

**Interstate Compact for the Supervision
Of Parolees and Probationers
Minnesota Department of Corrections
2003 Report to the Legislature**

The total cost of salaries, printing, and supplies incurred in development and preparation of this report was \$54,000 (reported as required by M.S. 3.197).

Printed on recycled paper with at least 10 percent post-consumer waste.

Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108-5219
(651) 642-0200
TTY (651) 643-3589
March, 2003

This information will be provided in alternative format upon request.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Findings	1
Figures 1A and 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests 2001-2002	2
Tables 1A and 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by State 2001-2002	3
Tables 2A and 2B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County 2001-2002	4
Tables 3A and 3B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County Type 2001-2002	5
Figure 2A: Requests by Border States 2001	6
Figure 2B: Requests by Border States 2002	7
Figure 3A: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests 2001	8
Figure 3B: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests 2002	9
Definition of “resident” according to the Compact	10
Impact of Community Notification	10
Figure 4A: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met 2001	11
Figure 4B: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met 2002	12
Figures 5A and 5B: Incoming Supervision Requests Rejected, by Reason 2001-2002	13
Figures 6A and 6B: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request 2001-2002	14
Offenders Transferred or Received by the Commissioner	15
Initial and Ongoing Costs Incurred by Minnesota	15
The Individual’s Criminal Record	16
Table 4: Controlling Offense of Offenders Entering Minnesota or Transferred Out of Minnesota 2001-2002	16
Tables 5A and 5B: Criminal Record of Offenders Entering Minnesota or Transferred Out of Minnesota 2001-2002	18
Violations of Terms of Probation or Parole	19
Figure 7A and Table 6A: Interstate Offenders’ Violation Status as of Case Closing 2001	20
Figure 7B and Table 6B: Interstate Offenders’ Violation Status as of Case Closing 2002	21
Table 7: Offenders Received in Minnesota under the Interstate Compact who are Subsequently Incarcerated in a Minnesota Correctional Facility for a Crime Committed in Minnesota	22
Appendix A: Minnesota Statutes Section 243.162	23
Appendix B1: Supervision Requests by State in 2001	25
Appendix B2: Supervision Requests by State in 2002	27
Appendix C1: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2001	29
Appendix C2: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2002	31
Appendix D1: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2001	33
Appendix D2: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2002	35

Introduction

The 1995 Minnesota Legislature directed the commissioner of corrections to:

“...collect, maintain, and analyze background and recidivism data on all individuals received by or sent from Minnesota under Minnesota Statutes, section 243.16, the interstate compact for the supervision of parolees and probationers.”

This report is submitted in accordance with the reporting requirement of this legislation. The legislation in its entirety is provided in Appendix A of this report. This report contains information for calendar years 2001 and 2002.

Findings

The Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) maintains data on interstate probation and parole supervision requests. This includes “incoming” supervision requests (requests for supervision from other states coming into Minnesota) and “outgoing” supervision requests (requests made by Minnesota to other states).

This report attempts to provide pertinent information in succinct tables for quick review by decision-makers and the general public. There are also appendices containing comprehensive information regarding the number of supervision requests by state (Appendix B) and by county (Appendix C) and decisions by state (Appendix D).

Minnesota sent more parole requests to Illinois than to any other state for both of the years covered in this report. Also for both years, Minnesota by a significant margin sent more probation requests to Wisconsin than to any other state. With respect to incoming cases, Wisconsin remained the leader for both years for parole and probation.

On January 2, 2003, there were 2,318 Minnesota probation cases and 138 Minnesota parole cases under active supervision in other states. There were 2,198 probation and 525 parole cases on active supervision in the State of Minnesota under the Interstate Compact. This number is a snapshot of cases active on January 2, 2003, and changes daily.

Figure 1A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests (2001)





Figure 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests (2002)



Observations of data in Figure 1A and 1B:

- Even though the number of incoming requests increased from 2001 to 2002, the percentage of the total number of incoming requests that were parole cases (24%) 2001 and (22%) 2002 remained consistent for both years.
- While the number of incoming requests increased between 2001 and 2002 by 102, the number of outgoing requests increased by 60.

It should be noted that Figures 1A and 1B provide a count of supervision requests in 2001 and 2002, not the number of individuals requesting supervision. If an offender is under correctional supervision by more than one jurisdiction, a request will be submitted by each jurisdiction through the requesting state's Interstate Compact Office to the proposed receiving state, and each request must be approved before a transfer occurs. (In other words, either all the offender's cases are transferred to the receiving state or none are transferred.) Accordingly, data collection at the "request" level allows for more efficient, effective, and informative management than "individual" based data.

Table 1A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by State (2001)

<i>a) States with the most probation supervision requests to Minnesota in 2001:</i>		<i>b) States to which Minnesota sent the most probation supervision requests in 2001:</i>	
Wisconsin	451	Wisconsin	337
North Dakota	172	North Dakota	212
Iowa	96	Iowa	92
Texas	60	Illinois	80
Illinois	40	South Dakota	71
 <i>c) States with the most parole supervision requests to Minnesota in 2001:</i>		 <i>d) States to which Minnesota sent the most parole supervision requests in 2001:</i>	
Wisconsin	73	Illinois	33
South Dakota	42	North Dakota	27
Illinois	41	Wisconsin	25
Texas	29	Texas	21
North Dakota	27	Michigan & California	14

Table 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by State (2002)

<i>a) States with the most probation supervision requests to Minnesota in 2002:</i>		<i>b) States to which Minnesota sent the most probation supervision requests in 2002:</i>	
Wisconsin	536	Wisconsin	315
North Dakota	193	North Dakota	214
Iowa	78	South Dakota	85
Texas	72	Iowa	83
Illinois	55	Illinois	78
 <i>c) States with the most parole supervision requests to Minnesota in 2002:</i>		 <i>d) States to which Minnesota sent the most parole supervision requests in 2002:</i>	
Wisconsin	89	Illinois	58
Illinois	51	Wisconsin	34
North Dakota	32	North Dakota	25
South Dakota	19	Texas	19
Colorado	18	Iowa	17

Table 2A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County (2001)*a) Counties receiving the most probation supervision requests in 2001:*

