Marilyn Scafe convened the fifth meeting of the Kansas Council for Interstate Adult Offender Supervision on May 8, 2003, in the Kansas Parole Board Conference Room.

Robert Sanders is Kansas’ Commissioner to the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision. He is also a member of the Compliance Committee, which is a sub-committee of the Interstate Commission. The Compliance Committee works closely with the Rules Committee. The purpose of this council meeting was to discuss any concerns or suggestions that the state of Kansas would like for the Rules Committee to consider when drafting the new rules. Robert needs to respond by May 16th to the Rules Committee.

Robert attended the first National Commission meeting in Scottsdale, Arizona, on November 18-20, 2002. David Gunthrop, Director of Community Corrections from Arkansas, was elected Chairman of the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision. By-laws were adopted at the Interstate Commission meeting and a handout was presented to the Kansas Council. It was later decided that a sub-committee would be established to create the by-laws for the Kansas Council. The Interstate Commissions’ by-laws would be used as a template. This item will be placed on the next agenda. The next National Commission will be held in Little Rock, Arkansas, on November 3-5, 2003.

The group was informed that the Interstate Commission has adopted the dues structure and formula-governing assessment for how much each states owes. Kansas has received an invoice and assessed a $25,000 fee. Roger Werholtz sees no problem with the annual assessment being added to the Kansas Department of Corrections budget, but doesn’t want the Department to be solely responsible for fines that will be assessed at the national level.

Robert advised that the Compliance and Rules Committee’s would meet in Lexington, Kentucky on June 4-6, 2003 to review the draft proposals for the respective subcommittees. All states are facing budget cuts so the Interstate Commission will pay for all travel and per diem.

There are currently four states that have not adopted the new Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision. The most notable to Kansas is Nebraska. The Interstate Commission has not taken a stance with those states that will not participate. If Nebraska does not participate, it might be possible to do an individual compact with them.
Marilyn Scafe wanted to know if Kansas was on track with the waiver of extradition. The reply was that it depends on whom you ask. Judges are making the decisions and we are unsure if they are going to recognize the by-laws of the Interstate Commission. This needs to be on the next agenda as a legal issues training item.

There was discussion regarding the need to establish qualifications for the Commission and Compact Administrator for Kansas. This needs to be on the next agenda.

A question was asked regarding medical and jail costs on our compact offenders and who pays them. Jerry Bauer advised that there is existing language in the current Compact on jail costs, but nothing on medical. Kansas does pay for medical costs, in some instances, for offenders being held on a Kansas parole violation warrant within the state of Kansas. Thus far, the Department has declined to pay medical expenses for offenders being held on Kansas Department of Corrections’ warrants in other states. Roger Werholtz stated that we need a policy statement on how Kansas handles these costs and then Robert can take it nationally.

Another item that needs to be addressed by the Rules Committee is with interstate compact plans. If a plan is rejected, it may set the offender’s release date back six months. An example of a rejection is one where an offender needs to go to a structured living plan and the receiving state rejects this because that particular plan is not a mandatory acceptance. Sometimes a plan is also rejected because there is missing information in the packet that is submitted.

Another item that needs to be addressed by the Rules Committee is timely response to violations. The Council recommended that a timeline needed to be established to respond to violations. In Kansas, the Department of Corrections is responsible for jail costs for offenders that are in jail for condition violations.

There was discussion regarding DNA samples. Their needs to be a mechanism in place for offenders to provide their DNA sample before they transfer to another state. Some states don’t have the same laws requiring DNA collection of felony offenses.

The next meeting will be held at 1:30 pm on July 1, 2003.