Members in Attendance
1. Warren Emmer
2. Genie Powers
3. Scott Taylor
4. Gary Tullock
5. Maureen Walsh
6. Dori Ege
7. Ann Clarke
8. Leo Lucey
9. William Rankin
10. Harry Hageman
11. Milt Gilliam
12. Robert Guy (ex-officio)
13. David Guntharp (ex-officio)
14. Pat Tuthill (ex-officio)

Staff
1. Don Blackburn
2. Ashley Hassan
3. Mindy Spring
4. Xavier Donnelly
5. Kelli Price
6. Kevin Terry
7. Sam Razor
8. Nicole Smith
9. Rick Masters

The meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m. Eleven of twelve members were present, establishing a quorum.

S. Taylor moved to approve the agenda. H. Hageman seconded. Agenda approved.

D. Ege moved to approve the minutes from November 14, 2006. A. Clarke seconded. Minutes approved.
Committee Reports

Rules Committee

- W. Rankin discussed the makeup of the members of the Committee.
- W. Rankin stated that the Committee had met on December 1, 2006 via WebEx. He added that the Committee discussed the ground rules for proceedings and a potential calendar of meetings, and agreed to hold two meetings in person, the first to be held in February.
- W. Rankin discussed the weblink to be used for posting comments on rules that the Committee will be examining. He then described those rules that had been referred to the Committee at the 2006 annual meeting and from regions. He then discussed the memo he sent to the regions regarding the timeline for proposal and comment.
- W. Rankin discussed the Advisory Opinion being drafted by the National Office to address issues with Rules 4.109-1 and 5.108. D. Blackburn added that the Opinion would be presented to the Executive and Rules Committees once completed.
- W. Emmer asked for clarification on how the weblink for rules comments was supposed to work following the Rules Committee’s February meeting.
- There was discussion of the budget allotted for the Committee. S. Taylor stated that he would send each Committee and Region chair the current budget for their Committees and Regions.

Training and Education Committee

- A. Clarke gave an overview of past and scheduled WebEx sessions. She then stated that she hoped to expand her Committee’s trainers.
- A. Clarke gave an update of recent on-site and Compact office WebEx trainings.
- She added that there had been a substantial increase in WebEx trainings, which would require a larger phone use budget for the Training Committee.
- W. Emmer asked for clarification of the Commission’s contract with WebEx. D. Blackburn provided that information and stated that the National Office was negotiating with WebEx and other vendors to cover the phone charges. W. Emmer asked if it was possible to require users and states to pay for their own phone charges, and S. Taylor asked for a breakout of the cost. D. Blackburn stated that the toll-free number could be replaced, and that he would provide usage details to S. Taylor.
- W. Emmer stated that the information on WebEx should be shared with the Commission when it next considered a dues increase.

Information and Technology Committee

- H. Hageman updated the Committee on the arbitration case against Softscape, Inc.
- H. Hageman then discussed the loss of members due to replacement appointments. He stated that he would send a letter from the Committee to
the National Office allowing DCAs to vote on Committee motions. W. Emmer voiced his support of this strategy.

- H. Hageman discussed the status of the new vendor search. He stated that the Committee hoped to interview potential vendors in mid-February.
- W. Emmer asked for a rough prediction of the timeline for the system. H. Hageman replied that he believed the software could be in the testing phase by the 2007 annual meeting, and that he did not believe the software could be in production by that time.

Compliance Committee

- L. Lucey stated that the Committee was still addressing the corrective action plans for Pennsylvania and Texas.
- R. Masters stated that a response to Texas’s proposed compliance plan may need to be drafted.
- L. Lucey stated that the process of auditing the compliance plans of both states would be addressed at the next Committee meeting. D. Ege asked if any person not on the Committee would be allowed to vote. L. Lucey replied that that question would be addressed at the next Committee meeting.

