

**STATEWIDE OFFICE OPERATIONS NETWORK**  
**Thursday, December 13, 2012**

**Hosting Agency:** Yamhill County Community Corrections

**Meeting Location:** 615 East Sixth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128-4584

**In attendance:** Michael Jackson, Marion County; Shawna Harnden, Parole Board; Carolyn Knox, Lincoln County; Melinda Garcia, Jefferson; Dianne Erickson, OISC; Cathy Snider, OISC; Emma Bouchet, Multnomah County; Kari Garcia, Multnomah County; Mindie Everett, Multnomah County; Marla Wiese, Multnomah County; Ruby McClorey, Interstate Compact; Mary Hunt, DOC; Lee Cummins, DOC; Carol Harrod, Clatsop County; Kimberly Losada, Clatsop County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Tonya Owens, Tillamook County; Patty Gaskins, Douglas County; Lisa Gilbertson, Multnomah County; Kristine Hume Bustos, LEDS; Diane Ballard, Jackson County; Teresa Yurkovich, Josephine County; Shanna Miller, Yamhill County; Vicki Wood, Yamhill County; Jessica Jauken, Wasco County; Cassy Polen, Polk County; Christy Elven, Washington County; Judy Bell, Benton County.

**Introductions/Welcome:** All attendees introduced themselves.

**Review/Additions/Corrections to Minutes:** Dianne OISC page 7, second paragraph, says Central Records maintains paper files; actually it's the State Records Center/Archives.

**Guest Speaker from LEDS – Kristine Hume Bustos:** In the LEDS training unit Dick Clever retired a couple months ago, which leaves only Kristine in the training unit. The open position recently vacated by Dick's retirement has been removed. They are hoping for a position jointly owned by training/auditing to be created. A lot of training is becoming computerized, which will diminish the administrative function. They are hoping to have a trainer/auditor who will monitor training online, offer training when the budget allows, and do auditing. They are applying for grants and hoping to use some of that money to redo the LEDS manual in more of a search-friendly format and update the online training. They are also hoping some funding can also go for onsite training.

Emails regarding recertification/expiration. Previously there was a six month window which users could recertify within, but that changed to a 60-day window. Every two years users need to recertify. They use the same 2011 memo as notification because it is an ongoing process. Be aware that if your due date to recertify is February 2, you don't have to wait to do your testing on February 2; you can do it anytime between now and February 2.

The biggest mistake people are making is that they aren't reading the directions. The biggest mistake LEDS reps are making is not realizing the default password is your ORI and is case sensitive – the OR and the G must be capitalized.

Different training modules are available depending on a user's level of certification. Only do the module that relates to you.

Regarding recertification there are practice quizzes – look on the bottom to see how many slides there are; be sure to do number 1 first, don't skip it. There is a ten-question test at the end. If you fail, wait one hour, and take it again.

Regarding the new certification process, LEADS is working to get rid of all that paper. They don't want LEADS reps to have to grade any more, and don't want users to have to print off and tape answers, etc. Eventually it will be all online and will raise the number of questions on the initial certification test.

Changes are coming, so be prepared to make adjustments. Testing and training will be more geared for comprehension and the functions of LEADS. LEADS reps should be training the users in their offices to teach them how to use LEADS. This is an important function of the LEADS rep. Training modules will be available in the future to assist the LEADS reps in training their users.

One big focus is security - how to use LEADS, how to protect it, improper use like running CCHs on people you shouldn't. Any and every time you do something in LEADS the transaction is saved on their message switch. It's never purged. They can go back years and look at the records. Searches on users and terminals are run to gather information. The information is always there. LEADS has no future plans to purge any of that stored data.

WebLEADS: Kevin Potter has put manual links on WebLEADS. It is updated approximately every 3-6 months; therefore, it is not always the most current information. Servers changed, links were broken, and may not be fixed. If you need information go to the LEADS website [www.Oregon.gov/OSP/CJIS](http://www.Oregon.gov/OSP/CJIS). There you will find links to manuals and customer service forms for things like changing LEADS rep, administrator change, user change, etc., all of which is done online now.

Nextest and LEADS don't talk to each other. Change in LEADS does not automatically change in Nextest. Information regarding users must be manually entered. Kristine is the only person who can do this.

