

Ralph M. Diaz
Secretary (A)
Jerry Powers
Director



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA STATE COUNCIL FOR INTERSTATE ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION

Minutes August 27, 2018

Present:	Anthony Pennella	Commissioner/Compact Administrator (Chair)
	Honorable Ana L. Espana	Judge, Superior Court of California, San Diego County
	Karen Neuwald	Appointee, Office of Senate Rules Committee
	Jim Salio	Chief Probation Officer, San Luis Obispo County
	Dave Robinson	Sheriff, Kings County
Guests:	Marvin Speed	Associate Director, DAPO
	Chris Smalling	Deputy Compact Administrator, Parole Agent III, DAPO
	John Edelman	Parole Agent III, California Parole Apprehension Team (DAPO)

Commissioner Pennella called the meeting to order at 10:07 AM.

- Opening of Meeting: Commissioner Pennella
- Roll call was completed and all Council members were present
- Commissioner Pennella thanked everyone for attending the State Council meeting.

I. Introduction of State Council Members and Guests

Commissioner Pennella introduced all State Council members.

II. Approval of Minutes from State Council Meeting Held on July 5, 2017

Commissioner Pennella would like for everyone to turn to the minutes from July 5, 2017, Tab 4, for approval. Ms. Neuwald approved the minutes and Chief Probation Officer Salio seconded the motion. Commissioner Pennella approved the meeting notes.

III. Introduction

Commissioner Pennella introduced Deputy Compact Administrator Chris Smalling and relayed that Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling will go over several reports and provide an update on the status of the Interstate Compact for California.

A. Overview

Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling informed the Commission that Interstate has 25 employees not including Mr. Pennella. Interstate only has two vacancies, which are the Program Technician (PT) II positions. Interstate is not going to fill those positions at this time. Interstate has been working to get two PT II positions that have been approved and Interstate is awaiting the final approval. One of the problems that Interstate has experienced in the last few years is retaining good staff. There is no upward mobility at the PT level, so Interstate has been able to get approval for two PT II positions. This will allow Interstate to promote good staff and retain some of our better employees. This will also cut down on our vacancy rate and constant retraining that Interstate has experienced in the past. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling reiterated that other than the two vacancies, Interstate is fully staffed. Interstate does have one Parole Agent that has been working out of class. However, her assignment ends this month. Once she returns, Interstate will be fully staffed.

B. Performance

Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling provided an overview of the statistics for 2017-18. One statistic that is noticeable, California is taking in a lot more offenders than we are sending out. The numbers of outgoing parole cases are significantly lower. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling attributes that to the penal code section that requires a parolee to pay their restitution prior to leaving the state of California. However, you can see that California takes in about twice as many cases than Interstate sends out. Chief Probation Officer Salio inquired if these statistics were inclusive of State Parole and Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS). Deputy Compact Administrator informed the Commission that a PRCS case is supervised by Probation. Therefore, they go into the Probation category. Karen Neuwald, Appointee, Senate Rules Committee, noted that how surprised she was regarding the statistics from other States and felt that California's numbers are "small potatoes" compared to the total in other states. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling informed the Commission that California is about fourth or fifth down. The biggest states are Texas with 16,000 and Florida and Georgia both have 13,000 apiece. Interstate gets a lot of cases from Florida, Georgia and Texas, as well as the neighboring states such as Arizona and Nevada, the boarding states. We are somewhere around fifth I've been in the Interstate Compact Unit for about four years.

Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling presented the information regarding the 2018 Interstate statistics. Refer to Tab 6, page 1, a letter

addressed to Anthony Pennella, the results of a 3 month compliance audit performed by the Interstate Commission. The first thing on the letter was the 2018 ICOTS photo audit. The audit was from January 1, 2018 to March 31, 2018 and looked at the photos that were submitted from July 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017 on photo quality. For fiscal year 2018 for the state of California, 822 passed, which 86.8% and 125 failed, which is 13.1% and the national average was 6.7% failed. We were a little higher than the national average as far as photo quality. These are the photos that probation officers and parole agents are submitting with the transfer request. We have made that a focus of our office. Interstate has sent out notices to all of the probation departments and Interstate Compact Coordinators letting them know the results of the audit and informing them that we will be auditing the photos as they come in. All of our staff look at photos and are looking for photo quality. What the Compact wants is just a basic mugshot. They do not want "selfies" or photos that are far away that you cannot identify them or the photo is blurry. It's funny that those photos will pass or get through, but stuff does. Here at our office, we have made that a focus of ours. If there is a photo that we don't believe will pass the compliance check we have sent it back and have them re-submit the booking photo. Basically, if you submit the booking photo, the primary mugshot photo, that is what they are looking for and the majority of the time it passes. That was a snap shot from July 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017.

Commissioner Pennella asked a question: "what happens if they submit a typical mugshot along with tattoo photos?" Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling replied "one problem we have identified and are working with the national offices and we actually went and looked back at what is going on right now and we had photos fail. Say the probation officer takes photos of primary mugshot; tattoos; one of his chest and his side profile. They are passing the main one but failing the next two because they don't meet the photo quality. That is something that we are looking into and working with the national office. I think that 13.1% failed, I think that's high and it is due to those photos that are not the primary mugshot not passing.

Ms. Neuwald, Appointee, Senate Rules Committee requested an explanation. Smalling further explained "a Probation Officer submits a transfer request and he submits the primary mugshot, that would pass then we would be 100% fine. However, some Probation Officers, in the interest making sure they submit a sufficient number of photos so that they could identify them, such as tattoos, scars, marks, or anything that would help the Probation Officer identify them, so they are submitting three or four photos as well as the primary mugshot. Those photos are failing due to not having the mugshot. I feel that we are being unjustly failed on those photos. Like I said, we are working with the National Office and I will make sure that before the next audit comes out that we are not getting penalized for those photos.

The 1st quarter performance review covered January 1, 2018 through March 31, 2018, Interstate Commission did an audit covering case closure notice; case closure reply; reporting instructions reply; transfer request reply; violation response compliance and request for progress notes compliance. Case Closure Notice compliance we are at 100%, the national average is 96%. Page 1, Tab 6 Case Closure Notice response we are at 98.5%, national average is 91%; Reporting Instructions Reply were at 99.3%, national number is 96%; Transfer Reply were at 99.6% and national average is 92% and the Violation Response compliance were at 90.3% and the national average was 84.2%. Interstate has a California offender, out of state. When another state like Georgia sends California a violation report requiring retaking, per the rules, we have 10 days to respond to that violation. The problems we have encountered is that if there is a problem with the Offender Violation Report, that it doesn't meet the standard or doesn't meet the rules. Previously, we would send that back to the sending state for corrections. However, the problems that we are running into are that if they never re-submit that violation report, our timeframe is still running. If they don't submit it within the 10 days, we get penalized for that. Our 2018 statistics from April 2018 forward, our early on response compliance is 90.3%. From April until July, we are at 100% because we stop sending them back and if there were problems we are making the sending state withdraw their violation which puts an end to the timeframe response. When the national office makes changes in ICOTS which is our tracking system sometimes they make changes and it affects other things and previously we didn't use to get penalized for sending a violation report back. This is something that we identified and we have taken the steps to correct it. When I go over the statistics for April to July that statistic is 100% now. The requested Progress Report is at 99.2% and the national average is 92.1%. As you see in most of the categories we are at 99% to 100%. Mr. Pennella is not satisfied with just passing, we want to be perfect or near perfect. That has been an ongoing goal of our unit. The last thing is duplicate offender requiring action to correct. In ICOTS, what can happen is one state will input a case for an offender and make a profile for him, and another state can make a profile for the same offender and they will input a profile for him. Then, we end up with two profiles for the same guy. It should be going under one profile. In California there were 88 possible duplicates and they were at 2.96% of active offenders and the national average is 1.4% of active offenders. During that time period, we were down two Supervising Program Technicians and that was their main function. In January 2018, we hired two new Supervising Program Technicians and we should have that number down or close to the national average.

