Department restrictions. It is their opinion that the Parole Board has, in the past, sent them questionable clients."

I am shocked about this point. We, as a Committee, are already debating whether the criteria for eligibility for the Electronic Program are the right ones. I find it offensive that another agency can unilaterally disregard the public's will or the guidelines, and place inmates in the program who would not normally be granted parole.

The November 16, 1990 memo on eligibility guidelines for the Home Confinement Program set forth four major criteria which make certain inmates ineligible for the program. New Jerseyans have a right to know to what extent these guidelines have been ignored. Let me highlight what I believe to be a few of the key quotes within the report which underscore the seriousness of the problems in the electronic bracelet program. This is in parts of the report:

"The program was run by interoffice communications forms. No policy and procedure manual has ever been promulgated by the Department. There is no collection of policy and procedure memos maintained in a central location which is accessible to program personnel."

Page 4 of the report says: "The program has a poor management information system." Also on that page it says: "The Parole Board has begun assigning parolees to EMHC irrespective of the program's exclusion criteria."

Page 6 says: "Nothing the inmate did allowed him to escape detection of the initial tampering with the transmitter and subsequent curfew violations. The failure to detect these actions was due to equipment and supervision failure."

Page 5: "During the summer of 1990, there was a feeling among field officers that the equipment did not work, with the primary problem being an excessive number of tampering problems. In the fall of 1990, Assistant Commissioner Howard held a meeting with Commissioner Fauver in which the Monitoring Program was discussed. Commissioner Fauver had been requested to expand the program by the Governor, with a target of 250 inmates by January. Assistant Commissioner Howard stated that she believed the program had lost credibility in the Department because 'EM never got its act together,'" and that is in quotations. "There was a perception that the Parole Board was incapable of running the program."

Page 10: This page reported that: "The contract for the electronic monitoring device runs out on June 14." We will address that as part of this meeting today. If it weren't for the report, we would not have been aware of that, but I understand after discussion with the Commissioner that that has been handled, and I believe it has been handled satisfactorily.

"Prior to the Palmer incident no one from Digital Products Corporation informed employees of the New Jersey Department of Corrections of the problem's existence, or that

they had changed the system's software. This information was not learned until after April 3."

Let me jump to page 15, where the failure of the electronic bracelet monitoring equipment to work properly in all cases, was discussed. Recommendation 17 on page 38 states: "The Telsol hardware problem should be addressed immediately by the Department and the equipment manufacturer. This problem is allowing violations to go undetected on the incident monitor screen. Until all equipment problems have been addressed, it is imperative that the on-line printer be continually monitored."

On page 17, it says: "Training for field officers and monitoring center staff is conducted 'on the job.'" We should have a training program in place. I don't believe this is the type of a program where on-the-job training is effective.

On pages 18 and 19: These pages outline how the Electronic Monitoring/Home Confinement Program was bent to the needs of the Parole Board. In fact, the Attorney General's Office sanctioned the eligibility of inmates for the program, who normally did not meet the criteria. That is on pages 18 and 19 of the report.

On pages 28 and 29: These pages illustrate inmate Tony Palmer's record, and the fact that while on the electronic bracelet he was actually arrested. Why wasn't the man removed from the program? Why was the incident report absent from the inmate's file?

On page 32: Palmer is listed as allegedly teaching another inmate how to tamper with the transmitter band. In fact, the other inmate did succeed in tampering, and was listed in the report as having been included on the March 9, 1992 computer printout as having committed a tamper. According to the report, officers did not know that a tamper occurred, due to equipment malfunction.

In the independent consultant's report one message, and it is the following one, is very clear: "The DOC program needs significant changes." Therefore, let me conclude my opening remarks by announcing some emergency procedures. On behalf of the Senate Law and Public Safety Committee, I would like these procedures followed in light of the stern and critical tone of the report. I anticipate that today's meeting will yield more critical material, which we will discuss during another hearing before the end of the month.

I am asking the Parole Board and the Department of Corrections to identify for me, by the end of this day -- and we will be here all day -- all Parole Board-recommended inmate participants in the Electronic Monitoring Program. According to the consultant's report, the Department was notified by the State Parole Board of their intention to begin using EMHC to release inmates who would not normally be granted parole. Furthermore, DOC officials were quoted in the report as saying: "After the Parole Board was denied the right to place a sex offender on the Electronic Monitoring Program, the Parole Board sought an opinion from the Attorney General's Office. The Attorney General's Office ruled that the Parole Board had the authority to place parolees in the program, and is not bound by Corrections Department restrictions." This practice is outrageous, and it must stop.

I am concerned that the contract with the electronic bracelet company is about to expire. I do not want to see any contract approved at this time, except at the way they have it approved right now. I just found out that the Commissioner has that handled, so we will remove that one from my statement.

On behalf of the Committee, we want written updates every two weeks by the Department as to the status of changes in reference to the problems we may address. A policy and procedures manual must be developed immediately. We expect the Department to restore the public's confidence in the program as

expeditiously as possible. I intend to see that major reforms are in place by the October 1 deadline.

For three weeks, my staff has requested a breakdown of all those currently enrolled in the DOC Electronic Monitoring Program and the category of crimes they have committed. On behalf of this Committee, we also want that list by the end of Friday. I would like, also, a list of any crimes or tampers committed for each of the years the program has been in operation.

On behalf of the Committee, we want the Department to forward to our attention all memos and statements listed in the footnotes of the report. We want the material by the end of this week. Those are all listed on the bottom of each report, as referenced.

We are also asking the Department to provide the names and addresses of other vendors who bid on the original contract, so we can contact them regarding their contract proposals. In particular, we want to know how these vendors handle training the employees who supervise the inmates. To Commissioner Fauver and the representatives of Digital Products Corporation, we are asking your assessment of whether or not the report was fair to you, and your reactions to the recommendations.

Starting today, I intend to lead the discussion by reviewing the report, section by section, or however deemed appropriate, with the Commissioner's approval. I am also pleased to announce that Dr. Joe Vaughn, the independent consultant, has indicated that he could not be here today, but he will be here at a future hearing we want to have, as we continue working on the program.

Again, Commissioner, and your staff, thank you very much for being here. Do any of the other members have any questions or statements they would like to make? (no response) If not, I think my first question would be to the

Commissioner. Why don't you join us up here, Commissioner? So that we have a beginning to this, I would like to ask the Commissioner if he generally agrees with the findings of this report, or is the report-- Whose beeper is that going off? Is it yours?

SENATOR COWAN: I'm being monitored. (laughter)

SENATOR KOSCO: He just went 150 feet from his wife.

I would like to ask that question again, Commissioner: Do we agree that the report was important and fair, and that the recommendations are on-line -- on target?

COMMISSIONER WILLIAM H. FAUVER: Senator, I agree with the recommendations in the report. We are prepared to discuss those with you today. But all the issues in there-- Before going into that, I am just going to briefly make a statement saying that before I discuss that with the Committee, I would like to address the statement that was in The Bergen Record the other day alleging that the Corrections Department knew the program was not working and that the Governor ordered it to be continued.

This is not true; it is absolutely not true. The Electronic Monitoring Program has operated under both Governor Kean and Governor Florio, and neither Governor has ever ordered me to place people in the program, or to expand the program. In my tenure as Commissioner, and previously as the Director of the Division of Corrections and Parole, I have never had any one of the four Governors that I worked for attempt to interfere in any way in the administration of the Department.

The goals that were established for the people in the program have been clear for more than a year and were contained in my budget presentations to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses last year. I have copies of that with me, starting with March of '91, where the number of inmates and the dates we would try to make with those numbers are there. That includes the 250.

My personal position would be -- and I would think the Governor's, too-- If a Governor ever had to order a Commissioner to do anything, he ought to get rid of him, or the Commissioner ought to have enough sense to resign. I don't think that is the relationship-- It is certainly not one that I have ever had with any Governor.

Having said that, I will be glad to go through these one by one, Mr. Chairman, if that is your prerogative. The only other thing I would say is, keep in mind, as I told the Committee at one of our meetings before, that we are really talking about-- Of all the people under sentence in New Jersey, not just from the State, but all over, over 100,000 people in this State are on alternative programs, whether they be probation, parole, or some of the intervention programs -- pretrial intervention. So, the majority of those committed are not inside. That is a trend that is true throughout the country, not just within the State.

At your pleasure, Mr. Chairman, if you would like to just go down through the recommendations, or--

SENATOR KOSCO: What I would like to do first, Commissioner, is to address the contract status right now so that this Committee has the same information that I have, which I just learned a few minutes ago. I had a quick discussion with the Commissioner. For the Committee members, the contract, as we know because of the report, expires the 14th of June. What the Commissioner has told me is that the Digital people wanted a three-year contract. The Commissioner then agreed, with the Department of the Treasury, that they will extend the contract for one year, but with an option to dissolve the contract in 60 days. Did I state that correctly?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR KOSCO: I felt that was a fair-- We have to continue the program. We can't just stop it, so we have to have a contract in order to do that. I just wanted to get that

section cleared up before we got started, because I know that was a deep concern to the members of the Committee; that we were going to continue with a program we might be having some concerns about with the particular type of manufacturer. I wanted them to understand that. We can now go on from there.

What would be the Committee's choice on how to handle this? I thought we would just-- If anyone has any particular questions you would like to ask about the contents of the report itself, because it is pretty much in-depth, and then we can get to the recommendations. In order to discuss the recommendations, we really have to go back to the contents of the report. Or would you prefer picking a recommendation and then going back to it? Whatever is comfortable for the Committee.

SENATOR COWAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, if the Commissioner-- How are you prepared to proceed? Do you want to address the recommendations in order? Is that what--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, not necessarily in order, but that was my intent -- to discuss the recommendations.

SENATOR COWAN: I have one question. I really haven't had much of a chance to look at this report over the past two days. When was this report requested by you? I assume this was all done at your requesting?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: That is correct.

SENATOR COWAN: I would like to know when, and what the purpose of your--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: The purpose was-- This was after the Palmer incident, when the arrest occurred. Rather than doing it in-house or using the Attorney General's people or anything else, I wanted to get an outside expert's opinion on the program, which is what we have. So it was requested, and was done-- Well, it was not done, but the consultant actually came the very next weekend. This was done prior to any, you know, any committees or anything else -- anybody else

asking me to do this. I wanted to do this. I made that decision on my own.

SENATOR KOSCO: Senator Girgenti?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Commissioner, you know the concerns I have had with the program. We have talked about them in the past. The one thing, as I reviewed the document here-- If you go to pages 68, 69, Department of Corrections, Interoffice Communication, "Subject: Eligibility/Exclusion - Home Confinement Program," evidently that is the criteria. It's, like, in the appendix.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: That's the eligibility criteria.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Right. When you go to the backside -- the second page of that-- We talked about this in the past. My concern is, when you read this-- You give the categories of individuals who cannot be on the program in here, in terms of what is laid out: convicted of rape, sodomy, and so forth. The second one: "Inmates presently convicted of criminal homicide," could mean that a person who had been convicted of homicide in the past, had served his time, is now back having committed another offense-- He is not presently convicted of homicide, so he is eligible for the program, the way that reads. Is that true?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: That is not the intent. That's how it reads; you're correct.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: That concerns me, because, you know, I think either you have to go over this type of-- I don't think these things-- I think they are inadequate, first of all -- the criteria. I think this has to be finely tuned. For instance, you could have a career criminal on this program, according to the way this reads, if you go on. It is not very clear. There are people in there--

When you came to us, or other people have stated continuously that it is for nonviolent offenders. When I see a

guy who was previously convicted of murder, in my opinion, he is a violent offender.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Right.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: If I see a guy who had a prior conviction for aggravated assault, if he had prior convictions for armed robbery, in my opinion, that is not the type of individual I want on the program, not only if it is this offense, but if he has done it before.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: I understand.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: That is one thing I picked up. I know we talked about it. That is one of the reasons I feel that, well, even the legislation I put forth now that spells out the different individuals who should be qualified for the program-- I don't know if you looked at it yet. I think we have to tighten that up.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: If I may, through you, Mr. Chairman, respond to the Senator: One of the recommendations in here from the consultant is the policy and procedures manual. I believe you will see, Senator Girgenti, that these changes are made in there. We do have that manual developed in this period of time. So, you know, I think that will address most of the concerns. I'm sure we will not agree on everything, but at least they will be something formally in writing, and, as the consultant said, more than just an interoffice memo.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay, thank you. On page 5 of the report, just to touch back on what we had said about the 250 people we wanted to increase-- I indicated out of the report here that in the fall-- But in the paragraph before that, on page 5, it says: "During the summer of 1990, there was a feeling among field officers that the equipment did not work, with the primary problem being an excessive number of tamper alarms. Assistant Commissioner Howard instructed Paporozzi to address the equipment problems. He contacted the vendor."

Digital told him that the equipment was okay, and that the problem was a lack of knowledge and training. Then they went on to explain that they knew they were having the problem, but that they couldn't troubleshoot to correct the problem.

In the next paragraph, it says in the report: "In the fall of 1990, Assistant Commissioner Howard held a meeting with Commissioner Fauver, in which the monitoring program was discussed. Commissioner Fauver had been requested to expand the program by the Governor, with a target of 250 inmates by January of 1991. During this meeting, questions were raised as to whether Parole or the Institutional Division should be responsible for operating the program. Assistant Commissioner Howard stated she believed the program had lost credibility in the Department because, 'EM could never get its act together.' There was a perception that Parole was incapable of running the program. The issue had been discussed as to whether the Department should run its own program or contract out the monitoring responsibilities to a private service provider."

This, Commissioner, indicates to me that the Governor gave you not only the number of people he wanted on the program, but the date he wanted it done by. So, either the Governor discussed this directly with Commissioner Howard and didn't talk to you about it, and then Commissioner Howard didn't give you that information at the time, but gave it to the person who was writing the report-- My guess would be that somewhere along the line there was another miscommunication.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, there may have been a miscommunication, but as I indicated in my opening statement, I mean, the number 250 is clearly in the February 26, 1991 statement to the Appropriations Committee -- the Assembly Appropriations. It was our goal to reach that by the end of the year, and the money was appropriated for it. As I indicated, I had never had a conversation with the Governor on putting people in -- any Governor.

SENATOR KOSCO: Do you know whether Commissioner Howard had a conversation with the Governor? When I say "the Governor," I should say, "the Governor's Office."

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: I don't think so, I don't know.

SENATOR KOSCO: Because according to this report, the person who wrote this report--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, you know, it is possible that he misunderstood, too, if the first part of it-- That is one of the reasons I want to try to go through the recommendations, because the second recommendation is: A decision should be made to place the program in one division or another, and there should be more responsibility placed on one person so that there is a focal point that everything comes back to.

I didn't get a chance to introduce to the Committee-- To my right is Mario Paparozzi, who was referred to in this report. We held a meeting just yesterday to reorganize some things. I asked Mario to take up the running of the Electronic Monitoring Program. He was with it initially at its inception a number of years back, and has been working on ISSP and other programs -- community programs -- more recently.

Also, the decision was made at the same time to place this program under the Chief of the Bureau of Parole, or in the Division of Policy and Planning, and it is the same Assistant Commissioner in charge of both of those. My feeling is that there was substance to the finding of the consultant that when a program is in-between two divisions -- in this case, the Adult Division and Policy and Planning -- you are always going to have gaps. So my intention was that the people-- Excuse me. My direction is that the people who will now report to Mr. Paparozzi will be-- Also, there will be some Adult people in there -- Adult Division people -- but they will come under the Bureau of Parole. He and the Chief of the Bureau will, you

know, ultimately have the responsibility on this. So I think that addresses the structure.

If you would like a comment on the equipment issue that you raised in that first paragraph--

SENATOR KOSCO: I have a question on your Department as it is presently functioning. We are dealing with one Department, or one aspect of the Department of Corrections, and that happens to be the Electronic Monitoring Program. Now, here we have a person from, wherever, Colorado or someplace, who came into the Department and spent a short period of time -- a relatively short period of time -- in the Department, who came up with 20 points that I think we all agree are pretty strong, directly to the point, and correct, if not word for word, at least in general theory. And here we have people who are in the Department on a day-to-day basis -- six, eight, ten, twelve, whatever number of hours a day. Why didn't our supervisors, the people who are supervising this program, see that these things were going on?

I mean, this stuff is so obvious, where you have animosity because he gets overtime and he doesn't get overtime; he gets a company car and he doesn't get a company car; and, you know, she is allowed to take two hours off and he is not allowed to take-- I mean, some of the things that were taking place in the Department, according to this report, were things that any manager who has any kind of common sense at all would have been able to detect and correct, so that the morale in the Department itself wouldn't be so bad. Why did it take an outsider to come in here and tell us we had people who were upset because they weren't getting overtime because they didn't know how to use the program, because they were getting on-the-job training instead of being instructed as to what procedures they should follow?

That leads me to the next part of my concern, if not a question: Do we have other divisions that have the same

problem, and are we, six months from now, going to be sitting here doing a hearing on another division in the Department of Corrections that has the same kind of morale problem, the same kind of personnel problem, the same kind of lack of reporting problem?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, there are a lot of answers to that. First of all, I really don't think there is a morale problem. I am aware of the issue on overtime, and have scheduled a meeting with the union representing the parole officers. I had one meeting with their President, and I scheduled a meeting -- there isn't a date yet, but before the end of the month. I told them we would meet with them to address the concerns you are talking about, such as the overtime concern.

I would like to point out, though, that when you say, "Why wasn't it--" I mean, the first recommendation in here is to stop the program at its -- to stop the growth of the program where it is until we have evaluated it. That was done prior to the consultant's report. It was done when I first came to your Committee. I agreed to do that that day. So, I think there are other things in here-- Part of this may be just the old "forest for the trees" issue. The people working on it are too close to it. That was one of the reasons I wanted an outside person. I didn't want the people here to have to be defensive and defend their program, but I wanted to know what was really going on. That is why I chose to do it that way. I did that, again, prior to anything else happening.

Yes, you're right. There are four divisions within the Department, and this is one of them: Policy and Planning, under which Parole comes, and under which Electronic Monitoring comes. As I said, to address that, at least part of it, I think the management issue is to put somebody specifically in charge, and then he is the person we can all go back to and fire when something goes wrong. So he was glad to be told that

he was going to have this job yesterday, and then the bad news was, "We have a Committee hearing tomorrow, and you better be there with all of the answers."

But, seriously, I think there is no question that that was a shortcoming. We had two divisions within the Department kind of vying for where this program should be, and somebody should have picked up on it, particularly me.

SENATOR KOSCO: You have settled that problem?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: In my opinion, I have, yes. I think that when you see the updates we give you, you will see that that is true.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. You are going to set up-- As far as this program is concerned, you are going to set up an organizational chart showing exactly how the program -- whose responsibilities are what for the program. The person who is in charge of the program -- who is Mario, I assume -- is going to be responsible for developing this manual -- the procedures manual you said is already in the process of being developed?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: It actually has been developed. I did not bring it because I haven't had a chance to go over it yet, but it is developed.

SENATOR KOSCO: Can you have a copy of that for us by Friday, when you give us some of the other information we asked for?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: It is in draft form.

SENATOR KOSCO: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes.

SENATOR KOSCO: Senator Girgenti?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Mr. Chairman, I know in your opening statement you made a few comments. I am just curious: Number one, in your request did you ask for, from the Commissioner, the background of all inmates who are presently in the Home Monitoring Program?

SENATOR KOSCO: Yes.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: I would like to see that.

SENATOR KOSCO: We had asked for that three weeks ago.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: I think that is important. I think beyond that, we would also like to know if you could provide us with the name, criminal offense, and other conditions of the sentence, such as being allowed out for work? Like we had a situation, as you know, in the Paterson situation, the guy said, "I only have to report in from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and I don't have to on weekends." I mean, this is a prison--

SENATOR KOSCO: Senator, we have a letter here. You gave copies to everybody, didn't you? (addressed to Committee Aide) We have a letter back here from the Department of Corrections, because we had requested that a long time ago.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Okay.

SENATOR KOSCO: But, here's the problem: This is a part of--

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Doesn't paragraph 2 answer the question?

SENATOR KOSCO: This is part of the problem we are having with the Department. It says here: "We cannot provide the specifics you requested in your letter, as it would require staff to physically audit each offender's record for the information. We can tell you, however, that in January 1992 there were--" But they don't have that in a consolidated form. So, whenever we go into a problem or a request for something we are looking for, we find we have a management problem. If we can't ask for something and get it, obviously you can't either.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes. That is covered under number 6 in the recommendations, that a management information system must be developed to be able to retrieve this information.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: See, Commissioner, my problem is, from my experience-- You know I have been checking into this, especially with the situation in Paterson.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Right.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: You know, our local Police Department has no idea who is on this program. Now with the legislation we passed, we may have a handle on it. But I am reading through the report and I see that there were between 58 and 62 people in Paterson. We don't know who they are, or where they are. I know you are making an effort to notify, but right now we have these people in the community, and we are very interested, obviously, when we see all this publicity, and with three events happening in the city already. People are beginning to question it. It must be mostly in Paterson and Passaic if it is in Passaic County. We have, I believe, 62 in the program at the present time.

I think it is important that people know who is on the program, what they have done, what their background is, and what the conditions are. I understand your problem, but you have to understand our problem, too. You know, we are dealing with a problem.

SENATOR KOSCO: We are going to continue to insist on that information update, so somebody better get started getting it together. That is something that-- I don't know how the Department can function without knowing that information.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Let me mention that by stopping the admissions, or the count on this, the number of people in it has dropped almost 100 in the period of time we have done this, so that will continue to go down. My intent is not to start putting people back in until we are comfortable with--

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. Senator Scott?

SENATOR SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner, I have two areas I would like to address quickly. One is, as Senator Girgenti alluded to, I am at a loss. Someone has the record of this guy who is going to be put out with a bracelet on a parole. I mean, am I correct in assuming that?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes.

SENATOR SCOTT: You have his record; you can look at it. We cannot get this from the Parole Board? We cannot get this from somewhere? It can't be documented so that the local police will know who and what they have done? I don't follow why that seems to be a problem. It seems like merely going to the Parole Board, whoever wants it, saying: "Here are the guys. Here is their record. Type it up, and give us a synopsis of it."

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, the problem is, it is not computerized, and that would have to be done manually. Let me tell you, what we can give you is the name, the offense, where the person is from, what kind of time they are doing. This request went further, though, and asked for background information. The basics we can give you right away. That is not the problem.

SENATOR SCOTT: I think I'm right. In other words, I think the police-- I know, if it was in my town, I would want to know something of the background. I don't think we are looking to get each detail on the crime committed, and all that. We want to know the type of person who is out there and what he has done in the past. I think that is what we are asking for. I don't understand the problem. Even if it is manual, there are still people who type pretty well. I don't see-- If it is a matter of time--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: All right, but just as an example-- As I said, it is our intent to do that, to get this material together where we can. But just to give you an example of why it is a problem, we have 15 major institutions spread throughout the State, and that is where the records are on each of these cases. It is not like they are in a central repository. That is what we are attempting to establish, which is one of the recommendations in here. Until we can do that electronically, we will do it manually.

SENATOR SCOTT: I want to persist in this question, because I am trying to get my own mind satisfied. In each institution -- each of the 15 -- there is somebody in charge and they have a clerical staff.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Right.

SENATOR SCOTT: If they have 10 or 20, could they not, on a phone call, compile this information rather quickly that they know who they sent out onto these programs, and then forward it to your office, so that you, then, could say, "Here is the total"? I don't see a problem in time. Decentralized work doesn't mean that nobody has the information at that place. Decentralization really should help, in that each of the 15 would be able to apprise you of who is going out on a program, what their background is, and so on, rather quickly, I would imagine. You know, we're talking about a couple of hundred. If we were talking about tens of thousands, I could say, well, now you have a major problem. But if you take the 500, or whatever it is that are out there, between 15-- I fail to see the problem on that. Perhaps we could expedite that by notifying the person in charge of the institution that you want it quickly.

There is one thing: In your letter of June 10, I guess you are giving us a message regarding the costs of the EM program. In 1990, for 140, it was \$213,000; 864,000 for 495; and \$3.5 million for 537. Of course, then the message, I imagine, to this Committee is that if you did not have the money, the one, instead of \$213,000, would cost \$3 million; instead of \$864,000, \$10 million, and so on. I do get the message that if we appropriate enough funds you will keep them in.

I don't think anyone here, however-- I think the message we gave the last time was that people already have told us, in the bonding on prisons and so on, that they want the bad guys incarcerated. They don't want to hear about the fact that

it costs an extra million dollars. I think the public would be well served to spend money on incarceration for the bad guys. Senator Girgenti has 62 people up there, and I know he is concerned, and I know the Police Department and his constituents are now very concerned about it. They are not asking the Senator how much it costs. They are asking, "How much are we going to pay when we get mugged, or are burgled, or whatever may happen to us?"

We are fully aware of the costs of this. In my opinion, we have been given a message by the people before that money for this program is well spent. While I appreciate the total figures, I want you to know that as far as I am concerned, I will vote for appropriations for the Department of Corrections to put these people in and to keep them in.

That's about all.

SENATOR KOSCO: Thank you. Senator Matheussen?

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: With all due respect, Mr. Commissioner, I have something that concerns me. You are by far the expert; I am not. But I need to clarify something in my mind. When I first saw this letter of June 10 this morning, it concerned me, regarding paragraph 2, where it says the Department could not comply with the request. We now have something like 450 people on this program, according to what you said this morning, because about 100 people have come off since May. We are dealing roughly with about 450 people.

Correct me if I am wrong, Commissioner, and, again, I am not coming as an expert; you are the expert. In my background, I believe that the police departments, even on a local level, can get what we customarily call a "rap sheet" on someone within seconds by just putting into the computer that every municipality is centralized into.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Right.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: So the State has available a rap sheet on all offenders. I would hope, and I would suspect,

that these 450 people-- We could have immediate access to what their background arrests and convictions are. Granted, it might be very summarial in nature, but that should be available within seconds by your Department.

If, in fact, your Department were to require something a bit more detailed, what we would normally call in the court system a "presentence report" so that a judge can sit down and take a look at a more detailed report on the background of a particular offender, then sometimes that can take up to a week or two for Probation or for the Department of Corrections or for the police department to work up. But, and correct me if I am wrong, is that information not immediately available as to how many arrests and how many convictions, and basically categorizing what kind of offenses that person has been convicted for? Is that not available within seconds?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes, it is.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Then why would you respond to our request--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Because that was not the question. The question was for all the people who have ever been in the program -- the 3000-plus people, many of whom are now out, paroled, and the records would not be at the institutions. The people you are talking about-- If you are only talking about a rap sheet, which is the current arrest, the previous arrests, convictions, etc., that is retrievable. That can be done exactly as you said. But the request was for more than that. It was for more background information which we would have to go through. That is the reason for that response.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Then perhaps it should be more clarified.

SENATOR KOSCO: Maybe we should revise it to just look at the people who are on the program right now.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: I would think that by tomorrow we should be able to have every single name with every rap sheet attached to it.

SENATOR KOSCO: But we need more than just a rap sheet, Senator.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: We do, but if we could at least just initially-- I think the public has demanded, and the public should know by now what kind of people we have out on the street on this bracelet program. Certainly, in a cursory manner, this Senate Committee can have that information by this afternoon; by tomorrow morning at the latest. If we want more detailed information, then granted, I would suspect that the Department of Corrections would need more time to prepare full background sheets. But I am not so certain that we need full background sheets for at least our initial inquiry as to the kind of people who are on this program, and the kinds of records they have.

Certainly Senator Girgenti asked some very directed questions. You have a criteria that has been set out in the report that says that, in fact, these people are not eligible. That cursory report that is available within seconds certainly would determine whether or not we have met that criteria.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Oh, yes, yes.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: In all due respect, I think we should have that information, and I would hope that you would share that with us immediately.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: We can get that, yes.

SENATOR KOSCO: We can get the narrowed down version of what is there now -- the people who are on the program now, why they are on the program, and what crime they have been convicted of.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: And also the conditions of the--

SENATOR KOSCO: And the conditions. Okay.

I would just like to go back to the contract for a moment.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. He can do it for all of them. It doesn't have to be just the 450, because all the inmates-- You must have all the inmates' names who participated in the program, whether they are off it now or not. All it takes is a name and a Social Security number, or a driver's license number, and you can access that information immediately. So we should be able to do all--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: On rap sheets, but not on their additional--

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: All the rap sheets. We should be able to do all 2693 of them on the rap sheets.

SENATOR KOSCO: I think right now we are interested in the people who are not there on the streets right now.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: That's a priority.

SENATOR KOSCO: Let's get more information on them, rather than less information on a whole lot of people. I think it would be more important to this Committee to have as much information as we can on those people who are--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: There now.

SENATOR KOSCO: --walking the streets right now--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Okay.

SENATOR KOSCO: --rather than to worry about the couple of thousand who have been out there. Did I sum it up?

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: You're right, yes. I think that is the immediate--

SENATOR KOSCO: I would like to-- Are you finished?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Lou, if I may-- Like you're saying, we want that immediately, but I would like to see the total at some point.

SENATOR KOSCO: The total developed, yes.

SENATOR SCOTT: Yes, right, to get a pattern.

SENATOR KOSCO: I would like to get back to the contract for a minute. We are going to expand the contract for at least one year.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: There was one follow-up question.

SENATOR KOSCO: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: We had given the Commissioner, I guess, like a two-week period for a follow-up report. Is, within that two-week period, a full background check available to this Committee on all the 450 participants?

SENATOR KOSCO: We had asked him by Friday.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: All right, but I am not talking about rap sheets now; I am talking about the full background reports on each one. Would that be available within two weeks? I know when you order a presentence report as you prosecute someone, certainly it is available within two weeks to the judiciary. I don't know how fast your Department of Corrections can do it.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, again, if you are talking about something like a presentence report, which is already done and in a form, yes. But if it is compiling-- See, I mean, understand that inmate folders can be three or four folders stacked this high (demonstrates) and you would have to go through the material manually.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: I understand that. Some of them have colorful records.

SENATOR KOSCO: Why don't we be specific. I will give an example of what we are looking for--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Okay.

SENATOR KOSCO: --and then the Committee members tell me if they agree. What we need is-- We are talking about the inmates who are on the program as we speak.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Right.

SENATOR KOSCO: We want their names, the date they were released, what the crime was they were incarcerated for, and what their sentence was.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Okay.

SENATOR KOSCO: Does anyone want to add to that?

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: I would want more, yes.

SENATOR SCOTT: That will give us the names and addresses.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: The other conditions of being on the program. I saw somewhere the hours that they are on the program. I want to know, you know, what are the conditions?

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. So we want their name and address where they are living, the date they were released, what the conditions are that they were released under, what was the crime they committed, and what their sentence was.

SENATOR SCOTT: Or their rap sheet, which would give us the background.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: We want a rap sheet on them, too. We want to know their prior convictions.

SENATOR SCOTT: Yes, prior convictions.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: The rap sheet will give you the date of birth, the date of the conviction, the sentence, previous sentences--

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Criminal background.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: --criminal background. It would not cover--

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. So you need the rap sheet, plus the conditions of the release, and the date they were released. Also, where they are presently released to.

SENATOR SCOTT: Yeah, what town.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: When I say conditions -- and I think I am clear -- are they supposed to be on a work program? What are their hours? I notice where some people are confined to their houses, where they can't work. Other people can get a job. I would like to know who is out on the street. You know, what their conditions are.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. Going back to the contract we discussed, when that contract was renewed, or is going to be renewed, certainly there are a whole lot of things in this report that refer to the equipment.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes.

SENATOR KOSCO: Is part of the new contract we are going to sign with them going to include the changes and updates in this equipment immediately, that this report addresses? Those are things that your Department physically cannot do, and you physically cannot do. The only thing that can do that is the company you have contracted with, where changes have to be made in the hardware, software, and the programming of it. Is that going to be spelled out in the new contract, so that we just don't sign an old contract? Are we going to include in the contract the provisions where they have to be responsible for certain training and updating of the personnel who are going to be involved in the system?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: The answer is yes. Some of the upgrading has already been done. When I last appeared before the Committee, you were told by me, and by the representatives from Digital, I believe, that one of the things we were going to do was go to the other kind of wristlet, which is a one-piece, instead of the rivets. That is being done, or is done, I am not sure. I think it is totally done right now.

On the other things, there are time frames in there. They talk about problems in the report with Telsol and the reporting. The company has developed a way to correct that and bypass so that the computers are notified. We are still doing the manual look at the printout, but they have made improvements already, and there are time frames for them to do others. For example, 60 days, 90 days, whatever.

I think the advantage of the contract, the way we see it now being worded, is that if things are not done, then, you know, obviously we are not stuck with a three-year contract.

SENATOR KOSCO: Yes, but if it is not in the contract in the first place and they don't do it, you really don't have anything to say. If it specifically says in the contract that they are responsible for teaching the people--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Oh, the training, yes, it does, and they are doing that.

SENATOR KOSCO: My other question about the contract is, I am having trouble understanding the relationship between CSS and Digital; why we have not heard anything from CSS. What exactly is CSS? What are they providing to the State? The contract was issued to CSS. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Say it again, Senator.

SENATOR KOSCO: The contract that the State has is with CSS.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes, yes.

SENATOR KOSCO: Where does Digital come into this? What is the relationship between Digital and CSS?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: They are the parent company, I believe is how they come into it. I think there is a representative from Digital who could probably explain that better than I.

SENATOR KOSCO: Does our contract allow for us a contract with one company, where they can sell the contract, or whatever, to another company?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: No, I don't think so.

SENATOR KOSCO: Because if that is what they did, the whole thing is--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: No, I think it is just a parent company. That is my impression.

SENATOR KOSCO: Is there anyone from the company who has an answer?

R I C H A R D A N G U L O: (speaking from audience) Yes. My name is Richard Angulo. I am Director of Marketing--

SENATOR KOSCO: You have to come up here to speak so we can get it recorded.

MR. ANGULO: My name is Richard Angulo. I am Director of Marketing and Sales for Digital Products Corporation. Computerized Surveillance Systems is our licensee for the State of New Jersey. As this market has grown since 1984, Digital Products, as well as every other manufacturer in this industry, has changed, from time to time, the manner in which they provide some of the support services, direct local technical support, sales efforts, and marketing sales support, in different markets. In New Jersey, CSS is our licensee. Digital Products provides all the technical equipment support and the training, and are working with them in a partnership to support the contract.

SENATOR KOSCO: So, in essence, CSS is not affiliated with Digital.

MR. ANGULO: They are our licensee.

SENATOR KOSCO: They are not part of the company that we issued the contract to.

MR. ANGULO: They are the company you issued the contract to. Throughout the country, many of the contracts for electronic monitoring are issued to service providers and/or distributors who obtain the equipment on a lease or a purchase basis -- on a rental basis -- from the manufacturer, but the manufacturer provides the technical support and the training.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. I didn't understand the connection between CSS and Digital, because CSS' name has never come up in the discussion; Digital's has. Suddenly I find out we are contracting with CSS.

Senator Scott?

SENATOR SCOTT: All right, thank you. I would like to ask a question of Digital: You manufactured the hardware for the program. Is that it?

SENATOR KOSCO: No, CSS manufactures it; Digital--

MR. ANGULO: We manufacture the equipment and the software and provide the training and the technical support.

SENATOR SMITH: And the hardware, too, right.

SENATOR KOSCO: Who is we?

MR. ANGULO: Digital Products.

SENATOR KOSCO: Digital.

SENATOR SCOTT: I'm trying to get to the same thing you are trying to get to. Who does what to whom, when, and why. All right. So, in other words, they, in effect, are going to sell what you are licensing them for?

MR. ANGULO: Exactly.

SENATOR SCOTT: Okay. I have one big question. Perhaps if you know the answer, Commissioner, I would appreciate it. Do you have any study-- Do you have information-- I mean, you are sales and marketing, so I am going to ask you a negative -- I think perhaps it is your competitors I should ask -- the failure rate and so on of your product? Have you done any studies throughout the country in the other states where you have provided this equipment? What is their rate of success and what are the problems they have had? Do you have anything like that for us?

MR. ANGULO: Yes. Specifically, we do keep track of where we have equipment problems, so we do have information on that. As a rule of thumb, I would say, keeping in mind that we are dealing with sophisticated technology that is going into an unfriendly environment, we have found statistically that with the problems we have, tampering of the equipment accounts for less than 1 percent. For the most part what we have is the offenders trying to discredit the equipment. The troubleshooting of that and identifying whether it is technical or something the offender is doing, is not always specific. But we find that that is less than 10 percent of the units we have in the field.

SENATOR SCOTT: Ten percent or 1 percent?

MR. ANGULO: One percent is tampering; 10 percent is total problems. So, now, as that compares to our competitors, Digital Products Corporation has over one-third market share. We are in 44 states, with--

SENATOR KOSCO: All right, we will get into that at a different time. We are not going--

SENATOR SCOTT: Yes.

MR. ANGULO: So we do have information as to our success.

SENATOR KOSCO: We don't want to get into that right now.

SENATOR SCOTT: I know. We are going to get a sales pitch.

MR. ANGULO: That is what I thought he--

SENATOR KOSCO: I want to stick with the things that the Department of Corrections is going to be handling, because--

SENATOR SCOTT: All right. I would like to make one request, if possible. If you would provide us with information you have-- I know it is going to be biased simply because it is your company, and Sales and Marketing would have a hard time putting a negative spin on their own product. But if you could provide us with any information whatsoever on the results in other states, and notify us what states actually have your product, then we would be able to follow up perhaps.

MR. ANGULO: Here is one example. This is one county that just, in March, ordered a contract -- Merced County, California. They conducted extensive field tests comparing our equipment to all the major manufacturers in the industry. Here is a copy of this letter for the Committee where they ended up selecting us. Now, this is after, like I said, extensive field testing. All equipment was tested for more than one week in a side-by-side comparison, looking at hardware, software, and everything else.

SENATOR SCOTT: All right. Let me stop you there. Field testing for more than one week is not the same. It is like talking to a toy manufacturer who field tested a toy and found out that a six-year old suddenly found a way to destroy it in 30 seconds. Once it is in the field, then we really have a field test; we really know what happened.

I think it would behoove us, Mr. Chairman, to get more information nationwide to see if there are any studies; if any other states are having problems similar to ours, incidences of tampering.

MR. ANGULO: Well, I think in the consultant's report, he talks about that in the beginning.

SENATOR KOSCO: That is another subject matter we are working on. Aggie has already contacted different companies, and she is compiling a whole program. This Committee is going to address that issue at another time. Okay?

SENATOR SCOTT: All right, very good.

SENATOR KOSCO: Senator Matheussen?

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: If I may. To the Commissioner: Mr. Commissioner, your letter of June 10, if I may refer to it-- I have already expressed my concerns with paragraph 2, and I think we, together, mutually, helped to resolve those problems. There is another concern of mine, and perhaps I am misreading it, or perhaps there is something in there that doesn't jump out at me, or I don't know enough about the background.

In paragraph 3, it states that in Fiscal Year 1990, the average daily population was 140. You expended \$213,000 to keep those people on the program. That averages out to \$1521.43 per year per inmate on the program. Fiscal Year 1991, the average daily population was 495; that expenditure, \$864,000. That averages out per inmate, per year, for the year, \$1745. What concerns me, though, is the projection for '92. With a daily population of 537 -- which we know might

change now because of the problems we have incurred-- Using that number 537, your Department projected a cost of \$3,552,000. That would estimate out at \$6614.53 per inmate per year. That is a jump -- a dramatic jump -- of almost five times for inmates to be on the EM program for an entire year.

Could you explain the reason for that dramatic increase from 1990 and 1991 up to 1992?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Well, part of it is, initially there was no base station, with the manning of the base station 24 hours a day, which includes a staff cost in here which was not-- The previous costs were really just equipment costs and start-up costs of the computers themselves, of the monitors, of the bracelets. This is coming out now to \$18 a day.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Eighteen dollars per day per inmate?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes. That is about the average cost now. We have it down as \$18.12.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: So, in 1990 and 1991 we were not monitoring them the same way we are in '92? The equipment wasn't in place yet? I don't understand. What didn't we have in '90 and '91 that we now have in '92?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Do you want to explain it?

M A R I O P A P A R O Z Z I: When the program first started, and as it was growing, we had a need to monitor people 24 hours a day, we realized. Actually, myself and an assistant monitored the whole State personally on our pagers, voluntarily. As the program grew, some staff still stuck with us voluntarily, but as it became more and more cumbersome, we had to actually institutionalize a central monitoring station. So we could no longer do it as individuals, where I would personally be getting phone calls around the clock seven days a week.

Quite frankly, when the program first began, I, myself, and my assistant, used our own cars to drive all over

the State. As the program again grew and got more institutionalized, we had a need to set up a base station where seven days a week, 24 hours a day, requires "X" number of people. Because of vacation and sick leave, that was a tremendous increase in cost. We increased vehicle assignment to staff. Staff were also wearing beeper pagers. Because it became a routine part of their job, they were given a stipend to function in that capacity above and beyond what their normal pay was. So all of those things initially were not figured in. We were developing and growing at the same time.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: How much of a stipend to carry a pager?

MR. PAPAROZZI: Two thousand dollars, I believe it is.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Two thousand dollars a year.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Two thousand dollars a year to carry a pager. How often are they paged?

MR. PAPAROZZI: A lot.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Constantly.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: What would be the reason for the page?

MR. PAPAROZZI: Shall I?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes.

MR. PAPAROZZI: To assess cases. If somebody goes out or comes back a few minutes late, the base station people will call the officer at home and say, "What kind of a person are we dealing with here? Do you want to call them? Do you want us to call a supervisor so you can be dispatched out to the house?" Those kinds of things; just routine ongoing assessments of casework, just to make sure we have a handle on the case. It's a lot; it's holidays, weekends. I know because I have been on the pager, as have many of the other people in this room. There is a lot of phone calling. It is an intrusion.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: If you could, would you give us the breakout figures for '90, '91, and '92 so we can just--

MR. PAPAROZZI: A breakout of what?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: The costs.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: The costs, yes, to accumulate \$213,864 and the \$3,500,000 figures.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes, Senator, we can get that.

SENATOR KOSCO: Senator Girgenti?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Commissioner, I realize we are skipping around here, but things that really jumped out at me when I read this report, when you were talking about the recommendations--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Under the third one, it says: "A decision should be made as to whether electronic monitoring is to be used in a custody program or a reintegration program." The question is: What do you feel it is, and how are they different? How is this going to be determined, or has this been determined at this point? There seems to be a conflict throughout the report in terms of these two areas that were mentioned earlier, between the two different divisions there.

What is your definition of the program? Maybe you can embellish on that.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: I addressed earlier, Senator, the fact that-- I agreed that there was a conflict, and I did place this within the Division of Policy and Planning, under the Bureau of Parole. So, in a sense, where I would differ with the consultant a little-- I don't really think it is an either/or. I think I am looking for both. I am looking for a control and a custody there, but also a reintegration. Let's not lose sight of the fact that to be eligible for this program you have to be within a certain period of your release date. So we are not talking about people who are not going back into the community who are going into this program.

So, in a sense, it is both. My feeling is, and my instructions to the people now running it are, that the custody part has to take place first because of the--

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Well, would it be supervised differently if it was either, or, you know--

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: I don't know that it would. I think the difference is that it clarifies who people are to report to. There is no question at all that this now comes under a person and where that structure is. I don't really think there is that split as it appears that one is custody and one is just reintegration into the community. I don't think that has been the case. But perception can be more important than reality, and that, of course, is what was seen.

Let me just give you an example of what I am talking about. There would be a difference, for example, in due process rights of people removed from the program if they were inmates out awaiting parole as opposed to parolees who are already out. They are entitled to much more in the way of rights by bringing them back -- or before we can bring them back, in the way of hearings and things like that. Those are the things that I think are cleared up by centralization of all this under a unit and a person.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: On page 23 of the report, we have: "Participants are required to be employed or actively seeking employment. Although there is no written policy addressing the issue, offenders are subject to a 30-day review process when unemployed. If it is felt the offender is not making an effort to secure employment, they may be returned to the institution."

How is this set up? In other words, somebody goes out every day and shops around for a job on this kind of a program, or, you know-- Could you define how this is brought about? I am concerned that, you know, some guy it out there for 30 days and he is supposed to be seeking a job, and he hasn't at the end of that 30-day period. How is this controlled? Or, you

know, is this a condition of their getting out? Are there some cases -- maybe I am asking a lot, but I have been trying to read this-- Are there some cases where the person can't leave the house, where he is under house arrest, as opposed to someone who goes out and shops around for a job, and has time off during the weekends? How is all that determined?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: With your approval, I'll let Mario--

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Yes, sure.

MR. PAPAROZZI: Actually, yes, there are some people who are not allowed out at all. It is a judgment call. We have some people when they first come out-- Maybe we will keep them in for the first week, or for a weekend. It would be more restricted even than a halfway house. When people are going out looking for jobs, if they are unemployed, we would expect that they would give the officer the name of the place they went, the person to whom they spoke, and then we can check into that and see if, in fact, it is real, or if the person is just trying to get over on the parole supervision process.

So, yes, it is a very accountable process. In the future, I think we are going to tighten that up even more, where maybe we will only allow them out two hours per day. Right now, if you are unemployed, the rule of thumb is three hours to go look for a job in the morning; 9:00 to 12:00 to go seek employment. But again, the philosophy of this program is that everything you do outside of the home should be some verifiable and constructive activity. That is the key. We want to be able to verify.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Could they continue to be unemployed and continue to be monitored?

MR. PAPAROZZI: In point of fact and in reality, in the past, yes. If someone was unemployed and yet was doing well in all other regards and was staying home, but just was

unsuccessful in finding a job, for whatever reason, yes, they could, conceivably, be on this program beyond 30 days, but with a review.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay, thank you. I have been doing some research and talking to a whole lot of people about this program, and one of the problems I find is, we have a conflict when we send a person out on this program. One of the conditions we have been speaking of is that-- For example, a person is a drug user. One of the conditions is that that person has to go to a drug program. Or he is an alcoholic, and he has to go to an alcoholic program. This person then goes to Alcoholics Anonymous. He goes to Alcoholics Anonymous at 1:00 in the afternoon. Because it is an anonymous program, you have absolutely no way of telling whether he was really there, or whether he was out robbing a bank.

Now, under the conditions you have set up, I think you should eliminate an anonymous program, because by the mere fact that these people have committed a crime, and have been convicted of a crime, they are no longer anonymous about anything. If they were convicted of a crime because they were drug users, they are no longer anonymous. Why should we allow them-- In one case I was told that the inmate said it was because-- He would not have been able to do certain things, if it weren't for the time he was allowed to go to Alcoholics Anonymous. "Well, how can you do that?" He said, "Because Alcoholics Anonymous is not allowed to tell the Parole Board whether I was there or not." So if you call and say, "Was inmate so and so there?" or, "Was so and so at the Alcoholics Anonymous program Thursday at 2:00?" the person there cannot violate that confidence. They say, "I cannot give you that information." So you have to just take that person's word for it. So instead of going there, they go someplace else. All it is is an opportunity for the inmate to violate the program by

saying he went to an anonymous drug program or to Alcoholic Anonymous, but not having been there in the first place.

You are going to have to address that during your process of setting up your plans. I just wanted to bring that out, because you will have to take that out of the conditions. There is no such thing as anonymous when you have been convicted of a crime.

MR. PAPAROZZI: I would like to respond just for a moment. As a person on the job for 20 years, that has been a long-standing problem of parole officers, the anonymity of AA, NA, Gamblers Anonymous, and that kind of thing. Also, because they are anonymous, you should know that there is no data that speaks to how well these programs do in turning people around, or how poorly they do -- because they are anonymous.

However, you're right. No one should be sent to a program if you have even one scintilla of a doubt in your mind that they might not be going to that program. But sometimes with NA and AA, what I would like to strive for would be a community sponsor that he would hook up with at an AA group. He would talk to that community sponsor. There is a name, there is a person, and it is all understood and aboveboard and out in the open. It is true that when you go to an AA meeting, no one there is obliged to verify whether you went or not, and they strictly address you by your first name.

Another thing we are encouraging the officers -- we will be encouraging the officers to do, is to go to the meetings in their areas on a random basis, the ones the people say they go to. We have had officers drop by unannounced and they see that the person is there, or is not there. But as a general rule of thumb, it is probably a bad idea to just keep incorporated in the system an anonymous type of a program where you can't verify where somebody is. I think that if one message has come through loud and clear from this Committee, it

is that you want accountability; you want to know where the people released to this program are at all times.

SENATOR KOSCO: Of course, another very touchy subject with me is the fact that the Parole Board, in my opinion, according to what I have been reading-- The Parole Board has interrupted, or interfered in the program that the Department of Corrections has, and the Attorney General's Office has authorized it. Then, according to my understanding, they took it a step further, and said: "Not only are we going to authorize people who are not even eligible for parole on any criteria to go into the bracelet program, but then you will have absolutely no jurisdiction over that person." Is that the way I read it?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Pretty close, but not exactly. The Parole Board has the ability to set the conditions of parole. So they can set the conditions of parole as assigning someone into the Electronic Monitoring system, even though we, if we were doing it, would not do it. They have that ability.

SENATOR KOSCO: But they still have to use the original criteria? In other words, a person has to be eligible for parole?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: They have to be eligible.

SENATOR KOSCO: Now, my reading of this plan is that they have taken people who have not yet become eligible for parole, and put them out into the system under the bracelet program.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: No, I don't think that is the case.

SENATOR KOSCO: Well, that is the way I read this report.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: They're saying-- For example, we have certain offenses that preclude somebody being put in the program, if we are doing it. So, let's say it is a homicide, which is the most extreme, and I am not sure there

are any out there like that. But if it is a homicide case, we would not put the person in. But if the Parole Board gives a person a parole with the condition that he be placed on the bracelet program, yes, then he would get into the program.

SENATOR KOSCO: Okay. This is the section of the report I was getting to. Under Section 4, it says: "On November 2, 1990, the Department was notified by the State Parole Board of their intention to--"

MR. PAPAROZZI: What page?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Where are you, Senator?

SENATOR KOSCO: Section 4, page 18. In the center of the page it says: "On November 2, 1990, the Department was notified by the State Parole Board of their intention to begin using EMHC to release inmates who would not normally be granted parole. They indicated the case referral procedure would be the same as used for placement in ISSP. The Parole Board also uses the program as an intermediate sanction prior to revocation. In some instances, they will reverse a revocation decision and place the offender under EMHC.