As LEADS rep it is encourage that you log in to Nextest and use the report function. Run those reports to confirm users who are active or inactive, that information is correct, and verify certification dates, etc.

Questions: Patty Gaskins asked about the tests- when she goes in and sees lots of folders with titles like classification, DMV, inquiry, non NCIC, etc.; how do you know what you need? Kristine replied to go to the folder directly related to your type of certification.

Lisa Gilbertson asked about users who are in the portal who are no longer working at her office. Kristine explained that you can make users inactive, that way the user isn't deleted. If you know they went to another agency email Kristine. There is a button you can click to show active users only. LEADS doesn't want the user records to go away; this maintains proof of what tests were taken by whom. There is always at least one security question on all users' tests. And there is a disclaimer that says you did the practice module (training). It's important for LEADS to maintain those records. Please

keep all your former users in there, just move them to inactive. It is easy for Kristine to change a user's ORI if they change locations.

As the LEDS rep you can change passwords and usernames. Name changes can be done in Nextest and LEDS. Certification levels can be changed by the LEDS rep. Initial expiration is only done by Kristine.

If you have questions or concerns or need to contact Kristine the email address to use is [Training.leds@state.or.us](mailto:Training.leds@state.or.us).

The group thanked Kristine for coming!

### **Email Decisions:**

Christy Elven had an email regarding a felony terminated to jail with no PPS ordered and wondered which closure code was best – RTNS or VIOL to LC then EXPI. Michael raised the idea that RTNS is no good because there is a sanction, which the group agreed; but questioned is VIOL worse?

The PV felony case was “terminated” and given jail time. The code CRTR is not for felony cases. RTNS is not right because of jail sanction. VIOL is wrong because the sentence wasn't revoked but terminated. Vicki Wood and Diane Ballard said they've been using RTNS because it's like the jail term is a separate sentence, rather than a sanction. Do we want to modify the definition of RTNS? Mary thinks since we don't enter straight jail anyway, it's like it's not a sanction. Maybe we should add this to odd scenarios in the manual. DECISION: Use RTNS code and put in the OPS manual under Chapter 14 – Odd Scenarios.

Judy brought up her email about the revocation sanction the PO wanted to submit two days after the offender was sentenced to DOC. Shawna explained that all this process has to start and happen including the hearing etc., prior to transport to DOC. “Auto-revoke” is more of an administrative action, where PPS is still running concurrently to the prison term. “Auto-revoke” means the offender is out of the parole board's control and the community correction agency's control. The board sees revocations as hard time even though they're being served in local jail. Auto-revoke is almost a good thing for the offender. Auto-revoke lets the O lines just run. Revocations stop run time on O lines and tack back on at the end. The definition of auto-revoke will be modified in the manual.

A question was raised about using the escape outcount code – does that code have to be used from an L location only, or can you move out to escape from your county location? Yes can use the escape code from the county location. The location should match who's controlling the offender; if the offender is in jail it should be your L location; if the offender is in outpatient treatment (not managed by your jail) they should be on the county location. In some counties the jail controls programs like work center, etc.; therefore if the offender is in a jail-controlled environment (but not jail itself) it's still the L location. Someone asked what RTP code is best to use in LEDS? Diane uses ABS if it's not an escape from the jail itself. Lee says technically it is escape (even if it's from a different location than jail), so yes, use the ESC code in the EPR. Someone asked if

that ESC RTP is for community agencies because the description says something about the institution. Judy pointed out that the institution doesn't use or create EPRs, so if a record type is available for use in creating an EPR, it's for the community agencies since we are the only ones creating EPRs. Someone asked if ESC creates a non-purging record like ABS; Mary suggests contacting John Garlic for the answer regarding this LEDS question. POSTNOTE: John Garlic confirmed that all RTP codes are for use by Community Corrections Agencies, and the ESC code currently does NOT create a non-purging record like ABS.

Angie Gustafson raised the email question regarding which NCIC code to use, looking for a general consensus - 1199 sexual assault code or rape 1198. Someone explained all codes ending in a 99 are generic and cover a variety of offenses under a general category (drugs, sexual assault, etc.). Is there a specific code that should be used or can we do the generals? Can it be a county by county decision or do we all have to have the exact? **DECISION:** When entering NCIC criminal code in a LEDS EPR it is a county by county decision to determine how specific of a code to use.

Bollinger case: Judy suggested that because the email from Bethany Smith was so well-written and understandable that we would just include that in the manual under the odd scenarios chapter. Dianne Erickson reviewed the email and agrees this is how the closing codes should be handled; the information Bethany sent is correct. If you are getting conflicting information on this matter or have questions, contact Merilee Novak at OISC. This email is correct. **DECISION:** Bethany's explanation will go into the manual for directions on closing Bollinger cases.

**OISC/Institution Records:** Dianne wants to strongly reemphasize to please make sure information is sent when offenders discharge! The only way for OISC to ever check on it is when Cathy has a sealing. It seems they are finding there is a lot of missing information. Please make sure to send those documents at discharge!!! This is really important. Please be diligent about sending documents at closing.

Cathy reminded everyone that the closing summary **always** goes on top when sending documents to OISC.

Michael asked if it is required to send something for probation cases like the board creates for closed PPS cases (Certificate of Expiration). His county does generate a form like that for probation cases. Answer is no they rely on the closing summary, but you can send it if you want. Local Control Expiration Certificates go to OISC like Parole Board Certificates of Expiration.

Kim Losada had a question about an offender who was in a nursing home and died. She has no death notice, no death certificate, no police report; offender on PPS local control - can she close this and what does OISC need for documentation regarding the death? A letter of notification or a statement from the nursing home is enough for OISC and closing in DOC400. Judy will send the link again for the social security death index and it was discussed that you may have to create a free account. Mindy warned to be careful when you fill out the form for the free account to not do the advertisement form, but actually do the website's form; they look similar and can easily be confused. The

advertisement form will lead to a situation where you have to pay in a month to receive continued access; the actual Genealogy.com's form will not.

**Welcome:** Ted Smietana, Director, and Jessica Beach, Deputy Director, welcomed the group.

**Parole Board:** Shawna reported there are new staff members at the board. The new chairperson at the board is Kristin Wings-Yanez. Things are shifting around a little bit regarding assigned duties: Debra Zwicker is now doing all the PPS orders; Abbie is now on job rotation with DOC until March 1; Melinda Boyer came back and now does sanctions. Email Shawna if you have any trouble getting responses. Annie Williamson will be warrants for now. Please use this email address for questions with warrants: [Paroleboardwarrants@doc.state.or.us](mailto:Paroleboardwarrants@doc.state.or.us). Lots of back up people have access to that email. Hearings Officer Tami Jarnport is still out, and Larry Monigan is still covering that position. Please use this generic email for questions regarding hearings [paroleboardhearings@doc.state.or.us](mailto:paroleboardhearings@doc.state.or.us) rather than sending emails to Tami while she's out. Tami's emails aren't forwarding to anyone else and you will receive a much faster response using the general hearings email. You can send emails to Shawna if necessary, and she'll forward them to Larry, but that general one is best. Shawna is also manually cleaning out Tami's email as time allows.

Vicki Wood likes the updated board employee lists Shawna sends out because they are so helpful. Shawna told the group there is a temp in the records department, and you can still send records request to Deb. Certificates of Expiration are done by Pat Ziegler.

Shawna is hoping for the board to be fully staffed in 2013.

Old sanctions needing CLNA codes: There is still a large number needing to be done. This issue was brought to board to take to OACCD to see about sending these as a clean-up list to the FAUG reps. Jay took it to OACCD last month and they were fine with it. They tried to create authority for FAUG reps to access the CLNA code, but it was causing problems with other authorities and not working as they'd hoped. The decision was to create and use test profiles as a way to sign on with Shawna's authority to use the CLNA code. The FAUG rep will log in with the test profile, get it done, get out, and change those to their profiles. Still figuring out how to instruct and create parameters for use of CLNA. There was talk of going back a year to do auto-closure of all sanctions over a year old. That was voted down. When this clean-up idea was presented no one realized how big this list was and what a huge undertaking this whole thing would be and what a strain it would put on one person at the board. Shawna will present the auto-closure idea again at next board meeting. Some counties are trying to clean these up, but the authority to change the sanction to COMP is limited. During this in-between time, keep sending board cases to Shawna. When a decision is made Jay will send an email.

