STATEWIDE OFFICE OPERATIONS NETWORK
Thursday, October 10, 2013

Hosting Agency: Hood River Community Corrections
Meeting Location: 309 State Street, 2nd floor
Hood River, OR 97031

In attendance: Judy Bell, Benton County; Michael Jackson, Multnomah County; Tausha Terland, Tri-County; Jessica Jauken, Wasco County; Christy Elven, Washington County; Chelo Ramirez, Hood River County; Cathy Snider, OISC; Eric Pointer, OISC; Nola McLennan, Jefferson County; Lisa D Wilcox, Multnomah County; Emma Bouchet, Multnomah County; Shawna Harnden, Parole Board; Mary Hunt, DOC; Lee Cummins, DOC; Kerri Humbert, Douglas County; Ofelia McMenamy, Clackamas County; Diane Ballard, Jackson County; Vicki Wood, Yahmill County; Karen Spieler, Columbia County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Lisa Gilbertson, Multnomah County; Nicole Rickart, Deschutes County; Kari Garcia, Multnomah County.

Welcome & Introductions: The group introduced themselves. Michael thanked Hood River for hosting.

Review Minutes: Shawna – On page 5, the 2nd to last paragraph says something about "only send sanctions to generic email." Those are Morrissey sanctions. This is not the regular sanctions. Morrissey is the hearings officer piece, meaning revocations. Regular sanctions go to Malinda Boyer. Morrissey revocations/hearings questions go to parole board hearings officer email. Also in Shawna's section it says that a request for expiration documents go to Parole Board Records Department (page 6); but they don't. Please send Expiration Certificate requests to Pat Ziegler, not the records desk. Things like old Parole Board Orders or BAFS or something older that has been archived can go to records desk. The section where Shawna talked about INOP time is still a little confusing and she will revise the INOP wording section.

Page 8, Vicki Wood clarified when she said she puts all credit days (like work credit, etc.) as time served; she puts them in an F8 note, not in the credit time served field on the offense line.

Email Decisions: Donna Hemman had a question about predatory sex offender EPRs where she noticed on the bottom of the EPR that it says something about "can't release predatory information" but she thought that an offender being predatory is public information. Michael will follow up with LEDS to find out 'what information' this message refers to that can't be released, what this means, and how/why this was produced onto the EPR.

Jessica Jaukens sent an email regarding a new admission that had never been on Oregon probation before and when she searched his SID in CIS it brought up a Multnomah County record. She talked to Multnomah County and they fixed their record to the correct SID on their record, so she could use the right SID for her guy.

Marion County had a compact offender who was originally to be on supervision until July 2015, but then got instructions to close with a 2013 date. It looked like California is closing early, what closure code would be used on the sentence incoming from California? If sending state is closing early, use EARL? Dawn Persels said in email no, not EARL because we don't know why it's closing early. Someone else suggested DISC (discharge from parole) Dawn agreed DISC would be better. Someone asked if we should use COMP, and many people think COMP is used when returning an offender back to the sending state, not for closing out at the end of supervision. Finding out more information from the sending state to determine if EARL is appropriate would be best, but if that's not possible DISC would be best. Early termination is for probation not parole or PPS so DISC is definitely the one for this example.

Tina asked about a juvenile second look offender who wanted to transfer and wondered how that happens. Second look is conditional release ordered by the court, so Eric Pointer thinks they need to go through court because of the conditions of the release the judge needs to approve the move. You can probably get the okay to transfer from judge. The court still retains jurisdiction.

Christy asked a question regarding expungment: how do counties handle their in-house data base – delete, seal, something else? Christy got some answers via email but many were all different. Is this simply a county by county decision? Michael thought OISC said we need to send and then purge ours; but if it was sent at closing, don't resend - just purge. People agree that it all needs to be purged from databases as well as hard files. Mary talks about how it's a problem when some things are hanging in databases. Mary suggests check with your county counsel, courts, and DA's offices to see how they handle purging data bases. Having any reference anywhere in your office might or might not be damaging. County counsel could help with liability. Nola said they were keeping expungment notices from the court and found out they shouldn't be even keeping those, because it is record that the offenses existed.

Christy had a client who was convicted and sentenced to three years, released on second look, appealed and released with vacate pending trial; therefore, the offender was released from his ICE hold and has not reported. Eric explained a little bit about second look – the I line stays open until the sentence is finished. An offender can stay on second look status forever unless they are not deported or show up for supervision. In this case, second look is moot because the sentence is thrown out. They need to close the I line (OISC does that) with VACA or RSNT code, and it reverts back to the court's jurisdiction. The community corrections office needs to do nothing because OISC is closing the I line and the court has jurisdiction.

