Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision
Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

March 12, 2015
3:00pm ET
WebEx

Members in Attendance:
1. Sara Andrews   Chairwoman, OH
2. Chris Norman   Vice-Chair, AL
3. Charlie Lauterbach  Treasurer, IA
4. Gary Roberge   CT
5. Chris Moore   GA
6. Jane Seigel   IN
7. Anne Precythe   NC
8. Geri Miller-Fox   UT
9. Dale Crook   VT
10. Anmarie Aylward   WA
11. Milt Gilliam Ex-Officio
12. Pat Tuthill Ex-Officio
13. Rick Masters Legal Counsel

Members not in Attendance:
1. Cathy Gibson-Beltz   NE
2. Jeremiah Stromberg   OR

Guests:
1. Charles Placek ND

Staff:
1. Harry Hageman
2. Barno Saturday
3. Kevin Terry
4. Xavier Donnelly

Approved on 4/8/2015. B.S.
5. Mindy Spring

Call to Order
Chairwoman S. Andrews (OH) called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm ET; ten voting members were present, establishing a quorum.

Agenda
Commissioner A. Precythe (NC) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner A. Aylward (WA) seconded.

Agenda approved.

Minutes
Commissioner A. Precythe (NC) moved to approve the minutes from February 10, 2015 as written. Commissioner J. Seigel (IN) seconded.

Minutes approved.

Discussion
Commissioner J. Seigel (IN) presented the Rules Committee report. The Rules Committee met on February 24, 2015. The Committee worked on justifications for bylaws changes. The Committee is scheduled to meet face-to-face on March 24-25, 2015.

Commissioner A. Precythe (NC) submitted the written Training Committee report (see attachment).

Commissioner G. Miller-Fox (UT) stated the DCA Liaison Committee met on February 9, 2015. The Committee discussed transfer requests and retaking issues. The DCA Region chairs provide mentoring services to new DCAs in their regions.

The Committee will meet again on May 18, 2015. Commissioner G. Miller-Fox (UT) will encourage DCA regions to meet prior to next DCA Liaison Committee meeting.

Commissioner G. Roberge submitted the written Technology Committee report (see attachment).

Commissioner C. Lauterbach presented the Finance Committee report. The Commission is 8.65% under the budget for this fiscal year. Currently, the long term investment portfolio is $1.2 million; the Commission has $1.7 million in cash with CSG.

Region Reports:
East Region: Commissioner D. Crook (VT) stated that the East Region met on March 10, 2015, but did not have a quorum. DE has a new commissioner - Alan Grinstead.
South Region: Commissioner C. Moore (GA) stated that the South Region has not met since the last Executive Committee meeting. The Region has new commissioners in MS and WV.

West Region: Commissioner A. Aylward (WA) stated the West Region met on March 11, 2015. The Committee decided to discuss Roberts Rules of Order at its April meeting.

Executive Director Report
Executive Director H. Hageman presented his written report to the Committee (see attachment).

The Committee engaged in the discussion on GA correction action plan deadline during the Executive Director report.

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) moved to extend the deadline. Committee D. Crook (VT) seconded.

Commissioner Moore is requesting the Executive Committee extend Georgia’s deadline to submit its corrective action plan until after this legislation to create the Department of Community Supervision passes and the leadership has been named.

Legal Counsel R. Masters informed the Committee that if the bill passes, it will be in effect on July 1, 2015.

Commissioner C. Placek (ND) asked to be heard and spoke against the motion. He asked the Committee to keep April 14 deadline. Georgia had to submit and implement its plan by April 14, however, North Dakota has not seen any plan in progress.

Victims’ Advocate P. Tuthill supports North Dakota’s position, opposing GA’s request to extend the deadline.

The Committee discussed the timeline and deadline for the corrective action plan.

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) amended the motion “Georgia shall both outline the corrective action plan and the steps it intends to take and implement it by September 1, 2015.”

Commissioner D. Crook (VT) agreed with the amendment.

Commissioner C. Moore (GA) stated that September 1 deadline will be difficult to achieve.

Executive Director H. Hageman took the roll call:

1. Andrews – No

Approved on 4/8/2015. B.S.
2. Norman – No
3. Lauterbach – No
4. Roberge – No
5. Moore – abstained
6. Seigel – No
7. Precythe – No
8. Miller-Fox – No
9. Crook – No
10. Aylward – No

Motion failed.