Shawna will get these sanction closures done as she receives the emails in sequential order. If you request a read receipt notification, you won't be getting those receipts until she opens them to complete them, which can be up to weeks later. If you're willing to do the research, AND the sanction was created while the offender was on a Community

status such as PostPrison/LC, Probation, Conditional Discharge, etc., Lee can close them.

Mary explained that the sanction program doesn't see compact cases as compact – it sees it as board; therefore sanctions on compact offenders can't be completed at the local level. Mary or Lee will complete those. A FAUG rep can close anything whose current status is a community status; there is no restriction on that right now. Any regular user who creates a sanction can complete it up to a year. The FAUG rep has authority after that year window, and can also return sanctions to PEND status. Compact parole is seen as a board status, not a community status.

Yesterday Shawna emailed the guide the board uses for determining inactive eligibility. Call her with questions.

Questions: Cathy at OISC asked since sealings used to be sent to Tami Jarnport, who should they be sent to now? Shawna answered to send to Pat Ziegler.

**Compact/ICOTS:** Ruby McClorey stated that Dawn asked her to bring payment forms to share with the group. She told the group to please take some if you need them; stack of forms was passed around. These forms are used as a receipt when a client pays the compact application fee of \$50. That fee goes into the extradition fund.

### **DOC CC Updates:**

Lee. Regarding the PSC, Lee sent out an email showing the new changes on the risk scores screen, and the new proxy reason code. She tried to do a better job of explaining other proxy reason codes. POs wanted to 'tool' shop (PSC vs. proxy) to achieve the score they wanted. If a PSC score is there, it shows up when you hit F6=Create. If there is an "n/s" (no score) where the PSC score should be then you can use that reason code for doing a proxy (NPSC). The program knows if there is a PSC score, and so it won't let you use that code if there is a score. Directors really want to go with the PSC score over the proxy. The proxy should only to be used if there is no PSC score, a lot of out of state criminal history, or a lot of juvenile arrest information. When comparing PSC vs. proxy – the tool is heavily weighted to use PSC. There have been lots of questions regarding the old LTD level. There are counties who utilize LTD as a determinate for mail-in caseload and are actually supervising LOWs. The creators of this program didn't think counties were supervising LOW cases. This issue will go to the OACCD Executive Committee on the 20<sup>th</sup>. Not sure of the fix yet.

OTTO will be coming on board soon. This type of notification program will be new for the community agencies. It will bring up a code on their caseload screen flagging things that need to be done. It may be able to be used for more than the PSC. It's kind of like an automatic to do list. POs report they are excited about having OTTO. Instead of a risk assessment due reminder, OTTO will tell them when a new PSC or proxy needs to be done. A couple examples a new PSC score needs to be done: a person is on a new custody cycle, they have been on abscond more than six months and returned. It is very important that these scores are done within the 60-day time frame required! There was a five million dollar reduction in funding for the last biennium because offenders

weren't classified timely. They must classify within 60 days of the admittance date. OTTO will help with that. OTTO will alert to level changes due to new crimes, new FAPA, etc. It will send alert reminders, and keep bugging the PO until it's done. They are still trying to figure out when OTTO will start notification, for example: x amount of days prior to due date. A red R will show on the caseload list indicating there is something that needs review. The PO can go in and see what the code is for. They will have a column where R will appear next to each offender. They don't know how long it will be before OTTO is implemented.

Judy asked if the offender comes out from local control does a new PSC need to be done? Yes!! All admissions – body movement – create the need for a new score. Funding is dependent on this.

Michael asked if adding a new probation will trigger OTTO to let us know a new score is needed. Not necessarily. OTTO will alert when there is a change in risk level – if the conviction changes the risk level because of the new crime, it will trigger the need to rescore, but if the new crime doesn't bump the risk level, it won't trigger. Funding is not dependent on these small changes in convictions and their corresponding updated PSC scores.