Hennepin	251
Ramsey	135
Dakota	86
Clay	59
Washington	58

b) Counties sending the most probation supervision requests in 2001:

Dakota	124
Washington	116
Ramsey	84
Clay	82
Polk	62

c) Counties receiving the most parole supervision requests in 2001:

Hennepin	107
Ramsey	47
Dakota	15
Olmsted	12
St. Louis	12

*d) * Counties sending the most parole supervision requests in 2001:*

Hennepin	56
Ramsey	41
Clay	17
Anoka	10
Polk	10

Table 2B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County (2002)*a) Counties receiving the most probation supervision requests in 2002:*

Hennepin	254
Ramsey	160
Clay	84
Washington	69
Dakota	67

b) Counties sending the most probation supervision requests in 2002:

Ramsey	118
Washington	98
Dakota	98
Hennepin	92
Clay	81

c) Counties receiving the most parole supervision requests in 2002:

Hennepin	125
Ramsey	44
Anoka	19
Clay	15
St. Louis	15

*d) * Counties sending the most parole supervision requests in 2002:*

Hennepin	70
Ramsey	50
St. Louis	23
Polk	13
Dakota	11

* Oftentimes parole offenders have numerous offenses from various counties. Therefore, on outgoing parole cases, the numbers reflect the county of commit for the controlling offense.

Table 3A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County Type (2001)


County type	<i>Incoming</i>		<i>Outgoing</i>		Total
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation	
CCA	260	795	165	732	1,952
Non-CCA	107	386	74	504	1,071
Total	367	1,181	239	1,236	3,023

Table 3B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County Type (2002)

County type	<i>Incoming</i>		<i>Outgoing</i>		Total
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation	
CCA	274	843	217	710	2,044
Non-CCA	94	439	88	520	1,141
Total	368	1,282	305	1,230	3,185


- The majority of requests for interstate transfer involve Community Corrections Act counties. Seventy percent of the requests from offenders outside Minnesota are for relocation to a Community Corrections Act county. Sixty percent of the requests to leave Minnesota have a Community Corrections Act county as the controlling county.
- Between 2001 and 2002 the breakdown of incoming and outgoing requests by delivery system has remained fairly consistent.

Figure 2A: Requests by Border States (2001)




- Figures 2A and 2B show incoming and outgoing requests by border states for Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002 respectively. Appendices B1 and B2 provide a further breakdown of the data contained in Figures 2A and 2B.

Figure 2B: Requests by Border States (2002)




- Over 60 percent of all incoming probation requests per year are from Minnesota's border states of Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, and North Dakota.
- 40 percent of incoming parole requests per year are from Minnesota's border states of Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, and North Dakota.
- Almost 60 percent of all outgoing probation requests per year are to Minnesota's border states of Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, and North Dakota.
- Almost 30 percent of all outgoing parole requests per year are to Minnesota's border states of Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Figure 3A: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests (2001)



- Figures 3A and 3B show Interstate Compact decisions on incoming and outgoing supervision requests in 2001 and 2002 respectively. The number of accept/reject decisions during a year will differ from the number of supervision requests during that year (Figures 1A and 1B) due to the time required to investigate individual requests. Appendices D1 and D2 provide a further breakdown of Figure 3A and 3B data by state.

Figure 3B: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests (2002)



- Supervision requests are generally rejected if an investigation finds that none of the criteria (residence, family, employment/visible means of support) are met, if the proposed residence and employment plan is invalid, or if the offender's whereabouts are unknown. Interstate parole supervision requests have a higher rejection rate than interstate probation requests for both incoming and outgoing cases.

Definition of “resident” according to the Compact:


According to the Interstate Compact, a resident is defined as:

“A resident of the receiving state...is one who has been an actual inhabitant of such state continuously for more than one (1) year prior to coming to the sending state and has not resided within the sending state more than six (6) continuous months immediately preceding the commission of the offense for which the conviction occurred.”

Impact of community notification on incoming parole cases:


The community notification law has placed restrictions on certain incoming sex offender cases. An end-of-confinement review committee hearing must be held in order to assign a sex offender risk level. Due to the nature of this process, a significant amount of past history and other paperwork are required. It is not uncommon for states not to comply with the need for appropriate paperwork, and this invariably results in rejection of the case. As other states begin to have their own community notification requirements, they have become more compliant with providing the required paperwork. The Interstate Unit does an initial screening to identify cases that require community notification; however, it is ultimately up to the Minnesota agent conducting the investigation to ensure that these cases are identified. In 2001, 32 sex offender cases that required an end-of-confinement review committee hearing were referred to Minnesota for supervision; 12 (38%) were accepted and 20 (62%) were rejected. In 2002, 14 of these cases were referred to Minnesota; eight (57%) were accepted and six (43%) were rejected.

Figure 4A: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met (2001)




* Some explanation is in order regarding “consent only” cases. All incoming cases receive extensive pre-screening if they do not meet any criteria, and they are rarely referred to the field unless there is some sort of exigency like hospitalization or treatment at a program such as Alpha House. It is also not uncommon for agents to exclude information in their replies regarding the status of a subject’s residency or employment, or whether they have family in Minnesota. Therefore, instead of guessing, Interstate staff will enter these cases as “consent only.”

Figure 4B: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met (2002)



It should be noted that an “accept” decision on a supervision request is not the same as the “activation” of an interstate case. Occasionally an offender’s supervision request is accepted but the offender does not actually move to the new jurisdiction due to changes in the offender’s circumstances. “Activation” of an interstate probation or parole case means that the offender’s interstate supervision request has been accepted and the offender has actually been transferred to the correctional authority in another state as specified in the supervision request. There can be a significant time lag between acceptance and activation of an interstate case, particularly if interstate supervision is requested by an offender who is incarcerated in a state or local correctional facility, since the interstate movement would not occur until the offender was released from prison or jail.

Figure 5A: Incoming Supervision Requests Rejected, by Reason (2001)



Cases may have more than one reason for rejection. The most compelling is used for the database.

Figure 5B: Incoming Supervision Requests Rejected, by Reason (2002)






Figure 6A: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request (2001)



The legislation does not ask for the basis of other states' accept or reject decisions on interstate supervision requests sent by Minnesota, but it does direct the DOC to collect data on "the basis of the commissioner's decision to request another state to receive an individual." A summary of the 2001 and 2002 data on this topic are given in Figures 6A and 6B.