Chief Probation Officer Salio asked "are all of the counties being trained." Deputy Commissioner Smalling informed the Committee about the lawsuit of 2014/15, and our main focus is training. We are very active in training. We have our annual training coming up in September. Every year, we have big group training and we also do individual county to county training. We cover every county in California. However, one problem we do

encounter is that there is a lot of turnover with the county probation staff. County probation staff has a rotation policy where they rotate their staff quite a bit. Therefore, we are doing training a couple of time per month. We have not done it this month because we have our big annual training where we invite the whole state. Training has always been a focus of ours. This year, it has been our desire to shift more of the focus to the Parole side because Probation Officers have access to ICOTS, therefore, they were our first concern as far as training. However, Parole has not been up to standard as far as understanding the rules and their application of the rules. At Interstate we have been able to counteract that because all of the parole cases in California are in the name of an assigned Parole staff in our office. As far as the field agents, it's my desire to give the field agents more training. We have started doing that by going to their individual unit meetings. Interstate has a two-hour presentation that we give to the field units. It is a full-time job to train the state of California. That was the audit statistics.

Tab 8 – Monthly Statistics for January 2018 through July 2018, this encompasses January through March, the audit that the national office performed. Violation Response (in purple), January, February and March, Interstate is at 92%, 90% and 100% respectively. The March when we stopped sending the Violation Reports back, were at 100%. Interstate has identified that problem and moved to correct it. The majority of the statistics in April through July were either at 100% or 99%. Compact Commissioner Pennella asked, “How often do you run the reports?” Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling informed the Commission that the reports are run on a monthly basis or bi-monthly basis depending on if there are any issues with our process. No less than once a month. Commissioner Pennella asked, “Has any of the other counties reached out to your or your supervisors about a “Report Card?” Smalling responded, “I haven’t had any request.” Some counties have reached out and wanted to know their stats are. Interstate can actually break down to the supervisors on how to run their own stats and tell how their staff is doing. Chief Probation Officer Salio asked, “So counties can run their own stats?” Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling explained on the ICAOS website, as supervisors we can give them access to run their own stats. They can break it down on the ICAOS website. Back in March, they recently changed the ICAOS website. It takes more time to learn the report running. It is much more in-depth than the previous Interstate Compact website. It may be a bit of a learning curb, but once you achieve it you can run any stat you want to. Deputy Compact Commissioner Smalling informed the Commission that if they did not know how to run the reports, they could call Interstate and staff would run the report for them. Chief Probation Officer Salio indicated that he will offer the training to the Chiefs. Commissioner Pennella asked Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling if stated “Interstate had any counties take the opportunity to come to your office and receive hands on training? Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling indicated that Interstate does offer training, if other counties come to the Interstate office and does Interstate offer hands-on training. Deputy Commissioner Smalling informed the

Committee that Interstate just came back from training down in Ventura County last month. Any Probation Officers that want to come to our office in Sacramento and want to receive hands on training on how to use Interstate Compact Offender Tracking System (ICOTS), on how to enter a transfer request, how to enter a reply to transfer and the data entry part of it. The Probation Officers can sit with our staff and Interstate staff will walk the Probation Officers through the process. The training that we provide to the County Probation Department is more about the rules and the concepts. Interstate does some go over some entry of the reports, but not to the detail that the Probation Officers could achieve at our office.

Most recently, Interstate worked with the STC and now our training is STC certified. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling indicated that he is aware that Probation Department's received STC training hours. One of the reasons we did that, it makes a difference in our training participation when County Probation Departments' know they will receive STC credits.

Chief Probation Officer Salio requested a flyer that he could give to the Chiefs' with regard to the training. Chief Probation Officer Salio also indicated that Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling was correct in saying that Probation has a lot of turn-over due to a person leaving the organization, retires or for whatever reason and then all of their knowledge goes with them. If he had something that he could give the Chiefs that would be helpful. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling indicated that we have a large list of all 58 counties with an identified Interstate Compact Coordinator. Smalling indicated that Interstate usually facilitates everything through the Coordinator such as our large group training we send it to the Compact Coordinators, their supervisor and all ICOTS users on our list; it usually funnels through that way. Chief Probation Officer Salio wanted to know, what if they are gone, how do you get the notice to them? Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling explained that the Compact Administrators notify the Interstate Unit with the changes and Interstate will ask, "Who's the replacement?" It would be easy to facilitate the training through the Coordinator. Chief Probation Officer Salio wanted to know if that process works. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling, responded, "it works, it doesn't always work okay, but it works. Interstate is always there to help.

Chief Probation Officer Salio suggested, if there is a formal process that you want Probation to come up with, let me know, Probation can come up with that.

Chief Probation Officer Appointee Karen Neuwald, Office of Senate Rules Committee, requested a document that outlined all of the training that had been provided in the past. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling indicated that the information was not placed in the binders; however, if you would like it emailed to you after this meeting. Ms. Neuwald asked if the training was helping because previously there were compliance issues and the courts really did not have the right information and some of the counties

did not have the right information. My sense is that the training is working. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling indicated that the training is paramount because it all starts with the Probation Department because they're the ones who have access to ICOTS and they're the ones who are starting this whole process and it trickles to the DA's and the courts. The training has made our job a lot easier. When you have an affective and trained Probation and Parole departments, it makes our job at Interstate Compact easier. We are sending fewer reports back; we are having less emails and telephone calls from other states with problems. The volume of work in our office seems to have increased more each year.

Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling attributes that to our training. It seems like everyone is figuring out how Interstate works. A lot of departments didn't know that they could arrest Interstate compact offenders; they didn't know how to submit a violation; they weren't really supervising these offenders.

Tab 7: In June 2018, state of Minnesota filed a formal complaint against the state of California. A quick synopsis of the scenario: A California probationer in the state of Minnesota being supervised by Minnesota. The offender was convicted of a new felony. Per the Interstate Compact Rule 5.102, it was a mandatory retake for California due to that new felony conviction. Interstate Compact office got involved. There were some issues with the warrant being issued. When the case was heard in the California court, the offender was discharged off probation prior to the offender being retaken off that warrant which is a violation of the Interstate Compact Rule 5.102. Our office attempted to intervene and advised the courts of the rules due to this situation being a mandatory retake. The courts choose not to take Interstate's advice and discharged the offender from Probation resulting in a formal complaint from the state of Minnesota.

Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling informed the Committee, if they actually read through the formal complaint, it puts the California Interstate Compact Office in a good light because we did everything we could to advise the courts of the rules to retake. "The court was aware that dismissal of the probation case was a violation of the Compact, yet they did so despite this knowledge. Commissioner Pennella and the California Compact Office staff were very responsive in order to stop this action and provided information to the court regarding the ICAOS rule and potential liability. However, the Nevada County Court chose to act in violation of the rules and neglect Interstate Office's advice.

Ms. Neuwald, Chairperson, Senate Rules Committee wanted to know if there was any other recourse against Nevada County. Commissioner Pennella informed the Commission that the National Office contacted him and requested a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) from the state of California. Commissioner Pennella was tasked with doing the CAP. The first step was to reach out to the presiding judge and informing him of what took place of the situation forwarding him all the documentation that was given to the

District Attorney's (DA) office and the DA's office informed the court at that time. The presiding judge responded back and the request was to provide training to the judge on the case and to other judges in his county. The presiding judge was not amendable to training. The next step in the CAP was to reach out to California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) Legal Office. Currently, the case is with CDCR's Legal Office. Legal is pulling the transcripts of the court on this case. Commissioner Pennella informed the Committee that he has spoken to the DA on the case and he adamantly informed Commissioner Pennella that the court was well informed of the Rules and it is on record. Additionally, the DA believes there are some emails between his office and the court. There have been some discussion what the next steps will be with CDCR Legal Office, but they will be reaching out he should have a conference call with CDCR Legal within the next week to discuss where we go from there. The Director of Parole will be notified. The final step was to wait until August 27, 2018, and make a formal request to the State Council to bring this situation up to the Judicial Committee and we may possibly have some leverage there. Commissioner Pennella informed the Committee that his fear is that this will continue to happen and we are limited on recourse. Commissioner Pennella informed the Commission that "mistakes do happen." However, in this case, the courts were well informed. Ms. Neuwald, Chairperson, Senate Rules Committee wanted to know if the presiding judge was the judge on this case. Commissioner Pennella responded, "no." The Honorable Ana Espana responded informed the council that generally, when there is a disagreement with a judicial decision, there is a course of appeal which in this case would happen because who is going to appeal the court's decision. Other than that there is the Commission of Judicial Performance. Judges are independent judicial officers who make their decisions on the facts of the law. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling informed the Committee that there is a \$25,000 fine that is associated with this complaint. Commissioner Pennella submitted the CAP to the National Office and the National Office was in favor of the CAP. Their recommendation and I have not received the final document. However, Commissioner Pennella was informed by the Director that the National Office was in favor of the CAP and that they were going to give California a one-year timeframe to implement training to the Nevada County court judge. However, if Interstate was unable to meet that timeframe, then there would be a \$25,000 fine associated with that complaint. Chief Probation Officer Salio asked if it was possible to eliminate a court because that County does not abide by the Interstate Compact Rules. Commissioner Pennella informed the Commission that he fears that the court would just send the offender.

Ms. Neuwald, Chairperson, Senate Rules Committee wanted to know if CDCR could sue County of Nevada for non-compliance or have them pay the \$25,000 fine since the violation is Nevada County's or somehow send formal letter to the Judicial Council stating that because Nevada counties overt non-compliance, they should be liable for the \$25,000 fine.

David Robinson, Sheriff, Kings County stated, “do you think that AB 109, Proposition 47 or Proposition 57 weighs in on some of decision-making on bringing someone back when we know in California there not going to do any jail time and they would just be released. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling responded that may be a consideration and may be on a judges’ mind. It is an ongoing problem for us. When you look at informal probation, a lot of cases go unsupervised. The informal probation cases are on probation with the courts but there is no active supervision. A lot of those cases per the Rules meet the criteria and have to be supervised out of state and are required to go through the Compact. Therefore, that is one road block that we run into. If we have an offender who commits a violation that is required to be retaken and the courts don’t issue a warrant. That is one of the problems we have then our office goes into training mode and it usually gets resolved.

Karen Neuwald, Chairperson, Senate Rules Committee would like to be kept in the loop as it pertains to how CDCR Legal will solve this issue. Ms. Neuwald felt that somebody needs to be held accountable and that CDCR will be facing a substantial fine for non-compliance.

Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling explained to the Committee the sex offender 290 registration procedure. The Department of Justice (DOJ) is the presiding authority over the sex offenders makes the determination on whether the offender is required to register here in California. Deputy Compact Administrator Smalling informed the Compact that he has been told by DOJ that look at the offender’s case and compare it to a comparable offense in California as to whether they would have to register in California or not. They would be required to obtain the conviction documents from the sending state and that process can take anywhere from two to four months. Interstate has begun a pre-registration prior to the sex-offenders getting to California. Interstate is sending DOJ all of their documentation so that DOJ can get a head start on all of these cases prior to the sex offenders coming to California. The pre-registration process is working really well. There were some issues in the past of the offender being here and not getting a determination on whether or not he or she has to register or not for three or four months. The offenders still are required to register until Interstate receives the final determination from DOJ as to whether or not they are actually required to register.

IV. PRESENTATIONS

A. Division of Adult Parole Operations – Executive Staff

Deputy Commissioner Smalling introduced Associate Director Marvin Speed, DAPO who will be speaking on the Probable Cause Hearing Process.

Associate Director Marvin Speed delivered a presentation, outlining the Probable Cause Hearing process and the recent changes in our process. Prior to AB 109 the Board of Parole Hearing had jurisdiction for parolees in the state of California so the Board would conduct all of the parole hearings and processes involved with state parolees. After AB 109, now the county Superior Courts have jurisdiction for revocation cases that are submitted to them from DAPO. Director Powers was concerned about standardization and consistency specifically for Interstate parolees under courtesy supervision by the state of California. Director Powers asked Associate Director Marvin Speed to see if it was feasible to conduct our own Probable Cause Hearings. Associate Director Marvin Speed reached out to Sacramento County who has always conducted their own Probable Cause Hearings for the Interstate offenders. Associate Director Marvin Speed reviewed the ICAOS Rules and determined the only requirement was to have a neutral and detached magistrate and for the hearing to take place in a reasonable proximity to where the violation occurred. It was determined that DAPO would be able to conduct Probable Cause Hearings for Interstate parolees under our courtesy supervision and developed a process. Associate Director Marvin Speed checked on the number of hearings that needed to be heard statewide. Last calendar year there were 68 Interstate hearings statewide, which equates to approximately 3-5 per month. Associate Director Speed went on to explain that it would not be much a workload for DAPO; it actually relieves the court of some of the burden of this population. Associate Director Marvin Speed developed a process to conduct the hearings. One concern was that the hearings were neutral and detached. Associate Director Marvin Speed explained to the Committee that he supervises the Independent Review Unit and it is a staff consisting of all Parole Administrators their function is to ensure due process and submissions to the court are up to proper standard. They are a check and balance unit for the work that the field submits to the courts. DAPO utilizes the Independent Review Unit as the neutral and detached hearing officer for these processes. Associate Director Marvin Speed informed the Committee that he is the only staff that has been conducting the hearings. Associate Director Marvin Speed background was as a Deputy Commissioner, Associate Chief Deputy Commissioner in the Executive Office of the Parole Board. Associate Director Marvin Speed went on to explain that he had conducted thousands of hearings. Therefore, he is the only trained Hearing Officer at the Division. Associate Director Marvin Speed informed the Commission that he is in the process of developing a way to train all of the Independent Review Officers to ensure they can conduct hearings. Associate Director Marvin Speed informed the Committee that the hearing workload is not so much that he can't do it himself. Associate Director Marvin Speed explained the formal process which looks similar to the revocation process at the Board use to look like. The parolee is allowed to waive their hearing. The parolee is

allowed to receive a notice of the charges that is presented by the State to substantiate the charges and then do a knowing and intelligent waiver, if they choose. If they do not choose to waive the right to a hearing, we will schedule a hearing. That is done at the local jails in whatever county the hearing is to take place. The hearings are actually recorded. Associate Director Marvin Speed goes through effective communication to ensure the parolee fully understands and can participate in the hearing; ADA requirements to see if the parolee has any disability that may require an accommodation, i.e., magnifying glass, mobility, help understanding, interpreter, etc. to ensure they can fully understand and participate in the hearing. Associate Director Marvin Speed explained that during the Probable Cause Hearing he explains the process to the parolee and ensures the parolee understands the basis of the charge. Once the parolee understands the charge; the parolee is given the opportunity admit or deny the charges or enter no plea. The Interstate parolee will go through the process and a Probable Cause Determination will be made.