They are still working out the bugs in the PSC programs, like problems with compact paroles, conditional discharges, etc. One thought was to make OJIN data match the score; but that won't work – conviction data is only taken from CIS, not OJIN. Misdemeanor arrests are taken from LEDS, but misdemeanor convictions are not taken from CIS. Patterns of crimes are taken into account (statutory, property, or person crimes) committing more crimes may not bump up the level/score; but if they commit crimes in more than one category, those may bump up the score more. When considering property crimes, statutory crimes, person crimes, etc., it looks at the worst crime; it's hard to look at the PSC and other sources and match them up. Sometimes there are glitches, but sometimes it's just the formula the program uses.

When looking at how many counties have converted all their offenders to PSC scores, according to a query, thousands are already done. Some counties haven't done any because by rule if an offender scores at MED or HI you must do the LS/CMI. So it is a work load issue. If you get into a pattern of only using 'policy' overrides, you may get a phone call - you should be doing the LS/CMI to determine the override. A policy override can't be done because the PO thinks they need that level; there needs to be a county policy in place. For example: often with drug court all offenders are closely supervised; therefore COUNTY policy is to supervise at a medium level – that works as a policy and is an acceptable use of the policy override.

There is currently no deadline scheduled for when it will be required for every offender to have a PSC score. This doesn't count reasons like abscond, or new crimes – those are required within that 60-day window from the date of admission to ensure proper funding.

Someone asked and Lee answered that the PSC scoring program will pull information from eCourt the same as it pulls from OJIN (FAPA orders). eCourt sentencing information must also be entered into CIS for it to be used by the PSC.

### **DOC CC Updates:**

Mary. PSC. Thanks to Angie Gustafson regarding the time frame question for people released from prison who need to be admitted. Mary has told this group 24 hours is ideal, but should be done within one week. Mary did a random check of expected arrivals: some counties are very current some are three months out. Now because of the new PSC and funding requirements, the offender has to be admitted in order to do a PSC, which must be done within 60 days from the actual admission date (regardless of when staff actually does the data entry). In order for that offender to be counted for funding, 60 days doesn't start from your audit stamp of when you did the data entry, or when the PO gets the file, it goes by the actual admission date! If you wait more than 60 days to admit, you've lost funding for that offender.

One offender missed is \$6,400 per biennium lost! That means your county does not get that money as part of their funding. An example to impart the magnitude: 100 offenders is \$640,000!! That's over a half a million dollars lost that won't go into the general community corrections budget funding. Each county loses from their allocation portion. Lots of money is lost by not admitting offenders and scoring them in time. Lots! It's a statewide impact because the general community correction pool of funding is reduced, which means each county's allocation is reduced. So everyone loses collectively.

After DOC releases an offender, the community agency is responsible for that offender whether they are admitted into CIS or not. That responsibility doesn't change just because the data entry isn't done.

Mary strongly suggests each county look at their expected arrivals list on a regular basis and deal with those. [To access that from the support staff menu: #23, then #4, then #3 – you can check arrivals with a #1 and releases with a #2; you can print or display]

Christy asked what happens if court orders weren't provided in a timely manner for local control - those offenders could be lost to funding if they weren't entered and released and scored within that 60-day time frame? Yes, unfortunately that is true.

Leave status is the same. Need those scores for funding. And when you admit to post from leave, need to score again. Lee will check on PSC score for leave; maybe it is not needed to score entering leave until the offender reaches post status. Just please remember to admit the leave movement when they are fresh on leave.

Run those expected arrivals report at least once a week to keep up with this stuff. This is important. Although it's nice to have, you really don't need the PPS order to admit. You can just pick up the body and worry about the O line later.

Someone asked and Mary answered that no PSC is needed when offender goes from institution to local control to finish sentence because he's still an inmate.

Michael asked when going from transitional leave to POST, does that affect the institution's count. He's been getting emails from Denise when these aren't picked up fast enough. These have impact on funding, but not on the institution. Make sure OISC closed the sentence line to POST and use that date to admit the body; you can wait for the PPS order to open that O line. The O line won't affect the PSC or the funding.