Figure 6B: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request (2002)



Offenders Transferred or Received by the Commissioner

The 1995 legislation specifies the following data collection and reporting topics for offenders “transferred or received by the commissioner”:

- The initial and ongoing costs incurred by Minnesota resulting from the individual’s transfer and the amount of money Minnesota receives from the sending state to reimburse Minnesota for these costs.
- The individual’s criminal record.
- Whether the individual violates the terms of probation or parole; if the individual violates the terms of probation or parole and commits a new offense in Minnesota; and whether the individual is arrested, convicted, incarcerated in Minnesota, or returned to the sending state.

This section presents the 2001 and 2002 data concerning these topics.

The numbers of offenders transferred and received in 2002 as presented in this report cannot be considered “final” numbers. Due to the time required for the parties involved (county and/or state correctional authorities in Minnesota and the other state, and the Interstate Compact Unit in the other state) to report information to Minnesota’s Interstate Compact Unit, not all of the offender movements under the Interstate Compact during a year are received by December 31 of that year. In order to submit this report by the deadline specified in the legislation, data analysis must begin in early January.

The initial and ongoing costs incurred by Minnesota resulting from the individual’s transfer and the amount of money Minnesota receives from the sending state to reimburse Minnesota for these costs.

Under the Interstate Compact, supervision of offenders between states is reciprocal. Therefore, Minnesota incurs no costs when an offender transfers to another state, nor is Minnesota reimbursed by sending states for the costs of supervising offenders received by Minnesota. In both 2001 and 2002, the cost incurred by Minnesota for each offender received into the state was estimated at \$2.25 per day for traditional supervision, \$7.00 a day for enhanced supervision, and \$21.95 a day for intensive supervision. These figures are the average per diems for community supervision by DOC agents of offenders on probation, supervised release, or parole. The level of supervision varies greatly from county to county as determined by the offense, offender needs, and community. The Minnesota Legislature has authorized state and local corrections agencies to charge supervision fees for offenders. All offenders in Minnesota under the Interstate Compact are subject to these fees.

The individual's criminal record.

Table 4 shows the controlling offense of offenders entering Minnesota or transferred out of Minnesota under the Interstate Compact in 2001 and 2002 respectively, broken down by supervision type (probation or parole) and offense.

Table 4: Controlling Offense of Offenders Entering Minnesota or Transferred Out of Minnesota in 2001 and 2002

F=Felony

M=Misdemeanor

U=Unknown T=Total

Offense Category	Year	Incoming Parole				Incoming Probation				Outgoing Parole		Outgoing Probation			Total
		F	M	U	T	F	M	U	T	F	F	M	U	T	
Arson	2001	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	4	7
Arson	2002	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	3	6
Assault	2001	10	0	0	10	31	31	0	62	11	29	31	0	60	143
Assault	2002	6	0	0	6	21	32	0	53	17	34	31	1	66	142
Burglary	2001	21	0	0	21	39	3	0	42	12	34	4	0	38	113
Burglary	2002	22	0	0	22	44	0	0	44	10	46	4	3	53	129
Crimes against Administration of Justice	2001	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	22	1	6	4	0	10	33
Crimes against Administration of Justice	2002	4	0	0	4	14	18	0	32	0	5	5	1	11	47
Criminal Sexual Conduct	2001	3	0	0	3	14	7	0	21	9	32	3	0	35	68
Criminal Sexual Conduct	2002	9	0	0	9	20	3	0	23	23	43	4	0	47	102
Disorderly Conduct	2001	0	1	0	1	4	22	1	27	0	0	7	0	7	35
Disorderly Conduct	2002	1	0	0	1	3	22	0	25	0	0	13	0	13	39
Drug	2001	34	0	0	34	115	41	0	156	25	115	6	0	121	336
Drug	2002	63	0	0	63	168	62	0	230	20	157	15	2	174	487
DWI	2001	4	2	0	6	20	42	1	63	0	1	179	0	180	249
DWI	2002	9	1	0	10	30	45	0	75	0	15	180	0	195	280
Endangerment	2001	1	0	0	1	5	3	0	8	0	0	2	0	2	11
Endangerment	2002	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	8	1	1	4	0	5	14
Escape/Flight	2001	3	0	0	3	6	1	0	7	1	16	4	0	20	31
Escape/Flight	2002	2	0	0	2	9	3	0	12	3	10	3	0	13	30
Forgery	2001	8	0	0	8	25	1	1	27	2	13	4	1	18	55
Forgery	2002	10	0	0	10	36	3	0	39	0	23	4	0	27	76
Fraud	2001	5	0	0	5	3	2	0	5	1	13	1	0	14	25
Fraud	2002	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	11	1	6	1	0	7	19
Harassment	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	8	9
Harassment	2002	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	4
Homicide	2001	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	7	4	0	0	4	15
Homicide	2002	5	0	0	5	4	0	0	4	5	1	1	0	2	16
Kidnapping	2001	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	7
Kidnapping	2002	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	4

