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OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

The Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association was held at the Sheraton Gibson Hotel in Cincinnati on October 10, 1970. Approximately 55 persons attended the meeting. A list of those attending is attached as Appendix A. Mr. George F. Denton, President of the Association and Compact Administrator for Ohio, presided.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M. by Mr. Denton. Mr. Denton welcomed the group on behalf of the State of Ohio and also gave the Annual Report of the President. During his report Mr. Denton pointed out that this was the Association's Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting and he commented on the achievements of the Association particularly the fine spirit of cooperation which had been developed over the years.

Mr. Denton noted that a brochure on the Compact, a proposed violation report form and uniform minimum parole regulations had been prepared at the direction of the 1969 meeting and would be discussed at the present meeting. He said also that the 1969 meeting had requested the Executive Committee to define the expression "a short time" with reference to the view that receiving states should not ordinarily request sending states to retake a parolee who had only a short time remaining on his sentence. Mr. Denton said that the Executive Committee had not been able to specify the number of days which should be considered "a short time" and felt that this matter must be left to the discretion of the Compact Administrator in each case.

Mr. William L. Frederick of the Council of State Governments gave the Annual Report of the Secretariat. A copy of this report will be found in Appendix B.

Mr. Charles H. Lawson of Florida gave the Annual Report of the Treasurer. This Report was referred to the Auditing Committee. The text will be found in Appendix C.

The Summary of the 1969 Annual Meeting was approved.

Mr. Denton appointed the following Committees: Auditing: Charles P. Chew, Virginia, Chairman; Ralph S. Falconer, Maryland. Resolutions: W. G. Sartorius, Missouri, Chairman; Allen Cook, Arizona; Irvin Riedman, North Dakota; W. Parker Hurley, Kentucky. Nominating: L.B. Stephens, Alabama, Chairman; Edward W. Grout, Colorado; Paul J. Gernert, Pennsylvania; R.W. Bobzin, Iowa; T.F. Telander, Minnesota.

MORNING DISCUSSION SESSION

COMPACT HANDBOOK

Mr. Denton said that the Executive Committee had recommended the publication of a handbook prepared by John W. Shoemaker of Ohio. He said that the Executive Committee had decided that 20,000 copies should be printed. Mr. Denton said the brochure which was published in 1965 would still be useful for some purposes but he pointed out that the new handbook contained many legal citations and would be especially valuable for judges. A motion was approved directing the Secretariat to order 20,000 copies of the new handbook.

- 1 -
A set of Uniform Minimum Parole Regulations prepared by Mr. Nichols of Maine at the direction of the 1969 meeting was read. Mr. Denton reported that the Executive Committee had decided that the rules would have to be adopted by all 50 parole boards of the desired uniformity in rules was to be achieved. There was a general feeling that many parole boards would prefer to use their existing rules. A motion was made and adopted that the proposed uniform rules be tabled.

PAROLE AND PROBATION VIOLATION REPORT FORM

The group discussed a proposed violation report form which had been prepared by Mr. Lawson of Florida. A copy of the form as amended from the floor will be found in Appendix D of this summary.

Mr. Frederick said that the form had been drafted at the request of the 1969 meeting because it was felt that the present optional violation report form might not be adequate in view of the present trend in the courts towards added protection of rights of parolees and probationers at revocation hearings. Some delegates expressed the view that use of the form should be optional since their own forms appeared to be adequate. Some delegates also suggested that narrative violation reports were acceptable as long as they contained all necessary information. A motion was made and approved that the form be adopted as an Optional Form.

Mr. Frederick said the Secretariat would send a letter to all Administrators explaining the purpose of the form and suggesting that all information be included if states used their own form or reported violations in narrative form.

A motion was made and approved that the violation report form be placed on the agenda for the 1971 meeting so that additional action could be taken based on experience with the form during the year.

ASKING RESPONDING STATE OFFICIALS TO APPEAR AT SENDING STATE REVOCATION HEARINGS

Mr. Gernert reported that his state's officials had been asked to appear at revocation hearings for technical violators in Delaware and Maryland and that he had been informed that this was required by statutes in these states. He said that submission of certified copies of the violation report would not suffice. It was reported that the same problem had arisen with regard to probationers from Colorado, North Dakota and Texas. Mr. Gernert pointed out that some courts might be mis-construing Mempa v. Rhay, a United States Supreme Court case involving a probation violator. In that case, however, no sentence had been imposed initially.

A motion was made and approved that the Resolutions Committee draft a resolution pointing out the problem and asking the National Association of Attorneys General to review the question. At the conclusion of the meeting such a resolution was adopted. See Resolution I in Appendix E.'

CONCURRENT SENTENCES

There was a brief discussion of California's "Stolicker Rule" which holds that a California prisoner is entitled to be made available to prison authorities of other states if the California court states or implies that his new sentence is
to run concurrently. In response to a question from Mr. Wood of New York, Mr. Spangler said a California court had sent an inquiry to New York to see if New York planned to follow through on the warrant it had filed with California. If the California court knew that New York planned to retake the prisoner and incarcerate him, the California court would probably order a concurrent sentence and turn the prisoner over to New York. Mr. Spangler said that there had been some instances in which California courts had discharged prisoners so that they could serve out their sentences in other states only to find that the original state of imprisonment had decided to give the prisoner parole and ask for California supervision under the Compact. Mr. Spangler said this was not the intent of the California court when it applied the Stoliker rule.

REQUESTING THE ARREST OF VIOLATORS WHEN THERE IS NO INTENTION OF RETAKING THEM

Mr. Lawson of Florida asked that states refrain from asking for arrest of violators unless a definite decision to retake them had been made. He also suggested that sending states should develop an efficient method of determining whether the violation warrants return before requesting the arrest of a violator.

Mr. Bobzin of Iowa said that his state reviews all cases periodically and removes its warrants on absconders if they have been missing five years.

SENDING CASES OUT OF STATE WITHOUT NOTICE OR REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. Strothers of North Carolina said that courts in his state sometimes sent probationers out of state without notice or a request for investigation but that his office was working with judges in an attempt to prevent such actions. He expressed the hope that other states would be receptive to requests for supervision even though they were made after the probationer already was in the proposed receiving state. He suggested that it would be in a state's best interest to accept supervision in such cases since the probationer would be in the state whether he was under supervision or not.

Mr. Telander said that 70 percent of the out-of-state cases in Minnesota were already in the state before the request for supervision was received. Mr. Gernert pointed out that his state's Attorney General had ruled that Pennsylvania would lose jurisdiction over probationers or parolees who were not placed under the Compact when they were permitted to move to other states.

Several delegates said they would like to be informed of the presence of any unsupervised probationers in their states.

There was a consensus that judges should be encouraged to follow the Compact. The group agreed that the Secretariat should ask the Conference of State Trial Judges to put the Compact on the agenda for their next meeting. It also was agreed that individual Administrators should work with judges in their state. Mr. Frederick said that he would write to the Conference of State Trial Judges again and he said that he would offer to send them copies of the new Compact handbook.

CIVIL PAROLE

In response to a question from one of the delegates, Mr. Spangler said that there was a new form of parole in California known as civil parole. This is used for narcotic addicts. When an addict comes before the California courts he may be committed to a narcotic rehabilitation center instead of to jail. This is a civil commitment, and persons under this type of commitment are not eligible for supervision under the Compact. Mr. Spangler emphasized that his agency does not handle
these cases. States to which a civil parolee goes might be able to provide
courtesy supervision but such parolees are not subject to extradition. Tech-
nically addicts under civil parole are known as "outpatients."

One of the delegates brought up the question of the status of first offenders
who are put on probation without conviction being recorded. Several states are
doing this primarily for those caught experimenting with drugs so that if probation
is successful the first offender will not have a record.

A motion was adopted and approved that the Executive Committee should set up
an ad hoc committee to determine what might be done in so far as the Compact is
concerned about such cases and those of civil parolees.

EXPEDITING WARRANTS IN DANGEROUS CASES

Mr. Spangler stressed the importance of deputizing officials to sign warrants
when the person normally authorized to sign them will be unavailable. He cited the
instance of a compact parolee who was detained for making threats while carrying a
gun. The sending state was unable to send a warrant quickly and the man had to be
released. He committed two murders shortly after his release.

RETAIKING CASES WITHOUT EXTRADITION

Discussion revealed that officials in some states refuse to recognize the
Compact waiver form or the Compact's provisions regarding the retaking of cases
without extradition. There was a consensus that Administrators should fight the
use of extradition proceedings or demands for a new waiver. The suggestion was
made that this matter be brought to the attention of state trial court judges.
The suggestion was also made that Compact Administrators should seek favorable
opinions from their Attorneys General on this point. Attention was called to
the fact that it is important to be sure an Attorney General understands the
Compact before he is asked for an opinion. One delegate remarked that some send-
ing states ask that a new waiver be signed when they anticipate difficulty with
local officials in the receiving state. The new waiver can sometimes prevent
delays when the sending state's officers arrive to pick up the man.

UNIFORM PAROLE REPORTING PROGRAM

Mr. Ernest Wink reported on this subject. A summary of his remarks follows.

Fifty-five agencies are now participating in the reporting program. About a
year ago a two-year follow up system was established and more than half of the
agencies are now reporting. The total file is now computerized.

A new LEAA grant has been secured to study parole decision making. The ob-
jective is to develop some models as to what type of information parole boards need
and use and what kind of information is relevant to parole decision making.

The first step, which has almost been completed, is establishing definitions
and determining objectives. The second step will be to prepare some basic expectancy
tables. The third step will be to follow a random sample of fifty percent of the
cases after release. The fourth step will be to monitor a small sample of parole
cases to find out what information was actually used for the decision making. The
fifth step will be a study of the entire program to find out the consequences of
utilizing the program and the computer to get information.
President Denton introduced Mr. Brevard E. Crihfield, Executive Director of The Council of State Governments, who had helped to organize the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association during the late forties and early fifties. A summary of Mr. Crihfield's speech follows.

I am delighted to be with you on the occasion of your Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting. It is a pleasure to look around the room and see some of my old friends. The Association has come a long way since its first meeting. You should all be proud at the effectiveness of your Association in making the Compact work. For the Council, working with the Association has been a privilege and a pleasure.

There are some new areas in which the Council is working which I think may be of interest to you as state officials. Let me describe them briefly.

The Council of State Governments is now very much committed to training programs for state officials. For the past several years we have assisted the National Association of State Budget Officers in conducting a series of institutes for budget analysts. Beginning a year ago, on behalf of the National Legislative Conference, we have held a number of seminars for legislators and legislative staff personnel. Also, again this year we will be repeating a program we conducted two years ago immediately following the elections for new Governors and their staffs. Now in cooperation with other organizations of state and local officials, we are exploring the possibility of providing training programs for management personnel in all areas of government.

There are three other areas in which we are heavily involved which I think will be of interest to you.

First, we are continuing to press for extension to other grant programs of the "block grant" concept embodied in the "Safe Streets Act".

Second, both the National Governors' Conference and the National Legislative Conference are giving strong support to proposals for revenue sharing.

Finally, we are working with the National Association of State Budget Officers and other groups to simplify existing grant-in-aid procedures and to reduce the tremendous volume of paper work with which state agencies must cope under existing law.

AFTERNOON DISCUSSION SESSION

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

Dr. E. Preston Sharp of the American Correctional Association gave this report. A summary of his remarks follows.

In the current Directory there is a list of full or part time parole boards. ACA would like to be informed if there are any errors. The work release information requested by the Association will be carried in the Directory again.

At this year's board meeting there will be a list of nominees for the Accreditation Council. A mail ballot will be sent out to determine who will be on the Accreditation Council. The Accreditation Council will be a separate entity independent of ACA.
There is a new Committee on Revision of Correctional Standards. The Chairman is Al Wagner of New Jersey. The Committee has an LEAA grant. The Committee's priorities will be in the juvenile field and the probation and parole sections. The revisions will be sent out in loose leaf form.

ACA is maintaining its technical consulting services. Requests for technical services should be directed to each state's planning commission.

LEAA now has regional offices and their names and addresses will be found in the Directory.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Mr. Fred Ward, Director of NCCD's Division of Research and Special Services, gave this report. A summary of his remarks follows.

NCCD has had to do some "belt tightening" but it is carrying on most of its programs. While certain staff has not been replaced new staff is being hired for new projects.

The Citizen Action Program has come of age. Leading corporations and citizens are supporting it actively.

NCCD is also moving ahead in the area of special services. It has developed a training center which is supported by three major grants. The center is working in the area of juveniles. It has a Probation Management Institute and it is running probation and parole institutes in various states.

NCCD has been working on new approaches to training. Some of these involve disparate groups. One pilot project brought together parole board members, probation administrators, wardens, department of corrections officials and ex-convicts. Another project brought together hippies, yippees, student militants, valedictorians and other top students, correctional administrators, judges, police chiefs and Washington bureaucrats. A great deal was learned and a publication on the subject is available through HEW.

NCCD has another special project which is about to begin in San Antonio, Texas. It will involve residents of the ghetto and key decision makers in the criminal justice system.

NCCD is starting an exchange program for parole board members. Robert Trimble will be getting in touch with each state's parole board about the project which would permit a member of a parole board to visit another state's board for a period of about a week.

NCCD has a new publication entitled "Crime and Delinquency Literature" which is published six times a year. It includes abstracts from 250 journals. It is hoped that this information can be computerized so that for six or seven thousand dollars a year an official can have a console in his office and retrieve information immediately on any subject in which he is interested.

COOPERATIVE RETURN OF VIOLATORS

Mr. Frederick said that it had been suggested that an LEAA grant be secured to make the Association's Cooperative Return Program workable. He said that the plan would permit an agent who was going to another state to pick up a violator to be
deputized to pick up and return violators for other states. Mr. Frederick noted that a number of states had joined the plan some years ago but they had not been able to make it work effectively because of the lack of a central information service from which they could ascertain when and where the agents of member states would be traveling. A motion was made and approved that the Executive Committee should study the matter of securing an LEAA grant for the Cooperative Return plan.

REPRESENTATIVE ON THE NATIONAL PAROLE INSTITUTE

A motion was made and approved that Mr. Francis Bridges, Jr. of Florida continue as the Association's representative on the National Parole Institute.

OTHER MATTERS

Mr. Strothers said that the discharge procedure often is slowed down because states fail to send progress reports regularly. Mr. Bobzin commented that sending states may demand quarterly reports under the Compact rules. Mr. Strothers said it would be helpful if states would send the reports automatically when quarterly reports have been requested. At present much staff time is wasted in reviewing cases and writing to delinquent states.

Mr. Strothers noted that receiving states sometimes fail to notify sending states when they permit a supervisee to transfer to a third state. There was a consensus that the sending state must be involved in the transfer.

Mr. Strothers reported his state sometimes allowed its own supervisees to travel to other states for periods exceeding 30 days for special purposes such as summer jobs. He said his office sometimes requested courtesy supervision in such cases. He asked if there was any objection to this procedure. No objections were made.

FINAL BUSINESS SESSION

NEXT ANNUAL MEETING

The group voted to express a preference to the Executive Committee for holding the next annual meeting in conjunction with the Congress of Corrections. 1/

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

The Auditing Committee reported that the Treasurer's accounts were in order. The Association approved the Report unanimously.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

The Report of the Resolutions Committee was adopted unanimously. The text of the Resolutions will be found in Appendix E.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The report of the Nominating Committee was adopted unanimously and the Secretariat was directed to cast one ballot for the following slate:

1/ At the conclusion of the meeting the Executive Committee met and agreed that the next Annual Meeting should be held at the Americana Hotel, Bal Harbour, Florida, August 7, 1971.
Mr. Denton announced that Compact Administrator Telander of Minnesota was retiring. Mr. Telander made a brief speech.

Mr. Denton turned the gavel over to Mr. Spangler. As his first act in office Mr. Spangler presented Mr. Denton with a certificate from the Association honoring him for his leadership as President

The Meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.
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SECRETARIAT'S REPORT

There have been several developments during the past year pertaining to the Compact and related matters which may be of interest to you.

First, S. 3749 has been introduced in Congress to authorize the District of Columbia to join the Compact.

Two legal opinions pertaining to the Compact have been reported to us. The Attorney General of Oregon has ruled that a probationer being supervised under the Compact may be retaken in the receiving state or a third state by agents of the sending state without extradition proceedings. 1/ In the case of State v. Phillips, 2/ the Missouri Supreme Court ruled that a probationer who had been sent to a halfway house in Minnesota without the prior consent of Minnesota could be retaken under the Compact since Minnesota subsequently accepted supervision and the probationer was aware of his status as a compact supervisee.

As always we would much appreciate it if you would be certain to report to us any court decisions or opinions of your Attorney General concerning the Compact.