Victims’ Advocate P. Tuthill presented her report. On Feb 2nd, Minnesota held a VineWatch personnel call. They established an Ad hoc VineWatch group that will meet in April.

The American Correction Association asked P. Tuthill to write an article about the Interstate Compact.

P. Tuthill sent Payton Tuthill Foundation’s brochures to DCA Brock (MD) to use in MD trainings.

Legal Counsel R. Masters presented the legal memorandum to the Committee for review (see amendment).

Commissioner A. Precythe (NC) requested clarification on having jurisdiction in another state’s matter.

Legal Counsel R. Masters presented the summary of AO 2-2015 (see attachment).

Executive Director H. Hageman stated that VA Attorney General took a stand that this type of case was not compact eligible.

Commissioner J. Seigel (IN) moved to approve AO 2-2015. Commissioner A. Precythe (NC) seconded.

Commissioner M. Gilliam (OK) spoke for the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

Old Business
Face-to-face Executive Committee Agenda: The Committee finalized the agenda (see attachment).

Approved on 4/8/2015. B.S.
Chairwoman S. Andrews (OH) asked the Committee to send her their goals by March 20th.

**New Business**
*Personnel Matters:* The Executive Committee discussed personnel matters in regard to the ICAOS Assistant Director’s position.

Commissioner C. Moore (GA) moved to go into the executive session. Commissioner A. Precythe (NC) seconded.

Motion passed.

The Committee voted adjourn after passing a motion to come out of executive session.

**Adjourn**
Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) moved to adjourn. Committee A. Precythe (NC) seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 4:07 pm ET.
Training Committee Report

Anne Precythe, Training and Public Relations Committee Chair

March 12, 2015

Training Committee News

- Trainer Group
  - Survey-21 respondents
    - ½ are DCAs or former trainers. Other ½ are other compact office staff or field staff recommended by DCA or Commissioner Trainers assigned for all the upcoming trainings
  - Intro meeting for new trainers April 6th
- On Demand Training Project
  - project to kick on this week with module using software simulation training around the violation report.
  - 4 of the 16 planned modules are scripted to date

Training Stats

- On Demand-Last 30 days
  - Over 220 unique attendees (typically is 160 on average per month)

Recent Trainings

- Training Requests
  - District of Columbia (February 10th & 11th)-2 day training for DCA and compact staff
  - California (March 11th & 12th) -2 day training for DCA and compact staff; March 17th Field Staff Rules Training
  - Kansas (March 10th) WebEx use only

Upcoming Trainings

- ICAOS Rules
  - 101-Eligibility April 14th
  - 102-Transferring Supervision April 15th
  - 103-Supervision in the Receiving State April 16th
  - 104-Mandatory Retaking for Sign Violations April 21st
  - 105-Mandatory Retaking for Felony or Violent Crimes & Absconders April 22nd
  - 106-Probable Cause Hearing April 23rd
ICOTS Helpdesk – There was no significant change in the number of tickets submitted in February. A large proportion of submitted tickets were related to the outstanding bug involving the “Logged in from another IP” error message, which was addressed in the latest ICOTS release at the end of February.

ICAOS Website – Website visits were down only slightly in February from the previous month, though the daily number of visitors was basically unchanged. The number of mobile visitors to the website continues to hover around a third of all website traffic.

ICOTS Security Release – A signed copy of the statement of work for bringing the public web portal functionality inside ICOTS was sent to Appriss. Work on the security release has begun, though no launch date is set. The national office will inform the committee when a timeline is available.

ICOTS Enhancements – ICOTS release 29.3 was pushed to production on Wednesday February 25, 2015. The enhancement functionality in this release was the new Notice of Failure to Arrive activity. Five outstanding bugs were also addressed. In addition to the “Logged in from another IP” issue mentioned previously, these were the bugs addressed:

- CAR-Reply not showing the correct contact information and dates on the PDF
- RFRI-Reply PDF displays incorrect Victim Sensitive checkbox
- Address and contact for Resident Family AND Employment or Means of Support is shown on the TREQ PDF after the reason for transfer changes
- In RFRI assistant for RFRIs built off rejected RFRIs, the RFRIs that were withdrawn are displayed

Information on the new enhancement and resolved bugs was posted to the ICOTS Helpdesk Knowledgebase.