F=Felony
M=Misdemeanor
U=Unknown T=Total

Offense Category	Year	Incoming Parole				Incoming Probation				Outgoing Parole				Outgoing Probation				Total
		F	M	U	T	F	M	U	T	F	M	U	T	F	M	U	T	
Non-Support	2001	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	16	0	1	0	0	1	17			
Non-Support	2002	2	0	0	2	11	6	0	17	0	4	1	0	5	24			
Property Damage	2001	1	0	0	1	7	6	0	13	0	15	7	0	22	36			
Property Damage	2002	0	0	0	0	8	19	0	27	0	11	1	0	12	39			
Prostitution	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1			
Prostitution	2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1			
Robbery	2001	15	0	0	15	6	0	0	6	10	2	0	0	2	33			
Robbery	2002	16	0	0	16	4	0	0	4	7	7	0	0	7	34			
Stolen Property	2001	1	0	0	1	6	4	1	11	2	10	1	0	11	25			
Stolen Property	2002	5	0	0	5	11	3	0	14	0	11	4	0	15	34			
Terroristic Threats	2001	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	6	4	16	3	0	19	29			
Terroristic Threats	2002	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	7	3	17	5	1	23	33			
Theft	2001	13	1	0	14	58	38	0	96	5	54	15	0	69	184			
Theft	2002	23	0	0	23	75	31	0	106	6	56	9	1	66	201			
Traffic/Accidents	2001	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	1	0	5	7			
Traffic/Accidents	2002	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	8	1	3	13	0	16	25			
Trespassing	2001	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6			
Trespassing	2002	2	0	0	2	8	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	12			
Unknown	2001	3	1	2	6	1	3	2	6	0	2	3	2	7	19			
Unknown	2002	1	0	0	1	4	6	0	10	0	3	3	0	6	17			
Vehicle Theft	2001	3	0	0	3	11	1	0	12	0	12	1	0	13	28			
Vehicle Theft	2002	3	0	0	3	10	6	0	16	1	23	0	0	23	43			
Violation of Order for Protection	2001	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5	2	6	4	0	10	17			
Violation of Order for Protection	2002	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	4	6	0	10	13			
Weapons	2001	4	0	0	4	7	2	0	9	4	7	2	0	9	26			
Weapons	2002	3	0	0	3	11	3	0	14	6	2	1	0	3	26			
Worthless Checks	2001	1	0	0	1	7	14	0	21	0	10	2	0	12	34			
Worthless Checks	2002	0	0	0	0	11	5	0	16	0	15	2	0	17	33			
Wrongfully Obtaining Public Assistance	2001	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	2	0	10	12			
Wrongfully Obtaining Public Assistance	2002	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	18	0	0	18	20			
Other	2001	3	1	1	5	16	6	0	22	0	4	12	0	16	43			
Other	2002	2	0	0	2	15	4	0	19	0	11	7	0	18	39			
Totals		328	8	3	339	961	540	6	1507	209	953	623	12	1588	3643			

Table 5A: Criminal Record of Offenders Entering Minnesota (incoming) or Transferred Out of Minnesota (outgoing) in 2001

	Incoming				Outgoing			
	Parole		Probation		Parole		Probation	
	*(n=148)		*(n=675)		*(n=102)		*(n=729)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
One or more person felonies	56	38%	123	18%	52	51%	127	17%
One or more property felonies	71	48%	201	30%	36	35%	191	26%
One or more drug felonies	49	33%	142	21%	29	28%	131	18%
One or more public order felonies	13	9%	44	7%	9	9%	33	5%
One or more other felonies	21	14%	51	8%	17	17%	51	7%
One or more misdemeanors	72	49%	439	65%	64	63%	508	70%

* The crimes are not mutually exclusive, and an offender may be counted more than once if he/she committed different types of crimes. Therefore, the total number of crimes does not equal the total number of offenders (n).

Table 5B: Criminal Record of Offenders Entering Minnesota (incoming) or Transferred Out of Minnesota (outgoing) in 2002

	Incoming				Outgoing			
	Parole		Probation		Parole		Probation	
	*(n=191)		*(n=832)		*(n=107)		*(n=859)	
	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%
One or more person felonies	75	39%	131	16%	72	67%	173	20%
One or more property felonies	97	51%	256	31%	57	53%	245	29%
One or more drug felonies	86	45%	228	27%	33	31%	198	23%
One or more public order felonies	30	16%	50	6%	7	7%	36	4%
One or more other felonies	22	12%	77	9%	19	18%	75	9%
One or more misdemeanors	105	55%	596	72%	66	62%	633	74%

* The crimes are not mutually exclusive, and an offender may be counted more than once if he/she committed different types of crimes. Therefore, the total number of crimes does not equal the total number of offenders (n).

Whether the individual violates the terms of probation or parole; if the individual violates the terms of probation or parole and commits a new offense in Minnesota; and whether the individual is arrested, convicted, incarcerated in Minnesota, or returned to the sending state.

Based on the structure of correctional services in Minnesota (with DOC, CCA, and county offices providing supervision) and the multitude of agencies involved in the Minnesota criminal justice system, not all information requested regarding arrests and convictions was available. However, data on offenders returned to the sending state or committed to a Minnesota correctional facility is documented at the time of Interstate case closing. This data is based upon information that the assigned agent puts in his/her report.

- In 2001, the data reports that five parolees and five probationers were returned to the sending state as a result of violation.
- In 2001, one parolee and nine probationers were committed to the Minnesota DOC for a new offense.
- In 2002, four parolees and nine probationers were returned to the sending state as a result of violation.
- In 2002, seven parolees and 16 probationers were committed to the Minnesota DOC for a new offense.

Violations of Minnesota State Statute 243.161

On August 1, 1997, Minnesota Statutes Section 243.161 became law. It reads:

“Any person who is on parole or probation in another state who resides in this state in violation of section 243.16, may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than five years or to payment of a fine of not more than \$10,000, or both.”

This law refers to sections 243.16, which is Minnesota’s statue regarding the Interstate Compact for the supervision of parolees and probations. This Minnesota law attached an enforcement function to existing Compact regulation 3-101. A check with the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission revealed there were no offenders sentenced for this offense in 2001. There were three in previous years, one in 1999 and two in 2000; they all received probation sentences. The information for 2002 was not available at the time of this report.

