



**ASSOCIATION OF JUVENILE COMPACT ADMINISTRATORS**  
**2002 Annual Meeting**  
**August 9, 2002**  
**Savannah, Georgia**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Officers Present:**

Michael C. Reddish, President  
Ronald J. Leffler, Vice President  
Donna Bonner, Secretary  
Cindy Pittman, Treasurer

**Secretariat:**

Kristine C. Prince

**States Represented:**

Judy Miller, Arkansas  
Patricia Burt, Connecticut  
Rose Holmquist, Delaware  
Jean Hall, Florida  
Robert Champion, Indiana Probation  
Karen King-Jones, Kentucky  
Sarah LeBlanc, Louisiana (a.m. only)  
Cynthia Yim, Maryland  
Brent Buerck, Missouri  
Lori Schweinfurt, Nevada  
John Gusz, New Jersey Probation  
Judy Stephens, North Carolina  
Robyn Peterson, Ohio  
Warren Lewis, Pennsylvania  
Ryan Pinto, Washington

Summer Foxworth, Colorado  
Sandra Matlack, Connecticut  
JoAnn Phillips Rohan, D. C.  
M. Jody Taylor, Idaho  
Christine Reece, Kansas  
Paul Gibson, Kentucky  
Beth Meng, Louisiana (a.m. only)  
Maxine Baggett, Mississippi  
Danise Sipple, Nevada  
E. Wayne Carmack, New Hampshire  
Dianne Miller, New York Parole  
Pamela Helbling, North Dakota  
Amanda Behe, Pennsylvania  
Dawne Gannon, South Carolina  
Michael Lacy, West Virginia

**Guests:**

Chad Foster, Council of State Governments, Lexington, KY  
John Mountjoy, Council of State Governments, Lexington, KY  
Richard Masters, Council of State Governments, Lexington, KY

1. **WELCOME/ROLL CALL**

Mike Reddish welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked Cindy Pittman for hosting the Awards Banquet Thursday evening at Mrs. Wilkes' Boarding House. He announced that Ron Leffler (IN Parole) was presented with the 2002 William L. Frederick Award. Chris Holloway of Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), John Mountjoy and Rick Masters of the Council of State Governments (CSG) were co-recipients of the Mitch Wendell Award for all of their efforts over the past several years in rewriting the Interstate Compact for Juveniles. Lifetime Achievement Awards were presented to Linda Bombaci (formerly of NH), Duane Edwards (formerly of NM) and Fred McDonald (formerly of WV).

Roll call was taken by the Secretariat.

## **2. VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

1. Mediation Panel: Ron Leffler reported that there were no mediations requested this year (Appendix H).
2. Audit: Mr. Leffler reported that he, Jody Taylor (ID), Pam Helbling (ND) conducted an audit of the AJCA financial records yesterday afternoon. All records appeared to be in order (Appendix I).
3. Budget: Mr. Leffer presented the proposed budget for the 2003 fiscal year (Appendix J). Mr. Leffler recommended that the dues for each state remain at the current rate of \$400.00 for the next fiscal year.

**Motion:** *Ron Leffler made a motion that the dues for the next fiscal year remain fixed at \$400.00. Jody Taylor seconded the motion. The motion carried.*

**Motion:** *Ron Leffler made a motion that the proposed 2003 budget be approved by the membership as submitted. Jody Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed.*

Mr. Champion (IN Probation) requested that an expenditure report be included with the meeting minutes.

## **3. TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT**

Jody Taylor facilitated a discussion in behalf of the Technology Committee. She explained that because each state's statistics will be reviewed and used in assessing dues for the National Commission when the new compact is adopted, it is imperative the AJCA begin to compile more detailed statistics from each state on all of the services ICJ provides to juveniles. The Technology Committee recommends that a data base be created through the AJCA website that would keep track of these statistics. Ms. Taylor asked the membership for suggestions as to what types of information should be collected for the data base. Some states were hesitant to put confidential juvenile information on the internet, but Ms. Taylor stated that, while numbers would be kept, it is not intended to track identifying information on the data base.

After some discussion of the issue, the membership decided that the first step in creating a national data base would be to find out what technology was available in every ICJ office by sending a survey to each state. Discussion ensued about the questions for the survey, and the following questions were agreed upon:

4. Do you have a computer in your ICJ office? Is it a PC, or a MAC?
5. What is the memory capacity of your computer? What is the capability?
6. What training have you received in the use of your computer? (What is your level of

- expertise?)
7. Do you have internet access? Gateway or dial-up?
  8. Are you supported by Information Technology staff?
  9. What is your computer's operating system? Windows or DOS?
  10. What word processing system do you use?
  11. What email program do you use? Is this a statewide email system? Are the email systems used by your locals compatible with the statewide system?
  12. Does your state accept electronic signatures?

