SOON Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2009
Yamhill County

Present: Karen Spieler, Columbia County; Deana Barry, Union/Wallowa County; Kathy; Diane Ballard, Jackson County; Charlene Rapley, Josephine County; Char McCarthy, DOC/Community Corrections; Vicki Wood, Yamhill County; Shannon Miller, Yamhill County; Lee Cummins, DOC; Christy Elven, Washington County; Mary Hunt, DOC; Judy Morrison, DOC; Kimberly Losada, Clatsop County; Susanna Schindler, Marion County, Michael Jackson, Marion County, Judy Dunn, Marion County; Shelby Ann Russell, Marion County, Toni Puckett, Clackamas County, Susan Taylor, Clackamas County, Jennifer Martinez, Clackamas County; Carolyn Knox, Lincoln County; Patty Arrington, Umatilla County; Lisa Gilbertson, Multnomah County; Sandee Norman, Multnomah County; Kyle Page, OISC; Sharie VanWells, OISC; Tami Sharp, OISC; Sue Blanchard, Lane County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Kim Rossotto, Douglas County; Donna Hemman, Polk County; Karen Rhein, Multnomah County

Introductions/Welcome:

Donna Hemman, Polk County brought the meeting to order and updated the group on a few housekeeping items. Vicki Wood welcomed the group to Yamhill County. Thank you for coming this is a great turnout. Ted Smietana is in interviews this morning and will stop by later in the morning to welcome the group.

A card was circulated for Sharon Johnson, who is dealing with a serious family illness.

Donna reviewed the process for the meeting: It is a pretty long agenda and with the weather like it is, we all are probably anxious to get back. She will be a harsh taskmaster in that if a discussion is going on too long she will ask the group to move on. Also, when you have an OPS related question between meetings, and it could be answered via E-mail, please shoot the E-mail to the entire group. It would really help save us some time at the meetings.

Karen thanked Donna for volunteering to facilitate the December meeting. Brenda Borders has resigned from her community corrections position and has taken a promotion with the Sheriff's office. Brenda is no longer going able to participate in the meeting as co-chair. We will need a new co-chair. We are looking for volunteers today. It has been a pleasure working with Brenda and we wish her all the best in her new position. Karen stated it has been great this past year for her as a new co-chair, and has been an invaluable learning experience. So, some of the people who are newer to the group, don't be afraid to volunteer. There are a lot of people here to support you. The rotation would be another year for Karen and 2 years for the new co-chair and then next December, we will select another co-chair. So if you are interested contact Karen or Donna.

As co-chairs are there a lot of other meetings to attend? No. The SOON group only meets six times a year. Karen stated she also participates on the manual committee and Brenda was a member of SUN, but co-chairs are not required to participate in either of those groups. Vicki Wood continues to attend the Automation Committee meetings for SOON.

Karen stated other than the manual committee she has not participated in other statewide committees. Some former co-chairs who were assigned a statewide group as part of their regular job have continued with those groups.

Donna stated while Tina and she were co-chairs she focused on the six SOON meetings a year for the two year term, because there is enough to do facilitating and minutes taking and it worked out really, really well.

Karen stated when Brenda and she took over, they agreed one person would take minutes and the other facilitated and they switched every other meeting, so it was not one full year of taking minutes and one full year of facilitating, it kind of gradually helped you assimilate. For them, it worked. So it could be arranged to best suit the person volunteering and be based on their strengths.

Review/Additions/Corrections to Minutes:
Are there any additions or corrections to the last minutes?