Figure 7A: Interstate Offenders Violation Status as of Case Closing 2001




Table 6A: Interstate Offenders' Violation Status as of Case Closing (2001)

Violation?	Incoming		Outgoing	
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation
No	104	470	69	407
Yes - returned to sending state	5	5	0	1
Yes - committed to MN DOC	1	9	10	4
Yes - action unknown	13	50	5	49
Yes - restructured/reinstated	1	1	0	2
Yes - committed other	1	8	1	7
Yes - warrant Issued	8	52	6	57
Total	133	595	91	527

Figure 7B: Interstate Offenders Violation Status as of Case Closing 2002




Table 6B: Interstate Offenders' Violation Status as of Case Closing (2002)

Violation?	Incoming		Outgoing	
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation
No	101	526	88	508
Yes - returned to sending state	4	9	0	10
Yes - committed to MN DOC	7	16	8	13
Yes - action unknown	11	59	4	71
Yes - restructured/reinstated	0	1	0	0
Yes - committed other	6	18	5	17
Yes - warrant issued	8	56	7	87
Total	137	685	112	706

Table 7: Offenders Received in Minnesota under the Interstate Compact who were Subsequently Incarcerated in a Minnesota Correctional Facility (MCF) for a Crime committed in Minnesota

NOTE: All data is cumulative (do not add numbers from left to right)

Type of offender and year received	Interstate offenders received	Incarcerated in an MCF within 12 months		Incarcerated in an MCF within 24 months	
		n	%	n	%
2000 parole	174	0	.00%	0	.00%
2000 probation	892	4	0.45%	4	0.45%
2000 total	1066	4	0.45%	4	0.45%
2001 parole	171	0	.00%	1	0.58%
2001 probation	764	5	0.65%	3	0.39%
2001 total	935	5	0.65%	4	0.97%

Since 12 months have not yet elapsed for most interstate offenders received during 2002, they are excluded from this table.

Appendix A: Minnesota Statutes Section 243.162 (Interstate Compact for Supervision of Parolees and Probationers; Data Collection)

Subdivision 1. [DATA COLLECTION REQUIRED.] The commissioner of corrections shall collect, maintain, and analyze background and recidivism data on all individuals received by or sent from Minnesota under Minnesota Statutes, section 243.16, the interstate compact for the supervision of parolees and probationers.

Subd. 2. [SCOPE OF DATA.] (a) The data collected shall include:

- (1) the number of individuals the commissioner is requested to receive from each state, the number of individuals which the commissioner agrees to receive from each state, and the basis of the commissioner's decision to receive or reject an individual; and
- (2) the number of individuals the commissioner requests each state to receive, the number of individuals each state agrees to receive, and the basis of the commissioner's decision to request another state to receive an individual.

(b) For each individual transferred or received by the commissioner, the commissioner shall collect the following data;

- (1) the initial and ongoing costs incurred by Minnesota resulting from the individual's transfer;
- (2) the amount of money Minnesota receives from the sending state to reimburse Minnesota for these costs;
- (3) the individual's criminal record;
- (4) whether the individual violates the terms of probation or parole; and
- (5) if the individual violates the terms of probation or parole and commits a new offense in Minnesota, whether the individual is arrested, convicted, incarcerated in Minnesota, or returned to the sending state.

Subd. 3. [REPORTS.] The commissioner of corrections shall collect the data required under subdivision 2 for all years beginning in 1990. The commissioner shall report to the legislature by February 15, 1996, the data collected for years 1990 to 1995. The commissioner shall report data collected for each subsequent year to the legislature by March 15 of each odd-numbered year.

Appendix B1: Supervision Requests by State in 2001

If a state is not listed, no business was done with it.

State	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	
ALABAMA	1	2	3	1	4	5	8
ALASKA	2	1	3	1	4	5	8
ARIZONA	4	17	21	2	31	33	54
ARKANSAS	4	6	10	1	7	8	18
CALIFORNIA	17	36	53	14	31	45	98
COLORADO	13	17	30	6	26	32	62
CONNECTICUT	0	2	2	1	1	2	4
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
FLORIDA	1	8	9	10	31	41	50
GEORGIA	3	9	12	4	11	15	27
HAWAII	2	0	2	0	0	0	2
IDAHO	0	5	5	0	9	9	14
ILLINOIS	41	40	81	33	80	113	194
INDIANA	10	12	22	10	27	37	59
IOWA	13	96	109	6	92	98	207
KANSAS	9	15	24	4	16	20	44
KENTUCKY	1	1	2	0	8	8	10
LOUISIANA	6	3	9	1	6	7	16
MAINE	0	1	1	0	2	2	3
MARYLAND	1	6	7	1	6	7	14
MASSACHUSETTS	0	4	4	1	2	3	7
MICHIGAN	7	10	17	14	21	35	52
MISSISSIPPI	4	3	7	7	4	11	18
MISSOURI	22	38	60	7	15	22	82
MONTANA	1	12	13	0	10	10	23
NEBRASKA	2	18	20	2	15	17	37
NEVADA	4	9	13	2	6	8	21
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	1	2	3	3
NEW JERSEY	0	7	7	0	3	3	10
NEW MEXICO	0	5	5	1	7	8	13
NEW YORK	1	13	14	5	13	18	32
NORTH CAROLINA	1	5	6	2	7	9	15
NORTH DAKOTA	27	172	199	27	212	239	438

State	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	Total
OHIO	6	4	10	1	9	10	20
OKLAHOMA	1	10	11	5	6	11	22
OREGON	8	5	13	0	6	6	19
PENNSYLVANIA	3	11	14	1	5	6	20
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
SOUTH CAROLINA	2	2	4	1	5	6	10
SOUTH DAKOTA	42	37	79	5	71	76	155
TENNESSEE	0	4	4	8	6	14	18
TEXAS	29	60	89	21	49	70	159
UTAH	3	3	6	1	5	6	12
VERMONT	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
VIRGINIA	0	9	9	1	5	6	15
WASHINGTON	3	6	9	2	17	19	28
WEST VIRGINIA	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
WISCONSIN	73	451	524	25	337	362	886
WYOMING	0	2	2	2	4	6	8
TOTAL	367	1181	1548	239	1236	1475	3023

Appendix B2: Supervision Requests by State in 2002

If a state is not listed, no business was done with it.

