STATEWIDE OFFICE OPERATIONS NETWORK
Thursday, June 11th 2015

Hosting Agency: Clatsop County
Meeting Location: Judge Guy Boyington Building 857 Commercial Street, Astoria OR 97103

In attendance:
Judy Bell, Benton County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Mary Hunt, DOC; Lee Cummins, DOC; Kimberly Losada, Clatsop County; Kerri Humbert, Douglas County; Terri Chandler, Jefferson County; Shawna Harden, Parole Board; Kari Garcia, Multnomah County; Marla Wiese, Multnomah County; Nicole Pauly, Multnomah County; Lisa Gilbertson, Multnomah County; Ashley Harmon, Multnomah County; Diane Ballard, Jackson County; Vickie Wood, Yamhill County; Christy Elven, Washington County; Joan Moorhead, OISC; Cathy Snider, OISC; Bobby Lenhardt, Jackson County.

Welcome & Introductions:
Sheriff Tom Bergin and LT. Kristen Hanthorn welcomed the group to Clatsop County. The group introduced themselves.

Review minutes:
Spelling correction- Debbie Wojciechowski.

OISC:
Cathy, where in the manual is the list of records you send to OISC? After the section is updated, who does she email? Answer: Chapter 24, page 9 (24.8.2). Send updates to Mindie Everett.

Cathy introduced Joan Moorhead. Joan is working in the vault purging files. Reminder: Closing summary on top!

Christy asked Cathy how to handle not having a closing summary for offenders who are inmates for life sentences. Cathy said it's okay to send the documents to OISC with an email explaining why they are being sent. One option would be to hand write a note on a Kardex and place that on top instead of a closing summary.

Compact:
Cathy asked the group what we do when a compact case is being sealed in another state. Judy recalled Mark Patterson at Compact said to send to him and his office will connect with the appropriate state's district compact administrator to have the record sealed or make arrangement for the Oregon record to be sealed.

There was a group discussion on the difference between setting aside and expungements. They are the same, expungement once meant the record would be destroyed. That is no longer the case.

Compact coordinator meeting is Wednesday, June 24th at DPSST.

Parole Board:
Shawna: the Board is still in the recruiting process for the Victim Specialist position. There are a few house bills that could affect staffing. The Level System Change could also affect staffing levels. They may need more staff.

Level System Change: Beginning January 2015, if deemed predatory their status remains the same. Until the Board knows more about the legislation they are at a standstill.

Shawna reminds the group that the Board needs signed orders for all offenders when they finish STTL and move onto PPS, any change in conditions, and when there are significant date changes. They want them all! If the offender signs it, send it. These are extremely important for the appeal process. Send via email to orders.boppps@doc.state.or.us.

Christy: When an offender reaches their review date, does it automatically go to unsupervised (UNSU)? Shawna: No, the PO must send documentation to the Board letting them know one way or the other. The PO must send the report to extend PPS to keep the case open or a copy of the UNSU letter to close to unsupervised. The PO will be notified if the offender does not meet the criteria for UNSU. The Board is going to be more proactive regarding UNSU in the future, sending out lists and reminders to the group. Email Shawna to verify the status of an offender if you're unsure. Judy asked if the Board could provide a report listing, per county, who is on UNSU. Shawna says she is on it, FAUG has requested the same list. It should be available around August.

Angie: Does SC7 only apply to active cases? Shawna: No, if it was on one case and that case expires, the restitution remains. Restitution is by offender, not case by case.

Judy heard that every time an offender is released, the counselor is looking at only the new release/case information. If this is the case, does that mean conditions on active PPS cases don't make it to the new PPS Order? Shawna: In the release process, the release counselor and the PO have the opportunity to request conditions. The Board may or may not see certain conditions and don't look at old cases. The PO needs to discuss conditions with the release counselor and ensure all relevant conditions are added to the release plan, especially ones pertaining to victims. The Board will usually go with the input of the release counselor and the PO. If a condition is missed at time of release, the PO will need to submit a consent to modify report. If there is a sanction, the PO can request a condition modification in the body of the sanction report form.

PBMIS Update: Getting close to completion (end of July or early August). They're currently going back through some of the larger modifications. Christy: Will Community Corrections (CC) have view access? Shawna: No, though, there will be auto chronos when cases are moved e.g. extends, UNSU etc.

DOC: Mary

Mary asked if the group is still hearing or involved in conversations regarding conditions tracking. Are there any questions that need to be addressed? The group had no notable concerns regarding recent changes to trackable conditions.