Tina had sent an email explaining that per the court order the offender was convicted of Theft I by Receiving, but the ORS on the order doesn't match the ORS in our CIS table. Eric replied (as some had in email) to enter the specific crime. We need to go with the words of crime not the ORS because mistakes are made sometimes. And sometimes when new crimes are added the people responsible for adding those new crimes into

the OJIN table don't always get it done timely; therefore when the clerks are preparing the order they type in the name of the crime and just chose the ORS in their table that is closest. If it makes you more comfortable to confirm, check with your DA. And if the ORS is not in our CIS table, send an email to OISCSUN (dloiscsunusers@doc.state.or.us) to have it added to table if needed.

OISC: Cathy – when OISC set up the sealing email, it was not intended for court orders to be sent via email because they must have the original certified copy of the sealing order. That email was set up to send the closed file materials not the certified sealing order.

Please remember that you don't have to send closed file materials electronically AND send in the US mail – so please do not do both.

The Closing Summary needs to be put on the top. Please train your temporary workers and all support staff who may be doing this work that this is an important procedure.

Eric Pointer – Looking at the minutes on page 9 at the top regarding the M57 discussion and data entry regarding treatment dollars. When OISC looks at judgments to determine if they should be marking those in the offense entry, they look for ORS 137.717 repeat property crimes which is a M57 indicator. OISC marks convicted M57 yes when this ORS is there. Repeat property crime offenders also makes them mark M57. There are very few situations where they mark M57 eligible, but will use if the language of the order says the person is being sentenced for a M57 crime but aren't sentencing on it or departing or not imposing on it.

Nola asked should they be marking yes for M57 in the offense if it's not on the order, but the crime is a M57 crime. Mary answered for community corrections agencies we DO NOT EVER mark M57 (convicted or eligible) *unless the court order specifically states it*. For community corrections agencies please only mark this on the offense if it's on the court order.

The treatment module is different than the offense. For M57 treatment dollars you should be marking it in the treatment module. OISC also does not mark on the offense if there is nothing on the judgment (either M57, repeat property crime offender, or ORS 137.717). That verbiage has to be on the order for OISC to enter it into the offense line.

Nola asked to clarify regarding M57 treatment dollars reports - can you run a report to find out how many people are eligible for the funding dollars? Yes, if you are marking them in the treatment module. DOC (Denise Sitler) monitors counties' funding dollars spending and marked treatment-eligible people (in the treatment module). If these people aren't marked in the module or your county isn't spending on the programs they applied for, there will be a conflict of data and you can expect that Denise may be questioning your county as to the discrepancy.

Eric – reminder if you find a judgment with an ORS that's not in our ORS table in CIS, send an email to OISC on the DL and a TPA will enter it into the table. Don't hesitate to contact OISC if you can't find the exact ORS, and please don't just pick the closest one. They are in the process of adding new ones right now due to changes in legislature, specifically regarding marijuana crimes. Pay close attention to new marijuana crimes because they're changing, and it's getting a little confusing. OISC is changing and adding to their ORS table, but the courts may not be updating as quickly as we are, so be careful and use the crime verbiage instead of the ORS the court provides.

Questions: Judy asked about a judgment reducing the crime of a previous felony conviction to a misdemeanor, it was an I line, will OISC do the data entry to modify the record? Yes, please send the judgment to OISC to the TPS distribution list or OISC SUN email (DLOISCTPS-LEADWORKERS-OISCTPS-LEADWORKERS@doc.state.or.us or DLOISCSUNUsers@doc.state.or.us).

Someone asked on a new DOC sentence, does the court automatically send the judgment to OISC. They should, and most likely do. Then OISC sends it to board. Michael mentioned it is important for community corrections to keep an eye on local control orders and make sure those local control orders get to the board if the offender is also serving DOC sentences.

Cathy asked Shawna to please tell Pat she's doing a fantastic job! Pat is so on top of everything and that's awesome for OISC.

PAROLE BOARD: Shawna wanted to verify that everyone got the new staff roster and indicated that it won't change again for a while.

They have a new board member, Sid Thompson. He comes from OYA and has 20 years criminal justice experience.

Shawna is working on the inactive/re-activate extending email by creating a quick cheat-sheet guide. She will be doing one for PPS and parole as well and will roll out all together when they are finished.

