    (I) WHETHER DESCRIPTIVE SENTENCING GUIDELINES SHOULD BE RETAINED BY THE STATE AS A SENTENCING STRUCTURE, EITHER IN THEIR CURRENT FORM OR IN A MODIFIED FORM;

    (II) WHETHER THE STATE SHOULD ADOPT GUIDED DISCRETION SENTENCING GUIDELINES AND, IF SO, WHAT TYPE OF GUIDED DISCRETION SENTENCING GUIDELINES SHOULD BE ADOPTED;

    (III) WHETHER THE STATE SHOULD RETAIN PAROLE AS A CORRECTIONAL OPTION OR ELIMINATE PAROLE FOR ALL INMATES OR ANY PARTICULAR CATEGORY OF INMATES;

    (IV) WHETHER THE STATE SHOULD INCREASE THE MINIMUM PORTION OF A SENTENCE THAT MUST BE SERVED BY ALL INMATES OR ANY PARTICULAR CATEGORY OF INMATES BEFORE BECOMING ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE;

    (V) WHETHER THE STATE SHOULD ELIMINATE GOOD TIME CREDITS OR OTHERWISE ALTER THE MANNER IN WHICH AN INMATE MAY OBTAIN RELEASE ON MANDATORY SUPERVISION;

    (VI) WHETHER THE STATE NEEDS TO TAKE ACTION TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS A COORDINATED SYSTEM OF ~~INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENTS~~ *CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS PROGRAMS* AT THE STATE AND COUNTY LEVELS AND, IF SO, WHAT ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN; AND

    (VII) ANY OTHER MATTER RELATING TO STATE AND LOCAL LAWS AND POLICIES GOVERNING SENTENCING, PAROLE, MANDATORY SUPERVISION, AND ~~INTERMEDIATE PUNISHMENTS~~ *CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS PROGRAMS*.

    (2) THE SENTENCING AND CORRECTIONAL PROCESS SHALL PURSUE THE FOLLOWING OBJECTIVES:

    (I) PROMOTE SENTENCING THAT MORE ACCURATELY REFLECTS THE TIME THAT AN OFFENDER WILL ACTUALLY BE INCARCERATED;

    (II) CONCENTRATE PRISON CAPACITY ON THE INCARCERATION OF VIOLENT AND CAREER OFFENDERS;

    (III) REDUCE UNWARRANTED DISPARITY IN SENTENCES FOR OFFENDERS WHO HAVE COMMITTED SIMILAR OFFENSES AND HAVE SIMILAR CRIMINAL HISTORIES;

    (IV) PRESERVE MEANINGFUL JUDICIAL DISCRETION IN THE IMPOSITION OF SENTENCES AND SUFFICIENT FLEXIBILITY TO PERMIT INDIVIDUALIZED SENTENCES; AND

    (V) ENSURE THAT SENTENCING JUDGES IN EVERY JURISDICTION IN THE STATE ARE ABLE TO IMPOSE THE MOST APPROPRIATE CRIMINAL PENALTIES, INCLUDING CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS PROGRAMS FOR APPROPRIATE NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS.