

**Interstate Compact for the Supervision
Of Parolees and Probationers
2005 Report to the Legislature**

The total cost of salaries, printing, and supplies incurred in development and preparation of this report was \$55,000 (reported as required by M.S. 3.197).

Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108-5219
(651) 642-0200
TTY (651) 643-3589
March 2005

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

This information will be provided in alternative format upon request.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Findings.....	1
Figure 1A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests (2003).....	2
Figure 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests (2004).....	2
Table 1A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by State (2003).....	3
Table 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by State (2004).....	3
Table 2A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County (2003).....	4
Table 2B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County (2004).....	4
Table 3A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County Type (2003).....	5
Table 3B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County Type (2004).....	5
Figure 2A: Requests by Border States (2003).....	6
Figure 2B: Requests by Border States (2004).....	7
Figure 3A: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests (2003).....	8
Figure 3B: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests (2004).....	9
Definition of “resident” according to the Compact.....	10
Impact of community notification on incoming parole cases.....	10
Figure 4A: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met (2003).....	11
Figure 4B: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met (2004).....	12
Figure 5A: Incoming Supervision Requests Rejected, by Reason (2003).....	13
Figure 5B: Incoming Supervision Requests Rejected, by Reason (2004).....	14
Figure 6A: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request (2003).....	15
Figure 6B: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request (2004).....	16
Offenders Transferred or Received by the Commissioner.....	17
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.	17
The individual’s criminal record.	18
Table 4: Controlling Offense of Offenders Entering Minnesota or Transferred Out of Minnesota in 2003 and 2004.....	18
Table 5A: Criminal Record of Offenders Entering Minnesota (incoming) or Transferred Out of Minnesota (outgoing) in 2003.....	20
Table 5B: Criminal Record of Offenders Entering Minnesota (incoming) or Transferred Out of Minnesota (outgoing) in 2004.....	20
Violations of Terms of Probation or Parole.....	21
Violations of Minnesota State Statute 243.161.....	21
Figure 7A: Interstate Offenders’ Violation Status as of Case Closing (2003).....	22
Table 6A: Interstate Offenders’ Violation Status as of Case Closing (2003).....	22
Figure 7B: Interstate Offenders Violation Status as of Case Closing (2004).....	23
Table 6B: Interstate Offenders’ Violation Status as of Case Closing (2004).....	23
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.....	24
Appendix A: Minnesota Statutes Section 243.162 (Interstate Compact for Supervision of Parolees and Probationers; Data Collection).....	25
Appendix B1: Supervision Requests by State in 2003.....	27
Appendix B2: Supervision Requests by State in 2004.....	29
Appendix C1: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2003.....	31
Appendix C2: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2004.....	33
Appendix D1: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2003.....	35
Appendix D2: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2004.....	37

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 2003 and 2004.

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 request 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 10, 2005, there were 1,917 Minnesota probation cases and 146 Minnesota parole cases under active supervision in other states. There were 1,754 probation and 396 parole cases on active supervision in the State of Minnesota under the Interstate Compact. This number is a snapshot of cases active on January 10, 2005, and changes daily.

Figure 1A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests (2003)





Figure 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests (2004)



Observations of data in Figures 1A and 1B:

- Even though the number of incoming requests decreased from 2003 to 2004, the percentage of the total of incoming requests that were parole cases (23%) in 2003 and (25%) 2004 remained consistent for both years.
- While the number of incoming requests decreased between 2003 and 2004 by 206, the number of outgoing requests only decreased by 18.

It should be noted that Figures 1A and 1B provide a count of supervision requests in 2003 and 2004, 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 (2003)

<i>a) States with the most probation supervision requests to Minnesota in 2003:</i>		<i>b) States to which Minnesota sent the most probation supervision requests in 2003:</i>	
Wisconsin	525	Wisconsin	349
North Dakota	218	North Dakota	204
Iowa	84	Iowa	98
Texas	59	Illinois	78
Illinois	52	South Dakota	68
<i>c) States with the most parole supervision requests to Minnesota in 2003:</i>		<i>d) States to which Minnesota sent the most parole supervision requests in 2003:</i>	
Wisconsin	87	Illinois	63
Illinois	46	Wisconsin	50
Texas	31	California	33
North Dakota	27	North Dakota	27
South Dakota	26	Texas	20

Table 1B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by State (2004)

<i>a) States with the most probation supervision requests to Minnesota in 2004:</i>		<i>b) States to which Minnesota sent the most probation supervision requests in 2004:</i>	
Wisconsin	460	Wisconsin	335
North Dakota	185	North Dakota	236
Iowa	69	Iowa	113
Texas	55	South Dakota	75
South Dakota	41	Illinois	69
<i>c) States with the most parole supervision requests to Minnesota in 2004:</i>		<i>d) States to which Minnesota sent the most parole supervision requests in 2004:</i>	
Wisconsin	103	Illinois	54
Illinois	52	Wisconsin	41
South Dakota	38	North Dakota	40
North Dakota	24	Texas	21
Iowa	23	California	16

Table 2A: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County (2003)

