States in Attendance:

1. Dori Ege (AZ)
2. Scott Taylor, Denise Sitler (OR)
3. Shane Sconce, Les Pozsgi (WY)
4. Sally Skiver (CO)
5. Mickie McGarvie, Syd Nakamoto (HI)
6. Sharon Jackson, Karen Stoll, Marita Williams (CA)
7. Amy Wright (NV)
8. Dave Nelson (ID)
9. Rob Carlson (AK)
10. Cathy Gordon (MT)
11. Barbara Longmore (UT) arrived late

Staff

1. Mindy Spring
2. Xavier Donnelly

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:07 pm EST by D. Ege.
Discussion

Proposed Rule Changes

- David Guntharp, ICAOS Chair, will propose the new method of voting (Rule 2.109) at the annual meeting to the Commission. D. Ege expressed support for the rule change because floor amendments can sometimes change the meaning of a rule which when voted on becomes federal law.
- Rule 1.101 “Victim”
  - Major change is the change of “suffered” to “incurred”
- Rule 1.101 “Relocated”
  - D. Ege noted that offenders incarcerated would not apply to this rule because how it is used in other rules.
  - D. Ege stated that this definition is needed because many states are creating their own definition of “relocate.”
  - Work travel permits will not apply to this rule and will fall back on own state’s policies.
- Rule 1.101 “Compact”
  - This definition will allow for not spelling out “Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision.”
- Rule 1.101 “Resident” & “Travel Permit”
  - “Relocate” was taken out of the two rules.
  - (r) (3) “ed” should be added to “remain”
- Rule 2.109 Rule Adoption Process
  - D. Ege noted that the goal of the proposed amendment is to eliminate floor amendments. Grammar changes may be made, but no floor amendments if the meaning of the rule is changed.
  - Rules may be proposed through a region, committee, or at the annual meeting.
  - D. Ege stated that any emergency rule amendment/adoption can be done via teleconference.
  - Comment time at the Annual meeting will be limited. The Rules Committee evaluates all comments prior to the final drafts for proposed rules go to the Commission. In June, the Rules Committee received comments from approximately 12 states prior to finalizing the drafts for the Annual meeting.
  - X. Donnelly noted that the Commission will be voting with an Audience Response System which will tally the votes electronically and all votes will be displayed in real time.
- Rule 2.110 Transfer of offenders under this compact
  - (b) was added to clarify how non-eligible offenders may travel to other states in which the sending state remains responsible for such offender.
• Rule 3.101 Mandatory transfer of supervision was broke out and numbering changed. (b) was incorporated into new rule 3.101-1
  o Discussion of “valid plan” D. Ege noted there was lots of discussion regarding the meaning of “valid” at the prior Rules Committee meeting. D. Ege stated that she voted to remove the word “valid” and lost. S. Taylor noted that he may bring the issue of defining the work “valid” to the Commission at the Annual Business Meeting to be referred to the Rules Committee.

• Rule 3.101-1 Mandatory transfers of Military, Families of Military, and Family members Employed
  o “reporting instructions and transfer of supervision” was added to (a), (b), and (c) of this rule to clarify “what” the offender is eligible for.

• Rule 3.101-2 Discretionary transfer of supervision
  o Rule was added in the hopes that discretionary cases will be more accepted.

• Rule 3.103 Acceptance of the offender by receiving state; exception
  o The rule has been reordered, “travel permit” was changed to “reporting instructions,” and a time frame was added to (5)(A).
  o D. Ege noted that the National Office has issued an Advisory Opinion for this rule and is only applicable to “offenders living in the receiving state at the time of sentencing”
  o Discussion of “issuing” in regards to all states

• Rule 3.104 Time allowed for investigation by receiving state
  o Changes are solely for the implementation of the electronic information system.
  o D. Ege noted that incomplete packets would be virtually impossible to transmit through the electronic information system; therefore they should just be rejected by the receiving state.

• Rule 3.104-1 Acceptance of offender; issuance of reporting instructions
  o Rules Committee recommended the amendment to deal with probationers.
  o Discussion of “What if plan falls apart?” D. Ege noted that if the plan of supervision falls apart, there would be no where to send the offender.

• Rule 3.106 Request for expedited reporting instructions
  o Amendment was proposed to assist in the transition to the electronic information system. Same language used in Rule 3.103.
  o New language proposed for (a)(1) to eliminate the practice of sending offenders on travel permits when reporting instructions have been denied.

• Rule 3.107 Transfer Request
  o Amendment proposed to assist in the transition to the electronic information system.
  o 2 consent forms have been eliminated. Since the receiving state will have jurisdiction once offender is accepted relocated, the forms are unnecessary.
  o Most controversial change is the elimination of “Criminal History.” Receiving states may run their own criminal histories.

• Rule 4.103 Special Conditions
Amendment proposed to clarify “When” special conditions may be imposed by the receiving state.

- Rule 4.105 Arrival and departure notifications; withdraw of reporting instructions
  - Amendment proposed to assist in the transition to the electronic information system.
  - D. Ege noted that all rules for NACIS will have a different effective date.
  - Discussion of “travel permit” to “reporting instructions.” M. Spring checked the minutes from the previous Rules Committee meeting. The changed was passed by the Rules Committee in June and the typo will be corrected by the national office. D. Blackburn will send out an email to the Commission noting the error.
  - D. Ege noted that all proposed rule changes must be sent out to the Commission 30 days prior to the Annual meeting. It was suggested that regions hold a conference call prior to submitting comments for proposed rules.

- Rule 4.110 Transfer to a subsequent receiving state
  - Amendment proposed to be consistent with Rule 3.107 and the elimination of the 2 forms.

**Sex Offender Rules**

- Discussion of the 3 or more significant violations in regards to sex offenders.
  - D. Nelson noted that in Idaho failing a polygraph is a violation, but may not be in another state. D. Nelson expressed that sex offenders should not have to have 3 violations before being reported due to the seriousness of them re-offending.
- It was expressed that sex offender supervision is different from other offenders. It may take a while to get ideas to address to the Commission.
- California has just passed new legislation for the supervision of sex offenders.
- D. Nelson stated he will send a note to D. Blackburn regarding the formation of a workgroup. D. Ege suggested including people who specialize in sex offender supervision and treatment. A motion will need to be made by the Executive Committee to get approval for such a workgroup.
- Discussion of violations. S. Taylor noted that different states see violations differently. The Commission should clarify that the receiving state determines what a violation is.

**California**

- The new Commissioner of California is Karen Stoll.
- K. Stoll announced that California is currently in the process of reorganizing the adult and juvenile correction policies and procedures. The Compact office will be moving before October 1st. Staff will remain the same.
- D. Nelson noted the recent progress made in California.
- K. Stoll is working on getting a training plan in place for NACIS.
- K. Stoll will be contacting the national office regarding coming to California for judicial training in November.

**Adjourn**

- The next meeting will be during the annual commission meeting in Phoenix in September.
- Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm EST/ 12:30 pm PST.