Sex Offender Ad-Hoc Committee

- R. Guy updated the Committee on the Ad Hoc Committee meeting to be held in March at the National Office and discussed the financial contributions of CSOM and NIC.
- R. Guy stated that he was gathering information and feedback from the entire Commission, and that that information would be provided to the Ad Hoc Committee members for discussion at the Lexington meeting.
- R. Guy stated that he did not have a budget for the meeting.
- R. Guy stated that he would be attending a legislative briefing hosted by the Council for State Governments in February.
- W. Emmer stated that R. Guy should use that opportunity to discuss potential agenda items and the responsibilities of the Commission with the representatives from CSOM and NIC that would also be attending the briefing. W. Emmer then stated that he hoped the Ad Hoc Committee would be able to provide a person to testify at state legislative sessions regarding sex offender supervision laws.
- D. Ege stated that at the October 26, 2006 Executive Committee meeting, R. Guy promised to deliver an agenda within 48 hours if the Committee would approve funding for a Lexington meeting. W. Emmer stated that an agenda was not provided because the Ad Hoc Committee was unable to get a quorum at its meeting. He told R. Guy to provide an agenda to the Executive Committee as soon as possible.
- R. Guy stated that he would provide an agenda once he had received feedback from the Commission.
- W. Emmer stated that the National Office could provide a rough estimate of the cost of the Lexington meeting that was not covered by other agencies, and that the Committee would discuss the issue in Old Business.
DCA Liaison Committee

- M. Gilliam described the final members of the Committee, and stated that the Committee was still developing a mission to present to the Executive Committee.
- M. Gilliam stated that he hoped to have a meeting within the next two to three weeks in order to provide feedback to the Rules Committee by February 1st.

Finance Committee

- S. Taylor stated that the Committee had not met since the annual meeting but that he hoped to hold quarterly meetings.
- S. Taylor stated that he was developing a new budget format to be sent for discussion, and that the Committee was meeting on the following Friday.

Executive Committee

- W. Emmer stated that the Committee needed internal controls for the Commission’s budget, and asked S. Taylor to be assertive. W. Emmer added that in order to ask for a dues increase, the Committee needed to demonstrate to the Commission that it was a good steward of the budget.
- W. Emmer added that an increase in the budget for the database tracking project from the Commission.
- D. Ege asked for clarification of the roles of the Chair, Executive Committee and National Office, and stated that not many decisions can be made without the approval of the entire Executive Committee.
- W. Emmer asked her to discuss the issue in New Business.

Region Reports

East Region

- M. Walsh clarified the request of the Region for funding assistance related to the January East Region meeting in Albany. W. Emmer asked her to address the matter in New Business.
- M. Walsh stated that the total amount the region was requesting was $5090.
- S. Taylor moved to approve the amount requested for the East Region meeting in Albany. G. Powers seconded.
- S. Taylor asked for clarification on those who would be attending the meeting. He added that he was concerned about setting a precedent for funding live region meetings and allowing DCAs to participate.
- S. Taylor proposed only funding the amount needed to send the Commissioners. W. Emmer suggested setting a budget for each region to use as necessary.
- D. Blackburn stated that he supported in-face region meetings, and noted that the East Region would be the least expensive to fund due to geographic proximity. He added that the Commissioners would likely support including DCAs, and stated that the Executive Committee would have to discuss how to fund these meetings.
• W. Emmer stated that the issue should be addressed in May at the Executive Committee meeting in Lexington, Kentucky.
• A. Clarke voiced her support of involving and funding DCAs.
• W. Rankin asked for clarification of the motion on the floor—was it to fund the entire amount requested or only the amount to send the Commissioners.
• S. Taylor stated that the motion supported the total amount requested.
• M. Gilliam stated that he agreed with the idea of setting an equal budget for each region to use as it wanted.
• H. Hageman stated that he was concerned about future cost implications, and that he opposed funding because it would lead to an increase in dues.
• **Motion passed 9-1.**

**South Region**
- G. Tullock discussed the most recent region meeting, including Committee recruitment, the recommendations of Tennessee’s state council, and establishing a boarder-state issues subcommittee. He added that he had not yet recruited a chair for that subcommittee.

**West Region**
- D. Ege discussed the most recent region meeting, including the Rules discussed and a possible Four Corners meeting.
- She added that she would contact region members via email to see if they wanted to call an additional meeting in order to discuss Rules proposals prior to the Rules Committee’s February 1st deadline.

