The Florida Senate

Interim Project Report 2007-110 *January 2007*

Committee on Criminal Justice

CONVICTED FELONS ON PROBATION AND PREVENTION OF SUBSEQUENT CRIMES

SUMMARY

The commission of serious crimes by Florida probationers in the last few years has led to attempts to reduce opportunities for probation violators to commit new crimes. Interim Project Report 2006-109 reviewed Florida's system for addressing probation violations, concluding that the response to the notorious crimes had resulted in a significant increase in jail and prison populations. Since that report, the Legislature enhanced penalties for probation violators and the Governor has committed to seek further legislation to expand the scope of those penalties.

This project reviewed the laws and policies that other states use to address probation violations. The survey results reflect that Florida is not alone in experiencing violent crimes committed by probationers, but may be unique in suffering several such crimes in a short period. Among interesting insights from the survey responses was the fact that some states allow the probation supervising authority to address less serious violations with reduced sanctions. This reportedly serves the multiple purposes of expediting consequences, reducing the backlog of accused violators in the local jails, and reducing the time spent by the judiciary on routine violation cases.

Based on the survey results that are reflected in this report's findings, staff recommends the Legislature explore methods to reduce the numbers of probation violators who are arrested and jailed for technical violations.[1] This could include authorizing non-judicial sanctions for certain technical violations.

BACKGROUND

In an ideal world, convicted criminals who have been given the opportunity to live in the community under supervision would not commit more crimes or violate the rules of their supervision. Unfortunately, offender recidivism is a considerable problem in the real world. It is particularly distressing to agents of the criminal justice system, the general public, and especially victims and their families when a supervised offender commits a new violent or sexual crime. In the last few years, several terrible crimes have been committed in Florida by offenders on some form of community supervision. Distressingly, in two of the most sensational cases the criminal had recently violated his probation, but had not been taken into custody.[2] Concerns were expressed by the media and others that the state was too lax on criminals who repeatedly violated the terms of their probation. The crimes and subsequent outcry seem to have prompted the Department of Corrections to implement a "zero tolerance" policy on alleged probation violations.

In 2005, the Legislature passed the Jessica Lunsford Act which created a number of new requirements relating to sex offenders and predators.[3] Among these is a requirement for electronic monitoring when such persons are supervised in the community. Also, an offender who is under supervision for sexual crimes involving children, or who is required to register as a sexual offender, cannot be released pending a violation

[1] Technical violations are those violations that do not include a new criminal offense.

[2] Joseph P. Smith abducted and murdered 11-year old Carlie Brucia on February 1, 2004. He was on drug offender probation at the time of the crime and had recently violated probation by failing a mandatory drug test. Troy Victorino was on probation following a prison term for beating a man in the head with a walking stick and ripping off one of his ears in 1996. He was arrested for another battery on July 29, 2004, but released on bond days before masterminding and participating in the brutal slaying of six acquaintances.

[3] John Evander Couey confessed to kidnapping, sexually assaulting, and murdering 9-year Jessica Lunsford in February 2005 and is pending trial. His confession was ruled to be inadmissible as evidence. Couey has a long criminal history, and was on county probation for possession of marijuana and narcotics equipment at the time of the offense.

hearing unless the court specifically finds that the offender is not a danger to the public.

Senate Interim Project 2006-109 reviewed Florida's sentencing policies and the sanctions ordered for violations of probation, noting that the courts have become more likely to address a violation by incarcerating the offender rather than continuing or modifying probation. Concurrently, the Department of Corrections' zero-tolerance policy increased the number of arrests for violation of probation. As a result of these policy changes, jail and prison populations have increased significantly.

The Legislature's Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) examined the state's felony community corrections program and issued a report in April 2006. Among other findings, OPPAGA reported that resources are not directed at offenders who pose the highest risk and that supervision is hindered by administrative tasks. As a consequence, OPPAGA recommended that statutory minimum caseload requirements should be removed and that the department should manage supervision based upon the offender's level of risk.[4]

Overview of Probation and Community Control in Florida

More than 110,000 offenders are actively supervised by the Department of Corrections on some form of community supervision.[5] Florida law recommends community supervision for offenders who do not appear to be likely to reoffend and who present the lowest danger to the welfare of society. Generally, this includes those offenders whose sentencing score sheet result does not fall into the range recommending incarceration under the Criminal Punishment Code.

The two major types of community supervision are probation and community control. Community control is a higher level of supervision that is administered by officers with a statutorily mandated caseload limit. Both probation and community control are judicially-imposed sentences that include standard statutory conditions as well as any special conditions that are directed by the sentencing judge.[6]

Approximately one-fourth of the supervised offenders are on probation or community control for committing murder, manslaughter, a sexual offense, robbery, or another violent crime. Another one-fourth have theft, forgery, or fraud as their most serious offense, and drug offenders account for another one-fourth.

Violation of Probation or Community Control

Under s. 948.06, F.S., whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that a probationer or community controllee has violated the terms imposed by the court in a material respect, the offender may be arrested without warrant by any law enforcement officer or parole and probation supervisor. A judge may also issue an arrest warrant based upon reasonable cause that the conditions have been violated. In either case, after arrest the offender is returned to the court that imposed the sentence.

Once brought before the court for an alleged violation, the offender is advised of the charge. If the charge is not admitted, the court may commit the offender to jail to await a hearing, release the offender with or without bail (subject to a dangerousness hearing for certain sex offenders and sex offenses), or dismiss the charge. If the offender admits the charge or is judicially determined to have committed the violation, the court may revoke, modify, or continue community supervision. If supervision is revoked, the court must adjudge the offender guilty of the offense for which he or she was on community supervision, and can impose any sentence that could have been imposed at the original sentencing.

As of October 31, 2006, 35,485 violations were pending against offenders who are on active or active-suspense status (a total of 149,335 offenders). This represents a rate of 237.6 violations per 1,000 offenders. OPPAGA reports that offenders classified as maximum risk commit a disproportionate number of offenses that are defined as serious under the Jessica

[4] OPPAGA Report No. 06-37, "Several Deficiencies Hinder the Supervision of Offenders in the Community Corrections Program," April 2006.

[5] All data concerning community supervision are from the Department of Corrections Monthly Status Report of Florida's Community Supervision Population, October 2006.

[6] Standard conditions are specified as such in statute and do not require oral pronouncement at sentencing. Special conditions include any other condition and are not enforceable unless orally pronounced by the court at the time of sentencing. *See Jones v. State*, 661 So.2d 50 (Fla 2nd Dist. 1995). Some special conditions are included in the statutes as options for the sentencing court, and others are devised by the court.

Lunsford Act. These include murder, sexual offenses, robbery, carjacking, child abuse, and aggravated stalking.[7]

METHODOLOGY

A survey was devised to question how other states deal with community supervision violators. The survey was distributed by mail to representatives of correctional agencies or the courts in all states (excluding Florida) and the District of Columbia. Responses were received from half of those surveyed. The responses were carefully reviewed and analyzed, and additional research and inquiry was conducted to explore any methods or procedures that differed from Florida practice. Staff reviewed reports, legislative documents, statistics, agency rules, and case law. In addition, staff met with local prosecutors and public defenders concerning processing of probation violations and observed a probation violation docket.

FINDINGS

High-Profile Crimes and Legislation Concerning Probation Violators

Florida is not unique in experiencing high profile crimes committed by probationers. Almost half of the responding states indicated that they had experienced such crimes, with four states providing specific information. As expected, media attention focused upon violent crimes, particularly when the perpetrator arguably should have been confined so as not to have the opportunity to commit the crime.

Thirteen states provided information in varying levels of detail about legislation or other programs designed to address misconduct by probationers, especially when focused on preventing future offenses. Several reported efforts reflect a belief that applying quick and appropriate responses to technical violations will divert the offender's behavior and deter further violations. Several also report special initiatives directed at managing sex offenders.

- Georgia has a legislatively-mandated pilot program for sentencing. The program gives judges an option to sentence certain offenders to probation with an initial sanction ranging in severity from probation supervision to probation detention center or residential substance abuse treatment facility. Technical violations are addressed in a sanctions hearing conducted by a Corrections hearing officer or a chief probation officer. The officer can impose an administrative sanction equal to or less than the sentence originally imposed by the sentencing judge. The primary purpose of the program is to address troublesome behavior quickly in order to reduce recidivism and protect the public. A second goal is to reduce the backlog of technical violation charges awaiting hearing before a judge, lessening the time spent in jail by probationers awaiting hearing as well as judicial time spent hearing violations.