The report from Denise on SB1145 data in CIS – this report doesn't show everyone who is actually in local control; it just shows those entered after July 1 (if the report is for the quarter July 1 – September 30 for example). Therefore, if five people started their local control sentence prior to July 1 even if they completed during that three-month window of the report they will not show up on the report. Everyone agreed those should be on the report. Tina was correct: the report only included offenders admitted during that period. They changed the report to include those admitted prior to and were in or ended during that time. This brought in lost offenders who started long ago but weren't released properly. It looks like those offenders are still in jail; do we want those to show on these clean-up lists? Yes, we do want to include all those for clean-up purposes. A new report will come out January. Char may be able to assist with these. Look at the report and if you just have a few and you can take care of it – great. Otherwise, contact Mary or Char for assistance.

### **DOC Service Request Updates:**

DOC is currently working on four requests.

- An FSN report is being worked on for electronic data transfer to DOR. It probably won't be ready for a January start, but more like February.
- A request from OACCD to fix the demographic and sex offender reports. This one has been completed, tested, and approved. It may go into production before Christmas. On the old reports, the count of sex offenders was wrong. The Demographic Report was only counting those with completed static 99s. The sex offender report needed a few changes too. They made both reports table driven and got rid of the hard coding. On the demographic report it will show the total number of sex offenders and also show how many are predatory (PSO), violent (SVDO), and those with static assessments done. It can sort and run alphabetically by name, or by zip, or by city. It used to be that you could also sort by crime category, but that's out and the ability to sort by offender status is in.
- Modify Felony = Misd field to allow for new E code for earned misdemeanor treatment. They're working on it, but it is not ready for testing. This is different than the C code – C code is still for completion; changing to that C code requires successful completion to use it. For the earned code: when you get the sentencing order with language indicating the offender has earned misdemeanor treatment with certain accomplishments, and you enter that E code, it will automatically change sentence type to misdemeanor was felony (MFP) . The E code will be immediate, like Y (for Yes this is a felony being treated as a misdemeanor at sentencing - FMP) is immediate. They are changing the C code

so the change for that code will only happen at the end (at Completion). Right now if the C code is marked at entry of the record, it immediately makes the sentence a misdemeanor, which isn't appropriate.

- An edit to require sex and race is being worked on. There are 1,536 records that do not have a sex or race entered; this number includes discharged and sealed records. We aren't going to worry about cleaning up discharged or sealed records. There are 150 or less current open records with no sex or race. Only two records were institution. Institution has sex and race fields on their first entry screen. Community corrections first admission screen will now add these two fields to that first screen. For now there is an edit that you can pass the admit screen without entering sex and race. Remember that you can use U for unknown and that is a valid race code. Mary handed out clean up lists so that counties can add in the sex and race for those offenders missing that data.

Two other requests to mention:

- Christy's request regarding not allowing sentence closure with an open sanction. They realized that would put a serious impact on OISC because they have to close our lines to VIOL and forcing all sanctions to be closed to close a sentence will be problematic. Instead we can change the edit on the sanction side, so that a PO can complete a sanction even if the offense is expired. It will not allow them to modify the sanction in any other way. This request is not assigned yet.
- OACCD edit. They didn't want a sentence closure if there was incomplete condition data on outcount measure data like compensatory fine, restitution, community service and SC7. They thought about putting an edit so you can't close the sentence without addressing that data, but that will affect OISC. They are considering putting the edit on the entry side. When entering those conditions you must have data in those conditions. A few people indicate having that condition in there is what prompts staff to look for that information. Most people don't get those follow up judgments after restitution has been ordered at a later date. Someone mentioned that, as it is now, restitution is not shown in eCourt. Christy talked about compact cases with a restitution condition because we're marking those as non-trackable. Michael asked why can't the edit happen at body closure. Someone also mentioned how with board cases, SC7 is marked for all cases, but only trackable on one count. Do we want the edit on the body or the sentence? If they can make it happen at sentence closure, let's do it; if we can't then let's put it on the body. You can enter the condition and mark it nontrackable until the information comes. If you change it to trackable, there will have to be a unit entered and can never be negative. Do the non-trackable conditions show on the POs caseload screen? No, it's not highlighted for them, but they can still go in and look at conditions. Mary will take this to FAUG and see if the condition not showing up for POs is something that matters to them. Check with your POs too.

