Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision  
Ad Hoc on Border Issues Committee Minutes  
January 22, 2014  
Meeting Room 31, 3rd Floor  
Renaissance Columbus Downtown Hotel  
50 North Third Street,  
Columbus, OH 43215

Members in Attendance:
1. Sara Andrews OH
2. Ed Gonzales NM
3. Kathleen Graves KS
4. Chris Norman AL
5. Michael Potteiger PA
6. Roger Wilson OH ex-officio
7. Jay Lynn NC ex-officio

Members not in Attendance:
1. Gary Roberge CT
2. Nancy Ware DC
3. Steve Robinson TX
4. Regina Grimes TX ex-officio

Staff
1. Harry Hageman
2. Mindy Spring

Guests:
1. Judge Howard H. Harcha III, Scioto County Common Pleas Court
2. Brian Sein, Franklin County Adult Probation
3. Lucy Sauer, Franklin County Adult Probation
4. Julie Doepke, Victim Advocate, Hamilton County Adult Probation and Ohio Council member
5. Ronell Jones, Ohio Compact Staff
6. Kristin Farrell-Logsdon, Ohio Compact Staff
7. Melissa Hunt, Ohio Compact Staff

Call to Order

Approved on 4/22/2014. B.S.
Commissioner S. Andrews (OH) called the meeting to order at 8:03 am ET. Five of eight committee members were present, establishing a quorum.

**Opening Remarks**
Commissioner S. Andrews (OH) provided opening remarks thanking everyone’s participation and asked the Ohio guests to introduce themselves.

**Discussion**
The Committee reviewed the Metropolitan Statistical Area document provided by Texas, committee charter, several ICAOS rules, and engaged in discussion.

Topics of discussion included:
- Feasibility of sending state retaining authority to supervise a compact eligible offender in another state.
  - The Committee agreed that this approach would not work for all compact eligible offenders. It would be difficult to determine, which offenders are eligible, due to the fact that states do not measure risk levels consistently.
  - Can a receiving state place offender on administrative supervision with the offender reporting to the sending state?
    - What would be the receiving state’s obligations?
      - Home visits
      - Arrest powers
      - Supervision level discrepancies
    - What are the public safety implications?
  - The Focus should be on offender success and not a way to circumvent process
  - How would this work in states with state probation and parole versus county probation?
- Difference of issues with offenders in metropolitan border areas versus rural border areas.
  - Metropolitan issues: Access to resources/treatment
  - Rural issues: Geographic-Probation office in receiving state may be much further than probation office in sending state.
    - E. Gonzales indicated additional issues could arise in border areas near reservations (i.e. Four Corners)
- Possibility for legal issues if a new process is created for offenders living near a border.
  - Obligation to notify receiving state and receiving state would need to agree
  - Violations/retaking offenders
  - States arranging agreements outside of the Interstate Compact.
  - Process would affect several ICAOS rules.
- How many offenders would be affected if a new process is created?
• Concentrating training in border cities

• Allow more direct communication in border areas

• Are there any states addressing issues in their border cities?
  o Commissioner E. Gonzales (NM) indicated Oregon and Washington compact offices meet weekly to discuss border issues between their states

The committee grouped the pros and cons for creating a new process for offenders living near borders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Offenders who spend majority of time outside jurisdiction (work, personal activities, school)</td>
<td>• Receiving state providing no assistance when offender is in their state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easier imposition of conditions by sending state</td>
<td>• Efficiency of process (new process, new exception, more work have to justify why the case should be retained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both states to be in agreement/flexibility in Rules (sending state provide progress reports to receiving state)</td>
<td>• Unknown public safety implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to services/supervision</td>
<td>• Rule and process implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration increase between states</td>
<td>• Fiscal implication (supervision fee, application fee, due)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Victim Input</td>
<td>• Caseload implications (states with county and state supervision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After lengthy discussion, the Committee agreed by consensus the problem and issues, as discussed by the group and in the documents provided by Texas, are not defined and would need to ask for input from Commissioners.

The Committee drafted survey questions to distribute among the commissioners.

The Committee will meet again by WebEx on March 12, 2014 at 2 pm ET.

**Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner E. Gonzales, seconded by Commissioner C. Norman. Meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm ET.