**Executive Director Report**
- D. Blackburn reviewed the new process for addressing Advisory Opinion requests, including the new appeal process and identifying requests as training issues.
- R. Masters stated that the legal group was not taking the position that Advisory Opinions are anything but opinions, and are not implying a right of appeal or judicial review.
- D. Ege asked if the Commissioners would be notified of the new process. D. Blackburn stated that an email would go out after the process was officially approved by the Executive Committee.
- **W. Emmer made a motion to approve the new Legal Advisory Group and the new process for addressing Advisory Opinions. A. Clarke seconded.**
- There was discussion of the cost related to the Legal Advisory Group. R. Masters stated that the National Office was doing the labor-intensive work and limiting the work of the Legal Advisory group to feedback.
- **Motion passed.**
- D. Blackburn discussed his trip to the Indiana State Council meeting and advised that there would be rule changes proposed through the Midwest Region.
• D. Blackburn stated that the National Office had sent out a performance survey, and asked that the Executive Committee call or email questions regarding it.

Victim Representative Report
• P. Tuthill stated that a meeting was scheduled for February to discuss the role of Victim Representatives in State Councils.

Legal Counsel Report
• R. Masters discussed the status of the arbitration against Softscape, Inc.

Old Business
• W. Emmer stated that the Executive Committee had voted unanimously in November to try and recoup losses from room cancellations at the 2006 Annual Business Meeting. He asked if the motion needed to be withdrawn. R. Masters said yes. W. Emmer stated that as he had voted for it, he would like to withdraw the motion.
• M. Walsh stated that she had missed the meeting discussing the room cancellations and discussed the reasons behind the block of rooms cancelled by Massachusetts. She asked that the Committee not hold the state of Massachusetts liable for the losses and that the issue be held as a lesson learned.
• S. Taylor made a motion to reconsider the November decision to try to recoup losses from room cancellations at the 2006 Annual Business Meeting. W. Emmer seconded. Motion passed.
• There was discussion of not pursuing compensation for attrition due to room cancellations, and how to avoid the issue in the future.
• D. Ege made a motion to defer the issue until the May Executive Committee meeting. G. Powers seconded. Motion passed.
• W. Emmer stated that he expected an agenda for the Sex Offender Ad Hoc meeting to be held in Lexington, KY to be delivered to him within 48 hours.
• S. Taylor moved to approve the budget for the Sex Offender Ad Hoc Committee meeting to be held in Lexington, KY. M. Walsh seconded. Motion passed.
• R. Masters stated that the Sex Offender Ad Hoc Committee should be included on the agenda for the 2007 Annual Business meeting in order to get the Commission to ratify it as a standing committee for the purpose of compliance with the bylaws and the provisions of the Compact and budget purposes down the line.

New Business
• D. Blackburn gave an overview of the updated agenda for the 2007 Annual Business Meeting.
• There was discussion of the process by which the dates for the meeting were changed. D. Ege stated that until the bylaws were changed, an emergency meeting of the Executive Committee must be called to amend the Annual
Business meeting dates and agenda. R. Masters noted that the Executive Committee has the power to do all things that the Commission can do with the exception of making rules or amending the Compact, and that the Chair has some unilateral authority in exigent circumstances, subject to later ratification by the Executive Committee or the Commission. W. Emmer asked for clarification of exigent circumstances. R. Masters explained that these would include situations requiring action in which it is impossible to consult with the Executive Committee or the Commission in advance.

- S. Taylor noted that changing the meeting agenda may have violated the intent of the bylaws, but that the issue on the table was whether the amended agenda was acceptable.
- W. Emmer stated that in the future, any decisions that need to be made with a deadline beyond 72 hours would result in an emergency Executive Committee meeting being called.
- There was further discussion of the decision to change the dates and agenda of the 2007 Annual Business Meeting.
- There was discussion of the dates for the 2008 Annual Business Meeting. W. Rankin, D. Ege and H. Hageman all expressed that they were not confident that a one day meeting was sufficient.
- **H. Hageman made a motion to go back to the original schedule for the 2008 Annual Business meeting.** W. Rankin seconded. Motion passed.

- **H. Hageman made a motion to adjourn.** M. Walsh seconded. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 1:42 p.m. EST.