<i>a) Counties receiving the most probation supervision requests in 2003:</i>		<i>b) Counties sending the most probation supervision requests in 2003:</i>	
Hennepin	223	Dakota	132
Ramsey	187	Ramsey	124
Clay	79	Washington	106
Dakota	76	Clay	86
St. Louis	69	St. Louis	78
<i>c) Counties receiving the most parole supervision requests in 2003:</i>		<i>d)* Counties sending the most parole supervision requests in 2003:</i>	
Hennepin	115	Hennepin	66
Ramsey	62	Ramsey	64
Dakota & Washington	14	Clay	21
Anoka	13	Dakota & Olmsted	18
St. Louis	11	St. Louis	17

Table 2B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County (2004)

<i>a) Counties receiving the most probation supervision requests in 2004:</i>		<i>b) Counties sending the most probation supervision requests in 2004:</i>	
Hennepin	211	Ramsey	112
Ramsey	147	Polk	106
Dakota	80	Dakota	103
Clay	79	Washington	83
Anoka	52	Clay	79
<i>c) Counties receiving the most parole supervision requests in 2004:</i>		<i>d) *Counties sending the most parole supervision requests in 2004:</i>	
Hennepin	99	Hennepin	65
Ramsey	61	Ramsey	51
Dakota	27	Clay	28
Anoka	19	St. Louis	19
St. Louis	13	Martin	12

*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 (2003)


County Type	<i>Incoming</i>		<i>Outgoing</i>		Total
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation	
CCA	282	876	241	732	2131
Non-CCA	103	415	105	511	1134
Total	385	1291	346	1243	3265

Table 3B: Interstate Compact Supervision Requests by County Type (2004)

County Type	<i>Incoming</i>		<i>Outgoing</i>		Total
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation	
CCA	275	734	210	730	1949
Non-CCA	96	365	99	532	1092
Total	371	1099	309	1262	3041


- The majority of requests for interstate transfer involve Community Corrections Act counties (CCA). Sixty-nine percent of the requests from offenders outside Minnesota are for relocation to a CCA county. Sixty percent of the requests to leave Minnesota have a CCA county as the controlling county.
- Between 2003 and 2004, the breakdown of incoming and outgoing requests by delivery system has remained fairly consistent.

Figure 2A: Requests by Border States (2003)




- Figures 2A and 2B show incoming and outgoing requests by border states for Calendar Years 2003 and 2004 respectively. Appendices B1 and B2 provide a further breakdown of the data contained in Figures 2A and 2B.

Figure 2B: Requests by Border States (2004)




- Almost 70 percent of all incoming probation requests per year are from Minnesota's border states of Wisconsin, Iowa, South Dakota, and North Dakota.
- In 2003, 43 percent and in 2004, 50 percent of incoming parole requests 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 (2003)



- Figures 3A and 3B show Interstate Compact decisions on incoming and outgoing supervision request in 2003 and 2004 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 Figures 3A and 3B data by state.

Figure 3B: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests (2004)



- 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 is 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 2003, 34 sex offender cases that required an end-of-confinement review committee hearing were referred to Minnesota for supervision; 9 (26%) were accepted, 22 (65%) were rejected, and 3 (9%) were cancelled. In 2004, 40 of these cases were referred to Minnesota; 7 (17%) were accepted, 29 (73%) were rejected, 1 (2%) was cancelled, and 3 (8%) are still pending.

Figure 4A: Incoming Supervision Requests Accepted, by Criteria Met (2003)




* Some explanation is in order regarding “consent only” cases. All incoming cases receive extensive pre-screening if they do not meet any criteria; they are rarely referred to the field unless there is some sort of exigency like hospitalization or treatment. 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 (2004)




It should be noted that an “accepted” 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 (2003)




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 (2004)




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

Figure 6A: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request (2003)



The legislation does not ask for the basis of other states’ acceptance or rejection 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 2003 data on this topic is given in Figure 6A.

Figure 6B: Outgoing Supervision Requests, by Criteria Forming the Basis of the Request (2004)



The legislation does not ask for the basis of other states’ acceptance or rejection 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 2004 data on this topic is given in Figure 6B.

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 2003 and 2004 data concerning these topics.

The numbers of offenders transferred and received in 2003 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 cost when an offender transfers to another state, nor is Minnesota reimbursed by sending states for the cost of supervising offenders received by Minnesota. In both 2003 and 2004, the cost incurred by Minnesota for each offender received into the state was estimated at \$3.34 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 the 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 2003 and 2004 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 2003 and 2004

F=Felony M=Misdemeanor		U=Unknown T=Total		Incoming Parole				Incoming Probation				Outgoing Parole	Outgoing Probation				Total
Offense	Year	F	M	U	T	F	M	U	T	F	F	M	U	T			
Arson	2003	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	4	9		
Arson	2004	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	5	6		
Assault	2003	11	0	0	11	28	36	0	64	21	38	29	0	67	163		
Assault	2004	15	1	0	16	29	23	0	52	13	44	23	0	67	148		
Burglary	2003	28	0	0	28	55	5	0	60	16	52	3	0	55	159		
Burglary	2004	25	0	0	25	34	4	0	38	12	45	5	0	50	125		
Crimes against Administration of Justice	2003	1	0	0	1	14	12	0	26	0	10	4	0	14	41		
Crimes against Administration of Justice	2004	3	0	0	3	15	13	0	28	0	17	12	0	29	60		
Criminal Sexual Conduct	2003	7	0	0	7	22	8	0	30	19	27	6	0	33	89		
Criminal Sexual Conduct	2004	4	0	0	4	17	9	0	26	27	26	7	0	33	90		
Disorderly Conduct	2003	0	0	0	0	2	27	0	29	1	0	5	0	5	35		
Disorderly Conduct	2004	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	19	0	1	5	0	6	25		
Drug	2003	56	2	0	58	191	68	0	259	35	167	7	0	174	526		
Drug	2004	67	2	1	70	187	60	1	248	39	169	9	1	179	536		
DWI	2003	12	0	0	12	24	56	0	80	0	22	169	0	191	283		
DWI	2004	9	1	0	10	20	44	0	64	0	25	231	0	256	330		
Endangerment	2003	2	0	0	2	5	2	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	10		
Endangerment	2004	2	0	0	2	3	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	7		
Escape/Flight	2003	3	0	0	3	7	3	0	10	2	10	2	0	12	27		
Escape/Flight	2004	4	0	0	4	4	2	0	6	0	8	1	0	9	19		
Forgery	2003	8	1	0	9	38	5	0	43	0	37	8	0	45	97		
Forgery	2004	8	0	0	8	28	6	0	34	2	24	3	0	27	71		
Fraud	2003	5	0	0	5	10	3	0	13	1	9	1	0	10	29		
Fraud	2004	1	0	0	1	6	2	0	8	0	8	3	0	11	20		
Harassment	2003	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	2	2	0	4	7		
Harassment	2004	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	7	0	8	10		

F=Felony M=Misdemeanor		U=Unknown T=Total		Incoming Parole				Incoming Probation				Outgoing Parole	Outgoing Probation				Total
Offense	Year	F	M	U	T	F	M	U	T	F	F	M	U	T			
Homicide	2003	11	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	19		
Homicide	2004	7	0	0	7	4	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	1	16		
Kidnapping	2003	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	6		
Kidnapping	2004	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	4		
Non-Support	2003	2	0	0	2	11	3	0	14	1	3	0	0	3	20		
Non-Support	2004	2	0	0	2	11	2	0	13	0	6	0	0	6	21		
Property Damage	2003	0	0	0	0	2	21	0	23	1	10	4	0	14	38		
Property Damage	2004	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	14	0	10	7	0	17	31		
Prostitution	2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Prostitution	2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Robbery	2003	8	0	0	8	6	0	0	6	17	7	0	0	7	38		
Robbery	2004	8	0	0	8	5	0	0	5	18	12	0	0	12	43		
Stolen Property	2003	2	0	0	2	8	2	0	10	1	12	1	0	13	26		
Stolen Property	2004	2	0	0	2	6	3	0	9	0	13	0	0	13	24		
Terroristic Threats	2003	1	0	0	1	3	3	0	6	1	13	3	0	16	24		
Terroristic Threats	2004	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	8	15		
Theft	2003	18	0	0	18	52	42	0	94	8	64	8	0	72	192		
Theft	2004	20	0	0	20	61	43	0	104	10	75	6	0	81	215		
Traffic/Accidents	2003	1	0	0	1	5	6	0	11	2	6	11	0	17	31		
Traffic/Accidents	2004	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	5	0	7	10	0	17	23		
Trespassing	2003	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10		
Trespassing	2004	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6		
Vehicle Theft	2003	4	0	0	4	9	8	0	17	1	10	0	0	10	32		
Vehicle Theft	2004	6	0	0	6	16	5	0	21	1	5	0	0	5	33		
Violation of Order for Protection	2003	1	0	0	1	3	3	0	6	1	2	2	0	4	12		
Violation of Order for Protection	2004	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	5	3	2	6	0	8	17		
Weapons	2003	6	0	0	6	10	6	0	16	4	6	0	0	6	32		
Weapons	2004	5	0	0	5	7	3	0	10	4	4	4	0	8	27		
Worthless Checks	2003	1	0	0	1	7	13	0	20	0	6	2	0	8	29		
Worthless Checks	2004	1	0	0	1	12	7	0	19	0	13	2	0	15	35		
Wrongfully Obtaining Public Assistance	2003	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	14	0	0	14	15		
Wrongfully Obtaining Public Assistance	2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	6		
Unknown	2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Unknown	2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
Other	2003	1	0	0	1	9	5	0	14	1	1	1	0	2	18		
Other	2004	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	1	2	0	3	6		
		385	7	1	393	1016	609	2	1627	283	1071	612	1	1684	3987		

Table 5A: Criminal Record of Offenders Entering Minnesota (incoming) or Transferred Out of Minnesota (outgoing) in 2003