"On January 9, 1991, an IOC was sent to the Parole Board advising them that the Department's exclusion criteria would preclude placement of a sex offender in the program. This stemmed from the Parole Board's desire to place an inmate in violation of the Corrections Department criteria. In this case, the inmate was not placed. Program administrators report the Parole Board has since sought an opinion from the Attorney General, who advised they have the authority to place parolees in the program, and are not bound by the Corrections Department's restrictions. It is their opinion that the Parole Board has, in the past, sent them questionable clients."

This is absolutely unacceptable in any way, shape, or form by, I think, this entire Committee. It should be unacceptable by the Department of Corrections that the Parole Board should be allowed to dictate to you that they are going

to put undesirable or questionable -- as it is put here -- people into the program, and then not let you have any control over it, on top of it.

I would like to have some type of a report back to us, as soon as possible, as to how many of these people that the Parole Board has demanded you put on the program, are on the program. I think the Parole Board is the Parole Board. If they want to become the Department of Corrections, we can put them under the Department of Corrections, if they choose that. But as long as they are responsible for paroles, let them concentrate on paroles.

Yes, sir?

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Mr. Commissioner, first of all, I don't want to seem like I am being critical of you today, because I am really not trying to be. But I am very concerned about this topic, and I am sure you are, too. Quite frankly, I consider you, and your staff, as having some of the toughest jobs in the State of New Jersey.

SENATOR KOSCO: Don't soften them up before you hit them. Just hit them.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Just hit them, okay. No, seriously, you do because anytime there is a mistake--

SENATOR KOSCO: Get to the point.

SENATOR MATHEUSSEN: Anytime there is a mistake, it becomes immediately subject to the public eye, and everybody is very concerned about it. I am concerned about the part of the report which deals specifically with the Palmer case. To me, in my opinion, this program, after being scrutinized, sets up some criteria as to who is eligible. The more scrutiny we do, the better your Department looks, because if we don't put bad people out on the street, people who should not be eligible, then they are probably going to have a good success record on the bracelet program.

But I also happen to think that once they are on it, it is a privilege to stay on it. To me, Mr. Palmer lost that privilege shortly after being given it. According to the report, in December he was arrested. As a matter of fact, on December 12, he was arrested right in front of his own house. It wasn't what the officer classified-- Somebody put in the report, "Failing to disperse," and the parole officer contacted the Police Department to determine that this was not a serious charge. Anytime, particularly a person on a bracelet program, but anytime someone fails to follow authority, I consider that somewhat of a serious crime, especially a person who is on a bracelet program now failing to follow authority, the authority of the Police Department.

He was ordered to disperse; he didn't. He was arrested, he was found guilty, and, as a matter of fact, he was sentenced in Municipal Court and fined \$150. At that time, it would seem to me that Mr. Palmer lost his privilege of being on this bracelet program. But, unfortunately, it did not stop there. Just a few days after being arrested -- as a matter of fact, three days after being arrested -- for his blatant disregard for police authority, he went and tampered with his bracelet. In three days, this gentleman basically ignored the police, and then tried to get off the bracelet program, and we never took him off.

Now, I am not -- believe me, I am not criticizing your Department. What I am trying to do, though, is say that not only do we need some criteria that screens people going into the program, but I think we need very hard and fast criteria for people who, once they are on the program, any violation -- any violation, and certainly a disregard for police authority, to me, is a serious violation -- should be immediately taken off and put back into incarceration.

I realize this is a savings to the State. I realize that this alternative sentencing is extremely important to hold

down our costs. But more important than that, I think we also have to realize, though, that the public safety is at risk here. A person who will defy a police officer certainly is going to defy the average person walking down the street, and maybe violate that person. I think Mr. Palmer obviously lost the honor of being on that program. He should have been taken off.

What I am saying is, we need to have a program so that any other Mr. Palmers who come along and have a problem once they are on the bracelet program, immediately go back into incarceration. This isn't a "give them a second chance" routine. They have one bite of the apple. If they blow it, they're back in jail. That is the way it should be -- period. Mr. Palmer didn't meet that criteria, and he should have been back in jail. Anyone who follows the same course should be back in jail.

I would hope that the Department would look at that, and set very hard and fast rules.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Include that in our criteria.

SENATOR KOSCO: Thank you, Senator. We pointed that out in the opening remarks, that he had been a continuous violator. We questioned that.

Are there any more specific recommendations that you would like to discuss here?

SENATOR SCOTT: Just one thing to add to the report: When they identify the inmates on the program from the Parole Board, could we also have the results of if any of them have violated the program and have been sent back?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes, we can--

SENATOR SCOTT: I would like to have that, too.

SENATOR KOSCO: Yes, Senator Girgenti?

SENATOR GIRGENTI: Just a sideline, Mr. Commissioner, on page 8. I just saw this last night, and maybe you could explain it. Under "Program Statistics," it says: "Forty

participants -- 1.77 percent -- were returned to custody for commission of a new offense; 24 for drugs, 10 for crimes against persons," and so forth. "There were 328 participants -- 14.51 percent -- returned for program violations, disciplinary infractions, or administrative reasons."

When you say "administrative reasons," now I am looking from the other end. If you have a guy on the program who has probably, let's say, been a model citizen, in terms of this program, has obeyed the program correctly, and has done everything right, and then he is up for parole-- What happens if he is denied parole, let's say, and he is in that six-month period, and then he has to wait another year? Does that mean he is automatically removed from the program? You know, with a guy who is a model citizen, I think it is almost working in reverse. Does that mean he has to go back to jail?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes. The Parole Board-- If he is denied parole, what they do is set a new date -- a new eligibility date, a new hearing date. If that exceeds the time that he could be in the--

SENATOR GIRGENTI: You know, I think you've got to look at that. I mean, from the other end, I don't think there is anything that could be more demoralizing, or destructive, than to have a guy out there who has really been doing everything correctly, perfectly, and then, all of a sudden, be denied, and go back to jail, after he has been off drugs, or whatever he has done. I think that would really probably destroy the individual.

Has that happened a number of times? Is that something that is common?

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: I think that it happened early. We have had meetings with the Board. This is not to cite to them that if somebody is in the community and has proven himself for "X" number of months to be okay-- Why aren't they the best possible candidates for parole, instead of being

reviewed? We have raised that issue with the Board. We also have the same problem with our halfway houses, where there is no EM, where a person successfully is doing well, but gets a year review. We have to pull them in because they don't fit the criteria.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: I mean, when you look at it and you see a case like the Tony Palmer case where you had problems with the guy, and in the other situation you have a guy who maybe has done everything correctly and according to the program, and he can be put back in-- See, I think we have to look at this whole-- You have to evaluate all of this criteria and really tighten it up. In some cases, a number of incidences, as the Chairman pointed out originally, and in the case of Palmer, certainly there was a history leading to this. You couldn't predict the event, obviously, but there was a history that this guy was trouble throughout. I mean, to the point where he was even showing somebody else how to tamper with the thing, you know.

SENATOR KOSCO: And proud of it.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: I am concerned about that. I think that is the one important thing, if anything comes out of this, the tightening up of the criteria, and, again, the sentencing area. I am pushing legislation, and I know you know that, Mr. Chairman. I think we should push that to make sure that some people cannot go on this program.

SENATOR KOSCO: Definitely.

SENATOR GIRGENTI: I don't want to see a case where a guy has had six aggravated assaults and six prior convictions, and because he happens to be in there now, he is going to get on this program. That is not my idea-- An armed robber is not my idea of the kind of person I think is supposed to be on this program, because we talked about nonviolent.

SENATOR KOSCO: That's right.

Okay. I think on that note we will conclude this meeting. We all have copies of the report, and we will all have more opportunity to look at it

The Commissioner is certainly in favor of most of the recommendations -- the 20 recommendations -- if not every single one of them. He has now directed Mr. Paporozzi to be the person responsible for this program, as I understand it, right now.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: That is correct.

SENATOR KOSCO: My suggestion at this point is: You have a list of things that this Committee has asked for. Some of the things were in my opening remarks, and I am sure you have a copy of that.

COMMISSIONER FAUVER: Yes.

SENATOR KOSCO: Some things we are asking for by the end of today, if possible. Some of them we are asking for by the end of the week. Certainly, we are going to be looking for that first 10-day report -- two-week report -- from the Department addressing specific recommendations that are part of the 20 recommendations.

I would direct your attention to the State Parole officers and ask you to please be in contact with the people who are doing the work out on the street. I have some information here from the New Jersey State Parole Officers, the P.B.A., Local No. 326, which addresses a lot of their concerns, and recommendations as to how they could better do their job. I would like you to include them in your deliberations and in your ideas, so you will be using the suggestions of the people out there doing the work while you are working on the recommendations.

We are going to have another hearing at the end of the month -- before the end of the month -- at which we will be able to upgrade our Committee. In the meantime, our Committee members will be making some suggestions through the Chair, and


we will share them with you on a regular basis, and continue this open dialogue we have been having.

I appreciate your openness, Commissioner, and your cooperation with everything that has taken place. We look forward to, by October 1, being able to report to the people of the State of New Jersey that this program is not only alive and well, but working 100 percent. I know some people say it cannot be 100 percent, but I am saying it has to be 100 percent. If that 1 percent that does not work ends up being a person who is released on the program to goes out and commits a homicide-- There is no such thing as percentages that makes any difference, if that ends up being the bottom line.


This program has to work, between the technology we are going to insist on and the expertise of the people working the program. We expect it to become a model for the whole country to follow. I believe we can do it.

Thank you very much. We will be back in touch with you as soon as we have a date for the next hearings. Thank you.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)



APPENDIX



**Evaluation of the
Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program**

Prepared for:

**Commissioner William H. Fauver
New Jersey Department of Corrections
Whittlesey Road
CN 863
Trenton, New Jersey 08625**

By:

**Dr. Joseph B. Vaughn
Criminal Justice Department
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093
(816) 543-4188**

May 18, 1992



Washington, D.C. 20534

Ref: NIC TA #92C1147

This technical assistance activity was funded by the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections. The Institute is a Federal agency established to provide assistance to strengthen state and local correctional agencies by creating more effective, humane, safe and just correctional services.

The resource person who provided the on site technical assistance did so on a contractual basis, at the request of the New Jersey DOC, and through the coordination of the National Institute of Corrections. The direct on site assistance and this subsequent report are intended to assist the New Jersey DOC in addressing issues outlined in the original request and in efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the agency.

The contents of this document reflect the views of Joseph Vaughn. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the National Institute of Corrections.

Executive Summary

Introduction

On April 3, 1992, inmate Tony Palmer, #YN110282, was arrested by the Paterson Police Department for the murder of Vernon Major which had occurred in the early morning hours of April 2nd. At the time of the homicide, Palmer was a participant in the New Jersey Department of Correction's Electronically Monitored Home Confinement (EMHC) program. Intense media coverage was brought to bear on the incident. Political officials raised questions about the program's integrity.

Arrangements were made for technical assistance through the National Institute of Corrections. The consultant was requested to evaluate the program's operation, management structure and equipment. A specific request was received to investigate the Palmer incident and his allegations that he was able to circumvent the equipment.

The full report contains a detailed analysis of the problem areas uncovered during the investigation. The findings, conclusions and recommendations developed as a result of the on-site investigation, review of department records and interviews conducted are presented below in summary form. The reader is cautioned, that in order to place this information a proper context, it is necessary to review the full report.

Findings and Conclusions

Development of the Program. The program began in September of 1989. It grew very rapidly over the next two years to an average size of 560 offenders. The number of initial memos would indicate the program was not well-planned prior to implementation. It was designed and operated on a day-to-day basis. The need to address overcrowded institutions drove the program to accept increasingly larger numbers of participants. This was occurring at a time when the administrative and operational processes were being developed. Increasing the size of the program compounded existing problems.

Responsibility for the program is divided between the Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions and the Division of Policy and Planning, each under the direction of an Assistant Commissioner. While supervision of inmates is carried out by policy and planning, the selection and overall responsibility for inmates remains with the institutions. The divisions have different responsibilities, priorities and mindsets regarding the supervision of program participants. Tension exists between the two divisions over program operation.

Additional tension existed within the Division of Policy and Planning stemming from the issues of overtime, assignment of agency vehicles and supervision. EMHC had essentially become a program outside the Parole Bureau. Personnel were responsible to any number of supervisors who often issued conflicting directives.

The program was run by inter-office communication forms. No policy and procedures manual has ever been promulgated by the department. There is no collection of policy and procedure memos maintained in a central location which is accessible to program personnel. There is no procedure to ensure new employees are given copies of or even review existing memos. Policies are often issued or changed verbally without corresponding documentation.

Training is conducted primarily "on-the-job." There is no established curriculum. No records of training received are kept in personnel files.

No workload or performances measures have ever been established for field or monitoring center personnel. The amount of approved overtime paid by the department would suggest there are not a sufficient number of employees assigned to the program and/or the process should be restructured.

Program Operation. The selection and enrollment process for the program is cumbersome and time consuming. Decisions to return inmates require a number of personnel from both divisions be involved in the process. Changes in program operations are difficult at best to achieve. These problems are inherent in the administrative structure of the program which splits responsibilities between two divisions with no one person having functional line authority over the people necessary to make the program work. Employees feel the internal management system is confused and policies are unclear.

The program has a poor management information system. There are too many individual reports prepared which are dependent on a multitude of people for their completion. Many of the forms require the same information be presented in a different format. Often information which is needed for supervision of employees, such as the number of field contacts, is not collected or is listed only in the supervision chronological report for each inmate.

There is no community risk assessment completed on potential program participants. They are classified according to institutional risk factors which can be presumed to differ significantly from those arising in a community setting.

The Parole Board has begun assigning parolees to EMHC irrespective of the program's exclusion criteria. If an incident occurs with one of these parolees, the department will most probably receive negative publicity. It is not possible to separate in the public's mind the differences in authority and responsibility of the Parole Board and the Department of Corrections. Any major incident which occurs in the near future will seriously undermine program integrity.

The monitoring center has too many responsibilities and not enough personnel. On an average day, there will be over 3,000 computer messages received on the line-printer. The process for resolving violation reports requires personnel to make too many phone calls. They are responsible for relaying information back and forth between the offenders, parole officers, on-call supervisors and the adult institution liaison officer. There is no supervisor on-duty in the monitoring center which is staffed by senior parole officers. The SPOs are not given sufficient authority to resolve incidents.

The records system in the monitoring center is cumbersome. Personnel are required to handle too many different pieces of paper and process too many forms. Reports and information are often filed on clipboards which increases the chances of information being misplaced.

Equipment. The equipment used in the monitoring program is manufactured by Digital Products Corporation, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The contract for provision of equipment was awarded to Computerized Surveillance Systems, Inc. (CSS), South Orange, New Jersey which has an unspecified relationship with the manufacturer. CSS certified in their response to the bid proposal that the equipment was tamper-proof. They further maintained the equipment would provide confirmation of the presence or absence of the wearer. "... confirmation is immediate, automatic and positive with no margin of error."

In August or September of 1991 incident monitor screens were installed in the monitoring center to alleviate the necessity of reviewing the on-line printer for violation notices. Although the manufacturer's operating manual for the equipment requires monitoring the printer, no one from the department was advised by Digital this was still necessary after the monitoring screens were installed.

The equipment suffered from a design flaw which under certain circumstances would prevent violation notices from appearing on the incident monitor screens. Once a transmitter was in the tamper mode, it would not continue to report this status, but would otherwise function normally. It would not report any further attempts to tamper with the equipment until the tamper circuits had been reset.

Digital Products Corporation was aware of the software problem prior to December of 1991 when Palmer's tampering with the transmitter was not detected by department personnel. In later consultations with department staff, Digital admitted having experienced the problem in their own monitoring center in Ft. Lauderdale. They developed software in November and December of 1991 which was installed on the department's computer system in January of 1992. Digital did not inform the Department of Corrections of the problem's existence or that they had installed new software.

There has been no written explanation from the manufacturer of the software problem which led to the tamper not being detected by monitoring center personnel, other than it was caused by "some outside interference."

While the receiver unit is programmed to call the central computer at least every six hours for a status report, there is no alert message generated if this is not successfully accomplished. In the field test, with the unit's AC power and telephone lines unplugged, no indication was given that the receiver had been disabled for almost twenty-four hours.

There are still problems with the equipment. The Telsol unit malfunctions, producing a "Telsol Interrupted" message. When this occurs, violation reports are blocked from going to the incident monitoring screen. A company representative was informed a problem existed on April 16, 1992. Three days later, the same employee gave no indication of any previous knowledge when asked by the consultant to explain how this was occurring.

Palmer Incidents. Tony Palmer met the selection criteria for the program. There were no indications in his supervision file, prior criminal history or psychological report of any propensity for violence. None of the factors listed in the exclusion criteria which would have precluded his placement in the program were present.

When enrolled in the program the equipment appeared to be operating normally. A needs assessment form was never filled out. No supervision plan listing goals and objectives for this inmate was ever located. Both of these items were required by division policy.

In the twenty-three weeks Palmer was in the program there were ten contact visits recorded by the parole officer. None of these visits revealed factors which would indicate he should have been returned to the institution. While under supervision, incident reports were prepared on two curfew violations, one minor arrest for violation of a city ordinance and one wristlet tamper.

Although Palmer was convicted of drug related offenses, it was nearly three months after his entry into the program before the first urinalysis was performed. Of the two tests for which results have been received, both were negative. The last urinalysis was performed the day before the homicide occurred.

Nothing the inmate did allowed him to escape detection of the initial tampering with the transmitter and subsequent curfew violations. The failure to detect these actions was due to equipment and supervision problems.

A design flaw in the software prevented the tamper notice from being sent to the monitoring screen. Personnel in the monitoring center had stopped reviewing the line-printer which did record the tamper incident because they were operating under the assumption it was no longer necessary. Once the unit was in a tamper mode, Palmers subsequent removal to violate curfew would not register as a "tamper" because the unit was already in tamper mode.

On the night the homicide occurred, there were equipment problems with System B which was used to monitor Palmer. A series of routine supervision calls were not successfully completed. A "Telsol Interrupted" message was received during the second set of supervision calls. It is unclear as to whether the messages were ever reported to the incident monitor screen or printed on the line-printer. Subsequent RF checks indicated the client was at home.

Problems which may have existed with Pagenet, the commercial paging company, are not believed to have had any effect on this incident. No "Pager Intrcpt Oprtr" message was received as is expected if there are equipment problems with the commercial paging system. Bell Atlantic Telephone Company was conducting field tests of a voice verification system in the monitoring center during November and December of 1991. It is unknown what, if any, effect their experiments had on the operation of the monitoring center or the equipment.

On January 18, 1992, division policy was implemented which required parole officers to carry their reset generator device with them and reset offender's tamper circuits at least monthly. There were five personal contact visits with Palmer after the December 16, 1991 tampering incident prior to the homicide occurring. The last visit was on April 1, 1992, the day before the homicide. The parole officers did not reset the tamper device on any of these occasions. If they had, a wristlet reset message would have been printed and the device would have generated a wristlet tamper message the next time Palmer attempted to remove it.

Other incidents indicate supervision problems exist in the department. One inmate's transmitter device remained in a tamper mode for almost seven days prior to discovery. This had occurred in March of 1992, prior to the homicide. At that period of time there was an existing division policy which required monitoring center personnel to run an equipment report every four hours. Assuming the equipment was operating properly, the equipment report should have detected the unit was in a tamper mode. Either the equipment reports did not reflect this, they were not run as required or department personnel failed to take action to correct the problem.

In a second incident, an inmates telephone had been disconnected for two days prior to discovery by monitoring center personnel. The printouts indicate the pager was called and a notice sent to the incident monitoring screen which showed the telephone line was busy. If a full client report had been run, monitoring center personnel should have been alerted to the fact that there had been no activities other than the attempted supervision calls for a two day period, thus a problem existed with the equipment.

The initial conclusions drawn by the Division of Policy and Planning and the Internal Affairs Unit were incorrect and based on incomplete information. The Internal Affairs Unit lacked the technical understanding of electronic monitoring to complete a thorough investigation of the matter in a short period of time. The equipment manufacturer was not forthcoming with explanations of system problems.

Table of Contents

National Institute of Corrections Preface.....	ii
Executive Summary	ix
Section 1 - Requested Assistance	1
Circumstances Leading to the Request	1
Assistance Requested	2
Description of the Problem.....	2
Description of Assistance Provided	3
Section 2 - Program History.....	4
Development of the Program.....	4
Policies and Procedures	7
Program Statistics.....	8
Additional Problems Reported By Staff	8
Section 3 - Electronic Monitoring Equipment	10
Equipment Acquisition.....	10
Equipment Modification.....	10
Equipment Operation.....	11
Field Test of Equipment.....	13
Problem Areas	15
Section 4 - Program Operation	18
Selection and Exclusion Criteria.....	18
Enrollment Process.....	21
Client Supervision.....	22
Section 5 - Palmer Incident	27
Admission to the Program.....	27
Supervision of Palmer	28
Vernon Major Homicide.....	30
Milton Wilson.....	32
Section 6 - Findings and Conclusions.....	33
Development of the Program.....	33
Program Operation	33
Equipment.....	34
Palmer Incident.....	35
Section 7 - Recommendations.....	37

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Monitoring Equipment Diagram	12
Figure 2 - Organizational Flow Chart: EMHC Program	20
Figure 3 - Sequence of Equipment Events: Palmer Incident.....	29

Appendices

Appendix A - New Media Articles.....	40
Appendix B - Program Statistics.....	49
Appendix C - Inter-Office Communications Relating to EMHC Program.....	60
Chronological Analysis of Memos Issued.....	61
August 13, 1990, Paparozzi, Table of Organization.....	64
October 15, 1990, Paparozzi, Needs Assessment.....	66
November 16, 1990, Hilton, Eligibility/Exclusion Criteria.....	68
December 6, 1990, Paparozzi, Inmates in County Facilities.....	70
December 26, 1990, Paparozzi, Wristlet Tamperers.....	71
December 26, 1990, Paparozzi, Responding to Out of Order Phones.....	72
January 18, 1991, Paparozzi, Wristlet Tamperers.....	73
May 17, 1991, Paparozzi, Programming Random Calls.....	74
September 30, 1991, Howard, Program Expansion.....	75
January 15, 1992, Adams, Equipment Problem Reports.....	77
Appendix D - Notice of Equipment Acquisition & Bid Response.....	78
Appendix E - Electronic Monitoring Equipment Materials.....	90
Printouts of Equipment Field Test.....	91
Printouts of Richard Norman.....	99
Fax to Digital Products Corporation.....	101
Printouts of Lorenzo Jamison.....	102
Appendix F - Complete Computer Printout of Tony Palmer.....	104
Appendix G - Documents Related to Palmer Incident.....	161
Program Application.....	162
Request For Site-Investigation.....	164
Transfer Order.....	165
Transfer Notification.....	166
Computer Printouts - Equipment Installation.....	167
Supervision Chronological Report.....	170
November 29, 1991 Incident Report.....	182
December 3, 1991 Incident Report.....	183
December 15, 1991 Overtime Assignment Sheet.....	184
April 3, 1992 Incident Report.....	185
Digital Products Corporation Manual, Page 25.....	189
April 3, 1992 IOC by Officer Bernal.....	190
April 3, 1992 IOC by Officer Ciccone.....	191
April 8, 1992 IAU Report by Pablo Alicea.....	192
April 8, 1992 IOC by Assistant Commissioner Howard.....	193
April 10, 1992 IAU Report by Joseph Malone.....	197
April 10, 1992 Letter from Digital Products Corporation.....	200
Milton Wilson Printouts.....	203

Section 1
Requested Assistance

Circumstances Leading to the Request

On April 3, 1992, Inmate Tony Palmer, # YN110282, was arrested by the Paterson, New Jersey Police Department for the murder of Vernon Major which had occurred in the early morning hours of April 2nd. At the time of the homicide, Palmer was a participant in the New Jersey Department of Correction's Electronically Monitored Home Confinement (EMHC) program.

Subsequent to his arrest, Palmer apparently told police officials he had been able to circumvent the monitoring device and leave his residence without detection. A great deal of national media attention was generated by the incident. Questions were raised by government officials as to negligence in the program's operation and reliability of the equipment. In a series of articles (See Appendix A), the equipment manufacturer denied any malfunction had occurred, suggesting the incident was due to human error.¹ Department officials initially released information that a "computer glitch" allowed Palmer to leave his residence undetected.² Members of the New Jersey State Senate announced their intention to hold public hearings.³ The media had become critical of the Paterson New Jersey Police Department's response to the initial call. Questions were raised regarding the manner in which the call was dispatched. When the call was first received, an ambulance was sent with no accompanying police officers.⁴ The police department in turn, was publicly critical of the Department of Corrections' (DOC) supervision of Palmer.⁵

Other unrelated incidents had fueled media attention. The parole board was under criticism for their release of a serial killer who was accused of committing additional murders while on parole. A program participant in Chicago had been accused of luring another individual to his apartment while under electronic monitoring and killing him.⁶ The FBI had announced its investigation into allegations of favoritism in awarding the electronic monitoring contract for the New York City Department of Corrections to BI Monitoring Corporation.⁷ A program participant in Indianapolis had absconded from the program and was accused of shooting two suburban police officers near Chicago, killing one of them.⁸

¹For example, see Gibson, D. "Maker Defends Ankle Monitor." *Record*, 4-10-92, p. B-1.

²For example, see Mendez, L. "State Says 'Glitch' in System Let Inmate Escape House Arrest." *The Star-Ledger*, 4-9-92, p. unknown.

³For example, see Mendez, L. "Home Jail Probe. Senate Committee Will Seek Answers on Inmate's Escape." *The Star-Ledger*, 4-10-92, p. unknown.

⁴For example, see Morley, H. "Cops Late to Slay Site. Response Time Of Paterson's Police Probed." *The Herald & News*, 4-11-92, p. unknown.

⁵For example, see Gibson, D. "Uproar Over Home Detention." *Record*, 4-11-92, p. unknown.

⁶Woo, J. & Lambert, W. "Questions Arise on Electronic Anklets." *The Wall Street Journal*, 4-9-92, p. B10.

⁷Raab, S. "F.B.I. Investigates City Prison Contract. Role of Influential Lobbyist Examined in Plan for Ankle Bracelets." *The New York Times*, 4-11-92, p. 29.

⁸Goering, L. "Inmate Home Release Programs Still Not Free of Fatal Flaws." *Chicago Tribune*, 4-14-92, p. 2-1.

Assistance Requested

On April 13, 1992 the consultant was contacted by Mr. Gary Hilton, Assistant Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Corrections, Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions, and requested to evaluate the electronic monitoring program. Mr. Hilton requested he examine the program's operation, management structure, and equipment. He was further requested to make an independent investigation into the Palmer incident.

The purpose of the investigation was to identify problem areas and provide recommendations for changes in the program. A technical assistance request (# 92C1147) was approved by the National Institute of Corrections and arrangements were made for on-site consultation.

Description of the Problem

The problem was found to be substantially as described in the initial request for assistance. Media attention on the program was increased by an article which appeared on April 17, 1992 in which the state ethics panel charged Assistant Commissioner Terri Howard, Division of Policy and Planning, and Senior Parole Officer Mario Paporozzi with improperly accepting a round-trip flight on a private aircraft to Florida. The flight had been arranged by Computerized Surveillance Systems (CSS) of South Orange, New Jersey to Ft. Lauderdale, Florida to inspect the manufacturing facilities of Digital Products Corporation. CSS was the successful bidder on the \$500,000 contract to supply electronic monitoring equipment manufactured by Digital to the state. It was Digital's equipment which was in use at the time of the Palmer incident. The trip had been unsuccessfully challenged during the bidding process by BI Incorporated, a rival manufacturer. The challenge had been put aside by the New Jersey Treasury Department's Director of the Division of Purchase and Property in June of 1991, which found the trip had been approved by correction's department lawyers.⁹

It became apparent there was a perception among employees of friction between the Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions and the Division of Policy and Planning which operates the program. The Paterson Police Department was withholding investigative reports and refused to return the monitoring bracelet they had seized from Palmer at the time of his arrest without a court order. The prosecuting attorney had issued a subpoena for records pertaining to Palmer and was believed to be considering filing charges against department personnel.

In an initial meeting with Commissioner William H. Fauver and Assistant Commissioner Hilton who had been assigned responsibility for overseeing the investigation, the consultant was informed the department wanted to determine, in so far as possible, what had actually occurred. While the staff was understandably apprehensive, the consultant was granted access to all requested materials and personnel. Investigative assistance and preliminary reports were made available from the department's internal affairs unit. During the on-site review all department personnel cooperated fully with the consultant's request for information.

The equipment manufacturer, Digital Products Corporation, at the time of the review, had not fully explained the possibility of an equipment malfunction. Based on their correspondence and conversations with staff members it appeared they were attempting to limit any liability on their part. While on-site, a letter was received by department personnel from BI, Incorporated, which expressed concern the incident may hurt the industry and that if

⁹Schwaneberg, R. "Corrections Duo Cited on Vendor's Gift Flight." *The Star-Ledger*, 4-17-92, p. 17.

the department had been using their equipment, this would not have happened. The electronic monitoring industry is very competitive and the danger exists a vendor might use the incident to promote their product over Digital's, increasing the potential for continued public criticism.

Description of Assistance Provided

On April 16, 1992 the consultant travelled to Trenton, New Jersey and remained on-site until April 20th. While on-site he interviewed department personnel, reviewed existing policies and procedures, observed the monitoring center operations, and inspected the department's electronic monitoring files and other relevant records. A meeting was held with the internal affairs unit. Personnel from internal affairs assisted in a field test of the monitoring equipment. An exit interview was held with Assistant Commissioner Howard and her staff. Prior to departure, an oral report was given to Commissioner Fauver, Deputy Commissioner Seidl and Assistant Commissioner Hilton.

Detailed descriptions of the interviews are contained in the body of this report which is organized by major categories. Relevant materials which were reviewed are attached in the appendix section.

Section 2 Program History

Development of the Program

On April 17, 1992 the consultant held an initial meeting with Assistant Commissioner Terri Howard whose division is responsible for the day to day operation of the program, Marie Gervasio, administrative assistant to Assistant Commissioner Howard, Senior Parole Officer Mario Paparozzi who initiated the electronic monitoring program, Senior Parole Officer Leonard Kraus who is currently in charge of the home confinement program, and Assistant District Parole Supervisor Steven Adams, who is responsible for supervising the monitoring center. Prior to the meeting the consultant had been provided an inter-office communication (IOC) dated April 14, 1992 from Assistant Commissioner Howard to Assistant Commissioner Hilton which briefly outlined the program's development.¹⁰

The purpose of the meeting was to obtain background information on the development and operation of the program. Unless specifically noted otherwise, information presented below was obtained during the interview of the above individuals.

The Electronically Monitored Home Confinement (EMHC) program began in September of 1989 under then Assistant Commissioner John P. Zerillo and was funded to handle a caseload of sixty participants. The original plans called for the program to be used for parole violators as an intermediate sanction prior to revocation. This initial proposal was never implemented. There had been many discussions about the use of electronic monitoring and a perception existed among some personnel that the program would never be put in place.

As originally implemented EMHC was designed as an inmate custody program to provide early release from institutions when prisoners were within 120 days of their parole date. Because this did not provide a large enough pool of participants, the time of eligibility was increased to target inmates who were within six months of their parole date.

When the program began, Mario Paparozzi and Modesto Fiume were issued pagers which notified them of program violations. Each officer assumed responsibility for half the state. As the activity level increased, it became necessary to seek additional personnel. Funding for three officers was authorized but the positions were never allocated. ISSP officers were co-opted from their regular field duties. With borrowed personnel, the ISSP/HCP program began and Mario Paparozzi was assigned as the director.

Almost immediately, a problem developed because officers were not authorized overtime. Under these circumstances they did not want to wear pagers or be on-call twenty-four hours a day. When the program reached approximately 150 inmates, the Deputy Commissioner of Corrections authorized the payment of overtime. Staff members assigned to the program were all given pagers. Within two weeks, staff members began to voice serious complaints. The pager system notified them of every reported activity, including routine messages which are generated by an inmate leaving or returning from their home at approved times. To this point, most of the cooperation which had been achieved was on a voluntary basis from staff members who believed in the program and wanted to demonstrate it was viable.

¹⁰See Appendix B to this report for copy of IOC.

The issue of overtime produced internal conflicts in the division. Parole officers had traditionally not been authorized overtime. Initially it was not known where the money would come from to pay for the overtime. Parole funds were re-allocated from other programs within the division.

Caseloads for EMHC officers were set at 20 to 25 inmates. Because the EMHC officers were actually ISSP officers who had been co-opted, their reduced caseload caused friction with other parole officers. The management structure initially was such that ISSP officers who were directly responsible to the District Parole Supervisor (DPS) were receiving direction from a multitude of people and these directions often contradicted what the DPS wanted done. In many instances, the central office overturned decisions made by the DPS. When vehicles were assigned to officers in the monitoring program, additional animosity developed in the division. The EMHC had essentially become a program outside the parole bureau, even though organizationally it was within it. Assistant Commissioner Howard feels these initial problems within the Division of Policy and Planning have been resolved.

During the Summer of 1990 there was a feeling among field officers that the equipment did not work, with the primary problem being an excessive number of tamper alarms. Assistant Commissioner Howard instructed Paparozzi to address the equipment problems. He contacted the vendor, Digital Products Corporation, and told them if the equipment problems were not corrected, the department would withdraw its contract. They responded the next day and it was subsequently determined a majority of the problems were not equipment related, but stemmed from a lack of knowledge and training. According to Paparozzi, no one in the department understood how to administer a monitoring program. The officers did not know how to operate the equipment. "We needed to learn about computers. If the printer paper jammed, it was a big deal to us. We couldn't trouble shoot to correct a problem. We learned about things as they happened. We needed training in the technical aspects."¹¹ A request by Assistant Commissioner Howard to visit other programs had been denied for a lack of state funds.

In the Fall of 1990, Assistant Commissioner Howard held a meeting with Commissioner Fauver in which the monitoring program was discussed. Commissioner Fauver had been requested to expand the program by the governor with a target of 250 inmates by January of 1991. During this meeting, questions were raised as to whether parole or the institutional division should be responsible for operating the program. Assistant Commissioner Howard stated she believed the program had lost credibility in the department because "EM could never get its act together."¹² There was a perception that parole was incapable of running the program. The issue had been discussed as to whether the department should run its own program or contract out the monitoring responsibilities to a private service provider.

The department had been operating a temporary base station at its East Orange district office. In the Fall of 1990 it opted to establish a permanent monitoring center at its central office complex in Trenton, New Jersey. The center was originally placed in the Stokes Building and subsequently moved to the Edge Building as space requirements increased. Initially, they did not have enough people to staff the monitoring center on a twenty-four hour basis. Personnel were not available to cover sick days, vacations, etc. Only one person worked per shift. If another employee was absent, they had to work double-shifts or Mario Paparozzi would cover the duties. Regular parole officers were still being used for EMHC and their caseloads began to suffer.

¹¹Paparozzi, M. Personal interview 4-17-92.

¹²Howard, T. Personal interview 4-17-92.

During this period of time program administrators felt as if they were being pressured to increase the number of participants without adequate resources.¹³ Concern had been expressed by the Office of Legislative Services because the program numbers were lower than desired. Assistant Commissioner Howard began to press Leonard Kraus to increase the numbers. Both Howard and Kraus held a meeting with the Deputy Commissioner to explain the problems they had been experiencing.

Discussions were held with institutional personnel regarding the number of inmates being referred by them to the program. The institutions felt parole officers were not making site investigations fast enough and that this accounted for the low number of participants, that the institutions were referring a sufficient number of inmates. This caused increased pressure on parole officers to do the pre-release site visits which began to interfere with supervision activities, creating conflicts with the district parole supervisors.

Relations with institutions were further strained because of the organizational design of the program. The identification, selection and approval for participants was done by the institutional division while the supervision was accomplished by the parole bureau. Parole officers assigned to the institutions were not involved in the selection process. Risk assessments were done according to institutional factors. Community risk assessment instruments were not used. Policy decisions were often believed to come from the institution liaison officer. Program administrators expressed concern that suitable inmates were not being referred to the program because it was not in the best interest of the institution to release them early. While the mindset of parole was re-integration and treatment, institutions operated under a custody orientation. The staff was believed "stressed due to a lack of cooperation."¹⁴

In July of 1991 funds were budgeted for additional monitoring personnel. Assistant Commissioner Howard states she was asked to delay hiring until October due to budget short-falls. In order to accommodate increasing numbers of participants, she believed it was necessary to hire additional personnel for the field and monitoring center. The thirteen officers co-opted from the ISSP program had been returned to their normal assignments. The hiring process for additional staff began in December of 1991. By January of 1992, eleven people were employed at the monitoring center with a budgeted staffing level of sixteen. As of April, 1992, twenty-three officers had been assigned to field responsibilities in the program. An additional thirteen officers assigned to the department's IPDP (an intensive drug supervision program which is federally funded) also participate in some monitoring activities.

Mario Paporozzi was reassigned effective August 12, 1991, as the ADPS in charge of the ISSP/JAP programs. Leonard F. Kraus was assigned as program director for the EMHC program on that date.¹⁵

¹³For example, see Paporozzi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Inmates in County Facilities*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to William Bruschini, Ken Steider, Onyweuchi Nkowcha and Rick Durkin, December 6, 1990. See also, Howard, T. *Electronic Monitoring*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to William H. Fauver, September 30, 1991. The Paporozzi memo is an attempt to identify additional program participants, even though they might have existing detainers placed against them. The Howard memo indicates staffing levels were being designed to handle approximately 10,125 inmates and parolees. Copies of the memos are contained in Appendix C to this report.

¹⁴Howard, T. Personal interview 4-17-92.

¹⁵Howard, T. *Reassignment*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Mario Paporozzi, August 18, 1991. See also, Howard, T. *EM Program*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Gary J. Hilton with copies to William H. Fauver and Richard, Seidl, August 12, 1991.

Policies and Procedures

From the time the program began in September of 1989 through April 2, 1992, there were 109 inter-office communications (IOCs) issued which related to EMHC. While thirty-five of these could be classified as administrative, seventy-four served to establish, implement or explain policies and procedures.¹⁶

The IOCs were those which could be located by staff during the on-site visit. While others may exist, EMHC personnel are assumed to not know of their existence if the administrators cannot locate them. For the first nine months of the program's operation, there were no policy/procedures memos issued. During this time, the program was relatively small, primarily being operated by Mario Paparozzi and Modesto Fiume.

The pattern of IOCs suggests the program was being developed and operated on a day-by-day basis. There is no record as to who was actually provided copies other than the individuals to whom the memo was addressed or copied to. There was no collection of existing IOCs in the monitoring center. IOCs were tacked to a bulletin board or kept on clipboards. Given the turnover of field and monitoring personnel, it is questionable as to whether anyone could establish that employees were advised of a particular policy or procedure.

A literal reading of the memos suggests confusion as to the lines of authority and responsibility in the department. The proposed organizational chart of August 13, 1990 would have placed individuals in the Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions and the Division of Policy and Planning under Mario Paparozzi. This would have included the Institutional Liaison Officer and the District Parole Supervisor.¹⁷

The confusion existing due to program responsibilities being shared by both divisions, each with its own assistant commissioner is perhaps best illustrated by three IOCs issued in May of 1991. Mario Paparozzi issued a policy memo implementing a notification procedure to be followed in the event a program participant was arrested for a serious crime. This memo was sent to both assistant commissioners and selected personnel in their divisions.¹⁸ At the same time, a memo was issued by Paparozzi to selected personnel within his own division requiring review of EM violations where return to custody was being considered. This was to be done by either himself or a supervisor at the central parole bureau.¹⁹ These memos were followed the next day by an IOC from Assistant Commissioner Hilton to Paparozzi which reprimanded him for exceeding his authority by attempting to establish administrative protocol for areas which Hilton was organizationally responsible. The relevant passage which clearly shows the confusion existing under the current organizational structure is as follows: "As you might be aware, the overwhelming majority of EM inmates are state sentenced inmates and

¹⁶See Appendix C for a chronological listing of IOCs issued and copies of selected memos referenced elsewhere in the text.

¹⁷Paparozzi, M. *Home Confinement Program Table of Organization*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Gary Hilton and Terri Howard, August 13, 1990. See Appendix C for copy of IOC.

¹⁸Paparozzi, M. *Notification Procedures for Arrests of Program Participants*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Program Staff with copies to Gary Hilton, Terri Howard, Leonard Kraus, Steven Adams, William Bruschini and file, May 2, 1991.

¹⁹Paparozzi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Arrest Procedures*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Douglas Modrow with copies to Terri Howard, Leonard Kraus, Steve Adams and file, May 2, 1991.

their over-all management is vested with the Adult Division. To this end, I will in no way, other than order of the Commissioner, relinquish my authority."²⁰

The department has never officially adopted a policy and procedures manual for the program. A manual prepared by Paporozzi, revision date October 18, 1989, was located while on-site. The manual was never officially promulgated by the department. During interviews conducted with monitoring center staff it was learned they had never seen the document. A second, undated manual marked "draft," was also located. A third manual, revision date February 10, 1992, was provided to the consultant by Assistant Commissioner Howard. This latest document is in the review process and has not yet been approved.²¹

Program Statistics

Since the beginning of the program in September of 1989 through April 10, 1992, there have been approximately 2,260 offenders assigned to EMHC. Of that number, approximately 2,115 were inmates and 145 were regular parolees. While this would represent an average of eighty new inmates assigned each month, as of January 1, 1992, there were 560 participants in the program indicating a rapid growth in the number of participants during the twenty-eight month period.

Forty participants (1.77 percent) were returned to custody for commission of a new offense; twenty-four for drugs, ten for crimes against persons (which includes Tony Palmer) and six for property offenses. There were 328 participants (14.51 percent) returned for program violations, disciplinary infractions or administrative reasons.²²

For the month of December, 1991, the number of participants on the program ranged from a low of 509 to a high of 564 per day. On December 16, 1991, the day the undetected tamper occurred, there were 539 participants in the program.²³

For the two week period of December 14, 1991 to December 27, 1991, there were 383 approved hours of overtime worked by field and monitoring center staff. While this represented only a one hour increase from the previous reporting period, monitoring center staff overtime increased by 51.5 hours while field overtime decreased by 52.5 hours. ²⁴

Additional Problems Reported By Staff

The program relies on the use of "on-call" supervisors to make decisions relative to violations and other problems which may arise. This responsibility is rotated among the ADPSs and Assistant Commissioner Howard one week at a time. There is no compensation

²⁰Hilton, G. *Notification Procedures for Arrests of Program Participants*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Mario Paporozzi with copy to Terri Howard, May 3, 1991.

²¹See Paporozzi, M. *Electronic Monitoring Program - Policy Manual*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Terri Howard, February 7, 1992. See also, Gervasio, M. *Electronic Monitoring Policy Manual*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Elaine Bellai, February 20, 1992.

²²Information obtained from department documents prepared after the Palmer incident. See Division of Policy and Planning. *Electronic Monitoring/Home Confinement Program Population and Characteristics*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Internal Document, April 10, 1992. Refer to Appendix B for copy of report.

²³Count, *Home Confinement*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Internal report generated by the EMHC program, December 16, 1991.

²⁴Kraus, L. *Overtime for E.M./Home Confinement Program*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Terri Howard, January 3, 1992.

for this additional duty. No supervisor is actually on duty in the monitoring center even though SPOs were initially selected to fill these positions to allow them to make decisions. Personnel in the monitoring center are concerned over a lack of consistency in directions and decisions received from the on-call supervisor.

Field officers do not have any type of communication equipment in their vehicles. In many instances communication with the monitoring center is delayed for up to an hour as they try to locate a telephone. Program administrators feel they should be provided with cellular telephones rather than radios due to the type of communications required. The purchase of vehicles for field personnel was also delayed.²⁵ Assistant Commissioner Howard reported she went outside the department chain of command to obtain vehicles.

There is a perception among personnel that turf battles over the program still exist. At various times, rumors have circulated that the program would be given to the Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions because inmates are placed in the program prior to being paroled. On several occasions it was rumored the special operations unit of the institution division would be given responsibility for the program. According to Assistant Commissioner Howard, she has resisted removal because she believes it should be operated as a re-integration program and not a custody program.

²⁵See Howard, T. *Electronic Monitoring*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to William H. Farver, September 30, 1991.

Section 3 Electronic Monitoring Equipment

Equipment Acquisition

The bid opening date for the current equipment contract was April 5, 1991. The contract was awarded on June 14, 1991 to Computerized Surveillance Systems, Inc., South Orange, New Jersey, which has an unspecified relationship with the equipment manufacturer, Digital Products Corporation of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The contract period runs from June 15, 1991 through June 14, 1992 and was in effect at the time the Palmer incident occurred. (See Appendix D for copy of notice of award and bid response from Computerized Surveillance Systems, Inc).

The bid specifications required an integrated system containing a continuously signalling RF component and a random telephone calling with verification component having the capacity to detect the presence or absence of the participant in a confinement area at least once every five minutes through an emitted RF signal. The band which attaches the transmitter to the offender was required to be *tamper-proof* (emphasis added). Computerized Surveillance Systems submitted the following certification to this bid specification: "CSS complies, the transmitter emits a tamper-alert radio signal to the receiver if the band is cut."²⁶ The transmitter unit was required to be capable of functioning passively in conjunction with the receiving unit and central computer to provide confirmation of the presence or absence of the wearer. Computerized Surveillance Systems responded to this specification as follows: "CSS fully complies, confirmation is immediate, automatic and positive with no margin of error."²⁷

Equipment Modification

When the base station was initially installed, monitoring personnel relied on a line-printer to report all computer generated messages. This required them to physically inspect each message on the printer to separate routine messages from violations or tamper alerts. As the workload increased this became too cumbersome and arrangements were made through Digital Products Corporation to obtain incident monitor screens which reported only violations. The incident monitor screens were added in August or September of 1991. The on-line printer was also kept operational in the monitoring center. At the time of the switch-over, Digital provided training to staff members.

In January of 1992 Digital updated the system software to address a problem they had experienced in their service bureau in Florida. When a pager busy signal is received by the computer, the violation notice was "bumped" from the system and did not appear on the incident screens. The exact date of the change cannot be confirmed from the file directories in Trenton because additional updating was done to the system during the week of April 6, 1992. In a conversation with Steve Zimko of Digital Products Corporation, Steve Adams was informed the company had been developing the software in November and December of 1991.

²⁶New Jersey Department of Treasury. "Specifications For Electronic Surveillance Equipment (T-0310). Term Contract - Advertised Bid Proposal Number 91-X-24714. June 14, 1991, p. 10.

²⁷*Id.* at p. 11.

Prior to the Palmer incident, no one from Digital Products Corporation informed employees of the New Jersey Department of Corrections of the problem's existence or that they had changed the system software. This information was not learned until after Palmer had been arrested on April 3, 1992.²⁸

Equipment Operation

Offenders are electronically monitored with equipment manufactured by Digital Products Corporation of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. Two operating manuals were provided by the manufacturer, a software manual²⁹ and a wristlet and verifier operation manual.³⁰ Field officers are supplied with a pamphlet which was prepared by the manufacturer outlining the required installation process.

Equipment in the home consists of a transmitter, a receiver and a verifier unit. The transmitter emits a low power radio frequency signal in the 300 MHZ range every 35 seconds. It is attached with a conductive rubber strap with metal inserts. The strap is secured using rivets and a crimping tool which creates a mark on the rivet. The band is constructed of rubber which is difficult to stretch. A tamper-alert feature is built into the band which will detect excessive stretching. If the band is cut off the device, a tamper message is sent. The tamper feature must be reset in the field with a reset device.

The receiver transmits messages to the monitoring station computers over telephone lines. If the computer is busy and unable to receive messages the receiver will attempt to re-dial for a specified number of times. The receiver transmits messages indicating violations of curfew, attempts to tamper with the transmitter or receiver, resets of the tamper devices, loss of AC power, telephone service interrupts and other equipment messages.

The verifier unit consists of a verifier box and a wristlet device mounted on the transmitter. The verifier can be used as a confirmation of violations reported by the transmitter and/or a random calling device to make periodic checks of the offender's presence. The randomized calling system is based on automated phone calls utilizing the Telsol unit in the monitoring center. When used as a confirmation device, the verifier automatically calls back to confirm violations of curfew.

The offender receives a recorded phone message which asks them to give their name and the current time. These responses are recorded on tape and can be manually reviewed by personnel in the monitoring center. The offender is then instructed to insert the wristlet device into the verifier box. When properly done an electronic handshake occurs which causes the computer to note a successful check. If the offender is not home, the device is inserted improperly or the call is not successfully completed for any reason, the device makes two more attempts to verify the offender's presence. If all three are unsuccessful, a violation notice is sent to the computer.

The monitoring center equipment consists of a file saver, two monitoring screens, a report printer, line-printer, pager and the Telsol unit. The number of program participants has necessitated use of more than one system in the monitoring center. Currently there are two main systems in use which are designated as "System A" and "System B." System A

²⁸Adams, S. Personal interview April 17, 1992.

²⁹Digital Products Corporation. *Wristlet/Transmitter Receiver/Verifier II Software Manual, version 2.xx*, not dated.

³⁰Digital Products Corporation. *Wristlet/Transmitter Receiver/Verifier II Operation Manual, MAN11490*, not dated.

monitors the participants from District Parole Offices #1 through #6. System B monitors the participants in District Parole Offices #7 through #13.

Messages coming into the monitoring center from the offender's home are received in a file saver. The non-incident screen is used to enter clients in the computer, change curfew times, and generate client history reports. The incident screen reports violation notices received from the offender's residence. The report printer allows staff to print reports from the screens. The line-printer records all messages as they are received.

When a transmitter is tampered with, a message comes from the offender's residence to the file saver. The computer causes the Telsol dialing unit to send a pager message. The message goes from the Telsol unit to a commercial paging company (Pagenet). The message is then sent by Pagenet to a pager located in the monitoring center. When the message is received on the pager (which is actually shut off to alleviate the noise), it displays the telephone number of the client and a two digit violation code.

