INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION
Rules Committee

April 3, 2007
11:00 a.m. EST

Web Conference
1-866-469-3239   Room 569 969 715

Committee Members in Attendance

1. William Rankin (Chair)
2. Dori Ege
3. Jeanette Bucklew
4. Ed Ligtenberg
5. Doreen Geiger
6. Kathie Winckler
7. Frank Herman
8. Gerald Vandewalle (ex-officio)
10. Kevin Dunphy (ex-officio)

Guests
1. Regina Grimes

Staff
1. Nicole Smith
2. Kelli Price
3. Mindy Spring
4. Rick Masters (legal counsel)
Call to Order

- W. Rankin called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. Seven of eight members were present, establishing a quorum.

Approval of Agenda
- The agenda was adopted by acclamation.

Approval of Minutes
- There was discussion of revision to the February 2007 minutes.
- K. Winckler made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. F. Herman seconded. Minutes approved as amended.

Final Review of Rule Drafts for Posting
- W. Rankin discussed changing the language proposed for Rule 3.101-3. D. Ege asked if this would take a motion. R. Masters stated that it would.
- W. Rankin made a motion to change the title of Rule 3.101-3 to that on the screen. D. Ege seconded. Motion passed.
- K. Tucker asked if the Committee should strike the word “immediately” from part (a) of Rule 3.101-3 and replace it with language similar to that in parts (a), (b), and (c) of the same rule.
- F. Herman stated that “immediately” stressed the urgency of accomplishing the rule.
- D. Ege stated that the Training Committee has been training on 10 calendar days for this rule. She stressed the importance of living with rules before changing them every year.
- W. Rankin noted that the draft was only being put out for comment.
- D. Geiger cautioned against changing a rule because of slower states.
- K. Winckler noted that the language was similar to that struck in other rules because it is left open to interpretation, especially if the time limit is taken to a judge.
- D. Ege noted that Rules 3.103, 3.106, 5.102, and 5.103 all have this language.
- D. Ege made a motion to keep the language adopted and effective 1/1/07 for Rules 3.101-3, 3.103, 3.106, 5.102 and 5.103 “10 calendar days”. K. Winckler seconded.
- There was discussion of the timeframe for Rule 3.103.
- D. Geiger stated that she was concerned about victim notification.
- E. Ligtenberg noted that the rules needed to include some time period.
- Motion passed.
- K. Winckler made a motion to delete the word “Compact” and insert “sending state”, and to insert “been” after “have not” in Rule 3.101-3(b). D. Ege seconded. Motion passed.
- There was discussion of the possible effects of changes in Rule 3.102(c) and the two versions presented.
• R. Masters noted that it was necessary to clearly delineate that there are two separate proposals.
• There was discussion of travel permits.
• W. Rankin asked that the two proposals for Rule 3.102 be referred to as “alternate versions”.
• W. Rankin and D. Ege will work together to edit the justifications to show the implications of the rule changes.
• J. Bucklew stated that she had to leave the conference. She stated that she had no concerns with any remaining rules or justifications to be discussed.
• There was discussion of Rule 3.103 and its justification. W. Rankin noted that paragraph 2 of the justification should read “receiving state” instead of “sending state”.
• K. Winckler discussed the proposal that she had sent out.
• W. Rankin made a motion to amend “continuation” to “continue” in Rule 3.103 and add “after notice of rejection or failure to send a transfer request.” F. Herman seconded. Motion passed.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 3.105-1 was forwarded for comment.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 3.106 was forwarded for comment.
• D. Geiger noted that the changes proposed to Rule 3.107 would require the Committee to clean up Rule 4.110.
• W. Rankin made a motion to remove language from Rule 4.111 as proposed. F. Herman seconded. Motion passed.
• W. Rankin asked D. Ege or K. Dunphy to look over the merger of Rule 4.109 to distinguish between the East Region proposal and the Rules Committee proposal. D. Ege volunteered.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 4.111 was forwarded for comment.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 4.112 was forwarded for comment.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 5.101 was forwarded for comment.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 5.108 was forwarded for comment.
• The proposal and justification for both proposals to Rule 5.111 was forwarded for comment.
• K. Winckler and D. Ege stated that the proposal and comments for Rule 5.111 made by the Rules Committee to the East Region should be distinguished from the proposal and comments provided by the East Region for Rule 5.111.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 5.111 was forwarded for comment.
• The proposal and justification for Rule 5.112 was forwarded for comment.

Old Business
• There was no Old Business.

New Business
• There was discussion of the timeline provided by the Sex Offender Ad Hoc Committee and its conflict with the timeline created by the Rules Committee.
• W. Rankin asked for dates that would be the latest possible to receive proposals and still allow the Committee to review and comment on proposals. He noted that
the Ad Hoc Committee could still present proposals to the Commission in the Annual Business meeting report, allowing the Commission to refer the proposals for the following year.

- W. Rankin noted that the Committee could accept their proposals and put forward to the Commission as from the Rules Committee.
- D. Ege cited Rule 2.109, which states that an Ad Hoc Committee cannot propose rules to the Rules Committee.
- W. Rankin proposed that the Committee ask the Sex Offender Ad Hoc Committee provide their proposals no later than May 2, 2007, and that those proposals should be forwarded through the Executive Committee. Any changes to the proposals would have to come through the Rules Committee.

- **E. Ligtenberg made a motion to adjourn.** F. Herman seconded. **Meeting adjourned at 12:59 p.m. EST.**