- An Oklahoma law enacted in November 2005 allows its Department of Corrections to impose sanctions for technical violations. The sanctions range from verbal reprimand to short-term incarceration in the local jail.

- North Carolina probation officers have authority to impose additional conditions and requirements on offenders who demonstrate non-compliant behavior. The policy is to address every detected violation, so this law allows timely intervention and behavior modification without returning the offender to court.

- Tennessee has developed a technical violator diversion program and a progressive intervention process to address less serious violations of probation or parole outside of the court system. Among available sanctions are increased supervision contacts, participation in programs or training, community service, and electronic monitoring. The programs have a goal of developing pro-social skills for offenders and reducing the costs of incarceration.

- Virginia reported development of technical violation guidelines that provide an increased range of sanctions particularly directed toward failure of substance abuse testing, absconding, and technical violations.

- Several years ago, Louisiana opened two alternative centers for technical violators with the purpose of providing programs to help reduce recidivism. The centers were closed due to the hurricanes and only reopened in July 2006. In the last session, the Legislature mandated that technical violators whose probation is revoked can only be incarcerated for 90 days after which they are returned to supervision. Both initiatives apply only to technical violators who have not committed a violent offense or sex offense.

[7] OPPAGA Report No. 06-037, s*upra* note 4.

- In 2002, Hawaii established a criminal justice system-wide collaboration with a five-year strategic plan to enhance the use of intermediate sanctions and reduce recidivism by 30%. A key component of the plan is the use of services and programs to manage offenders. The state has also begun to implement a "swift and sure consequences" program to respond quickly to probation violations. The program was initially targeted at drug offenders, but has been expanded to include high risk sex offenders and domestic violence offenders.

Offenders or Types of Offenses for which Confinement is Required Until a Judicial Hearing

Information was sought as to whether there were any requirements for certain classes of alleged violators to remain in confinement pending a hearing before a judge. While the majority of responding states do not have such requirements, a number gave detailed affirmative responses. The most common restriction was a requirement that offenders charged with a new felony offense are not eligible for automatic bail or bond consideration without being seen by a judge. The most commonly mentioned specific offenses that trigger a hearing requirement are sex offenses and violent offenses. One state specifically mentioned numerous DUI offenses as a trigger. Some states issue a notice to appear for less serious violations and the offender is not jailed while awaiting a hearing.

Release Restrictions

In Florida and most other states, offenders who are charged with a probation violation are eligible to be considered for release with or without bail pending the violation hearing. However, there are a few states that make certain classes of offenders or types of offenses statutorily ineligible for release prior to the violation hearing. In Georgia, probationers who are charged with physical injury, attempted physical injury, or terroristic threats are not entitled to bond consideration until after a court hearing. Violent offenders and sex offenders are ineligible for bail or bond in Louisiana.

In Oregon, the offender is held without bail until hearing if the probation officer deems the offense to be serious enough for arrest. However, if the alleged violation is less serious, the probation officer can offer the offender the chance to waive judicial hearing. If waived, the probation officer addresses the violation through a graduated series of sanctions ranging from reprimand to a short jail stay. Hearings are held within 15 days by a hearing officer.

In Washington, no one arrested on a DOC warrant is eligible for bail or bond.

North Dakota's response noted that interstate compact offenders are not eligible for bail or bond under the rules of the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision.

Danger to the Community Finding

Florida law prohibits release with or without bail of an alleged probation violator who is under supervision for sexual battery or sexual crimes involving children, or who is required to register as a sexual offender or predator, unless the court makes a finding that the probationer is not a danger to the public.[8] Three other states reported that a judge must make a formal finding that an alleged violator is not a danger to the community before release. Alaska applies the requirement to all offenders, and in Arkansas it applies to felony probationers with a new felony offense. Virginia statutes also require consideration of danger to the public for all offenders, but it is not clear whether a formal finding is required. In addition, many responses noted that consideration of danger to the community is a factor considered by the court in determining whether release under any conditions is appropriate.

Only two states reported that a formal danger to the community finding is required as a part of the sentencing processing. Alaska and Washington apply the requirement to all offenders. Again, many other states noted that the probationer's likelihood to be a danger to the public is an important consideration in determining an appropriate sentence or sanction.