The violation message and result of the pager call are printed out on the line-printer. At the same time, a violation report is sent to the incident monitor screen. Prior to installation of new software in January of 1992, if a pager busy signal was received, the violation report and result of the pager call were printed on the line-printer, but were not sent to the incident monitor screen. At the time of this report, there was only one pager in the monitoring center and all offender's systems were programmed to page that one number. Digital is in the process of expanding the number of pagers to limit the likelihood of a "pager busy" signal being received. If the commercial paging company was experiencing equipment problems, it would likely be reported as a "Pager Intrcpt Oprt" message.³¹

If a client leaves home early, a message is sent to the monitoring center's file saver. The Telsol unit calls the offender's home and attempts to verify their presence. If the call was successful (indicating the transmitter signal was in error) no further action is taken other than to record the incident on the line-printer. The line-printer will also show a notation that the client returned home late when the transmitter's signal is again picked-up by the receiver. Both of these messages are ignored. If the call is not successful, meaning the wristlet device was not properly inserted into the verifier or the message was not received, the Telsol will make a total of three attempts to call the offender. If the third attempt is still not successful, a pager call is generated which causes the violation notice to be displayed on the incident screen.

If the client returns home late, a pager call is generated which causes the violation to be displayed on the incident monitor screen. The violation is also printed out on the line-printer. No Telsol call is generated because the violation already confirms the offender is present.

Additional tests, messages and tasks can be performed or received by the system. These are not relevant to the incident in question and therefore not detailed in this report. Readers should refer to the manufacturer's manuals for a complete explanation of system operation.

Field Test of Equipment

On April 18, 1992, the consultant conducted a field test of the equipment in the Edge Building located at the headquarters complex of the New Jersey Department of Corrections. Present during the test were Assistant Commissioner Howard, Senior Parole Office John Klett, Principal Investigator Joseph Malone and Senior Investigator Robert Mucciarelli. The

³¹Goralewski, D. Digital Products Corporation Service Technician. Telephone interview, April 19, 1992.

test started at 3:25 PM using a telephone on the centrex system. This prevented the equipment from operating properly and the receiver unit was deprogrammed.³²

The equipment was moved to another officer where an outside telephone line was available. Once re-installed, the monitoring center was called and requested to generate a test call. The test call was received at 4:21 PM during which the wristlet device was inserted into the verifier box successfully.

The two attempts to install the equipment had generated thirteen messages, including a "wristlet tamper" notification at 4:24 PM. An incident report was sent to the incident monitor screen which was printed out at 4:58 PM. This indicates a delay of thirty-four minutes from the time the tamper was reported to the computer until it appeared on the incident monitor screen. Monitoring personnel report this is not uncommon. Messages are queued in the system until the incident report is printed.

Beginning at 4:28 PM the following actions were performed with the corresponding computer messages being generated:

- 1628HRS The AC power cord to the receiver unit was unplugged. Computer recorded incident as occurring at 1628 and printed at 1629. The pager was called at 1631.
- 1630HRS The AC power cord to the receiver unit was plugged back in. Computer recorded incident as occurring at 1630 and printed at 1635. At 1637 the computer recorded the client as having been added/changed.
- 1630HRS The transmitter's tamper circuit was reset. The indicator light on the tamper reset generator came on. The attempt to reset the tamper circuit was not successful. No tamper reset message recorded by the computer. The transmitter remains in tamper mode.
- 1633HRS The consultant stretched the transmitter band until the tamper indicator light on the receiver came on. No corresponding wristlet tamper message was recorded by the computer. (Note: under normal field operations, the indicator lights on the receiver box would not be left operable.)
- 1635HRS The transmitter's tamper circuit was reset. Computer recorded the incident as occurring at 1635 and printed at 1637. At 1637 a client added/changed message was recorded and printed by the computer. At 1640 a second client added/changed message was recorded and printed by the computer.
- 1643HRS Consultant left the building, went out to the parking lot and got into a vehicle. The device was tampered with by stretching the band. The computer recorded and printed a wristlet tamper message at 1645. At 1646 the consultant went back into the building. The printer recorded and printed a pager called message at 1647. The monitoring center called at 1647 and requested the consultant insert the wristlet device into the verifier box. Center advised this had been successfully completed. Officer Klett made several attempts to reset the tamper device. He then installed a new band. At 1700 the computer recorded and printed a client added/changed message.

³²See Appendix E for printouts and reports generated in the monitoring center during the field test.

- 1706HRS Transmitter with the new band is reset with the tamper reset generator. The tamper reset message was recorded at 1707 and printed at 1716.
- 1711HRS Monitoring center called and requested the consultant unplug and then reinsert the receiver unit's AC power cord into the wall socket. No corresponding computer message was recorded.
- 1716HRS The transmitter's tamper circuit was reset without the transmitter having been tampered with. No corresponding computer message was recorded.
- 1717HRS Consultant and Officer Klett left the building and grounds. The computer recorded a client left early message at 1717 which was printed at 1729. While out of the building a Telsol call was received on the phone. Investigator Mucciarelli hung up the telephone. The computer recorded a hang-up message at 1733 which was printed at 1734. A pager called message was recorded and printed at 1736. An incident report was printed from the incident monitor screen at 1750.
- 1740HRS Consultant and Officer Klett returned to the building. Computer recorded a client home late message at 1740 which was printed at 1741. At 1743 a pager called message was recorded and printed by the computer. An incident report was printed from the incident monitor screen at 1754.
- 1752HRS The tamper circuit was reset while the transmitter was not in the tamper mode. No corresponding computer message was recorded.
- 1802HRS The consultant cut the overlapped portion of the strap. He next cut halfway through the remaining strap. While attempting to bridge the straps with a paper-clip, the tamper indicator light on the receiver unit came on at 1810. No corresponding computer messages were recorded.
- 1814HRS The AC power cord and telephone cord were disconnected by the consultant. An equipment added/changed message was recorded and printed at 1814. Client added/changed messages were recorded and printed at 1821 and 2203.

The consultant was left in the computer system after the transmitter had been removed and the receiver unplugged from the AC power and telephone services. The next activity generated by the computer occurred on April 19, 1992 at 5:38 PM when the Telsol attempted to make a routine supervision call. A second attempt was made at 5:40 PM. Both calls were recorded as "no answer," and a pager call was generated at 5:42 PM. An incident report was printed out from the incident monitoring screen at 5:56 PM. At 6:48 PM, 6:58 PM and 7:08 PM the Telsol again attempted to make routine supervision calls. The pager was called at 7:11 PM and an incident report was printed from the incident monitor screen at 7:12 PM.

Problem Areas

Prior to the installation of new software in January of 1992, a pager busy signal would cause violations to be bumped from the system and not reported on the incident monitor screen. They would, however be reported on the line-printer. While staff have been instructed to again monitor the line-printer, the potential for error still exists. A review of the line-printer reports for Systems A and B on April 18, 1992 shows there were 3,125 messages received in one day. This was described by monitoring center staff as being a "normal" to "slow day" in terms of the amount of activity.

If the transmitter's tamper circuit is not reset properly, the indicator light on the reset generator will still come on. It is necessary for officers to confirm the reset attempt was successful with the monitoring center. Once the transmitter is in tamper mode, additional tampering attempts will not be reported.

If the tamper circuit is reset on a routine basis, the equipment will not show a tamper reset message unless the device was in a tamper status at the time it was reset. While this will not allow you to review records to ensure officers are routinely resetting the devices as required by division policy, receipt of a tamper message under these circumstances would indicate a previously undetected tamper had occurred.

If both the AC power and telephone cords are unplugged, there is no way for the device to communicate with the host computer system. Even though the system is programmed to make a status check every six hours if no activity is detected, this cannot occur when the unit has been disabled because the calls are generated from the receiver to the computer. There is no internal program in the computer to recognize when it has not been called by a particular receiver for over six hours. During the field test, the receiver was disabled and no indication of a problem was received in the monitoring center until the Telsol unit attempted to make a random supervision call. In this case, had the consultant been an offender, it would have been almost twenty-four hours before any problem was detected by the monitoring center.

The system is dependent on use of a commercial paging station, Pagenet, to transfer messages. Information was received by administrative staff that Pagenet is currently experiencing problems due to an overload of calls. Reportedly they are in the process of updating their pager switching system.³³ It is unknown what if any effect this may have had on the base station operation in December of 1991 when the undetected tamper occurred. Computer printouts do not, however, show any "Pager Intercept Oprtr" messages which are expected to appear if there is a problem with the commercial paging system.

During November and December of 1991, when the unreported tamper alert occurred with Palmer, Bell Atlantic Telephone Company was utilizing the monitoring center to field test equipment on twenty-five clients. They shut down testing of the voice-verification experiment due to equipment problems. It is unknown what if any effect this may have had on the base station operation in December of 1991.

While on-site the consultant learned of additional equipment problems. On April 15th or 16th, 1992, SPO Jeff Shaw was working in the monitoring center. During his shift he discovered two wristlet tamper messages on the line-printer which were not reported to the incident monitor screens. This was apparently caused by a "Telsol Interrupted" message being received as the system was attempting to make a Telsol call. He marked both messages on the line-printer's printout and ran a full client report on the inmates. The tampers were discussed with ADPS Rod Buriak over the telephone. SPO Shaw could not recall the names of the two inmates.

Shaw stated the Telsols for System B were not operating properly on the night of April 16, 1992. He had discussed this with Dan Goralewski, Digital's service technician, who was at the monitoring center on April 17, 1992. He also informed him of the two unreported wristlet tampers. Goralewski told Shaw the Telsols had too many clients on them. They are designed to handle only fifty clients. Some of them had as many as eighty-five clients assigned to a unit. It was his statement to Shaw that the center should have a minimum of two

³³Howard, T. Personal interview, April 17, 1992.

more Telsol units to handle the current number of offenders. Goralewski balanced the number of offenders on the Telsol units on April 17, 1992.³⁴

In a manual search of the supervision files at the monitoring center, the consultant located the records of inmate Richard Norman, # PN235193. On April 16, 1992 a wristlet tamper was recorded at 5:53 AM. The pager was called at 5:58 AM and the message was displayed on the incident monitor screen. The transmitter was reset at 8:49 PM. At 9:42 PM a second wristlet tamper was recorded. At 9:46 PM a "Telsol Interrupted" message was recorded. No pager call was recorded, indicating the wristlet tamper message was never sent to the screen.

A "Telsol Interrupted" message indicates there are hardware problems with the Telsol unit. One Telsol unit can interrupt the other Telsol units in the monitoring center. According to Digital's technician, this should not cause any type of software problem and the violation should still be reported to the incident monitor screen.³⁵ When asked to explain the Norman incident, he could not. He did not indicate he had previously been aware of this type of problem and requested a faxed copy of the full client report. This was sent by the consultant and SPO Vern Cox at 7:08 PM on April 19, 1992 from the monitoring center.³⁶

The second problem involves inmate Lorenzo Jamison, # PN226199. SPO Vernon Cox discovered the inmate's telephone service had been disconnected for two days after sending field personnel to check a series of "Busy" messages received when the Telsol unit had attempted to make a routine supervision call. The last recorded message was received by the computer on April 9, 1992 at 9:22 AM when the client left home. Fifteen "Busy" messages were recorded between 2:31 PM on April 9, 1992 and 1:05 PM on April 11, 1992. During that time period there were four "Pager-Called" messages recorded, indicating that four reports were sent to the incident monitor screen.³⁷

It is unknown if the incident reports actually appeared on the screen. If they did, action should have been taken by monitoring center and field personnel to resolve the reported violations. A full client report would have shown no routine activities for the inmate after 9:22 AM on April 9th. This should have alerted monitoring center personnel to a problem's existence.

The computer recorded a "Busy" message. If the telephone was disconnected, under normal circumstances, the phone company places a recorded message on the line indicating the telephone number is no longer in service. This should result in an "Intercept Operator" or "Recorded Speech" message being received.³⁸

Training for field officers and monitoring center staff is conducted "on the job." A manual supplied by the manufacturer lists a suggested training outline and certification examination.³⁹ There is no documentation of training received by any employees other than memorandum which may be created after a training session or meeting.

³⁴Shaw, J. Telephone interview, April 18, 1992 at 7:39 PM. Interview was conducted as a conference call. Also present were Principal Investigator Joseph Malone and Senior Investigator Robert Mucciarelli.

³⁵Goralewski, D. Digital Products Corporation Service Technician. Telephone interview April 19, 1992.

³⁶See Appendix E for copy of fax transmission report.

³⁷Cox, V. Personal interview, April 18, 1992. See Appendix E for copy of full client report on Jamison which had been retained by Cox.

³⁸Digital Products Corporation. *Wristlet/Transmitter Receiver/Verifier II Operation Manual, MAN11490*, not dated, p. 19.

³⁹*Id.*, p. 22.

Section 4 Program Operation

Selection and Exclusion Criteria

The program is designed primarily as an early release mechanism for inmates in the state's correctional facilities. A limited number of parolees have also been placed in the program by the parole board. The department's selection and exclusion criteria are set forth in an IOC dated November 16, 1990.⁴⁰ Inmates are eligible for participation if they are within six months of their parole date, are in minimum custody status, have made satisfactory overall institutional adjustment as evaluated by the institutional classification committee and have a current (within the last six months) psychological evaluation which indicates they are suitable for placement in a community release program.

Those excluded from the program include inmates convicted of rape, sodomy, statutory rape, carnal abuse, sexual assault, arson, fire setting, malicious destruction involving arson, or kidnapping and related offenses. Inmates with current convictions for criminal homicide, murder, manslaughter, or death by auto by involving the use of intoxicants are excluded. On January 21, 1992, an inter-office communication was issued regarding those convicted of homicide which clarified that the exclusion refers only to those inmates whose present conviction was for a homicide related offense.⁴¹

Inmates in county facilities with detainees, warrants or open charges may be reviewed on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the local authorities to determine their suitability for the program.⁴²

On November 2, 1990 the department was notified by the state parole board of their intention to begin using EMHC to release inmates who would not normally be granted parole. They indicated the case referral procedure would be the same as used for placement in ISSP.⁴³ The parole board also uses the program as an intermediate sanction prior to revocation. In some instances, they will reverse a revocation decision and place the offender under EMHC.

⁴⁰Hilton, G. *Eligibility/Exclusions Home Confinement Program*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to All Administrators-Adult, Youth Facilities, November 16, 1990. See also, Bruschini, W. *Exclusions from Home Confinement Program*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Gary Hilton and Terri Howard, October 9, 1990, for prior amended draft. Copy of November 16, 1990 IOC included in Appendix C.

⁴¹Hilton, G. *Clarification of Eligibility Criteria*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to All Administrators-Adult, Youth Facilities, January 21, 1992.

⁴²See also, Paporozzi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Inmates in County Facilities*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to William Bruschini, Ken Steider, Onyweuchi Nkowcha and Rick Durkin with copies to Terri Howard and Gary Hilton, December 6, 1990.

⁴³Nickolopolous, L. *Electronic Monitoring/Home Confinement Program*. New Jersey State Parole Board: Inter-Office Communication to Terri Howard with copy to Commissioner Faiver, Mr. Hilton and Mr. Egles, November 2, 1990.

On January 9, 1991, an IOC was sent to the parole board advising them that the department's exclusion criteria would preclude placement of a sex offender in the program.⁴⁴ This stemmed from the parole board's desire to place an inmate in violation of the correction's department criteria. In this case the inmate was not placed. Program administrators report the parole board has since sought an opinion from the Attorney General who advised they have the authority to place parolees in the program and are not bound by corrections' department restrictions. It is their opinion that the parole board has in the past sent them questionable clients.

The identification and selection of inmates is accomplished through the Adult Institution Liaison Officer. The Adult Institution Liaison Officer (AIL) has a network of coordinators in the institutions who work for the Adult Institutional Superintendent. In the event a problem or dispute arises, it must be settled by the Assistant Commissioner for Institutions. The coordinators have responsibilities other than the identification of inmates for EMHC which can create a conflict in priorities. On August 14, 1990 a policy memo was issued requiring statistics on the number of persons who were interviewed and the number who accepted placement at each institution be submitted to Mario Paparozzi.⁴⁵

The institutional coordinator and/or the classification committee identifies potential participants. (There is confusion, among program administrators, as to the actual process used within the institution to identify suitable inmates). An application form which contains the program rules is signed by the inmate requesting placement in EMHC.⁴⁶ The form must also be signed by the chairman of the institutional classification committee. The institutional coordinator then sends a "request for investigation of proposed home confinement plan" form to the AIL.⁴⁷ The form is given to the MIS technician in the Policy and Planning Division for entry into the computer. (The offices of the MIS and the AIL are located in the same building at the department's headquarters complex).

The MIS technician faxes the form to the appropriate district parole office.⁴⁸ The district office then assigns the case to a parole officer who is responsible for conducting a site investigation. During the site investigation a determination is made as to whether the equipment will work in the residence and if the family or others living there are cooperative.⁴⁹ Once the site investigation is complete, the form is faxed back to the MIS who delivers it to the AIL.

The file is then sent by the AIL back to the institution for further processing. The inmate's classification is checked, updated medical and psychological reports are obtained, and a warrant check is conducted. Once completed, the file is given to the institution's classification

⁴⁴Paparozzi, M. ISSP/HCP. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Louis Nickolopoulos with copies to Terri Howard, Gary Hilton, Len Kraus and William Bruschini, January 9, 1991.

⁴⁵Paparozzi, M. Home Confinement Program. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to William Bruschini, Onye Nkowcha, Cynthia Simmons Wilson and Michael Voll with copy to Modesto Fiume, August 14, 1990.


⁴⁶Form #84

⁴⁷Form #688

⁴⁸See Gervasio, M. Site Investigations. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/EM/IPDP Staff with copies to Terri Howard, Mario Paparozzi, Leonard Kraus, Steven Adams and Shobha Naik, April 30, 1991. Memo provides the rationale for faxing reports rather than other distribution methods.

⁴⁹Holley, F. EMHC Home Site Investigations. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff, March 26, 1991.

Figure 2
Organizational Flow Chart
Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program



NOTE: Chart constructed from information provided during April 17, 1992 meeting with Assistant Commissioner Howard, Marie Gervasio, Mario Paparozzi, Leonard Kraus and Steve Adams. Reflects their description of decision flow and may or may not be representative of department's official organizational chart.

committee for final approval. Institutional parole officers do not sit on the classification committee and a community risk assessment is not completed.

If the inmate is approved for placement in the program, a transfer order is issued by the AIL to the institutional classification officer and the institutional coordinator through the Assistant Commissioner Hilton.⁵⁰

Copies of the order are sent to the superintendent of the sending institution, the receiving district parole office, the Bureau of Parole Central Office IPO, the institutional parole officer from the sending institution, regional institution, offender records unit, CICS data base at Garden State, institutional parole counselor from the sending institution and the parole board's division of hearings.

In addition to the above, an inter-office communication is faxed to the senior classification officer at the sending institution, the district parole office supervisor and the regional institution classification officer notifying them of the inmates transfer date and transportation arrangements. The inmate is either transported to the district parole office by the institutional division's central transportation unit or is picked up by a parole officer at the institution.

The program maintains a report of pending site-investigations arranged by district parole office. The report contains the inmate's name, number, current place of confinement, date the request was faxed, due date and whether placement was approved.⁵¹ District Parole Supervisors are required to review all overdue site plans with their officers upon notification from Leonard Kraus. A weekly memo form was created for this purpose.⁵²

Enrollment Process

Once received at the parole office the inmate is given a preliminary orientation by the parole officer. There is no standard protocol for inmate orientation. The information provided will vary from officer to officer. The program rules, contained in the application, were signed by the inmate at the institution and the parole officers assume the institutional coordinator has explained them to the inmate.⁵³

The equipment is installed in the participant's residence and its operation explained by the parole officer. Once all the necessary equipment has been connected, a test call is made to ensure the equipment is operating properly. The printout from the test call and monitoring computer enrollment sheet are kept in the inmate's file. The inmate is instructed how to use the verifier component of the system. A walk through test is conducted to determine how far the inmate can go from the receiver without generating an alarm and to locate any "dead zones" in the house which interfere with the equipment's operation. Prior to leaving the inmate's residence, the parole officer is to confirm the equipment is operating properly with the monitoring center.⁵⁴

⁵⁰Unnumbered form.
⁵¹Unnumbered computerized form titled: *Pending HCP Investigations*.
⁵²Howard, T. *Standing Operating Procedure - Pending Site Investigations*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Steven D. Adams with copies to Leonard Kraus, Rodney Buriak, Frank Fuccello, Marie Gervasio and Shobha Naik, March 31, 1992.
⁵³This was the consensus of opinion reached during the April 17, 1992 meeting with Howard, Gervasio, Papanozzi, Kraus and Adams.
⁵⁴Papanozzi, M. *Installations*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Staff, December 19, 1990.

A curfew schedule is provided to the inmate and a reporting date is established. Random supervision calls from the Telsol unit are to be generated within thirty minutes after a curfew period begins. A second call is to be generated between the hours of 6:00 PM and midnight unless the offender is scheduled to be out of their residence at that time. Additional calls can be scheduled at the option of the supervising officer.⁵⁵ The parole officer will then start a case supervision plan for review during the next office visit which contains goals and objectives for the client.

Client Supervision

The caseload for each EMHC officer is set at twenty-five participants. Program administrators report this ratio is generally adhered to, although in some instances the number of inmates under supervision by a parole officer may reach thirty.⁵⁶

A case file is maintained with a chronological listing of supervision activities for each inmate.⁵⁷ The file will also contain any incident reports prepared while the client is under supervision, a copy of the case supervision plan developed by the parole officer and other institution documents.⁵⁸

A policy was established on October 15, 1990 that needs assessment forms were to be completed on all participants in EMHC during the first seven days of supervision.⁵⁹ Use of the needs assessment form was discontinued in October of 1991 because the number of inmates being released each week precluded completing one for each offender. This was apparently done without a corresponding IOC being issued to change the policy. Risk assessment forms were never required by the Division of Policy and Planning because they were not being used in the release decision process and therefore felt to be inappropriate.

Officers are expected to see inmates once a week. They are not, however, held accountable for field contacts. Information on the number of contacts made is not recorded anywhere but in the supervision chrono. This makes it difficult if not impossible to confirm officers are completing the number of required contacts. In practice, the number of visits is left to the officer to determine on a case by case basis.⁶⁰ Offenders are provided the phone

⁵⁵Paparozi, M. *Programming Random Calls*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station with copies to T. Howard, L. Kraus, S. Adams and K. Fowler, May 17, 1991.

⁵⁶Information obtained during April 17th meeting with Howard, Gervasio, Paparozi, Kraus and Adams.

⁵⁷See Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to William Hamp, Leonard Kraus and Steve Adams, March 25, 1991. The supervision chronological is a handwritten report maintained on plain paper.

⁵⁸Other documents contained in the file would include: parole eligibility calculation; request for pre-parole investigation; pre-parole report, intake forms, offense information form, prior court history, case supervisor analysis form and adult presentence report forms from the Superior Court of New Jersey - Criminal Division's Case Management Office; judgement of conviction and order of commitment from sentencing court; inmate history and face sheet forms from the Department of Corrections; medical examination report; psychological evaluation report; application for program admission; site-investigation reports; and copies of the transfer orders.

⁵⁹Paparozi, M. *Needs Assessment*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to Fred Holley, Domenick Sparino, William Hamp, Modesto Fiume and Cynthia Simmons, October 15, 1990. See Appendix C for copy of IOC.

⁶⁰Information obtained during April 17th meeting with Howard, Gervasio, Paparozi, Kraus and Adams.

number to the monitoring center to contact their parole officer in the event of an emergency. During normal duty hours they are to call the District Parole Office.⁶¹

Offenders are subject to a curfew schedule which is established by the supervising parole officer (SPO). Curfew schedules are prepared by the SPO and faxed to the monitoring center for entry into the computer.⁶² Changes in curfew schedules are to be approved by the field parole officer assigned to supervise the inmate and faxed to the monitoring center.⁶³ In an emergency which requires the inmate to leave their residence during an established curfew, they are to notify the monitoring center which will notify their parole officer. The parole officer is then to confirm the necessity for leaving.

Participants are required to be employed or actively seeking employment. Although there is no written policy addressing the issue, offenders are subject to a thirty day review process when unemployed. If it is felt the offender is not making an effort to secure employment, they may be returned to the institution.⁶⁴

There is no EMHC policy established regarding the frequency of drug testing for inmates. Other policies in the Parole Bureau, which were not reviewed, may address this issue. The program has issued three memos to staff regarding administrative procedures and required reports for drug testing⁶⁵ and three memos which address policy on disciplinary procedures relating to urine testing.⁶⁶ Program administrators are concerned over the length of time required to obtain urinalysis reports. The department uses an in-house laboratory operated by the institutional division and results can sometimes take six weeks.

When offenders are scheduled for a parole release hearing the SPO is required to submit a case assessment to the parole board on an IOC. The assessment details the inmate's adjustment in the community, participation in any required community-based treatment programs, employment record and the officer's opinion as to the prognosis regarding the inmate's ability to successfully adjust to a community setting without placement in ISSP or

⁶¹Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Emergency Number*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff, December 18, 1990. See also, Paparozi, M. *Providing Phone Numbers to Offenders*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Staff, December 19, 1990. This second memo details problems created by offenders calling the monitoring center for non-emergency purposes.

⁶²Adams, S. *Curfew Schedule Changes*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Electronic Monitoring Staff, October 9, 1991. A special Fax memo form is used to accomplish notification of the monitoring center of curfew schedules.

⁶³Paparozi, M. *Curfew Changes*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff, ISSP/HCP Officers with copies to Modesto Fiume and Shobha Naik, October 22, 1990.

⁶⁴Information obtained during April 17th meeting with Howard, Gervasio, Paparozi, Kraus and Adams.

⁶⁵Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Urine Monitoring*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to ISSP Officers, Modesto Fiume and William Bruschini, August 27, 1990. See also, Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Urine Collection Procedures*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to Modesto Fiume, William Bruschini, and Don Roberts, August 31, 1990; and, Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to Modesto Fiume, William Bruschini and Distribution B, August 27, 1990.

⁶⁶Paparozi, M. *Urine Monitoring*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Staff with copies to Terri Howard, Fred Holley, Leonard Kraus, William Bruschini and Base Station, February 21, 1991. See also, Wiechnik, K. *Disciplinary Charges*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Mario Paparozi, May 6, 1991; and, Paparozi, M. *Disciplinary Charges*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Terri Howard with copies to Leonard Kraus and Steven Adams, May 7, 1991.

EMHC.⁶⁷ Subsequent memos required the faxing of progress reports to the appropriate institutional parole counselors when a parole hearing was scheduled. These memos arose out of a situation where progress reports were not sent to the institution and the parole hearing could not be held.⁶⁸

If a transmitter tamper alert is reported, officers are required to reset the device. The decision to respond after office hours is made in consultation with the on-call supervisor and the parole officer. Division guidelines permit waiting until 8:00 AM the next morning to notify the supervising officer.⁶⁹

On January 18, 1991, a memo was issued which required parole officers to reset the tamper alert feature on the transmitter at least monthly or sooner if the equipment had been changed. The policy required them to carry their reset device with them while making field visits.⁷⁰ There is no policy or directive which informed the officers to visually inspect the transmitter bands for evidence of tampering.

If the offender's telephone is out of order, division policy requires the officer to respond immediately.⁷¹ There was no written policy located which addressed the issue of phones which are out of order for extended periods of time. There is an informal policy that if an offender's telephone service is disconnected they will be returned to the institution.

If a receiver unit in the offender's home shuts down, division policy requires it be re-programmed immediately.⁷² If necessary, officers are to obtain replacement equipment for another district or the central office.⁷³ Problem equipment is to be reported to the program director on a daily basis.⁷⁴ When returning equipment to C.S.S. or the monitoring center,

⁶⁷Paparozzi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Parole Release Hearings*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Staff with copies to Terri Howard, Douglas Chiesa, Len Kraus and William Bruschini, January 10, 1991.

⁶⁸Durkin, R. *Progress Reports for Parole Hearings*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Mario Paparozzi, February 20, 1991. See also, Paparozzi, M. *Inmate Progress Reports*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Dennis Wertz, Anthony Lanza and William Strollo with copies to Leonard Kraus, William Bruschini and Richard Durkin, February 20, 1991.

⁶⁹Paparozzi, M. *Wristlet Tamperers*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Night Shift with copies to Leonard Kraus and Shobha Naik, December 26, 1990. See Appendix C for copy of IOC.

⁷⁰Paparozzi, M. *Wristlet Tamperers*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Staff with copies to Terri Howard and Lenny Kraus, January 18, 1991. See Appendix C for copy of IOC.

⁷¹Paparozzi, M. *Responding to out of Order Phones*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Night Shift with copies to Leonard Kraus and Shobha Naik, December 26, 1990. See Appendix C for copy of IOC.

⁷²Paparozzi, M. *Programming Receivers*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Night Staff with copies to Leonard Kraus and Shobha Naik, December 26, 1990.

⁷³Paparozzi, M. *Radio Frequency*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Shobha Naik with copies to Modesto Fiume, DPSs and ISSP Officers, August 14, 1990.

⁷⁴Paparozzi, M. *Problem Equipments*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP Night Shift with copy to Leonard Kraus, December 27, 1990. See also, Paparozzi, M. *Identification of Problem Equipments*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to ISSP/HCP - Night Shift with copy to Len Kraus, December 19, 1990.

field officers are required to submit a receipt for the units. The report describes any problems which exist with the equipment and lists any missing parts.⁷⁵

Field officers are required to fax weekly reports of case counts for their ISSP, JAP and HCP clients to the MIS Technician. The DPSs are responsible for ensuring the reports are submitted.⁷⁶ Monitoring center personnel are required to verify in writing the total inmate count for each shift. The center is provided a daily count by the MIS Technician.⁷⁷ The MIS Technician is required to provide a numerical count of inmates to the program director by 11:00 AM each morning. On a weekly basis the MIS technician provides a roster of participants to the program director and CCU.⁷⁸

Violation Procedures

When a violation occurs and notification is received on the incident screen, monitoring center personnel call the client's residence to try and resolve the situation. If the problem can not be resolved on the telephone, the client's parole officer is called. Once the officer is notified, the base station telephones the on-call supervisor (the program director, ADPS, or Assistant Commissioner Howard) to discuss the situation. A decision is made by the on-call supervisor as to whether or not the parole officer is to be sent to the client's residence. The center then calls the parole officer back and informs them of the decision made by the on-call supervisor. A report is generated on the incident screen which is completed by monitoring center personnel and faxed to the parole officer.

If an officer is dispatched to the field after hours, the monitoring center logs their activity and the amount of overtime on a daily report form.⁷⁹ Overtime must be approved by the on-call supervisor.⁸⁰

If an inmate is arrested for any crime, the parole officer is required to schedule an appointment with their supervisor for a file review within one week. Prior to the review, the officer forwards a copy of the incident report and the client's report for the month prior to the new criminal offense.⁸¹ Disciplinary charges are written up and forwarded to the regional

⁷⁵Adams, S. *H.M.U. Equipment*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Electronic Monitoring Staff, September 25, 1991.

⁷⁶Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to Modesto Fiume, Bill Bruschini, Cynthia Simmons Wilson and Shobha Naik, August 14, 1990. See Also, Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP - Statistics*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Parole Staff with copies to Terri Howard, Modesto Fiume and Cynthia Simmons, August 31, 1990.

⁷⁷Paparozi, M. *Inmate Shift Count*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station with copies to T. Howard, L. Kraus, S. Adams and M. Gervasio, May 17, 1991.

⁷⁸Paparozi, M. *ISSP/HCP*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Shobha Naik with copies to Modesto Fiume and William Bruschini, September 18, 1990.

⁷⁹Howard, T. *OT Report - Base Station OT Assignment Sheet*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Leonard Kraus with copy to Steven Adams, January 16, 1992. See also, Adams, S. *Overtime Assignment Form*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station Staff with copies to Terri Howard, Leonard Kraus, Mario Paparozi, Rodney Buriak, Frank Fucello and Richard Higgins, January 17, 1992.

⁸⁰Paparozi, M. *Dispatches for Overtime*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station with copies to Terri Howard, Leonard Kraus and Steve Adams, May 7, 1991.

⁸¹Howard, T. *Policy*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Mario Paparozi, Leonard Kraus and Steven Adams, April 15, 1991.

institution within one week if the offender is an inmate.⁸² If the offender is a parolee, the violation must be addressed through the parole revocation process.

Personnel in the monitoring center are required to complete an incident report any time a participant is returned to an institution or has other law enforcement involvement.⁸³ The report is forwarded to the program administrator. If an inmate escapes, monitoring center personnel are required to prepare an IOC to the department's Office of Public Information.⁸⁴

Curfew violations are assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine if the inmate should be returned to the institution. A positive urinalysis results in an automatic return to the institution. If the inmate is arrested for a new offense which is bailable, they are returned to the institution. For minor offenses (disorderly conduct or traffic offenses), the matter is to be reviewed with the AIL who makes the decision to return. The AIL, by division policy, is to be contacted only after the case has been reviewed with the on-call supervisor.⁸⁵

If officers are dispatched to return inmates to custody, the municipal police department is called and request to assist in taking the offender into custody. If municipal officers are not available, the on-call supervisor is contacted who then makes a decision as to whether the officers will wait until a municipal officer is available or call for alternative backup.⁸⁶

On January 15, 1992, a policy was instituted at the suggestion of Digital Products Corporation to run an equipment problem report every four hours. This report identifies units which have no AC power, no RF or have been tampered with.⁸⁷ The four hour time frame was suggested by Digital because the battery life in receivers is approximately eight hours. The procedure was initially prompted by receiver shut downs. A tamper status will show up on the printout for approximately five days after the initial tampering occurs.

⁸²Kraus, L. *EM(HCP) Inmates Arrested on New Charges*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Em(HCP)IPDP Staff with copies to Terri Howard, Mario Paparozzi, Steve Adams, Frank Fuccello and Rodney Buriak, September 6, 1991.

⁸³Adams, S. *Policy - EM Returns/Arrests*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Staff with copies to Terri Howard and Leonard Kraus, January 24, 1992.

⁸⁴Paparozzi, M. *Notification for Escapes*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station with copies to Terri Howard, Leonard Kraus, Steven Adams and Kevin Fowler, June 18, 1991.

⁸⁵Paparozzi, M. *Notification Procedures - Case Decisions*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station with copies to Terri Howard, Leonard Kraus and Steven Adams, April 30, 1991.

⁸⁶Howard, T. *Municipal Police Involvement*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Leonard Kraus, January 22, 1992.

⁸⁷Adams, S. *Equipment Problem Reports*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station Staff with copy to Leonard Kraus, January 15, 1992.

Section 5 Palmer Incident

Admission to the Program

Tony Palmer pled guilty on March 3, 1990 to possession of a controlled dangerous substance with intent to distribute within 1,000 feet of school property. He was sentenced to serve three years.⁸⁸

On October 5, 1990 he pled guilty to additional charges of possession of a controlled dangerous substance with intent to distribute within 1,000 feet of school property and obstructing administration of law or other government functions. He was sentenced to three years with a minimum parole eligibility term of eighteen months for the possession charge. He received a three year sentence for the obstruction charge with a minimum parole eligibility term of twelve months. These sentences were to be served concurrently with the one imposed in March of 1990.⁸⁹

Palmer was assigned to the Mountainview Youth Correctional Facility. Reports in his supervision file show no institutional problems. He was granted full minimum status on March 1, 1991.⁹⁰ His parole eligibility date was established as April 4, 1992.⁹¹

An application for admission to the home confinement program was signed by Palmer on September 26, 1991. On that date a request for investigation of proposed home confinement plan was forwarded to District Parole Office #12. A handwritten note on the application form indicates the plan was verbally approved on October 18, 1991. Signed approval for the plan was given on October 21, 1991 by Senior Parole Officer Richard P. Ciccone.⁹²

A psychological examination was completed by Edmund Zuzock at the Mountainview facility on September 20, 1991. There were no indications of any propensity for violence or anti-social behavior. Palmer was found psychologically suitable for community release. A medical examination was conducted on October 15, 1991 by Dr. Francis Byrne at the Mountainview facility. The inmate was medically cleared for transfer to the pre-parole home confinement program.

On October 25, 1991 a transfer order was issued to the pre-parole home confinement program to become effective October 30, 1991. On that same day, an IOC was faxed to District Office #12 indicating Palmer would be delivered to the parole office by central transportation.⁹³

Palmer was assigned to SPO Richard Ciccone for supervision. On October 30, 1991 the inmate was taken to his residence, 30 N. 3rd Street, Paterson, New Jersey, where the

⁸⁸Passaic County, New Jersey. Indictment # 89-10-1702-L

⁸⁹Passaic County, New Jersey. Indictment # 90-05-0728-L

⁹⁰New Jersey Department of Corrections. *AIMS FACE SHEET*, April 3, 1991.

⁹¹New Jersey State Parole Board. Parole Eligibility Calculation, November 15, 1990.

⁹²See Appendix G for copy of application and site investigation forms.

⁹³See Appendix G for copy of transfer orders.

equipment was installed. The equipment was operating normally and the Telsol test call was successful.

The computer was programmed to make a random Telsol call between 4:10 PM and 5:00 PM every evening but Friday, when the call was scheduled to occur between 4:10 PM and 6:20 PM. A second call was scheduled to be made between 5:01 PM and 10:00 PM every day but Friday, when the call was scheduled to occur between 10:40 PM and 11:10 PM.⁹⁴

On November 4, 1991, Officer Ciccone sent a letter to the Paterson Chief of Police advising him of Palmer's placement in the program.⁹⁵ No needs assessment form was ever completed on the inmate. The supervision file received by the consultant did not contain a case supervision plan with goals and objectives for the inmate.

Supervision of Palmer

A review of the supervision chronological report and other materials reveal the following concerning the supervision of Tony Palmer while he was in the EMHC program.⁹⁶ After the initial installation process on October 30, 1991 until the time of his arrest in April of 1992, parole officers recorded making five home visits where Palmer was contacted and one where only his mother was contacted. There were four office visits recorded in the chrono and one additional contact on December 15, 1991 at his residence to reset a tamper alert.

No urinalysis tests were performed until January 28, 1992, almost three months after Palmer had been admitted into the program. The second urinalysis was performed on March 3, 1992, with the last test being given on April 1, 1992. Results of the first two tests were negative. Results of the third test have not yet been received.

On November 29, 1991, an incident report was filed when Palmer was fifty-nine minutes late getting home. He told the monitoring center he was late because his friend who was giving him a ride home had been stopped by the police for improper merging.

On December 3, 1991, an incident report was filed when Palmer returned home late. Handwritten notes indicate there was trouble on the telephone line. Parole Officer Bernal was paged and advised of the information. No entry was located in the supervision chrono to explain the disposition of this incident.

On December 12, 1991, he was arrested by the Paterson Police in front of his residence for "failing to disperse." His parole officer contacted the police department and determined this was not a serious charge. On December 13, 1992, Palmer went to the District Parole Office to explain the arrest. On February 5, 1992 he was fined \$150 by the Paterson Municipal Court. Entries in the supervision chrono indicate Palmer was paying his fine as directed by the court. No incident report was found in the inmate's file regarding the arrest.


On December 15, 1991, Palmer tampered with his transmitter at 10:11 PM. The device was reset at 10:44 PM by Officers Ciccone and Rosner. No report was found in the file for this incident. His overtime for this incident was not noted on the base station overtime report.

⁹⁴See Appendix G for copy of equipment installation printouts.

⁹⁵See Supervision chrono.

⁹⁶See Appendix G for copy of the supervision chronological report. Unless otherwise noted, information on the supervision of Palmer was obtained from the chrono.

Figure 3
Sequence of Equipment Events
Palmer Incident



The report does show he and officer Rosner were on overtime status from 9:00 PM until midnight replacing equipment on another inmate.⁹⁷

On December 16, 1991, Palmer tampered with his transmitter at 7:11 PM. The wristlet tamper message was blocked from going to the incident monitor screen by a pager busy signal. The tamper was never detected by department personnel. From this time on, Palmer's transmitter device remained in a tamper mode which prevented any subsequent tampering from being reported.⁹⁸

SPO Jeff Shaw was working in the monitoring center on December 16, 1991 when the undetected tamper occurred. The line-printer was not being monitored because the center was understaffed. He and the other employees assumed all violations were appearing on the incident monitor screens. No one in the department was aware of the equipment problems. The manual provided by Digital Products Corporation requires monitoring center personnel to review the line-printer reports.⁹⁹ His training was all in-service other than a one-day classroom session. He never had received a policy manual. All policies were established either verbally or by inter-office communication.

Based on a review of the client printouts and interviews with staff and employees of Digital Products Corporation, the following sequence of events occurred on December 16, 1991 which allowed the wristlet tamper message to go undetected by monitoring center staff. The wristlet tamper message was sent by the transmitter to the home receiver unit. The receiver unit sent a message to the computer's file saver over the telephone lines. The computer instructed the Telsol unit to send a pager message to Pagenet, the commercial paging company. Pagenet attempts to send a message to the pager located in the monitoring center and receives a pager busy message. The pager busy status was reported to the Telsol unit. The wristlet tamper and pager busy messages are printed out on the line-printer. The pager busy signal prevented the message from being displayed on the incident monitoring screen. This was caused by software problems which were reprogrammed in January of 1992.

Between the December 16th tampering and Palmer's arrest on April 3, 1992, there were five personal contacts by parole officers with the inmate.¹⁰⁰ The last visit occurred on April 1, 1992, one day before the homicide. The transmitter was never reset as required by division policy issued January 18, 1991.

Vernon Major Homicide

Tony Palmer was arrested on April 3, 1992 for the murder of Vernon Major which had occurred on April 2nd at approximately 12:11 AM at 145 Riverview Towers, Paterson, New Jersey. An incident report was prepared by the monitoring center which indicates they were notified at approximately 5:00 AM¹⁰¹ ADPS Higgins and SPO Ciccone were both paged and notified of the incident by the monitoring center. Bill Bruschini was notified as was SPO Kraus.¹⁰²

⁹⁷New Jersey Department of Corrections. *Electronic Monitoring/Home Confinement Overtime Assignments*, 12-15-91.

⁹⁸See Appendix F for copy of the full computer printout on Palmer.

⁹⁹Digital Products Corporation. *Wristlet/Transmitter Receiver/Verifier II Operation Manual*, MAN11490, not dated, p. 25.

¹⁰⁰The contacts occurred on January 15th, January 28th, March 3rd, March 27th and April 1, 1992.

¹⁰¹This is inconsistent with the time the full client report was printed which was at 4:49 AM on which the notes were made.

¹⁰²See Appendix G for copy of incident report and monitoring center notes.

The computer printouts for the dates in question show the client returned home on April 1, 1992 at 3:44 PM and did not leave until 10:55 AM on April 2, 1992. This would place him at home when the homicide was reported to have occurred. This information was provided to the Paterson Police Department to whom Palmer had apparently already admitted being at the homicide.

A note on the client report printed on April 3, 1992 indicates there were problems with System B on April 1st. The printout shows three attempts were made to complete a routine supervision call between 4:51 PM and 4:56 PM, each resulting with an invalid verifier # message. A pager called message was printed at 4:58 PM. Routine calls were again attempted at 5:50 PM and 6:00 PM. At 6:10 PM, a Telsol Interrupted message was printed. At 9:45 PM on April 1st, and 5:45 AM on April 2nd, routine RF checks indicated the client was at home.

The line-printer was not being monitored, therefore, none of the invalid supervision calls were detected by monitoring personnel.

On April 3, 1992 SPOs Ciccone and Bernal went to the Paterson Police Department and examined the transmitter which had been seized from Palmer at the time of his arrest. Both officers noted that upon close examination of the device it appeared that different rivets had been used to secure the band. The rivets were not of the type used by the program. The officers were advised that the Paterson Police had photographs of Palmer removing the transmitter.¹⁰³

An investigation into the incident was conducted by the department's internal affairs unit. On April 3, 1992, Senior Investigators Pablo Alicea and R. McCourt interviewed Palmer at the Paterson Police Department. Palmer told them he had removed the transmitter on four occasions without being detected by the monitoring system. He had used a pair of needle nose pliers, an eye lash curler and his own rivets to reinstall the transmitter. According to Palmer, his parole officer contacts him only once a month and had never inspected the transmitter.¹⁰⁴

Additional investigation was conducted by Principal Investigator Joseph Malone and Senior Investigator Robert Mucciarelli.¹⁰⁵ They had received an IOC from Assistant Commissioner Howard on April 8, 1992 which outlined her preliminary assessment of the incident.¹⁰⁶ During their conversations with representatives of Digital Products Corporation, they felt they were not being provided answers to questions about the reliability of the equipment and how the tamper was not reported to the incident monitor screen. On April 15, 1992, the two investigators held a conference call with Steve Zimko, Digital Products Corporation. Also present were Leonard Kraus and Assistant Commissioner Howard. During the conversation they were informed the company was working on developing new safeguards which would prevent a reoccurrence of this type of event in the future.

¹⁰³ See Inter-Office Communications prepared on April 3, 1992 by Michael J. Bernal and Richard Ciccone.

¹⁰⁴ Alicea, P. *Inmate Tony Palmer S.P.#YN110282*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Ira R. Friedman, April 8, 1992.

¹⁰⁵ Malone, J. *An Investigation Concerning Tony Palmer #YN110282 Alleged Ability to Elude the Electronic Monitoring System*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Debbie Faunce, April 10, 1992.

¹⁰⁶ Howard, T. *Tony Palmer YN#110282 Home Confinement Case*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Joseph Malone with copies to William H. Fauver, Richard A. Seidl, James V. Stabile and Leonard F. Kraus, April 8, 1992.

On April 10, 1992, a letter was received by Assistant Commissioner Howard from Digital which outlines their review of Palmer's computer file and analysis of how the incident occurred. They fail to explain the software problems other than to say it "may have been caused by some type of outside interference."¹⁰⁷

Milton Wilson

After the arrest of Tony Palmer, the internal affairs unit requested all inmates be placed in a restricted status until their transmitters had been inspected and the tamper circuit reset.¹⁰⁸ During this process, Officers Mike Bernal and Richard Ciccone contacted inmate Milton Wilson, # YN108554. Wilson told the officers he had been shown how to tamper with the transmitter band by Tony Palmer. he was familiar with Palmer because both had been employed at the same location. Wilson told the officers he had only tampered with the device on one occasion. He did not tamper with it any further because he was afraid of being caught.

The officers had Wilson attempt to remove the transmitter band in their presence with a pair of needle nose pliers. He was unable to do so. The band and rivets which Milton had tried to remove were ultimately given to Assistant Commissioner Howard. The rivets were badly damaged and would have been noticeable upon a visual inspection of the device. No written report had been prepared on this incident.¹⁰⁹

In reviewing Wilson's file, the consultant located a computer printout dated March 15, 1992 which shows the inmate's transmitter had been tampered with on March 9, 1992 and not reset. A handwritten note on page three of the printout reads: "The above named subject, according to this report has been in tamper since 3-9-92." There is no record in the file indicating when the device was reset. According to the printout, the tamper occurred at 4:26 PM. The next entry on the printout shows a "Telsol Interrupted" message at 4:30 PM. This was followed by a successful Telsol check at 5:07 PM.¹¹⁰

As previously discussed in Section 3 of this report, the "Telsol Interrupted" message is believed to block violation messages from appearing on the incident monitor screen. Officers watching the incident screen would not have been alerted to the tampering. The tamper condition should have been discovered prior to March 15, 1992, if the daily equipment reports were being run as required by division policy issued on January 15, 1992.¹¹¹ This, however, assumes the same problems which prevented the tamper from going to the incident monitor screen did not also prevent it from being recorded in the daily equipment report.

¹⁰⁷Zimko, S. Letter to Assistant Commissioner Howard, April 10, 1992.

¹⁰⁸Howard, T. *EMIHCP Schedules*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Leonard Kraus with copies to Steve Adams, Rodney Buriak and Frank Fuccello, April 9, 1992.

¹⁰⁹Howard, T. Personal Interview, April 17, 1992.

¹¹⁰See Appendix G for copy of computer printout on Milton Wilson.

¹¹¹Adams, S. *Equipment Problem Reports*. New Jersey Department of Corrections: Inter-Office Communication to Base Station Staff with copy to Leonard Kraus, January 15, 1992.

Section 6 Findings and Conclusions

Development of the Program

The program began in September of 1989. It grew very rapidly over the next two years to an average size of 560 offenders. The number of initial memos would indicate the program was not well-planned prior to implementation. It was designed and operated on a day-to-day basis. The need to address overcrowded institutions drove the program to accept increasingly larger numbers of participants. This was occurring at a time when the administrative and operational processes were being developed. Increasing the size of the program compounded existing problems.

Responsibility for the program is divided between the Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions and the Division of Policy and Planning, each under the direction of an Assistant Commissioner. While supervision of inmates is carried out by policy and planning, the selection and overall responsibility for inmates remains with the institutions. The divisions have different responsibilities, priorities and mindsets regarding the supervision of program participants. Tension exists between the two divisions over program operation.

Additional tension existed within the Division of Policy and Planning stemming from the issues of overtime, assignment of agency vehicles and supervision. EMHC had essentially become a program outside the Parole Bureau. Personnel were responsible to any number of supervisors who often issued conflicting directives.

The program was run by inter-office communication forms. No policy and procedures manual has ever been promulgated by the department. There is no collection of policy and procedure memos maintained in a central location which is accessible to program personnel. There is no procedure to ensure new employees are given copies of or even review existing memos. Policies are often issued or changed verbally without corresponding documentation.

Training is conducted primarily "on-the-job." There is no established curriculum. No records of training received are kept in personnel files.

No workload or performance measures have ever been established for field or monitoring center personnel. The amount of approved overtime paid by the department would suggest there are not a sufficient number of employees assigned to the program and/or the process should be restructured.

Program Operation

The selection and enrollment process for the program is cumbersome and time consuming. Decisions to return inmates require a number of personnel from both divisions be involved in the process. Changes in program operations are difficult at best to achieve. These problems are inherent in the administrative structure of the program which splits responsibilities between two divisions with no one person having functional line authority over the people necessary to make the program work. Employees feel the internal management system is confused and policies are unclear.

