



Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

**East Region Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2018 · 2:00 pm ET
Teleconference**

Members in Attendance:

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Dale Crook | Chair, Vermont |
| 2. Gary Roberge | Connecticut |
| 3. Scott McCaffery | Maine |
| 4. Samuel Plumeri | New Jersey |
| 5. Robert Maccarone | New York |
| 6. Raquel Colon | Puerto Rico |
| 7. Rick Mullgrav | U.S. Virgin Islands |
| 8. Linda Rosenberg | Pennsylvania |

Members not in Attendance:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Jim Elder | Delaware |
| 2. Paul Treseler | Massachusetts |
| 3. Mike McAlister | New Hampshire |
| 4. Patricia Coyne-Fague | Rhode Island |

Guests:

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| 1. Natalie Latulippe | Connecticut |
| 2. Tami Ford | Connecticut |
| 3. Jeanne Steward | New Hampshire |
| 4. Candice Alfonso | New Jersey |
| 5. Robin Stacy | New Jersey |
| 6. Felix Rosa | New York |
| 7. Matt Charton | New York |
| 8. Kay Longenberger | Pennsylvania |
| 9. Matt Reed | Pennsylvania |
| 10. Ingrid Salazar | Rhode Island |
| 11. Donna Pratt | Vermont |

Call to Order

Commissioner D. Crook (VT) called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm ET. Eight commissioners were present, a quorum was established.

Agenda

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) moved to approve the agenda as amended, tabling the 3 items requested by NY for next meeting and replacing with discussion on IVINS under New Business. Commissioner R. Maccarone (NY) seconded. Agenda approved.

Minutes

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) moved to approve the minutes from October 10, 2017 as written. Commissioner S. Plumeri (NJ) seconded. Minutes approved.

Discussion

Top five measurable public safety compliance factors

D. Crook indicated the ICAOS Compliance Committee is asking the regions to provide what they think are the top five measurable public safety compliance factors. D. Crook initiated the conversation by stating that factors such as number of new arrest violations and successful completions (offenders who transfer via the Compact without issues) would be some important measures for the Compliance Committee to consider.

R. Maccarone noted that absconder violations where a warrant is issued should be distinguished from violations of new crimes or technical violations.

A. Lippert further clarified the factors could include:

- “What do states think is most important and be proactive using tools (case management, dashboards, etc.)”
- “How do we measure the compact success and how can the compact evaluate the success of offenders?”
- “Does the compact improve public safety and offender rehabilitation?”

F. Rosa noted counting arrests of compact offenders by strictly using ICOTS data could be challenging as although more arrests are reported using ICOTS Progress Reports, some states are still reporting arrests on ICOTS Violation Reports Requiring Retaking.

D. Pratt indicated since offenders who have been arrested can’t be retaken, these cases are most difficult to manage for Vermont.

G. Roberge noted review of technical violations and imposition of sanctions could vary across states. Connecticut uses protective scores and regularly assesses offenders, but other states likely use various processes or may not conduct regular assessments. K. Longenberger suggested this type of measure for compact population would have to be measured against that state’s offender population and D. Pratt agreed you can’t compare one state to another in these situations.

N. Latulippe provided an example as to where states transmission of ICOTS Offender Violation Reports may be compared to that state’s rate for revocation.

Issues with the sex-offender and the transfer of sex-offenders rules

N. Latulippe stated issues Connecticut encounters are related to the definition when a sex offender is not required to register in the sending state, but may have to in the receiving state. K. Longenberger noted Pennsylvania experiences push back when trying to verify registration in the receiving state prior to submission of a transfer.

N. Latulippe also stated Connecticut experiences issues when sex offenders are returning to the sending state. It was suggested sending states should have 5 days to respond for returning sex offenders. K. Longenberger indicated Pennsylvania experiences more issues when a receiving state is given 5 days to investigate the residence when the offender has no ties in the sending state.

A Lippert requested that Connecticut provide their concerns in writing for the rules committees. It was also noted that M. Thompson serves on the Rules Committee and can provide Pennsylvania’s concerns at its upcoming meeting.

The Benchbook’s content: its usefulness and user-friendliness

R. Maccarone noted NY finds the benchbook useful in its current form.

N. Latulippe suggested updates could be made to pare down some information, streamline the topics, add relevant whitepapers and remove any obsolete information

New Business

DCA Liaison Committee

D. Crook indicated that a DCA will soon serve as DCA Liaison Chair and ex-officio member of the Executive Committee. Commissioners should provide any recommendations to D. Crook and A. Lippert for consideration.

Accessing the National Office for Technical & Training Needs

D. Crook reminded states that all communication and technical and training requests made to the national office by staff must be funneled through the DCA.

Region Goals

D. Crook presented the region missions and goals.

Mission:

Serve as a liaison between the Commission and states within a defined geographic area. Provide assistance, share best practices, recommend rule changes, and report to the Executive Committee.

2018 Goals:

1. Develop a list of known best practices, emerging trends and training opportunities.
2. Engage discussions on aligning compact practices with principles of reentry/justice reinvestment.

IVINS

R. Maccarone summarized a recent conversation with Pat Tuthill, Victim's Representative, and the Commission's concerns with IVINS. Specifically the low number of states using the system and victims registering for notifications.

R. Maccarone noted that the Commission should consider making victim notification a priority as many cases do have victims and implementation of victim notification should be more deliberate. It was suggested that time for discussions at the 2018 ABM is warranted.

G. Roberge expanded on some of the issues seen with IVINS. One unintended consequence seen recently is the ability for offenders to register for IVINS notifications, particularly when a violation report is submitted into ICOTS. In addition to the more than \$223,200 spent in the last 5 + years since IVINS was implemented, usage is an issue. If states are following the rules around victim notification, it is assumed those states are using some other form of victim notifications. Connecticut through its own UAT and field testing of IVINS has also encountered inconsistencies in the notifications.

A. Lippert indicated that any formal decisions will be made by full the Commission at the Annual Business Meeting.

G. Roberge followed up that the intent of the conversation is not to eliminate victim notification, but rather evaluate whether IVINS is this the best way to provide victim notification.

Adjourn

Commissioner G. Roberge (CT) moved to adjourn. Commissioner S. McCaffrey (ME) seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm ET.