Service request 2686 was submitted requesting fields for a To Be Determined (TBD) field and effective date added to the restitution condition. It has been entered and scored. There is still time to make changes. Mary asks that we think on this request to determine what will get us what we need. The group discussed many aspects of the condition, including how this edit will affect the trackable data, if the edit should be tied to OTTO as a due date reminder, what the report should look like, and if there should be an edit that prevents closure if TBD is still marked. Mary says she requested to have the TBD date and the effective date added to the existing report, and that she will find out what can be done to prevent cases from being closed with TBD marked. Lee explained that OTTO is tied to the caseload, not the case and will notify the PPO. The discussion ended with the group tentatively deciding to have a TBD Y/N field, the sentence date auto fill, the condition trackable Y with a TBD flag for the report. Mary asks that we continue thinking about the request and also think about possible changes to the report.

CIS will now keep a list of the PO history for each caseload. It also auto fills phone numbers from the master employee maintenance table when you assign users to a caseload. If a phone number is incorrect go to F11 – 2 – E to update employee information. It will update the caseload info automatically.

Programmers have assigned an L caseload for any county that didn't have one for their L location. It is a county by county decision to use or not use the caseload number the programmer assigned. If you don't like the number, you can create a new number in your L location. Judy asks that you go back to your location and take a look at your L location caseload number and see what it looks like and if you like it.

Judy brought up a scenario where courts converting cases to bench instead of allowing them to close to EDIS. Mary: Cases are to be closed to EDIS by the community corrections office and the court can make them bench on their end if they like. The case cannot later convert back to formal, because it will still qualify for EDIS. The bill is going back to legislature in an effort to clean up the legal definition of supervision. Judy created a cheat sheet to help SOON reps identify what can go to EDIS. Mary reminded the group that if restitution is owed, the case is not eligible for EDIS. There is not an edit for this in CIS so we need to be careful when closing cases. Christy asked if cases qualify for EDIS if the order reads upon successful completion of a set amount of time, the case will be reduced to a misdemeanor. Would the case reduced to a misdemeanor if EDIS before set amount of time? Does that make them ineligible for EDIS? Judy and Mary agreed that decision would be up to the judge. If the case remains a felony, it would qualify. Judy will update cheat sheet modifying verbiage about MFP.

DOC: Lee

IT's development manager had conversations about the email issues we were experiencing. Community corrections offices were not getting emails from other agencies. Plea to county staff: If you know something is wrong and you're not getting the emails you should, please let the DOC Help Desk know right away. It's hard for them to go too far back to research the issue.

Lee responded to the email sent to the group regarding the PSC. The PSC manual is online; please feel free to look at the manual. OJIN is no longer involved in the PSC calculation at all. All conviction information that the PSC uses is from CIS. LEDS arrest data is refreshed daily too.

Lee asks if anyone has had heard of any issues with the fix that allowed the closing of sanctions for compact offenders. Email sent 4/15/15. No issues noted.

FYIs:

The issue of the General conditions numbering clean up has been added to Senate Bill 377 to rectify the risk assessment condition (d) being inserted in the General Condition 4 slot which moved the remaining conditions down. The risk assessment condition will become the new last condition GC 17. Report as Required will be moved back to (m) GC 13 which will then move Sex Offender Treatment back to (N) GC 14 and Mental Health Eval back to (O) GC 15. Our general conditions in CIS remain correct as does the Board's general and special conditions.

The work group for the special conditions table will start after summer vacations.

The fix for the missing supervision levels in the caseload screen has been submitted as a service request, but in the meantime the low/medium/high is still missing. The only way to fix that is to do a new one. A report to identify these was sent to the SOON and FAUG distribution lists on 6/26/15..

The treatment module has been fixed. You can no longer assign someone who is discharged to treatment.

DOC Service requests:

Service request 2633 for the new programming to track departure data will be coming soon. Part of that request was to add departure data to the kardex. Fields being removed from the kardex include TPD (Tentative Parole Discharge Date), the 'From' field (or possibly made the county of conviction instead), the PVP (Parole Violator Project), the RED (Red tag, special project), and the TSP (Tactical Supervision Program). These fields will make room for the departure data and future requests. Suggestion to add an offender email address field in CIS and on the kardex. This suggestion is not part of this service request.

From the information provided, no hard edits are being requested for grid scores at this time. We will revisit this down the road. It is the District Attorney's office who provides the grid scores for the judgments. Judy spoke with a representative at OJCIN about making the departure information and grid scores mandatory when preparing judgments and she suggested that Multnomah County has a lot of influence and perhaps they can push for that. Ultimately if the DA's office doesn't provide that information to the court, it doesn't appear on the judgment.

Service Request 2681 for changing the position to field in the W/W conditions screen. The request is to have the position to seq # field change to position to code, utilizing the 4 letter code instead of the sequence number. This request is hopefully coming in the not too distant future.

Service Request 2683: FAUG requested to change how they view offender phone numbers. Example: Having CELL phone display instead of changing it to HOME Phone. They also request to add the email address field.