	Incoming				Outgoing			
	Parole		Probation		Parole		Probation	
	*N=194		*N=876		*N=145		*N=802	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One or more person felonies	193	99.5%	847	96.7%	97	66.9%	789	98.4%
One or more property felonies	192	99.0%	847	96.7%	94	64.8%	790	98.5%
One or more drug felonies	192	99.0%	847	96.7%	85	58.6%	792	98.8%
One or more public order felonies	191	98.5%	840	95.9%	68	46.9%	788	98.3%
One or more other felonies	191	98.5%	841	96.0%	62	42.8%	790	98.5%
One or more misdemeanors	193	99.5%	868	99.1%	118	81.4%	799	99.6%

*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 2004

	Incoming				Outgoing			
	Parole		Probation		Parole		Probation	
	*N=199		*N=751		*N=138		*N=882	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One or more person felonies	186	93.5%	652	86.8%	90	65.2%	771	87.4%
One or more property felonies	191	96.0%	661	88.0%	75	54.3%	783	88.8%
One or more drug felonies	190	95.5%	671	89.3%	81	58.7%	779	88.3%
One or more public order felonies	180	90.5%	634	84.4%	58	42.0%	754	85.5%
One or more other felonies	184	92.5%	641	85.4%	51	37.0%	761	86.3%
One or more misdemeanors	195	98.0%	716	95.3%	107	77.5%	836	94.8%

*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).

Violations of Terms of Probation or Parole

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 2003, the data reports that 20 parolees and 25 probationers were returned to the sending state as a result of a violation.
- In 2003, 15 parolees and 21 probationers were committed to the Minnesota DOC for a new offense.
- In 2004, 22 parolees and 48 probationers were returned to the sending state as a result of a violation.
- In 2004, seven parolees and 10 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 section 243.16, which is Minnesota’s statute regarding the Interstate Compact for the supervision of parolees and probationers. 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 2002 or 2003. The information for 2004 was not available at the time of the report.

Figure 7A: Interstate Offenders' Violation Status as of Case Closing (2003)




Table 6A: Interstate Offenders' Violation Status as of Case Closing (2003)

Violation	Incoming		Outgoing	
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation
NO	188	897	109	788
Yes - returned to sending state	20	25	0	15
Yes - committed to MN DOC	15	21	11	13
Yes - action unknown	17	66	1	85
Yes - restructured/reinstated	0	3	1	1
Yes - committed other	4	12	6	25
Yes - warrant issued	14	110	9	112
Total	258	1134	137	1039

Figure 7B: Interstate Offenders' Violation Status as of Case Closing (2004)




Table 6B: Interstate Offenders' Violation Status as of Case Closing (2004)

Violation	Incoming		Outgoing	
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation
NO	141	649	110	705
Yes - returned to sending state	22	48	1	34
Yes - committed to MN DOC	7	10	9	11
Yes - action unknown	7	61	1	65
Yes - restructured/reinstated	0	2	1	1
Yes - committed other	0	9	3	26
Yes - warrant issued	12	116	5	105
Total	189	895	130	947

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	
2002 Parole	186	4	2.15%	4	2.15%
2002 Probation	955	8	0.84%	6	0.63%
2002 Total	1141	12	1.05%	10	0.88%
2003 Parole	191	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2003 Probation	950	0	0.00%	2	0.21%
2003 Total	1141	0	0.00%	2	0.18%

Since 12 months have not yet elapsed for most interstate offenders received during 2004, 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.

Subdivision 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.

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix B1: Supervision Requests by State in 2003

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

State	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
ALABAMA	0	1	1	3	3	6	7
ALASKA	0	2	2	0	7	7	9
ARIZONA	7	20	27	8	35	43	70
ARKANSAS	2	8	10	6	4	10	20
CALIFORNIA	11	17	28	33	30	63	91
COLORADO	19	21	40	5	19	24	64
CONNECTICUT	0	2	2	0	3	3	5
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	3	16	19	12	33	45	64
GEORGIA	4	14	18	5	8	13	31
HAWAII	3	0	3	0	3	3	6
IDAHO	4	7	11	2	4	6	17
ILLINOIS	46	52	98	63	78	141	239
INDIANA	7	18	25	9	12	21	46
IOWA	22	84	106	14	98	112	218
KANSAS	11	18	29	3	12	15	44
KENTUCKY	1	5	6	2	8	10	16
LOUISIANA	0	2	2	0	6	6	8
MAINE	0	4	4	0	0	0	4
MARYLAND	0	3	3	0	4	4	7
MASSACHUSETTS	1	3	4	0	2	2	6
MICHIGAN	2	12	14	11	31	42	56
MISSISSIPPI	0	4	4	6	5	11	15
MISSOURI	13	35	48	10	17	27	75
MONTANA	11	8	19	1	10	11	30
NEBRASKA	3	20	23	2	14	16	39
NEVADA	7	5	12	2	18	20	32
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	2	2	4	4
NEW JERSEY	0	1	1	1	1	2	3
NEW MEXICO	5	7	12	2	8	10	22
NEW YORK	4	6	10	5	9	14	24
NORTH CAROLINA	0	1	1	3	7	10	11
NORTH DAKOTA	27	218	245	27	204	231	476
OHIO	3	4	7	4	8	12	19
OKLAHOMA	1	8	9	3	8	11	20
OREGON	2	2	4	2	7	9	13
PENNSYLVANIA	8	5	13	3	5	8	21
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	1	1	0	0	0	1

State	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	3	4	2	4	6	10
SOUTH DAKOTA	26	42	68	10	68	78	146
TENNESSEE	2	4	6	4	13	17	23
TEXAS	31	59	90	20	60	80	170
UTAH	2	3	5	2	3	5	10
VERMONT	0	2	2	0	1	1	3
VIRGINIA	1	7	8	2	4	6	14
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
WASHINGTON	6	5	11	4	9	13	24
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
WISCONSIN	87	525	612	50	349	399	1011
WYOMING	2	7	9	3	7	10	19
	385	1291	1676	346	1243	1589	3265

Appendix B2: Supervision Requests by State in 2004

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

State	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
ALABAMA	0	1	1	1	3	4	5
ALASKA	4	1	5	1	9	10	15
ARIZONA	7	19	26	7	38	45	71
ARKANSAS	6	5	11	6	10	16	27
CALIFORNIA	13	11	24	16	28	44	68
COLORADO	7	20	27	4	29	33	60
CONNECTICUT	1	3	4	0	1	1	5
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	3	3	0	0	0	3
FLORIDA	0	18	18	8	33	41	59
GEORGIA	2	8	10	3	11	14	24
HAWAII	0	2	2	3	2	5	7
IDAHO	2	3	5	1	5	6	11
ILLINOIS	52	39	91	54	69	123	214
INDIANA	5	14	19	8	12	20	39
IOWA	23	69	92	15	113	128	220
KANSAS	9	9	18	4	10	14	32
KENTUCKY	0	1	1	1	3	4	5
LOUISIANA	8	2	10	4	6	10	20
MAINE	0	2	2	0	1	1	3
MARYLAND	2	2	4	1	3	4	8
MASSACHUSETTS	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
MICHIGAN	3	9	12	9	21	30	42
MISSISSIPPI	0	4	4	3	10	13	17
MISSOURI	12	14	26	9	16	25	51
MONTANA	1	6	7	3	9	12	19
NEBRASKA	6	22	28	6	14	20	48
NEVADA	7	3	10	2	11	13	23
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
NEW JERSEY	0	2	2	1	0	1	3
NEW MEXICO	2	3	5	2	6	8	13
NEW YORK	1	7	8	5	8	13	21
NORTH CAROLINA	0	3	3	0	5	5	8
NORTH DAKOTA	24	185	209	40	236	276	485
OHIO	5	8	13	3	12	15	28
OKLAHOMA	3	3	6	2	12	14	20
OREGON	3	7	10	1	14	15	25
PENNSYLVANIA	2	4	6	1	7	8	14
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

State	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	3	3	2	3	5	8
SOUTH DAKOTA	38	41	79	9	75	84	163
TENNESSEE	1	4	5	10	8	18	23
TEXAS	11	55	66	21	44	65	131
UTAH	0	1	1	1	9	10	11
VERMONT	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
VIRGINIA	1	8	9	0	4	4	13
WASHINGTON	5	8	13	1	9	10	23
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	103	460	563	41	335	376	939
WYOMING	2	4	6	0	4	4	10
	371	1099	1470	309	1262	1571	3041

Appendix C1: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2003

County	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
AITKIN	0	1	1	2	2	4	5
ANOKA	13	46	59	15	32	47	106
BECKER	3	11	14	3	17	20	34
BELTRAMI	2	5	7	2	7	9	16
BENTON	4	5	9	3	12	15	24
BIG STONE	0	1	1	0	2	2	3
BLUE EARTH	5	14	19	1	6	7	26
BROWN	0	3	3	0	2	2	5
CARLTON	0	9	9	2	7	9	18
CARVER	2	6	8	2	5	7	15
CASS	3	5	8	0	2	2	10
CHIPPEWA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHISAGO	3	9	12	1	13	14	26
CLAY	7	79	86	21	86	107	193
CLEARWATER	3	0	3	0	4	4	7
COOK	0	3	3	0	1	1	4
COTTONWOOD	0	4	4	0	9	9	13
CROW WING	1	13	14	4	13	17	31
DAKOTA	14	76	90	18	132	150	240
DODGE	1	3	4	1	1	2	6
DOUGLAS	3	3	6	0	14	14	20
FARIBAUT	3	1	4	2	6	8	12
FILLMORE	1	6	7	2	11	13	20
FREEBORN	4	12	16	3	6	9	25
GOODHUE	3	17	20	5	21	26	46
GRANT	0	2	2	0	0	0	2
HENNEPIN	115	223	338	66	50	116	454
HOUSTON	4	16	20	0	8	8	28
HUBBARD	1	4	5	1	0	1	6
ISANTI	1	4	5	1	2	3	8
ITASCA	1	10	11	1	25	26	37
JACKSON	1	5	6	0	7	7	13
KANABEC	1	5	6	3	2	5	11
KANDIYOHI	5	13	18	5	4	9	27
KITTSO	1	4	5	0	3	3	8
KOOCHICHING	1	4	5	2	3	5	10
LAC QUI PARLE	1	1	2	0	2	2	4
LAKE	0	3	3	2	3	5	8
LAKE OF THE WOODS	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
LE SUEUR	3	3	6	0	5	5	11
LINCOLN	0	1	1	0	3	3	4

County	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
LYON	3	9	12	1	10	11	23
MAHNOMEN	3	8	11	0	1	1	12
MARSHALL	0	7	7	3	6	9	16
MARTIN	2	5	7	5	20	25	32
MCLEOD	0	4	4	1	6	7	11
MEEKER	0	1	1	1	1	2	3
MILLE LACS	2	4	6	2	5	7	13
MORRISON	2	3	5	1	6	7	12
MOWER	0	9	9	7	22	29	38
MURRAY	0	1	1	2	5	7	8
NICOLLET	1	1	2	1	1	2	4
NOBLES	1	9	10	1	10	11	21
NORMAN	3	7	10	0	4	4	14
OLMSTED	6	37	43	18	38	56	99
OTTER TAIL	5	25	30	3	27	30	60
PENNINGTON	3	10	13	0	6	6	19
PINE	2	12	14	0	8	8	22
PIPESTONE	1	7	8	0	6	6	14
POLK	4	34	38	5	51	56	94
POPE	3	1	4	0	1	1	5
RAMSEY	62	187	249	64	124	188	437
RED LAKE	1	3	4	0	1	1	5
REDWOOD	1	3	4	0	3	3	7
RENVILLE	1	4	5	0	0	0	5
RICE	3	12	15	3	11	14	29
ROCK	2	4	6	0	2	2	8
ROSEAU	1	3	4	3	7	10	14
SCOTT	6	10	16	5	19	24	40
SHERBURNE	3	13	16	1	13	14	30
SIBLEY	0	1	1	0	3	3	4
ST. LOUIS	11	69	80	17	78	95	175
STEARNS	9	27	36	3	25	28	64
STEELE	3	5	8	2	12	14	22
STEVENS	0	1	1	1	2	3	4
SWIFT	1	2	3	0	3	3	6
TODD	3	4	7	0	2	2	9
TRAVERSE	0	2	2	0	1	1	3
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WABASHA	0	7	7	1	11	12	19
WADENA	1	3	4	3	0	3	7
WASECA	1	3	4	3	2	5	9
WASHINGTON	14	57	71	5	106	111	182
WATONWAN	1	1	2	2	3	5	7
WILKIN	0	10	10	0	13	13	23
WINONA	3	22	25	6	24	30	55
WRIGHT	4	11	15	7	11	18	33
YELLOW MEDICINE	2	3	5	1	4	5	10
	385	1291	1676	346	1243	1589	3265

Appendix C2: Supervision Requests by Minnesota County in 2004

County	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
AITKIN	1	2	3	0	4	4	7
ANOKA	19	52	71	8	28	36	107
BECKER	1	10	11	1	17	18	29
BELTRAMI	3	5	8	2	9	11	19
BENTON	1	2	3	1	10	11	14
BIG STONE	2	0	2	0	1	1	3
BLUE EARTH	3	8	11	1	6	7	18
BROWN	1	4	5	0	11	11	16
CARLTON	2	11	13	2	10	12	25
CARVER	0	7	7	3	12	15	22
CASS	2	3	5	0	5	5	10
CHIPPEWA	3	1	4	1	1	2	6
CHISAGO	2	12	14	2	23	25	39
CLAY	10	79	89	28	79	107	196
CLEARWATER	1	4	5	0	0	0	5
COOK	0	1	1	0	2	2	3
COTTONWOOD	1	1	2	0	5	5	7
CROW WING	3	12	15	1	11	12	27
DAKOTA	27	80	107	7	103	110	217
DODGE	1	3	4	0	5	5	9
DOUGLAS	0	7	7	3	9	12	19
FARIBAUT	3	3	6	2	3	5	11
FILLMORE	0	5	5	0	7	7	12
FREEBORN	0	8	8	1	17	18	26
GOODHUE	3	9	12	1	30	31	43
GRANT	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
HENNEPIN	99	211	310	65	66	131	441
HOUSTON	4	16	20	0	12	12	32
HUBBARD	1	2	3	0	3	3	6
ISANTI	1	3	4	1	2	3	7
ITASCA	3	3	6	1	5	6	12
JACKSON	2	7	9	2	10	12	21
KANABEC	2	1	3	0	3	3	6
KANDIYOHI	0	2	2	3	5	8	10
KITTSOON	0	1	1	0	3	3	4
KOOCHICHING	0	2	2	2	2	4	6
LAC QUI PARLE	1	0	1	0	2	2	3
LAKE	2	0	2	1	2	3	5
LAKE OF THE WOODS	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
LE SUEUR	0	2	2	2	1	3	5
LINCOLN	0	2	2	1	1	2	4
LYON	0	5	5	1	12	13	18

County	Incoming (I)			Outgoing (O)			Total
	Parole	Probation	(I) Total	Parole	Probation	(O) Total	
MAHNOMEN	1	1	2	0	3	3	5
MARSHALL	1	3	4	3	0	3	7
MARTIN	2	3	5	12	14	26	31
MCLEOD	0	6	6	1	8	9	15
MEEKER	1	1	2	0	6	6	8
MILLE LACS	1	5	6	2	6	8	14
MORRISON	0	6	6	2	3	5	11
MOWER	4	8	12	3	13	16	28
MURRAY	2	2	4	0	5	5	9
NICOLLET	3	2	5	0	5	5	10
NOBLES	4	7	11	0	10	10	21
NORMAN	2	5	7	3	3	6	13
OLMSTED	7	22	29	10	42	52	81
OTTER TAIL	5	16	21	1	18	19	40
PENNINGTON	0	5	5	1	4	5	10
PINE	3	11	14	1	8	9	23
PIPESTONE	0	7	7	2	7	9	16
POLK	2	21	23	10	106	116	139
POPE	0	1	1	0	3	3	4
RAMSEY	61	147	208	51	112	163	371
RED LAKE	0	0	0	1	10	11	11
REDWOOD	1	1	2	1	0	1	3
RENVILLE	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
RICE	1	8	9	7	10	17	26
ROCK	2	5	7	0	5	5	12
ROSEAU	3	4	7	1	7	8	15
SCOTT	6	12	18	1	24	25	43
SHERBURNE	4	12	16	2	6	8	24
SIBLEY	0	4	4	1	4	5	9
ST. LOUIS	13	49	62	19	47	66	128
STEARNS	3	21	24	9	32	41	65
STEELE	0	11	11	3	13	16	27
STEVENS	0	2	2	1	5	6	8
SWIFT	3	0	3	0	1	1	4
TODD	1	5	6	1	4	5	11
TRAVERSE	1	0	1	0	4	4	5
WABASHA	2	7	9	0	9	9	18
WADENA	2	0	2	1	4	5	7
WASECA	1	2	3	3	4	7	10
WASHINGTON	9	47	56	5	83	88	144
WATONWAN	0	1	1	1	6	7	8
WILKIN	3	12	15	1	12	13	28
WINONA	5	18	23	2	31	33	56
WRIGHT	4	11	15	4	20	24	39
YELLOW MEDICINE	4	1	5	0	4	4	9
	371	1099	1470	309	1262	1571	3041

Appendix D1: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2003

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

State	Incoming								Outgoing								TT
	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	
ALABAMA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	0	1	4	8
ALASKA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	9	11
ARIZONA	5	1	2	8	14	2	6	22	3	0	5	8	11	4	15	30	68
ARKANSAS	0	0	2	2	5	0	2	7	1	1	4	6	5	1	1	7	22
CALIFORNIA	7	0	3	10	11	3	5	19	9	3	20	32	12	5	11	28	89
COLORADO	5	3	10	18	14	1	7	22	4	1	0	5	10	6	5	21	66
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	7
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	3	0	1	4	8	3	6	17	4	3	6	13	18	1	12	31	65
GEORGIA	2	0	2	4	12	0	3	15	4	2	1	7	10	4	0	14	40
HAWAII	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4
IDAHO	2	1	1	4	4	0	3	7	0	1	0	1	3	1	1	5	17
ILLINOIS	22	0	36	58	20	3	31	54	26	9	37	72	45	12	15	72	256
INDIANA	2	1	9	12	13	0	10	23	5	2	2	9	9	5	4	18	62
IOWA	10	1	11	22	71	3	20	94	7	2	4	13	67	5	17	89	218
KANSAS	3	3	6	12	11	0	4	15	1	0	2	3	4	1	4	9	39
KENTUCKY	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	1	0	2	3	4	1	2	7	14
LOUISIANA	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	8	12
MAINE	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
MARYLAND	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	5	8
MASSACHUSETTS	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	7
MICHIGAN	1	0	1	2	8	0	4	12	9	0	2	11	25	6	6	37	62
MISSISSIPPI	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	5	1	3	3	7	3	1	1	5	18
MISSOURI	7	1	5	13	12	1	16	29	3	3	6	12	8	3	8	19	73
MONTANA	4	1	5	10	6	0	1	7	1	0	0	1	4	0	5	9	27
NEBRASKA	2	0	2	4	14	2	5	21	0	0	1	1	4	1	9	14	40
NEVADA	2	0	6	8	7	0	3	10	3	0	0	3	3	0	16	19	40
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	4
NEW JERSEY	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	7
NEW MEXICO	1	0	4	5	6	0	1	7	2	0	0	2	4	0	2	6	20
NEW YORK	2	1	1	4	5	0	1	6	1	1	3	5	3	1	7	11	26
NORTH CAROLINA	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	0	5	3	2	0	5	12
NORTH DAKOTA	13	4	8	25	158	14	41	213	13	1	11	25	150	1	42	193	456
OHIO	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	4	1	0	4	5	6	0	3	9	20
OKLAHOMA	1	0	0	1	5	0	2	7	1	0	1	2	5	1	1	7	17
OREGON	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	2	3	2	0	4	6	13
PENNSYLVANIA	4	0	4	8	1	0	2	3	1	0	3	4	2	0	2	4	19
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