Variation in Procedure Depending On Offense Underlying Probation or Nature of Alleged Violation

Nine states reported that their procedures for processing a violation of probation can vary if the alleged violator is on probation for a violent offense, sexual offense, or drug offense. Ten states indicated that they have different procedures if the offense that was alleged as the basis for the violation of probation charge was a violent offense, sexual offense, drug offense, or other felony or misdemeanor. Some specific approaches include:

- Hawaii gives non-violent, first-time drug offenders who violate probation a statutory option to undergo assessment and prescribed treatment rather than

[8] Section 948.06(4), F.S.

face revocation and imprisonment. It also has enhanced provisions for violent offenders.

- In Tennessee, drug offenders in some jurisdictions have access to drug courts where sanctions for probation violation are often less severe but are imposed more quickly. There is also a policy that violent offenses and sexual offenses result in issuance of a warrant.

- Louisiana does not have laws mandating special processing for certain types of offenders, but its procedures give emphasis to violent, drug, and sex offenders. It has a zero-tolerance policy toward probation violations by sex offenders.

- South Carolina also has no statutory mandates, but its hearing officers take into account prior criminal history, drug offenses, and sex offenses before making a recommendation as to whether to continue or revoke probation. It also has a policy of issuing a probation violation warrant if an offender is picked up on a domestic violence charge, while in other cases it might wait until resolution of the new crime in court.

- A special suspended sentence is applicable to some drug offenders in Washington. These offenders are sanctioned in accordance with a special sanctions grid, and there is a presumption of revocation of probation at a third hearing. Also, violent offenders and sexual offenders generally are assessed as having a higher risk level and are more likely to be revoked, even though there is no statutory mandate for more serious sanctions.

- In North Carolina, the original sentence strongly influences the likelihood of revocation for violation. This is determined by consideration of both the probationer's prior record and the seriousness of the offense for which he or she is on probation.

- Virginia has separate probation violation sentencing guidelines for felony offenses and technical violations. The probationer's prior offense record and previous history of violations are factors that add points toward sentencing. There are special provisions for certain violent offenses and certain sexual offenses. Those sexual offenses require that a risk assessment be prepared along with the sentencing guidelines.

- Oregon has a structured sanctions grid that takes into account the seriousness of prior offenses.

- Georgia statutes regulate the maximum sanction that may be imposed upon a violator depending upon whether the probationer has violated a general condition of probation, a special condition of probation, or has committed a new felony offense.

- California requires that serious and violent offenders have their parole violations referred to the Board of Parole Hearing for adjudication. These offenders are not eligible to participate in some alternative sanctions. Sex offenders are also ineligible for alternative sanctions, even if they do not fall into the serious or violent offender category. They are also tracked and evaluated for consideration as a Sexually Violent Predator.

Other than the dangerousness hearing that is required for sex offender probationers, Florida does not have formalized differences in procedures for different classes of offenders. However, the seriousness of the original offense or of the alleged violation is a factor that is considered in processing or sanctioning a violation charge.

Impact of Prior Violations

Only a few responding states indicated having laws or procedures that differ depending on a probationer's record of prior probation violations. However, it is likely that all sanctioning authorities give some consideration to a probationer's response to prior sanctions. Among those who reported formalized procedures, South Carolina has a graduated scale of sanctions that increases with subsequent violations. Washington's sanctioning grid calls for more confinement for each violation. Florida adds community sanction violation points to the sentencing scoresheet for each violation and successive violation.[9]

Treatment of Technical Violations

The general consensus among responders is that technical violations include any violation of the conditions of probation that does not constitute a new criminal offense. Specific examples include:

- Failing to report as directed
- Failing to pay restitution
- Failure to pay fees

[9] Section 921.0024(1)(b), F.S.

- Moving without advising the supervising agent
- Absconding from supervision
- Positive test for drug use
- Violation of association restrictions
- Violation of travel restrictions
- Failure to complete a supervision strategy
- Failure to attend counseling
- Violation of curfew
- Not being home for home visits
- Not attending treatment

Eighty percent of the responding states indicated that technical violations are treated differently than new criminal offenses when addressing a probation violation. In most states it appears to be a matter of balancing the seriousness of each offense. However, several states reported that probation officers have some flexibility in using intermediate sanctions to deal with technical violations, while new law violations must be reported to the court.