Service Request 2634: New sanction code CONS. Codes available will be SANC-sanctionable, PSSR-court no sanction, and CONS-misdemeanor, county corrections office does not allow sanction to be imposed.

Currently only working on one request for the Community Side- Request: New fee type: COLL-Sent to a collection agency instead of DOR.

Mary is looking for volunteers to help with Webleds service requests. Ashley, Lisa and Christy Volunteered.

Chapter 2 Review:
Judy reviewed the newly updated chapter 2. Ashley highlighted the addition of the instruction on converting Bench cases to formal, utilizing the pop-up calendar in CIS to calculate length of sentence.

LEDS/Webleds:
Judy mentioned that the STTL conditions do not transfer into LEDS. Mary will connect with LEDS and find out the fix for this. Judy will look into it as well.

Laura Carney is the contact for WebLeds profile issues.

Jennifer Lhadd is no longer with LEDS training.

RR -– Christy in Washington County asked for suggestions to get an arrest onto an offender's criminal history. Judy suggested she try contacting Eric Pointer, who is now with Benton County Circuit Court, as he may be able to assist.

FBI numbers are changing to FNU numbers. The FNU will be alpha numeric and the same length as the FBI. Existing FBI numbers will not change. This change will not affect CIS.

The newly issued Oregon Drivers Licenses now have a letter as the first character. If you have issues with entering License numbers into LEDS, contact the LEDS helpdesk with the offender's name & SID.

Manual Committee:
There are three chapters up for grabs. If you're interested in joining, please contact Mindie.

Local Control:
LSA Manual Committee continues to work on the updates and revisions to the LSA manual. Once that is complete, our manual committee with make subsequent changes to the OPS manual.

Other OPS related issues:
REVP Code issue- Offender must be convicted in a federal institution. Same goes for INAC. You don't need sentencing order to move to this outcount, but you do need to know that the offender was sentenced. Don't use REVP or INAC while the offender is in holding pending adjudication.

ECourt brought on three more counties in June: Deschutes, Klamath, and Lake.

Ashley asked what the difference was between Measure 57 (M57) convicted or eligible. Group said the court order must say M57 eligible in order to be marked Y in CIS work with offenses field. All measure 57 cases who are convicted are eligible, so there is no need to mark both as that is redundant. Not all cases who are eligible are convicted; therefore, if the judgment says "eligible" but not convicted, you would only mark eligible. If the judgment is silent on both, you don't mark anything.

Christy presented a scenario where an offender was in drug court on an FCD and opted out. Five months later the offender was dismissed on the FCD case. Do we close the case on the opt out date or the dismissed date? The group decided the case should be closed to DISM as of the dismissal date, not the opt out date.

Email:
Ashley followed up on email asking if any CC agencies are currently using electronic notaries. Ashley found that since 2013, the State of Oregon has allowed the use of electronic notaries. Your agency is required to use a vendor that meets the criteria outline by the Secretary of State. Unfortunately, there are no known vendors in the State of Oregon at this time.

SUN:
Judy is becoming the newest SUN user. Tina Shippey will be mentoring Judy.

Mary is updating the SUN manual. She will send it out for review soon.

FAUG:
Chris Christy was there for the STTL presentations. FAUG meets again August 19th and 20th.

Local Control:
If an LC case is released from an institution and is not listed on the Board Order, please send case information to Judy.

FSN:
FSN was held in Douglas County this past April. They have been reviewing chapters and updating when necessary. FSN added the COLL service request listed above. The new account type will be available soon and will be announced as such when it is ready to go live.

OACCD:
OACCD was held May 13-14: They are actively discussing legislative issues. There was a discussion regarding marijuana. They meet again July 8-9th.

Round Table:
Angie asked Mary if there was an update on the issue of having information fall off kardexes if offenders have too many offenses. Mary said it went in on a ticket. She will find out where they are with that. Mary suggested a possible work around of making screen prints of the display screen; paging down and printing each screen until you've printed all offenses.

Angie asked if others are asking for amended orders if you don't get the sentence guidelines. Answer: Yes.

Angie asked if an offender is on Local Control in another county and not actually in Jail, should that county move the offender from the JAIL LC supv status code to a more appropriate code such as INTX or WKRL? The group agreed, they should be moved to an appropriate code to reflect what is happening with the offender.

Kimberly asked the group what they do when they run out of "other" in conditions. The group discussed several ways to work around the problem, including writing shorthand, filling in as much information as possible, and/or writing see order in just one "other" condition.

Kimberly asked if anyone had an automated pad for Sex offender registration. Answer: No

Shawna asked for suggestions or feedback on the Board section in the manual. She will be reformatting it soon.

Ashley asked for clarification on the REVP condition code. The code reads charged. Should it be convict? If so, can we change the verbiage in CIS to convict on the REVP and INAC long description?

Our next meeting is in on August 13th in Deschutes County.

Meeting adjourned.