K. Merz called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. (EST). A quorum was established.
• **K. Merz** presented a summary of the last Executive Committee Meeting
  • Newly revised Rules for review from Rules Committee
  • Update on NACIS
  • W. Emmer gave an update on the actions of the Compliance Committee
  • Bench books and *The Evolving Use and Changing Role Of Interstate Compacts: A Practitioner’s Guide* is now for sale on the Interstate Commission’s website.
  • DCA luncheon has been approved at Annual Business Meeting.
  • Discussion of paying for ex-Officios at Annual Business Meeting.
  • Discrepancy between PPCAA and the National Office on remaining funds for DCAs.
  • Process at Annual Meeting for Region breakout sessions.
  • Voting at Annual Business meeting
• **K. Merz** discussed the Region Chair Meeting last week regarding the election of new officers.
• W. Emmer stated that he is planning on asking for the support of the Midwest Region for supporting his nomination for Chair of the Executive Committee.
• K. Merz opened up discussion on the approval of the previous meeting’s minutes.
• **H. Hageman** moved to approve the minutes from the previous meeting and K. Pellant seconded.
  • Motion passed.
• **K. Merz** began discussion on Rule Changes/Recommendations
  • H. Hageman voiced his concern on the continued effort to expand the Misdemeanant rule.
  • Indiana voiced a concern on clarifying what a reduced crime is.
  • J. McKenzie stated that this rule change was proposed based on concern for public safety and not case loads.
  • Discussion on:
    • Rule 1.101 “special condition”
    • Rule 1.101 “relocate.”
      ▪ Discussion of the pros and cons of adding “consecutive” to this definition.
  • Definition for “warrant”
    ▪ A. Hegewald questioned the necessity of the definition for “warrant” as it only appears in two rules.
  • Rule 2.101
    ▪ A. Hegewald strongly objects to the deletion of the word “formal” because it is important for County Authorities in Border States to communicate directly. He feels this is unnecessarily burdensome.
K. Merz stated that the Compact is trying to ensure that the requirements of the Compact are being met. And, to allow informal agreements would defeat the purpose of the Compact.

K. Merz suggested waiting until the implementation of NACIS to address this again.

- Rule 2.105
- Rule 2.109
- Rule 3.101
- Rule 3.101-1
- Rule 3.103

A. Hegewald explained that these changes are to address "shock probation," meaning if the offender is being released to probation supervision it is ok, but not parole.

- Discussion of how this rule affects different states, i.e. North Dakota and Michigan.
- K. Merz stated that this rule may need to have individual comments on it.

- Rule 3.106

K. Pellant asked if this rule deals with reporting instructions for parolees

C. Placek stated that he would like to see a timeframe for a response.

Consensus was that there needs to be some sort of a timeframe incorporated into this rule.

- Rule 4.103-1
- Rule 4.111

A. Hegewald stated that this doesn't give time for the notifying victims as specified in another rule. This rule should include a clause making exceptions for cases where a victim must be notified of offender movement.

- Rule 5.101-1

H. Hageman stated that he has an issue with the practicality of this rule.

A. Hegewald stated that IN suggests adding "mandatory" before "retaking;" and they see no reason to take an offender into custody if the sending state is not going to retake that offender.

- Rule 5.102
- Rule 5.103

A. Hegewald asked if the receiving state must have sent 3 investigations reports and received a reply from the sending state before the receiving state can invoke this mandatory return.

K. Merz answered, no, according to an Advisory Opinion by D. Blackburn.
Discussion of the necessity of the receiving state sending 3 distinct violation reports to comply with this rule.

- Rule 5.106
- Rule 5.108

- A. Hegewald stated that his state would like to add the words “at its discretion” after receiving state. A. Hegewald said that his state could not guarantee that the offender would be held because it is under County jurisdiction and the state has no control over that.
- M. Buscher stated that Illinois is having a difficult time with Cook Co. The Cook County Jail doesn’t think that they have to hold out-of-state offenders. M. Buscher asked for advice on this issue.
- K. Merz encouraged Commissioners to forward these issues to Executive Director, Don Blackburn.
- Discussion continued about issues with Rule 5.108

- Rule 5.111
- K. Merz encouraged Commissioners getting comments in writing as soon as possible.

**New Business**

- Discussion of a proposed Rule 2.111 submitted by J. McKenzie regarding notification of travel permits from sending state to the destination state.
- J. McKenzie explained that this rule would allow the offender to travel to another state for 30 or more and 60 cumulative days per year. J. McKenzie stated that this rule came out of the debate on “relocate” at the 2005 Annual Business Meeting.
- Discussion of the intentions and potential use of this proposed rule.
- E. Ligtenberg stated that this rule could not be done efficiently until NACIS is fully functional.
- J. McKenzie asked that the Midwest region push to have the Rules Committee consider this rule.
- J. McKenzie moved K. Pellant seconded that rule 2.111 be sent to the Rules Committee for review.
- Motion did not pass.
- M. Buscher asked if any other states have received any equipment preparing for NACIS.
- K. Pellant stated that Kansas has already begun preparing for NACIS.
- K. Merz stated MN is putting preparations on hold until UAT is approved.

**Adjourn**

- Motion to adjourn made by K. Merz, seconded by K. Pellant.
- Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm EST