State	Incoming								Outgoing								TT
	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	8
SOUTH DAKOTA	16	3	9	28	30	3	8	41	6	2	3	11	57	4	10	71	151
TENNESSEE	3	0	0	3	3	0	3	6	2	2	1	5	2	0	10	12	26
TEXAS	14	1	16	31	38	1	15	54	10	1	7	18	30	5	20	55	158
UTAH	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	2	7
VERMONT	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
VIRGINIA	0	0	1	1	4	0	3	7	2	0	1	3	5	0	1	6	17
WASHINGTON	2	0	2	4	3	0	3	6	2	1	2	5	6	2	3	11	26
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
WISCONSIN	47	11	33	91	353	19	184	556	20	3	29	52	261	9	92	362	1061
WYOMING	1	0	1	2	2	1	4	7	2	0	1	3	2	2	3	7	19
	191	33	186	410	865	60	406	1331	154	42	169	365	806	93	347	1246	3352

A=Accepted | C=Canceled | R=Rejected | T=Total | TT=Grand Total

Appendix D2: Decisions on Interstate Supervision Requests in 2004

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

State	Incoming								Outgoing								TT
	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	
ALASKA	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	1	2	8	13
ALABAMA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	4	6
ARKANSAS	2	0	3	5	4	0	2	6	2	0	5	7	2	1	3	6	24
ARIZONA	7	0	1	8	12	1	5	18	0	0	5	5	23	5	15	43	74
CALIFORNIA	7	0	8	15	4	0	3	7	6	2	9	17	11	14	16	41	80
COLORADO	8	1	2	11	13	0	7	20	0	0	2	2	18	2	9	29	62
CONNECTICUT	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	5
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
DELAWARE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
FLORIDA	0	0	0	0	12	0	6	18	2	2	5	9	19	9	12	40	67
GEORGIA	4	0	0	4	5	0	4	9	1	0	3	4	5	1	5	11	28
HAWAII	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	3	7
IOWA	19	0	2	21	49	1	24	74	7	3	6	16	93	5	22	120	231
IDAHO	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	0	4	5	13
ILLINOIS	18	2	37	57	19	4	20	43	22	13	25	60	48	11	32	91	251
INDIANA	2	0	2	4	7	0	6	13	6	0	2	8	5	4	4	13	38
KANSAS	4	1	3	8	7	0	4	11	2	0	2	4	4	4	4	12	35
KENTUCKY	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	4	8
LOUISIANA	2	0	3	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3	0	3	6	14
MASSACHUSETTS	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
MARYLAND	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	7
MAINE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
MICHIGAN	1	0	2	3	6	0	4	10	4	3	5	12	16	2	2	20	45
MISSOURI	5	0	6	11	9	2	11	22	2	2	5	9	6	1	8	15	57
MISSISSIPPI	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4	2	3	0	5	6	0	5	11	20
MONTANA	0	1	1	2	4	1	2	7	2	0	1	3	3	1	7	11	23
NORTH CAROLINA	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6	9
NORTH DAKOTA	18	3	3	24	155	11	27	193	23	5	14	42	200	9	50	259	518
NEBRASKA	2	2	0	4	13	0	7	20	1	1	4	6	4	2	9	15	45
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
NEW JERSEY	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
NEW MEXICO	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	1	3	7	13
NEVADA	2	0	3	5	2	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	4	0	4	8	17
NEW YORK	0	0	1	1	5	1	3	9	2	0	2	4	6	0	2	8	22
OHIO	3	0	3	6	3	0	2	5	0	1	1	2	6	1	4	11	24
OKLAHOMA	0	0	1	1	2	0	3	5	1	1	0	2	5	0	4	9	17
OREGON	0	0	1	1	3	0	3	6	0	0	1	1	4	2	6	12	20
PENNSYLVANIA	0	1	2	3	2	0	3	5	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	6	15

State	Incoming								Outgoing								TT
	Parole				Probation				Parole				Probation				
	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	A	C	R	T	
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	2	1	0	3	2	0	2	4	10
SOUTH DAKOTA	27	2	5	34	37	3	5	45	6	1	2	9	53	4	16	73	161
TENNESSEE	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	4	3	3	5	11	3	1	6	10	26
TEXAS	9	0	8	17	37	0	23	60	11	2	7	20	37	2	12	51	148
UTAH	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	1	0	0	1	4	0	5	9	13
VIRGINIA	0	0	1	1	6	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	12
VERMONT	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
WASHINGTON	0	1	6	7	3	1	2	6	1	0	1	2	5	1	4	10	25
WISCONSIN	53	2	51	106	314	19	167	500	14	11	19	44	254	19	93	366	1016
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WYOMING	1	0	0	1	4	0	1	5	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	3	10
VIRGIN ISLANDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	201	18	158	377	769	46	360	1175	129	56	139	324	887	105	379	1371	3247

A=Accepted | C=Canceled | R=Rejected | T=Total | TT=Grand Total