South Carolina classifies technical violations in two categories: (1) "compliance violations" that reflect a resistance to following supervision guidelines such as maintaining contact, meeting financial and drug testing requirements, or failing to attend substance abuse training; and (2) "community safety violations" that include violation of movement restrictions, weapons violations, and any violations committed by a sex offender except those that are purely financial. As would be expected, community safety violations are sanctioned more seriously than compliance violations.

California's response pointed out that the individual circumstances of each violation are critical, regardless of whether the violation is technical or a new crime. For example, California might withhold proceeding on a violation charge against a parolee who is on parole for a less-serious, non-violent offense until after a new criminal charge of public intoxication is resolved. On the other hand, an offender on parole for committing a violent felony might have parole revoked immediately and be returned to prison for committing a relatively minor technical violation.

Florida assesses additional points to the sentencing scoresheet if a violation is based upon commission of a new felony.[10] Otherwise, there is not a formal distinction in the procedural process between new criminal offense violations and technical violations. However, it should be noted that the processing of a new criminal charge is separate and distinct from processing a violation of probation charge based upon the same offense.

Felonies vs. Misdemeanors

Approximately half of the respondents specifically indicated that there is a legal or procedural distinction between how violations involving new felony offenses and new misdemeanor offenses are treated. Even those that did not give such a specific response still indicated that the severity of the offense is considered. Only one state indicated that a conviction holds the same weight regardless of whether it is a felony or a misdemeanor. There was also some indication that misdemeanor domestic violence cases are viewed more seriously than other misdemeanor offenses.

Arrest Authority

Probation officers possess and use arrest authority in two-thirds of the responding states. In the remaining states, the probation officers either have no statutory arrest authority or have an administrative policy against making arrests. Only two of the respondents reported that their officers have arrest authority but do not have adequate equipment and vehicles to make arrests.

As discussed previously, Florida probation officers have arrest authority for probation violations. However, the April 2006 OPPAGA report on Florida's community corrections programs found that officers lack authority to transport offenders or holding cells to detain them while awaiting transport by law enforcement. OPPAGA noted this lack of resources and dependence upon local law enforcement as a problem for both the corrections and law enforcement agencies.

Unlike Florida, the majority of responding states do not authorize a law enforcement officer to arrest a probationer without either a judicial warrant or authorization from the probation office. Thus, an officer who observed a known probationer violating a condition of probation (such as curfew) that does not constitute a new criminal offense could not arrest the offender on the scene. A number of states allow a probation officer to arrest a probationer without a warrant. Presumably, this reflects an assumption that the probation officer has greater knowledge of the conditions of probation and the offender's circumstances, and can exercise discretion with more knowledge than a law enforcement officer.

[10] Id.

Coordination between Law Enforcement and Corrections

There is a wide range of variation in the methods by which probation officers are informed that a probationer under their supervision has been arrested or had other contact with law enforcement.

Several states do not have a procedure in place, and essentially depend upon cooperation between the law enforcement agencies and probation offices. The effectiveness of this type of *ad hoc* arrangement varies from place to place. It tends to be effective in rural areas where the officers have personal relationships, but much less useful in urban areas. Another common method is manual matching of arrest records with probation case loads. Even when a computer is used to access the records (such as a probation officer routinely checking his probationer's NCIC), it is essentially a cumbersome and untimely method.

Other states use technology effectively by automatically generating a notice (usually by e-mail or telephone voice or text message) to the probation officer. In some states, the probation officer is automatically notified whenever one of his or her charges is arrested or even has an inquiry made against the database. The most advanced system includes the law enforcement officer's name, agency, and the date and time of the arrest or records check. Another sophisticated system routes certain types of contacts to a corrections duty officer for immediate guidance.

Florida's Jessica Lunsford Act directed the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems (CJJIS) Council to examine issues of information-sharing within the criminal justice community. The Council has made a number of recommendations that would be beneficial for supervision of probationers. Significant progress has already been made, particularly with regard to implementation of "Rapid ID" fingerprint checks.