The program has a poor management information system. There are too many individual reports prepared which are dependent on a multitude of people for their completion. Many of the forms require the same information be presented in a different format. Often information which is needed for supervision of employees, such as the number of field contacts, is not collected or is listed only in the supervision chronological report for each inmate.

There is no community risk assessment completed on potential program participants. They are classified according to institutional risk factors which can be presumed to differ significantly from those arising in a community setting.

The Parole Board has begun assigning parolees to EMHC irrespective of the program's exclusion criteria. If an incident occurs with one of these parolees, the department will most probably receive negative publicity. It is not possible to separate in the public's mind the differences in authority and responsibility of the Parole Board and the Department of Corrections. Any major incident which occurs in the near future will seriously undermine program integrity.

The monitoring center has too many responsibilities and not enough personnel. On an average day, there will be over 3,000 computer messages received on the line-printer. The process for resolving violation reports requires personnel to make too many phone calls. They are responsible for relaying information back and forth between the offenders, parole officers, on-call supervisors and the adult institution liaison officer. There is no supervisor on-duty in the monitoring center which is staffed by senior parole officers. The SPOs are not given sufficient authority to resolve incidents.

The records system in the monitoring center is cumbersome. Personnel are required to handle too many different pieces of paper and process too many forms. Reports and information are often filed on clipboards which increases the chances of information being misplaced.

Equipment

The equipment used in the monitoring program is manufactured by Digital Products Corporation, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The contract for provision of equipment was awarded to Computerized Surveillance Systems, Inc. (CSS), South Orange, New Jersey which has an unspecified relationship with the manufacturer. CSS certified in their response to the bid proposal that the equipment was tamper-proof. They further maintained the equipment would provide confirmation of the presence or absence of the wearer: "... confirmation is immediate, automatic and positive with no margin of error."

In August or September of 1991 incident monitor screens were installed in the monitoring center to alleviate the necessity of reviewing the on-line printer for violation notices. Although the manufacturer's operating manual for the equipment requires monitoring the printer, no one from the department was advised by Digital this was still necessary after the monitoring screens were installed.

The equipment suffered from a design flaw which under certain circumstances would prevent violation notices from appearing on the incident monitor screens. Once a transmitter was in the tamper mode, it would not continue to report this status, but would otherwise function normally. It would not report any further attempts to tamper with the equipment until the tamper circuits had been reset.

Digital Products Corporation was aware of the software problem prior to December of 1991 when Palmer's tampering with the transmitter was not detected by department

personnel. In later consultations with department staff, Digital admitted having experienced the problem in their own monitoring center in Ft. Lauderdale. They developed software in November and December of 1991 which was installed on the department's computer system in January of 1992. Digital did not inform the Department of Corrections of the problem's existence or that they had installed new software.

There has been no written explanation from the manufacturer of the software problem which led to the tamper not being detected by monitoring center personnel, other than it was caused by "some outside interference."

While the receiver unit is programmed to call the central computer at least every six hours for a status report, there is no alert message generated if this is not successfully accomplished. In the field test, with the unit's AC power and telephone lines unplugged, no indication was given that the receiver had been disabled for almost twenty-four hours.

There are still problems with the equipment. The Telsol unit malfunctions, producing a "Telsol Interrupted" message. When this occurs, violation reports are blocked from going to the incident monitoring screen. A company representative was informed a problem existed on April 16, 1992. Three days later, the same employee gave no indication of any previous knowledge when asked by the consultant to explain how this was occurring.

Palmer Incident

Tony Palmer met the selection criteria for the program. There were no indications in his supervision file, prior criminal history or psychological report of any propensity for violence. None of the factors listed in the exclusion criteria which would have precluded his placement in the program were present.

When enrolled in the program the equipment appeared to be operating normally. A needs assessment form was never filled out. No supervision plan listing goals and objectives for this inmate was ever located. Both of these items were required by division policy.

In the twenty-three weeks Palmer was in the program there were ten contact visits recorded by the parole officer. None of these visits revealed factors which would indicate he should have been returned to the institution. While under supervision, incident reports were prepared on two curfew violations, one minor arrest for violation of a city ordinance and one wristlet tamper.

Although Palmer was convicted of drug related offenses, it was nearly three months after his entry into the program before the first urinalysis was performed. Of the two tests for which results have been received, both were negative. The last urinalysis was performed the day before the homicide occurred.

Nothing the inmate did allowed him to escape detection of the initial tampering with the transmitter and subsequent curfew violations. The failure to detect these actions was due to equipment and supervision problems.

A design flaw in the software prevented the tamper notice from being sent to the monitoring screen. Personnel in the monitoring center had stopped reviewing the line-printer which did record the tamper incident because they were operating under the assumption it was no longer necessary. Once the unit was in a tamper mode, Palmers subsequent removal to violate curfew would not register as a "tamper" because the unit was already in tamper mode.

On the night the homicide occurred, there were equipment problems with System B which was used to monitor Palmer. A series of routine supervision calls were not successfully completed. A "Telsol Interrupted" message was received during the second set of supervision calls. It is unclear as to whether the messages were ever reported to the incident monitor screen or printed on the line-printer. Subsequent RF checks indicated the client was at home.

Problems which may have existed with Pagenet, the commercial paging company, are not believed to have had any effect on this incident. No "Pager Intrcpt Oprtr" message was received as is expected if there are equipment problems with the commercial paging system. Bell Atlantic Telephone Company was conducting field tests of a voice verification system in the monitoring center during November and December of 1991. It is unknown what, if any, effect their experiments had on the operation of the monitoring center or the equipment.

On January 18, 1992, division policy was implemented which required parole officers to carry their reset generator device with them and reset offender's tamper circuits at least monthly. There were five personal contact visits with Palmer after the December 16, 1991 tampering incident prior to the homicide occurring. The last visit was on April 1, 1992, the day before the homicide. The parole officers did not reset the tamper device on any of these occasions. If they had, a wristlet reset message would have been printed and the device would have generated a wristlet tamper message the next time Palmer attempted to remove it.

Other incidents indicate supervision problems exist in the department. One inmate's transmitter device remained in a tamper mode for almost seven days prior to discovery. This had occurred in March of 1992, prior to the homicide. At that period of time there was an existing division policy which required monitoring center personnel to run an equipment report every four hours. Assuming the equipment was operating properly, the equipment report should have detected the unit was in a tamper mode. Either the equipment reports did not reflect this, they were not run as required or department personnel failed to take action to correct the problem.

In a second incident, an inmates telephone had been disconnected for two days prior to discovery by monitoring center personnel. The printouts indicate the pager was called and a notice sent to the incident monitoring screen which showed the telephone line was busy. If a full client report had been run, monitoring center personnel should have been alerted to the fact that there had been no activities other than the attempted supervision calls for a two day period, thus a problem existed with the equipment.

The initial conclusions drawn by the Division of Policy and Planning and the Internal Affairs Unit were incorrect and based on incomplete information. The Internal Affairs Unit lacked the technical understanding of electronic monitoring to complete a thorough investigation of the matter in a short period of time. The equipment manufacturer was not forthcoming with explanations of system problems.

Section 7 Recommendations

Based on a review of the program and investigation of the Palmer incident, the following recommendations are offered:

1. The program's growth should be stopped until problem areas have been addressed. Adding more offenders to the system will only compound existing problems.
2. The administrative structure of the program should be reviewed. A decision should be made to either place the program in one division, vest one individual with functional line authority over personnel in both divisions necessary for program operation or to create a new division with the sole responsibility for community corrections.
3. A decision should be made as to whether electronic monitoring is to be used in a custody program or a re-integration program. If it is to be operated as a custody program it would appear logical to place it under the Division of Adult and Juvenile Institutions. If it is to operate as a re-integration program, it properly belongs under the Division of Policy and Planning.
4. A policy and procedures manual should be developed and implemented to guide program personnel.
5. Training should be formalized and documented. If an "on-the-job" component is to be used, an FTO form should be developed which documents each trainee has been exposed to and required to competently perform all required duties. The documentation should be filed in the employee's personnel file.
6. A management information system should be developed for the program which produces relevant information and eliminates duplication of efforts. Given the size of the program, computerization would greatly facilitate this task.
7. Regardless of where the program is ultimately placed, community risk assessments which have been validated for this program should be used.
8. If the program is to operate as a re-integration program, needs assessments should be completed and the number of contacts with participants increased.
9. Further discussions should be held with the Parole Board regarding selection and exclusion criteria for EMHC. Actions of the Parole Board can negatively effect the Department of Corrections if inappropriate parolees commit a subsequent offense.
10. Changes should be implemented in the monitoring center. There is too much activity for the number of people assigned to one shift. A records system should be designed in consultation with monitoring center personnel which facilitates their work.

11. Monitoring center personnel should be given the authority to direct resolution of incidents. This might be accomplished by assigning a supervisor to each shift. The supervisor should assume the duties currently being performed by the shift monitor which include running the daily equipment report and inspecting the line-printer to verify violations have been addressed. In any event, the number of phone calls back and forth to resolve one incident should be reduced. If monitoring center personnel are not allowed to assume more responsibility, the justification for staffing the center with senior parole officers becomes questionable.
12. The response policy to violations should be reviewed. Officers are sent into high-crime areas without any type of communications device to summon assistance. The department may wish to form a response team to verify violations and address equipment problems after hours. While this system has been used successfully in other jurisdictions, a study of the economic feasibility and division of responsibilities between parole officers and response team members should be conducted.
13. Unique or unusual supervision problems should be documented along with a full client printout. While they could be used for supervision of personnel, the primary purpose would be to identify operational problems and resolve them. A secondary use for the material would be in staff training programs.
14. The enrollment process for clients should be standardized. Officers should not assume offenders understand program rules simply because they were explained to them in the institution when the application form was signed.
15. The frequency of drug testing should be standardized, particularly for those participants with a prior drug history. The department should consider using on-site drug testing technology for community release programs. This would provide an immediate indication of problem behavior. The institution's laboratory could then be used to confirm the on-site test results for later disciplinary or parole proceedings.
16. Efforts should continue with the manufacturer to resolve equipment problems. To that end, printouts from the line-printer should be retained as long as storage space is available. Software and hardware problems should be documented. The information should be provided to program administrators who should ensure the problem has been corrected.
17. The Telsol hardware problem should be addressed immediately by the department and the equipment manufacturer. This problem is allowing violations to go undetected on the incident monitor screen. Until all equipment problems have been addressed, it is imperative the on-line printer be continually monitored.
18. Workload and performance measures should be established for the program. Until these are completed, it is difficult to assess the proper staffing levels for the field and monitoring center.
19. A critical incident policy should be developed. Procedures should be in place to guide the department in terms of immediately addressing the incident, relations with the media and the necessity for an internal affairs investigation. The department would benefit from adopting an "airplane crash" approach to media releases. While the pressure for immediate press releases is understandable, like an airplane crash, the reconstruction of events can be a time consuming process. Initial speculations which later prove to be incorrect can lead to unwarranted accusations of an attempt to

conceal the truth. The department's public information officer should be requested to develop a protocol in consultation with media representatives which will prevent this type of problem from occurring. The Internal Affairs Unit had no protocol for this type of investigation. They would benefit greatly by being provided a preliminary written assessment and full client printouts of any monitoring investigation requested.

20. Both short and long-term evaluation plans for the program should be developed and implemented. In order to accomplish this, the program's goals and objectives must be clearly defined.

APPENDIX A

News Media Articles

Source: Gibson, D. *Record*, 4-10-92, p. B-1.

Maker defends anklet monitor

State cites failure as death is probed

By David Gibson *Record Staff Writer* 4/10/92

How could a state convict under the watchful eye of electronic home surveillance in Paterson elude the sophisticated system and later allegedly shoot a man to death during an illicit foray?

Debate over that question grew sharp Thursday as the Florida manufacturer of the monitoring devices insisted that his equipment had worked just fine, while the state Corrections Department continued to reject human error as the culprit.

Meanwhile, in Trenton, criticism of the two-year-old home detention program came from state Sens. John A. Girgenti, a Hawthorne Democrat, and Louis Kosco, R-Paramus, who called on the Legislature to probe the Paterson case. They also introduced a bill requiring that state corrections officials notify local police when a home detainee is sent to their community.

A Corrections Department spokesman, James Stabile, responded by saying the notification already is mandatory and was

done in this case. He added: "An alternative to incarceration is something a lot of legislators have been requesting for a lot of years. This is an alternative."

The whiplash pace of finger-pointing and second-guessing resulted from an April 2 incident in which 21-year-old Tony Palmer allegedly shot a friend, 19-year-old Vernon Major, once in the head with Major's .22-caliber pistol. Major died a few hours later. Although police said the shot was fired during "horseplay" at the victim's apartment building, Palmer was charged with murder.

The furor erupted when police discovered that Palmer was a state convict under home detention who was unfastening his monitoring anklet and leaving his North Third Street home whenever he liked. Palmer was allowed outside to work between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m.; the shooting occurred at about 12:15 a.m.

The Corrections Department is in the midst of an internal investigation, but Stabile on Thursday reiterated the preliminary findings that when Palmer first tampered with his anklet on Dec. 16, the 24-hour monitoring station in Trenton was not alerted because of a computer glitch.

Theodore Sabarese, president of Digital Equipment Corp. of Pompano Beach, Fla., which rents the bracelets and computer system to the state, said the problem rested with corrections officials. The tampering showed up on the computer as it should have, he said, but apparently no one noticed.

"There was no equipment problem," Sabarese said. "And it has to be either equipment malfunction or human error."

Sabarese also said corrections officials visit convicts each week and would quickly notice whether the four rivets holding the device together had been removed or forced. The rivets are specially made and have a distinctive seal when they are fastened.

See ANKLET Page B-2

ANKLET: Malfunction is debated

From Page B-1

tened in place, he said.

Stabile said corrections officers visit home detainees once a month. He had no explanation as to how Palmer's jammed rivets had been overlooked during four visits to his home since the initial tampering. "It wasn't detected," Stabile said. "But the investigation is continuing."

Random telephone checks to ascertain that Palmer was at home continued after the tampering, Stabile said, but no one could explain how Palmer eluded those as well.

The black plastic-and-rubber strap has a radio monitor that sets off an alarm when a convict travels more than 150 feet from a transmitter installed in his telephone, and any tampering also should trip an alarm.

Candidates for home detention

are supposed to be first-time offenders convicted of non-violent crimes who are within six months of release. Palmer had served the minimum 18 months behind bars on a three-year drug dealing conviction.

In response to Girgenti's call for a probe and his insistence that local authorities be notified of the presence of home detainees, Stabile said a letter alerting Paterson Police Chief Richard W. Munsey to Palmer's status was sent Nov. 4, 1991, as Palmer was returned to Paterson.

Munsey was not available for comment late Thursday.

Passaic County Prosecutor Ronald S. Fava, who has asked the state attorney general to investigate the incident, said his office never was notified of Palmer's presence, and he requested notification in the future.

In his press release Thursday, Girgenti condemned the "breakdown" of the home detention system. "Apparently, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to outwit the creators of the ankle monitor," he said.

At a three-hour meeting Thursday with a representative of the device's New Jersey distributor, Fava tried to ascertain what it would take to evade the home monitor's safeguards. But he said the representative of Computerized Surveillance Systems Inc. was not able to answer all his questions. Fava requested a meeting next week with the Florida manufacturer.

Fava is concerned about the effectiveness of the devices because Passaic County has just begun using the monitors. Frank Castaldo, 18, the Clifton man charged with masterminding a

teen plot to strangle 17-year-old Robert A. Solimine to death in February, was the first given home detention through use of an anklet when he was sent home under strict bail conditions last month.

Three juvenile alleged co-conspirators are set to be released under the same conditions, but Fava said Thursday that he would ask the court to stipulate that all the suspects be personally visited at home at least five times a week.

Several counties are using or are set to implement the use of electronic monitors for inmates or convicts on probation. The state has had a program in place for two years. There are currently 655 convicts on the devices; 1,700 have been under the program.

Stabile said the program has been largely successful.

Source: Mendez, I. The Star-Ledger, 4-9-92, p. unknown

THE STAR-LEDGER, Thursday, April 9, 1992

State says 'glitch' in system let inmate escape house arrest

By IVETTE MENDEZ

Officials vow new 'safeguard' will prevent a repeat

A "technical glitch" allowed a Paterson inmate under house detention to periodically remove his electronic surveillance anklet without detection for four months, including prior to a fatal shooting with which he was charged last week.

A "safeguard" has been installed to prevent any repeat of the "technical glitch," said Jim Stabile, a spokesman for the Corrections Department.

"There is no indication that this is a widespread thing," said Stabile, adding that the department was checking whether there were other inmates affected. "We've taken steps to prevent this from occurring again through the (manufacturing) company," he said.

Referring to inmates accepted into the program, Stabile said, "These are non-violent people who are six months from release. This was an anomaly."

The Attorney General's Office is taking a look at the two-year-old program in which 1,700 state inmates have been enrolled.

"We are working with the corrections agency to study the program but, more so, the reliability of the electronic monitoring," said Chuck Davis, a spokesman for the Department of Law and Public Safety.

The error allowed Tony Palmer, a 21-year-old serving a sentence for a

Palmer, under house detention since October, was permitted to leave from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. to go to work. When he wanted to go out at other times, he told police, he would remove the rivets from the plastic anklet using pliers, thus breaking the electronic circuit.

He was arrested Friday at his home and charged with shooting Vernon Major, 19, about 12:05 a.m. Thursday with the victim's gun during "horseplay," according to police.

Detective Sgt. Alex Robertson said Paterson police called the monitoring base after they picked up Palmer. The number of the unit is on the band, which Palmer was wearing when police awakened him shortly after 4 a.m. to arrest him.

"We asked for his status and they tell us that he's been in the house all night," said Robertson. "We knew that he was out of the house around midnight because that's when the shooting occurred."

The electronic equipment in Trenton showed that he arrived at his home at 2:44 p.m. Wednesday and a random electronic check at 9:45 p.m. verified his presence. At 4:45 a.m. Thursday, just hours after the shooting, a check showed that he was home. Another check showed that he left at 10:55 a.m.

At police headquarters during Friday's questioning, he showed police how he slipped out of the band.

"He asked us for a pair of pliers, and in about 15 minutes he was able to take it off and hand it to us," said Robertson, adding that the state program did not contact Paterson police when Palmer removed the anklet, indicating

that Trenton was not aware he had.

Robertson said the rivets on the band were "mangled" and that Palmer told police he would periodically purchase new ones at a hardware store.

Theodore Sabares, president of Digital Products Corp., which manufactures the electronic equipment used by the state, said the rivets are specially made and are not commercially available. He said the rivets on Palmer's anklet at the time of his arrest were the original ones.

A parole officer, he said, would detect whether the inmate tampered with the bolts. According to police, Palmer said his band was not checked.

The Corrections Department monitors 700 inmates in the program, which accepts minimum-custody state inmates convicted of non-violent crimes who are scheduled to be released in six months.

Palmer, scheduled to be released this month, is in the Passaic County jail. In addition to murder, he is charged with escaping a detention center and possession of an unlawful weapon.

'He asked us for a pair of pliers, and in about 15 minutes he was able to take (the anklet) off and hand it to us.'

— Sgt. Robertson

drug conviction, to leave his home at will since Dec. 10 undetected by a round-the-clock monitoring staff at a base station operated by the Corrections Department.



Tony Palmer
Slipped anklet undetected

Source: Mendez, I. The Star-Ledger, 4-10-92, p. unknown

'HOME JAIL' PROBE

Senate committee will seek answers on inmate's escape

Ledger 4-10-92

By IVETTE MENDEZ

A state Senate committee has scheduled a special investigatory hearing to determine how an inmate enrolled in the house detention program removed his electronic surveillance anklet without detection for four months, including prior to a fatal shooting with which he is charged.

"I'm not only shocked, I'm very angry to think that someone is dead because someone possibly didn't do their job," said Sen. Louis Kosco (R-Bergen), chairman of the Senate Law and Public Safety Committee.

"I want to do something right now before I put \$3.7 million into a program that Corrections Department officials may not know how to run," said Kosco, who plans on calling in Corrections Commissioner William Fauver and Attorney General Robert Del Tufo.

A hearing is planned for 12:30 p.m. April 21 in the Passaic County Administration Building in Paterson. The Attorney General's Office is also studying the two-year-old home detention program in light of the recent developments.

The announcement came a day after the Corrections Department said a computer glitch had allowed Tony Palmer, a 31-year-old Paterson man serving a sentence for a drug conviction, to leave his house at will since Dec. 16 undetected by a



Inmate Tony Palmer is charged with killing a man after he broke his electronic anklet, similar to the one shown. The device is used for home surveillance of prisoners.

round-the-clock monitoring staff in a base station.

Palmer under house detention since October, told police that he would remove the rivets from his

plastic anklet. Police have charged him with last Thursday's murder of Vernon Mayor, 19, in Paterson.

In a related development, Sen. John Girgenti (D-Passaic) yesterday

introduced a bill that would require correction officials to notify county and municipal law enforcement officials whenever an inmate is going to be sent home under the monitoring program. The bill would require at least 48 hours' notice.

Corrections Department spokesman Jim Stabile said the state routinely notifies police departments about home detention inmates although not necessarily ahead of time. He said Paterson police were notified Nov. 4 about Palmer's Oct. 30 release into the program.

Passaic County Prosecutor Ronald Fava yesterday got a first-hand look at the system, manufactured by Florida-based Digital Products Corp., which monitors 100 inmates in New Jersey. He called the 14-hour demonstration "useful" but said another one was scheduled to answer further questions.

The Palmer homicide investigation has raised a concern that the anklet provides a "built-in alibi" according to senior assistant prosecutor William Purdy.

"We have witnesses to the (shooting) incident, but depending on where the case goes, this individual can claim to have been at home," said Purdy.

The home detention program, designed for non-violent offenders, has been widely touted by criminal justice officials as a way to alleviate prison overcrowding.

Breaking of surveillance anklet, killing probed

Ledger 4-8-92

Associated Press

PATERSON — State officials on Tuesday investigated how a man under house arrest broke his surveillance anklet and then allegedly killed another man.

Terri Howard, assistant commissioner of the state Department of Corrections, said the machine properly registered that Tony Palmer broke the electronic anklet.

She said human error was not to blame, but would not elaborate why Palmer was not apprehended. Howard said results of the probe may be available today.

Cops late to slay site

Response time of Paterson's police probed

By HUGH MORLEY
The Herald & News 4-11-92

PATERSON -- The Police Department's Internal Affairs Division is investigating a delay in the dispatch of a police car to the fatal shooting of 19-year-old Vernon Major at Riverview Towers, the police chief said yesterday.

The investigation follows on the heels of the state Department of Corrections acknowledging at least two problems with its home-confinement program. Major's alleged killer escaped from the program the morning of the shooting.

The Corrections Department and the Attorney General's Office are investigating how Tony Palmer, a convicted drug dealer, escaped from the program shortly before the shooting April 2 without detection by the department's computer system.

Police Chief Richard Munsey said the Internal Affairs probe centers on whether Major's injury was initially treated by a civilian dispatcher as a confirmed shooting he

They're looking into how the call came in and why there was only an ambulance (sent).
— Police Chief Richard Munsey

said the call may have gone out over the police radio merely as a sick call.

"They're looking into how the call came in and why there was only an ambulance (sent)," he said. "Normally in something like that a police unit would have responded also."

The chief declined to give further details, but added: "There was wrong information given in the call, that's basically what we're looking at."

Munsey said the dispatch mix-up did not result in any delay in the arrival of the ambulance. The chief also said the delayed patrol car incident had no impact on the criminal investigation into the shooting.

The apparent errors by the state and police raise questions about government response to problems in the inner city.

On the day of the shooting, Major's mother, Patricia, said she believed the ambulance took too long to respond to Vernon Major's aid.

Patricia Major, who said she arrived at her son's side within minutes of the shooting, said about five 911 calls were placed before the ambulance arrived about 20 minutes after the first emergency call.

PROBE

Continued from Page A1

A security guard at Riverview Towers, Leonard Miller, also said he believed that the ambulance took at least 15 minutes to arrive.


Munsey declined to comment on how many 911 calls were received.

City Public Safety Director William E. Dolan said there was no delay in the response of the emergency medical technicians to the scene or in transporting Major to the hospital.

Dolan said the call was received at 12:12 a.m. April 2. The ambulance arrived at the scene at 12:18 a.m., and Major arrived at St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center at 12:39 a.m.

Dolan said the 21 minutes to transport Major to the hospital was not unusual because the youth required treatment before transportation.

Authorities charge that Palmer left his North Third Street home shortly before the killing, despite the fact that he



A Trenton corrections officer displays an electronic ankle used for home surveillance of prisoners.

was to be confined there in the state home detention program.

The Corrections Department is probing how Palmer removed an electronic surveillance bracelet and left it behind

without alerting authorities.

The department claimed before the Palmer case that removal or tampering of the bracelet would immediately alert authorities.

SLX

Source: Gibson, D. Record, 4-11-92, p. unknown

Uproar over home detention

By David Gibson *DG*
Record Staff Writer *4-11-92*

PATERSON — Police Chief Richard W. Munsey on Friday denied that his department was ever notified that a state convict had been released to home confinement months earlier. The convict allegedly fooled the confinement system and is charged with shooting a man to death last week.

A state Corrections Department spokesman, however, stood by his claim that his agency sent a letter to Munsey a few days after the convicted drug dealer's return to Paterson. Spokesman James Stabile said his records show a letter notifying Munsey of Tony Palmer's release was sent on Nov. 4 of last year.

"Absolutely not," retorted Munsey. "And even if we did receive it, what are we supposed to do? Go to his house every five minutes? It's ridiculous."

The notification issue is just one of several disputes arising from the April 2 death of Vernon Major, 19, who was shot in the head with his own pistol, allegedly by the 21-year-old Palmer as the two friends were "horsing around," as police put it.

An investigation showed that Palmer, convicted in 1990 for drug dealing, was under home confinement and was being monitored by corrections officials through a sophisticated electronic bracelet around his ankle.

The device is supposed to set off an alarm if tampered with or if the inmate moves more than 150 feet from home except from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Random computer-generated phone checks also kept track of Palmer.

But officials said that since mid-December, Palmer had been slipping out of the anklet to go out at night, and it was during one such foray that Major was killed. Stabile says initial findings blame a computer malfunction; the Florida-based manufacturer blames human error.

The incident has brought the 2-year-old home confinement program under close scrutiny: Passaic County Prosecutor Ronald S. Fava has asked the attorney general to investigate, and state Sen. John Girgenti, D-Hawthorne, and Sen. Louis Kosco, R-Paramus, on Thursday called for a probe

J.M.

LAW

Questions Arise on Electronic Anklets

By JUNDA WOO
AND WADE LAMBERT

Staff Reporters of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Law-enforcement authorities may soon be facing a new challenge: how to stop people from getting free of the electronic ankle bracelets that most states are using to keep track of parolees and others under house arrest.

Last week, possibly for the first time, a man wearing such an anklet slipped out of it undetected. The anklet's fancy circuitry is supposed to detect wearers' movements and warn authorities when the lock has been tampered with.

New Jersey officials say a 21-year-old Paterson man, Tony Palmer, used pliers to pull out four key rivets on the anklet, but they say they're stumped about why no alarm went off. Freed from the anklet, Mr. Palmer allegedly shot and killed another man.

The maker of the anklet, Digital Products Corp., Pompano Beach, Fla., disputes that the device didn't work. But if the suspect did, indeed, outsmart the technology—as corrections officials and prosecutors in the murder case both contend—the widespread use of such anklets to keep individuals confined to their homes could be called into question.

Mr. Palmer, who was charged Friday with murder, was one of as many as 75,000 people in the nation currently wearing electronic surveillance anklets or bracelets. Instead of going to jail, they wear the devices and live in their own homes. In many cases, they also participate in work-release programs.

The bracelets are now used in almost every state as a cheaper and less restrictive alternative to incarceration. The devices—which typically can be concealed under clothing—send off signals when a person leaves a monitored area, such as his home. In addition, monitoring agencies call the person at random several times a day, and the person must then plug part of the bracelet into the home telephone to prove his presence.



LEGAL BEAT

But even as the devices grow more popular, more criminal-justice officials are realizing that they may not be foolproof. "It's like burglar alarms and car alarms," says Joseph B. Vaughn, editor of the Journal of Offender Monitoring in Warrensburg, Mo. "Anything that a human builds, another human can figure out how to get around."

Some people have managed to escape by leaving the house for scheduled work-leave appointments and then vanishing. Others have cut the bracelets or anklets, which are made of plastic, and fled before police could respond to alarms.

One Chicago man defeated the system by luring his victim to his apartment and then killed him there. And narcotics offenders wearing bracelets have set up drug-selling businesses at their homes.

"Let's not forget, these devices are a tool, not a substitute for a jail cell," says Theodore M. Sabarese, president of Digital Products.

The giant in the electronics-monitoring business, BI Inc., Boulder, Colo., says that no more than 1% of wearers tamper with their bracelets and that most of them are caught. Intervention, a nonprofit criminal rehabilitation group in Denver that uses monitoring bracelets, says it has a 2.5% violation rate.

Most programs allow only first-time drug or drunk-driving offenders into monitoring programs. The average wearer tends to be someone like Ruben Chacon of Denver, who is wearing a bracelet for two months in lieu of spending six months in prison. Mr. Chacon works during the day as an electrical instrumentation designer, and pays the \$10 a day that the monitoring costs. "It's better than serving time in jail," he says. "I was looking at maybe losing my job."

The devices usually cost up to \$11 a day to operate, while a prison stay costs governments \$40-\$150 a day. "It's inexpensive, and it really is effective," says Cheryl Marshall, Intervention's program director. When people are forced to plan every moment that they're out of the house, impulse behavior such as drinking while driving tends to disappear, she adds.

The plastic bracelets have been used to track criminals since 1983, when BI adapted them from bracelets originally used on cattle. While manufacturers are hesitant to discuss the technology involved, Mr. Vaughn said that in most systems cutting the bracelet breaks a circuit, which then triggers an alarm. Some systems also sense the bracelet's proximity to the wearer.

Although civil libertarians were worried when the systems were introduced, most now accept them as a useful alternative to prisons. "There's no greater invasion of privacy than imprisonment," said Harvard law professor Philip B. Heymann.

F.B.I Investigates City Prison Contract

Role of Influential Lobbyist Examined in Plan for Ankle Bracelets

By SELWYN RAAB

Federal agents are investigating a disputed \$1.9 million contract to use ankle bracelets to electronically monitor inmates released from New York City jails, officials said yesterday.

Law-enforcement and city officials said the inquiry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Federal prosecutors in Manhattan is focusing on whether officials in the city's Correction Department showed improper favoritism in tentatively awarding the annual contract in November to the BI Monitoring Corporation of Boulder, Colo.

The law-enforcement officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said that investigators also were examining the role of Sid Davidoff, an influential lobbyist whose law firm represented the company in its negotiations with the city, played in the selection of BI Monitoring.

The city canceled the contract in December after five companies whose proposals were rejected complained that they had been unfairly disqualified for technical reasons or that BI was the only vendor allowed to revise its price package.

The contract negotiations were conducted by the Correction Department, the agency that administers the city's jail system. In December, Allyn R. Sielaff resigned as Correction Commissioner after Mayor David N. Dinkins admonished him for the handling of the contract.

A spokesman for the Correction Department, Thomas M. Antenen, said that the agency's records on the contract were subpoenaed by the United States Attorney's office in Manhattan in February. "We supplied them with everything they asked for," said Mr. Antenen.

Several former and current department officials have been questioned by F.B.I. agents who investigate public corruption, law-enforcement and city officials said. One of those who acknowledged being questioned was Marian Tsuji, a former assistant Correction Commissioner, who had been the head of the unit that recommended the awarding of the contract to BI Monitoring.

Ms. Tsuji, who resigned her city job in February, declined in an interview to discuss the details of the questioning by the F.B.I.

Robert J. Cramer, an assistant U.S. Attorney who is in charge of the case, and whose unit also investigates public corruption, declined to be interviewed, saying, "The subpoena speaks for itself."

Law-enforcement officials said that the Government's inquiry was being conducted separately from one begun late last year by the city's Department of Investigation. The Federal authorities have prosecutive powers while the Investigation Department can only issue reports and

recommendations concerning abuses at city agencies.

Federal officials declined to say what prompted their investigation.

The investigation Department inquiry is expected to be completed in a few weeks, said Peter J. Benjaminson, the department's spokesman.

Allison Lewis-Smith, the Deputy Commissioner for Legal Affairs in the Correction Department, said that she had been questioned by city investigators about her professional relationship with Mr. Davidoff. She had been an associate in Mr. Davidoff's Manhattan law firm, Davidoff & Malito, before joining the department in 1990.

Ms. Lewis-Smith said yesterday, as she has previously, that she no role in the award. She said she had not been questioned by Federal investigators.

Howard S. Druckman, a partner in the Davidoff firm, said Mr. Davidoff "had nothing to do with this contract" and that no member of the firm had been questioned by the F.B.I.

Last week, the city reported that the Davidoff firm led all lobbyists before city agencies in 1990, collecting \$1.7 million in fees.

Under the tentative contract with the city, BI Monitoring agreed to provide up to 500 bracelets to be strapped to the ankles of inmates. The bracelets would transmit a signal to verify that each inmate is at home or at approved job or school.

The Dinkins administration viewed the program as a major step in cutting prison costs by releasing inmates who are awaiting trials for nonviolent crimes.

City officials said new bids for the contract will be solicited after the Department of Investigation issues a report on the BI contract.

David J. Hunter, the president of BI Monitoring, said that the company might not compete for the new contract if it is awarded by low bid and not for technical competence.

"We have a Cadillac product and don't intend to sell it a Chevy price," he said.

Columbia Faculty to Meet About Leadership Concerns

By ROBERT D. McFADDEN

Amid growing signs of dissatisfaction with Columbia University's leadership, the faculty of Arts and Sciences has been summoned to an extraordinary meeting later this month to grapple with concerns ranging from budget shortfalls and projected cuts to fears that the quality of education at one of the nation's premier universities is being eroded.

The meeting is billed as informational but is expected to be an outspoken forum for rising faculty resentments against the administration. It is to be held April 23 under the auspices of an 11-member executive committee of the faculty of Arts and Sciences, which sent a letter yesterday to the faculty's 500 members, urging them to attend.

"It is essential that faculty have trust and confidence in their leaders, if painful reductions are to be made while maintaining our essential faith in Columbia's future," the letter declared. "Our consultations with faculty in the Arts and Sciences suggest that the competence of the administration is being questioned and that trust is low."

The letter did not directly criticize Columbia's President, Michael I. Sovern, and provost, Jonathan R. Cole, who have outlined a three-year plan to reorganize the university in an effort to cope with shortfalls that have been projected at \$50 million next year and \$87 million in the 1992-93 school year.

Tied to Fund-Raising

But the letter suggested that many of Columbia's problems were attributable to "failed or incomplete fund-raising," a chief responsibility of Mr. Sovern, it also criticized an admini-

strations with the faculty "to clear away the confusion expressed by the committee" on the making of management and policy decisions.

Mr. Knobel also said many of the questions raised were already being addressed by a long-range Commission on Strategic Planning, a group of faculty members, students, administrators and alumni appointed by Mr. Sovern last month.

"The university administration considers the committee's letter an understandable expression of concern for the continued good health of the Arts and Sciences as we face difficult choices ahead," Mr. Knobel added. "The administration has every confidence that we will meet the challenges successfully."

Major Component of Faculty

The faculty of Arts and Sciences is a major component of the 5,700-member faculty. Its members teach in five schools: Columbia College, the main undergraduate unit, and the School of General Studies, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the School of International and Public Affairs and the School of the Arts.

Like many other major research universities, Columbia has been severely hurt by rising costs for employee benefits and student financial aid and by falling income from government assistance and endowment investments. Last November, 28 chairmen of departments within Arts and Sciences threatened to resign their chairs because of threatened budget cuts.

East December Mr. Sovern projected a \$50 million shortfall in a 1990 million budget for the 1992-93 school year, and an \$87 million shortfall in the \$1 billion budget for 1993-94. The trustees later authorized Columbia to



At The New York Times New York City treatment of an age, called on Brooklyn.



the administration out of hearing the the the of Education on 10 days off

Is Back on Solid Foods

found to exist around the abscess no longer exists." Edwards said that there are

Corrections duo cited on vendor's gift flight

By ROBERT SCHWANEBERG

A state ethics panel yesterday charged two high-ranking officials of the state Corrections Department with improperly accepting a flight to Florida from a company that supplies the state with the "electronic bracelets" used to monitor prisoners under house arrest.

The Executive Commission on Ethical Standards voted 5-0 to file the charges even though the state Treasury Department had examined the same allegations last June and concluded that they were without merit. The Treasury Department found the trip—to inspect the factory where the electronic devices are made—had been approved by Corrections Department lawyers.

Rita Strmensky, the director of the ethics commission, said the charges were filed against Assistant Corrections Commissioner Terri Howard, who is in charge of policy development and planning, and Senior Parole Officer Mario Paporozzi, who heads the state's electronic monitoring-home confinement program. Paporozzi is a Union County freeholder.

Both are charged with violating a provision of the state's conflict-of-interest law that bars state employees from accepting any "gift" or "favor" under circumstances that could be "reasonably" interpreted as an effort to influence how they perform their official duties.

They were also charged with violating a section barring any activities that might "reasonably" create the "impression or suspicion" that they had violated their "trust" as state employees.

Strmensky said the two officials are charged with accepting a round-trip flight from New Jersey to Florida on a "private aircraft" arranged by Computerized Surveillance Systems (CSS) Inc. of South Orange. The company was the successful bidder last year on a \$500,000 contract to supply the state with the electronic ankle bracelets used to monitor probationers and parolees under home confinement.

The charges could be sent to an administrative law judge for a fact-finding hearing, Strmensky said.

She said there was "no allegation concerning the legitimacy of the trip," which took place over Dec. 10 and 11, 1990. But she noted that under a 1988 executive order signed by Gov. Thomas Kean, state vendors are barred from offering "things of value" to state employees.

"The executive branch is very concerned with the appearances that can be created" when vendors give gifts or do favors for state employees, Strmensky said.

CSS officials could not be contacted yesterday, but last June the company's president, Al Miller, dismissed the charges by a rival bidder as "sour grapes."

Jim Stabile, spokesman for the Corrections Department, said the visit was "a business trip to the manufacturing plant of the electronic equipment."

The trip was unsuccessfully challenged last year by BI Inc. of Boulder, Colo., a rival supplier of electronic monitoring equipment.

More recently, the home detention program has come under intense scrutiny because of revelations that a detainee routinely removed his electronic ankle bracelet and left his home with-

"The executive branch is very concerned with the appearances that can be created' when vendors give gifts or do favors for state employees.

— Rita Strmensky,
Ethics director

out being detected. The scheme came to light when 21-year-old Tony Palmer of Paterson, who was under house arrest on a drug charge, was arrested for fatally shooting 19-year-old Vernon Mayor. Palmer told police that he used a pair of pliers to remove the rivets from the anklet. The device was manufactured by Florida-based Digital Products Corp.

A state Senate committee has scheduled a hearing for next week on whether the tampering went undetected due to human error or a technical glitch.

Last June, Lana Sims, director of the Division of Purchase and Property in the Treasury Department, rejected the contention that CSS's flying Howard and Paporozzi to Florida was a "questionable" practice requiring that the contract be put aside.

In upholding the contract with CSS, Sims wrote that the Corrections Department "has advised me that prior to making the trip, it sought and received clearance for same from counsel. I find therefore no basis to conclude any improprieties existed."


Source:
The Star Ledger,
4-17-92, p. 17.

APPENDIX B

Program Statistics

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Gary J. Hilton
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Adult Institutions

FROM: Terri Howard
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Policy & Planning 

DATE: April 14, 1992

SUBJECT: Electronic Monitoring

The Department of Corrections' Electronic Monitoring/Home Confinement Program was begun in September, 1989. The program began with two administrators responding directly to all incidents from personal pagers. The activity level required the hiring of two parole officers to assist the program administrators in monitoring the pagers after hours and on weekends. These officers were located in the Bureau of Parole's East Orange District Office. As the program expanded a base station was developed in the Stokes Building in the Department of Corrections' central office. A decision was made to hire Senior Parole Officers to man the base station on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis. The base station was put in operation in the fall of 1990. By March of 1991, Base Station staff numbered six officers who responded to violations through the visual monitoring of an on line printer. They would then page caseload carrying field officers to respond to any incidents, i.e., curfew violations, campers, etc. In August of 1991, the expansion of the program necessitated a move of the Base Station to larger quarters in the Edge Building also on the Department of Corrections' Central Office grounds. The program had grown from an initial group of 30 to 50 parolees and inmates in 1989 to a count of 250 in January of 1990, 500 by July of 1991 to 600 by January of 1992, and to a total of 680 this date.


In September of 1991, after the move to the Edge Building there was an upgrade in monitoring equipment where an incident report software package was installed. Base Station staff expanded to 7 officers in the Fall of 1991, 11 Senior Parole Officers in December of 1991 to a current staff of 16 Senior Parole Officers. Field staff concurrently increased with the growth of the caseload from an original 13 officers

available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to a current staff of 36 field officers statewide responding to all program violations and/or inmate's needs.

sal

Attachments

59X



NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

STATE OF NEW JERSEY



ELECTRONIC MONITORING/HOME CONFINEMENT PROGRAM
POPULATION AND CHARACTERISTICS

Division of Policy and Planning
Bureau of Parole

April 10, 1992

60x

**ELECTRONIC MONITORING/HOME CONFINEMENT PROGRAM
POPULATION AND CHARACTERISTICS**

INTRODUCTION

The New Jersey Department of Corrections, Division of Policy and Planning, Bureau of Parole, in conjunction with the Division of Adult Institutions, initiated an Electronic Monitoring/Home Confinement Program (EM/HCP) in September of 1989. Through this program, selected inmates are released from a correctional institution to their home and are supervised by trained parole officers using a state-of-the-art electronic surveillance system. Upon completion of the custodial portion of their sentence, offenders are transferred to regular parole supervision.

The EM/HCP is designed as an intensive reintegration program. The goal of this program is to have the selected offenders employed and receiving mandated services (mental health, drug counselling, etc.) prior to transfer to regular parole supervision.

Besides the delivery of mandated services, the EM/HC program provides a process or structure to assist in reducing program failures and to increase public safety. Program failure or recidivism usually occurs within six months of release. This program addresses the issue of recidivism by providing an intensive bridge from custody to community that is vital during this difficult time.

EM/HCP SCREENING, PLACEMENT AND MONITORING

Prior to release to EM/HCP, minimum custody inmates are evaluated carefully by the Division of Adult Institutions, Home Confinement Liaison for intensive supervision community placement. Criteria includes completion of a psychological evaluation and satisfactory institutional adjustment. Inmates are ineligible to participate if they have been convicted of murder, rape, arson, kidnapping or related offenses. After preliminary selection, those inmates are referred to the intensive parole program for a thorough site investigation in which the inmate's home, family, and community are evaluated for their potential to foster a positive readjustment. Upon completion of these processes, inmates are released to the care of an EM/HCP Senior Parole Officer.

The Senior Parole Officers responsible for the supervision of these inmates are trained in intensive intervention methods to effect the offender's successful release from custodial care. The use of an electronic monitoring device provides a 24 hour surveillance mechanism, ensuring compliance with all program conditions, including curfew monitoring. The 24 hour supervision is performed by Senior Parole Officers at an around-the-clock

base station located on central office grounds at DOC headquarters in Trenton, New Jersey. The use of Senior Parole Officers for this service addresses the difficult adjustment period and the need for intensive support systems and crisis intervention that maximizes the offender's successful release from custody.

The goal of EM/HCP is reintegration with accountability. This includes a focus on fines and restitution collection in addition to employment. To date, this program has been effective with an overall employment rate of 55% and the remaining 45% actively seeking employment or involved with community and/or vocational programs. Some districts have had as much as 86% of their EM/HCP caseload employed at one time.

By January, 1992, under the direction of Assistant Commissioner Howard, the program was expanded from 50 offenders to an average of 560 offenders. The EM/HCP is beginning a longitudinal research project to assess the effectiveness of this program and its impact on recidivism. This is a preliminary report which summarizes the first 28 months of experience with the EM/HC program.

ADMISSIONS TO THE PROGRAM

Since the inception of the program in September 1989, approximately 2260 state offenders have been released from prison and county jails to the EM/HC program. Of that total, approximately 2115 were inmates and 145 were state parolees who had violated the conditions of their regular parole supervision program. All 2115 state inmates were physically incarcerated in a state or county facility at the time of their admission to the EM/HC program. All state parolees were either physically incarcerated in a state or county institution or were about to be apprehended for return to a state correctional institution. A major goal of this program has been to provide alternate placement for state prison inmates who would otherwise have occupied scarce prison beds.

RELEASE OUTCOME

Of the 2215 inmates released from state prison, approximately 15% or 328 were returned for program violations, disciplinary infractions or for administrative reasons. There have been only forty instances of new crimes reported. These include 24 arrests for drug offenses, 10 for persons offenses (including 1 homicide) and 6 for property offenses. This represents less than two percent of the total inmates who have been assigned to the program.

CURRENT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

On January 1, 1992, there were 544 state inmates and 16 state parolees who were being supervised in their homes under the EM/HC program. An analysis of selected characteristics of this group

was made and compared to the Department's general prison population. These data are summarized below:

Base Offense

Appendix A displays the percentage of offenders in both EM/HC and the general population by base offense at the time of commitment. These data show substantial differences between the EM/HC group and the general inmate population. The EM/HC group has a much lower incidence of inmates with offenses against persons (18% vs. 47%) and a much higher incidence of inmates with drug offenses than the general population (68% vs. 36%).

Race/Ethnicity

Appendix B displays the percentage of offenders in the EM/HC program and the general prison population by race/ethnicity. The data indicates that race/ethnicity characteristics are roughly comparable for inmates on EM/HC and inmates in the general population.

County of Commitment

Appendix C displays offenders in the EM/HC program by county of commitment. In addition, a comparison of the percentage of EM/HC residents by county is made with the percentage of inmates by county within the general population.

Employment

Fifty-five percent of the 560 program participants are gainfully employed. The remaining 45% are actively seeking employment or participating in vocational or community programs.

Earnings

EM/HCP participants earned approximately \$1.6 million in wages during calendar 1991 and paid approximately \$275,000 in State and Federal income taxes. During the first quarter of calendar 1992, EM/HCP participants earned \$466,000 in wages. Projecting this figure for a full year would yield approximately \$1.9 million in earnings. Based on projected earnings and with state and federal taxes estimated at 17% of wages, EM/HCP participants will pay approximately \$317,000 in taxes during calendar 1992.


Per Capita Costs

The average cost to supervise and monitor an EM/HC participant is \$12.80 per day or approximately \$4700 on an annual basis. This represents about one fifth or 20% of the per capita cost to house an inmate in a secure institution within the Department.


Future Plans

As of April 1, 1992, the EM/HC program had a total count of 680, an increase of 120 or 21% since January 1, 1992. Present plans call for continual and gradual increase of the EM/HC Program consistent with public safety concerns and DOC appropriations.

