STATEWIDE OFFICE OPERATIONS NETWORK
Thursday, October 11, 2012

Hosting Agency: Marion County Community Corrections
Meeting Location: Chemeketa Community College- Brooks Regional Training Facility
4910 Brooklake Road, NE
Brooks, Oregon 97305

In attendance: Donna Hemman, Polk County; Christy Elven, Washington County; Mary Michael, Grant County, Roni Hickerson, Grant County; Robin Filbeck, Tillamook County; Pam Mathes, Klamath/Lake County; Chelo Ramirez, Hood River County; Shawna Harnden, Parole Board; Dianne Erickson, OISC; Cathleen Snider, OISC; Tina Shippey, Coos County; Vicki Wood, Yamhill County; Mary Hunt, DOC; Denise Sitler, DOC; Carolyn Knox, Lincoln County; Karen Spieler, Columbia County; Diane Ballard, Jackson County; Teresa Yurkovich, Josephine County; Tausha Terland, Tri-County; Jessica Jauken, Wasco County; Marla Wiese, Multnomah County; Mindie Everett, Multnomah County; Kari Garcia, Multnomah County; Nola McLennan, Jefferson County; Michael Jackson, Marion County; Susie Schindler, Marion County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Nicole Rickart, Deschutes County; and Judy Bell, Benton County.

Introductions/Welcome: Kevin Karvandi, Operations Manager in Marion County welcomed the group and expressed that he greatly appreciates all that we do. The group introduced themselves.

Guest Speaker: Mary Claire Buckley, Executive Director of the Psychiatric Security Review Board (PSRB).

Ms. Buckley provided an insightful overview into the PSRB, including information on its mission, function, goals, limitations, governing rules, relevant legislature, role and relationship with community corrections agencies regarding dual clients, prisons, judges, District Attorneys, defense attorneys, community mental health providers, the Oregon State Hospital, and the Oregon Health Authority, as well as a general overview regarding conditions that qualify an offender for the guilty except for insanity plea and aid and assist clients. Ms. Buckley provided a slideshow printout (which is attached to these minutes) outlining her presentation.

Ms. Buckley opened the floor to questions. Mindie Everett asked how she can get information regarding dual clients. Ms. Buckley answered that anyone can call the PSRB at 503-229-5596. There is a lot of public information regarding offenders that can be obtained by calling.

Denise Sitler: – The new PSC assessment tool rolled out on September 1. There were some small issues requiring slight modifications and/or considerations. OACCD decided, after receiving input from the field and observing its operation, to reconvene the risk assessment work group. Their first meeting was last Monday to discuss the issues that have arisen. A summary of the issues discussed is as follows:

Incoming compact offenders: When we enter the sentence on compact cases we try to pick the crime that most closely resembles the out-of-state crime, and enter that. Part of the calculation in the PSC is the crime and severity, so it's pulling that crime from what we've entered – which is not the exact crime. It's also not pulling in the arrest related to that crime since that is on an out-of-state rap sheet. Because it's not an Oregon crime and arrest, if that was the only conviction the PSC should have been getting 'no criminal history' and not creating a PSC score at all, but because the sentence is entered, the system is giving you a PSC score. The proxy can be used, but the PO can't add the correct reason code.
Resolution: All non-Oregon sentences (as determined by the two-letter "county" code representing the state it's from) will not be counted into the PSC, or if the record is marked as compact offender upon admission it also won't be counted into the PSC and therefore the system won't create a PSC score. This will allow a proxy to be created with a reason code of NPSC=No PSC Score Available or BOTH=OOS History & No PSC score.
Mindie asked what if there is both an Oregon history and they have a new incoming compact? Denise explained if there are both – do the research and look at NCIC criminal histories and decide what needs to be done. When doing the PSC the PO should run and look at the full NCIC criminal history including juvenile if available. If there is an extensive out of state history, you should be running the proxy. Remember the LS/CMI can support the PSC and be used to determine and override the assessment level.

System data updating: In CIS, the conviction entered is updated and available to the PSC nightly. LEDS data is not updated into the program nightly, but they are working on that. On the CJC website, information is also not updated nightly, but they are also working on feeding data to CJC to update nightly. CJC is receiving information from OJIN quarterly, LEDS monthly, and CIS nightly. This is why there is a difference between the CJC website scores and CIS PSC scores. They are working to coordinate and feed information on the same schedule so PSC scores match in both systems.

