Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

June 8, 2026 · 1:00 PM ET · Teleconference · APPROVED on June 16, 2026

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

1. Commissioner Tracy Hudrlik (MN), Chair
2. Commissioner Chris Moore (GA)
3. Commissioner David Cady (NH)
4. Commissioner John Mosley (MO)
5. Commissioner Amy Vorachek (ND)
6. Commissioner Jeremy Vukich (WY)
7. Ex-Officio Brenna Kojis (WI)
8. Ex-Officio Kaitlyn O'Leary (MA)
9. Thomas Travis, Legal Counsel

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

1. Katrina Ransom (OH)
2. Commissioner Deon McDaniel (NV)?

STAFF

1. Ashley Lippert, Executive Director
2. Mindy Spring, Operations Manager
3. Barno Saturday, Logistics Coordinator
4. Suzanne Brooks, Education & Implementation Manager
5. Drake Greeott, Web Development Manager
6. Xavier Donnelly, System Manager

CALL TO ORDER

Chair T. Hudrlik (MN) called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM ET. A quorum was established.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

A motion by Commissioner A. Vorachek (ND) to approve the meeting agenda was adopted.

A motion by Commissioner J. Mosley (MO) to approve the minutes from April 20, 2026, Rules Committee meeting was adopted.

DISCUSSION

Rule Comments Review: Operations Manager M. Spring presented a summary of comments received during the public comment period.

Chair T. Hudrlik (MN) noted that several individuals from the same state submitted separate comments, and that the tally shows slightly more "do not support" than "support" comments on Chapter 5. The committee acknowledged that the picture may look different at the ABM.

Operations Manager M. Spring noted that of the rules receiving comments, Chapter 5 generated the most feedback and the most concern. There were only four comments from Commissioners, including the Rules Committee Chair and a Rules Committee member. She noted that no state outside of the pilot states had gone through the full workflow of the Violation Response Tool (VRT) during the comment period, which raised concern about whether comments reflected actual use of the tool.

Chair T. Hudrlik (MN) asked the committee to divide comments into two categories: comments that reflect a need for rule language changes, and comments that reflect a need for additional training and education rather than a rule amendment. The two most common concerns identified in the comments were: the VRT will add significant additional work, and the tool is duplicative of existing in-state violation matrices.

Operations Manager M. Spring clarified that the VRT contains approximately a few stability questions that are not typically captured in in-state violation matrices. The tool is not intended to replace a state's existing process but to add a stability-focused layer to the retaking assessment.

Executive Director A. Lippert noted that Education and Implementation Manager S. Brooks is planning a Tuesday Takeaway session to guide states through the tool. She further noted that the national plans to address misconceptions and provide additional clarification during its presentation of the Chapter 5 package at the Annual Business Meeting.

R&R Workgroup Chair A. Vorachek (ND) noted that a primary concern raised during the comment period was confusion regarding the order of operations in the proposed rules and the application of the 30-day timeframe. She emphasized the importance of drafting rules that can be interpreted and applied consistently without reliance on extensive training and expressed support for continued discussion with the R&R Workgroup to improve clarity.

Executive Director A. Lippert stated that several years ago, approximately $200,000 was spent on ICOTS enhancements related to violations that ultimately were not utilized as intended. She noted that the national office is exploring options for embedding the Violation Response Tool within INSITE; however, because INSITE is currently undergoing active development, only limited enhancements can be pursued at this time.

She further indicated that, if the Chapter 5 package is approved at the Annual Business Meeting, the national office would seek quotes for embedding the Violation Response Tool in INSITE and discuss those options with the Technology Committee and Executive Committee. She also suggested that implementation timelines and effective dates for the proposed rules be topics for discussion at the committee's next meeting.

Chapter 5 Comments: The committee discussed Rule 5.102 and discussed potential changes to address submitted concerns specifically around the 30-Day Timeframe and "Discovery vs. Determination" Language.

Chair T. Hudrlik (MN) stated that the timeframe language was originally struck from the rule proposal, then reinstated at the Rules Committee's recommendation to the Executive Committee to prevent scenarios in which violation reports are submitted months after the fact.

Given the complexity of the language changes needed, the committee agreed that additional time was needed to finalize the proposed language before making a formal recommendation.

Town Hall Feedback: Chair Hudrlik noted that four states completed the town hall survey, all of whom found it very helpful. No specific concerns were raised from the feedback received.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

The committee tabled old and new business items for the next Rules Committee meeting. Executive Director A. Lippert offered to work on draft revisions to Chapter 5 for the committee's next meeting. The committee will meet again before the R&R Workgroup meeting on June 23, 2026.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 12:04 pm ET.