Violation Hearings

A majority of states require that probation violation hearings be conducted by the court, in most cases by the judge who imposed the sentence of probation. Five states reported that the hearings were conducted by a hearing officer, in some states depending upon the nature of the violation. The states in which a hearing officer conducts the probation violation hearing were more likely to report definite time periods and shorter lengths of time between when the probationer is jailed and holding the violation hearing. The shortest regular time was in South Carolina, where hearings are conducted by corrections hearing officers on a weekly basis. Washington reported an average of 10 days with the hearing also conducted by a corrections hearing officer. Oregon's maximum time was 15 days, conducted by a hearing officer.

Half of the states in which the violation hearings are conducted by the court reported that the hearing was held within a week to a month, and in some cases can be held within a matter of days. However, the remaining states indicated that the time varies from case to case, with no indication of an average time or a broad range of months.

Typical Sanctions

There were few surprises in the examples of typical sanctions that are imposed as the result of probation violations. On the opposite ends of the severity spectrum are continuation of probation after a verbal reprimand and revocation of probation with imposition of a prison sentence. Responses in between those extremes relate to either punitive measures (jail with or without work release, work crew, community service, boot camp program); increased monitoring or intensified supervision (drug court, electronic monitoring, day reporting, extension of period of probation, curfew); or treatment and training (substance abuse, anger management, halfway house placement). Some states noted that they follow a continuum of efforts to correct behavior before revoking probation and incarcerating the offender.

Approximately one-third of the responding states reported that certain classes of offenders must be incarcerated or subjected to enhanced supervision after a probation violation. Special requirements are most commonly applied to violent offenders and sexual offenders.

Caseloads

Twenty-one states provided a quantifiable answer concerning the typical number of offenders that are supervised by a probation officer. The responses showed that most average caseload ratios fell in the 90:1 to 100:1 range. The highest reported general caseload ratio was 300:1 for low risk offenders. Next highest was 163:1. The lowest reported general caseload ratio was 35:1. Florida's caseload ratio for the general probation population is 66:1.

Most states reported having some types of specialized caseloads. All but two that responded to the question about specialized caseloads reported having a specialized sex offender caseload. Thirty offenders to

one officer was both the lowest and the most commonly reported ratio for sex offender supervision. The highest reported ratio was 87:1. Florida's sex offender and post-prison release caseload ratio is 27:1.

Other reported specialized caseloads include mental health, drug/alcohol, DUI, drug court, domestic violence, violent offender, high or special need offenders (such as mentally or physically disabled, terminally ill), high-risk cases with intensive supervision, re-entry, gender specific, and electronic monitoring. The lowest report caseload ratio was 14:1 for Texas' super intensive supervision of certain parolees. The lowest reported caseload for probationers was 15:1 for Minnesota's intensive supervised release program. New Mexico maintains an intensive supervision program caseload with a 20:1 ratio for high risk offenders on electronic monitoring. The caseload ratio for community control in Florida is 17:1.

Additional Comments

Respondents took the opportunity to comment on aspects of the probation violation process that were not directly addressed by survey questions. The most common observation was that the best way to reduce recidivism is to help offenders succeed in their community. This can include individual mentoring, assistance with finding and keeping employment, training in family dynamics and financial management, and treatment for inappropriate behaviors. The need for adequate numbers of trained officers and appropriate officer-to-offender caseload ratios was also emphasized in order to allow early intervention to address and redirect delinquent behaviors. Finally, a recommendation was made that resources be directed toward supervision of medium and high risk offenders, with emphasis placed on sex offenders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Legislature should consider reducing jail admissions by restricting use of a blanket "zero-tolerance" policy that results in the arrest of most alleged probation violators regardless of the severity of the alleged violation or background of the offender.

- The Legislature and the judiciary should explore the benefits of issuing notices to appear in appropriate cases based upon the offender's background and the nature of the alleged violation.

- The Legislature should facilitate imposition of swift consequences for less serious violations by authorizing the Department of Corrections to impose intermediate sanctions for specified technical violations without judicial involvement.

- The Legislature should carefully consider OPPAGA's recommendation for removal of mandatory caseload limits and require that supervision be based upon an assessment of risk by the Department of Corrections.

- The judiciary should be encouraged to develop methods to expedite hearings for offenders who are not eligible for bail or release prior to resolution of a violation charge.

- The Legislature should consider implementing the recommendations of the CJJIS Council and continue to develop uses of technology assets to ensure that all concerned criminal justice agencies have timely and accurate information about the status of persons on community supervision.