Everything else hasn't been assigned and isn't being worked on. We still have two others on the list set to be worked on next. (1) An edit so you cannot delete an offense when Inop days are attached to it. (2) Regarding the feature to change/override an offender with a Post-Prison/BD status and the board has closed interest or you have petitioned to close interest to Post-Prison/LC. People were using that to change the status to board. The edit would not allow you to change a local to a board, but only override from board to local. Someone asked if it would remove an old override when it comes in on a new cycle. Mary said no, it's not automatically taken off at the end of a cycle. If an offender was overridden from board to local, then you close the cycle, and the offender comes back in on board status, the status will still show as local. You would then you just go in and delete that override to return to board status. Be sure to use the F14=Recalculate function on W/W Offenses screen after you remove the old override data.

Vicki asked Shawna about the proposed idea regarding that we still petition the board to retake control vs. the idea that the board would automatically relinquish control when all board cases closed and local control cases are still running. Shawna will let us know when the board is back to looking at that. For now, with all the current transitions and stuff going on at the board, changes regarding this are on hold; meaning you must continue to petition the board to retake control after board cases expire and local cases are still running.

There are twelve more service requests that are all for FSN, including one for purchasing an entire new fee system to work with CIS.

### **Reports Committee:**

The OACCD Reports Committee met October 23, headed by Steve Berger. The main priority was to look at LS/CMI reports. The group realized it just needed a few modifications. The biggest issue was the new reports created weren't pulling in any misdemeanor data. They thought it was only data on the funded cases (MEDs and HIs) that was needed, but the Directors said no - we need all the data. They are going to look at that. In CMIS you can pull in your misdemeanor information, but it's not a simple process. Data Warehouse will have to create a new batch of reports to add the misdemeanor data. There is only one person who can work on this with one person temporarily allowed to help. There is no time frame on when misdemeanors will be available on these reports.

The group wanted to add a column to show a list of offenders with no behavior change. They wanted to be able to see who's being reviewed and who's not. They are developing help text on the LS/CMI reports to make the information they're giving you more clear. Also there are sex offender POs who want new reports on the Stable Acute, the new Static 99R, ODARA, and the polygraph module. Those will go into CIS. Mary will go to SOSN and FVSN to see what kind of information is needed for their reports. Directors want these new reports to be a priority. These reports will go in as a service request, which may bump other service requests down in the queue.

After all that we'll hopefully get more people involved in the Reports Committee to review existing CIS reports: what works, what doesn't, what's being used, etc. and then also PSC reports, the OTTO program and its reports. They want OTTO to remind PPO's when the Stable is due, and within LS/CMI to alert when the behavior change plan is due.

### **OPEN AGENDA/OPS RELATED ISSUES:**

**LEDS/WebLeds:** Mary asked if the PVP record type works now. Christy saw one on one of her reports. Mary's just wondering about the description: did that change show up? Yes. Mary offered her help if any problems arise.

Jessica Jauken asked since there is a new juvenile code as a reason to run the proxy vs. the PSC, can we look up juvenile records? You have to have access to JJPS, and gaining access to JJPS is a process. Your county's Juvenile Director has to sponsor you and ask for the request for access. The Directors have forms to fill out. Judy said when there is an indication of a juvenile record they just call their Juvenile Department and ask; they've always been very helpful.

**OPS Manual:** Met yesterday and reviewed half the glossary. The group has decided to take a lot out and make changes. Next meeting is scheduled for April. Judy brought up the fact that some counties were having trouble receiving large Word files. Angie will send out an updated chapter, and then send a follow-up email immediately after. If you get the follow-up email, but not the chapter you can contact Angie. Chapters can be sent in Word or PDF. If you need updated chapters and don't see them on the web, or think there may be a more recent version than what's on the web, you can contact Judy or Angie – they both have all the recent chapters saved. POSTNOTE: Although Manette is still experiencing some system issues, she was able to make quite a few updates on the web. The links to the most recent chapter versions are still causing some problems, so it may be a while before all the chapters are completely updated. The dates listed as the date the chapter was revised/updated is now completely accurate.