Questions for board: Christy – had client the PO gave a 60-day sanction, the board hearings officer changed the sanction from 60 to 45 days, then the offender was released after the 45 days but the hearings officer/board changed it back to 60 days. The second change (override) doesn't show on the sanction, only in the board notes. Mary explained that the PO updates that on her side because the board doesn't have access to that from their board system. When the board did the second override, did anything get sent to the PO? Only the teletype which is sent to the jail and PO office printer. The FAUG rep can go back in and put to pending and someone at community corrections goes in and puts that override back to 60 days in the override section.

Judy asked about a board release who wasn't showing on her expected arrivals report. Group members gave suggestion as to why it may have happened, including instruction

to check the movement history and audit stamp to see when the movement was actually entered.

Emma from Multnomah County asked about changing teletype location and emails. Send that request to Shawna and she'll revise that. Michael said a lot of that for Multnomah County will be an internal thing. The Board can do it by location, but not by caseload. Lisa from Multnomah County asked about providing a group email and Shawna said that is fine for them. Whatever email you send Shawna she will include. Group emails are great for Shawna and would be great for all of DOC like Compact, etc.

Compact: No one present from Compact, but Ruby said if there is anything for Compact, just send an email.

DOC: Mary -

Mary and Lee are in a new location, and she sent an email with their new phone numbers. She and Lee are currently housed on the Oregon State Prison campus in the middle house on the right with Interstate Compact/Extraditions. She lost a lot of data/emails relating to SOON and other user groups during the move.

Mary sent a question this week on the DL regarding OJIN access. Thank you for your responses. Mary was asked to compile this information for her IT staff. The group that monitors OJIN profiles has changed within DOC. IT wondered why they are responsible for overseeing this county-level access. The only answer was "Because it's always been done that way." Counties have the option of not using the DOC profile. If it starts with DOC (ex: doclin01) it's a profile assigned to DOC and then divvied out. Some counties just went directly to OJIN for profiles. DOC may change the oversight of community corrections' OJIN access and have counties getting their own profiles. Clackamas, Douglas, Jackson, Jefferson, Klamath, Lake, and Washington use their own profiles. There will be no impact for those offices. There were a few counties that Mary didn't hear back from. But most of the counties she heard from appear to be using the same profiles as listed on her old 2001 list.

OACCD reports committee met yesterday. They are facing a huge undertaking. They've made it through management statistic reports and have identified five that the group feels are not beneficial and may be eliminated. IT will run a usage query to see if anyone is using those. They want all reports to have the option to run by specific caseload or by location. They want the options for summary and detail on every one. They will remove the print overnight option, but everything will have print or display option. Most reports will add risk level information (maybe on detail report to sort by level). These are the initial standards that every report will have. In the fee system at the end of the report where there is a summary and a definition section – they want to add definitions to all reports.

The group has asked to do one big service request with all changes, but Mary can't do that. Mary may need to put in individual service requests for each report or it may be

possible to group some of the reports together. It will also depend on whether they're going to make changes to existing reports or creating brand new reports. Before deleting a report the committee will go to each group to check for objections. Some reports are really, really old.
Right now we can get misdemeanant data from CMIS (data warehouse) and hoping for more comprehensive reports from there. There is a need for PSC reports.

Mary explained to the group that you don't have to be on the committee to offer suggestions or concerns. Just send Mary an email if you have input.

The newest committee Mary has joined is regarding HB3194, earned discharge. She has been asked to assist with putting together the rule used for managing this new bill and enter a service request for a new termination code. Parts of HB3194 went into effect August 1, 2013. Felony crimes sentenced to felony probation or local control on or after August 1, 2013 are eligible for reduction in the term of supervision. The offender must serve at least six months of their supervision sentence and cannot serve less than half their supervision sentence. The committee is recommending POs use a form similar to the inactive probation form used currently. A report/form will need to be done on each sentence as it becomes eligible. We will be able to do a closure code either on an individual sentence or the whole body just like INPR, except that unlike INPR it will not be an outcount, but a permanent closure. Mary has submitted the request to have the new closure code (called EDIS for Earned Discharge) created .