State	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	
ALABAMA	0	0	0	0	6	6	6
ALASKA	1	1	2	0	3	3	5
ARIZONA	11	19	30	6	41	47	77
ARKANSAS	3	2	5	3	8	11	16
CALIFORNIA	10	15	25	13	30	43	68
COLORADO	18	22	40	6	23	29	69
CONNECTICUT	0	3	3	1	1	2	5
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	1	19	20	10	34	44	64
GEORGIA	7	14	21	8	16	24	45
HAWAII	2	1	3	0	2	2	5
IDAHO	1	0	1	3	4	7	8
ILLINOIS	51	55	106	58	78	136	242
INDIANA	15	20	35	7	23	30	65
IOWA	15	78	93	17	83	100	193
KANSAS	5	5	10	4	8	12	22
KENTUCKY	0	5	5	1	4	5	10
LOUISIANA	5	2	7	1	4	5	12
MAINE	0	2	2	1	1	2	4
MARYLAND	0	2	2	2	3	5	7
MASSACHUSETTS	0	7	7	0	2	2	9
MICHIGAN	9	3	12	13	29	42	54
MISSISSIPPI	1	6	7	5	8	13	20
MISSOURI	7	32	39	11	20	31	70
MONTANA	4	9	13	2	13	15	28
NEBRASKA	5	13	18	1	15	16	34
NEVADA	8	10	18	4	8	12	30
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
NEW JERSEY	1	5	6	1	4	5	11
NEW MEXICO	4	7	11	0	6	6	17
NEW YORK	3	8	11	1	9	10	21
NORTH CAROLINA	2	6	8	3	7	10	18

State	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	Total
NORTH DAKOTA	32	193	225	25	214	239	464
OHIO	4	4	8	4	11	15	23
OKLAHOMA	0	6	6	9	8	17	23
OREGON	4	3	7	4	5	9	16
PENNSYLVANIA	2	15	17	2	7	9	26
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	0	1	0	4	4	5
SOUTH DAKOTA	19	51	70	10	85	95	165
TENNESSEE	2	5	7	5	8	13	20
TEXAS	15	72	87	19	50	69	156
UTAH	2	1	3	0	0	0	3
VERMONT	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
VIRGINIA	2	5	7	1	6	7	14
WASHINGTON	2	14	16	5	15	20	36
WEST VIRGINIA	1	0	1	1	3	4	5
WISCONSIN	89	536	625	34	315	349	974
WYOMING	4	6	10	2	5	7	17
TOTAL	368	1282	1650	305	1230	1535	3185

Appendix C1: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2001

County	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	
AITKIN	0	1	1	1	1	2	3
ANOKA	10	36	46	10	42	52	98
BECKER	6	13	19	4	7	11	30
BELTRAMI	5	7	12	0	9	9	21
BENTON	1	3	4	5	8	13	17
BIG STONE	1	1	2	1	1	2	4
BLUE EARTH	3	8	11	1	6	7	18
BROWN	4	3	7	2	3	5	12
CARLTON	2	5	7	0	4	4	11
CARVER	1	5	6	0	2	2	8
CASS	3	2	5	1	5	6	11
CHIPPEWA	1	1	2	1	6	7	9
CHISAGO	3	13	16	0	24	24	40
CLAY	11	59	70	17	82	99	169
CLEARWATER	1	8	9	0	0	0	9
COOK	1	2	3	0	2	2	5
COTTONWOOD	3	6	9	3	3	6	15
CROW WING	0	10	10	1	8	9	19
DAKOTA	15	86	101	8	124	132	233
DODGE	2	4	6	0	0	0	6
DOUGLAS	1	4	5	0	8	8	13
FARIBAULT	1	5	6	1	0	1	7
FILLMORE	2	5	7	0	5	5	12
FREEBORN	3	12	15	3	13	16	31
GOODHUE	3	31	34	2	35	37	71
GRANT	0	1	1	0	4	4	5
HENNEPIN	107	251	358	56	61	117	475
HOUSTON	2	17	19	0	6	6	25
HUBBARD	0	3	3	0	2	2	5
ISANTI	3	6	9	0	4	4	13
ITASCA	1	7	8	1	10	11	19
JACKSON	0	1	1	0	14	14	15
KANABEC	3	1	4	0	1	1	5
KANDIYOHI	7	6	13	4	15	19	32
KITTSOON	0	3	3	3	2	5	8
KOOCHICHING	0	1	1	0	3	3	4
LAC QUI PARLE	2	1	3	1	7	8	11
LAKE	0	0	0	0	5	5	5
LAKE OF THE WOODS	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
LE SUEUR	0	2	2	1	6	7	9
LINCOLN	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
LYON	5	4	9	2	20	22	31
MAHNOMEN	0	1	1	0	0	0	1

County	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	
MARSHALL	1	4	5	0	1	1	6
MARTIN	1	8	9	0	20	20	29
MCLEOD	5	1	6	3	8	11	17
MEEKER	0	2	2	0	2	2	4
MILLE LACS	3	4	7	1	8	9	16
MORRISON	3	7	10	1	8	9	19
MOWER	4	14	18	1	4	5	23
MURRAY	1	1	2	1	0	1	3
NICOLLET	0	2	2	1	3	4	6
NOBLES	7	8	15	1	16	17	32
NORMAN	0	5	5	0	3	3	8
OLMSTED	12	35	47	8	35	43	90
OTTER TAIL	2	24	26	0	19	19	45
PENNINGTON	0	2	2	3	3	6	8
PINE	4	6	10	2	10	12	22
PIPESTONE	2	3	5	2	14	16	21
POLK	3	25	28	10	62	72	100
POPE	0	3	3	0	3	3	6
RAMSEY	47	135	182	41	84	125	307
RED LAKE	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
REDWOOD	3	1	4	0	5	5	9
RENVILLE	0	2	2	2	2	4	6
RICE	1	12	13	4	14	18	31
ROCK	3	2	5	0	2	2	7
ROSEAU	3	3	6	1	6	7	13
SCOTT	2	18	20	0	20	20	40
SHERBURNE	5	5	10	1	23	24	34
SIBLEY	1	5	6	0	2	2	8
ST. LOUIS	12	55	67	9	64	73	140
STEARNS	3	25	28	1	20	21	49
STEELE	0	2	2	3	5	8	10
STEVENS	0	4	4	0	1	1	5
SWIFT	1	2	3	0	5	5	8
TODD	4	5	9	0	7	7	16
TRAVERSE	1	1	2	0	4	4	6
WABASHA	2	11	13	0	6	6	19
WADENA	0	1	1	0	4	4	5
WASECA	0	3	3	1	3	4	7
WASHINGTON	11	58	69	7	116	123	192
WATONWAN	0	1	1	1	0	1	2
WILKIN	0	5	5	1	21	22	27
WINONA	1	22	23	2	32	34	57
WRIGHT	5	9	14	2	8	10	24
YELLOW MEDICINE	1	2	3	0	2	2	5
TOTAL	367	1181	1548	239	1236	1475	3023