The Technology Committee also reviewed several enhancement requests at the last meeting. The majority were approved for addition to the list of enhancements. The committee will be reviewing the previous list of approved enhancements and prioritizing it. The goal is to have a well vetted list of proposed enhancements for consideration in FY2017.

Fusion Center – The Wisconsin Statewide Information Center reviewed the proposed MOU between their fusion center and ICAOS. They requested a few changes, which were accepted and a signed copy was sent to their office.
Executive Director’s Report  
March 2015

Commissioners Changes/Vacancies

Commissioner Vacancies include CO, MD, PA and TX.

MD plans to have a Commissioner in place sometime in April.

Diann Skiles, Records Director is the new Commissioner for WV, Christy Gutherz, Deputy Commissioner for the MS Department of Corrections is the new Commissioner for MS and Chief Alan Grinstead, Chief of Community Corrections is the new DE Commissioner.

The national office has not heard from Warrington Chapman, VI Commissioner in more than 18 months. He does not respond to email. I sent the last email on Monday and copied the Governor’s attorney.

Complaints, Conflict Resolution and Misc. calls

The GA Governor announced in the State of the State address, a legislation to create the Department of Community Supervision by combining Adult Probation, Parole, and Juvenile Probation. Commissioner Moore stated that indications are the legislation will pass and the new agency will be a complete overhaul that includes a new commissioner and a new board of authority.

For this reason, Commissioner Moore is requesting the Executive Committee extend Georgia’s deadline to submit its corrective action plan until after this legislation passes and the leadership of the Dept. of Community Supervision has been named and brought up to speed.

The national office resolved a dispute between CA and TX regarding the retaking of a sex offender.

Compliance Audits

Mindy finished the AK, HI, IN, SD and TX audits and is starting on the audits for April that include CA, MS, VT and WI. In May she will audit ID, IA, MN and UT.

Other

Barno made the Cleveland site visit for the 2016 ABM and she is working on the arrangements for the upcoming rules committee meeting at Indianapolis and the executive committee meeting in Louisville, KY.

I spoke with Executive Director Doug Dretke of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Huston University about adding information on the compact to their training programs. They are the Secretariat for a number of probation, parole and jail
associations. Director Dretke indicated he is interested in developing training materials they can use in their programs and at conference workshops.

The national office changed the way it does the meeting minutes. Whenever there is a written report we will make it an attachment to the minutes instead of repeating the information in the minutes. It is a little more efficient and reduces the chance of error.
October 14, 2014 Motion

Commissioner C. Lauterbach (IA) moved to fine Georgia $100K as results of its default and to be required to participate in technical assistance and remedial training in regards to nationwide warrants and retaking obligations the completion of which will result in said fine being abated. Such training may include members of judiciary, attorney general office, governor’s office, sheriff department, and other stakeholders as deemed appropriate. Georgia shall outline in a correction action plan, the steps it intends to take to remedy the default and shall implement the plan within six months. Commissioner C. Gibson-Beltz (NE) seconded
MEMORANDUM

To: ICAOS Rules Committee

From: Richard L. Masters, General Counsel

Re: Extent of Receiving State’s Authority to Address Significant Violations

Date: March 12, 2015

As the result of issues raised during ICAOS Executive Committee deliberations concerning ICAOS Advisory Opinion 1-2015 and the authority of a receiving state to sanction ‘significant violations,’ the purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance to the Rules Committee in considering whether ICAOS rules pertaining to this issue should be amended and to clarify whether and the extent to which such authority can be permissibly exercised over offenders transferred pursuant to the Compact.

In considering these questions, we begin by acknowledging the constitutional prerogative that the legislature “is lodged with the power to define, classify and prescribe punishment for crimes committed within the state.” See State v. Rush, 697 N.E.2d 634 (Ohio 1998); In re Vasquez, 705 N.E.2d 606 (Mass. 1999); State v. Scott, 961 P.2d 667 (Kan. 1998) (It is the legislature's prerogative to make policy decisions and specify punishments for crime); State v. Mitchell, 577 N.W.2d 481 (Minn. 1998) (In sentencing, legislature has power to define punishment for crimes, and courts are executor of legislative power); Shaffer v. State, 740 So.2d 273 (Miss. 1998) (Power to define crimes and prescribe punishments is legislative in nature and is constitutionally vested in state legislature); Mullins v. Com., 956 S.W.2d 222 (Ky. App. 1997) (Legislature has power to designate what is a crime and sentences for violations thereof, and included therein is power to limit or prohibit probation or parole. Const. § 29); People in Interest of R.W.V., 942 P.2d 1317 (Colo. App. 1997) (Although sentencing traditionally is judicial function, it is not within sole province of judiciary; rather, the General Assembly has inherent powers to prescribe punishment for crimes and to limit court's sentencing authority); Riffe v. State, 675 N.E.2d 710 (Ind. App. 1996) (Legislature fixes penalties for crimes, and trial court's discretion in sentencing does not extend beyond limits prescribed by statute);