OCMS overrides: The workgroup received a request from a county regarding updating assessment scores. The county wanted to override the old OCMS scores rather than do new PSC score. At the time we could, although there are many reasons not to. The workgroup discussed this, but before responding to the county who asked the question, that county resolved their issue. The group also made it so currently there is no ability to go into OCMS. It is all locked.

Proxy codes: When you create a proxy you must enter a reason code. Currently there are three reason codes: out-of-state criminal history, no PSC score, or both. Suggestions were made for more reason codes to create a proxy.

> Juvenile criminal history. Some POs want to do a proxy because the juvenile history is not being captured, but currently there is no code for that. They will add that code.

Arrest data. A PO created a PSC that was based on arrest data, but wanted to do a proxy instead. The only information going into a proxy is the age of first arrest and the number of arrests. Since the PSC is already pulling arrest data there is no reason for a code (and no reason to do a proxy) because it's the same thing.

Sanctions. Some POs felt concern because sanctions are not captured and used to calculate the PSC score, when that information could raise the risk score. The workgroup is tabling that issue, because the tool should be evaluated for six months to see how well it works. If a PO has concerns that the risk score is too low, they should do an LS/CMI to determine a risk override if necessary. If a PO finds an offender with lots of sanctions but coming up low, have them set these names aside to see what it looks like in six months. How many sanctions are given varies too much to affectively use that data and would most likely compromise the validity of tool.

Work with Risk Assessments screen. Currently on that screen an override is showing only as OVRDE and not the reason code for the override. They will adjust that screen so that the reason can be seen. The IT department will make changes and send options to the group for approval. There is limited space, but they will do what they can. They might use the 'reassess date' space and eliminate that information from showing.

LTD vs. LOW assessment score. The LTD category went away completely. Part of the reason for that is that both LTD and LOW are funded the same. Some counties raised concerns about losing the ease of recognizing LTDs, since for some they easily know all LTD clients are on casebank, and without that separate designation it is hard to determine who is who without digging into the records. Perhaps they can create reports to help with that.

Overrides. Two years ago a study was done regarding risk score overrides, which found that 30 percent of cases were overridden. Evidence-based practices indicate that number should be only 5 to 10 percent. With the PCS tool there should be limited overrides. The override code of "policy" has been left open to interpretation, but should only be used sparingly and for good reason. If a county's number of "policy" overrides is high, Denise will contact that county to find out why. The workgroup is honing the definition and scope regarding "policy" overrides. For example if a PO uses the "policy" override because they think an offender needs to be supervised at a certain level but an LS/CMI hadn't been done yet, or they are simply ignoring the LS/CMI score, then perhaps it is a training or communication issue. Using the "policy" override will still be a county decision, but the workgroup will provide guidelines. They are looking to have counties be consistent with policy overrides.

OTTO and inmate assessments. The reports committee is reviewing the risk assessment reports for the PSC/proxy. They are setting up the OTTO notification system that will send an alert when a new crime has been added, a violation entered,

etc. that indicates a new PSC needs to be done. If an offender is in an inmate status you cannot do a PSC. When DOC did a study of how many people weren't assessed within 60 days of admission, which is required to be counted into the budget, there was $5 million worth of people not counted and budgeted for. What was happening in a lot of cases is that offenders were assessed while still on inmate status, but then not done within 60 days of admission to community corrections, presumptively because the PO would see the assessment there already. Funding requires a risk assessment is done within 60 days of admission to community supervision, otherwise they are not getting counted and not getting included in the budget numbers. It is important to assess every offender within 60 days of admission to maintain funding. They will open up to allow inmate assessments again but connect the information to OTTO, so the PO will get a reminder to do an assessment again within 60 days.

PCS Manual. It seems there is an overall misunderstanding of how PCS and proxy scores are calculated, what's included in there, and so on. Lee will include more information in the manual. It is a very complex formula.

Questions. Denise opened the floor to questions.

Donna – Since admission will trigger the need for the assessment, what happens if you admit, assess, but then back out the admission, readmit? Will a new assessment be required after you readmit? Denise: Yes, this could cause a problem. If the custody cycle of the assessment doesn't match same cycle you are supervising on, these won't be counted. This is not common, but be aware if it does. Denise recently sent a quarterly report to the directors with a list of offenders who have not been assessed within 60 days of admission; at the group's request she will also send this list to the SOON group.

Judy asked if there is a small out of state criminal history compared to a lengthy Oregon criminal history would you run a proxy anyway, or just go with the PSC? Denise: You can try both and see which is more accurate. It probably isn't necessary or advantageous to do a proxy if the out-of-state history is small compared to the Oregon history. And remember, POs can and should use the LS/CMI to help determine appropriate risk level.

Jessica Jauken asked about wildlife violations because she read those are not counted in the PSC, and Denise confirmed stating game violations are not counted. Jessica has an offender with no other crimes besides a game violation, and when the PSC was done it changed him from low to high. Jessica provided the specific offender. Denise will look into this to see if the system is actually pulling those violations and will adjust the program.

STTL. The new STTL information was included with the last SOON minutes. Denise is running this program now, and you can send all your questions regarding STTL to her. Since the program's inception, only 4 offenders put out to STTL have been brought

back to prison; 138 have successfully completed. If you have any questions, send them to Denise; she can help!

Compact: The Oregon Compact audit is happening right now. Dawn Persels recently sent information to the national office as they requested. Dawn thanked everyone for preparing for this audit and doing clean up. She thinks we'll be graded at a strong level because of all the hard work. Ruby worked on a lot of reports and saw a disconnect between inmate and the field regarding compact. Ruby asked Dawn if she could be the contact person for release counselors. Yes! Now Ruby will be the liaison between release counselors and community corrections agencies regarding inmates who will compact directly upon release from prison.

Denise reminded everyone those offenders who leave the institution and immediately compact out need the PSC assessment done within 60 days of release, too!

Dawn spoke of how the compact office receives lots of calls and emails, but when questioned find people aren't looking at ICOTS for answers first. Please, do look for the answers online in ICOTS; dig around in there; most answers can be found. This will save you a lot of time because looking around in ICOTS will probably result in finding the answer faster than waiting for a call back or email from someone in the compact office.

Dawn is still currently doing judicial training. Dawn is available to meet with staff, court staff, judges, District Attorneys, public defenders, etc. to explain and educate regarding compact.

Jeremiah Stromberg is the new assistant director. Dawn has met with him, and finds he has been a strong supporter of compact.

Dawn is noticing a lot of transfer request responses are past due. She sees POs are trying to coordinate home visits unsuccessfully and wait to accept the transfer until the home visit is complete, but they pass the deadline for response. Please realize the answer is due on day 45, and your PO can reject the transfer due to no home visit. The offender can reapply if needed.

Review/Additions/Corrections to Minutes: Dianne from OISC, page 2 – change expunction to expungement. Even though expungement is not a dictionary word, the SOON group will accept it as a word and use "expungement" from now on.

Mary Hunt, page 3, third paragraph that starts out "Margaret has questions about the process." OISC doesn't send release packet – a DOC release counselor or local control release counselor sends the release packet.

Email Decisions: Sharon and Karen, Columbia County– email regarding judgments to vacate. Sharon found the "legal definition" of the term of vacate includes the language "to overrule or void and remove from criminal history." Their District Attorney said it will

be removed from the offender's criminal history. If that's the legal definition – shouldn't it be removed from the DOC system? The manual doesn't say to remove it like setting aside. Christy thought it was important to leave in there to show the history; to keep the record to show the original conviction, subsequent supervision, and court decision to vacate. Other group members agreed and said you need a specific order to set aside or to remove. Sharon sent email to the judge regarding the definition she found with the "overrule or void and remove from the criminal history" language and asked if the offense is vacated should the Department of Corrections remove the record from its system and treat it like an expungement? They did what the manual says, which was closed to VACA with an F8 note. In the past they've received order *and* set aside order regarding a vacated sentence. Donna Hemman thinks we should just treat the vacated sentence the normal way, until receiving further order from the court or request order to expunge. Others agreed - don't seal without a specific order; with only the vacate judgment – just vacate sentence, don't expunge or seal record. Mary says there is a different ORS for vacate than the ORS for sealing etc., so you should go by what the order says. Dianne from OISC agreed – go by the order and look for language to seal or expunge. If it's only vacate, then only vacate. OISC needs that second order to set aside or expunge. Dianne will look at their specific judgment and figure it out.

On page 1 of the minutes it indicates we will revisit an email decision that only had half of the question answered. This was Vicki Fisher's question regarding local control that was moved out to treatment, and wanted to know when does the local control end. After treatment ends? Or at the end of jail term? Subsequently, when does PPS start? Should she keep the offender in local control status while in treatment with different housing movement? – Yes, we decided that portion of the question. The unanswered portion of the question is when does PPS start? Diane Ballard says after the jail officially releases. Nola had a similar situation, and she started PPS after treatment. Diane Ballard says use the date the jail says is the official release date. Mary suggests looking at the order, does it say he must *attend* treatment or *complete* treatment in order to successfully receive day for day credit? If the order only says attend, when time for the local sentence is complete, move to PPS. Donna wonders about the intent of the court. What did the order actually say? If it's not clear you can inquire to the court about their intention and get that clear. The definitive answer depends on the court order and the intent of the court. Do the calculation for the local control sentence, move the offender to the different housing status when he moves to treatment, and if it doesn't say he must 'complete' treatment to receive credit, move him to PPS at end of the local control sentence.

OISC/Institution Records: Dianne – would like to revisit the issue of setting aside and sealing records. She is looking for a consensus. She was instructed from last month please update chapter in manual regarding sealing records, and she is working on that. There was a question about Cathy's list and what do we do with those records if they're found. They want to create procedures that everyone can agree upon. If the record hasn't been previously sent, be sure to send it, but only send what would normally be sent at closing, don't send the whole file. OISC can't destroy these records, they just seal and set aside, that way they are available to reopen if the court orders that. Dianne

asked the group regarding the other records that OISC won't archive – do you destroy them? Keep them? Send them? Marion County destroys. Everyone else agreed - they shred or otherwise destroy them. Dianne was just making sure everyone purges those extra documents.

Donna asked where do they keep all that paper? Central Records maintains the paper files as provided in a warehouse for 75 years, and then items are sent to Archives. Dianne is not totally sure how Archives maintains those records, but knows they are maintained indefinitely.

OISC has been noticing more and more that on some files nothing was received at all by OISC. They are becoming aware of the matter when they receive an order to seal or set aside and find they have never received anything from the supervising community corrections office. Be sure to send closing summaries at the very least. And please, at closing send all documents that Central Records maintain. If you aren't sure if they've been previously sent, please send them again. It's better for them to have two than to not have any.

If you need to send documents for sealing, now you can send to the newly set up electronic mailbox so you don't have to send paper in the US mail. You also don't need to send documents that have been previously sent at closing. And remember to only send the normal central records documents, not the whole file. The email address to send documents for records to be sealed or expunged is oiscsealings@doc.state.or.us. If you're not sure if OISC has previously received the documents, just send them anyway. They would rather delete doubles than not have anything.

Mindie from Multnomah County asked about conditional discharges. Do you want the closing summary on those? Dianne says yes. Cathy explained that some counties don't send conditional discharges because they aren't convictions. OISC will maintain them if they are sent. If you're not sure if we've received something, just send it anyway.

Don't send misdemeanor cases to OISC except for sex offenses. OISC does take and you should send misdemeanor sex offense cases. Michael stated he thought at some point someone said we're not to send those? Cathy says yes – send them! Christy says they don't send any misdemeanors. Counties should be sending misdemeanor sex offenses to OISC.

Regarding sealing records, Donna said that Polk County destroys all records in their office, but heard the court said no – keep them, just keep them sealed. Is that right? No, OISC says county community corrections agencies don't keep them, OISC does. Someone asked if they want the whole file? NO, only send the usual closing documents, not everything. And then destroy the rest of the file.

Marla from Multnomah County asked if OISC wants the records electronically or the hard copy. OISC responded now counties can send them either way – both options are okay.

Christy asked if they are purging records from DOC400 when there is a current open supervision. No – they are contacting the county first.

Judy asked what happens when you are closing and reopening an offender all within the same custody cycle, like with compact or closure to bench then back to supervised probation. Dianne explained that the supervising county would send OISC an email that says case reopened, and they will purge all closing documents previously sent, so then at the second closing you would send all documents from the file. Some counties had concerns about that procedures because most counties mark everything that has been sent to OISC and don't resend what's already marked. Someone asked if OISC purges everything and we don't resend it, what happens then? Or is it possible they can merge the two files? Dianne thought perhaps she can add the notification email to the top of the file and keep the file, so we won't have to resend all documents at the second closing. Upon further reflection Dianne realized that is the current practice – they will retain the material, add the email notification to the file material, and merge it all together at the second closing. For counties who will resend because of their practices – they should include information in their email so OISC can know it's safe to purge. Send notification email to oisc@state.or.us. Tina asks to recap – in the notification email should we explain whether or not we will send all documents or not send previously sent documents at the second closing? No, Dianne says if you are only sending updated stuff there is no need to mention it in the email, but if you are sending ALL closing documents again at the second closing, put that in the email.

Parole Board: Shawna – Jeremiah Stromberg is now gone from the parole board and over at the Department of Corrections. There is currently only a two-member board. A new member, Amber Cotts, is starting. There is currently no chair person. The parole will not have a third person until at least December. Currently there are staffing issues due to people out, leaving, etc.

They have a hearings officer out, may slow down hearings. Email box is probably full. If you have POs who aren't able to get their packets through because of the email bouncing back, have them send it to Shawna for now and she will make sure it gets dealt with.

Regarding the CLNA project, on page 3 of the August minutes where it says it may take Shawna a few days to get to your request; that should read *weeks* not days. She is the only person working on this clean up for the entire state.

Regarding the old sanctions that need to be cleaned up/codes changes – Shawna will leave all emails as unread until she has a chance to deal with it. This helps her track where she is at on getting things done. If you are expecting a "message read" return receipt, it will come when she opens the email to start working on your county.

If you have an urgent situation, call Shawna. If she does not answer her phone, dial zero and have Pat find her. She is usually bouncing around the office too much to be chained to her desk, but that doesn't mean she's not available to help you.

Christy stated her county hasn't been getting the Certificate of Expiration notices. Pat had her email address entered incorrectly, so those emails were bouncing back. Pat fixed that. Shawna told the group to let Pat know if you aren't getting those. And you can call Shawna if you need answers.

Nola asked on PPS orders with several counts with expiration dates under the same case number, why is there no count number listed? It is difficult to match up the counts to the DOC400 screen. Christy says they are in reverse order. The last DOC400 entry is first PPS sentence.

DOC – CC Updates: Mary Hunt - Checking in regarding the email she sent in September. This was information mostly. This was a list of offenders on active supervision in CIS, but all open offenses had reached or passed their max date. Many of these offenders are on an outcount status. Mary was hoping having this list would have been helpful. She can see that counties closed lots of cases. There were only a few really old cases where the body was closed but the offense was open. Mary can run these for us occasionally if we like.

When there is a problem completing sanctions, if the FAUG rep can't do it, send those to Lee and Mary and they will take care of them. Ex: probation sanction sent to board, board returned, no community corrections agency can complete it; send those to Mary and Lee.

FAUG asked for a new condition code for zero-tolerance probation. The code will be ZERO. Zero-tolerance offenses can still be sanctioned. The PO may not want to sanction. It depends on which condition the zero-tolerance is tied to whether or not they can sanction. POs can't sanction for violations tied to a zero-tolerance probation condition. For example if on a case there is zero tolerance regarding victim contact, a PO can't sanction if victim contact was the violation. In that example, they must report it to the court. You should not mark an offense as non-sanctionable because some conditions could be zero tolerance and some not zero tolerance on the same offense.

DOC - Reports Committee: There is a reports committee meeting October 23; only certain people are currently invited. In the past representatives from SOON, FAUG, OACCD, and FSN have been involved. Mary is hoping we can do that again. The committee needs input from those groups. Mary asked if there was anyone from the SOON group who would like to volunteer to attend reports committee meetings. Volunteers will not be needed for the first meeting on October 23, and may not be required to travel for all meetings as there is excellent teleconferencing available. Tina Shippey asked Mary to send out information so people can check with their bosses; she is most likely available to be involved via teleconferencing. Donna Hemman is a

possible. Christy Elvin is a maybe, and Judy Bell is a maybe. Mary is also hoping a programmer will be there.

DOC - Service Requests: Same as last time. Not working on any SOON requests at this time. Number 2536 is still in the queue, which is the one to modify the program for the felony = misd to add the E (for earned) code. That is the next SOON request to be worked on. IT told Mary which of the current requests are considered small service requests and asked Mary to prioritize them. Mary provided six: two for SOON, two for OACCD, and two for FSN. One of SOON's request is second on the list, which is the hard edit on status override feature. The other SOON request is fifth in line and is the one to prevent an offense from being deleted if there are in/op days attached to it. Regarding regular service requests, IT is currently working on the FSN electronic transfer of data to DOR and creation and transfer of adjustment memo. The programming on this service request is currently in progress. All analyses, guidelines, and criteria are set out. We're hoping to look at it at the next FSN meeting on October 25. Hoping for a clean 'go-live' date like December 1, or January 1, 2013.

IT is also currently working on, for OACCD, fixing the demographic and sex offender reports so they will give accurate numbers. Currently the demographic report gives a count of sex offenders only if a Static 99 was completed on or after the admission date. The Static is not used on everyone, so some sex offenders weren't showing up on the report. When changed, the report will pull data differently and will provide more detailed information regarding sex offenders. The counts on the demographics report will match counts on the sex offender report.

There are still plenty of other services requests to be worked on in the future.

Open Agenda/OPS Related Issues:

LEDS/WebLEDS – Michael had a question regarding changing the description of the PVP code as previously discussed. Mary answered – yes, the change was made, an email went out, and a post note was put in the August minutes on page 7, which explains the changed description language. LEDS and WebLEDS both were changed and the training manual updated. This was done in September. Let Mary know if it's not working. Marion County has their own server that hasn't updated yet. Mary will have Kevin check those counties on different servers.
POST NOTE: DOC Operations Division has not been able to upload the LEDS/WebLEDS changes yet because DOC is in the process of moving everything to new servers. Once the new servers are in place, all changes will be uploaded. When that's been done, Marion, Multnomah, and Tillamook Counties will be able to upload the changes to their servers. Mary Hunt will let SOON Reps know as soon as the changes are in place on the DOC side.

Judy had a question – she checked to ensure an EPR was cancelled the day after expiration and found the EPR, but was titled, "expired record." Is this common? Yes,

Donna explained it is there for 24 hours after the expiration date as kind of a last chance to catch it.

Mary Michael has been trying to start a new LEDS user and has been having some difficulty. There used to be inquiry/update choice – is that outdated? The group responded, yes. The whole process is very involved. Vicki said things have changed – an inquiry-only user means they can't update EPRs or delete them or anything. The entry test is needed to do any entry. The LEDS testing requirements are changing again in January. Mary Michael is having difficulty finding out what they need while trying to get a new user certified. Someone explained that to be able to do any entry or updating the user needs that separate level of certification.

Mary Hunt suggests the SOON group invite a LEDS rep to a SOON meeting to give updates and changes, etc. Christy will contact LEDS and see if we can get someone.

OPS Manual – please use it. It's there. We're always working on it. Mindie asked if the website is getting updated. Mary explained the new DAS system is still causing problems making it unable to upload and update the website. If you need information regarding most updated chapters contact anyone on the manual committee. Mary keeps emails with updated chapters in a folder designated for only that. However you want to track that in your office is up to you. Jessica asked about table of contents because it needs updating.

Michael had a judgment stating the offender voluntarily quit diversion. It shows no conviction, no upcoming hearing, no anything just that the client voluntarily quit diversion. The OPS manual says do nothing without a judgment. So what do we do? Close to RTNS? Judy suggests check with the court, see what the court intends regarding dismissal or new judgment, etc. Others agreed and added to check OJIN.

Local Control – Kari asked if anyone has ever had a Local Control/Board/OYA combination. She has a 17 year old, Measure 11. Judy thought that the board would pick up all onto their PPS order – OYA and the local control. Kari said there are two counts from OYA, one sentence done in local control jail. Donna says it's always a board case until they release interest. Tina says Abbie needs a release plan and a copy of the original orders to add the local control and OYA sentences to the order.

Other OPS Related Issues – Michael had an email sent to manual committee. An offender went from a conditional discharge right to local control. People suggested he close line out to VIOL and add the L line. The long description in DOC400 doesn't mention conditional discharge in that VIOL description. Mary thinks it's not even a service request, but easy to add language. She just needs SOON and OISC to agree on changing the language. Vicki says yes; add conditional discharge and felony diversion to the description language since everyone uses that VIOL code that way already. The group agrees. Mary says a lot of codes are so old, sometimes you just have to apply them today even if the long description doesn't include today's practices. Often

conditional discharges and diversions are treated like probations, but not in all instances.
POST NOTE: The language in the long description has been changed to include felony conditional discharge and felony diversion.

Michael followed up on the issue of tracking compensatory fines in the release plan program and when you put conditions in DOC400 there is no code for compensatory fine, only restitution. Mary informed the group that it went to FAUG, and they voted to have the new code added. Mary will check to see if they can just add that or if it will be a service request.

Michael – someone in his office sent an email to the District Attorney asking about a court order that sentenced the offender to six months jail with no PPS. The offender served a prison term then PPS on same charge. File was closed to EXPI in 2007. Offender appealed sentence, was resentenced to less jail and the court intended for him to serve no extra time. OISC can change the I line if provided proper judgments. Then Marion could enter the L line. How does Marion County enter the L? Should they enter it as one day since he's not serving any more time? No, they should enter it for the six months with six months credit for time served so the record shows the actual sentence. Michael should send it to Dianne Erickson, and she'll get it to the right person to fix the I line portion of it. He will probably have to reopen the body to go back to enter the additional lines needed. Mindy talked about putting the record to an outcount or something to avoid showing that he's on current supervision. Someone suggested that maybe he should have been put out to the appeal outcount in the first place and not to EXPI. When a case is on appeal, depending on the language in the judgment, he may or may not be supervised during the appeal process. There are two appeal outcounts – unsupervised and supervised. Mary Michael asked if you have a Stay of Execution would you use that appeal outcount? This was to stay the execution of his conditions, while waiting for appeal. No, Mary Hunt says this was holding open his sentence waiting for appeal.

Nola had an appeal sentence with no PPS. She took it to the District Attorney, and they provided an amended judgment during the appeal to add PPS. How does that affect this if it's an unsupervised or supervised appeal? Vicki Wood said specific language is on the appeal judgment/document. Unless it specifically says 'unsupervised' then it is supervised. Ask the appellate court for clarification if needed.

Tabled Discussion – none

User Groups:

SUN – Group met yesterday in Salem. Good turnout. Good meeting. Group has tasked Mary to update the SUN manual.

FAUG – They meet next November 14 and 15 in Josephine County.

SOSN – Still no word on a liaison. No word or updates for us. Next meeting is later this month.

FSN – This group meets October 25 in Jackson County.

OACCD – Next meeting is November 15 and 16 in Eugene.

The next SOON meeting is scheduled for December and will be held in Yamhill County.

Need to set schedule for 2013 SOON Meetings. Several Counties stepped up to volunteer and the schedule for next year will be as follows:

February - Polk
April – Benton
June – Tillamook
August - Deschutes
October – Hood River
December – Yamhill, unless some other county would like to host December

Roundtable: Mary Michael – this is her last SOON meeting, as she is retiring. She has appreciated this group so much. She expressed that she thinks this group is most fabulous thing ever. Mary thanked everyone for being a bright spot in her job and for these friendships. She stated sometimes people might not realize that simply answering a question helps so much and can really change and brighten her day. Mary Hunt will add Roni Hickerson to the SOON and FSN email distribution lists.

Tina – Coos has a new PO - Chris Webley. He is great and is a former police officer. Coos County may be hiring a new director soon.

Nola – Windows 7 not printing correctly from PO menus. Her IT department is working on it and has been for some time, but it is not getting better. Teresa had some problems when they switched over to Windows 7, but easily resolved them. Someone said some printers are not compatible with Windows 7. Vicki Wood also had non-compatible printers with Windows 7. Nola can email Mary some information and Mary will have someone look at it to see if there is anything in the background that might be going on.

Meeting adjourned.