Ms. Taylor thanked everyone for their participation. The survey will go out from the Technology Committee in the next several weeks.

#### **4. COMPACT REWRITE PRESENTATION**

President Reddish introduced Chad Foster, John Mountjoy and Rick Masters from the Council of State Governments. He reported that in the future, Chad Foster would be replacing John Mountjoy as the CSG project manager. Further, Mr. Reddish excused Chris Holloway of OJJDP because his wife is expecting at any time. Mr. Reddish thanked all three gentlemen for coming to the Annual Meeting to make a presentation on the progress of the compact rewrite.

Mr. Mountjoy gave a brief history of how the compact came to be rewritten, noting that problems with the current compact which was drafted in 1955 had become apparent to many who worked in the juvenile justice field. A survey of the perceived effectiveness of the compact was done by the National Institute of Corrections Research Division (Larry Linke) in 2000, and the results pointed out that there were some serious inefficiencies in the current compact.

An Advisory Panel was convened with funding provided by OJJDP and facilitated by CSG who has historically have provided expertise in interstate compact law since CSG was created in 1933. The Advisory Panel members represented many juvenile justice agencies, representatives from the judicial branch, the legislative branch and the executive branches of government, victims' rights advocates, and public safety as well as four representatives from AJCA. Three meetings were held in late 2000 and during 2001. It was the consensus of the Advisory Panel that the current compact was faced with some serious structural problems and needed to be rewritten. The Panel drafted a lengthy list of recommendations which have driven the development of the new compact.

The Advisory Panel selected a Drafting Committee comprised of representatives from the agencies listed above as well as people who had expertise in compact law and those who had expertise in drafting legislation. The Drafting Committee held several meetings in late 2001 and 2002. A proposed new Interstate Compact *for* Juveniles was drafted and presented to the Advisory Panel for their approval. The Panel approved the proposed new compact and sent copies to all Compact Administrators, Deputy Compact Administrators and agency directors in each state. The compact was published on the CSG website and comments were solicited during the month of April

2002. Mr. Mountjoy reported that all comments received have been carefully considered and some changes were made to the original proposal based upon the comments.

Members indicated interest in what the future of AJCA would be when the new compact is adopted. Mr. Masters explained that in the past, AJCA has had both the responsibility of a professional organization and the responsibility of a legal body in drafting rules and regulations. Once the new compact is adopted, the new National Commission will be responsible for drafting rules and regulations. Mr. Masters suggested that at that time, AJCA may choose to continue as a professional organization providing training and collegiality for those who work with the compact day-to-day. However, Mr. Masters added that AJCA will continue with rule-making authority for those states who have not yet signed on to the new compact until there is only one unsigned state left.

When questioned about why a new compact is necessary rather than fixing the old compact, Mr. Masters responded that the new compact provides a clearly created power structure which does not exist in the current compact. This specific delegation of authority is given to a National Commission which is named in the compact and given the power to promulgate rules and regulations. The new compact regulates the way rules are made and mandates that the creation of new rules will follow the Model Administrative Procedures Act which sets minimum standards for the rulemaking process.

Also, it was felt that the language of the current compact is too detailed. The language of the new compact is more general and will remove the micro-managing language contained in the current compact.

Further, the new compact provides for an enforcement mechanism and sanctions against states for non-compliance with compact rules and regulations. It is assumed that most non-compliance is a result of ignorance of the rules, and the first line of enforcement will be technical assistance and training offered to the offending state. If noncompliance continues, then alternative dispute resolution will be used. Binding arbitration will follow as the next step. The final step for those states who refuse to comply will be financial in the form of fines and assessments. States can be sued in the Federal District Court with a request that the offending state pay all damages along with attorney fees and court costs. Non-complying states can also be suspended from the National Commission or terminated altogether.

Mr. Masters informed the members that CSG received only three comments on their web site and six letters during the comment period. The comments concerned the following issues:

- The budget and responsibilities of the National Commission and ensuring that states are assessed in a fair and equitable manner.
- The role and membership of the state councils.
- Delegation of authority and the rule-making process.

Mr. Masters explained that states will be assessed fees based on the population of the state

and the numbers of juveniles needing services. Each will be weighted. The “weighting” of each will be decided upon by the National Commission. In the new Adult Compact, states have been assessed between \$18,000 and \$48,000 per year, and he stated that he assumes that the juvenile compact assessment will be similar.