The Interstate Compact on Juveniles which this Association helped to develop was ratified by South Carolina this year and Congress also authorized the District of Columbia to join. The only non-member states are Georgia and New Mexico.

This Association also helped to develop the Agreement on Detainers. The Agreement was ratified by Arizona, Tennessee and Virginia this year, bringing the total number of member states to twenty-eight. Bills are pending in Congress to authorize joinder by the District of Columbia and the federal government. 3/

The new Compact on the Mentally Disordered Offender was ratified by Delaware this year. Seven states, Delaware, Illinois, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island and South Dakota now have ratified it.

Also in the field of corrections, the State of Kentucky ratified the Interstate Corrections Compact this year. Delaware, Minnesota and Vermont also are members.

Last year you requested that a table on statutory minimums and maximums for parole and probation be distributed for inclusion in your manuals. Such a table was distributed with Newsletter 77. A table entitled Comparison of Parole Rules was sent to you in April for your manuals. Copies have been placed with the other meeting material on the table for use during the discussion of Uniform Minimum Parole Regulations.

During the year we also distributed a memorandum sent to us by Paul Gernert of Pennsylvania entitled, "Transportation of Parole Violators by Airlines." We have a small supply of this memorandum. If you would like to have a copy, please leave a note with Jane Parks.

Some states have not sent in their reports on the Interstate Movement of Parolees and Probationers. We would appreciate receiving them by October 30. We have not received reports from the states of: Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont and West Virginia.

1/ Opinion No. 6604, March 3, 1969
2/ 443 S.W. 2d 129 (Mo.Sup.Ct. 1969)
3/ H.R. 2172 and H.R. 6951
### FINANCIAL STATEMENT
July 1, 1969 - June 30, 1970

**CHECKING ACCOUNT - THE TALLAHASSEE BANK & TRUST CO., TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH RECEIPTS</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash on hand 7/1/69</td>
<td>Council of State Governments $ 317.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenses incurred by Wm. L. Frederick &amp; secretary at Annual meeting 8/16/69 (travel, hotel &amp; misc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues received 69-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues received 70-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rec'd on savings account</td>
<td>The Raddison Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,820.68</td>
<td>298.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,725.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30 to 8/21/69 1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21 to 12/31/69 4.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/69 to 6/25/70 6.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rec'd on savings certificates</td>
<td>Council of State Governments 202.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105.74</td>
<td>Postage money 7/1/68 to 6/30/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. # 4270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. # 5278</td>
<td>The Genovese Press, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multigraphing, mimeographing and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Comm. Meeting 2/26/70</td>
<td>64.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stouffer (meeting rm.) 41.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luncheon 23.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary Expense</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance 6/30/69 $6,192.06</td>
<td>4,872.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checking $620.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savings $291.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savings cert. 3,960.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY** $ 6,192.06

**TOTAL ACCOUNTABILITY** $ 6,192.06
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE PAID</th>
<th>INVOICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-4-69</td>
<td>#5175</td>
<td>$ 28.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-29-69</td>
<td>#5149 &amp; 5271</td>
<td>190.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-3-69</td>
<td>#5285</td>
<td>78.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-17-69</td>
<td>#5943</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6-70</td>
<td>#6034</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24-70</td>
<td>#7071</td>
<td>20.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-22-70</td>
<td>#7258</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-22-70</td>
<td>#7305</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-22-70</td>
<td>#7308</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-22-70</td>
<td>#7329</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-29-70</td>
<td>#7381</td>
<td>48.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 426.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1970 - 71 MEMBERSHIP DUES PAID
As of June 30, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA (parole)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA (probation)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGIN ISLANDS</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**               **$1,500.00**
USE OF COMPACT FORM B, VIOLATION REPORT FORM

At its 1970 Annual Meeting, the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association discussed the importance of receiving states providing full information to sending states concerning all violations by parolees or probationers under Compact supervision. It was agreed that it was essential that sending states have full and complete information on all violations in order to make legally sound decisions concerning revocation. Revocations of parole or probation by a sending state may be subject to challenge in the courts if the grounds for the revocation are not fully documented.