Appendix C2: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2002

County	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	
AITKIN	1	1	2	2	2	4	6
ANOKA	19	54	73	10	40	50	123
BECKER	4	14	18	1	9	10	28
BELTRAMI	1	16	17	2	7	9	26
BENTON	0	1	1	0	9	9	10
BIG STONE	0	1	1	0	4	4	5
BLUE EARTH	4	12	16	2	3	5	21
BROWN	2	2	4	0	1	1	5
CARLTON	2	9	11	1	5	6	17
CARVER	3	8	11	1	7	8	19
CASS	2	4	6	1	6	7	13
CHIPPEWA	1	2	3	1	4	5	8
CHISAGO	3	12	15	1	22	23	38
CLAY	15	84	99	10	81	91	190
CLEARWATER	0	1	1	1	1	2	3
COOK	0	1	1	0	4	4	5
COTTONWOOD	0	2	2	1	4	5	7
CROW WING	2	15	17	0	8	8	25
DAKOTA	13	67	80	11	98	109	189
DODGE	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
DOUGLAS	1	4	5	1	6	7	12
FARIBAULT	3	8	11	0	2	2	13
FILLMORE	0	5	5	2	6	8	13
FREEBORN	6	10	16	2	11	13	29
GOODHUE	3	24	27	2	29	31	58
GRANT	0	3	3	0	3	3	6
HENNEPIN	125	254	379	70	92	162	541
HOUSTON	2	22	24	2	8	10	34
HUBBARD	0	3	3	1	2	3	6
ISANTI	0	9	9	1	5	6	15
ITASCA	0	3	3	1	12	13	16
JACKSON	1	3	4	9	12	21	25
KANABEC	2	1	3	0	5	5	8
KANDIYOHI	2	15	17	3	11	14	31
KITTSOON	0	1	1	1	3	4	5
KOOCHICHING	2	1	3	0	4	4	7
LAC QUI PARLE	1	0	1	0	2	2	3
LAKE	0	5	5	2	1	3	8
LAKE OF THE WOODS	1	2	3	0	2	2	5
LE SUEUR	1	6	7	0	1	1	8
LINCOLN	0	4	4	2	5	7	11
LYON	6	5	11	0	19	19	30
MAHNOMEN	1	4	5	0	1	1	6

County	Incoming			Outgoing			Total
	Parole	Probation	Total	Parole	Probation	Total	Total
MARSHALL	2	3	5	4	3	7	12
MARTIN	2	3	5	7	13	20	25
MCLEOD	0	9	9	2	10	12	21
MEEKER	1	2	3	1	1	2	5
MILLE LACS	0	1	1	1	3	4	5
MORRISON	1	1	2	1	1	2	4
MOWER	3	8	11	3	24	27	38
MURRAY	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
NICOLLET	2	2	4	0	6	6	10
NOBLES	5	8	13	0	18	18	31
NORMAN	2	2	4	1	3	4	8
OLMSTED	7	27	34	9	22	31	65
OTTER TAIL	0	21	21	2	28	30	51
PENNINGTON	3	11	14	1	6	7	21
PINE	3	13	16	3	6	9	25
PIPESTONE	3	7	10	1	12	13	23
POLK	8	33	41	13	60	73	114
POPE	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
RAMSEY	44	160	204	50	118	168	372
RED LAKE	1	1	2	0	0	0	2
REDWOOD	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
RENVILLE	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
RICE	1	7	8	2	7	9	17
ROCK	1	3	4	1	3	4	8
ROSEAU	1	4	5	1	2	3	8
SCOTT	2	7	9	2	18	20	29
SHERBURNE	0	14	14	6	20	26	40
SIBLEY	1	3	4	0	0	0	4
ST. LOUIS	15	61	76	23	65	88	164
STEARNS	6	21	27	5	20	25	52
STEELE	3	9	12	2	5	7	19
STEVENS	1	3	4	0	5	5	9
SWIFT	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
TODD	0	2	2	0	6	6	8
TRAVERSE	0	0	0	0	4	4	4
WABASHA	1	11	12	0	5	5	17
WADENA	0	2	2	0	2	2	4
WASECA	2	7	9	1	1	2	11
WASHINGTON	11	69	80	8	98	106	186
WATONWAN	0	0	0	1	6	7	7
WILKIN	2	1	3	1	23	24	27
WINONA	3	29	32	8	24	32	64
WRIGHT	2	9	11	1	13	14	25
YELLOW MEDICINE	0	3	3	0	6	6	9
TOTAL	368	1282	1650	305	1230	1535	3185

Appendix D1: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2001

If a state is not listed, no Interstate business was done with it.

A=Accepted T=Total	Incoming								Outgoing								
C=Canceled TT=ALL R=Rejected TOTAL	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
State	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	Total
ALASKA	2	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	4	9
ALABAMA	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3	0	1	4	9
ARKANSAS	2	0	2	4	1	0	5	6	1	1	0	2	5	1	3	9	21
ARIZONA	3	0	0	3	10	3	5	18	0	0	3	3	18	5	9	32	56
CALIFORNIA	11	2	4	17	11	1	19	31	1	1	9	11	16	5	17	38	97
COLORADO	9	0	4	13	8	2	4	14	2	0	2	4	10	1	12	23	54
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	3
FLORIDA	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	8	6	1	2	9	14	1	13	28	45
GEORGIA	1	0	3	4	3	0	4	7	1	0	3	4	8	1	3	12	27
HAWAII	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
IOWA	5	1	3	9	57	4	25	86	2	0	4	6	66	3	29	98	199
IDAHO	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	7	0	2	9	14
ILLINOIS	12	5	13	30	14	0	18	32	6	5	21	32	31	12	19	62	156
INDIANA	0	0	9	9	4	0	2	6	3	1	9	13	19	3	4	26	54
KANSAS	6	0	3	9	6	1	3	10	1	0	2	3	6	1	12	19	41
KENTUCKY	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	7
LOUISIANA	1	0	3	4	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	6	13
MASSACHUSETTS	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	6
MARYLAND	0	0	1	1	3	0	2	5	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3	10
MAINE	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3
MICHIGAN	1	1	4	6	4	0	6	10	10	1	4	15	18	1	3	22	53
MISSOURI	7	2	9	18	23	2	11	36	7	1	4	12	10	2	3	15	81
MISSISSIPPI	0	0	3	3	2	1	0	3	1	1	4	6	1	0	0	1	13
MONTANA	2	0	0	2	7	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	6	1	5	12	24
NORTH CAROLINA	0	0	2	2	3	0	3	6	0	1	3	4	6	0	2	8	20
NORTH DAKOTA	14	3	8	25	107	6	42	155	14	1	9	24	144	6	54	204	408
NEBRASKA	1	0	1	2	6	1	3	10	1	0	0	1	8	1	6	15	28
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2
NEW JERSEY	0	0	1	1	3	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	10
NEW MEXICO	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	6	1	0	0	1	4	0	2	6	13
NEVADA	1	0	2	3	3	0	5	8	1	1	1	3	4	0	4	8	22