While the Compact and its duly authorized rules take precedence over conflicting state law, it is equally important to keep in mind that a Compact rule cannot exceed the scope of authority.

---

delegated by the legislatively enacted provisions of ICAOS to the Commission which promulgates the ICAOS rules. See Bowen v. Georgetown University, 488 U.S. 204, 208 (1988).

Article I the Purpose of the ICAOS acknowledges that supervision will be transferred between sending and receiving states and specifically provides that “The compacting states recognize that there is no “right” of any offender to live in another state and that duly accredited officers of a sending state may at all times enter a receiving state and there apprehend and retake any offender under supervision subject to the provisions of the compact and Bylaws and Rules promulgated hereunder.”

The transfer of supervision of a compact offender under the compact and ICAOS rules, as presently conceived, does not deprive the sending state of jurisdiction over the offender, unless it is clear from the record that the sending state intended to relinquish jurisdiction. See, e.g., Scott v. Virginia, 676 S.E.2d 343, 347 (Va. App. 2009); State v. Lemoine, 831 P.2d 1345 (Kan. Ct. App. 1992). While the receiving state exercises jurisdiction over the offender for purposes of supervision, the sending state retains jurisdiction over the offender for purposes of probation or parole revocation. See, Advisory Opinion 3-2008 Id. (sending state retains jurisdiction to revoke probation; transfer of the duties of visitation and supervision over probationers does not explicitly mean a complete transfer of jurisdiction). One court, interpreting the ICPP, precursor to the ICAOS, held that:

“Under the Interstate Parole and Probation Compact, * * * [a] receiving state assumed the duties of visitation and supervision over defendant. Florida Administrative Code Rule 23-4.001 provides an effective, businesslike method for permitting persons under supervision to leave one state and take up residence in another state with assurance that they will be supervised in the receiving state and can be returned to the sending state in case of sufficient violation. One of the functions of the receiving state is to properly report all violators to the original sending state, with appropriate recommendations. (Citations omitted).^2

Consistent with this legal analysis the current compact and the text of Rule 4.109 (5) and (7) recognize that a receiving state has the authority to make a ‘disposition’ of any offense or infraction and make a recommendation of further remedial action. However, neither the Compact nor ICAOS rules gives a receiving state the authority to revoke the probation or parole imposed by authorities in a sending state. See Scott v. Virginia supra. at p. 347; See also Peppers v. State, 696 So. 2d 444 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1997) (emphasis added).

While a receiving state may, independent of the sending state, initiate criminal proceedings against offenders who commit crimes while in the state (See, e.g., Rule 5.101); a receiving state may not, as part of the offender’s conviction for such crimes, revoke the probation or parole imposed on the offender in the sending state or decide to provide no supervision once an offender is transferred in accordance with the ICAOS rules, See Advisory Opinion 1-2007.

---

Moreover, whether a sending state continues to exercise jurisdiction over an offender or has relinquished or forfeited that jurisdiction is generally a matter that can only be determined by the sending state. See Crady v. Cranfill, 371 S.W.2d 640 (Ky. Ct. App. 1963) (“[U]nder ICPP a sending state retains authority over offender through the retaking provisions; it is inappropriate for the courts of a receiving state to arrogate to themselves the determination of whether a sending state has forfeited its right to retake offenders under parole from that state”).