For these reasons, the Association approved as an official Compact Form the attached Form B. However, recognizing the fact that many states already are providing all necessary information concerning violations either by use of other forms or through lengthy letters, it was decided to make use of Form B official. It is imperative, however, that all of the information required on Form B be provided in any violation report sent to a sending state.
### PAROLE AND PROBATION FORM B

**VIOLATION REPORT FORM**

**Date:**

**To:**

**From:**

**Parolee:**

**Probationer:**

**Case Number:**

**Re:**

**TYPE OF REPORT**

- Delinquency w/o arrest
- Arrest
- Conviction
- Follow-up

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Warrant requested
- Remain under supervision
- Return for Suspension or Revocation Hearing

**ARREST DATA**

**Date:**

**City:**

**County:**

**Agency:**

**SPECIFIC CHARGE OR TECHNICAL VIOLATION**

(If technical, list rules violated and document under additional comments section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Charge/Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION**

- In custody
- On Bond
- Amount
- ROR

**DATE OF OFFENSE OR VIOLATION OCCURRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABSCONDING DATA**

Date moved w/o permission

Last known address

**COURT DATA**

Date of Sentence

Offense

Name and Location of Court

Court of Record? Yes _ No _

Date of Conviction

Specific Sentence

Plea

Name and address of institution to which committed

- fel
- misd

* Use of this Form is optional but all officials should use it in reporting violations or be certain that all information required on the form is included in any other type of document used for reporting violations. This form is a substitute for the previous Compact Form B.
VIOLATION REPORT FORM

FOLLOW UP OR CONTINUATION SHEET

Date: ___________________

To: ___________________________ From: ___________________________

Parolee: ________________ Probationer: ___________________________

Re: __________________________ Case Number: ______________________

______________________________________________________________

Date of sentence ____________ Name and Location of Court __________________________

______________________________________________________________

Offense _______________________________________________________

Date of Conviction ____________ Specific Sentence __________________________

______________________________________________________________

Plea ______________ Name and Address of Institution _______________

to which committed ____________________________________________

__________________________ fel ______ misd _________________

Location of subject: ___________________________

Status of charge: ___________________________

Recommendations: _____________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
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VIOLATION RETURN FORM

RETURN

Should return be attempted under Interstate Compact? Yes ____ No ____

Will subject waive extradition? Yes ____ No ____

Has he signed a Waiver? Yes ____ No ____

Date and place transfer officers should take custody ____________________

Name, address and phone number of person to be contacted upon arrival to pick up violator: ____________________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS *

Please give below or on back of form or on attachments: (1) How violation occurred (give facts); (2) Subject's statement; (3) History of supervision; (4) If recommended, indicate plans for continued supervision as alternative to suspension or revocation.

Recommendations of Administrator or Interstate Correspondent to sending agency:

* In addition to the information reported here, please attach all documents and material necessary to provide a comprehensive and detailed report of all acts and circumstances about which information is necessary in making a revocation determination.

- 19 -
RESOLUTIONS

I

WHEREAS, the effectiveness of the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers is dependent upon the willingness of each state to accept violation reports from other states, to return violators when requested and to take all necessary subsequent action including revocation or parole or probation on the basis of such reports; and

WHEREAS, courts in some states now are refusing to accept such reports as sufficient evidence at revocation hearings and are requiring parole or probation officials from supervising states to appear personally at revocation hearings; and

WHEREAS, such requirements threaten to impose a burden, in terms of costs and staff time, on parole and probation agencies that could severely limit the usefulness of the Compact;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association at its Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 10, 1970, that the National Association of Attorneys General be requested to consider this matter with a view to recommending that each Attorney General take whatever action he deems necessary and proper to remove this obstacle to the effective functioning of this Compact.

II

BE IT RESOLVED, that George Denton of Ohio and his staff be congratulated and commended for his year of leadership as President of the Compact Administrators Association

III

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ad Hoc Committee chaired by Charles Lawson of Florida and the members of his Committee be commended for the preparation and presentation of the Uniform Violation Report Form.

IV

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Secretariat forward a letter of heartfelt condolences to the families of those members who have died the past year.

V

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Secretariat forward a letter expressing the sincere appreciation of the Association for the dedicated work and many years of service given to the Association of those members who have retired during the past year.

VI

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association again commends The Council of State Governments, and specifically William L. Frederick and his staff, Jane Parks, for their continuing efforts on behalf of the Compact and the Association.