APPENDIX A
OFFENSE TYPE (AS OF JANUARY 1, 1992)




ADULT RESIDENTS
(N=21,818)




ELECTRONIC MONITORING
(N=560)

**APPENDIX B
RACE/ETHNICITY (AS OF JANUARY 1, 1992)**

66X



**ADULT RESIDENTS
(N-21,818)**



**ELECTRONIC MONITORING
(N-560)**

APPENDIX C

NJ DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
ELECTRONIC MONITORING/HOME CONFINEMENT PROGRAM
BY COUNTY OF COMMITMENT

	# IN PGM	% OF TOTAL	% OF TOTAL DOC POPULATION
ESSEX	91	16.3%	23.2%
HUDSON	71	12.7%	8.1%
PASSAIC	56	10.0%	8.8%
UNION	54	9.6%	9.0%
CAMDEN	50	8.9%	10.1%
MONMOUTH	40	7.1%	6.3%
MIDDLESEX	35	6.3%	5.0%
ATLANTIC	29	5.2%	7.0%
MERCER	28	5.0%	4.9%
MORRIS	21	3.8%	1.2%
BERGEN	14	2.5%	3.7%
OCEAN	12	2.1%	1.5%
CAPE MAY	11	2.0%	0.8%
GLOUCESTER	10	1.8%	1.0%
CUMBERLAND	10	1.8%	2.2%
WARREN	9	1.6%	0.8%
SOMERSET	7	1.3%	1.8%
SALEM	5	0.9%	0.6%
BURLINGTON	3	0.5%	2.0%
HUNTERDON	2	0.4%	0.5%
SUSSEX	2	0.4%	0.3%
TOTAL	560	100.0%	100.0%

APPENDIX C

Inter-Office Communications Relating to EMHC Program

Appendix C
Chronological Listing of Inter-Office Communications
Relating to the EMHC Program

DATE	TYPE	FROM	TO	SUBJECT
5/18/90	Policy	Hilton	Institutional Administrators	Time eligibility for community release programs
8/13/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Hilton/Howard	HCP table of organization
8/13/90	Admin	Paparozzi	Distribution	ISSP/HCP staffing
8/14/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Naik	Radio frequency
8/14/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	HCP - statistics form
8/14/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Bruschini, Nkwocha, Wilson, Voll	HCP - statistics form
8/27/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Urine monitoring
8/31/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Faxing Statistics
8/31/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Urine collection
9/18/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Shobha Naik	Inmate counts
9/20/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Urine report form
10/9/90	Policy	Bruschini	Hilton & Howard	Draft of exclusion criteria
10/9/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Parole from EMHC
10/15/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Needs assessment
10/22/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff - ISSP/HCP Officers	Curfew changes
11/2/90	Policy	Parole Board Chairman	Howard	Placement of parolees by order of the board
11/2/90	Admin	Fauver	Howard	Overtime
11/16/90	Policy	Hilton	Facility Administrators	Eligibility criteria
11/20/90	Admin	Howard	Parole Staff	Overtime
11/30/90	Policy	Parole Board	Holley, Paparozzi, Fiume	Parolees travel restrictions
12/6/90	Admin	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Parolees travel restrictions
12/6/90	Admin	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Compensatory time
12/6/90	Admin	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	PARS
12/6/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Bruschini, Steider, Nkowcha, Durkin	Inmates in county facilities
12/10/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Program uniformity
12/18/90	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	ISSP/HCP phones
12/19/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Night Shift	Identification of problem equipment
12/19/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Installations
12/19/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Providing phone numbers to inmates
12/20/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Installations
12/26/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Night Shift	Programming receivers
12/26/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Night Shift	Wristlet tampers
12/26/90	Admin	Paparozzi	Aulisi	Inventory
12/26/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Night Shift	Out of order phones

Appendix C
Chronological Listing of Inter-Office Communications
Relating to the EMHC Program - Continued

DATE	TYPE	FROM	TO	SUBJECT
12/27/90	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Night Shift	Problem equipment
12/27/90	Admin	Paparozzi	Naik, McIntosh	Equipment tracking
1/9/91	Admin	Paparozzi	Parole Board Chairman	Exclusion of sex offenders from EMHC
1/10/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Parole release hearings
1/10/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Paging officers
1/10/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	District pager coverage
1/10/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Providing phone numbers to offenders
1/10/91	Admin	Paparozzi	Steider	Form development
1/18/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Wristlet tamper, requirement to re-set monthly
1/28/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Equipment tracking
1/28/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Naik	Equipment returns
2/1/91	Admin	Wertz	Paparozzi	PARS
2/11/91	Admin	Paparozzi	Wertz	PARS
2/11/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Equipment returns
2/20/91	Admin	Durkin	Paparozzi	Progress reports for parole hearings
2/20/91	Admin	Paparozzi	Wertz, Lanza, Strollo	Inmate progress reports
2/21/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Urine monitoring
2/21/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Staff	Medical/dental treatment for inmates
2/22/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Central Office ISSP/HCP Staff	Overtime
2/22/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Base Station Staff	Time sheets
2/26/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Central Office Staff	Equipment purchases
3/25/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Chronos on inmates
3/26/91	Policy	Holley	Parole Staff	Site investigations
3/27/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Parole Staff	Medical treatment for inmates
3/27/91	Policy	Howard	Forker	Medical treatment for inmates
4/5/91	Admin	Paparozzi	Howard	Program expansion
4/9/91	Admin	Paparozzi	Howard	ISSP/HCP transports by central transport
4/15/91	Policy	Howard	Paparozzi, Kraus, Adams	Arrested inmates
4/29/91	Policy	Adams	ISSP/EM/IPDP Staff	Return of defective equipment
4/29/91	Policy	Adams	ISSP/EM/IPDP Staff	Disciplinary charges
4/30/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Base Station	Notification procedures

Appendix C
Chronological Listing of Inter-Office Communications
Relating to the EMHC Program - Continued

DATE	TYPE	FROM	TO	SUBJECT
4/30/91	Policy	Kraus	Naik	Program application
4/30/91	Policy	Gervasio	ISSP/EM/IPDP Staff	Site investigations
5/2/91	Policy	Paparozzi	ISSP/HCP Program Staff	Arrested inmates
5/2/91	Policy	Paparozzi	Modrow	HCP arrest procedures
5/3/91	Admin	Hilton	Paparozzi	Arrest procedures
5/6/91	Admin	Wiechnik	Paparozzi	Disciplinary charges
7/30/91	Policy	Adams	Base Station Staff	Equipment change
8/7/91	Policy	Kraus	Naik/Base Station	Agreement forms
8/8/91	Admin	Howard	Paparozzi	Reassignment
8/12/91	Admin	Howard	Hilton	Reassignment of Paparozzi
8/13/91	Policy	Adams	Base Station Staff	Telephone procedures
8/13/91	Admin	Adams	Base Station Staff	Requests for time off
9/6/91	Policy	Kraus	EM(HCP)/IPDP Staff	Arrested inmates
9/19/91	Admin	Adams	Base Station Staff	Holiday compensation
9/19/91	Admin	Adams	Paparozzi	Equipment problems
9/25/91	Policy	Adams	Electronic Monitoring Staff	Equipment returns
9/30/91	Admin	Howard	Fauver	Program expansion - equipment request
10/8/91	Policy	Adams	Base Station Staff	Incident reports
10/9/91	Policy	Adams	Electronic Monitoring Staff	Curfew changes
12/9/91	Admin	D'ilio	Kraus	Security: Edge building
12/11/91	Admin	Adams	Base Station Staff	Security: Edge building
1/15/92	Policy	Adams	Base Station Staff	Equipment problem report to be run every four hours
1/16/92	Admin	Howard	Kraus	Overtime reports
1/17/92	Policy	Adams	Base Station Staff	Overtime reports
1/21/92	Policy	Hilton	Facility Administrators	Clarification of eligibility criteria
1/22/92	Policy	Howard	Kraus	Municipal police to provide back-up for parole officers
1/24/92	Policy	Adams	Base Station Staff	Incident reports for arrested/returned inmates
2/7/92	Admin	Paparozzi	Howard	Policy manual
2/20/92	Admin	Gervasio	Bellai	Policy manual
2/13/92	Admin	Adams	Base Station Staff	Overtime
3/31/92	Policy	Howard	Adams	Site investigations
4/2/92	Admin	Adams	Kraus	Overtime

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Gary J. Hilton
Terri Howard

FROM: *M. A. Paparozzi*
Mario A. Paparozzi

DATE: August 13, 1990

SUBJECT: Home Confinement Program
Table of Organization

Attached is the new organizational chart for the Home Confinement Program. Under this new structure, Bill Bruschini and Onye Nkwocha will be detailed to the HCP and will report to me.

Bill Bruschini will continue to be the primary program resource for all matters relating to institutional policy and procedure. If policies and procedures need to be modified/changed in order to improve operations, they will be presented by me to Assistant Commissioners Howard and Hilton. No policy change will occur unless prior authorization is received.

Responsibility for all aspects of program operations rests with me. The authority to carry out tasks related to the program may be delegated by me to the staff assigned to the Home Confinement Program.

In order to improve program efficiency and effectiveness, Messrs. Bruschini and Nkwocha will be physically relocated to the area adjacent to my office. Efforts will continue to secure adequate office space for staff of the Home Confinement Program.


Please let me know if you approve of the contents of this IOC as well as the attached Table of Organization.

Thank you.

sal

c: File (ISSP/HCP - Policy) ✓

Organisational Chart - Home Confinement Program



DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Parole Staff
FROM: *Mario A. Paparozzi*
Mario A. Paparozzi *cm*
DATE: October 15, 1990
SUBJECT: Needs Assessment

There may be some confusion as to when a needs assessment should be completed. Needs assessments should be completed for all cases assigned to the ISSP/HCP caseload. The assessment should be completed during the first seven days of supervision.

Cases already under supervision should be assessed over the next thirty days. Completed needs assessment reports shall be submitted to C.P.B. monthly.

clm

c: Fred B. Holley
Domenick Sparino
William Hamp
Modesto Fiume
Cynthia Simmons
file (ISSP/HCP - Policy)

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

MONTH OF: September 1990

DISTRICT OFFICE	OFFICER	MINIMUM	MEDIUM	MAXIMUM	TOTAL
1	ROSNER	0	0	0	0
1	SIESHOLTZ	0	0	0	0
2	DORLAND	1	0	0	1
3	BUTLER	7	2	0	9
3	HIGGINS	1	2	0	3
4	FEDORS	4	7	2	13
4	KRAEMER	0	0	0	0
5	FERRARA	0	0	0	0
5	LINDSAY	0	9	0	9
6	KLETT	0	1	0	1
6	SWAYSER	0	0	0	0
7	BOLANOS/K	0	14	2	16
8	GARRIS	0	0	14	14
8	MCINTYRE	0	0	0	0
10	ATKINSON	8	19	0	27
10	CONLON	0	0	0	0
11	CHITREN	0	1	0	1
11	NOVAK	21	2	2	25
12	CAREY	0	1	1	2
12	CICCONE	0	0	0	0
13	DOERING	0	0	0	0
13	MASON	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		42	58	21	121

Note: Zero total reflects that the information has not been received.

Date: 10/10/90

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: All Administrators
Adult, Youth Facilities

FROM: Gary J. Hilton, Assistant Commissioner
Division of Adult Institutions

SUBJECT: Eligibility/Exclusions Home Confinement Program

DATE: November 16, 1990

A candidate for participation in the Home Confinement Program will be eligible to be considered for the program when they are within six (6) months of:

- A. 1. an established parole date;
2. an actual parole eligibility date established by the State Parole Board;
3. an expiration of maximum sentence or
4. an anticipated parole date, as established by the State Parole Board, for inmates serving indeterminate sentences.
5. has a recommended Parole date set by NJSPB but is awaiting written notification.
- B. 1. Be eligible to be classified for full minimum status by the classification committee.
2. State sentenced inmates housed in county jails under contract population or housed in back up population in the county jail, awaiting transfer into the state system, must be eligible for minimum custody status as defined by NJAC 10A:9-4, when being considered for the Home Confinement Program by County Assistance Unit Classification Committee.
- C. 1. Have an appropriate psychological evaluation not more than six (6) months old addressing the inmates suitability for placement in Community Release program.

Page -2-

3. I. Have made a satisfactory overall institutional adjustment as evaluated by the Institutional Classification Committee.
4. The following circumstances shall make an inmate ineligible for participation in the Home Confinement Program:
1. Inmates convicted of rape, sodomy, statutory rape, carnal abuse (2A) or sexual assault (2C), arson, fire setting, malicious destruction involving arson, kidnapping and related offenses;
 2. Inmates presently convicted of Criminal Homicide (2C:11-2), Murder (2C:11-3), Manslaughter (2C:11-4), Death by Auto, (2C:11-5), by which the vehicle was operated under the influence of intoxicants.
 3. Inmates whose placement in the program would impact negatively on the program, create adverse community reaction, or jeopardize the integrity of the Electronic Monitoring Home Confinement Program.
 4. Inmates with detainers, warrants, or open charges which have been reviewed on a case by case basis, in collaboration with the local authorities involved, in which the inmate's placement in the program would result in an arrest.
- If you should have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact Electronic Monitoring staff members for further clarification.

c.: Mario Paparozzi, Policy & Planning

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: William Bruschini
Ken Steider
Onyweuchi Nkowcha
Rick Durkin

FROM: Mario Paporozzi

DATE: December 6, 1990

SUBJECT: ISSP/HCP - Inmates in County Facilities

If you identify an inmate in a county facility who is eligible for our program except for the fact that there is a municipal detainer lodged against the offender, please obtain the municipality from which the detainer was lodged as well as the reason for the detainer and provide this information to me ASAP. It may be possible for us to make arrangements to release an offender to our program even if there are municipal detainees on file.

clm

c: Terri Howard ✓
Gary Hilton
file (ISSP/HCP)



DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: ISSP/HCP Night Shift
FROM: Mario A. Paparozzi *Mario*
Supervising Parole Officer
DATE: December 26, 1990
SUBJECT: Wristlet Tamper

Whenever there is a wristlet tamper it is necessary to reset the verifier. Therefore, the supervising officer should be called and directed to re-set the unit. If the tamper occurs after 9:00 pm and before 8:00 am, the night shift officer may, if the assessment indicates, wait until 8:00 am to contact the supervising officer.

sal

c: Leonard F. Kraus
Shobha Naik
File (ISSP/HCP).

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: ISSP/HCP Night Shift
FROM: Mario A. Paparozzi
Supervising Parole Officer
DATE: December 26, 1990
SUBJECT: Responding to Out of Order Phones

Whenever it is determined that an offender's phone is out of order, the supervising officer is to be dispatched immediately.

sal

C: Leonard F. Kraus
Shobha Malik
File (ISSP/HCP)

Box

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: ISSP/HCP Staff
FROM: *Mario* Mario Paparozzi
DATE: January 18, 1991
SUBJECT: Wristlet Tamperers

The number of wristlet tamperers will be significantly reduced if the procedure listed below is followed:

- 1) Use four rivets to connect bands.
- 2) When removing a band and then replacing it, use different holes, if necessary use a new band.
- 3) Reset transmitters after a receiver is programmed not before.
- 4) Carry your reset generator with you. At least monthly, sooner if a unit has been changed, reset the transmitter just to make sure it is not in the tamper mode.

clm

c: Terri Howard
Lenny Kraus
file (ISSP/HCP)

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Base Station

DATE: May 17, 1991

FROM: Mario A. Paparozzi

PHONE: (609)292-1437

SUBJECT: Programming Random Calls

Several issues came up at last Thursday's meeting. This IOC should serve to reaffirm our policies relative to the issues discussed.

1. The computer shall be programmed to generate a telephone call to the offender within thirty minutes of the end of a scheduled curfew.
2. At least one computer generated phone call shall be made to the home of all offenders between the hours of 6 p.m. and midnight, unless the offender is scheduled to be out during this time. More computer generated calls should be scheduled if deemed appropriate by the Base Station Officer.
3. Shoba shall provide a weekly review of the telsoi load to Kevin Fowler. This report shall be provided to Kevin every Friday by 3 p.m.

T. Howard
L. Kraus
S. Adams ✓
K. Fowler
file (ISSP/HCP)

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: William H. Fauver
Commissioner

FROM: Terri Howard
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Policy & Planning

DATE: September 30, 1991

SUBJECT: Electronic Monitoring



As you know we are beginning to promote parole officers to seniors to fill the expanded electronic monitoring program. The plan for expansion is as follows:

- 1) We will promote 17 field officers to assume caseloads. This will bring the total count of officers including the IPDP officers to 41. Therefore, we can handle approximately 10,125 inmates and parolees.

Assignment of officers will be as follows:

- DO #1 (Bergen, Morris & S. Passaic):
 - 2 existing parole officers
 - 2 new EM Officers
- DO #2 (Essex)
 - 2 existing parole officers
 - 1 new EM Officer
- DO #3 (Monmouth)
 - 2 existing parole officers
 - 1 new EM Officer
- DO #4 (Hudson)
 - 2 existing parole officers
 - 1 new EM Officer
- DO #5 (Union)
 - 2 existing parole officers
 - 1 new EM Officer
- DO #6 (Burlington, Hunterdon & Mercer)
 - 2 existing parole officers
 - 1 new EM Officer

DO #7 (Camden)
 3 existing parole officers
 2 new EM Officers

DO #8 (Atlantic & Ocean)
 2 existing parole officers
 1 new EM Officer

DO #9 (Essex)
 2 existing parole officers

DO #10 (Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, & Salem)
 3 existing parole officers

DO #11 (Middlesex & Somerset)
 2 existing parole officers
 1 new EM Officer

DO #12 (Passaic, Sussex, & Warren)
 2 existing parole officers
 1 new EM Officer

DO #13 (Essex)
 2 existing parole officers
 4 new EM Officers

2) We will promote eight officers to be assigned base station responsibilities. This allows the base station to assign at least two officers per shift.

3) The EM program was approved for the purchase and rental of 21 cars. I'd like permission to order 20 of these immediately.

17 will be assigned to field officers
 3 will be assigned to regional ADPSs.

4) The program was approved for the purchase of communications devices. The officers need portable phones. I'd like permission to purchase the most cost-effective portable phone available.

5) The other immediate purchases I'd like to make are:

33 flashlights
 33 handcuffs

Please advise as to whether I am able to purchase the resources I need to expand the program.

sal

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Base Station Staff
FROM: Steven D. Adams *Stee*
DATE: January 15, 1992
SUBJECT: Equipment Problem Reports

As discussed in the Base Station Staff Meeting of 1-14-92 this is to confirm the procedure for the above report. The equipment problem report identifying cases with "no A.C. power", "no R.F." and recent "tamper" is to be run every four hours and the identified problems to be addressed immediately.

This report is to be run at 12 midnight, 4 a.m., 8 a.m., 12 noon, 4 p.m., and 8 p.m. daily. Please implement this procedure immediately.

clm

c: Leonard Kraus
file ✓

APPENDIX D

Notice of Equipment Acquisition & Bid Response



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
 PURCHASE BUREAU
 224 STATE ST. 9TH FLOOR TRENTON, NJ 08628-1000
 CONTRACT NUMBER: 24714
 ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT

NUMBER 44490
 DATE 05 14 91
 EFFECTIVE DATE 08/15/91
 EXPIRATION DATE 08/14/92
 CONTRACTOR COMPUTERIZED SURVEILLANCE

COMPUTERIZED SURVEILLANCE
 SYSTEMS INC
 213 VALLEY ST SUITE 302
 SOUTH ORANGE NJ 07078

VENDOR NO. 00000248
 VENDOR PHONE 1001783-1000
 FIC/ISSN 00000248
 REG AGENCY 0000
 PURCHASE BUREAU
 AGENCY REG NO.
 PURCH REG NO. 19874
 FISCAL YEAR 91
 COMMUNITY CODE 88087
 SOLICITATION # 24714
 BID OPEN DATE 04/08/91

TERM CONTRACT FROM: 08/15/91 TO: 08/14/92 ESTIMATED AMOUNT: \$ 500,000.00

- 1. ORDERING PERIOD: CONTRACT BEGINNING ORDERING PERIOD IS: 06/15/91
 CONTRACT ENDING ORDERING PERIOD DATE IS: 06/14/92
- 2. F.O.B. POINT: DESTINATION
- 3. DELIVERY: DELIVERY WILL BE MADE WITHIN 007 DAYS ARO UNLESS
 SPECIFIED DIFFERENTLY ON EACH LINE OR UNLESS AN ALTERNATE
 DELIVERY SCHEDULE IS INDICATED. AN ALTERNATE DELIVERY
 SCHEDULE IS ENCLOSED HEREIN: NO
- 4. CASH DISCOUNT TERMS: CASH DISCOUNT TERMS ARE 00.00 DAYS.
- 5. PERFORMANCE BOND: PERFORMANCE BOND REQUIRED: NO ; DATE REQUIRED 00/00/00
 AMOUNT 50 ; PERCENT OF CONTRACT 0.00%
- 6. RETAINAGE: RETAINAGE PERCENT IS 0.00%
- 7. COOPERATIVE PROC: THIS CONTRACT IS AVAILABLE FOR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION USE UNDER
 THE COOPERATIVE PROCUREMENT PROGRAM: YES
- 8. BID REFERENCE NO: YOUR BID REFERENCE NUMBER IS: 5191
- 9. AWARDED LINES: YOU WERE AWARDED 1 LINES FROM THE SOLICITATION NUMBER 24714
 THESE LINES ARE INCLUDED AS A PART OF THIS CONTRACT.

ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS A PART OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 24714 INCLUDING ANY ADDENDA
 THERETO AND ALSO INCLUDING THE BIDDER'S PROPOSAL AS ACCEPTED BY THE STATE ARE
 INCLUDED HEREIN BY REFERENCE AND MADE PART HEREOF EXCEPT AS SPECIFIED HEREIN

THIS IS NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF PURCHASE AND
 PROPERTY ACTING FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, OF THE OFFER
 REFERENCED ABOVE BY YOUR FIRM WHOSE NAME AND ADDRESS APPEAR ABOVE.

BUYER _____ DATE _____ *** ORIGINAL SIGNED ***
 FOR DIRECTOR _____ DATE _____
 DIVISION OF PURCHASE AND PROPERTY

USING AGENCIES CANNOT PROCESS INVOICES FOR PAYMENT OF DELIVERED
 GOODS AND/OR SERVICES UNTIL THE PROPERLY EXECUTED BOND HAS BEEN
 RECEIVED AND ACCEPTED BY THE PURCHASE BUREAU.

NOTICE OF AWARD COPY

PRICE SHEET

CONTRACT - COMMODITIES

PURCHASE BUREAU
 STATE PURCHASE & SECURITY
 DIVISION
 150 N. STATE ST., 9TH FL. SCR
 TRENTON NJ 08629-0230

NUMBER
 44490

CONTRACTOR
 COMPUTERISED SURVEILLANCE

LINE NO.	COMMODITY/SERVICE DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE \$	PERCENT DISCOUNT	ESTIMATED AMOUNT
30001	UNLESS SPECIFIED OTHERWISE BELCON SWITCH STATE-VIDE ONLY COMMODITY CODE: 680-87-021798 LINE COSTS PER TRANSMITTER/RECEIVER SET PER DAY PER AM. QUANTITY AS PER THE ATTACHED SPECIFICATIONS BRAND: CH BOARD PLUS SYS MODEL: 172400 DAILY COST INCLUDES THE CENTRAL COMPUTER SYSTEM.	1	EACH	3.98		

NOTICE OF AWARD COPY

88X

SPECIFICATIONS

TERM CONTRACT - ADVERTISED BID PROPOSAL

DEPT OF TREASURY
OFFICE OF PURCHASE & PROPERTY
DEPT OF TREASURY
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
OFFICE OF PURCHASE & PROPERTY
TREASURY

No. 33629-0000

NUMBER 33629-0000
OPEN DATE 04.09.97 TIME 2 PM
NUMBER 0000

BIDDER COMPUTERIZED SURVEILLANCE

SPECIFICATIONS
FOR
ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT
(T-0310)

PURPOSE OF BID

THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY IS SOLICITING PROPOSALS FOR A TERM CONTRACT TO PROCURE THE LEASING AND OUTRIGHT PURCHASE OF ELECTRONIC MONITORING SERVICES FOR HOME DETENTION PROJECTS IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY. IT IS ESTIMATED THAT THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY WILL MONITOR THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY INDIVIDUALS FOR THE CONTRACT PERIOD. CSS understands, agrees and will conform.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SYSTEM OPERATION

AN ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM FOR MONITORING INMATES AND PAROLEES, AS DESCRIBED ABOVE, IS TO USE INTEGRATED COMPONENTS CONNECTED TO A CENTRAL DATA BASE WHICH WILL TEST FOR THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF AN INDIVIDUAL, RECORD AND REPORT VIOLATIONS, INITIATE ALARMS, MAKE RANDOM TELEPHONE CALLS AND MONITOR SYSTEM PERFORMANCE. CSS understands, agrees and will conform.

NOTE TO PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS

IN ORDER TO RECEIVE CONSIDERATION FOR A SUBMITTED PROPOSAL, RESPONSES SHOULD INCLUDE AN EXPLANATION FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL AREA OF REQUESTED INFORMATION. Please see attached "RESPONSE TO SPECIFICATIONS" for those items requiring an explanation.

SPECIFICATIONS

THE SYSTEM DESIRED IS A COMBINATION OF A CONTINUOUSLY SIGNALING (CS) RADIO FREQUENCY (RF) AND A RANDOM TELEPHONE CALLING WITH VERIFICATION COMPONENT (PASSIVE SYSTEM) WHICH WILL HAVE THE ABILITY TO DETECT THE PRESENCE/ABSENCE OF THE PARTICIPANT IN THE CONFINEMENT AREA AT LEAST ONCE EVERY FIVE MINUTES. THE DETECTION SHALL BE THROUGH AN EMITTED RF SIGNAL. THE RF SIGNAL EMITTED FROM THE PARTICIPANT'S ATTACHED TAMPER-RESISTANT TRANSMITTER CONFINEMENT AREA. THE RECEIVER IS CONNECTED TO THE CENTRAL COMPUTER OVER STANDARD PHONE LINES. THE PASSIVE RANDOM CALLING FEATURE FUNCTIONS OVER STANDARD PHONE LINES AND PROVIDES POSITIVE VERIFICATION THAT THE TRANSMITTER IS WITHIN THE CONFINEMENT AREA. CSS fully complies with these requirements.

A. DESIRABLE FEATURES OF THE THREE MAIN COMPONENTS
(TRANSMITTER, RECEIVER, CENTRAL COMPUTER) INCLUDE:

TRANSMITTER

- THE UNIT MUST BE CAPABLE OF SECURE ATTACHMENT TO THE OFFENDER'S WRIST OR ANKLE. THE BAND WHICH ATTACHES THE TRANSMITTER SHALL BE TAMPER-PROOF. CSS complies, the transmitter emits a tamper-alert radio signal to the receiver if the band is cut.

SPECIFICATIONS	TERM CONTRACT - ADVERTISED BID PROPOSAL	
DEPT OF TREASURY DIV OF PURCHASE & SUPPLY DEPT OF TREASURY 110 STATE ST - 9TH FLOOR CN-230 BOSTON	NUMBER OPEN DATE CANCELLED	PROJECT NUMBER CA. NO. 91 DATE 1970 BIDDER COMPUTERIZED SURVEILLANCE
NY 08625-0230		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - THE UNIT SHALL BE SHOCK RESISTANT AND WATERPROOF. CSS complies. - THE UNIT SHALL BE SMALL ENOUGH TO WEAR UNDER A SWEATER IF WORN ON THE WRIST AND UNDER NORMAL SLACKS IF WORN ON THE ANKLE. CSS complies. - THE UNIT SHALL BE CAPABLE OF FUNCTIONING PASSIVELY IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE RECEIVING UNIT AND CENTRAL COMPUTER IN ORDER TO PROVIDE CONFIRMATION OF THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF THE WEARER. CSS fully complies, confirmation is immediate, automatic and positive with no margin of error. - THE TRANSMITTER AND RECEIVER WILL TRANSMIT A RADIO SIGNAL WHICH IS UNIQUE TO THE WEARER. CSS fully complies. - THE TRANSMITTER AND RECEIVER SHALL BE UNIQUELY ENCODED FOR THE OFFENDER WEARING THE TRANSMITTER. CSS complies. - THE TRANSMITTER BATTERY MUST BE OF THE REPLACEABLE TYPE AND DESIGNED TO LAST AT LEAST ONE YEAR BEFORE REPLACEMENT IS NEEDED. CSS complies. - THE SIGNAL RANGE FOR THE TRANSMITTER WILL BE BETWEEN 100 AND 200 FEET. CSS complies. - THE TRANSMITTER SHALL SEND AN RF SIGNAL AT LEAST ONCE EVERY MINUTE. CSS complies, R F Signal is sent every 35 seconds. - THE DEVICE USED TO VERIFY THE PASSIVE TRANSMITTER SHALL OPERATE OVER STANDARD TELEPHONE LINES (MODULAR JACK TYPE). CSS complies. - THE DEVICE USED TO VERIFY THE TRANSMITTER SHALL BE UNIQUELY ENCODED SO AS TO ENABLE POSITIVE CONFIRMATION OF THE PRESENCE OF THE TRANSMITTER. CSS fully complies 		
RECEIVER		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - THE RECEIVER SHALL BE OF THE TYPE WHICH CAN BE INSTALLED TO STANDARD MODULAR TELEPHONE JACKS (RJ11-C). CSS complies. - THE RECEIVER SHALL BE CAPABLE OF COMMUNICATING ONLY WITH A UNIQUE TRANSMITTER WORN BY THE OFFENDER. CSS complies. - THE RECEIVER SHALL BE CAPABLE OF DETECTING ATTEMPTS TO DUPLICATE THE TRANSMITTER SIGNAL OF THE WEARER. ATTEMPTS AT DUPLICATION OF THE SIGNAL WILL BE DETECTED AND REPORTED TO A CENTRAL COMPUTER. CSS fully complies, any attempts will be reported immediately. - THE RECEIVER SHALL BE POWERED BY 110 VOLT A.C. POWER. THERE SHALL BE AN INTERNAL BATTERY IN THE RECEIVER WHICH WILL TAKE OVER IN THE EVENT OF INTERRUPTION OF A.C. POWER. THE BACK-UP INTERNAL BATTERY SHALL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE POWER TO THE RECEIVER 		

SPECIFICATIONS

TERM CONTRACT - ADVERTISED BID PROPOSAL

DEPT OF TREASURY
 DIV OF BUDGET & PROPERTY
 DEPT OF TREASURY
 110 STATE ST
 02109
 BOSTON

NUMBER
 OPEN DATE
 CLOSURE

31000P COMPUTERIZED SURVEILLANCE

FOR AT LEAST 16 HOURS IN THE EVENT OF A POWER FAILURE. THE ELECTRICAL WIRE CONNECTING THE RECEIVER TO A.C. POWER SHALL BE UL APPROVED, AT LEAST 12 FEET LONG, HAVE A TABLE TOP (AS OPPOSED TO A PLUG ATTACHED) TRANSFORMER, AND BE OF THE TWO PRONG TYPE (NON-POLARIZED). CSS complies.

- THE RECEIVER SHALL INCLUDE AN INTERNAL CLOCK AND MEMORY WHICH CAN STORE AND TIME STAMP DATA IN THE EVENT OF INTERRUPTION OF A.C. POWER. CSS complies.
- THE RECEIVER SHALL BE OF THE TYPE WHICH CAN SEIZE A PHONE LINE WHEN NOT IN USE. IT (THE RECEIVER) SHALL ALSO BE CAPABLE OF DELIVERING COURTESY "ALERT BEEPING TONES" ON A LINE IN USE. THESE TONES ARE INTENDED TO ALERT THE OFFENDER TO YIELD THE LINE SO THAT THE RECEIVER CAN COMMUNICATE WITH A CENTRAL COMPUTER. CSS fully complies.
- ANY REQUIRED SURGE PROTECTORS SHALL BE BUILT-IN OR PROVIDED FOR INCOMING POWER AND TELEPHONE LINES. CSS complies.
- THE VENDOR PROVIDES ON-SITE INSTRUCTION ON THE INSTALLATION OF THE RECEIVER. CSS will comply with both personal training and written manuals.
- THE RECEIVER WILL BE ABLE TO IMMEDIATELY DETECT:
 - * WHEN TRANSMITTER IS IN OR OUT OF THE DESIGNATED CONFINEMENT AREA; CSS complies, "In or Out," always reported regardless of curfew schedule.
 - * LOSS OR RESTORATION OF A.C. POWER; CSS complies.
 - * TAMPERING WITH THE RECEIVER OR TRANSMITTER; CSS complies and report both.
 - * RESTORATION OF DISCONNECTED PHONE SERVICE; CSS complies.
 - * ATTEMPTS TO DUPLICATE THE UNIQUE RADIO FREQUENCY INVOLVED. CSS complies.
- THE RECEIVER SHALL HAVE THE CAPABILITY OF AUTOMATIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE CENTRAL COMPUTER WITHIN A MAXIMUM OF SIX HOUR INTERVALS. THE PURPOSE OF THIS AUTOMATIC COMMUNICATION IS TO CONDUCT A CHECK TO DETERMINE THAT THE EQUIPMENT IS FUNCTIONING PROPERLY. CSS fully complies.

CENTRAL COMPUTER

- INSTALLATION OF AN APPROPRIATE CENTRAL COMPUTER AND ALL NECESSARY SOFTWARE. CSS complies.
- A BACK UP POWER SOURCE IN THE EVENT OF INTERRUPTION OF A.C. POWER. CSS complies, uninterruptable power supply provided.
- THE CAPABILITY TO BACK UP DATA ON A DAILY BASIS. CSS complies.

SPECIFICATIONS	TERM CONTRACT - ADVERTISED BID PROPOSAL
DEPT OF TREASURY DIV OF PURCHASE & PROPERTY DEPT OF TREASURY 33 - STATE ST - 3RD FLOOR CN-230 TRENTON NJ 08625-2230	NUMBER 3 OPEN DATE 04-08-84 NUMBERED 1000 BIDDING COMPUTERIZED SURVEILLANCE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REPLACEMENT OF MONITORING EQUIPMENT IN THE EVENT THAT IT BREAKS DOWN AND CANNOT BE REPLACED WITHIN FOUR HOURS. REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT WILL BE INSTALLED BY THE VENDOR AND OPERABLE WITHIN 24 HOURS. CSS will comply. - THE COMPUTER SHALL HAVE THE CAPABILITY OF GENERATING AUTOMATIC CONTINUOUS PHONE CALLS AND STORING ALL VOICE RESPONSES OF THE PARTICIPANT AS WELL AS DATA GENERATED BY THE TRANSMITTER, RECEIVER, AND RANDOM PHONE CALLS. ALL VOICE TRANSMISSIONS SHALL BE PERMANENTLY RECORDED ON FLOPPY DISKS AND ARCHIVED ON TAPE. CSS will comply. - THE COMPUTER SYSTEM SHALL HAVE THE CAPABILITY OF PERFORMING RANDOM PHONE CALLING WITHIN AT LEAST FOUR CUSTOMIZED CURFEW PERIODS FOR EACH OFFENDER ON THE SYSTEM. CSS complies and provides up to 8 periods. - THE COMPUTER SYSTEM SHALL BE ABLE TO GENERATE AN AUTOMATIC PHONE CALL TO THE PROGRAM PARTICIPANT IN THE EVENT THAT AN ABSENCE OF RF IS DETECTED. THE AUTOMATIC CALL BACK FEATURE MUST PROVIDE A 100% ACCURATE VERIFICATION THAT THE OFFENDER IS PRESENT. CSS fully complies. - THE COMPUTER SYSTEM SHALL BE CAPABLE OF STORING DATA BASE TYPE INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS. IN ADDITION, THE COMPUTER SYSTEM WILL HAVE TEXT EDITING CAPABILITY TO ENABLE THE RECORDING OF RELEVANT CASE INFORMATION. CSS complies. - THE COMPUTER SYSTEM SHALL CONTAIN AN ALERT DEVICE AND RADIO PAGER CONFIGURATION TO ENABLE THE NOTIFICATION OF PERSONNEL OF ANY PROGRAM VIOLATIONS AND EQUIPMENT. CSS complies. <p>B. BACK-UP CAPABILITY See Attachment.</p> <p>IN THE EVENT OF A TAMPER AND/OR VIOLATION IN THE PRIMARY FEATURE OF THE SYSTEM (THAT BEING THE CSRF SIGNAL) DESCRIBE WHAT PROCEDURES ARE IMPLEMENTED TO PROVIDE VERIFICATION OF THE INDICATED MESSAGE. See Attachment.</p> <p>C. EASE OF INSTALLATION See Attachment</p> <p>DESCRIBE THE INSTALLATION PROCEDURE REQUIRED FOR YOUR EQUIPMENT CONSIDERING THIS WILL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF DOC PERSONNEL. See Attachment</p> <p>IT IS DESIRABLE FOR THE SITE RECEIVER TO BE ATTACHED TO THE PARTICIPANT'S TELEPHONE USING STANDARD TELEPHONE JACKS AND HOUSE RESIDENTIAL ELECTRICAL CURRENT WHERE REQUIRED. See Attachment.</p> <p>WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS FOR TRANSMITTER ATTACHMENT, RECEIVER HOOK-UP, AND POSSIBLE TROUBLE SHOOTING SITUATIONS ARE ALSO DESIRABLE. See Attachment.</p> <p>D. SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS See Attachment.</p>	

SPECIFICATIONS		TERM CONTRACT - ADVERTISED BID PROPOSAL	
DEPT OF PRISON OFFICE OF PURCHASE & ACQUISITION DEPT OF PRISON STATE ST - 3rd FLOOR PHOENIX AZ 85025-0220	NUMBER OPEN DATE CLOSURE	BIDDING COMMUNICATED SURVEILLANCE	BIDDING COMMUNICATED SURVEILLANCE

THE EFFICIENCY OF THE RF SIGNAL IS EXPECTED TO BE AT LEAST 95% TO MINIMIZE DOWN TIME FOR REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT OF EQUIPMENT. See Attachment.

SPARE TRANSMITTER-RECEIVER PAIRS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE AT A POSSIBLE RATIO OF 1 SPARE SET FOR EVERY 15 (OR 20) SETS IN USE. (AT NO ADDITIONAL COST UNLESS UTILIZED). CSS agrees and complies.

E. REMOTE CAPABILITIES-/PAGING CAPABILITIES See Attachment

DESCRIBE YOUR CENTRAL COMPUTER'S CAPABILITY FOR INDICATING ALL RELEVANT INFORMATION (E.G., ENTER, LEAVE, PRESENCE, TAMPER, VIOLATION) TO A REMOTE LOCATION PRINTER (OR TERMINAL). IN THE EVENT OF A TAMPER OR VIOLATION DESCRIBE PAGING CAPABILITIES TO FIELD PERSONNEL. See Attachment.

F. TECHNICAL SUPPORT

THE VENDOR WILL BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING ONGOING SERVICES FOR THE TERM OF THE CONTRACT. CSS will fully comply with these requirements:

- A DESIGNATED FULL-TIME PERSON TO ASSIST IN REPLACEMENT OF UNITS AND LOW BATTERIES AS NEEDED. IN ADDITION, THE FULL-TIME VENDOR SUPPLIED STAFF PERSON WILL ASSIST IN INSTALLATIONS, HOOK-UPS, AND REPAIRS OF ANY EQUIPMENT INVOLVED IN THE ENTIRE MONITORING SYSTEM. THE FULL-TIME PERSON WILL BE EXPECTED TO WORK ALONE OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH PAROLE OFFICERS IN VARIOUS OFFICE AND COMMUNITY SETTINGS. ALL REPAIRS AND/OR REPLACEMENT ARE TO BE MADE WITHIN 24 HOURS.

G. EQUIPMENT COMMUNICATION See Attachment for all items in this paragraph

DESCRIBE HOW YOUR CENTRAL COMPUTER AND SITE RECEIVER COMMUNICATION WITH EACH OTHER TO RELAY INFORMATION AS WELL AS ENSURE PROPER FUNCTION.

PROVIDE THE RANGE OF FREQUENCY (DURING A TYPICAL DAILY CONFINEMENT PERIOD FROM 7:00 P.M. TO 7:00 A.M.) FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- NUMBER OF SIGNALS EMITTED FROM TRANSMITTER (HOURLY)
- NUMBER OF PHONE RELAYS FOR GATHERED EMITTED SIGNALS TO CENTRAL COMPUTER AND LENGTH OF TIME OF EACH CALL.
- NUMBER OF COMMUNICATIONS FROM CENTRAL COMPUTER TO SITE RECEIVER AND LENGTH OF TIME OF EACH.

DESCRIBE ANY OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL FEATURES OR CAPABILITIES.

H. EQUIPMENT UPGRADE See Attachment.

DESCRIBE YOUR ABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO PROVIDE IMPROVED EQUIPMENT

RESPONSE TO SPECIFICATIONS

The following is the Computerized Surveillance Systems, Inc. (CSS) response to the NJ State Specifications contained on pages 10 through 17 of Bid Proposal document # 91-X-24714.

CSS complies and meets all requirements of this specification without exception. A compliance note is typed at the end of each paragraph or subparagraph to confirm our understanding of that particular item. For those responses requiring an explanation, (in accordance with the NOTE TO PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS in middle of page 10), we submit the following response explanations: - - -

Page 13, Para. B, Back-up Capability - In the event a tamper and/or violation in the primary RF system is reported, the Central Computer System automatically and immediately calls back to the home and requires the client to verbally respond to questions (which are permanently tape recorded) and insert the passive part of the ankle/wristlet into a Verifier device for 100% confirmation of presence or absence.

Page 13, Para. C, Ease of Installation - The installation of the Central Computer System is performed by CSS personnel and does not require DOC personnel. Installation of the client's transmitter and home units are easily done within 15 to 20 minutes. DOC personnel will be thoroughly trained and given written manuals. See manufacturer's ON GUARD PLUS Manual # 11490 for detailed instructions. Installations for home units are for standard telephone jacks and house 110 vac outlets, however, the manuals contain detailed instructions for adapters if non standard jacks are encountered.

Page 13, Para. D, System Effectiveness - The ON GUARD PLUS transmitter is the most efficient available on the market with an efficiency rating of better than 99.99%. It transmits a signal every 35 seconds for a period duration of only 3 milliseconds, or a duty cycle of better than 1 to 11,600. This efficient use of power allows a minimum operating life of 1 year before the lithium battery replacement is needed. When replacement is needed, it is only a 5 or 10 minute operation and can be done in the field by an officer.

Page 14, Para. E. Remote Capabilities - Paging Capabilities - The ON GUARD PLUS Central System has the capability of sending a variety of information to a remote location printer and/or terminal. This can be done by cable if the remote location is relatively nearby, or via a *modem* over the telephone line if obstructions are in the way or location more than 1000 feet away. A number of different standard reports can be sent such as Client Reports, Equipment Reports, Officer Caseload, Statistics Reports or an unlimited group of custom designed reports. Officer paging capability includes pager display of client's phone number and 2 digit code for any one, combination or all of the following events:

Client Left Home	No AC Power	Phone Disconnect
Client Returned Home	AC Power Restored	Spurious Transmitter
Client Left Early	No Receiver Battery	Wristlet Tamper
Client Home Late	Receiver Shutdown	Wristlet Reset
RF-Check Client Home	RF-Check Client Away	Receiver Tamper

There are an additional 33 call statuses and system diagnostics that can be programmed to initiate paging to other phone numbers if needed.

Page 14, Para. G. Equipment Communication - The Central Computer may initiate a telephone call to the home Receiver and/or the Receiver may initiate a call to the Central Computer, depending on the action required at any particular time. In either case the telephone communication link uses uniquely coded tone sequences and data rates that are not the same as any other known equipment. This gives excellent security and prevents experimenters or "computer hackers" from attempting to defeat the system. The Receiver is programmed to call the Central Computer on occurrence of any of the events listed in the paragraph above, and at least every six hours for a status report. On specified violations, the Central Computer will automatically and immediately call back to the Receiver/Verifier in the home for positive verification of the client's presence or absence. Verbal responses will also be permanently recorded at the Central Computer. The Central Computer may be programmed to initiate randomly timed calls to the client's home, independent of the RF system. This is an additional check or verification of the client's presence using the totally passive part of the system.

During a typical daily confinement period from 7 pm to 7 am, the following data requested by the State, is provided: -

- Approximately 103 signals are emitted hourly from the transmitter.
- Average number of phone calls from Receiver to Central Computer are about 3 and average length of connect time on each call is about 22 seconds.
- Average number of calls by Central Computer to the Receiver/Verifier is about 2 and average length of connect time on each call is about 40 seconds.

These statistics were supplied from the Hitek Monitoring Service Bureau in Ft. Lauderdale, FL which also uses the ON GUARD PLUS System as proposed in this bid. Hitek is a division of Digital Products Corporation, the designer and manufacturer of the ON GUARD PLUS System.

Page 14, Para. H, Equipment Upgrade - Any product upgrades or enhancements which are released by the manufacturer during the term of this contract will be made available at no additional cost to the State of New Jersey. Any accessory, auxiliary or other related new product released by the manufacturer, which may be desired by the State, will be offered to the State at the most favored price.

APPENDIX E

Electronic Monitoring Materials

ON GUARD Equipment Master File 11.51
Equipment Serial #: 902360 Date of Entry: 04-18-1992 RF- Outgoing Response Time: Ten Minutes RF- Outgoing Suzzer Yes/No: Y
DOC Number of Equipment Holder: 000000 Client Name of Equipment Holder: VAUGHN Officer Name of Equipment Holder: KLETT Type of Equipment being used: Drive-By Receiver

F1-Help F2-Save F3-Prev F4-Next F5-Clr F7-Del F8-Print F9-Find F10-Exit
 16:14:36

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-18-1992 Current Time: 16:14

DOC Number:000000 Dates = Entry:04-18-1992 Termination:04-18-1992
 Officer's Name:KLETT, JOHN
 Client's Name:VAUGHN, MR.
 Street Address:WHITLESSEY RD. ,TRENTON Zip:08650
 State:NJ
 Office:DO6
 Equipment #:902360 Drive-By Receiver
 Beeper Number:7778804 Phone Number:9898246
 Message Number:02 Telsol Number:1
 Offense:NONE

Curfews:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Saturday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	08:50	17:10	17:40	17:41	20:00	20:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes:

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
902360	Illegal Number	15:12-04/18	15:12-04/18	Changed Equipment
902360	Illegal Number	15:14-04/18	15:14-04/18	Client Added/Changed

CURRENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-15-1992

Current Time: 13:12

903260	Illegal Number	18:45-04/18	18:45-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	18:47-04/18	18:47-04/18	Client Added
903260	Illegal Number	17:00-04/18	17:00-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	17:07-04/18	17:15-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	17:17-04/18	17:23-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	17:22-04/18	17:24-04/18	Client Added
903260	Illegal Number	17:26-04/18	17:26-04/18	Client Home Late
903260	Illegal Number	17:40-04/18	17:41-04/18	Client Added
903260	Illegal Number	17:43-04/18	17:43-04/18	Client Added
903260	Illegal Number	18:14-04/18	18:14-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	18:21-04/18	18:21-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	22:03-04/18	22:03-04/18	Client Added/Changed
903260	Illegal Number	18:01-04/19	18:01-04/19	Client Added/Changed

Total Statuses Printed: 29

INCIDENT REPORT

18:03:00 04-18-1992

REPORT# 0148

TO: 000

ATTN:

FR: BUCHAN, MO.
(17700)

CASE OFFICER: LEFT

9 999 999-9946

Officer:	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Saturday	0001	0050	1710	1740	1741	2000	2001	2200

Incident(s):	Actual Time	Report Time	Status of Action.....
	18:18 04-18	18:16 04-18	Client Added/Changed
	18:24 04-18	18:22 04-18	**Wristlet Tagger
	18:27 04-18	18:27 04-18	Client Added/Changed

Verbal Response S.M.S. Notes.....

Notes - CALLED SA HE VERIFIED SUCCESSFULLY SP.RO LEFT BARR.

S.M.S. Initials - P.MOYLE SP.RO.

INCIDENT REPORT

DATE: 04-12-1991

REPORT NO: 103X

TO: [illegible]

[illegible]

BY: [illegible]

DATE OF REPORT: 04-12-91

PHONE NO: 1 800 850-8246

Location	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Rate	Rate	Start	Stop
Geography	0001	0850	1710	1740	1741	1741	1741	1741

Incident No.	Actual Time	Report Time	Status of Action
	17:17 04-12	17:29 04-12	Client Left Earl.

Verbal Response E.M.S. Notes.....

Notes - SA LEFT AT SIX PM SEVENTEEN MINUTES AFTER HIS ALLOTTED PERIOD.

E.M.S. Initials - P.MOVLS SP.PG.

INCIDENT REPORT

DATE: 04-12-1991

OFFICER: 1017

TO: SFP

1730

FR: 1013-1015

CASE OFFICER: KLETT

101100

3 333 333-3248

Officer:	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Services:	1711	0050	1710	1740	1741	0000	2001	0000

Incident:	Actual Time	Report Time	Status of Action
	17:40 04-12	17:41 04-12	Client Home Late

Verbal Response E.M.S. Notes.....

Notes - SA WENT OUT FOR 20 MINUTES. SP.FO. KLETT PAGED.

E.M.S. Initials - P.MOYLE SP.FO.

17-55-15 10-13-1957
 17-55-15
 17-55-15, 17-55-15, 17-55-15
 17-55-15, 17-55-15, 17-55-15

Operator	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Smith	17:00	17:00	17:00	17:10	17:00	17:00	17:00	17:00

Operator	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Smith	17:00	17:00	17:00	17:10	17:00	17:00	17:00	17:00

Manual Response E.M.S. Notes.....

Notes - TEST EXPERIMENT.

E.M.S. Initials - P. MOYLE SR. PC

REPORT NO. 100-10-1000
 DATE: 10/10/50
 CASE OFFICER: [Name]
 [Address]
 [City]

Offense	Arrest	Date	Arrest	Arrest	Arrest	Arrest	Date
[Offense]	[Arrest]	[Date]	[Arrest]	[Arrest]	[Arrest]	[Arrest]	[Date]

Incident # [Number] Date Reported [Date] Status of Report.....
 [Number] [Date] [Date] No Delay
 [Number] [Date] [Date] No Delay

Special Response - [] Notes.....

Notes -

E.M.B. Initials - [Initials]

TRANSMISSION REPORT

NUMBER OF PAGES 21 APR 13 1962 CITY OF

DATE	REMOTE TERMINAL IDENTIFICATION	MODE	TIME	RESULTS	TOTAL PAGES	LEFT OFF
	CITY OF DIGITAL PRODUCTS	SEST	001547	OK	21	

WICHEL REPORT
 11/19/91 08:15:15-1991

Current Time: 15:57

Call Number: 58121214 Dates: Entry: 01/25-1992 Termination: 15-02
 Caller's Name: RADAR, MARK
 Caller's Address: 121150N, LORENZO
 Service Address: 31502 SPOOKSIDE PLACE, PLAINFIELD NJ 07060

Office: NJ

Office: 00 05
 Equipment #: 650593 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Receiver Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 19087543402
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 4

Offense: 000 WITH INTENT

	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	07:50	14:10	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Tuesday	00:01	07:50	14:10	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Wednesday	00:01	07:50	14:10	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Thursday	00:01	07:50	14:10	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Friday	00:01	08:00	09:01	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Saturday	00:01	09:00	09:01	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Sunday	00:01	09:00	09:01	15:00	15:01	22:00	22:01	22:00
Supervisor:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Note: INMATE thru 00R ** ESCAPE 11/17/92 **

APPENDIX F

Complete Computer Printout of Tony Palmer

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:17

 DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 504737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5
 Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICS , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfews:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervisions:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:26

 DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5
 Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICS , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfews:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59

IENT FULL REPORT

urrent Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 10:39

IC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522

State: NJ
Officer: DO 12
Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Table with columns: Offense, Period 1, Period 2, Period 3, Period 4. Rows include days of the week (Monday-Friday) and supervision status (No Calls, One Call).

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

Story For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number, Equipment Type, Time - Date (Actual), Time - Date (Printed), Status of Action

IENT FULL REPORT

urrent Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 10:49

IC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522

State: NJ
Officer: DO 12
Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Table with columns: Offense, Period 1, Period 2, Period 3, Period 4. Rows include days of the week (Monday-Tuesday) and supervision status (No Calls, One Call).