A=Accepted T=Total	Incoming								Outgoing								
C=Canceled TT=ALL R=Rejected TOTAL	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
State	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	Total
NEW YORK	0	0	0	0	8	0	6	14	0	0	4	4	7	1	5	13	31
OHIO	2	0	1	3	2	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	6	1	2	9	18
OKLAHOMA	0	0	1	1	8	0	3	11	2	1	1	4	6	0	2	8	24
OREGON	3	1	3	7	4	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6	18
PENNSYLVANIA	0	1	2	3	3	0	8	11	0	0	2	2	0	0	5	5	21
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	7
SOUTH DAKOTA	28	2	8	38	24	2	11	37	2	0	1	3	52	1	19	72	150
TENNESSEE	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3	2	5	10	0	1	5	6	19
TEXAS	18	0	5	23	36	1	20	57	10	3	7	20	31	8	13	52	152
UTAH	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	8
VIRGINIA	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	3	9
VERMONT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	2	0	2	4	3	0	2	5	2	0	0	2	6	1	8	15	26
WISCONSIN	36	4	39	79	299	16	141	456	6	0	16	22	221	19	83	323	880
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
WYOMING	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	2	0	0	2	2	1	1	4	9
TOTAL	171	22	141	334	689	44	378	1111	90	24	121	235	762	84	356	1202	2882

Appendix D2: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2002

If a state is not listed, no Interstate business was done with it.

A=Accepted T=Total	Incoming								Outgoing								
C=Canceled TT=ALL R=Rejected TOTAL	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
State	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	Total
ALASKA	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4
ALABAMA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	6
ARKANSAS	1	0	2	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	7	14
ARIZONA	6	1	4	11	14	0	2	16	0	1	3	4	25	5	7	37	68
CALIFORNIA	8	1	3	12	10	0	10	20	4	2	7	13	16	10	9	35	80
COLORADO	7	1	10	18	13	2	12	27	2	1	6	9	14	6	9	29	83
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	4
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	0	1	0	1	11	1	6	18	5	0	7	12	20	4	8	32	63
GEORGIA	4	0	1	5	7	1	5	13	3	0	2	5	5	0	5	10	33
HAWAII	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	5
IOWA	10	2	4	16	45	6	29	80	8	0	6	14	58	3	18	79	189
IDAHO	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	3	7
ILLINOIS	22	1	30	53	31	1	28	60	16	10	19	45	59	8	28	95	253
INDIANA	2	0	11	13	11	1	9	21	2	0	6	8	11	2	8	21	63
KANSAS	2	0	2	4	4	0	6	10	3	0	2	5	4	1	3	8	27
KENTUCKY	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	7	11
LOUISIANA	2	0	6	8	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	3	15
MASSACHUSETTS	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	9
MARYLAND	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	5	0	0	5	9
MAINE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2
MICHIGAN	6	0	5	11	3	1	1	5	4	3	5	12	17	4	2	23	51
MISSOURI	3	1	5	9	22	1	12	35	2	0	6	8	11	3	5	19	71
MISSISSIPPI	1	0	0	1	3	0	4	7	1	0	2	3	4	0	5	9	20
MONTANA	2	0	2	4	9	0	4	13	0	0	2	2	2	0	10	12	31
NORTH CAROLINA	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	6	1	1	0	2	5	4	1	10	19
NORTH DAKOTA	20	9	7	36	160	16	35	211	17	1	10	28	162	6	51	219	494
NEBRASKA	2	1	1	4	14	0	5	19	1	0	1	2	12	2	5	19	44
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2
NEW JERSEY	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	11
NEW MEXICO	1	0	2	3	4	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	8	18
NEVADA	7	0	1	8	5	0	4	9	1	0	2	3	1	0	6	7	27

A=Accepted T=Total	Incoming								Outgoing								
C=Canceled TT=ALL R=Rejected TOTAL	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
State	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	Total
NEW YORK	1	0	3	4	3	0	3	6	1	1	0	2	6	5	1	12	24
OHIO	3	0	3	6	2	0	2	4	2	1	1	4	9	0	3	12	26
OKLAHOMA	0	1	0	1	1	1	4	6	5	1	2	8	5	1	3	9	24
OREGON	2	1	2	5	1	0	3	4	1	0	2	3	4	1	1	6	18
PENNSYLVANIA	1	0	2	3	5	2	9	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	7	8	28
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	8	9
SOUTH DAKOTA	17	1	4	22	43	3	6	52	7	1	2	10	65	6	15	86	170
TENNESSEE	0	0	1	1	2	0	3	5	0	1	3	4	1	0	6	7	17
TEXAS	13	0	5	18	46	5	30	81	11	1	8	20	32	4	14	50	169
UTAH	3	0	0	3	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	9
VIRGINIA	0	0	2	2	6	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	15
VERMONT	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
WASHINGTON	0	0	1	1	9	1	6	16	2	2	1	5	12	2	4	18	40
WISCONSIN	46	3	37	86	329	28	164	521	13	3	16	32	217	19	68	304	943
WEST VIRGINIA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	4
WYOMING	2	0	2	4	4	1	0	5	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	4	14
TOTAL	199	24	160	383	841	76	415	1332	120	30	130	280	825	104	323	1252	3247