B. John Edelman, Parole Agent III, California Parole Apprehension Team, (CPAT) DAPO

Deputy Commissioner Chris Smalling introduced John Edelman, Parole Agent III, Supervisor.

Parole Agent III Edelman delivered a presentation which outlined the operation of the CPAT. Agent Edelman presented to the Committee that his unit is responsible for the Sierra District, Capital District and the Delta District. The area of supervision is from Modesto to the Oregon border, as well as Nevada County. CPAT has teams in the Bay Area, Bakersfield and Fresno. Currently, in the Northern region, which begins in Ventura County and north of that, we have 18 Parole Agent I's; 5 Parole Agent II's; 3 Parole Agent III's and 1 District Administrator that oversees the program.

Currently, CPAT will receive transfer cases for parolees who abscond their parole supervision. CPAT's will receive referrals after 30 days from not being supervised by their assigned Parole Agent. Thirty days gives the Unit's own Parole Agents time to attempt to locate the parolee; contact family members, etc. However, CPAT Unit can take parolee-at-large (PAL) within an hour; twenty-fours, etc. CPAT has the ability to take a case at any time. It is the CPAT's responsibility to bring these parolees back.

Parole Agent III Edelman explained that CPAT works with Office of Correctional Safety; US Marshalls and Federal Bureau of Investigations in order to apprehend the PAL population. Parole Agent III Edelman informed the Committee that the PAL population like to leave the state of California. Therefore, CPAT will request the face sheets, mugshots and the warrant from the assigned agent. Parole Agent III Edelman informed the Committee that some states have rural police departments with limited staff. However, 99.9% of the time when CPAT contacts out of state law enforcement, they are willing to assist CPAT. Once CPAT get the person apprehended, sometimes CPAT will reach out to the Interstate Compact

Unit for assistance and inform them that the individual was apprehended. Agent Edelman explained to the Committee that once a PAL is apprehended. Most of the time, Extradition will contact CPAT and inform them that the individual has apprehended and provide CPAT with the information regarding the arresting agency, etc. CPAT will monitor the case until the individual is extradited back to California. Once the parolee is in a county facility, CPAT will transfer the case back to the parole unit.

Commissioner Pennella wanted to know if there were any statistics indicating larger arrest during the holidays or summer months. Parole Agent III Edelman informed the Commission that in the summertime there are a lot more arrests.

V. STATE COUNCIL COMMENTS

Commissioner Pennella asked if the State Council had any comments; Karen Neuwald, Chairperson, Senate Rules Committee expressed that she had an issue with information being in the newspaper regarding violations of the Compact and provided copies of the newspaper article. Ms. Neuwald requested that any Commission be aware of any Compact issues that may come out in the newspaper. Commissioner Pennella informed the Commission that DAPO has a policy that any news-worthy information be vetted through our Public Information Officer. Commissioner informed Ms. Neuwald that he will forward her concerns to the Public Information Officer.

Honorable Anna Espana informed the Commission regarding the bench card and it is posted on the judicial education website and is accessible to all judges. Judge Espana informed the Commission that she is now going to do a podcast in October 2018 that essentially follows the bench card and it will be another tool in which we educate judges statewide. Commissioner Pennella wanted to know if Judge Espana received any feedback from the bench card that was posted. Judge Espana informed the Commission that many of the judges felt that the bench card was quite helpful for training purposes. The bench card is also going to be presented at the judicial college which is the initial training for all new judges.

Karen Neuwald, Chairperson, Senate Rules Committee wanted to commend Commissioner Pennella and his staff for working on this.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Commissioner Pennella gave the opportunity for the public to address the Council, but no one responded.

VII. CONCLUSION

Commissioner Pennella adjourned the meeting at 11:40 AM. Ms. Neuwald asked when the next Council meeting will be held. Commissioner Pennella informed the Committee that Deputy Commission Administrator Small and Deputy Commissioner DeJeus will reach out to the state panel members for possible dates for next year.