Review reports will be sent on these monthly. It will be like the INPR report - just because they're on the report doesn't mean they automatically qualify. The PO will have to review the case/offender to see if it's eligible. There will be a checklist for POs to follow. Discharging either a sentence or body means full-on discharge. There is no coming back to "active." This type of discharge is a full-fledged discharge of either just one sentence or a full body closure. Misdemeanors aren't qualified for earned discharge. When an offender is given earned discharge on a case your office will notify the Court and the DA. Under HB3194, the decision is up to the local supervisory authority on both felony probation and local control cases whether or not to give the earned discharge. This doesn't make INPR go away or any other early closure types. OACCD should have the procedures (Oregon Administrative Rule) in place by the time we get to six months past the origination date (August 1, 2013).

Michael asked about putting edits on the closure code so it can't be used wrong. Judy asked will this document go to OISC? It's an early termination document and most in the group believe OISC will want it because they want similar documents. Someone mentioned it would probably only go to OISC if it's approved, not if it's denied. Cathy thinks OISC would probably want it. Dianne Erickson can make the final decision and then will add this to their documents list in the OPS manual.

The checklist/form has to be done with recommendation to discharge or not. It will have to be done either way and signed off by the supervisor. The supervisor makes the final

recommendation whether to discharge or not. If an offender qualifies completely they should be discharged – this is a budgeting issue.
Mary will get the information to confirm that local control cases under board authority are not eligible. These probably don't qualify. Felony probation with board cases can be done (just the probation sentence, not the body).

Jessica asked if this is based on conviction date or crime date. Mary answered the language is "sentenced" date.

All of what Mary is talking about regarding earned discharge is an explanation of what has been recommended – but no final decisions have been made. This is just to give the SOON group an overview of what is coming and some ideas of how things might go.

DOC: Lee –

OACCD had an I-learn presentation (training tool). The I-learn presentation was just informational; the infrastructure for its use is not set up yet. There is a meeting set for later this month regarding setting up accounts for DOC, to review legal liability, to discuss curriculum, etc. There is still much to be decided and agreed upon before it can be used the way DOC is intending. Eventually counties will have access to all this. Please don't go in and create an I-learn account until it's time. Once an account is created, your profile will follow you from location to location, and can track all your training records, send reminder emails, etc.

Risk assessment workgroup: There are a few small updates. They are still working on several issues. Policy overrides – OACCD has determined policy overrides can't be used as a placeholder waiting for the special assessment to be done (like LS/CMI). Your county must have a policy in order for a PO to use the 'policy' override. A list of county policy examples went out. The website data is updated monthly vs. CIS updated nightly - this is still the same, which can make different scores between the two sites. The committee wants consistency and they've determined a way to get that online database updated nightly, but we're waiting for technical details to be worked out.

PSC cutoff scores are going to be relooked at. When initial scores were set for each level, CJC looked at the entire population of offenders in CIS. This population included outcounts, which wasn't a real representation because statuses like abscond were overridden to low. They relooked at everything based on the supervised population and the score levels changed slightly. And they may change those levels. OACCD is taking that to the executive committee. The OJIN FAPA variable was removed. They found that data was not always very accurate, in part because it was only updated quarterly into the PCS database. They found that the FAPA data only affected about 2 percent of scores anyway, so they agreed to remove it. Lee sent list of offenders' scores that changed. It's up to the counties to do a new PSC, but it's not mandated.

OTTO was put on hold and might be back on the programmer's table relatively soon. When we get to the testing point, some SOON members, as well as FAUG members, will be asked to test. There is lots of potential usage for OTTO.

Editing in OCMS program had a strange issue. Programmers found another county could do an override on an offender in a different county, but didn't have authority to remove it. Lee put in a ticket so that you cannot change or override a PSC score for an offender supervised by a different county.

There are lots of offenders still with old OCMS assessment scores. There is no reminder in the system that a reassessment is due. They ran a query on all offenders not in institution, discharged, nor on outcounts, and found 2898 active supervised offenders still with an OCMS score with no PSC score. That may go out to the counties for cleanup. Possibly when OTTO comes on board it will notify that the PSC will need to be done.

DOC: Service Requests – no updates.

OPS related issues:

LEDS/WebLEDS – Karen from Columbia County had an offender with a no contact minor males on the EPR, PO wanted it removed, when Karen did the XN mask it wouldn't remove it. When entered SC4 it comes up no contact minor males not what it really is. SC3 and SC4 have changed on the Board side but the LEDS side didn't change. So it was difficult to remove because she didn't know what the original entry was. Michael will send LEDS an email to see what it shows on their end, and see if they have a separate table that they maintain rather than just pulling from the CIS table. [**Post Note:** Michael followed up with LEDS and they have made the changes to SC3 & SC4. The new language for each will be: SC3 – No contact with minors, SC4 – Prohibited Locations Minors Use.]