This agency concept is also inherent in the arrest and detention of offenders in a receiving state where the relationship between officials in a sending state and officials in a receiving state has been defined by courts as an agency relationship. Courts recognize that in supervising out-of-state offenders the receiving state is acting on behalf of and as an agent of the sending state. See, State v. Hill, 334 N.W.2d 746 (Iowa 1983) (trial court committed error in admitting out-of-state offender to bail as status of the offender was not controlled by the domestic law of Iowa but rather by the Interstate Compact for Probation and Parole and the determinations of sending state authorities); State ex rel. Ohio Adult Parole Authority v. Coniglio, 610 N.E.2d 1196, 1198 (Ohio Ct. App. 1993) (“For purposes of determining appellee’s status in the present case, we believe that the Ohio authorities should be considered as agents of Pennsylvania, the sending state. As such, the Ohio authorities are bound by the decision of Pennsylvania with respect to whether the apprehended probationer should be considered for release on bond and the courts of Ohio should recognize that fact.”).

In supervising out-of-state offenders, authorities in a receiving state are not acting exclusively as authorities of that state under the domestic law of that state, but are also acting as agents of the sending state and to a certain degree are controlled by the lawful decisions of sending state officials. “Under the terms of the compact, the receiving state “will assume the duties of visitation and supervision over probationers or parolees of any sending state. Transfer of supervision under this statute is not a transfer of jurisdiction. . . Although the day-to-day monitoring of probationers becomes the duty of the receiving state, the sending state does not abdicate its responsibility.” See Keeney v. Caruthers, 861 N.E.2d 25 (Ind. App. 2007); Scott v. Virginia, 676 S.E.2d 343, 348 (Va. App. 2009) (emphasis added).

Consistent with the ‘agency relationship’ of sending and receiving states created under the compact, it has the authority to exercise the degree of control necessary to monitor and supervise the offender as long as the receiving state acts with the knowledge that its authority over the transferred compact offender, in the absence of a new offense committed in the receiving state, is dependent upon the authority granted to it by the sending state. Using this approach the receiving state has some authority to address a “significant violation,” and with the knowledge and consent of the sending state could impose sanctions short of revocation of probation or parole which remains vested in the sending state under the jurisdiction of the sentencing court or parole board.
Background & History:

The Commonwealth of Virginia recently granted a conditional pardon to a convicted offender and ordered him to be transferred to a secure treatment facility in Florida for a period of ten (10) years from his release by the Department of Corrections conditioned upon the successful fulfillment of all treatment recommendations and requirements of the ‘treatment team’ and staff providing his care. Failure to comply with all conditions will result in the loss of all privileges provided under the terms of the conditional pardon and, at the discretion of the Governor, subject the offender to immediate arrest and incarceration to complete the terms of his original sentences. Based upon the above facts and pursuant to Commission Rule 6.101(c) the Commonwealth of Virginia has requested an advisory opinion regarding the requirements of the Compact and ICAOS Rules on the following issue:

Issue:

Whether an offender who has been granted a conditional pardon in the Commonwealth of Virginia and is transferred to a secure treatment facility in the State of Florida is eligible for transfer under the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision?

Applicable Rules:

Rule 1.101, in relevant part, provides as follows:

“‘Offender’ means an adult placed under, or made subject to, supervision as the result of the commission of a criminal offense and released to the community under the jurisdiction of courts, paroling authorities, corrections, or other criminal justice agencies, and who is required to
Whether an offender who has been granted a conditional pardon in the Commonwealth of Virginia and is transferred to a secure treatment facility in the State of Florida is eligible for transfer under the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision?

“Supervision” means the oversight exercised by authorities of a sending of receiving state over an offender for a period of time determined by a court or releasing authority, during which time the offender is required to report to or be monitored by supervising authorities, and to comply with regulations and conditions, other than monetary conditions, imposed on the offender at the time of the offender's release to the community or during the period of supervisions in the community.”

Rule 2.106 provides:

“Rule 2.106 Offenders subject to deferred sentences

Offenders subject to deferred sentences are eligible for transfer of supervision under the same eligibility requirements, terms, and conditions applicable to all other offenders under this compact. Persons subject to supervision pursuant to a pretrial release program, bail, or similar program are not eligible for transfer under the terms and conditions of this compact.

Analysis and Conclusion:

The Commission has previously opined in ICAOS Advisory Opinion 3-2005 that the placement of an offender in an out of state treatment program may trigger the requirements of the Compact even if the offender is not subject to supervision by corrections officials. In that opinion the Commission determined that an offender who was required to participate in a treatment program in another state was subject to the Compact. It was also noted that even in the absence of direct
supervision by corrections officials, a provision in a court order requiring compliance with the terms of treatment constituted “supervision” for purposes of triggering the Compact. The imposition of treatment as a condition of release with the corresponding requirement of adherence to all treatment recommendations and the probability of probation revocation upon failure to comply was sufficient to require the sending state to comply with the Compact and its rules.