APR-23-82 FBI 17:19 ID: DIGITAL PRODUCTS TEL NO: 202-727-9629 2025 202
 Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls
 Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

Story For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
53680	15:40-10/30	15:40-10/30	15:40-10/30	Changed Equipment
53680	15:40-10/30	15:40-10/30	15:40-10/30	Changed Equipment
04737	15:41-10/30	15:41-10/30	15:41-10/30	Changed Equipment
04737	15:45-10/30	15:45-10/30	15:45-10/30	Client Added/Changed
04737	15:53-10/30	15:53-10/30	15:53-10/30	*wristlet Tamper*
04737	15:57-10/30	15:57-10/30	15:57-10/30	Pager-Called
04737	16:02-10/30	16:02-10/30	16:02-10/30	Wristlet Reset
04737	21:34-10/30	21:35-10/30	21:35-10/30	*No Verifier Detected
04737	21:40-10/30	21:42-10/30	21:42-10/30	Successful
04737	22:02-10/30	22:03-10/30	22:03-10/30	RF Check-Client Home
04737	06:03-10/31	06:03-10/31	06:03-10/31	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:24-10/31	10:36-10/31	10:36-10/31	Client Left Home
04737	14:59-10/31	15:01-10/31	15:01-10/31	Client Returned Home
04737	15:31-10/31	15:32-10/31	15:32-10/31	Busy
04737	21:01-10/31	21:05-10/31	21:05-10/31	RF Check-Client Home
04737	05:05-11/01	05:05-11/01	05:05-11/01	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:54-11/01	11:06-11/01	11:06-11/01	Client Left Home
04737	11:05-11/01	11:06-11/01	11:06-11/01	RF Check-Not Home
Total Statuses Printed:		18		

Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	23:59

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 10:21

04737	17:36-11/07	17:36-11/07	RF Check-Client Home
04737	01:36-11/08	01:37-11/08	RF Check-Client Home
04737	06:03-10/31	06:03-10/31	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:24-10/31	10:36-10/31	Client Left Home
04737	14:59-10/31	15:01-10/31	Client Returned Home
04737	15:31-10/31	15:32-10/31	Busy
04737	21:01-10/31	21:05-10/31	RF Check-Client Home
04737	05:05-11/01	05:05-11/01	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:54-11/01	11:06-11/01	Client Left Home
04737	11:05-11/01	11:06-11/01	RF Check-Not Home
04737	13:26-11/01	13:26-11/01	Client Added/Changed
04737	14:31-11/01	14:31-11/01	Client Returned Home
04737	15:22-11/01	15:22-11/01	Recorded Speech
04737	20:31-11/01	20:32-11/01	RF Check-Client Home
04737	04:32-11/02	04:32-11/02	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:32-11/02	10:33-11/02	RF Check-Client Home
04737	13:20-11/02	13:35-11/02	Client Left Home
04737	14:27-11/02	14:32-11/02	Client Returned Home
04737	14:53-11/02	14:54-11/02	*No Verifier Detected
04737	14:58-11/02	14:59-11/02	Successful
04737	15:15-11/02	15:15-11/02	Hang up
04737	15:25-11/02	15:26-11/02	Successful
04737	20:32-11/02	20:32-11/02	RF Check-Client Home
04737	04:32-11/03	04:32-11/03	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:32-11/03	10:38-11/03	RF Check-Client Home
04737	11:35-11/03	11:47-11/03	Client Left Home
04737	11:59-11/03	12:01-11/03	Client Returned Home
04737	11:59-11/03	12:10-11/03	Client Left Home
04737	14:13-11/03	14:14-11/03	Client Returned Home
04737	14:56-11/03	14:56-11/03	Busy
04737	14:58-11/03	14:58-11/03	Busy
04737	15:01-11/03	15:01-11/03	Busy
04737	15:03-11/03	15:03-11/03	Busy
04737	15:05-11/03	15:05-11/03	Pager-Called
04737	18:14-11/03	18:14-11/03	Busy
04737	18:29-11/03	18:30-11/03	*No Verifier Detected
04737	18:31-11/03	18:32-11/03	Pager-Called
04737	20:14-11/03	20:14-11/03	RF Check-Client Home
04737	04:14-11/04	04:18-11/04	RF Check-Client Home
04737	10:18-11/04	10:22-11/04	RF Check-Client Home
04737	12:45-11/04	12:58-11/04	Client Left Home
04737	15:04-11/04	15:06-11/04	Client Returned Home
04737	15:24-11/04	15:25-11/04	Successful
04737	16:23-11/04	16:24-11/04	*No Verifier Detected
04737	16:28-11/04	16:29-11/04	Successful
04737	18:57-11/04	18:57-11/04	Busy
04737	19:12-11/04	19:12-11/04	Busy

Total Statuses Printed: 73

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 10:21

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsel Number: 5
 Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Surveys:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		19:27-11/04	19:27-11/04	Busy
604737		19:42-11/04	19:42-11/04	Busy
604737		19:45-11/04	19:45-11/04	Pager-Called
604737		21:05-11/04	21:06-11/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737		22:43-11/04	23:12-11/04	*Client Left Early
604737		23:01-11/04	23:12-11/04	*Client Home Late
604737		23:14-11/04	23:14-11/04	Busy
604737		23:15-11/04	23:15-11/04	Pager-Called
604737		23:16-11/04	23:16-11/04	Pager-Called
604737		07:12-11/05	07:12-11/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737		09:52-11/05	09:52-11/05	Client Added/Changed
604737		13:12-11/05	13:13-11/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737		14:05-11/05	14:17-11/05	Client Left Home
604737		14:58-11/05	14:59-11/05	Client Returned Home
604737		20:59-11/05	21:03-11/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737		05:03-11/06	05:03-11/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737		10:19-11/06	10:31-11/06	Client Left Home
604737		11:22-11/06	11:23-11/06	Client Returned Home
604737		12:19-11/06	12:31-11/06	Client Left Home
604737		14:57-11/06	14:58-11/06	Client Returned Home
604737		15:57-11/06	15:57-11/06	Busy
604737		16:00-11/06	16:01-11/06	Successful
604737		20:58-11/06	20:59-11/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737		04:59-11/07	04:59-11/07	RF Check-Client Home
604737		09:50-11/07	10:01-11/07	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Report Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:08

```

-----
04737 20:17-11/08 20:20-11/08 RF Check-Client Home
04737 03:22-11/09 03:57-11/09 *Client Left Early
04737 03:52-11/09 03:57-11/09 *Client Home Late
04737 03:59-11/09 03:59-11/09 Successful
04737 04:00-11/09 04:00-11/09 Pager-Called
04737 09:57-11/09 09:58-11/09 RF Check-Client Home
04737 12:34-11/09 13:05-11/09 Client Left Home
04737 14:24-11/09 14:38-11/09 Client Returned Home
04737 15:03-11/09 15:04-11/09 Successful
04737 20:38-11/09 20:39-11/09 RF Check-Client Home
04737 04:38-11/10 04:39-11/10 RF Check-Client Home
04737 10:39-11/10 10:39-11/10 RF Check-Client Home
04737 14:50-11/10 14:50-11/10 Busy
04737 15:05-11/10 15:06-11/10 Successful
04737 16:39-11/10 16:43-11/10 RF Check-Client Home
04737 20:58-11/10 20:58-11/10 Busy
04737 21:13-11/10 21:13-11/10 Busy
04737 21:28-11/10 21:29-11/10 Invalid Ver Contact
04737 21:30-11/10 21:30-11/10 Pager-Called
04737 22:43-11/10 22:44-11/10 RF Check-Client Home
04737 06:43-11/11 06:44-11/11 RF Check-Client Home
04737 12:08-11/11 12:19-11/11 Client Left Home
04737 14:53-11/11 14:54-11/11 Client Returned Home
04737 15:32-11/11 15:33-11/11 Hang up
04737 20:53-11/11 20:54-11/11 Successful
04737 20:54-11/11 20:55-11/11 RF Check-Client Home
04737 04:55-11/12 04:55-11/12 RF Check-Client Home
04737 09:48-11/12 10:00-11/12 Client Left Home
04737 13:33-11/12 13:35-11/12 Client Returned Home
04737 13:33-11/12 13:45-11/12 Client Left Home
04737 14:55-11/12 14:55-11/12 Client Returned Home
04737 15:38-11/12 15:39-11/12 Successful
04737 18:11-11/12 18:11-11/12 Busy
04737 18:26-11/12 18:27-11/12 Successful
04737 20:55-11/12 21:12-11/12 RF Check-Client Home
04737 05:12-11/13 05:12-11/13 RF Check-Client Home
-----
Total Statuses Printed: 62
-----

```

IDENT FULL REPORT
 Print Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:08

C Number: YN110282 Dates - Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 1604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsel Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Days:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59

Provisions: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls
 Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
04737	11:12-11/13	11:13-11/13	RF Check-Client Home	
04737	13:17-11/13	13:28-11/13	Client Left Home	
04737	14:59-11/13	15:00-11/13	Client Returned Home	
04737	15:23-11/13	15:23-11/13	Busy	
04737	15:39-11/13	15:40-11/13	Successful	
04737	17:10-11/13	17:10-11/13	Busy	
04737	17:25-11/13	17:26-11/13	Successful	
04737	21:00-11/13	21:02-11/13	RF Check-Client Home	
04737	05:02-11/14	05:02-11/14	RF Check-Client Home	
04737	11:02-11/14	11:03-11/14	RF Check-Client Home	
04737	12:12-11/14	12:23-11/14	Client Left Home	
04737	12:40-11/14	12:41-11/14	Client Returned Home	
04737	12:39-11/14	12:51-11/14	Client Left Home	
04737	14:54-11/14	14:55-11/14	Client Returned Home	
04737	15:45-11/14	15:46-11/14	*No Verifier Detected	
04737	15:50-11/14	15:51-11/14	Successful	
04737	18:10-11/14	18:11-11/14	*No Verifier Detected	
04737	18:17-11/14	18:18-11/14	Successful	
04737	20:55-11/14	20:59-11/14	RF Check-Client Home	
04737	04:59-11/15	04:59-11/15	RF Check-Client Home	
04737	09:38-11/15	10:10-11/15	Client Left Home	
04737	01:36-11/08	01:37-11/08	RF Check-Client Home	

04737 15:14-11/08 15:15-11/08 Successful

604737 APR-22-1992 14:29-11/17 14:30-11/17 DIGITAL PRODUCTS TEL NO: 3205-737-7609 Client Returned Home

323 708

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:22

604737	14:59-11/17	15:00-11/17	Successful
604737	20:30-11/17	20:31-11/17	RF Check-Client Home
604737	21:34-11/17	21:35-11/17	Successful
604737	04:31-11/18	04:31-11/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737	09:41-11/18	09:53-11/18	Client Left Home
604737	11:33-11/18	11:34-11/18	Client Returned Home
604737	12:44-11/18	12:56-11/18	Client Left Home
604737	13:13-11/18	13:17-11/18	Client Returned Home
604737	15:47-11/18	15:48-11/18	Successful
604737	18:26-11/18	18:27-11/18	Successful
604737	19:17-11/18	19:18-11/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737	03:18-11/19	03:18-11/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	09:18-11/19	09:25-11/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:48-11/19	12:00-11/19	Client Left Home
604737	12:48-11/19	12:49-11/19	Client Returned Home
604737	12:54-11/19	13:05-11/19	Client Left Home
604737	14:38-11/19	14:39-11/19	Client Returned Home
604737	15:57-11/19	15:58-11/19	Successful
604737	20:39-11/19	20:40-11/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	21:33-11/19	21:33-11/19	No Answer
604737	21:43-11/19	21:44-11/19	Successful
604737	04:39-11/20	04:40-11/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:40-11/20	10:51-11/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:07-11/20	12:18-11/20	Client Left Home
604737	14:49-11/20	14:50-11/20	Client Returned Home
604737	15:37-11/20	15:38-11/20	Successful
604737	20:50-11/20	20:50-11/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737	21:23-11/20	21:24-11/20	No Verifier Detected
604737	21:28-11/20	21:28-11/20	Successful
604737	04:50-11/21	04:51-11/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:50-11/21	10:51-11/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:15-11/21	12:26-11/21	Client Left Home
604737	12:35-11/21	12:37-11/21	Client Returned Home
604737	12:38-11/21	13:46-11/21	Client Left Home

Total Statuses Printed: 60

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:22

```

-----
604737 14:59-11/17 15:00-11/17 Successful
604737 20:30-11/17 20:31-11/17 RF Check-Client Home
604737 21:34-11/17 21:35-11/17 Successful
604737 04:31-11/18 04:31-11/18 RF Check-Client Home
604737 09:41-11/18 09:53-11/18 Client Left Home
604737 11:33-11/18 11:34-11/18 Client Returned Home
604737 12:44-11/18 12:56-11/18 Client Left Home
604737 13:13-11/18 13:17-11/18 Client Returned Home
604737 15:47-11/18 15:48-11/18 Successful
604737 18:26-11/18 18:27-11/18 Successful
604737 19:17-11/18 19:18-11/18 RF Check-Client Home
604737 03:18-11/19 03:18-11/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 09:18-11/19 09:25-11/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 11:48-11/19 12:00-11/19 Client Left Home
604737 12:48-11/19 12:49-11/19 Client Returned Home
604737 12:54-11/19 13:05-11/19 Client Left Home
604737 14:38-11/19 14:39-11/19 Client Returned Home
604737 15:57-11/19 15:58-11/19 Successful
604737 20:39-11/19 20:40-11/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 21:33-11/19 21:33-11/19 No Answer
604737 21:43-11/19 21:44-11/19 Successful
604737 04:39-11/20 04:40-11/20 RF Check-Client Home
604737 10:40-11/20 10:51-11/20 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:07-11/20 12:18-11/20 Client Left Home
604737 14:49-11/20 14:50-11/20 Client Returned Home
604737 15:37-11/20 15:38-11/20 Successful
604737 20:50-11/20 20:50-11/20 RF Check-Client Home
604737 21:23-11/20 21:24-11/20 No Verifier Detected
604737 21:28-11/20 21:28-11/20 Successful
604737 04:50-11/21 04:51-11/21 RF Check-Client Home
604737 10:50-11/21 10:51-11/21 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:15-11/21 12:26-11/21 Client Left Home
604737 12:35-11/21 12:37-11/21 Client Returned Home
604737 12:38-11/21 13:46-11/21 Client Left Home
Total Statuses Printed: 60
-----

```


CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:22

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates: Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST., PATTERSON Zip: 07522
State: NJ
Office: DO 12

Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900484
Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICS, POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Table with columns: Curfew, Period 1 (Start/Stop), Period 2 (Start/Stop), Period 3 (Start/Stop), Period 4 (Start/Stop). Rows include days of the week (Monday-Sunday) and Supervision status (No Calls, One Call).

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Table with columns: Equipment Number, Equipment Type, Time - Date (Actual), Time - Date (Printed), Status of Action. Lists various events like 'Client Returned Home', 'Busy', 'Successful', and 'RF Check-Client Home' with corresponding timestamps.

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:48

DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992

Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH

Client's Name: PALMER, TONY

Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON

Zip: 07522

State: NJ

Office: DG 12

Equipment #: 604737

Receiver and Verifier Combined

Beeper Number: 7778804

Phone Number: 12017900464

Message Number: 02

Telcel Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICS , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		05:07-11/22	05:07-11/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737		11:07-11/22	11:07-11/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737		11:57-11/22	12:08-11/22	Client Left Home
604737		12:48-11/22	12:49-11/22	Client Returned Home
604737		12:53-11/22	13:11-11/22	Client Left Home
604737		13:20-11/22	13:25-11/22	Client Returned Home
604737		13:20-11/22	13:34-11/22	Client Left Home
604737		15:00-11/22	15:01-11/22	Client Returned Home
604737		15:24-11/22	15:24-11/22	Busy
604737		15:41-11/22	15:41-11/22	Busy
604737		15:56-11/22	15:56-11/22	Busy
604737		15:58-11/22	15:58-11/22	Busy
604737		16:00-11/22	16:00-11/22	Pager-Called
604737		17:22-11/22	17:37-11/22	*Client Left Early
604737		17:33-11/22	17:37-11/22	*Client Home Late
604737		17:39-11/22	17:40-11/22	Successful
604737		17:40-11/22	17:40-11/22	Pager-Called
604737		19:18-11/22	19:19-11/22	Successful
604737		22:21-11/22	22:22-11/22	Successful
604737		01:37-11/23	01:51-11/23	RF Check-Client Home
604737		07:51-11/23	07:51-11/23	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:34-11/23	12:46-11/23	Client Left Home
604737		12:48-11/23	12:49-11/23	Client Returned Home
604737		12:47-11/23	12:58-11/23	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 11:48

604737	19:42-11/23	19:43-11/23	Successful
604737	20:34-11/23	20:38-11/23	RF Check-Client Home
604737	21:55-11/23	21:56-11/23	*No Verifier Detected
604737	22:00-11/23	22:01-11/23	*No Verifier Detected
604737	22:02-11/23	22:02-11/23	Pager-Called
604737	04:38-11/24	04:39-11/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:38-11/24	10:39-11/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:50-11/24	14:01-11/24	Client Left Home
604737	14:38-11/24	14:39-11/24	Client Returned Home
604737	14:48-11/24	14:48-11/24	Successful
604737	19:37-11/24	19:37-11/24	Busy
604737	19:52-11/24	19:53-11/24	Successful
604737	20:39-11/24	20:52-11/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737	04:52-11/25	04:52-11/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:52-11/25	10:53-11/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:02-11/25	11:13-11/25	Client Left Home
604737	12:53-11/25	12:54-11/25	Client Returned Home
604737	12:55-11/25	13:06-11/25	Client Left Home
604737	13:35-11/25	13:37-11/25	Client Returned Home
604737	14:13-11/25	14:24-11/25	Client Left Home
604737	15:02-11/25	15:05-11/25	Client Returned Home
604737	15:33-11/25	15:34-11/25	Successful
604737	21:05-11/25	21:05-11/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	21:36-11/25	21:36-11/25	Client Added/Changed
604737	23:27-11/25	23:39-11/25	*Client Left Early
604737	23:41-11/25	23:41-11/25	Busy
604737	23:43-11/25	23:43-11/25	Pager-Called
604737	23:55-11/25	23:58-11/25	*Client Home Late
604737	23:54-11/26	00:05-11/26	*Client Left Early
604737	00:07-11/26	00:08-11/26	*No Verifier Detected
604737	00:09-11/26	00:09-11/26	Pager-Called
604737	00:07-11/26	00:10-11/26	*Client Home Late
604737	00:12-11/26	00:12-11/26	Pager-Called
604737	06:10-11/26	06:10-11/26	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:10-11/26	12:10-11/26	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:47-11/26	12:59-11/26	Client Left Home
604737	14:35-11/26	14:35-11/26	Client Returned Home
604737	14:36-11/26	14:48-11/26	Client Left Home
604737	15:40-11/26	15:40-11/26	Client Returned Home
604737	15:41-11/26	15:57-11/26	Client Left Home
604737	16:03-11/26	16:05-11/26	Client Returned Home
604737	16:09-11/26	16:26-11/26	Client Left Home
604737	17:11-11/26	17:11-11/26	Client Returned Home
604737	19:44-11/26	19:45-11/26	Successful
604737	21:39-11/26	21:40-11/26	Hang up
604737	21:49-11/26	21:50-11/26	*No Verifier Detected
604737	21:51-11/26	21:51-11/26	Pager-Called
604737	22:12-11/26	22:13-11/26	Successful
604737	01:11-11/27	01:12-11/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:12-11/27	07:12-11/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:12-11/27	07:12-11/27	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:05

604737	16:38-11/28	16:39-11/28	Client Returned Home
604737	18:20-11/28	18:21-11/28	*No Verifier Detected
604737	18:26-11/28	18:27-11/28	Successful
604737	22:08-11/28	22:08-11/28	Busy
604737	22:39-11/28	22:51-11/28	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:51-11/29	06:51-11/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:31-11/29	07:43-11/29	Client Left Home
604737	13:43-11/29	13:43-11/29	RF Check-Not Home
Total Statuses Printed:			87

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:05

 DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Officer: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		18:44-11/29	18:45-11/29	Hang up
604737		18:54-11/29	18:54-11/29	Hang up
604737		18:59-11/29	19:01-11/29	*Client Home Late
604737		19:03-11/29	19:03-11/29	Pager-Called
604737		19:04-11/29	19:04-11/29	Busy
604737		19:06-11/29	19:06-11/29	Pager-Busy
604737		19:17-11/29	19:17-11/29	Pager-Called
604737		21:15-11/29	21:16-11/29	Successful
604737		03:01-11/30	03:01-11/30	RF Check-Client Home
604737		09:01-11/30	09:01-11/30	RF Check-Client Home
604737		13:30-11/30	13:42-11/30	Client Left Home
604737		14:30-11/30	14:31-11/30	Client Returned Home
604737		16:35-11/30	16:36-11/30	Successful
604737		20:31-11/30	20:32-11/30	RF Check-Client Home
604737		20:30-11/30	20:41-11/30	*Client Left Early
604737		20:43-11/30	20:44-11/30	*No Verifier Detected
604737		20:45-11/30	20:45-11/30	Pager-Called
604737		20:44-11/30	20:45-11/30	*Client Home Late
604737		20:47-11/30	20:47-11/30	Busy
604737		20:48-11/30	20:48-11/30	Pager-Called
604737		21:55-11/30	21:56-11/30	*No Verifier Detected
604737		22:01-11/30	22:02-11/30	Hang up

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:20

DCC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
State: NJ
Office: DO 12
Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5
Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	16:14-12/07	16:15-12/07	Successful	
604737	19:47-12/07	19:48-12/07	Successful	
604737	20:25-12/07	20:26-12/07	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	04:26-12/08	04:26-12/08	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	10:26-12/08	10:27-12/08	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	11:50-12/08	12:04-12/08	Client Left Home	
604737	12:05-12/08	12:06-12/08	Client Returned Home	
604737	12:20-12/08	12:42-12/08	Client Left Home	
604737	13:09-12/08	13:10-12/08	Client Returned Home	
604737	13:08-12/08	13:19-12/08	Client Left Home	
604737	13:29-12/08	13:32-12/08	Client Returned Home	
604737	13:36-12/08	13:48-12/08	Client Left Home	
604737	14:37-12/08	14:38-12/08	Client Returned Home	
604737	15:20-12/08	15:20-12/08	Hang up	
604737	15:30-12/08	15:31-12/08	Successful	
604737	20:37-12/08	20:38-12/08	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	21:24-12/08	21:25-12/08	Successful	
604737	04:38-12/09	04:39-12/09	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	07:31-12/09	07:43-12/09	Client Left Home	
604737	13:43-12/09	13:43-12/09	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	14:55-12/09	14:55-12/09	Client Added/Changed	
604737	18:29-12/09	18:31-12/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:31-12/09	18:43-12/09	Client Left Home	
604737	18:49-12/09	18:50-12/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:11-12/09	19:12-12/09	Successful	
604737	02:49-12/10	02:50-12/10	RF Check-Client Home	

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:20

```

-----
604737 07:28-12/10 07:39-12/10 Client Left Home
604737 13:39-12/10 13:40-12/10 RF Check-Not Home
604737 19:12-12/10 19:12-12/10 *Client Home Late
604737 19:14-12/10 19:14-12/10 Pager-Called
604737 19:15-12/10 19:15-12/10 Hang up
604737 19:25-12/10 19:25-12/10 Hang up
604737 19:36-12/10 19:37-12/10 *Invalid Insert
604737 19:38-12/10 19:38-12/10 Pager-Called
604737 21:51-12/10 21:51-12/10 Hang up
604737 22:01-12/10 22:01-12/10 Busy
604737 22:16-12/10 22:16-12/10 *Invalid Insert
604737 22:18-12/10 22:18-12/10 Pager-Called
604737 03:12-12/11 03:14-12/11 RF Check-Client Home
604737 08:20-12/11 08:32-12/11 Client Left Home
604737 02:16-12/06 02:16-12/06 RF Check-Client Home
604737 08:16-12/06 08:17-12/06 RF Check-Client Home
604737 09:04-12/06 09:15-12/06 Client Left Home
604737 15:15-12/06 15:16-12/06 RF Check-Not Home
604737 18:46-12/06 18:47-12/06 *Client Home Late
604737 18:49-12/06 18:49-12/06 Pager-Called
604737 20:05-12/06 20:05-12/06 Successful
604737 21:21-12/06 21:22-12/06 Successful
604737 02:47-12/07 02:48-12/07 RF Check-Client Home
604737 08:48-12/07 08:48-12/07 RF Check-Client Home
604737 10:30-12/07 10:42-12/07 Client Left Home
604737 14:08-12/07 14:16-12/07 Client Returned Home
604737 14:12-12/07 14:23-12/07 Client Left Home
604737 14:24-12/07 14:25-12/07 Client Returned Home
Total Statuses Printed: 54
-----

```

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:36

 DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-20-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ

Officer: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017500464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:5
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:5
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:5
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:5
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:5
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:5
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:5

Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	03:12-12/11	03:14-12/11	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	08:20-12/11	08:32-12/11	Client Left Home	
604737	14:32-12/11	15:25-12/11	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	17:45-12/11	17:47-12/11	Client Returned Home	
604737	17:44-12/11	17:55-12/11	Client Left Home	
604737	19:01-12/11	19:02-12/11	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:24-12/11	19:25-12/11	Successful	
604737	03:02-12/12	03:03-12/12	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	08:49-12/12	09:11-12/12	Client Left Home	
604737	09:03-12/12	09:11-12/12	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	15:11-12/12	15:15-12/12	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	18:06-12/12	18:08-12/12	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:35-12/12	18:47-12/12	Client Left Home	
604737	19:03-12/12	19:06-12/12	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:28-12/12	19:29-12/12	*No A.C. Power	
604737	19:29-12/12	19:31-12/12	A.C. Power Restored	
604737	19:31-12/12	19:31-12/12	Successful	
604737	19:32-12/12	19:32-12/12	Pager-Called	
604737	21:06-12/12	21:22-12/12	*Client Left Early	
604737	21:24-12/12	21:25-12/12	Hang up	
604737	21:26-12/12	21:26-12/12	Pager-Called	
604737	21:56-12/12	21:57-12/12	Hang up	
604737	00:17-12/13	00:27-12/13	*Client Home Late	
604737	00:29-12/13	00:29-12/13	Pager-Called	
604737	06:27-12/13	06:28-12/13	RF Check-Client Home	

Total Statuses Printed: 28

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:52

```
-----  
604737 14:24-12/15 14:25-12/15 Client Returned Home  
604737 14:48-12/15 14:48-12/15 Busy  
604737 15:03-12/15 15:04-12/15 Successful  
604737 18:25-12/15 18:25-12/15 Busy  
604737 18:40-12/15 18:40-12/15 Recorded Speech  
604737 18:50-12/15 18:50-12/15 Recorded Speech  
604737 18:52-12/15 18:52-12/15 Pager-Called  
604737 20:25-12/15 20:26-12/15 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 22:11-12/15 22:13-12/15 **Wristlet Tamper**  
604737 22:15-12/15 22:15-12/15 Pager-Called  
604737 22:44-12/15 22:45-12/15 Wristlet Reset  
Total Statuses Printed: 90  
-----
```

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:52

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
State: NJ
Office: DD 12

Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
Message Number: 02 Telsel Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES, POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	06:45-12/16	06:45-12/16		RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:40-12/16	07:51-12/16		Client Left Home
604737	13:51-12/16	13:52-12/16		RF Check-Not Home
604737	18:33-12/16	18:34-12/16		Client Returned Home
604737	18:42-12/16	18:54-12/16		Client Left Home
604737	19:00-12/16	19:02-12/16		Client Returned Home
604737	19:11-12/16	19:12-12/16		**Wristlet Tamper**
604737	19:14-12/16	19:14-12/16		Pager-Busy
604737	19:37-12/16	19:38-12/16		Successful
604737	21:00-12/16	21:01-12/16		Successful
604737	03:12-12/17	03:14-12/17		RF Check-Client Home
604737	09:14-12/17	09:15-12/17		RF Check-Client Home
604737	14:16-12/17	14:27-12/17		Client Left Home
604737	18:47-12/17	18:51-12/17		Client Returned Home
604737	18:46-12/17	18:58-12/17		Client Left Home
604737	19:03-12/17	19:03-12/17		Client Returned Home
604737	20:52-12/17	20:53-12/17		Hang up
604737	21:02-12/17	21:02-12/17		Successful
604737	03:03-12/18	03:13-12/18		RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:27-12/18	07:39-12/18		Client Left Home
604737	11:09-12/18	11:09-12/18		Client Added/Changed
604737	13:39-12/18	13:39-12/18		RF Check-Not Home
604737	18:12-12/18	18:13-12/18		Client Returned Home
604737	18:32-12/18	18:32-12/18		Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 12:52

604737	20:03-12/18	20:04-12/18	Successful
604737	03:43-12/19	03:43-12/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:41-12/19	07:53-12/19	Client Left Home
604737	13:53-12/19	14:04-12/19	RF Check-Not Home
604737	18:44-12/19	18:51-12/19	Client Returned Home
604737	19:49-12/19	20:00-12/19	Client Left Home
604737	20:01-12/19	20:02-12/19	Client Returned Home
604737	22:42-12/19	22:42-12/19	Successful
604737	23:22-12/19	23:22-12/19	Busy
604737	23:25-12/19	23:25-12/19	Busy
604737	23:27-12/19	23:27-12/19	Busy
604737	23:29-12/19	23:29-12/19	Busy
604737	23:31-12/19	23:31-12/19	Pager-Busy
604737	23:41-12/19	23:41-12/19	Pager-Called
604737	04:02-12/20	04:02-12/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:51-12/20	08:03-12/20	Client Left Home
604737	00:17-12/13	00:27-12/13	*Client Home Late
604737	00:29-12/13	00:29-12/13	Pager-Called
604737	06:27-12/13	06:28-12/13	RF Check-Client Home
604737	09:07-12/13	09:18-12/13	Client Left Home
604737	12:54-12/13	12:55-12/13	Client Returned Home
604737	13:09-12/13	13:21-12/13	Client Left Home
604737	18:53-12/13	18:53-12/13	Client Returned Home
604737	19:29-12/13	19:30-12/13	Successful
604737	20:30-12/13	20:31-12/13	*No Verifier Detected
604737	20:35-12/13	20:36-12/13	Successful
604737	22:28-12/13	22:29-12/13	Successful
604737	02:53-12/14	02:54-12/14	RF Check-Client Home
604737	08:54-12/14	08:54-12/14	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:06-12/14	11:18-12/14	*Client Left Early
604737	11:20-12/14	11:21-12/14	*No Verifier Detected
604737	11:22-12/14	11:22-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	11:49-12/14	11:49-12/14	Busy
604737	11:54-12/14	11:54-12/14	Client Added/Changed
604737	12:04-12/14	12:04-12/14	Busy
604737	12:19-12/14	12:19-12/14	Hang up
604737	12:21-12/14	12:21-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	12:40-12/14	12:41-12/14	*Client Home Late
604737	12:43-12/14	12:43-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	18:25-12/14	18:26-12/14	*No A.C. Power
604737	18:28-12/14	18:28-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	18:54-12/14	19:02-12/14	A.C. Power Restored
604737	19:14-12/14	19:14-12/14	Recorded Speech
604737	19:24-12/14	19:24-12/14	Recorded Speech
604737	19:34-12/14	19:34-12/14	Busy
604737	19:38-12/14	19:38-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	03:01-12/15	03:05-12/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	09:05-12/15	09:06-12/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:28-12/15	11:29-12/15	Successful
604737	11:33-12/15	11:33-12/15	Client Added/Changed
604737	11:34-12/15	11:34-12/15	Client Added/Changed
604737	12:07-12/15	12:07-12/15	Client Added/Changed
604737	12:08-12/15	12:08-12/15	Client Added/Changed

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 13:39

604737	18:47-12/20	18:59-12/20	Client Left Home
604737	19:11-12/20	19:14-12/20	Client Returned Home
604737	19:11-12/20	19:23-12/20	Client Left Home
604737	22:27-12/20	22:27-12/20	Client Returned Home
604737	22:53-12/20	22:54-12/20	Successful
604737	23:01-12/20	23:16-12/20	*Client Left Early
604737	23:14-12/20	23:16-12/20	*Client Home Late
604737	23:18-12/20	23:18-12/20	Busy
604737	23:19-12/20	23:19-12/20	Pager-Called
604737	23:21-12/20	23:21-12/20	Busy
604737	23:22-12/20	23:22-12/20	Pager-Called
604737	23:23-12/20	23:23-12/20	Busy
604737	23:25-12/20	23:25-12/20	Hang up
604737	23:28-12/20	23:28-12/20	Pager-Called
604737	23:54-12/21	00:16-12/21	*Client Left Early
604737	00:07-12/21	00:16-12/21	*Client Home Late
604737	00:18-12/21	00:19-12/21	Successful
604737	00:19-12/21	00:19-12/21	Pager-Called
604737	06:16-12/21	06:17-12/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:25-12/21	11:36-12/21	Client Left Home
604737	14:19-12/21	14:20-12/21	Client Returned Home
604737	14:53-12/21	14:54-12/21	Successful
604737	15:31-12/21	15:32-12/21	Successful
604737	19:46-12/21	19:46-12/21	Hang up
604737	19:56-12/21	19:57-12/21	Successful
604737	20:20-12/21	20:20-12/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737	21:33-12/21	21:33-12/21	Busy
604737	21:48-12/21	21:49-12/21	Successful
604737	04:20-12/22	04:21-12/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:20-12/22	10:21-12/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:56-12/22	13:08-12/22	Client Left Home
604737	14:37-12/22	14:41-12/22	Client Returned Home
604737	15:08-12/22	15:08-12/22	Busy
604737	15:10-12/22	15:10-12/22	Busy
604737	15:12-12/22	15:12-12/22	Pager-Called
604737	19:39-12/22	19:40-12/22	Successful
604737	20:41-12/22	20:41-12/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737	04:41-12/23	04:42-12/23	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:44-12/23	07:56-12/23	Client Left Home
604737	13:56-12/23	13:56-12/23	RF Check-Not Home
604737	18:35-12/23	18:36-12/23	Client Returned Home
604737	18:41-12/23	18:52-12/23	Client Left Home
604737	19:07-12/23	19:08-12/23	Client Returned Home
Total Statuses Printed: 122			

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 13:39

604737	23:23-12/24	23:24-12/24	Successful
604737	06:35-12/25	06:35-12/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:35-12/25	12:36-12/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:30-12/25	13:42-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	14:07-12/25	14:07-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	14:38-12/25	14:50-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	14:49-12/25	14:50-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	15:31-12/25	15:42-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	16:04-12/25	16:05-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	16:55-12/25	17:06-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	17:23-12/25	17:24-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	18:03-12/25	18:15-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	21:05-12/25	21:07-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	21:08-12/25	21:20-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	21:33-12/25	22:31-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	21:32-12/25	22:31-12/25	Client Left Home
604737	22:33-12/25	22:34-12/25	Client Returned Home
604737	22:58-12/25	22:58-12/25	Recorded Speech
604737	23:08-12/25	23:09-12/25	Successful
604737	23:18-12/25	23:18-12/25	Successful
604737	06:34-12/26	06:34-12/26	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:10-12/26	12:29-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	13:29-12/26	13:30-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	13:42-12/26	13:54-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	14:24-12/26	14:25-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	14:28-12/26	14:40-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	15:17-12/26	15:17-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	15:49-12/26	16:01-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	16:09-12/26	16:10-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	16:20-12/26	16:32-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	17:41-12/26	17:42-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	17:47-12/26	18:39-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	18:37-12/26	18:39-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	18:56-12/26	19:08-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	19:20-12/26	19:21-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	19:28-12/26	19:39-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	20:52-12/26	20:54-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	20:51-12/26	21:02-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	22:03-12/26	22:05-12/26	Client Returned Home
604737	22:04-12/26	22:15-12/26	Client Left Home
604737	22:41-12/26	22:46-12/26	*Client Home Late
604737	22:48-12/26	22:48-12/26	Pager-Called
604737	22:50-12/26	22:51-12/26	Successful
604737	23:19-12/26	23:19-12/26	Busy
604737	23:21-12/26	23:21-12/26	Busy
604737	23:23-12/26	23:23-12/26	Busy
604737	23:25-12/26	23:25-12/26	Busy
604737	23:27-12/26	23:27-12/26	Pager-Called
604737	06:46-12/27	06:46-12/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	04:02-12/20	04:02-12/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:51-12/20	08:03-12/20	Client Left Home
604737	14:03-12/20	14:03-12/20	RF Check-Not Home
604737	17:58-12/20	17:58-12/20	Client Returned Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 13:39

 DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ

Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59

Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		19:28-12/23	19:40-12/23	Client Left Home
604737		22:45-12/23	22:45-12/23	Busy
604737		22:35-12/23	22:45-12/23	Client Returned Home
604737		23:00-12/23	23:01-12/23	Successful
604737		23:24-12/23	23:24-12/23	Busy
604737		23:26-12/23	23:26-12/23	Recorded Speech
604737		23:28-12/23	23:28-12/23	Busy
604737		23:30-12/23	23:30-12/23	Pager-Called
604737		03:52-12/24	03:52-12/24	Client Added/Changed
604737		06:45-12/24	06:46-12/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737		07:46-12/24	07:57-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		13:57-12/24	14:05-12/24	RF Check-Not Home
604737		15:05-12/24	15:06-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		15:28-12/24	15:39-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		16:05-12/24	16:08-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		16:20-12/24	16:32-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		16:31-12/24	16:32-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		18:33-12/24	18:45-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		18:47-12/24	18:48-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		18:50-12/24	19:01-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		19:14-12/24	19:15-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		19:16-12/24	19:38-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		20:10-12/24	20:16-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		20:13-12/24	20:25-12/24	Client Left Home
604737		22:34-12/24	22:35-12/24	Client Returned Home
604737		22:02-12/24	22:10-12/24	Successful

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 14:10

604737	19:58-01/02	19:59-01/02	Client Returned Home
604737	20:17-01/02	20:29-01/02	Client Left Home
604737	22:17-01/02	22:32-01/02	Client Returned Home
604737	23:03-01/02	23:04-01/02	Successful
604737	23:18-01/02	23:18-01/02	Busy
604737	23:22-01/02	23:22-01/02	Recorded Speech
604737	23:24-01/02	23:24-01/02	Busy
604737	23:26-01/02	23:26-01/02	Pager-Called
604737	06:32-01/03	06:32-01/03	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:46-12/27	06:46-12/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:46-12/27	12:47-12/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:45-12/27	12:56-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	14:56-12/27	14:58-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	15:13-12/27	15:25-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	15:47-12/27	15:47-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	16:56-12/27	17:11-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	18:08-12/27	18:09-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	18:15-12/27	18:27-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	18:29-12/27	18:30-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	18:29-12/27	18:41-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	19:06-12/27	19:07-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	19:08-12/27	19:20-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	19:33-12/27	19:33-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	19:35-12/27	19:43-12/27	Client Left Home
604737	22:02-12/27	22:04-12/27	Client Returned Home
604737	22:45-12/27	22:46-12/27	Successful
604737	23:16-12/27	23:16-12/27	Busy
604737	23:18-12/27	23:18-12/27	Successful
604737	06:04-12/28	06:04-12/28	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:04-12/28	12:05-12/28	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:03-12/28	12:14-12/28	Client Left Home
604737	13:51-12/28	13:57-12/28	Client Returned Home
604737	14:01-12/28	14:16-12/28	Client Left Home
604737	14:48-12/28	14:49-12/28	Successful
604737	16:54-12/28	16:54-12/28	Busy
604737	17:09-12/28	17:09-12/28	Busy
604737	17:24-12/28	17:25-12/28	*No Verifier Detected
604737	17:26-12/28	17:27-12/28	Pager-Called
604737	18:23-12/28	18:24-12/28	Successful
604737	20:16-12/28	20:16-12/28	RF Check-Client Home
604737	04:16-12/29	04:17-12/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:16-12/29	10:17-12/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737	14:55-12/29	14:55-12/29	Busy
604737	15:10-12/29	15:11-12/29	Successful
604737	16:11-12/29	16:12-12/29	Successful
604737	16:17-12/29	16:26-12/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737	16:54-12/29	16:54-12/29	Busy
604737	17:09-12/29	17:09-12/29	Busy
604737	17:24-12/29	17:25-12/29	Successful
604737	22:26-12/29	22:33-12/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:33-12/30	06:34-12/30	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:54-12/30	08:13-12/30	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 14:10

```
-----
604737 18:14-12/30 18:15-12/30 Client Returned Home
604737 18:21-12/30 18:49-12/30 Client Left Home
604737 18:46-12/30 18:49-12/30 Client Returned Home
604737 19:51-12/30 20:03-12/30 Client Left Home
604737 20:56-12/30 20:57-12/30 Client Returned Home
604737 22:59-12/30 23:00-12/30 Successful
604737 23:29-12/30 23:29-12/30 Successful
604737 04:56-12/31 04:57-12/31 RF Check-Client Home
604737 10:57-12/31 10:57-12/31 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:42-12/31 13:25-12/31 Client Left Home
604737 14:48-12/31 14:50-12/31 Client Returned Home
604737 14:51-12/31 15:26-12/31 Client Left Home
604737 15:05-12/31 15:26-12/31 Client Returned Home
604737 15:37-12/31 16:50-12/31 Client Left Home
604737 16:41-12/31 16:50-12/31 Client Returned Home
604737 17:27-12/31 17:38-12/31 Client Left Home
604737 18:32-12/31 18:33-12/31 Client Returned Home
604737 20:07-12/31 20:44-12/31 Client Left Home
604737 20:38-12/31 20:44-12/31 Client Returned Home
604737 21:14-12/31 21:26-12/31 Client Left Home
Total Statuses Printed: 99
-----
```

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 14:10

 DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH GRD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: 00 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Seeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL
 Curfew: Period 1 Period 2 Period 3 Period 4
 Start Stop Start Stop Start Stop Start Stop
 Monday 00:01 09:50 16:10 17:00 17:01 22:00 22:01 23:59
 Tuesday 00:01 09:50 16:10 17:00 17:01 22:00 22:01 23:59
 Wednesday 00:01 09:50 16:10 17:00 17:01 22:00 22:01 23:59
 Thursday 00:01 09:50 16:10 17:00 17:01 22:00 22:01 23:59
 Friday 00:01 09:50 16:10 18:20 22:40 23:10 23:11 23:59
 Saturday 00:01 09:50 16:10 17:00 17:01 22:00 22:01 23:59
 Sunday 00:01 10:20 16:10 17:00 17:01 22:00 22:01 23:59
 Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls
 Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		22:34-12/31	22:47-12/31	Client Returned Home
604737		22:55-12/31	22:56-12/31	Successful
604737		23:30-12/31	23:30-12/31	Successful
604737		06:46-01/01	06:47-01/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:47-01/01	13:07-01/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737		15:07-01/01	15:19-01/01	Client Left Home
604737		15:40-01/01	15:41-01/01	Client Returned Home
604737		15:40-01/01	15:52-01/01	Client Left Home
604737		18:58-01/01	18:59-01/01	Client Returned Home
604737		20:04-01/01	20:38-01/01	Client Left Home
604737		20:18-01/01	20:38-01/01	Client Returned Home
604737		22:57-01/01	22:57-01/01	Successful
604737		23:13-01/01	23:14-01/01	Successful
604737		04:38-01/02	04:38-01/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737		10:38-01/02	10:39-01/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737		13:40-01/02	14:03-01/02	Client Left Home
604737		16:36-01/02	16:38-01/02	Client Returned Home
604737		16:55-01/02	17:07-01/02	Client Left Home
604737		17:10-01/02	17:27-01/02	Client Returned Home
604737		17:27-01/02	17:39-01/02	Client Left Home
604737		17:56-01/02	17:57-01/02	Client Returned Home
604737		17:58-01/02	18:09-01/02	Client Left Home
604737		18:10-01/02	18:11-01/02	Client Returned Home
604737		18:19-01/02	18:41-01/02	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 14:54

604737	19:22-01/03	19:55-01/03	Client Left Home
604737	19:57-01/03	19:58-01/03	Client Returned Home
604737	19:58-01/03	20:10-01/03	Client Left Home
604737	20:23-01/03	20:24-01/03	Client Returned Home
604737	20:22-01/03	20:24-01/03	Client Left Home
604737	22:32-01/03	22:33-01/03	Client Returned Home
604737	22:43-01/03	22:58-01/03	*Client Left Early
604737	23:00-01/03	23:01-01/03	*No Verifier Detected
604737	23:02-01/03	23:02-01/03	Pager-Called
604737	23:02-01/03	23:02-01/03	*Client Home Late
604737	23:04-01/03	23:05-01/03	Successful
604737	23:05-01/03	23:05-01/03	Pager-Called
604737	23:30-01/03	23:31-01/03	Successful
604737	07:02-01/04	07:03-01/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:03-01/04	13:04-01/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:01-01/04	13:13-01/04	Client Left Home
604737	13:21-01/04	13:22-01/04	Client Returned Home
604737	13:29-01/04	13:40-01/04	Client Left Home
604737	14:30-01/04	14:32-01/04	Client Returned Home
604737	14:44-01/04	14:45-01/04	Successful
604737	15:21-01/04	15:22-01/04	Successful
604737	16:16-01/04	16:16-01/04	Busy
604737	16:31-01/04	16:31-01/04	Busy
604737	16:46-01/04	16:46-01/04	Busy
604737	17:01-01/04	17:01-01/04	Busy
604737	17:03-01/04	17:03-01/04	Pager-Called
604737	20:31-01/04	20:32-01/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737	04:32-01/05	05:14-01/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:14-01/05	11:15-01/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:33-01/05	14:05-01/05	Client Left Home
604737	14:06-01/05	14:08-01/05	Client Returned Home
604737	15:08-01/05	15:09-01/05	Hang up
604737	15:10-01/05	15:10-01/05	Successful
604737	17:32-01/05	17:32-01/05	*Invalid Insert
604737	17:42-01/05	17:42-01/05	Successful
604737	20:08-01/05	20:08-01/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	04:08-01/06	04:09-01/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	08:01-01/06	08:13-01/06	Client Left Home
604737	14:13-01/06	14:13-01/06	RF Check-Not Home
604737	18:15-01/06	18:17-01/06	Client Returned Home
604737	18:18-01/06	18:33-01/06	Client Left Home
604737	18:37-01/06	18:39-01/06	Client Returned Home
604737	22:41-01/06	22:41-01/06	Successful
604737	23:23-01/06	23:24-01/06	Successful
604737	02:39-01/07	02:39-01/07	RF Check-Client Home
604737	07:53-01/07	08:05-01/07	Client Left Home
604737	14:05-01/07	14:05-01/07	RF Check-Not Home
604737	17:38-01/07	17:39-01/07	Client Returned Home
604737	19:21-01/07	19:33-01/07	Client Left Home
604737	19:34-01/07	19:36-01/07	Client Returned Home
604737	19:34-01/07	19:46-01/07	Client Left Home
604737	21:22-01/07	22:00-01/07	Client Returned Home
604737	22:50-01/07	22:50-01/07	

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-02-1992

Current Time: 14:54

```
-----  
604737 23:00-01/07 23:01-01/07 Successful  
604737 23:28-01/07 23:29-01/07 Successful  
604737 06:00-01/08 06:01-01/08 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 08:00-01/08 08:14-01/08 Client Left Home  
604737 14:14-01/08 14:15-01/08 RF Check-Not Home  
604737 18:08-01/08 18:09-01/08 Client Returned Home  
604737 18:27-01/08 18:38-01/08 Client Left Home  
604737 19:50-01/08 19:52-01/08 Client Returned Home  
604737 22:49-01/08 22:50-01/08 *Invalid Insert  
604737 22:59-01/08 22:59-01/08 Successful  
604737 23:28-01/08 23:28-01/08 Successful  
604737 03:51-01/09 03:52-01/09 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 07:51-01/09 08:02-01/09 Client Left Home  
Total Statuses Printed: 32  
-----
```

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
------------------	----------------	----------------------	-----------------------	------------------

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 14:34

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates * Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DG 12

Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Seeper Number: 7778904 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5
 Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICS , POSS GDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:00
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:00
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:00
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:00
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:00
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:00
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:00
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	14:02-01/09	14:03-01/09	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	17:55-01/09	17:56-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:29-01/09	18:41-01/09	Client Left Home	
604737	18:48-01/09	19:49-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:28-01/09	19:40-01/09	Client Left Home	
604737	19:40-01/09	19:42-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:41-01/09	19:54-01/09	Client Left Home	
604737	19:56-01/09	19:57-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:59-01/09	20:10-01/09	Client Left Home	
604737	20:14-01/09	20:15-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	20:15-01/09	20:27-01/09	Client Left Home	
604737	21:10-01/09	21:11-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	21:48-01/09	21:59-01/09	Client Left Home	
604737	22:45-01/09	22:45-01/09	Busy	
604737	22:34-01/09	22:45-01/09	Client Returned Home	
604737	23:00-01/09	23:01-01/09	Successful	
604737	23:15-01/09	23:16-01/09	Successful	
604737	06:45-01/10	06:46-01/10	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	06:32-01/03	06:32-01/03	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	11:25-01/03	11:46-01/03	Client Left Home	
604737	17:45-01/03	17:46-01/03	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	18:08-01/03	18:09-01/03	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:07-01/03	18:22-01/03	Client Left Home	
604737	18:28-01/03	18:29-01/03	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:28-01/03	18:40-01/03	Client Left Home	

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 15:09

 DOC Number: YN110282 Dates Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TCNY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 102 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00

Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	06:45-01/10	06:46-01/10	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	11:44-01/10	11:56-01/10	Client Left Home	
604737	17:56-01/10	17:56-01/10	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	18:47-01/10	18:48-01/10	Client Returned Home	
604737	21:02-01/10	21:14-01/10	Client Left Home	
604737	22:04-01/10	22:05-01/10	Client Returned Home	
604737	23:00-01/10	23:01-01/10	Successful	
604737	23:30-01/10	23:31-01/10	Successful	
604737	06:05-01/11	06:06-01/11	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	10:52-01/11	11:04-01/11	Client Left Home	
604737	11:49-01/11	11:57-01/11	Client Returned Home	
604737	11:56-01/11	12:08-01/11	Client Left Home	
604737	13:57-01/11	14:24-01/11	Client Returned Home	
604737	14:03-01/11	14:24-01/11	Client Left Home	
604737	14:25-01/11	14:26-01/11	Client Returned Home	
604737	14:56-01/11	14:57-01/11	Successful	
604737	20:25-01/11	20:26-01/11	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	20:42-01/11	20:43-01/11	Successful	
604737	04:26-01/12	04:26-01/12	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	10:26-01/12	10:27-01/12	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	13:07-01/12	13:18-01/12	Client Left Home	
604737	14:09-01/12	14:09-01/12	Client Returned Home	
604737	14:08-01/12	14:20-01/12	Client Left Home	
604737	14:34-01/12	14:35-01/12	Client Returned Home	