**Local Control:** Sue Blanchard in Lane County asked when offenders go into local control in other counties and are releasing to Lane, please email the release plan and other info (order etc.) to Amy Friend, as well as the PO as soon as possible. Lee talked about the 99 caseloads in counties. The 99 caseload in every county is designated for release plans. Someone should go into the DOC400 caseload management option and connect who is responsible for release plans to that caseload number for your office. She will recommend to Lane to attach Amy Friend to that caseload so she can get those emails automatically. Your county can have multiple users as the primary attached to a caseload. Use Option 18 to review and make sure that's updated. Whoever is listed in there, that person is getting the release plan information and no one else does.

### **Other OPS Related Issues:**

Angie had a new release from prison, went in to change to the offense to sanctionable, and found a code (SSCR) that doesn't allow sanctioning; what to do about that? The original court order probably didn't allow structured sanctions and that was put in then;

now you can change it to SANC because the board controls sanctioning, not the court anymore.

Asking for clarification on conditional discharges that are dismissed: Do we change to DISM with court order date? Or just change to DISM with same date. What was the actual decision? **DECISION:** Don't change the codes in DOC400 at all, just do an F8 note and send the dismissal order to OISC. Often OISC has nothing to seal on conditional discharges because some counties aren't sending anything. The only problem comes when they get an order to unseal a conditional discharge record, which is rare. Dianne Erikson is not going to change policy regarding sending conditional discharges (it's a county-by-county decision whether to send), but she will speak to her administrator to see if he wants to change policy and require that all conditional discharges be sent. For now, everything is status quo.

**TABLED DISCUSSIONS:** none.

**USER GROUPS:**

**SUN:** nothing new.

**FAUG:** Met November 14 and 15 in Josephine County. Most of the meeting was spent on PSC concerns. They will be meeting again in February in Tillamook. Just before last FAUG meeting, got call from a county where one of their POs changed the caseload of an offender from his caseload to another's caseload. Mary and Lee thought they took that authority away, which used to be under Option 22. But it could also be accessed using F11, 4, 0 – but that wasn't taken away. FAUG agreed to get rid of that. Mary is putting in a request to remove that access from the PO side. If a PO in your office needs that authority they will need to have the SUPPISIS authority. To make this type of change, please submit an Update User Authorization Form to DOC's Profile Administrators.

In September Mary sent a list of records where all sentences reached max term date; the group thought it was good, and they got a lot of closures thanks to the list. They want that report to come out quarterly. These are reports where the body should have been long since discharged. FAUG wants this list to go to FAUG and SOON. Although the POs need to act first on those closures, it's a good warning for support staff of what's coming. Some had previous custody cycles where the body was closed but the offenses were open. That's something support staff would just clean up.

They also discussed reports that users would like in PDF, which SOON had some, as did FSN and FAUG. DOC was going to put the reports in a folder on a DOC server. But most community corrections agencies don't have access to the DOC server and its folders. Since there are only two community corrections agencies that are state agencies that can access it – Linn and Douglas – we're not going to go forward with it at this time.

**SOSN:** Jeff Hanson is the liaison. Lee suggests Christy send an email to Jeff before the meetings to see if there are any updates. They did implement the new Static 99R.

**FSN:** Nothing new.

**OACCD:** Nothing. Meeting again in January.

**ROUND TABLE:**

New eCourts replacing OJIN: some things are different than OJIN; access to certain information seems to have changed. Some stuff isn't accessible like restitution and supervised vs. bench probation. Linn, Jefferson, and Crook counties are coming on next in January 2013.

Angie – merge documents – not enough in the manual. Users thought when sentences were merged the max date disappears; therefore the lines don't have to be closed. Mary says to do the same termination date and code for all sentences, even if it's been merged and there is no max date showing – it still needs closing. Don't worry about the fact that an expiration max date is not in there. The manual committee will add this information about closing merged lines into the manual.

Dianne Erikson polled the group to see which counties send conditional discharge information at closing: with a show of hands it looks like about 1/3 to 1/2 of the group does send them.

Michael announced he is leaving Marion County soon and going to Multnomah County. He may not be allowed to continue with SOON, SUN, or the manual committee. Susie will still be the SOON contact for Marion County.

Cassy Polen said she'll see everyone in Polk County on Valentine's Day (February 14, 2013) for the next SOON meeting.

*Meeting adjourned.*