Kerri verified and we confirmed in CIS to use only probation conditions for probation cases and PPS conditions (SC) for PPS.

Judy brought up height and weight limits for LEDS. She learned through a question that Sue Blanchard had that LEDS has limits regarding height and weight. If your offender falls outside those limits, just use the highest or lowest limit closest to the real information and put the exact measurements in the MIS field.

Christy was entering conditions in an EPR; she entered SC11 (no contact victim) then typed in a name for the no contact, but only the first name printed out. Michael had something similar where the full phone number wasn't being pulled in and he could never figure out what was wrong. Michael thought if it wasn't happening every time but only on certain entries, the user should stop as soon as they notice the problem and contact the LEDS helpdesk right away so they can look at the problem as it is occurring.

Jessica – received a transfer from Hood River, and the EPR was there. Then the offender had new charges, so she added more conditions. Then the offender had LE contact, but LE found no EPR. Jessica ran a QW and QWHD and found nothing. She did find it all by looking it up by the offender's SSN. Karen talked about a discrepancy with warrant having "JR" and the EPR not having the "JR" so they weren't matching up. Some other counties found occasional glitches. Michael recommends the user contact the LEDS helpdesk right as you're dealing with the issue before you fix it so that they can see what's happening. Don't cancel and recreate first before you call the helpdesk.

Vicki reminded the group that we should be using QLW not QW. She was told that during an audit because the QW runs outside of Oregon as well as Oregon.

OPS manual: Has not met since the last SOON. They will meet again in December. Please pay attention to new chapters coming out, and get them out to staff and keep your manuals updated. Lee brought up the question of archiving chapters and minutes. This will be discussed at the next meeting. If anyone in the SOON group has suggestions or questions or you want to join the manual committee – please do!

Local control: Shawna had a question – do counties enter crime commit date when they enter the local control sentence? Some do, some don't. There isn't a place for it on the first entry screen, but after it's entered you go back to enter that crime date. The board WANTS that! It makes a big difference to the board. Shawna asked to please start entering that data. It would be really helpful. This isn't a hard and fast request, but this data is very helpful to them. There are lots of pieces on the Board side that this data effects.

Judy brought up the reminder please DON'T ENTER STRAIGHT JAIL as a local control sentence. This affects a lot of data, including funding. If you are not clear as to whether a felony jail sentence with no PPS is straight jail, please contact your DA's office and confirm.

Other OPS related issues: None

Tabled Discussions: None (next time manual retention).

User groups:

SUN – no update. New system not available yet. Douglas and Linn (state agencies) should not use the new automated forms available to them when requesting a ticket to a Super User, because the SUN user doesn't see that yet.

FAUG – met August 21 and 22. Heidi Stetson delivered the same presentation that she's done for SOON. Meeting again November 13 & 14 in Multnomah County.

SOSN – is meeting October 22 and 23 in Astoria.

FSN – meets again October 24 in Washington County.

OACCD – met last in Bend – had I-learn presentation, reviewed HB3194, will meet again Nov 21 and 22 in Eugene.

Judy asked members to please consider being co-chair of this SOON group as a minute taker. Judy's last month is April 2014.

Scheduled 2014 meeting locations: February – Marion County, April – Jefferson County, June – Coos County, August – Lincoln County, October - Jackson County, and December – Yamhill County.

Next SOON meeting is scheduled for December 12 in Clackamas County. Heidi Stetson offered tour of the OSP forensic lab.

Roundtable: Jessica Jaukens – is wondering about community service in different counties, which do and don't take referrals regarding supervised/not supervised. Michael recommends she send an email to the SOON group. Jessica will compile the answers and share that with the group.

Chelo – Hood River hired a new corrections staff because Chelo became a PO. The new staff member may begin attending SOON meetings.

Eric – had a question for Lee/OACCD and subgroups regarding HB3194 – is there a group for re-entry courts, where the court has concurrent jurisdiction with parole board? Lee answered there is no group for that yet. Lee suggests since Chris Hoy of Clackamas is the president of OACCD check in with him for help with that.

Nola has a new staff assistant starting November 1. Terri Chandler.

Emma – Multnomah County is changing SOON reps.

Clackamas also has changes and new SOON reps will be coming to meetings; they will be rotating meetings.

Meeting adjourned.