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 15:09

```

-----
604737 19:53-01/12 19:54-01/12 Successful
604737 20:35-01/12 20:36-01/12 RF Check-Client Home
604737 04:36-01/13 04:37-01/13 RF Check-Client Home
604737 07:48-01/13 08:00-01/13 Client Left Home
604737 14:00-01/13 14:14-01/13 RF Check-Not Home
604737 17:45-01/13 17:46-01/13 Client Returned Home
604737 19:12-01/13 19:23-01/13 Client Left Home
604737 21:35-01/13 22:10-01/13 Client Returned Home
604737 22:05-01/13 22:17-01/13 Client Left Home
604737 22:32-01/13 22:32-01/13 Client Returned Home
604737 22:50-01/13 22:51-01/13 Successful
604737 23:26-01/13 23:26-01/13 Busy
604737 23:28-01/13 23:29-01/13 Successful
604737 06:32-01/14 06:32-01/14 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:33-01/14 12:33-01/14 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:53-01/14 13:31-01/14 Client Left Home
604737 13:46-01/14 13:47-01/14 Client Returned Home
604737 13:56-01/14 14:07-01/14 Client Left Home
604737 14:37-01/14 14:38-01/14 Client Returned Home
604737 14:42-01/14 14:54-01/14 Client Left Home
604737 15:58-01/14 15:59-01/14 Client Returned Home
604737 16:18-01/14 16:30-01/14 Client Left Home
604737 18:09-01/14 18:14-01/14 Client Returned Home
604737 18:42-01/14 18:54-01/14 Client Left Home
604737 19:43-01/14 19:44-01/14 Client Returned Home
604737 21:05-01/14 21:16-01/14 Client Left Home
604737 21:43-01/14 21:48-01/14 Client Returned Home
604737 22:46-01/14 22:47-01/14 Successful
604737 23:30-01/14 23:30-01/14 Busy
604737 23:32-01/14 23:32-01/14 Pager-Called
604737 05:48-01/15 05:49-01/15 RF Check-Client Home
604737 07:50-01/15 08:02-01/15 Client Left Home
604737 14:02-01/15 14:02-01/15 RF Check-Not Home
604737 14:10-01/15 14:11-01/15 Client Returned Home
604737 14:11-01/15 14:23-01/15 Client Left Home
604737 18:01-01/15 18:05-01/15 Client Returned Home
604737 18:09-01/15 18:20-01/15 Client Left Home
604737 18:36-01/15 18:41-01/15 Client Returned Home
604737 23:08-01/15 23:08-01/15 Successful
604737 23:20-01/15 23:21-01/15 Successful
604737 02:41-01/16 02:48-01/16 RF Check-Client Home
604737 07:49-01/16 08:00-01/16 Client Left Home
604737 14:00-01/16 14:01-01/16 RF Check-Not Home
604737 17:41-01/16 17:42-01/16 Client Returned Home
604737 18:00-01/16 18:11-01/16 Client Left Home
604737 18:54-01/16 18:56-01/16 Client Returned Home
604737 19:22-01/16 19:34-01/16 Client Left Home
604737 19:44-01/16 19:45-01/16 Client Returned Home
604737 22:47-01/16 22:47-01/16 Successful
604737 23:26-01/16 23:27-01/16 Telsol Interrupted
604737 23:26-01/16 23:26-01/16
    
```

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 15:15

DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992

Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH

Client's Name: PALMER, TONY

Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON

Zip: 07922

State: NJ

Office: 00 12

Equipment #: 604737

Receiver and Verifier Combined

Beeper Number: 7778804

Phone Number: 12017900464

Message Number: 02

Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		17:38-01/17	19:09-01/17	Client Returned Home
604737		18:32-01/17	19:09-01/17	Client Left Home
604737		19:27-01/17	19:28-01/17	Client Returned Home
604737		19:48-01/17	20:06-01/17	Client Left Home
604737		20:19-01/17	20:32-01/17	Client Returned Home
604737		23:08-01/17	23:08-01/17	Telsol Interrupted
604737		23:25-01/17	23:26-01/17	Successful
604737		04:32-01/18	04:33-01/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737		10:32-01/18	10:33-01/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737		14:45-01/18	14:45-01/18	Successful
604737		16:33-01/18	16:53-01/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737		21:37-01/18	21:37-01/18	Successful
604737		22:59-01/18	23:03-01/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737		07:03-01/19	07:07-01/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:55-01/19	13:07-01/19	Client Left Home
604737		13:14-01/19	13:15-01/19	Client Returned Home
604737		13:38-01/19	13:53-01/19	Client Left Home
604737		14:35-01/19	14:36-01/19	Client Returned Home
604737		14:56-01/19	14:56-01/19	Busy
604737		14:58-01/19	14:58-01/19	Busy
604737		15:00-01/19	15:00-01/19	Busy
604737		15:02-01/19	15:02-01/19	Busy
604737		15:04-01/19	15:04-01/19	Pager-Called
604737		20:36-01/19	20:55-01/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737		04:55-01/20	04:56-01/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737		08:00-01/20	08:11-01/20	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 15:51

```
-----  
604737 14:11-01/20 14:18-01/20 RF Check-Not Home  
604737 19:17-01/20 19:19-01/20 Client Returned Home  
604737 19:32-01/20 19:54-01/20 Client Left Home  
604737 20:27-01/20 20:31-01/20 Client Returned Home  
604737 23:07-01/20 23:07-01/20 Successful  
604737 23:15-01/20 23:16-01/20 Successful  
604737 04:31-01/21 04:32-01/21 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 10:13-01/21 11:50-01/21 Client Left Home  
604737 10:32-01/21 11:50-01/21 RF Check-Not Home  
604737 17:50-01/21 17:50-01/21 RF Check-Not Home  
604737 19:41-01/21 19:43-01/21 Client Returned Home  
604737 20:42-01/21 20:54-01/21 Client Left Home  
604737 22:36-01/21 22:46-01/21 Client Returned Home  
604737 22:55-01/21 22:55-01/21 Busy  
604737 23:30-01/21 23:30-01/21 Busy  
604737 23:32-01/21 23:32-01/21 Pager-Called  
604737 06:46-01/22 06:46-01/22 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 08:03-01/22 08:15-01/22 Client Left Home  
604737 14:15-01/22 14:15-01/22 RF Check-Not Home  
604737 18:38-01/22 18:39-01/22 Client Returned Home  
604737 19:04-01/22 19:16-01/22 Client Left Home  
604737 19:22-01/22 19:23-01/22 Client Returned Home  
604737 19:48-01/22 20:00-01/22 Client Left Home  
604737 20:46-01/22 20:50-01/22 Client Returned Home  
604737 20:48-01/22 21:00-01/22 Client Left Home  
604737 21:03-01/22 21:04-01/22 Client Returned Home  
604737 22:43-01/22 22:43-01/22 Busy  
604737 22:58-01/22 22:58-01/22 Successful  
604737 23:22-01/22 23:23-01/22 Successful  
604737 05:04-01/23 05:04-01/23 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 11:04-01/23 11:05-01/23 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 12:44-01/23 13:04-01/23 Client Left Home  
604737 14:28-01/23 14:32-01/23 Client Returned Home  
604737 16:22-01/23 16:34-01/23 Client Left Home  
604737 18:13-01/23 18:18-01/23 Client Returned Home  
604737 18:12-01/23 18:24-01/23 Client Left Home  
604737 18:26-01/23 18:27-01/23 Client Returned Home  
604737 19:24-01/23 19:36-01/23 Client Left Home  
604737 19:41-01/23 19:41-01/23 Client Returned Home  
604737 19:41-01/23 20:31-01/23 Client Left Home  
604737 21:40-01/23 21:41-01/23 Client Returned Home  
604737 23:04-01/23 23:05-01/23 Successful  
604737 23:25-01/23 23:26-01/23 Successful  
604737 03:41-01/24 03:41-01/24 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 03:45-01/17 03:46-01/17 RF Check-Client Home  
604737 07:52-01/17 08:07-01/17 Client Left Home  
604737 14:07-01/17 14:08-01/17 RF Check-Not Home  
-----  
Total Statuses Printed: 73  
-----
```

604737	05:58-02/05	05:59-02/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:59-02/05	11:59-02/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:41-02/05	13:53-02/05	Client Left Home
604737	14:02-02/05	14:02-02/05	Client Returned Home
604737	14:09-02/05	14:21-02/05	Client Left Home
604737	16:08-02/05	16:09-02/05	Client Returned Home
604737	16:18-02/05	16:19-02/05	Successful
604737	17:09-02/05	17:10-02/05	*No Verifier Detected
604737	17:14-02/05	17:15-02/05	Successful
604737	19:04-02/05	19:04-02/05	Busy
604737	19:52-02/05	19:05-02/05	*Client Left Early
604737	19:07-02/05	19:07-02/05	Hang up
604737	19:09-02/05	19:09-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	19:19-02/05	19:20-02/05	Hang up
604737	19:29-02/05	19:30-02/05	Hang up
604737	19:31-02/05	19:31-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	21:17-02/05	21:18-02/05	*Client Home Late
604737	21:21-02/05	21:21-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	21:17-02/05	21:35-02/05	*Client Left Early
604737	21:28-02/05	21:35-02/05	*Client Home Late
604737	21:38-02/05	21:39-02/05	Hang up
604737	21:39-02/05	21:39-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	21:40-02/05	21:40-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	21:55-02/05	22:06-02/05	*Client Left Early
604737	22:08-02/05	22:09-02/05	Hang up
604737	22:10-02/05	22:10-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	23:14-02/05	23:15-02/05	*Client Home Late
604737	23:17-02/05	23:17-02/05	Pager-Called
604737	07:15-02/06	07:15-02/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:15-02/06	13:16-02/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:28-02/06	13:40-02/06	Client Left Home
604737	14:22-02/06	14:22-02/06	Client Returned Home
604737	14:24-02/06	14:46-02/06	Client Left Home
604737	15:30-02/06	15:30-02/06	Client Returned Home
604737	15:33-02/06	15:45-02/06	Client Left Home
604737	16:07-02/06	16:09-02/06	Client Returned Home
604737	16:39-02/06	16:40-02/06	Successful
604737	22:09-02/06	22:09-02/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:09-02/07	06:10-02/07	RF Check-Client Home
604737	05:51-01/31	05:52-01/31	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:27-01/31	10:28-01/31	Client Left Home
604737	14:21-01/31	14:35-01/31	Client Returned Home
604737	15:06-01/31	15:41-01/31	Client Left Home
604737	16:08-01/31	16:11-01/31	Client Returned Home
604737	16:48-01/31	16:49-01/31	*No Verifier Detected
604737	16:53-01/31	16:54-01/31	Successful
604737	22:11-01/31	22:12-01/31	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:11-02/01	06:12-02/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:45-02/01	11:57-02/01	Client Left Home
604737	12:37-02/01	12:38-02/01	Client Returned Home
604737	16:50-02/01	16:51-02/01	Invalid Verifier *
604737	17:00-02/01	17:01-02/01	Successful
604737	18:11-02/01	18:12-02/01	Successful

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 16:42

DCC Number: YN110282 Dates: Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 20 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522

State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsel Number: 5
 Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICE, POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		11:20-02/03	11:31-02/03	Client Left Home
604737		12:21-02/03	12:44-02/03	Client Returned Home
604737		12:24-02/03	12:44-02/03	Client Left Home
604737		12:48-02/03	12:49-02/03	Client Returned Home
604737		13:11-02/03	13:56-02/03	Client Left Home
604737		14:10-02/03	14:19-02/03	Client Returned Home
604737		14:09-02/03	14:21-02/03	Client Left Home
604737		15:54-02/03	15:55-02/03	Client Returned Home
604737		15:27-02/03	15:27-02/03	Successful
604737		15:55-02/04	05:56-02/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737		11:11-02/04	11:11-02/04	Client Added/Changed
604737		11:32-02/04	11:43-02/04	Client Left Home
604737		12:24-02/04	12:25-02/04	Client Returned Home
604737		12:36-02/04	12:47-02/04	Client Left Home
604737		13:08-02/04	13:11-02/04	Client Returned Home
604737		13:29-02/04	13:31-02/04	Client Returned Home
604737		15:31-02/04	15:32-02/04	Client Left Home
604737		15:33-02/04	15:51-02/04	Client Returned Home
604737		15:54-02/04	15:55-02/04	Client Returned Home
604737		16:22-02/04	16:22-02/04	Hang up
604737		16:33-02/04	16:34-02/04	Invalid Verifier #
604737		16:43-02/04	16:45-02/04	Busy
604737		16:47-02/04	16:47-02/04	Pager-Called
604737		21:54-02/04	21:58-02/04	RF Check-Client Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 17:05

 DOC Number: YN110282 Dates Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ

Officer: DC 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778604 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59

Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls
 Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	15:58-02/11	16:04-02/11		Client Returned Home
604737	16:28-02/11	16:29-02/11		Successful
604737	19:58-02/11	19:59-02/11		Successful
604737	22:04-02/11	22:05-02/11		RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:05-02/12	06:05-02/12		RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:05-02/12	12:05-02/12		RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:57-02/12	13:09-02/12		Client Left Home
604737	13:32-02/12	13:33-02/12		Client Returned Home
604737	13:33-02/12	13:44-02/12		Client Left Home
604737	14:40-02/12	14:40-02/12		Client Returned Home
604737	14:47-02/12	15:19-02/12		Client Left Home
604737	16:14-02/12	16:21-02/12		*Client Home Late
604737	16:23-02/12	16:23-02/12		Pager-Called
604737	19:17-02/12	19:18-02/12		Successful
604737	22:21-02/12	22:23-02/12		RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:24-02/13	06:25-02/13		RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:59-02/13	12:10-02/13		Client Left Home
604737	13:28-02/13	13:29-02/13		Client Returned Home
604737	15:38-02/13	16:00-02/13		Client Left Home
604737	16:19-02/13	16:20-02/13		*Client Home Late
604737	16:22-02/13	16:22-02/13		Pager-Called
604737	16:57-02/13	16:57-02/13		Successful
604737	19:13-02/13	19:14-02/13		Successful
604737	21:46-02/13	21:46-02/13		Busy
604737	21:48-02/13	21:48-02/13		Busy
604737	21:50-02/13	21:50-02/13		

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 17:28

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates * Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: 00 12
 Equipment #: 504737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59

Supervision: No Calls No Calls No Calls No Calls

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
504737	12:20-02/20	12:47-02/20	RF Check-Client Home	
504737	14:06-02/20	14:18-02/20	Client Left Home	
504737	15:52-02/20	15:53-02/20	Client Returned Home	
504737	16:15-02/20	16:16-02/20	Successful	
504737	20:14-02/20	20:15-02/20	Successful	
504737	21:53-02/20	21:53-02/20	RF Check-Client Home	
504737	05:53-02/21	05:53-02/21	RF Check-Client Home	
504737	06:26-02/14	06:26-02/14	RF Check-Client Home	
504737	12:26-02/14	12:26-02/14	RF Check-Client Home	
504737	13:13-02/14	13:25-02/14	Client Left Home	
504737	15:41-02/14	15:41-02/14	Client Added/Changed	
504737	15:53-02/14	15:57-02/14	Client Returned Home	
504737	18:08-02/14	18:20-02/14	*Client Left Early	
504737	18:19-02/14	18:21-02/14	*Client Home Late	
504737	18:22-02/14	18:23-02/14	Successful	
504737	18:24-02/14	18:24-02/14	Pager-Called	
504737	19:03-02/14	19:15-02/14	Client Left Home	
504737	19:39-02/14	19:52-02/14	Client Returned Home	
504737	19:39-02/14	19:55-02/14	Client Returned Home	
504737	19:45-02/14	19:57-02/14	Client Left Home	
504737	19:56-02/14	19:57-02/14	Client Returned Home	
504737	19:57-02/14	20:09-02/14	Client Left Home	
504737	22:40-02/14	22:41-02/14	*Client Home Late	
504737	22:43-02/14	22:43-02/14	Pager-Called	
504737	23:02-02/14	23:02-02/14	Busy	

152X

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 17:28

604737	23:06-02/14	23:06-02/14	Recorded Speech
604737	23:08-02/14	23:08-02/14	Pager-Called
604737	06:41-02/15	06:41-02/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:41-02/15	12:42-02/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	14:53-02/15	15:10-02/15	Client Left Home
604737	15:14-02/15	15:15-02/15	Client Returned Home
604737	15:22-02/15	15:37-02/15	Client Left Home
604737	15:25-02/15	15:26-02/15	*Client Home Late
604737	15:28-02/15	15:28-02/15	Pager-Called
604737	15:39-02/15	15:39-02/15	Successful
604737	19:31-02/15	19:32-02/15	Successful
604737	22:25-02/15	22:27-02/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:27-02/16	06:27-02/16	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:27-02/16	12:33-02/16	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:32-02/16	13:44-02/16	Client Left Home
604737	15:25-02/16	15:38-02/16	Client Returned Home
604737	15:40-02/16	15:52-02/16	Client Left Home
604737	15:58-02/16	15:59-02/16	Client Returned Home
604737	16:52-02/16	16:53-02/16	Successful
604737	17:43-02/16	17:44-02/16	Successful
604737	21:39-02/16	22:00-02/16	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:00-02/17	06:00-02/17	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:00-02/17	12:00-02/17	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:48-02/17	13:00-02/17	Client Left Home
604737	16:00-02/17	16:01-02/17	Client Returned Home
604737	16:16-02/17	16:17-02/17	Successful
604737	21:49-02/17	21:50-02/17	Successful
604737	22:01-02/17	22:01-02/17	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:01-02/18	06:02-02/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:29-02/18	11:41-02/18	Client Left Home
604737	12:22-02/18	12:23-02/18	Client Returned Home
604737	12:21-02/18	12:33-02/18	Client Left Home
604737	15:54-02/18	15:55-02/18	Client Returned Home
604737	16:35-02/18	16:36-02/18	Successful
604737	21:55-02/18	21:56-02/18	RF Check-Client Home
604737	05:56-02/19	05:56-02/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:56-02/19	12:00-02/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:32-02/19	13:44-02/19	Client Left Home
604737	14:26-02/19	14:33-02/19	Client Returned Home
604737	14:35-02/19	14:47-02/19	Client Left Home
604737	16:15-02/19	16:15-02/19	Busy
604737	16:04-02/19	16:13-02/19	Client Returned Home
604737	16:30-02/19	16:30-02/19	Busy
604737	18:18-02/19	18:19-02/19	Successful
604737	21:50-02/19	21:51-02/19	Successful
604737	22:13-02/19	22:19-02/19	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:13-02/20	06:20-02/20	RF Check-Client Home

Total Statuses Printed: 73

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 17:41

DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992

Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH

Client's Name: PALMER, TONY

Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST.

, PATTERSON

Zip: 07522

State: NJ

Office: DD 12

Equipment #: 604737

Receiver and Verifier Combined

Beeper Number: 7778804

Phone Number: 12017900464

Message Number: 02

Telcel Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES, POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	05:53-02/21	05:53-02/21	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	11:53-02/21	11:54-02/21	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	15:06-02/21	15:17-02/21	Client Left Home	
604737	15:37-02/21	15:39-02/21	Client Returned Home	
604737	15:38-02/21	15:57-02/21	Client Left Home	
604737	16:06-02/21	16:07-02/21	Client Returned Home	
604737	16:30-02/21	16:31-02/21	Successful	
604737	17:30-02/21	17:30-02/21	Busy	
604737	18:07-02/21	18:08-02/21	Successful	
604737	22:07-02/21	22:08-02/21	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	22:56-02/21	22:57-02/21	Successful	
604737	06:07-02/22	06:08-02/22	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	12:08-02/22	12:08-02/22	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	13:40-02/22	13:52-02/22	Client Left Home	
604737	14:26-02/22	14:27-02/22	Client Returned Home	
604737	14:29-02/22	14:40-02/22	Client Left Home	
604737	16:10-02/22	16:12-02/22	*Client Home Late	
604737	16:14-02/22	16:14-02/22	Pager-Busy	
604737	16:24-02/22	16:24-02/22	Pager-Called	
604737	16:37-02/22	16:38-02/22	Successful	
604737	20:41-02/22	20:42-02/22	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	20:46-02/22	20:47-02/22	Successful	

604737 12:12-02/23 12:13-02/23 RF Check-Client Home
 604737 14:44-02/23 14:55-02/23 Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 17:41

604737	15:58-02/23	15:59-02/23	Client Returned Home
604737	15:57-02/23	15:08-02/23	Client Left Home
604737	15:08-02/23	15:10-02/23	Client Returned Home
604737	16:45-02/23	16:46-02/23	Successful
604737	17:33-02/23	17:33-02/23	Busy
604737	17:48-02/23	17:48-02/23	Successful
604737	21:52-02/23	21:52-02/23	Successful
604737	22:09-02/23	22:10-02/23	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:10-02/24	06:10-02/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:10-02/24	12:11-02/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737	14:21-02/24	14:33-02/24	Client Left Home
604737	15:13-02/24	15:14-02/24	Client Returned Home
604737	15:14-02/24	15:25-02/24	Client Left Home
604737	16:06-02/24	16:08-02/24	Client Returned Home
604737	16:55-02/24	16:56-02/24	Successful
604737	18:24-02/24	18:25-02/24	Successful
604737	22:07-02/24	22:08-02/24	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:08-02/25	06:09-02/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:08-02/25	12:09-02/25	RF Check-Client Home
604737	15:14-02/25	15:25-02/25	Client Left Home
604737	16:10-02/25	16:11-02/25	*Client Home Late
604737	16:12-02/25	16:13-02/25	Hang up
604737	16:14-02/25	16:14-02/25	Pager-Called
604737	16:22-02/25	16:23-02/25	Successful
604737	20:04-02/25	20:17-02/25	*Client Left Early
604737	20:19-02/25	20:20-02/25	*No Verifier Detected
604737	20:21-02/25	20:21-02/25	Pager-Called
604737	20:27-02/25	20:28-02/25	*Client Home Late
604737	20:30-02/25	20:30-02/25	Pager-Called
604737	04:27-02/26	07:18-02/26	RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:07-02/26	10:19-02/26	Client Left Home
604737	12:11-02/26	12:11-02/26	Client Returned Home
604737	13:04-02/26	13:19-02/26	Client Left Home
604737	16:03-02/26	16:08-02/26	Client Returned Home
604737	16:14-02/26	16:15-02/26	Hang up
604737	16:24-02/26	16:24-02/26	Successful
604737	22:08-02/26	22:08-02/26	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:08-02/27	06:12-02/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:12-02/27	12:12-02/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:56-02/27	14:08-02/27	Client Left Home
604737	15:28-02/27	15:40-02/27	Client Returned Home
604737	15:30-02/27	15:41-02/27	Client Left Home
604737	16:14-02/27	16:15-02/27	*Client Home Late
604737	16:17-02/27	16:17-02/27	Pager-Called
604737	16:39-02/27	16:39-02/27	Busy
604737	16:54-02/27	16:54-02/27	Successful
604737	17:41-02/27	17:42-02/27	Successful
604737	22:15-02/27	22:15-02/27	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:13-02/28	06:15-02/28	RF Check-Client Home

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		15:21-02/28	15:26-02/28	Client Left Home
604737		16:06-02/28	16:06-02/28	Client Returned Home
604737		16:41-02/28	16:41-02/28	Busy
604737		18:13-02/28	18:14-02/28	Successful
604737		22:06-02/28	22:07-02/28	RF Check-Client Home
604737		23:04-02/28	23:04-02/28	Successful
604737		06:07-02/29	06:07-02/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:07-02/29	12:08-02/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737		15:11-02/29	15:31-02/29	Client Left Home
604737		15:44-02/29	15:49-02/29	Client Returned Home
604737		16:39-02/29	16:40-02/29	Successful
604737		19:52-02/29	19:53-02/29	Successful
604737		21:49-02/29	21:49-02/29	RF Check-Client Home
604737		05:49-03/01	05:50-03/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737		11:50-03/01	11:54-03/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737		13:57-03/01	14:08-03/01	Client Left Home
604737		16:08-03/01	16:09-03/01	Client Returned Home
604737		16:17-03/01	16:29-03/01	*Client Left Early
604737		16:31-03/01	16:31-03/01	Hang up
604737		16:33-03/01	16:33-03/01	Pager-Called
604737		16:32-03/01	16:33-03/01	*Client Home Late
604737		16:36-03/01	16:36-03/01	Pager-Called
604737		19:16-03/01	19:16-03/01	Busy
604737		19:31-03/01	19:31-03/01	Busy
604737		19:46-03/01	19:47-03/01	Successful
604737		20:30-02/01	20:30-02/01	Busy

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:03

604737		20:45-03/01	20:46-03/01	Successful
604737		22:33-03/01	22:37-03/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737		06:37-03/02	06:37-03/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:37-03/02	12:45-03/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:35-03/02	12:47-03/02	Client Left Home
604737		13:59-03/02	14:11-03/02	Client Returned Home
604737		15:17-03/02	15:28-03/02	Client Left Home
604737		16:07-03/02	16:12-03/02	Client Returned Home
604737		16:43-03/02	16:44-03/02	Successful
604737		19:06-03/02	19:06-03/02	Busy
604737		19:23-03/02	19:24-03/02	Successful
604737		22:11-03/02	22:24-03/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737		06:24-03/03	06:25-03/03	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:25-03/03	12:25-03/03	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:16-03/03	12:33-03/03	Client Left Home
604737		13:18-03/03	13:19-03/03	Client Returned Home
604737		13:35-03/03	13:46-03/03	Client Left Home
604737		13:57-03/03	14:01-03/03	Client Returned Home
604737		13:56-03/03	14:07-03/03	Client Left Home
604737		16:05-03/03	16:06-03/03	Client Returned Home
604737		16:43-03/03	16:44-03/03	Successful

604737	12:14-03/04	12:13-03/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:45-03/04	13:55-03/04	Client Left Home
604737	16:09-03/04	16:10-03/04	Client Returned Home
604737	16:28-03/04	16:28-03/04	Busy
604737	16:43-03/04	16:44-03/04	Successful
604737	21:50-03/04	21:50-03/04	Busy
604737	21:53-03/04	21:53-03/04	Busy
604737	21:56-03/04	21:57-03/04	Successful
604737	22:10-03/04	22:11-03/04	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:11-03/05	06:11-03/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:11-03/05	12:18-03/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	13:58-03/05	14:10-03/05	Client Left Home
604737	16:12-03/05	16:16-03/05	*Client Home Late
604737	16:18-03/05	16:18-03/05	Pager-Called
604737	16:41-03/05	16:42-03/05	Successful
604737	19:40-03/05	19:41-03/05	Successful
604737	21:17-03/05	21:17-03/05	Busy
604737	21:32-03/05	21:33-03/05	*No Verifier Detected
604737	21:34-03/05	21:34-03/05	Pager-Called
604737	22:16-03/05	22:17-03/05	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:16-03/06	06:17-03/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:15-02/28	06:15-02/28	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:15-02/28	13:01-02/28	RF Check-Client Home
Total Statuses Printed:			72

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	12:20-03/07	12:29-03/07	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	13:40-03/07	13:59-03/07	Client Left Home	
604737	14:01-03/07	14:03-03/07	Client Returned Home	
604737	14:15-03/07	14:26-03/07	Client Left Home	
604737	16:06-03/07	16:11-03/07	Client Returned Home	
604737	16:12-03/07	16:12-03/07	Successful	
604737	16:51-03/07	16:51-03/07	Busy	
604737	16:53-03/07	16:53-03/07	Busy	
604737	16:55-03/07	16:55-03/07	Busy	
604737	16:59-03/07	16:59-03/07	Busy	
604737	17:01-03/07	17:01-03/07	Pager-Called	
604737	20:15-03/07	20:15-03/07	Busy	
604737	20:31-03/07	20:31-03/07	Busy	
604737	20:45-03/07	20:47-03/07	Successful	
604737	22:11-03/07	22:19-03/07	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	06:18-03/08	06:19-03/08	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	12:19-03/08	12:20-03/08	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	16:56-03/08	16:56-03/08	No Answer	
604737	16:58-03/08	16:58-03/08	No Answer	
604737	17:04-03/08	17:05-03/08	Successful	
604737	18:20-03/08	18:25-03/08	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	02:25-03/09	02:26-03/09	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	08:25-03/09	08:25-03/09	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	14:25-03/09	14:30-03/09	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	16:29-03/09	16:29-03/09	Successful	
604737	20:30-03/09	20:31-03/09	RF Check-Client Home	

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:26

604737	22:53-03/09	22:53-03/09	Client Added/Changed	
604737	04:30-03/10	04:31-03/10	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	10:31-03/10	10:32-03/10	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	15:08-03/10	15:23-03/10	Client Left Home	
604737	15:26-03/10	15:33-03/10	Client Returned Home	
604737	15:24-03/10	15:36-03/10	Client Left Home	
604737	16:13-03/10	16:15-03/10	Client Home Late	
604737	16:17-03/10	16:17-03/10	Pager-Called	
604737	16:26-03/10	16:27-03/10	Successful	
604737	17:51-03/10	17:51-03/10	Busy	
604737	18:06-03/10	18:06-03/10	Busy	
604737	18:21-03/10	18:21-03/10	Busy	
604737	18:36-03/10	18:36-03/10	Busy	
604737	18:38-03/10	18:38-03/10	Pager-Called	
604737	22:14-03/10	22:25-03/10	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	06:25-03/11	06:26-03/11	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	12:26-03/11	12:33-03/11	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	13:44-03/11	14:01-03/11	Client Left Home	
604737	15:54-03/11	15:57-03/11	Client Returned Home	
604737	16:24-03/11	16:24-03/11	Busy	

APR-02-12 FRI 18:51 10:00:00 TEL 408-305-7211 FAX 408-305-7211

604737	20:35-03/11	20:37-03/11	Successful
604737	21:57-03/11	22:01-03/11	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:01-03/12	06:01-03/12	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:49-03/12	11:49-03/12	Client Added/Changed
604737	12:01-03/12	12:02-03/12	RF Check-Client Home
604737	16:18-03/12	16:19-03/12	Successful
604737	18:01-03/12	18:06-03/12	RF Check-Client Home
604737	20:31-03/12	20:31-03/12	Busy
604737	20:46-03/12	20:46-03/12	Busy
604737	21:01-03/12	21:01-03/12	Busy
604737	21:16-03/12	21:16-03/12	Busy
604737	21:18-03/12	21:18-03/12	Pager-Called
604737	02:03-03/13	02:18-03/13	RF Check-Client Home
604737	08:18-03/13	08:18-03/13	RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:16-03/06	06:17-03/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:17-03/06	12:47-03/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	15:24-03/06	15:35-03/06	Client Left Home
604737	16:11-03/06	16:12-03/06	*Client Home Late
604737	16:14-03/06	16:14-03/06	Pager-Busy
604737	16:24-03/06	16:24-03/06	Pager-Called
604737	17:47-03/06	17:48-03/06	Successful
604737	22:12-03/06	22:16-03/06	RF Check-Client Home
604737	22:57-03/06	22:57-03/06	Successful
604737	06:16-03/07	06:20-03/07	RF Check-Client Home

Total Statuses Printed: 72

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:40

```

-----
604737 17:26-03/17 17:27-03/17 Successful
604737 18:07-03/17 18:07-03/17 RF Check-Client Home
604737 19:10-03/17 19:11-03/17 Successful
604737 02:07-03/18 02:08-03/18 RF Check-Client Home
604737 08:08-03/18 08:08-03/18 RF Check-Client Home
604737 14:08-03/18 14:08-03/18 RF Check-Client Home
604737 16:16-03/18 16:17-03/18 *No Verifier Detected
604737 16:21-03/18 16:22-03/18 Successful
604737 20:08-03/18 20:18-03/18 RF Check-Client Home
604737 04:17-03/19 04:25-03/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 10:25-03/19 10:25-03/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 16:25-03/19 16:26-03/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 16:28-03/19 16:29-03/19 Telsel Interrupted
604737 22:26-03/19 22:29-03/19 RF Check-Client Home
604737 06:29-03/20 06:30-03/20 RF Check-Client Home
604737 02:05-03/13 02:18-03/13 RF Check-Client Home
604737 08:18-03/13 08:18-03/13 RF Check-Client Home
604737 14:18-03/13 14:22-03/13 RF Check-Client Home
604737 14:39-03/13 14:53-03/13 Client Left Home
604737 15:50-03/13 15:51-03/13 Client Returned Home
604737 15:52-03/13 16:16-03/13 Client Left Home
604737 16:08-03/13 16:16-03/13 Client Returned Home
604737 17:58-03/13 17:59-03/13 Successful
604737 22:16-03/13 22:21-03/13 RF Check-Client Home
604737 22:51-03/13 22:52-03/13 Successful
604737 06:21-03/14 06:22-03/14 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:22-03/14 12:26-03/14 RF Check-Client Home
604737 15:14-03/14 15:26-03/14 Client Left Home
604737 16:17-03/14 16:18-03/14 *Client Home Late
604737 16:20-03/14 16:20-03/14 Pager-Called
604737 16:51-03/14 16:52-03/14 Successful
Total Statuses Printed: 57
-----
    
```

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:40

 DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12

Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsel Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	18:03-03/14	18:04-03/14		Successful
604737	19:07-03/14	19:07-03/14		Busy
604737	19:22-03/14	19:23-03/14		*No Verifier Detected
604737	19:24-03/14	19:24-03/14		Pager-Called
604737	22:17-03/14	22:18-03/14		RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:18-03/15	06:18-03/15		RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:18-03/15	12:18-03/15		RF Check-Client Home
604737	16:42-03/15	16:43-03/15		Successful
604737	18:18-03/15	18:19-03/15		RF Check-Client Home
604737	02:19-03/16	02:19-03/16		RF Check-Client Home
604737	08:19-03/16	08:20-03/16		RF Check-Client Home
604737	10:57-03/16	11:08-03/16		Client Left Home
604737	12:45-03/16	12:46-03/16		Client Returned Home
604737	13:03-03/16	13:14-03/16		Client Left Home
604737	13:54-03/16	13:55-03/16		Client Returned Home
604737	13:53-03/16	14:23-03/16		Client Left Home
604737	16:04-03/16	16:06-03/16		Client Returned Home
604737	16:48-03/16	16:49-03/16		Successful
604737	18:02-03/16	18:02-03/16		Busy
604737	18:17-03/16	18:17-03/16		No Answer
604737	18:27-03/16	18:28-03/16		Successful
604737	22:06-03/16	22:06-03/16		RF Check-Client Home
604737	06:06-03/17	06:06-03/17		RF Check-Client Home
604737	12:06-03/17	12:07-03/17		RF Check-Client Home
604737	16:14-03/17	16:14-03/17		Busy
604737	16:29-03/17	16:30-03/17		Successful

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 19:55

E04737 21:46-03/21 21:47-03/21 Successful
Total Statuses Printed: 27

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 18:55

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992

Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH

Client's Name: PALMER, TONY

Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522

State: NJ

Officer: DC 12

Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined

Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017300464

Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES, POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		22:19-03/21	22:23-03/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737		06:23-03/22	06:23-03/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:23-03/22	12:23-03/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737		16:39-03/22	16:40-03/22	Successful
604737		18:23-03/22	18:24-03/22	RF Check-Client Home
604737		18:59-03/22	18:59-03/22	Busy
604737		19:14-03/22	19:15-03/22	Successful
604737		02:24-03/23	03:37-03/23	RF Check-Client Home
604737		06:29-03/20	06:30-03/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:30-03/20	12:30-03/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737		15:10-03/20	15:22-03/20	Client Left Home
604737		16:03-03/20	16:04-03/20	Client Returned Home
604737		18:03-03/20	18:03-03/20	Busy
604737		18:18-03/20	18:19-03/20	Successful
604737		22:04-03/20	22:04-03/20	RF Check-Client Home
604737		23:09-03/20	23:10-03/20	*No Verifier Detected
604737		23:11-03/20	23:11-03/20	Pager-Called
604737		06:04-03/21	06:04-03/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:04-03/21	12:10-03/21	RF Check-Client Home
604737		12:23-03/21	12:34-03/21	Client Left Home
604737		14:19-03/21	14:20-03/21	Client Returned Home
604737		15:08-03/21	15:30-03/21	Client Left Home
604737		16:11-03/21	16:19-03/21	*Client Home Late
604737		16:21-03/21	16:21-03/21	Pager-Called
604737		16:34-03/21	16:35-03/21	*No Verifier Detected
604737		16:40-03/21	16:41-03/21	Successful

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 19:44

DOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsel Number: 15

Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	15:48-03/23	15:37-03/23	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	16:17-03/23	16:16-03/23	Hang up	
604737	16:19-03/23	16:20-03/23	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	16:22-03/23	16:22-03/23	Pager-Called	
604737	20:38-03/23	20:38-03/23	Busy	
604737	20:48-03/23	20:48-03/23	Busy	
604737	21:36-03/23	21:55-03/23	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	05:54-03/24	05:55-03/24	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	11:55-03/24	12:09-03/24	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	16:31-03/24	16:32-03/24	Successful	
604737	17:24-03/24	17:25-03/24	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	17:26-03/24	17:26-03/24	Pager-Called	
604737	18:09-03/24	18:09-03/24	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	21:46-03/24	21:46-03/24	No Answer	
604737	21:56-03/24	21:56-03/24	No Answer	
604737	21:58-03/24	21:58-03/24	No Answer	
604737	22:00-03/24	22:00-03/24	Pager-Called	
604737	02:09-03/25	02:10-03/25	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	08:09-03/25	08:10-03/25	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	14:10-03/25	14:10-03/25	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	14:46-03/25	14:58-03/25	Client Left Home	
604737	15:58-03/25	16:00-03/25	Client Returned Home	
604737	16:37-03/25	16:37-03/25	Hang up	
604737	16:40-03/25	16:41-03/25	Successful	
604737	17:09-03/25	17:09-03/25	Successful	
604737	21:55-03/25	21:55-03/25	Successful	

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 13:44

```

-----
604737 22:00-03/25 22:03-03/25 RF Check-Client Home
604737 06:03-03/26 06:04-03/26 RF Check-Client Home
604737 11:51-03/26 12:18-03/26 Client Left Home
604737 12:04-03/26 12:18-03/26 RF Check-Not Home
604737 14:53-03/26 14:54-03/26 Client Returned Home
604737 15:34-03/26 15:49-03/26 Client Left Home
604737 15:52-03/26 15:56-03/26 Client Returned Home
604737 17:36-03/26 17:36-03/26 Busy
604737 17:46-03/26 17:46-03/26 Successful
604737 21:56-03/26 22:00-03/26 RF Check-Client Home
604737 06:00-03/27 06:00-03/27 RF Check-Client Home
604737 12:00-03/27 12:04-03/27 RF Check-Client Home
604737 14:22-03/27 14:33-03/27 Client Left Home
604737 15:56-03/27 15:57-03/27 Client Returned Home
-----
Total Statuses Printed: 40
    
```

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 20:03

DOC Number: YN110282 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
State: NJ

Office: DO 12 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Equipment #: 604737 Phone Number: 12017300464
Beeper Number: 7778804 Telsol Number: 5
Message Number: 02

Offense: ABSTRUCTING JUSTICS , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	06:00-03/27	06:00-03/27	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	12:00-03/27	12:04-03/27	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	14:22-03/27	14:33-03/27	Client Left Home	
604737	15:56-03/27	15:57-03/27	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:17-03/27	18:18-03/27	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	18:19-03/27	18:19-03/27	Pager-Busy	
604737	18:29-03/27	18:29-03/27	Pager-Called	
604737	21:57-03/27	22:04-03/27	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	23:02-03/27	23:03-03/27	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	23:04-03/27	23:04-03/27	Pager-Called	
604737	06:04-03/28	06:05-03/28	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	12:04-03/28	12:19-03/28	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	13:49-03/28	14:02-03/28	Client Left Home	
604737	14:59-03/28	15:01-03/28	Client Returned Home	
604737	16:26-03/28	16:27-03/28	Successful	
604737	17:00-03/28	17:00-03/28	Telsol Didn't Respond	
604737	17:02-03/28	17:02-03/28	Telsol Didn't Respond	
604737	17:12-03/28	17:12-03/28	Telsol Didn't Respond	
604737	17:22-03/28	17:22-03/28	Busy	
604737	17:32-03/28	17:32-03/28	Busy	
604737	17:42-03/28	17:42-03/28	Busy	
604737	17:44-03/28	17:44-03/28	Pager-Called	
604737	20:59-03/28	20:59-03/28	Busy	
604737	21:01-03/28	21:05-03/28	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	21:09-03/28	21:10-03/28	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	21:11-03/28	21:11-03/28	Pager-Called	

04737	10:55-04/02	11:10-04/02	Client Left Home
04737	12:53-04/02	12:54-04/02	Client Returned Home
04737	12:52-04/02	13:03-04/02	Client Left Home

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 09:32

04737	12:05-04/02	13:06-04/02	Client Returned Home
04737	14:22-04/02	14:36-04/02	Client Left Home
04737	14:49-04/02	14:51-04/02	Client Returned Home
04737	15:07-04/02	15:07-04/02	Client Added/Changed
04737	15:02-04/02	15:14-04/02	Client Left Home
04737	15:49-04/02	15:50-04/02	Client Returned Home
04737	16:44-04/02	16:45-04/02	Successful
04737	19:16-04/02	19:17-04/02	Successful
04737	21:49-04/02	21:50-04/02	RF Check-Client Home
04737	04:27-04/03	04:38-04/03	*Client Left Early
04737	04:40-04/03	04:40-04/03	Hang up
04737	04:42-04/03	04:42-04/03	Pager-Called
04737	06:04-03/28	06:05-03/28	RF Check-Client Home
04737	12:04-03/28	12:19-03/28	RF Check-Client Home
04737	13:49-03/28	14:02-03/28	Client Left Home
04737	14:59-03/28	15:01-03/28	Client Returned Home
04737	16:26-03/28	16:27-03/28	Successful
04737	17:00-03/28	17:00-03/28	Telset Didn't Respond
04737	17:02-03/28	17:02-03/28	Telset Didn't Respond
04737	17:12-03/28	17:12-03/28	Telset Didn't Respond
04737	17:22-03/28	17:22-03/28	Busy
04737	17:32-03/28	17:32-03/28	Busy
04737	17:42-03/28	17:42-03/28	Busy
04737	17:44-03/28	17:44-03/28	Pager-Called
04737	20:59-03/28	20:59-03/28	Busy
04737	21:01-03/28	21:05-03/28	RF Check-Client Home
04737	21:09-03/28	21:10-03/28	*No Verifier Detected
04737	21:11-03/28	21:11-03/28	Pager-Called
04737	05:05-03/29	05:05-03/29	RF Check-Client Home
04737	11:05-03/29	11:31-03/29	RF Check-Client Home
04737	14:22-03/29	14:33-03/29	Client Left Home
04737	14:41-03/29	14:42-03/29	Client Returned Home
04737	15:32-03/29	15:44-03/29	Client Left Home
04737	15:58-03/29	15:58-03/29	Client Returned Home
04737	16:16-03/29	16:17-03/29	Successful
04737	19:32-03/29	19:32-03/29	Recorded Speech
04737	19:42-03/29	19:42-03/29	Successful
04737	21:58-03/29	21:59-03/29	RF Check-Client Home
04737	05:59-03/30	06:01-03/30	RF Check-Client Home

Total Statuses Printed: 65

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Time: 09:32

CC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
 Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
 Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
 Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON Zip: 07522
 State: NJ
 Office: DO 12
 Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
 Beeper Number: 7778804 Phone Number: 12017900464
 Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Offense:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737		12:01-03/30	12:01-03/30	RF Check-Client Home
604737		14:26-03/30	14:37-03/30	Client Left Home
604737		15:53-03/30	15:55-03/30	Client Returned Home
604737		16:16-03/30	16:17-03/30	Successful
604737		21:54-03/30	21:55-03/30	RF Check-Client Home
604737		05:55-03/31	05:55-03/31	RF Check-Client Home
604737		11:11-03/31	11:22-03/31	Client Left Home
604737		16:15-03/31	16:16-03/31	Successful
604737		17:33-03/31	17:33-03/31	Successful
604737		19:52-03/31	19:52-03/31	RF Check-Client Home
604737		03:52-04/01	03:53-04/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737		09:53-04/01	09:53-04/01	RF Check-Client Home
652796		12:38-04/01	12:58-04/01	Client Left Home
652796		15:44-04/01	15:45-04/01	Client Returned Home
652796		16:31-04/01	16:52-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796		16:54-04/01	16:55-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796		16:56-04/01	16:57-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796		16:58-04/01	16:58-04/01	Pager-Called
652796		17:50-04/01	17:50-04/01	Busy
652796		18:00-04/01	18:01-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796		18:10-04/01	18:10-04/01	Telsol Interrupted

APPENDIX G

Documents Related to Palmer Incident

MOUNTAINVIEW YOUTH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
ANNANDALE, NEW JERSEY 08801

PRE-PAROLE HOME CONFINEMENT PROGRAM APPLICATION

I PALMER, Tony Number 110282

Institution MYCE-H.P. B. Parole Date 4-4-92 M/TN
I hereby request to participate in the PreParole Home Confinement Program. I have been advised of the following Department of Correction rules, regulations, and conditions of the program. I understand that I must have a parole eligibility date of no greater than six (6) months from the date of my placement in the program.

1. I agree to obey all laws.
2. I agree to report as instructed by my Parole Officer.
3. I agree to go directly to the District Parole Office upon leaving my institution of confinement or as otherwise directed by an authorized DoC representative. I agree to remain at my approved residence except during hours permitted by my parole officer; unauthorized absence from my approved residence may be deemed to be an escape under the criminal code;
4. I agree not to change my residence for any reason at any time without the prior approval of my parole officer;
5. I agree to be confined to my approved residence whenever I am not employed (day or evening) except for the hours that my parole officer permits me to search for a job or engage in another approved activity and to comply with any home confinement program modifications made by my parole officer;
6. I agree to maintain telephone service at all times at my approved residence;
7. I agree to respond to all telephone calls made to my approved residence by the Electronic Monitoring System and to comply with its instructions. I acknowledge that these calls will be made randomly, during the the curfew hours imposed by my parole officer;
8. I agree not to tamper with or otherwise damage any of the electronic monitoring equipment which is installed at my residence. I acknowledge that any deliberate damage to the equipment may result in disciplinary action including being assessed repair and/or replacement costs for the equipment involved;
9. I agree not to remove, or attempt to remove the monitoring bracelet or anklet which will be affixed to my wrist or ankle by any authorized officer; any attempt, or removal, to do so may be considered an attempt to escape;

Form #64
SMD
3/6/90

10. I agree to make every effort to obtain employment within (30) days and to maintain that employment; I agree to notify my parole officer immediately upon termination of any employment;

11. I agree not to travel beyond the boundaries of the State of New Jersey under any circumstances;

12. I agree to refrain from any drug use not prescribed for me by a licensed physician;

13. I agree to refrain from alcohol usage in any form;

14. I agree to submit to random and frequent urine testing;

15. I agree to abide by all rules and requirements of the Home Confinement Program;

16. I understand and agree that I will be monitored at home, at work, at school, or any other approved location by my parole officer;

The following conditions may be imposed by the District Parole Supervisor, Assistant District Parole Supervisor or other designated representative:

17. I may be required to avoid association with certain individuals as identified by my parole officer;

18. I may be required to participate in certain outpatient or residential treatment programs as deemed necessary by the Parole Board (as a condition of parole) or my parole officer for successful participation in this program;

19. I agree to any additional conditions deemed appropriate by the District Parole Supervisor, or his representative, or the Department of Corrections, to those stated above to ensure successful participation in this program;

I UNDERSTAND AND AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL THESE CONDITIONS UPON ACCEPTANCE IN THE PREPAROLE HOME CONFINEMENT PROGRAM. I UNDERSTAND THAT NON-COMPLIANCE WITH ANY OF THE ABOVE CONDITIONS MAY BE CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND/OR BE SUFFICIENT CAUSE FOR TERMINATION FROM THIS PROGRAM AND RETURN TO A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS.

Signature: Tony Palmer Date: 9-26-91

Witness: _____ Date: 9-26-91

Chairman, Class Committee: B.A. Howard Date: 9-24-91

c: Inmate
Classification Office
Central Office Coordinator

(Rev. 1.10.90)

BUREAU OFFICE 100-20000 ... 9-633-9246 ... OCT 2 1991 9:43 FROM HANOVER ANNANDALE NO ... PAGE 224

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF PROPOSED HOME CONFINEMENT PLAN

AM

Part I: (To be completed by Inst. Home Confinement Coordinator)

To : District Office No. 12 PAROLE DATE SET 4-11-92 m/m

Inmate's Name PALMER, Tony # 110282
Institution: M.V.C.E. satellite unit: U.S. 11-18
Social Security Number: 158-76-7284 D.O.B.: 11-18-70
Inmate alias (if known): _____

Inmate has approved Parole Plan: YES NO (2nd FL)
Address: 30 North 3rd Street PATRICKSON NJ

Complete Address to be Investigated: Same

Name of Person Accepting Supervision Of Subject on Home Confinement
ALBERTHA PALMER relationship to inmate MOTHER

Phone Number: (201) 790-0464 When likely to be home EVERYDAY 8 AM to 10 PM

Date: 9-26-91 _____
Signature Home Confinement Coordinator

Part II: (To be completed by ISSP Officer)

To: HOME CONFINEMENT COORD., DIV. OF ADULT INST. FAX 609-633-9248
& Institutional Classification Officer.

Residents	Age:	Yes:	No:	Known to Prob/Parole
<u>Al Bertha Palmer</u>	<u>48</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>WILLIAM PALMER</u>	<u>47</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>ALLEN PALMER</u>	<u>30</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Denise Palmer</u>	<u>9</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

if known to Prob/Par give details _____

Will residents accept the inmate on the approved date? YES NO

Do residents seem willing to cooperate with parole authorities?
 YES NO Comments: _____

Home Confinement Plan Approved: YES NO. If no give reasons: _____

Approval Plan

Date: 10/21/91 Richard P. Cicone D#12
Signature, District Parole Supv. or Designee

FORM 688
6/87

Approval Plans

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

DATE: 10/25/91

TO: Institutional Classification Officer
Institutional Home Confinement Coordinator

THRU: Gary J. Hilton, Assistant Commissioner
Division of Adult Institutions

FROM: William M. Bruschini, Pre-Parole Home Confinement Coordinator (609) 292-9453
FAX: 633-9248

RE: PALMER, Tony, MYCF 110282

The above named inmate is approved for transfer to the Pre-Parole Home Confinement Program on WEDNESDAY 10/30/91. He/She is subjected to electronic monitoring at his/her approved residence at:

30 NORTH 3RD ST. PATTERSON, N.J. 2ND FL.

Telephone Number: 201 790-0464. This is your authority to

transfer the above inmate to the custody/supervision of the District Parole Supervisor in Parole District # 12.