Clearly this case involves a person who has been convicted of not just one, but three separate felonies all of which involved assault and battery on law enforcement officers, including a corrections officer which occurred on 5-31-11, 3-7-14 and 1-8-15. The terms of the conditional pardon require the Virginia offender to comply with all treatment recommendations for a period of ten (10) years the violation of which will result in the forfeiture of all privileges granted and, at the discretion of the Governor, the offender “shall be subject to immediate incarceration to complete the term of his original sentences.”

While in this case the terms and conditions of release are provided in the conditional pardon issued by the Governor of Virginia, it is equally clear that in Virginia, as in virtually all other states, a person with a conditional pardon remains subject to conditions of release. A conditional pardon does not restore civil rights or rights of citizenship, and the executive, like any other ‘paroling authority’ can revoke the pardon if a person does not comply with the conditions of release. In fact, a person receiving a conditional pardon has the same restrictions as a person on parole. When the conditions are not fulfilled, a conditional pardon or a parole can be revoked and the person violating such conditions can be re-imprisoned.

As the Commission has previously observed in Advisory Opinion 4-2004, “In determining the eligibility of an offender for application of ICAOS one must look not at the legal definitions but rather the actions taken by a court of competent jurisdiction or paroling authorities.” This opinion also concluded that ICAOS Rule 2.106 is applicable to situations in which “...the court
Whether an offender who has been granted a conditional pardon in the Commonwealth of Virginia and is transferred to a secure treatment facility in the State of Florida is eligible for transfer under the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision?

Because the individual in this case has clearly been convicted of the felonies in question and has been conditionally released, by a paroling authority who in this case happens to be the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, he is clearly an “offender” for purposes of the compact. It also appears that the terms of the conditional pardon satisfy the requirements of ‘supervision’ under the compact. The conditional pardon provides for oversight to be exercised over the offender by the secure treatment facility, or in a less restrictive environment, for a fixed period of ten (10) years. Compliance with treatment conditions are required the violation of which will result in incarceration for the completion of the sentences previously imposed.

Summary:

Based upon the terms of the compact, the above referenced rules and the legal authorities cited herein, an offender who has been granted a conditional pardon in the Commonwealth of Virginia and is transferred to a secure treatment facility in the State of Florida is eligible for transfer of supervision under the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision.
Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Face-to-Face Executive Committee Meeting Agenda
8 am – 5 pm EDT
April 8, 2015

Broadway A Room, Third Floor
The Brown Hotel
335 West Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky, 40202

Call to Order
• Chairwoman Andrews (OH)

Roll Call
• Executive Director Hageman

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes
• March 12, 2015

Committee Reports
• Rules – Commissioner Seigel (IN)
  o Rules Proposals
• Training – Commissioner Precythe (NC)
• Deputy Compact Administrators Liaison – Commissioner Miller – Fox (UT)
• Technology – Commissioner Roberge (CT)
• Compliance – Commissioner Stromberg (OR)
• Finance – Commissioner Lauterbach (IA)
• East Region – Commissioner Crook (VT)
• Midwest Region – Commissioner Gibson-Beltz (NE)
• South Region – Commissioner Moore (GA)
• West Region – Commissioner Aylward (WA)
• Victims’ Representative – Pat Tuthill (FL)
• Legal Counsel – Rick Masters

Executive Director Report
• Executive Director Hageman

Old Business

New Business
• Approve FY2017 Budget Recommendation – Charles Lauterbach
• Compliance Process – Jeremiah Stromberg
• Retaking and Sanction Guidelines – Chris Moore
• Personnel – Harry Hageman
• ICOTS Enhancement Priorities/Budget – Gary Roberge
• FY 2016 Compliance Audit – Harry Hageman
• CSG Affiliation – Harry Hageman
• Justice Reinvestment Workgroup – Ann Precythe
• ABM Planning Workgroup – Chris Norman & Jeremiah Stromberg
• Goals/Objectives for the upcoming year – All
• Cleveland, OH Site Visit - Barno Saturday
• Robert’s Rules of Order – Harry Hageman

Adjourn