Mr. Masters further indicated that CSG recommends that both juvenile and adult National Commissions use economies of scale and combine both commissions in one location. He stated that while administrative functions may be shared, policy makers and compact administrators will be kept separate. (CSG plans to submit a bid to house both compacts on their campus in Lexington, Kentucky. However, Mr. Masters stated that the bidding process will be competitive and open to any entity who wishes to bid.)

In discussing the proposed state councils, Mr. Masters said that the purpose of the state councils is to create an institutionalized channel of communication about juvenile justice issues within a state. The state councils are to meet at least once per year. The compact language states that these councils will have an advisory role and may provide oversight. However, if an individual state wishes to limit its state council to an advisory function only, they have the option to change that language in their statute. Some members indicated concern about the proposed role of the state councils and suggested that compact language be modified to clarify that the role of the council is advisory only, and to make that language consistent throughout the whole compact.

Some members indicated that, in their opinion, the current compact seems to be working well, and questioned why the new compact is necessary. They questioned why the Advisory Panel did not just give some strong enforcement mechanism to AJCA instead of creating a National Commission. Mr. Masters responded that the survey conducted by NIC in 2000 indicated that the way things are being done currently is *not* working well. Many problems with the current compact were cited by probation and parole administrators, field officers, agency directors, etc., in the survey. The new compact is a better tool for ICJ administrators and gives them the resources they need in order to do their jobs in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

Members also indicated concern over the proposed national commission and questioned the need to create a national commission and of giving it authority to make rules that are binding on all states. Again, Mr. Masters responded that this is already happening with AJCA and the new national commission will have more resources and more sanctioning powers than AJCA currently has.

Mr. Master distributed copies of the proposed Interstate Compact for Juveniles (Appendix K). Jody Taylor suggested that the language in Article IX (State Councils), should be changed to state that the membership of the state council should include the compact administrator, deputy administrator, or *designee*.

Another question arose as to the membership of the national commission. Mr. Reddish pointed out that AJCA representatives to the Advisory Panel were successful in getting language in

the new compact stating that the membership of the national commission would include the compact administrator *or his/her designee* as well. The hope was that the membership of the National Commission would be comprised of individuals who work with the compact day-to-day and who know the most about the compact, not political appointees who have no experience or knowledge of the compact. Mr. Mountjoy and Mr. Masters agreed.

When questioned about the exact responsibilities of the national commission, Mr. Masters stated that the commission will have rule-making authority, enforcement authority and budgetary responsibilities. This will take the time-consuming responsibilities off the shoulders of volunteer AJCA officers and Board members as is happening now in AJCA. The national commission will also have access to legal counsel, will have research assistance, and will provide trouble-shooting, education and training.

In reviewing the compact with the group, several changes were suggested. Item "E" in paragraph two on page one, should read: "make contracts for the cooperative institutionalization *in public facilities* in member states for delinquent youth needing special services." Mr. Masters and Mr. Mountjoy agreed to this change.

Mr. Masters outlined the next steps towards the adoption of the compact which includes legislative briefings, getting the endorsement of stakeholders in agencies which are impacted by the ICJ, creating an information clearinghouse which would include a comprehensive website and developing an interactive, multi-media CD rom. CSG is looking towards beginning the process of putting together lists of legislators and key players in each state who may be interested in sponsoring the compact legislation. In order to get the compact adopted in each state, juvenile justice agency support will be needed as well as legislative and gubernatorial support. CSG asked for the input of members in strategizing how best to do this. Compact administrators will be asked to identify the key players in their agencies and in their states whom CSG can contact and work with.

CSG has drafted the following proposed schedule:

January 2003	First introduction of legislation in state legislatures
December 2003	Have at least ten signatory states
December 2004	Have at least thirty signatory states
May 2005	Have met the 35-state threshold
Fall 2005	First meeting of Interstate National Commission <i>(At which time dues will be assessed in time to be included in Fiscal Year 2006 state budgets.)</i>

Mr. Masters indicated his willingness to meet with state legislators, legislative judiciary committees and juvenile justice agency heads to present the new compact and to answer questions during the upcoming several years.

In conclusion, both Mr. Masters and Mr. Mountjoy expressed their opinion that they have no doubt that the passage of the new compact is truly in the best interests of those who work with the ICJ, in the best interests of the juveniles being served, and the communities in which they live. They encouraged the group to check out the CSG website which will contain all the latest information about the proposed compact.

Mike Reddish thanked Mr. Masters and Mr. Mountjoy for their presentation and for all of their efforts and hard work in behalf of the Interstate Compact. He indicated that in tomorrow morning's meeting, the group will be asked to approve a resolution endorsing the new compact.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The silent auction was then closed. All of the proceeds will be donated to an agency within the host state of Georgia serving at-risk juveniles.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted:

Kristine Prince, AJCA Secretariat  
August 22, 2002