PAROLE ELIG. DATE: mm 4/4/92

c Superintendent (Sending Institution)
District Parole Office # DO # 12
Bureau, of Parole, Central Office - I.P.O.
Institutional Parole Officer (Sending Institution)
Regional Institution : NORTHERN STATE
Offender Records Unit, Central Office, D.O.C.
C.I.C.S., Data Base, Garden State
Institutional Parole Counselor (Sending Institution)
State Parole Board, Division of Hearings

NOTE: If telefaxed, receiving agent is responsible for forwarding copies to personnel located at receiving institution. Sender is responsible for forwarding all other copies.

493X

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

F A X COMMUNICATION

PLEASE HAND DELIVER IMMEDIATELY

DATE: 10/25/91

TO: Senior Classification Officer at MYCF
 District Office Supervisor, D.O. 1 12 Att: ISS? Off.
 Classification Officer, Regional Institution at N.S.P.

FR: William M. Bruschini Phone: 292-9453
 Home Confinement Coordinator Fax: 633-9248
 Division of Adult Institutions

RE: PALMER, Tony MYCF 110282

The above subject is being transferred to the Home
 Confinement Program on WEDNESDAY 10/30/91.

It will be the parent institution's responsibility to
 forward two photographs and a copy of the inmate's Face
 Sheet to this office prior to transfer.

* TRANSPORTATION WILL BE PROVIDED BY:

CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION

Note: Sr. Class. Officer - Please forward copy to Institution
 Home Confinement Coordinator

TOTAL OF 2 PAGES IN THIS COMMUNICATION, INCLUDING THIS SHEET.

174X

*Returned
4/2/92
(New
Charge)*

ON GUARD Client Master File
 DOC Number: YN110332 Dates = Entry: 10-12-1991 Termination: 04-02-1992

Officer's Name Last: CICCONE First: RICH Middle:
 Client's Name Last: PALMER First: TONY Middle:
 Address : 30 NORTH 3RD ST. City: PATTERSON State: NJ
 Zip Code: 07532 Office: 00 12 Equipment #: 524707
 Beeper #: 7778804 Phone #: 12017900464 Reg: 02 Telcol: 5
 Offense : ABSTRACTING JUSTICE , POSS CIB WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfews:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	15:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	19:50	22:00	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 3ND FLOOR
 F1-Help F2-Save F3-Prev F4-Next F5-Clr F7-Del F8-Copy F9-Find F10-Exit
 15:43:03

Setting up the PF Receiver

V1.5:

The Equipment Serial Number of the Receiver	[884737]
Incoming Phone Number of the Central Station	[180010018]
Revision Letter of the Receiver	[]
Dialing Method of the PF Receiver	[Pulse Dialing]
Wait Time Before Disconnect	[ThirtyFive Seconds]
Incoming Phone Line to use for Programming	[1]

Fill in all selections or press [ENTER] for the defaults.

F1 - Displays the Help screen	F6 - Clears the current field
F2 - Programs the Receiver	F8 - Reserved for Future Use
F10 - Returns to the Main Menu	

13:53:09

176X

Call Completed. Busy

Telsol Test 10-30-1991, 15:54:44
Phone: 912017900464 Telsol #: 01 Message #: 2

Starting Telsol Test
Sending DC to Telsol
Sending Data to Telsol
Waiting for Outcome of Call
Call Completed. Busy

Telsol Test 10-30-1991, 15:55:09
Phone: 912017900464 Telsol #: 01 Message #: 2

Starting Telsol Test
Sending DC to Telsol
Sending Data to Telsol
Waiting for Outcome of Call
Call Completed. Busy

Telsol Test 10-30-1991, 15:57:13
Phone: 912017900464 Telsol #: 01 Message #: 2

Starting Telsol Test
Sending DC to Telsol
Sending Data to Telsol
Waiting for Outcome of Call
Good Handshake. Wristlet Code: E000

ON GUARD Telsol Test		v2.51
Phone Number [912017900464]	
Telsol Number [01]	Message Code [02]	
Optional Codes for a BEEPER CALL Test: (Message Code must be 08)		
First Pause Value [050]		
Second Pause Value [500]		
Digits to Send after Connect []	
Printer Function is Currently: On		
Current Status of Telsol Test: Good Handshake. Wristlet Code: E000		

F1 - Help	F8 - Stop Telsol Test
F2 - Start Telsol Test	F9 - Change Printer Status
F3 - Communications Trace	F10 - Return to the Main Menu

15:58:34

SSTC 3002 - 10:30 - 2:30 PM

Tony Palmer
#110.232

problem - enclosed

- 10-30-91 - O - s/parent's office for EM hold up
- 10-30-91 - H - P.O. thought s/s line hold up
EM. 30 North 3rd St Pat. (790-0464 (2nd Fl.))
- 10-30-91 - T - P.O. called back EM/Line hold up
EM equipment this date OK'd Test Call.
- 11-4-91 - L. letter to Chief Police Hosing of s/s release
- 11-4-91 - L. FAX. rec'd s/s mention work,
No problem.
- 11-4-91 - L. FAX rec'd. ^(note) s falls too much.
on phone acct to FAX.
- 11-6-91 - T - P.O. called s/at home. s/s EM working
s/went to (Wilson bank Mall.) and P.O. refer
NSES.
possible TOB at staples.
- 11-7-91 - H - P.O. Cicero to # 30 N. 3rd St.
s/kms about. s/ advised P.O. he went to (PIC)
as P.O. Advised and is looking for any time work.
s/s mother advised P.O. of any NO problem at all
attitude good at this time.

10000 Kalman
#110282

~~10000~~
~~110282~~

- 10-23-91 - L - FAX: ~~to Enigma~~ to ENCL the
date ~~discipling change of~~
- 11-25-91 - L - FAX rec'd & full to leg.
- 11-25-91 - O - ^{Cecilia} spread to P.O. the Am. S/dest &
John S/produced a letter for Judge.
Cecilia herself stated that was attached
P.O. to Cecilia. P.O. could S/ on talking here on
this call.
- 11-25-91 - T - P.O. Cicere called P.D. on 3rd floor.
Mike Kelly spoke to his secretary who
told P.O. to send S/ up to Public
Defender's office to Cecilia they will get
back to P.O. Note P.O. get letter
from Judge for file.
- 11-25-91 - T - Cicere 9:30 AM S/ has received
employment 8:00 AM till 5:00 PM. P.O. OK'd.
Mon - Fri
EM will set up schedule.
- 11-26-91 - L - EN OK'd Virginia the date
- 11-26-91 - H - P.O. Cicere to #30 N 30th St Pat N.J.
spat here about & John. S/ job was off back P.O.
transferred to Job. Mervin

100 25 102 15:21 00:12 PATTERSON
Patricia M. Palmer

Tony Palmer
 # 110282

12-11-91 - L. FAX rec'd from SA/Bone
 stating s/s plus 96 the book.

12-12-91 - T. ^{N. 42} Reque Call from SA/Bone
 s/ at Pat Police Dept. P.O. to
 Clark.

12-12-91 - T. P.O. Called Pat ^{Police} Police
 Dept. Booking dept. P.O. advised
 s/ was charged with (Failing to appear)
 given a summons. And ROK called
 to Police Dept not a serious charge. s/ was
 in front of home.

12-12-91 - R. P.O. Call SA/Bone & ATNison to advise
 of subject's status P.O. to advised s/
 on above.

12-12-91 - T. P.O. Ciccone called s/ AM. s/ stated
 he was taking parboy out and officer account.
 s/ will advise of further

12-13-91 - L. FAX rec'd.

- 1-3-91 - L. EM FAX rec'd EM OK'd
 1-6-92 - L. FAX rec'd EM OK'd
- 1-6-92 - H - P.O. ^{Br} Quinn ~~to~~ 30 N 30th St.
 P.O. spoke to S/ at work as P.O.
 T.J. Michael's Mornal \$100 per hr \$210 per
 week. No problem whatsoever.
- 1-7-92 - T. S/ called Am left message with (P.O.
 Cong) ~~to~~ home P.O. Call him
- 1-10-92 - T. S/ called to state re T.J. Michael's.
 Mornal \$700 per. \$300 per week
 (Boes) Danny Delport No problem at
 home. And working all jobs
- 1-15-92. E.P.O. spoke to S/ at T.J. Michael Co S/ made
 \$19000 1-10-92. This per period will be \$300 per
 week. S/ about 45 hrs S/ wants to know his
 status as when he will get paid. P.O. advised
 S/ P.O. will know same. and advise.
- 1-16-92. T. P.O. called Ken Steiner SPB
 Advising of S/ ~~at~~ wants to know
 status.

12/13/91 - L. P.O FAXed 5/5 times
 Change from Court to MRS
 Brown Class. dest N.S.P.
 for Adjustant.

12-13-91 - O. Spent at office to
 Advise that to plan (NO) to
 July to decide the case will be
 heard in February 1992. I went to
 work P.O. Atkand of the
 need not to go to front of his
 home. ^{NPT} I does live in one high
 density crime area in front of his

12-14-91 - Beyer call Ret's of 10:30 2:30 PM

12-15-91. Beyer call Ret's of 10:30 2:30
 P.O. receive original copies.

12-15-91 - T. Beyer call for Rich
 Carlini DO Roset m.s/.

Notes - Employment
Notes for dis. use

Tony Palmer

- 12-15-91 - H. P.O. Ciime & P.O. Rosner
 to SFS home. S/ sent & sold
 #30 N. 3rd St. S/ produced
 his time card to P.O.
 P.O. Rosner written as
 directed by EM/ase.

12-18-91 - T. S/ called State Man to Fish
 work 10:30 to 11:00 P.O.
 spoke to SFS boss Dan Delgado
 440-4468
 PO OK'd

12-18-91 - T. PO called EM/Bure OK'd
 Ann.

12-19-91 - L. FAX read out SAT & Sun
 10:30 - 2:30.
 OK'd.

12-20-91 - L - FAX read Acknowled out thru state
 EM OK

Kinden - enlment
- Dr. in's Licen

Tony Palmer

110282

1-22-92 - T. vice call S/S home.
S/ still working for M.R. Delgado - NO
J.J. Michels Monday
S/Make \$237.00 No other notes.

1-27-93 - H. P.O. ^{MPAIX 1:00 PM}
30 N. 31st St. Pkt. of notes stated -
S/ want to cash check boss told of work
Not there must be someone. P.O. to check
Same. No problem at all others. STA 1-28-92 AM

1-28-92 - O. reported to DB #12 - S/ absent 4
Sta. S/ stated W was very bad ^{4 days} this
week last PM ^{\$241.00} of NAs 90.00
Work 10:00 AM to 4:01 PM. no other notes
note. S/ waiting for call from employer to return
to work P.O. received union this date
Note - S/ going to M.V. to renew driver license
if possible.

1-29-92 - T. P.O. called S/ to advise of schedule
Change Mon to SAT. 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Sunday 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM

1-29-92 - L - P.O. sent to EM to the date

2-4-92 - T. S/ called to state he needs welfare HRS
5:30 PM to 11:00 PM Mon to SAT 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM
Sunday 10:30 AM to 6:00 PM

Prob - employment - check on medical Terry Palmer
has drug usage under # 110282

2-18-92 - H - of home note because he missed his
bus. OK Unperf. EM.

2-25-92 - T. PO call of to Advise of to call his old Boss
for comment, check on NOTES. PO refer
to PIC. of state his usual down has done
up and his notes/with districts super

2-25-92 & 2-29-92 P.O. Also Covering
Carload 2Y Cover on Vac.

2-26-92 - L - Drug screen
Results Negative This date

3-3-92 - T- PO call of to state he may have (PT) JOB and
will need has. PO Advise of to must let P.O. have details of same.

3-3-92 H- P.O. to son submit spot here with his matter of work
also work. PO was Advise of that the
JOB is a Contract and helping keep a some school mistakes
will Advise P.O. of his days. of has no money for Party
P.O. covered of when he allow contract to pay on party

Note P.O. second urine this date. s/c (V2) has cleaned
up after treatment of SA92

Tony Palmer
110252

3-17-92 - L. P.O. made out (SR) arrest on
S of SPB sent to SPB this date

3/17/92 - CAR - CMIS

3-19-92 - T. P.O. called S/P home. S/P unable
to attend SPB because at
6:30 AM there was 6 to 8 inches
of snow roads were treacherous.

3-19-92 - T. P.O. called Pat Munnell Court / Court / Not on file

3-23-92 - T. P.O. called ~~SPB~~ SPB advised that S/P
will be re-scheduled for SPB on Capital Blvd
~~(Court / Court / Not on file)~~

3-27-92 - H. P.O. at 3:30 PM 3/27/92 Pat S/P had visit
his father. S/P alert & able P.O. advised of court
JOB search advised to look present job good
to handle the date P.O. advised S/P to go to
Meyers office on 3-31-92 for JOB ID card
S/P good to go.

3-27-92 - T. P.O. called Pat Munnell Court / Court / Not on file
advised 1991 Book needed Advise P.O. to call 3-28-92.

3-31-92. L. Day seen Parents Negative
This date.

3-3-92. T. PO again call Pat Mumpf Court Clerk they (12-11-91)
located (1991 Doc) (M. 24) which is P.O. that Docid # 16527
(Cheng was Father & daughter) 33.79 \$/wk
Q. in a \$1.50 fee 25% cost \$50 UCCB on 2/5/92
Some male payment 2592 no made payment.
Re Mumpf Court in Lansing M. 11-11-91
\$1.50 fee as of this date PO should check for
their diligences and help in the matter

4-1-92. L. - Transmittal of Renew Rec'd the date
\$60 UCCB \$50 habeas fee \$1000 Debt

4-1-92. 0 - Separated to DO #12 s/ alert & s. chn.
s/ still seeking employment, Problem even
is a girl friend is sick at present time.
s/ may have SOB in near future. P.O.
referred (NJES) (LIC) MARRIAGE of 6/1/92
P.O. should advise this date P.O. should
s/ in paying his penalty. s/ also stated
he is paying fine as directed.

TONY PALMER
#110282

APPROX 5:50 AM
4-3-92 - T- Beeper call to P.O. Advised by
EM/Base Station. Subject was arrested for
MURDER & Poss of weapon. P.O. & go to
home & pick up S/S BOX AND
Assess the situation

4-3-92 - H APPROX 7:00 AM.
P.O. pick up S/S BOX this date
at 30 N. 3rd St. Pat. N.J.
P.O. Deployed Box with Lonnie Selgin EM

4-3-92. T- P.O. Called Det Mike Fine 851-6902
Pat N.J. Police Dept. P.O. ^{returned} Police Dept
has S/I in custody with bracelet. P.O. will
be at Police Dept in short period of time

4-3-92. T. P.O. called Supervisor Ken Krause Trenton
Advised of the situation, who advised P.O.
& go to Police Dept. and pick up
Bracelet

4-3-92. C. P.O. Cicero & P.O. Bernal to Paten Police
Dept spoke & Detective Dept. Mike Fine Advised
P.O. they are using bracelet as evidence gone
P.O. to meet P.O. at Trenton

4-3-92-C PO was also advised that they
are keeping said investigation at
the police Dept at present time.

From Paterson Police Dept.

4-3-92-T-PO called ADPS Bussick Trenton
advised of the situation. that Wristlet
will be kept as evidence at the time
get event reports sent down to Trenton.

4-3-92-T-PO rec'd call ADPS Bussick
this date to send Churns & event reports.
B3AP.

4-3-92-L. Event Reports & Churns faxed
this date.

INCIDENT REPORT

19:06:50 11-29-1991

REPORT# 19120

TO: DO 12

ATTN:

RE: PALMER, TONY
YN110282

1 201 790-0464

CASE OFFICER: CIOCCONE

Durfeys:	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Friday	0001	0650			1810	2120	2121	2359

Incident(s):	Actual Time	Report Time	Status of Action.....
	13:43 11-29	13:43 11-29	RF Check - Not Home
	18:44 11-29	18:45 11-29	Hang Up
	18:54 11-29	18:54 11-29	Hang Up
	18:59 11-29	19:01 11-29	Client Home Late

Verbal Response E.M.S. Notes.....

Notes -
 *** 59 MINUTES LATE..... VERIFYER INSERT SUCCESSFUL.... SUBJECT CLAIMS HE WAS LATE BECAUSE HE WAS ON HIS WAY HOME IN HIS FRIENDS CAR WHEN POLICE STOPPED THE CAR FOR IMPROPER MERGING... SUBJECT SAYS HIS FRIEND WAS DRIVING....

E.M.S. Initials - SP.PO W.CARR

INCIDENT REPORT

REPORT# 18888

146:01 12-03-1999

DO 12

ATTN:

SALMER, TONY
VN110182

1 201 760-0444

CASE OFFICER: 11111111

Surveys:	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Tuesday	0001	0650			1310	2230	2221	2259

Incidents:	Actual Time	Report Time	Status of Action.....
	13:43 12-03	13:50 12-03	A.C. Power Restored
	14:01 12-03	14:01 12-03	Pager Busy
	14:12 12-03	14:12 12-03	Pager Called
	13:12 12-03	13:12 12-03	Client Home Late

Verbal Response
Line Busy 18.46

E.M.S. Notes.....

Notes -

E.M.S. Initials - DAN FOSTER

20:09. Busy

20:10 NS Bell Request for Break throw
All Cont. Busy.

20:37 Busy.

20:39 Att. Trouble on the line

21:06 PO Bernal Paged.

21:10 PO Bernal will follow up

Incident Report

Date: 4/3/92 Time: 5:00

Base Station Officer's name: Wackowski

Supervising Officer's name: Rich Higgins

Tony Palmer EM Inmate/Parolee Name

12-110222 EM Inmate/Parolee Number

Returned yes no

Reason:

Administrative Return

Reason: _____

Program Violation

Charge: _____

New criminal activity; yes no

Law Enforcement Agency Involved: Patterson PD

Comments: 5/arrsted 4/3/92 by Patterson PD
+ charged with murder + poss of weapon (handgun)

sal
EMIR

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Document Date: 04-03-1991

Current Time: 04:49

DOC Number: NY110383 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992
Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH
Client's Name: PALMER, TONY
Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. PATTERSON Zip: 07522
State: NJ
Office: DO 12
Equipment #: 604737 Receiver and Verifier Combined
Beeper Number: 7775804 Phone Number: 12017902444
Message Number: 02 Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfews:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:30	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:30	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		One Call		One Call		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE END FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	Combined	03:53-04/01	03:53-04/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737	Combined	09:53-04/01	09:53-04/01	RF Check-Client Home
652796	Combined	12:38-04/01	12:38-04/01	Client Left Home
652796	Combined	13:44-04/01	13:45-04/01	Client Returned Home
652796	Combined	16:51-04/01	16:52-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796	Combined	16:54-04/01	16:55-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796	Combined	16:56-04/01	16:57-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796	Combined	16:58-04/01	16:58-04/01	Pager-Called
652796	Combined	17:50-04/01	17:50-04/01	Busy
652796	Combined	18:00-04/01	18:01-04/01	Invalid Verifier #
652796	Combined	18:10-04/01	18:10-04/01	Telsol Interrupted
604737	Combined	21:45-04/01	21:45-04/01	RF Check-Client Home
604737	Combined	05:45-04/02	05:45-04/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737	Combined	11:55-04/02	11:10-04/02	Client Left Home
604737	Combined	12:53-04/02	12:54-04/02	Client Returned Home
604737	Combined	12:53-04/02	13:03-04/02	Client Left Home
604737	Combined	13:05-04/02	13:06-04/02	Client Returned Home
604737	Combined	14:22-04/02	14:36-04/02	Client Left Home
604737	Combined	14:49-04/02	14:51-04/02	Client Returned Home
604737	Combined	15:07-04/02	15:07-04/02	Client Added/Changed
604737	Combined	15:08-04/02	15:14-04/02	Client Left Home
604737	Combined	15:49-04/02	15:50-04/02	Client Returned Home
604737	Combined	16:44-04/02	16:45-04/02	Successful
604737	Combined	19:16-04/02	19:17-04/02	Successful
604737	Combined	21:49-04/02	21:50-04/02	RF Check-Client Home
604737	Combined	04:27-04/03	04:38-04/03	*Client Left Early

CLIENT FULL REPORT
Current Date: 04-03-1992

Current Title: 04143

604737	Combined	04:40-04/03	04:40-04/03	Hang up
604737	Combined	04:41-04/03	04:41-04/03	Pager-Called
Total Statuses Printed: 25				

5:00 - Call from Pat since Patricia's (04/02/92)
 advised that she is coming to
 change of number + place of work. Change
 in incident occurred in some state
 by Pat. She advised that RF is
 client no more. Status is
 right

5:12 AOPS Higgins

5:18 SA PO Ciccone Agud

5:20 AOPS Higgins returned call + was advised of
 situation. Decision made to have SA PO Ciccone
 up box from S/Residence. Obtain incident report from
 Patricia Rd. - Bruschi to be notified.

6:00 SA PO Ciccone returned page was advised of situation
 he will pick up subject's box. Steps taken to
 obtain full client report + interview subject
 at Patricia Rd.

609-883-173

6:25 Bill Bruschi Adult Institutions Page.

6:58 Bill Bruschi Page.

07:00 - R - Reviewed case with Bill
Bruschi. Wait for his call back.07:21 - T - R. Liccare deprogrammed
monitor and removed equipment07:37 - T - Page briefed SBO. Know on
situation.~~Supervisor's Office~~

DO'S: EACH DAY IN THIS ORDER

1. Backup History File.
2. Review Real Time Printout.
3. Review recorded responses from the TELSOL tape cassettes, correlate with the real time printout, and make appropriate notation where needed.
4. Get your Daily/Weekly Reports as required: i.e., Officer Case Load, Client History
5. Make a TELSOL test call (from the Option File) to the office phone so you can answer and date/time the new position on the tape for responses.
6. Add/Change/Delete Client File as required.
7. Backup the Master Client File only when you Add/Change/Delete information in the Client File.

DON'TS:

1. Don't physically move the Central System equipment without first contacting a Hitek representative.
2. Don't turn the Central System power off at any time, except if an emergency occurs.
3. Don't plug-in other electrical products or systems into the same power circuit as the Central System.
4. Don't ship or return any Hitek product without first getting an MRA # (Material Return Authorization) from Hitek Customer Service Department.

OFFICE OF THE WARDEN

D.O. NO. 12

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Mr. Leonard Krause - SPO
EMHC

DATE: 4/3/92

Attention: Mr. Rodney M. Buriak ADPS

FROM: Mr. John R. Beaton - DPS
District Office #12

PHONE:

SUBJECT: Tony PALMER
YN 110288

On 4/3/92 I accompanied Sr. PO Ciccone to Paterson Police as part of a continuing investigation of program violation on the above named subject.

At the Detective Bureau we asked to speak to Detective Fenner the Officer of Record regarding the above named subject. We requested the subject's bracelet and we were told the bracelet was part of evidence. The detective allowed us visual inspection of bracelet. Upon close examination of the bracelet, it was determined that different rivets had been used. The type of rivet used is not the type of rivet used by EMHC. The detective further advised that the photos had been taken of the subject taking the bracelet off. Said photos were also part of evidence. Police reports were requested and we were advised that said reports were not available as this case is still under investigation. The detective did provide us with a copy of the booking sheets.


Michael J. Bernal
Sr. PO - EMHC

JRB:MJB:eft

Date signed: _____ 1992
cr.: 4-3-92

1984

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION


D.U. NO. 12

TO: Mr. Leonrad Krause - SPO
EMHC
DATE: 4/3/92
Attention: Mr. Rodney M. Buriak - ADPS

FROM: Mr. John R. Beatos - JPS
District Office #12
PHONE:

SUBJECT: Tony PALMER
YN 110282

On 4/3/92 Sr. PO Ciccone along with Sr. PO Bernal went to Paterson Police Department. This was part of a continuing investigation of program violations. At the Detective Department, PO asked to speak to Detective Finer regarding the above named inmate. PO Ciccone requested the bracelet and I was told the bracelet was part of the evidence. Both POs Ciccone and Bernal were allowed visual inspection of the bracelet. Upon close examination of same, it appeared that different rivets had been used. PO was told that they had photos of subject taking the bracelet off. PO then requested arrest reports and investigation reports. PO was advised that he can only have booking sheets. Not any investigation reports available at this time.


Richard Ciccone
Sr. PO EMHC


JRB:RC:eft

Date signed: _____ 1992
cr.: 4-3-92

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Ira R. Friedman
Chief Investigator
Internal Affairs Unit

DATE: 4-8-92

FROM: Pablo A. Alicea 
Sr. Investigator
Internal Affairs Unit - EJSP

SUBJECT: INMATE TONY PALMER S.P.#YN110282

On April 3, 1992 this unit was informed that inmate Palmer had been arrested by the Paterson Police Department for the offense of Murder. Subject was a participant of the Home Confinement Program at the time of his arrest.

This writer, in the company of Senior Investigator R. McCourt, reported to the Paterson Police Department. Subject was interviewed in regards to him circumventing the electronic surveillance system, which monitors his whereabouts. Inmate Palmer stated that he removed the rivets from his ankle bracelet, and left it at the house. Subject further revealed that he has removed his ankle bracelet on three other occasions, without being detected by the monitoring system. Subject further stated that with the use of needle nose pliers, an eye lash curler and his own rivets, he will remove and put back together his anklet. When asked why his parole officer did not detect the tampering, subject stated that the device is not checked. Subject further stated that he only meets with his parole officer once a month.


After the interview this writer requested the anklet, rivets and pictures that were taken from inmate Palmer. This request was denied by Det. Michael G. Finer, the arresting officer.

PAA/mt

c: IAU/EJSP file: Home Confinement

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: Joseph Malone
Principal Investigator

FROM: Terri Howard 
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Policy & Planning

DATE: April 8, 1992

SUBJECT: Tony Palmer YN#110282
Home Confinement Case

After a full investigation of each status report on the referenced individual since his entry into the electronic monitoring program on October 30, 1991, we have found the following:

- 1) On December 15, 1991 at 22:11 a tamper was registered on the anklet Tony Palmer was wearing. The tamper was reported at 22:13 (see attached).
- 2) At 22:15 on December 15, 1991, the tamper was reported to the incident screen at the Central Office Base Station and the parole officer on duty paged the supervising field officer. The supervising field officer requested dispatch to reset the tamper. The on call supervisor was paged and permission was given to dispatch and reset.
- 3) At 22:44 on December 15, 1991 the anklet tamper was reset by field officer at 22:45. The tamper reset was reported to the Base Station by the computer.
- 4) On December 16, 1991 at 19:11 another tamper was reported on Tony Palmer's anklet. At 19:12 the tamper was reported to the on line printer (see attached print out).
- 5) At 19:14 on December 16, the central station attempted to report the tamper to the incident monitor that is staffed by the Base Station Officers. This signal was unable to be completed (see "pager busy"), therefore, the tamper signal was unable to be seen on the incident monitors which are the monitors that the parole officers staff.

After speaking with Digital Products in Florida it

201X

seems that this was a unique incident. The tamper signal was bumped out of the screens of incidents and did not appear again. Therefore, the anklet remained in the tamper mode and was able to be removed and reattached.

Although we were not aware of this tamper, as of January 1, 1992, the EM/HCP began running a batch report every four hours which is designed to report on any unresolved incidents which were reported to the central station. This procedure was suggested by Digital Products and was implemented to ensure all incidents would be double checked. Once when the incident was displayed and processed on the incident monitor and again through this batch report that is generated directly from the central station's on-line history file. If we had implemented this procedure on December 16, 1991, this tamper would have been seen.

In addition, Digital Products has enhanced the incident processing software to detect all incidents reported to the central station regardless of whether or not the pager is successfully alerted. This software is currently installed and operational in our monitoring center.

After a very thorough investigation, it seems that this particular incident was due to a very unusual set of circumstances which is now addressed by procedural changes and central station software enhancements. The anklet reported the tamper, therefore, the integrity of the anklet is not the issue. Also the tamper was not printed on the incident monitor, therefore, the integrity of the supervision is not the issue.

With the enhancement to the incident reporting software by Digital Products and the enhanced procedure of running the batch report every four hours to detect any unresolved incidents, this type of incident should not be able to occur unnoticed again. This is a unique incident that happened, however, since this occurrence, all of our officers are checking anklets throughout the State.

sal

c: William H. Fauver
Richard A. Seidl
James V. Stabile
Leonard F. Kraus
File

CLIENT FULL REPORT

Current Date: 04-04-1992

Current Time: 11:54

SOC Number: YN110292 Dates = Entry: 10-30-1991 Termination: 04-04-1992

Officer's Name: CICCONE, RICH

Client's Name: PALMER, TONY

Street Address: 30 NORTH 3RD ST. , PATTERSON

Zip: 07522

State: NJ

Office: 00 12

Equipment #: 604737

Beeper Number: 7778804

Message Number: 02

Receiver and Verifier Combined

Phone Number: 12017900464

Telsol Number: 5

Offense: ABSTRACTING JUSTICES , POSS CDS WITHIN 1,000FT SCHOOL

Curfew:	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	09:50	16:10	18:20	22:40	23:10	23:11	23:59
Saturday	00:01	09:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	10:20	16:10	17:00	17:01	22:00	22:01	23:59
Supervision:	No Calls		No Calls		No Calls		No Calls	

Notes: INMATE 2ND FLOOR

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status of Action
604737	06:45-12/16	06:45-12/16	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	07:40-12/16	07:51-12/16	Client Left Home	
604737	13:51-12/16	13:52-12/16	RF Check-Not Home	
604737	18:33-12/16	18:34-12/16	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:42-12/16	18:54-12/16	Client Left Home	
604737	19:00-12/16	19:02-12/16	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:11-12/16	19:12-12/16	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:14-12/16	19:14-12/16	Client Returned Home	
604737	19:37-12/16	19:38-12/16	Successful	
604737	21:00-12/16	21:01-12/16	Successful	
604737	03:12-12/17	03:14-12/17	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	09:14-12/17	09:15-12/17	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	14:16-12/17	14:27-12/17	Client Left Home	
604737	18:47-12/17	18:51-12/17	Client Returned Home	
604737	18:46-12/17	18:58-12/17	Client Left Home	
604737	19:03-12/17	19:03-12/17	Client Returned Home	
604737	20:52-12/17	20:53-12/17	Hang up	
604737	21:02-12/17	21:02-12/17	Successful	
604737	02:53-12/14	02:54-12/14	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	09:34-12/14	09:34-12/14	RF Check-Client Home	
604737	11:06-12/14	11:18-12/14	Client Left Early	
604737	11:30-12/14	11:31-12/14	*No Verifier Detected	
604737	11:32-12/14	11:33-12/14	Pager-Called	
604737	11:49-12/14	11:49-12/14	Busy	
604737	11:54-12/14	11:54-12/14	Client Added/Changed	
604737	12:04-12/14	12:04-12/14	Busy	

CLIENT FULL REPORT
 Current Date: 04-04-1992

Current Time: 11:54

604737	12:19-12/14	12:19-12/14	Hang up
604737	12:21-12/14	12:21-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	12:40-12/14	12:41-12/14	*Client Home Late
604737	12:43-12/14	12:43-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	18:25-12/14	18:25-12/14	*No A.C. Power
604737	18:38-12/14	18:38-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	18:54-12/14	19:02-12/14	A.C. Power Restored
604737	19:14-12/14	19:14-12/14	Recorded Speech
604737	19:24-12/14	19:24-12/14	Recorded Speech
604737	19:34-12/14	19:34-12/14	Busy
604737	19:38-12/14	19:38-12/14	Pager-Called
604737	03:01-12/15	03:05-12/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	09:05-12/15	09:06-12/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	11:28-12/15	11:29-12/15	Successful
604737	11:33-12/15	11:33-12/15	Client Added/Changed
604737	11:34-12/15	11:34-12/15	Client Added/Changed
604737	12:07-12/15	12:07-12/15	Client Added/Changed
604737	12:09-12/15	12:21-12/15	Client Left Home
604737	14:24-12/15	14:25-12/15	Client Returned Home
604737	14:48-12/15	14:48-12/15	Busy
604737	15:03-12/15	15:04-12/15	Successful
604737	18:25-12/15	18:25-12/15	Busy
604737	18:40-12/15	18:40-12/15	Recorded Speech
604737	18:50-12/15	18:50-12/15	Recorded Speech
604737	18:52-12/15	18:52-12/15	Pager-Called
604737	20:25-12/15	20:26-12/15	RF Check-Client Home
604737	22:11-12/15	22:13-12/15	**Wristlet Tamper**
604737	22:15-12/15	22:15-12/15	Pager-Called
604737	22:44-12/15	22:45-12/15	Wristlet Reset

Total Statuses Printed: 55

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

TO: DEBBE FAUNCE
ASSISTANT CHIEF INVESTIGATOR
INTERNAL AFFAIRS UNIT

DATE: 4/10/92

FROM: JOSEPH MALONE *JM*
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
INTERNAL AFFAIRS UNIT

PHONE: 992-9392

RE: AN INVESTIGATION CONCERNING TONY PALMER =YN110282
ALLEGED ABILITY TO ELUDE THE ELECTRONIC MONITORING SYSTEM

As directed by Assistant Chief Faunce, Internal Affairs Unit, Central Office, this writer along with Senior Investigator Robert Mucciarelli, conducted an investigation into allegations that assigned "Home Confinement" inmate, Tony Palmer =YN110282, was able to elude electronic house arrest by dislodging the rivets from the strap of the electronic ankle bracelet with the aid of pliers. The preliminary results of the investigation are as follows:

ALLEGATIONS:

On Friday, April 3, 1992 at 4:27am, inmate Tony Palmer =YN110282, who was under electronic house arrest (home confinement status) was arrested at his home at 30 North Third Street, Paterson, New Jersey and charged with an Offense of Murder. Palmer was charged with shooting a male subject at 145 Presidential Boulevard, Paterson, NJ at 12:11am on Thursday, April 2, 1992. Palmer was additionally charged with Possession of a Weapon and Escape. The arrest was conducted by Paterson Police Detective Michael G. Finer and members of his department. Palmer was alleged to have made statements to Detective Finer, indicating that he (Palmer) had been able to elude the electronic monitoring system by dislodging the rivets from the straps of the electronic ankle bracelet and then leaving the anklet in the house.

PAGE 2

This officer was also advised by other Internal Affairs Investigators that it was also rumored among the inmate population that the electronic monitoring system could also be circumvented by bridging the electronic field of the ankle device through it's rivets with copper wire, extending the circumference of the straps of the ankle device and then removing it without detection.

INVESTIGATOR'S COMMENTS:

A. On receipt of the allegations and directly after being assigned the investigation on April 3, 1991, this Investigator contacted the Internal Affairs Unit at East Jersey State Prison and requested to have someone interview Palmer at the Paterson Police Department concerning his allegations, and to retrieve the electronic ankle device for examination. Senior Investigators Fabio Alibea and Richard McCourt of the East Jersey State Prison Internal Affairs Unit interviewed Palmer at the Police Department. This was a verbal interview which focused entirely on Palmer's allegation of circumventing the electronic surveillance system which monitors his access and egress from his home.

Inmate Palmer advised the Investigators that he removed the rivets from his ankle bracelet, and left it at his house. Palmer further revealed that he has removed his ankle bracelet on three other occasions, without being detected by the monitoring system. Palmer described using needle nose pliers, an eyelash curler and his own rivets to remove and put back together his anklet. When asked why his parole officer did not detect the tampering, Palmer stated that the device is not checked. He further alleged that he only meets with his parole officer once a month.

The request to have the anklet, rivets and pictures that were taken from inmate Palmer, returned to the Department of Corrections was denied by Detective Finer, the arresting officer. Finer later advised this investigator that the material is considered evidence and cannot be released without a court order.

B. On Monday, April 6, 1992, a full status report was conducted on Tony Palmer from his October 13, 1991 entry into the electronic monitoring program. The report revealed two recorded tampers to Palmer's monitoring device. The first incident occurred on December 15, 1991 at 22:01 hours. The tamper notification was properly received at the base station on-line printer, and the printer immediately transmitted the tamper notification in both an audible and visual alarm to the incident monitor. Subsequently the field officer was alerted and Palmer's device was reset within the hour.

PAGE 3

The second incident occurred the very next day on December 16, 1991 at 19:11 hours. At this time the tamper was properly received again by the line printer at the base station. As the printer attempted to transfer the incident to the incident monitor, it was blocked from entry into the monitor by a "pager busy" signal. For reasons that are unclear the on-line printer did not resend the tamper alert to the incident monitor, therefore the signal was unable to be seen or heard on the incident monitors which are staffed by parole officers.

Consequently, Palmer's electronic monitoring device remained in the tamper mode which prevented registering future tampers on the device, but still continued to record his access and egress from his home if the device was worn.

207x



Digital Products Corporation

April 10, 1992

Ms. Terri Howard
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Policy and Planning
New Jersey Department of Corrections
Administration Building
Whittlesey Road
Trenton, NJ 08625

Dear Ms. Howard:

At the request of the NJ DOC, I have reviewed the history which was logged on the NJ DOC central station computer for the client, Tony Palmer, DOC# YN110282 between October 30, 1991 and April 3, 1992. A summary of my findings are as follows:

12/15/91 - 10:11PM, the monitoring unit assigned to Tony Palmer detected that the transmitter was tampered. A 10:13PM that evening, this event was reported to and logged by the central station.

12/15/91 - 10:15PM, the central station successfully issued a pager call for this incident.

12/15/91 - 10:44PM the monitoring unit assigned to Tony Palmer detected that the transmitter tamper circuitry was reset. At 10:44PM that evening, this event was reported to and logged by the central station.

12/16/91 - 7:11PM the monitoring unit assigned to Tony Palmer detected that the transmitter was tampered. At 7:12PM that evening, this event was reported to and logged by the central station.

12/16/91 - 7:14PM the central station attempted to generate a pager call for this incident, but encountered a busy signal.

The unit was not reset after this event.

At the time of the above mentioned events, the central station worked in the following manner:

Each event is logged on the central station's hard disk in a history file for five calendar days. Each day, the history file is copied to a floppy disc for archiving.

These events may be viewed or recalled via the following report utilities:

- 'On-line' history report
- Client history report
- Equipment history report

In addition, a 'Daily' report is provided to report on any 'unresolved' tamper, power outage, or failure to report. This report should be run at least once each day.

An interactive on-line incident processing program is available to automatically display reported incidents that are successfully reported to the system pager.

Additional protection against unauthorized tampering is provided by visual inspection of the transmitter and band by the corrections officer. Rivets, not commercially available, and a special riveting tool with a customized branding/sealing device is provided with the equipment. A visual inspection of the unit is recommended during each routine visit with the client.

On December 16, 1991, the tamper reported was not successfully paged, which may have been caused by some type of outside interference. This means that the incident processing workstation would not process this incident. Detection of this event would occur when the 'Daily' report was run or during a manual review of the various reports available.


Without knowledge of and unrelated to the above mentioned events, the following actions have been taken which will prevent an occurrence of this type from going undetected in the future:

A procedure has been implemented by the NJ DOC to run the 'Daily' report every four hours.

An enhancement to the Incident processing software has been delivered to NJ DOC. This new software will detect all incidents reported to the central station regardless of whether or not the pager was successfully alerted.

The combination of the new procedures and enhanced software provide a double level of protection to insure that this type of incident will not go undetected in the future.

Sincerely,



Stephen Zimko
Director of Technical Services

06 1 0 23

CLIENT - CALL REPORT

Current Date: 03-15-1992

Current Time: 10:38

Call Number: N106554 Dates = Entry: 01-24-1992 Termination: 03-15-1992
 Client's Name: PARSON, MIKE
 Client's Name: WILSON, MILTON
 Street Address: 112 WARREN ST 2FL PARSON 210-1700
 State: NJ
 Office: 00 12
 Equipment #: 051276 Receiver and Verifier: 003100
 Messgr Number: 778004 Phone Number: 210-1700
 Message Number: 02 Telnet Number:
 Offense: BURGLARY

	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3		Period 4	
	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop	Start	Stop
Monday	00:01	12:20	21:40	22:10	22:11	23:00	23:01	23:59
Tuesday	00:01	14:20	21:40	22:10	22:11	23:00	23:01	23:59
Wednesday	00:01	14:20	21:40	22:10	22:11	23:00	23:01	23:59
Thursday	00:01	14:20	21:40	22:10	22:11	23:00	23:01	23:59
Friday	00:01	11:20	17:10	18:00	18:01	20:00	20:01	22:59
Saturday	00:01	07:50	16:10	17:00	17:01	21:00	21:01	23:59
Sunday	00:01	09:00	09:01	17:00	17:01	21:00	21:01	23:59

Supervision: No Calls One Call One Call No Calls

Notes: INMATE

History For ALL STATUSES

Equipment Number	Equipment Type	Time - Date (Actual)	Time - Date (Printed)	Status or Action
051276		17:37-03/14	17:37-03/14	Busy
051276		17:52-03/14	17:52-03/14	Busy
051276		18:07-03/14	18:07-03/14	Busy
051276		18:09-03/14	18:09-03/14	Pager-Called
051276		19:01-03/14	19:01-03/14	Busy
051276		19:16-03/14	19:17-03/14	Successful
051276		21:24-03/14	21:24-03/14	RF Check-Client Home
051276		03:54-03/15	03:55-03/15	RF Check-Client Home
051276		11:25-03/15	11:25-03/15	RF Check-Client Home
051276		12:01-03/08	12:01-03/08	RF Check-Client Home
051276		13:00-03/08	13:01-03/08	Successful
051276		18:01-03/08	18:02-03/08	RF Check-Client Home
051276		18:27-03/08	18:28-03/08	Successful

211X

pg 2 of

031276	20:51-03/09	20:54-03/09	Successfull
031276	01:00-03/09	01:03-03/09	RF Check-Client Home
031276	01:02-03/09	01:05-03/09	RF Check-Client Home
031276	01:05-03/09	01:08-03/09	Client Left Home
031276	14:00-03/09	14:01-03/09	Client Returned Home
031276	14:02-03/09	14:14-03/09	Client Left Home
031276	14:17-03/09	14:20-03/09	Client Home Late
031276	14:24-03/09	14:24-03/09	Pager-Called
031276	14:51-03/09	14:58-03/09	Successful
031276	16:25-03/09	16:25-03/09	RF Check-Client Home
031276	16:26-03/09	16:31-03/09	Client Home Late
031276	17:05-03/09	17:07-03/09	Successful
031276	17:25-03/09	17:27-03/09	Successful



CLIENT HOME REPORT
Current Date: 03-15-1992

Current Time: 19:38

031276	23:25-03/09	23:27-03/09	RF Check-Client Home
031276	06:27-03/10	06:27-03/10	RF Check-Client Home
031276	07:42-03/10	07:54-03/10	Client Left Home
031276	13:07-03/10	13:08-03/10	Client Returned Home
031276	14:39-03/10	14:51-03/10	Client Left Early
031276	14:53-03/10	14:53-03/10	No Answer
031276	14:55-03/10	14:55-03/10	Pager-Called
031276	14:59-03/10	14:59-03/10	No Answer
031276	15:01-03/10	15:01-03/10	Pager-Called
031276	15:38-03/10	15:37-03/10	Client Home Late
031276	16:01-03/10	16:01-03/10	Pager-Called
031276	16:19-03/10	16:20-03/10	Successful
031276	21:58-03/10	21:59-03/10	RF Check-Client Home
031276	05:59-03/11	05:59-03/11	RF Check-Client Home
031276	08:16-03/11	08:27-03/11	Client Left Home
031276	13:46-03/11	13:46-03/11	Client Added/Changed
031276	13:38-03/11	13:47-03/11	Client Returned Home
031276	14:05-03/11	14:05-03/11	Client Added/Changed
031276	14:35-03/11	14:47-03/11	Client Left Home
031276	20:47-03/11	20:48-03/11	RF Check-Not Home
031276	21:22-03/11	21:24-03/11	Client Returned Home
031276	21:38-03/11	21:59-03/11	Successful
031276	22:16-03/11	22:16-03/11	No Answer
031276	22:26-03/11	22:26-03/11	No Answer
031276	22:36-03/11	22:36-03/11	No Answer
031276	22:41-03/11	22:41-03/11	Pager-Called
031276	03:24-03/12	03:24-03/12	RF Check-Client Home
031276	11:24-03/12	11:25-03/12	RF Check-Client Home
031276	14:57-03/12	15:08-03/12	Client Left Home
031276	21:08-03/12	21:09-03/12	RF Check-Not Home
031276	21:25-03/12	21:28-03/12	Client Returned Home
031276	22:08-03/12	22:09-03/12	Successful
031276	22:28-03/12	22:29-03/12	No Verifier Detected
031276	22:33-03/12	22:34-03/12	No Verifier Detected
031276	22:35-03/12	22:35-03/12	Pager-Called
031276	05:28-03/13	05:28-03/13	RF Check-Client Home
031276	11:28-03/13	11:29-03/13	RF Check-Client Home
031276	12:19-03/13	12:34-03/13	Client Left Home
031276	16:33-03/13	16:37-03/13	Client Returned Home
031276	17:39-03/13	17:39-03/13	Home

17:00-00:10	17:01-00:10	successful
16:20-00:10	16:21-00:10	successful
16:10-00:10	16:11-00:10	check-outlet none
16:00-00:10	16:01-00:10	check-outlet none
15:50-00:10	15:51-00:10	check-outlet none
15:40-00:10	15:41-00:10	check-outlet none
15:30-00:10	15:31-00:10	check-outlet none
15:20-00:10	15:21-00:10	successful
15:10-00:10	15:11-00:10	successful
15:00-00:10	15:01-00:10	successful
14:50-00:10	14:51-00:10	successful
14:40-00:10	14:41-00:10	successful
14:30-00:10	14:31-00:10	successful
14:20-00:10	14:21-00:10	successful
14:10-00:10	14:11-00:10	successful
14:00-00:10	14:01-00:10	successful
13:50-00:10	13:51-00:10	successful
13:40-00:10	13:41-00:10	successful
13:30-00:10	13:31-00:10	successful
13:20-00:10	13:21-00:10	successful
13:10-00:10	13:11-00:10	successful
13:00-00:10	13:01-00:10	successful
12:50-00:10	12:51-00:10	successful
12:40-00:10	12:41-00:10	successful
12:30-00:10	12:31-00:10	successful
12:20-00:10	12:21-00:10	successful
12:10-00:10	12:11-00:10	successful
12:00-00:10	12:01-00:10	successful
11:50-00:10	11:51-00:10	successful
11:40-00:10	11:41-00:10	successful
11:30-00:10	11:31-00:10	successful
11:20-00:10	11:21-00:10	successful
11:10-00:10	11:11-00:10	successful
11:00-00:10	11:01-00:10	successful
10:50-00:10	10:51-00:10	successful
10:40-00:10	10:41-00:10	successful
10:30-00:10	10:31-00:10	successful
10:20-00:10	10:21-00:10	successful
10:10-00:10	10:11-00:10	successful
10:00-00:10	10:01-00:10	successful
9:50-00:10	9:51-00:10	successful
9:40-00:10	9:41-00:10	successful
9:30-00:10	9:31-00:10	successful
9:20-00:10	9:21-00:10	successful
9:10-00:10	9:11-00:10	successful
9:00-00:10	9:01-00:10	successful
8:50-00:10	8:51-00:10	successful
8:40-00:10	8:41-00:10	successful
8:30-00:10	8:31-00:10	successful
8:20-00:10	8:21-00:10	successful
8:10-00:10	8:11-00:10	successful
8:00-00:10	8:01-00:10	successful
7:50-00:10	7:51-00:10	successful
7:40-00:10	7:41-00:10	successful
7:30-00:10	7:31-00:10	successful
7:20-00:10	7:21-00:10	successful
7:10-00:10	7:11-00:10	successful
7:00-00:10	7:01-00:10	successful
6:50-00:10	6:51-00:10	successful
6:40-00:10	6:41-00:10	successful
6:30-00:10	6:31-00:10	successful
6:20-00:10	6:21-00:10	successful
6:10-00:10	6:11-00:10	successful
6:00-00:10	6:01-00:10	successful
5:50-00:10	5:51-00:10	successful
5:40-00:10	5:41-00:10	successful
5:30-00:10	5:31-00:10	successful
5:20-00:10	5:21-00:10	successful
5:10-00:10	5:11-00:10	successful
5:00-00:10	5:01-00:10	successful
4:50-00:10	4:51-00:10	successful
4:40-00:10	4:41-00:10	successful
4:30-00:10	4:31-00:10	successful
4:20-00:10	4:21-00:10	successful
4:10-00:10	4:11-00:10	successful
4:00-00:10	4:01-00:10	successful
3:50-00:10	3:51-00:10	successful
3:40-00:10	3:41-00:10	successful
3:30-00:10	3:31-00:10	successful
3:20-00:10	3:21-00:10	successful
3:10-00:10	3:11-00:10	successful
3:00-00:10	3:01-00:10	successful
2:50-00:10	2:51-00:10	successful
2:40-00:10	2:41-00:10	successful
2:30-00:10	2:31-00:10	successful
2:20-00:10	2:21-00:10	successful
2:10-00:10	2:11-00:10	successful
2:00-00:10	2:01-00:10	successful
1:50-00:10	1:51-00:10	successful
1:40-00:10	1:41-00:10	successful
1:30-00:10	1:31-00:10	successful
1:20-00:10	1:21-00:10	successful
1:10-00:10	1:11-00:10	successful
1:00-00:10	1:01-00:10	successful
0:50-00:10	0:51-00:10	successful
0:40-00:10	0:41-00:10	successful
0:30-00:10	0:31-00:10	successful
0:20-00:10	0:21-00:10	successful
0:10-00:10	0:11-00:10	successful
0:00-00:10	0:01-00:10	successful

Total statuses printed: 73

3-15-92

THE ABOVE NAMED SUBJECT,
ACCORDING TO THE REPORT HAS BEEN
IN TAMPA SINCE 3-9-92.

S. Jordan

3