Those in attendance: Ms. Rose Ann Bisch, Mr. Randy Hartnett, Mr. Jim Early, The Honorable Joe Mullery, Mr. Richard Crawford, Ms. Jill Carlson, Ms. Freddie Davis-English, The Honorable Michelle Larkin, Ms. Suzanne Elwell, Mr. John Stuart for Carolina Lamas. Mr. Stephen King, Ms. Mical Peterson, Ms. Elizabeth DeRuyck for Midge Christianson

Those not in attendance: The Honorable Julianne Ortman, The Honorable Tim Kelly, Mr. Marvin Davis, Sheriff Bill Bergquist, Mr. Pete Orput, Ms. Carolina Lamas, Ms. Midge Christianson

Ms. Suzanne Elwell called the meeting to order.

Ms. Suzanne Elwell requested introduction around the table for new members.

The January 10th, 2011 minutes were approved.

Election for Chair and Vice-Chair
- There was a motion to appoint Steve King as the Chair of the Council. The motion passed.
- There was a motion to appoint Suzanne Elwell as the Vice-Chair. The motion passed.

UPDATE ON THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS GROUP
- Ms. Elwell explained victim notifications should take place according to each states victim rules
- There was discussion regarding victim notification requirements

INTERSTATE COMPACT ON JUVENILES (ICJ)
- ICJ Updates
  - Ms. Bisch attended the ICPC National Conference last month
  - An ICJ/ICPC MOU has been established where Ms. Bisch is working to establish a closer working relationship between ICJ and ICPC
  - Handouts related to issues others states have faced due to not being part of the Juvenile Compact were distributed

- Proposed rule amendments
  - Rule 1-101 definition of Sex Offender
    - The council would support this rule change as long as rule 4.103 is passed as proposed and still includes the word adjudicated
Minnesota counties use diversion and other pre-trial activities to keep certain juvenile offenders from having to register or be subject to sex offender conditions

The council was concerned that the proposed changes to this definition could result in a large number of juveniles being subject to registration and sex offender rules in other states that they would not otherwise be subject to in the dispositional state

- **Rule 1-101 definition of Significant Violation**
  - The council felt the new definition is too broad and left too much discretion to the individual agent in the receiving state

- **Rule 4-103 Transfer of Supervision Procedures for Juvenile Sex Offenders**
  - Overall the council supports this rule, however there was some confusion regarding the proposed rule change
  - The definition of juvenile sex offender was changed to include a broad group of juveniles, not just those adjudicated of a sex offense.
  - The council felt the intent of the proposal was confusing, although would support this proposal as long as the word adjudicated remained in the rule

**INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION (ICAOS)**

- **ICOTS Updates**
  - State Statistics reports were distributed for review

- **Proposed rule amendments**
  - **Proposal to Amend ICAOS Bylaws, Article VII, Committees and to create Ad hoc Committees**
    - The Council supported this proposal as submitted
  - **Rule 1.101 definition of Resident**
    - The Council supported this proposal as submitted
  - **Rule 1.101 definition of Violent Crime**
    - A member had concerns about a non-contact sex offender being classified as a violent offender
    - The Council felt that if the purpose of the revision was to exclude hunting offenses then the rules should specifically state it excludes hunting offenses. There was also a question if the way the rule is currently written would it include arson offenses or the sale of a firearm.
    - The Council felt the proposed language could exclude certain offenses that were not intended to be excluded
    - After a discussion the Council supported this proposal as submitted
  - **Rule 1.101 definition of Violent Offender**
    - The Council Supported this proposal as submitted
  - **Rule 3.101-3 Transfer of supervision of sex offenders**
    - The Council felt the language contained in (d) 1 should contain “shall assist” instead of will assist. The Council felt it is their obligation to assist with finding housing
  - **Rule 3.107 Transfer Request**
- The Council felt the language consisting of “at the imposition of sentence” in A (2) should be removed as most charges are reduced before the imposition of the sentence
- The Council felt the conditions of supervision should be sent at the time the transfer is submitted or at the very least at the time the offender departs for the receiving state
- The Council felt there should be a requirement to justify why an offender is being classified as gang affiliated
- A member believed the language relating to gang affiliation is aimed at the minority population

  o Rule 4.111 Return to the sending state
    - The Council felt there needs to be a time limit on how long the sending state has to do the victim notification. It would also seem that the language from Rule 3.108-1 (a) “or return to the sending state” should be removed. Rule 3.108 (a) should be changed to include the return to the sending state.
  
  o Rule 4.112 Closing of supervision by the sending state
    - The Council supported this proposal as submitted

- **Old Business**
  - None reported

- **Questions & Open Forum**
  - Mr. King commented on the benefit of the different viewpoints of the Council Members

The Council agreed to decide on the date of the next meeting at a later date.