



Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Midwest Region Meeting MINUTES

November 15, 2021 – 11:00 am ET
Video Conference

Members in Attendance:

1. Sally Kreamer (IA), Chair
2. Mary Kay Hudson (IN)
3. Allen Godfrey (MN)
4. Sally Reinhardt-Stewart (NE)
5. Amy Vorachek (ND)
6. Katrina Ransom (OH)
7. Bradley Lewandowski (SD)

Members not in attendance:

8. Rebecca Walton (IL)
9. Hope Cooper (KS)
10. Russell Marlan (MI)
11. Joselyn López (WI)

Guests:

1. Heather Bell (IA)
2. Simona Hammond (IA)
3. Angie Hensley-Langrel (IN)
4. April Simmons (IN)
5. Ian Doyle (IN)
6. Joel Gruber (IN)
7. Nita Wright (IN)
8. Matthew Billinger (KS)
9. Daryn Cobb (MI)
10. Tracy Hudrlik (MN)
11. Alyssa Miller (ND)
12. Blair Hofeldt (NE)
13. Susan Barnard (NE)
14. Suzanne Brooks (OH)
15. Chuck Frieberg (SD)
16. Sarah Ball (SD)
17. Brenna Puestow (WI)

Staff:

1. Ashley Lippert, Executive Director
2. Allen Eskridge, Policy and Operations Director
3. Barno Saturday, Logistics and Administrative Coordinator
4. Mindy Spring, Administrative and Training Coordinator

5. Xavier Donnelly, ICOTS Project Manager
6. Drake Greeott, Web Development Manager

Call to Order

Chair S. Kreamer (IA) called the meeting to order at 11:00 am ET. Seven out of eleven voting members were present, a quorum was established.

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Commissioner A. Godfrey (MN) moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner M. Hudson (IN) seconded. Agenda approved.

Commissioner M. Hudson (IN) moved to approve the minutes from September 22, 2021 meeting as drafted. Commissioner A. Vorachek (ND) seconded. Minutes approved.

Discussion

Commissioner S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) stated that she wanted clarification regarding the reopening of Compact cases following an abscond when an offender has been apprehended in the receiving state. The Q2 Retaking Management meeting addressed reopening these cases in accordance with Advisory Opinion (AO) 1-2019 and emphasized states should be utilizing the addendum activity to submit hearing results.

She continued that at one time, Nebraska Parole reopened its cases and submitted the documentation through the addendum. After the Commission published AO 1-2019, Nebraska Parole opted to send the Compact Action Request (CAR) instead of reopening cases. She requested clarification on handling such cases in compliance with AO 1-2019.

Training Coordinator M. Spring stated that according to AO 1-2019, when a receiving state apprehends an absconder within its jurisdiction, it becomes a compact matter. Therefore, the case should be reopened in ICOTS and add all available correspondence regarding the violation, PC hearing and status, and location to the addendum and not a CAR.

DCA S. Hammonds (IA) noted that it was difficult to start supervising a recently apprehended client who absconded years ago, just because of their pending charges. She noted that her agents were not happy to do a home visit to the client's address that they had not approved in advance.

DCA S. Brooks (OH) stated that it was important for a receiving state to reopen those cases, specifically when offenders had pending charges, since the receiving states were in the best position to monitor these offenders compared to the sending states. Ohio had no issues with this practice, nor did they experience any pushback from the officers resuming the supervision of these cases.

DCA T. Hudrlik (MN) noted that Minnesota tries to work with the other state on these cases. However, Minnesota works on the clients' supervision plan before they are released.

DCA S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) asked the region whether there was an ability to retake after the supervision was resumed in the receiving state as the pending charges are being resolved.

DCA T. Hudrlik (MN) stated that there had been times when a state agreed to resume the supervision and withdraw the absconder violation. Then the state would resume supervision with the knowledge that the warrant would have to be reissued once those charges were resolved. If the clients end up going into custody on new charges, once they completed their new sentence, the warrant would be reissued.

Commissioner A. Godfrey (MN) asked the region if they had any funding formula to help offset the retaking cost on the county level.

Chair S. Kreamer (IA) stated that the DOC was responsible for parole transportation costs and the counties were responsible for probation transportation costs. They did not have any special funds to offset these costs.

Commissioner M. Hudson (IN) stated that they had a county transportation fund derived from the offender application fees.

DCA D. Cobb (MI) stated that about four years ago, Michigan raised their offender application fee from \$100 to \$200 to offset the transportation cost for counties. He added that at violation hearings, the probation agents request offenders to pay restitution in the amount of transportation cost.

Commissioner K. Ransom (OH) stated that Ohio did not have application fees and did not have any special funds to offset the transportation fees. Their counties pick up the cost for transport.

Commissioner A. Vorachek (ND) stated that North Dakota established a transport fund that collected interstate fees. Each year, they reviewed the fund and if it had less than \$75,000 on June 30th, they charged counties for their individual transfers. She added that because North Dakota's parole officers were armed, they transported the offenders.

Commissioner S. Reinhardt-Stewart (NE) stated that the Department of Corrections transported parolees. The Parole Office did not charge application fees. She added that they passed the cost of the return back to the offenders.

S. Barnard stated that NE Probation did not charge application fees. She noted issues when counties did not want to spend money on transportation costs for discretionary retaking cases.

She added that Nebraska put together a training PPT for new state council members and offered to share it with the region.

DCA C. Frieberg (SD) stated that SD Probation did not have a fund for transportation and their counties were responsible for the cost.

Commissioner B. Lewandowski (SD) added that on Parole side, the Department of Corrections covered the transport and housing costs for all parolees.

DCA B. Puestow (WI) noticed a trend that when clients had pending charges and were subject to retaking for behavior requiring retaking, agents had been keeping clients in custody to wait out the disposition of new charges rather than resume supervision. The Compact Office created a

workgroup to add language in their electronic case manual for agents regarding the appropriate custody length and supervision strategies when they have to resume the supervision for those clients. She inquired if other states had encountered those issues.

Commissioner A. Godfrey (MN) stated that most of the time, if the court releases an offender, Minnesota will honor and continue the supervision of that client in the community until the charges were resolved.

DCA M. Billinger (KS) stated that Kansas made those decisions based on the public safety perspective.

Chair S. Kreamer (IA) stated that like Kansas, Iowa made these decisions based on public safety.

The region decided to preschedule its quarterly meetings. The national office will setup meetings in February and May 2022.

Old Business/New Business

There was no old/new business to discuss.

Adjourn

Commissioner M. Hudson (IN) moved to adjourn. Commissioner K. Ransom (OH) seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 11:46 pm ET.