

# INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR JUVENILES

## **Rules Committee Meeting Minutes**

July 7, 2021  
3:00 p.m. ET  
Via WebEx



---

### **Voting Members in Attendance:**

1. Tracy Hudrlik (MN), Commissioner
2. Judy Miller (AR), Designee
3. Mary Kay Hudson (IN), Commissioner
4. Roy Curtis (ME), Designee
5. Julie Hawkins (MO), Commissioner
6. Edwin Lee, Jr. (NJ), Designee
7. Stephen Horton (NC), Commissioner
8. Daryl Liedecke (TX), Commissioner

### **Non-Voting Members in Attendance:**

1. Kelly Palmateer (NY)
2. Raymundo Gallardo (UT)

### **Members Not in Attendance:**

1. Tomiko Frierson (IL), Commissioner
2. Galan Williamson (ME), Commissioner
3. Caitlyn Bickford (NH), Commissioner
4. Jennifer LeBaron (NJ), Commissioner
5. Maureen Clifton (WY), Commissioner
6. Matt Billinger (KS)
7. Dawn Bailey (WA)

### **Guest in Attendance:**

1. Abbie Christian (NE) Technology Committee Member

### **National Office Staff & Legal Counsel in Attendance:**

1. MaryLee Underwood, Executive Director
2. Emma Goode, Logistics and Administrative Specialist
3. Jenny Adkins, Operations and Policy Specialist
4. Amanee Cabbagestalk, Training and Administrative Specialist

### **Call to Order**

Chair Hudrlik (MN) called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. ET.

### **Roll Call**

Director Underwood called the roll and a quorum was established.

### **Agenda**

**M. K. Hudson (IN) made a motion to approve the agenda as presented.  
E. Lee, Jr. (NJ) seconded. The motion carried.**

## Minutes

**J. Miller (AR) made a motion to approve the June 10, 2021 meeting minutes as presented. D. Liedecke (TX) seconded. The motion carried.**

## Discussion

### **Rule 8-101: Travel Permit** - *proposed by the ICJ Technology Committee*

- Chair Hudrlik welcomed Abbie Christian (NE), a member of the ICJ Technology Committee and the UNITY Business Analysis (BA) Team.
- A. Christian (NE) indicated that she appreciates the opportunity to provide an explanation of the Technology Committee's proposal to ICJ Rule 8-101. The proposal came from the UNITY BA Team during the development and design of UNITY. The BA Team discussed the issue at length, including how to address juveniles who lived in the receiving state prior to adjudication.
- Most people think of "relocate" as a physical move or change in residence. However, the ICJ Rules define "relocate" as "when a juvenile remains in another state for more than ninety (90) consecutive days in any twelve (12) month period." Due to that definition, UNITY requires travel permit information as part of the referral packet.
- Some maintain a travel permit is not needed because the juvenile is already in the "receiving" state. Others point out that the "receiving" state may not be aware a juvenile is there and may not see a packet of information for weeks. The travel permit provides notice that the juvenile is there and provides a clear process timeline for submission of the referral packet.
- Some suggest that the Form VI accomplishes the same thing; however, the Form VI gives permission to apply for a transfer. Others argue that the Form IV provides notice however is a part of the referral packet which could come weeks later.
- The BA Team and Technology Committee agreed that it is in the best interest of the juvenile and public safety to propose a rule amendment that would add consistency across the nation, as there are different opinions and practices.
- In summary, the goal was not to create more work, rather they felt strongly that requiring travel permits is in the best interest of the juvenile and public safety. On behalf of the Technology Committee, A. Christian (NE) asked the Rules Committee to reconsider the proposal and recommend it for adoption.
- J. Hawkins (MO) shared her concern that requiring travel permits for this population of juveniles could lead to states being out of compliance. She also noted that, earlier this year, the Rules Committee discussed the definition of "relocate." She stated that she believes the definition was not intended to be applied to all sections of the rules.
- A. Christian (NE) commented that it was difficult to build a data system around ambiguous rules. The BA Team determined that requiring the travel permit would ensure the receiving state is notified, while giving the sending state a reasonable amount of time to get the packet assembled.
- M. K. Hudson (IN) commented that while it may be counter intuitive to issue a travel permit for a youth already in the receiving state, the receiving state may not be aware they are already there. Additionally, the juvenile's presence in the receiving state does not indicate they are approved to reside there. The travel permit is a notice for the short term and an avenue to stay in communication.

- J. Miller (AR) commented that if a state worker has time to complete a travel permit, there is time to complete a referral. She questioned completing the Form VII with the same address for both the current and the relocation addresses. A. Christian (NE) replied that a UNITY enhancement is expected to ensure that fields are pre-populated in these cases.
- J. Miller (AR) stated that she understands the need for notification; however, does not see the need to require a travel permit in all instances.
- T. Hudrlik (MN) reviewed the term “relocate.” J. Hawkins (MO) and J. Miller (AR) supported reconsidering the definition of “relocate” in the next rules cycle.
- J. Hawkins (MO) recalled modifications to the rules in the past with the intent to reduce the number of travel permits. A. Christian (NE) questioned if states had a concern when a juvenile is in a receiving state over 30 days without notice. M. K. Hudson (IN) noted that the title of the form “travel permit” is a misnomer and asked if there was another section of the rules that would be a better fit. A. Christian (NE) replied that the travel permit serves as both a notice and allows permission.
- J. Hawkins (MO) stated that she understands the purpose for notification. However, most of her cases are a request for the transfer of supervision and she believes this would be an additional unnecessary document to add a travel permit. K. Palmateer (NY) commented that state’s practices should be based on the rules and the system was designed in accordance with the current rules.
- Chair Hudrlik opened the floor for a motion to reconsider Rules Committee previous decision to withdraw support. No motion was made.
- M. K. Hudson (IN) suggested having someone from the Technology Committee join the Rules Committee for the rule proposals presentation during the Annual Business Meeting and all agreed.

### **2021 Annual Business Meeting Training Session**

- Chair Hudrlik presented a list of the 15 proposed rule amendments and asked members to volunteer to present during the 2021 Annual Business Meeting Rule Proposals Training Session. The members agreed to have representatives from both the Rules Committee and the committee that submitted the proposal to present collectively during the session.
- Amanee Cabbagestalk, Training and Logistics Specialist, will confirm all presenters and contact each regarding preparation for the session.
- The training session is slated for October 4, 2021 @ 3:30 p.m. EST

### **Old Business**

There was no old business.

### **New Business**

There was no new business.

### **Adjourn**

- The next scheduled meeting of the Rules Committee is August 4 @ 3:00 p.m.
- **M. K. Hudson (IN) made a motion to adjourn. D. Liedecke (TX) seconded. Chair Hudrlik adjourned the meeting by acclamation at 3:56 p.m. ET.**