Mary stated she has corrections: On page 1, on the issue of the EN supplemental... in the first sentence, it says, Mary talked with Kevin Potter. I never talked with Kevin Potter. I talked to Darryl Hecht and he is the one who spoke with Kevin Potter. Darryl is the WebLEDS Administrator for DOC and our conduit to Kevin. We go to Darryl and Darryl goes to Kevin. The rest of that section is okay except that Darryl is not working with Kevin on a process to notify the Department of Corrections, he is working with the Department of Corrections IT to develop a process to notify you, the end users, when changes occur in WebLEDS. Kevin already works closely with IT and lets them know every time he is doing an update. What is happening is the DOC IT shop has not in the past sent the update information out to end users. So Darryl is working on that piece to see if he can make it a cleaner process. We don't want the end users surprised when updates come through and all of a sudden something is not working. And Darryl's name is being spelled wrong. It is D-A-R-R-Y-L.

No further corrections

E-mail decisions:
SO Registration and discharges: Did anybody have any questions about Dawn's response? It appears we will continue to send the notice of discharges. Christie stated Pat and Dawn emailed the Washington County SOSN representative. Thursday, at the ESL meeting, the NOD forms were brought up and the process or distribution was discussed. The consensus of the group was, to send the forms for the predatory offenders only as this is the statutory requirement. Vi Beatty at OSP will notify her staff of the change in the process. Christy will send a copy of the SOSN response to Karen for inclusion in the minutes.

Death Notices:
The group discussed who death notices are sent to and when? Is a death notice the same as a

closing summary or death certificate? Kyle stated are we talking about a death certificate or just a death notice? Kyle stated OISC do get documents that say closed due to death. If they are not inmates then it is less important to us to know that information. OISC will keep the death notice and store it. Mindie stated Multnomah County sends them to the judges and to the parole board sometimes, depending on if they were still on supervision.

The Parole Board is notified with closure notice on Parolees on Abscond status that have died and then the closing summary is sent to OISC. If the Board receives a copy of the death certificate, they in turn will send the county of record the expiration notice and copy OISC.

Donna stated the question was, "Do we need to send notification of death if they are on discharge status?" Kyle stated it is not necessary. Christy stated she sends the death certificate to the Board; the Board then E-mails her a copy of the expiration notice.

WebLEDS Update:

Donna recommended we move on to the WebLEDS update when Dan Malin, LEDS Auditor and his boss, Director Terry O'Connell arrived.

Dan replaced Clancy Griffith, who was the LEDS auditor for 16 years. Dan is currently in the first year of a three year audit cycle and has completed audits on 11 counties this year. They will see how the coming year goes in terms of audits, budgets and resources. Dan had put together an audit plan that encompassed the 3 years (2009-2011), but right now his travel is restricted to those areas that can be reached by car within a day. Dan said it would be nice to see those in the Eastern part of the state, but he doesn't know when that might happen. For the first 6 months of 2010, he will be focusing on Marion, Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington and Lane Counties. Those are the ones he can reach in a day. He has completed Benton and Linn and Tillamook, and a few counties over in Eastern Oregon. He was able to get down to Curry County before his travel was restricted and just finished Yamhill County. It has been a pretty good year for audits. Community Corrections and parole and probation agencies use LEDS uniquely and differently than the Sheriff's office, courts, and the DA's offices. Community Corrections agencies typically run inquiries on CCH and enter EPR records. NCIC will not perform an audit on your agency because the Oregon EPR records do not reside in NCIC. They could reside in NCIC and in fact some states do enter their supervision records in NCIC. When performing an audit I look at the same for all agencies: Training; security; and use of LEDS for criminal histories.

OSP just completed their 2009 NCIC audit in January 2009. Dan has outlined his audit program more in line with how they handle their audits and learned quite a bit from their processes. So, now when he comes out, he sends a CCH survey with the advance audit letter and asks agencies, from a certain number of randomly selected CCH runs, to give me the reason the person was run. For many agencies this isn't a difficult task. Most of the runs will have been within the last 30 days, so you were checking one of your clients or someone was leaving supervision or they were being revoked or whatever the case might be, it is pretty easy to determine.

Dan also work with the Sheriff's office to review extraditable warrant records, protection orders

and audit missing person records. These are three record types NCIC puts emphasis on which reside in NCIC as well as LEDS. There have been a few folks who have recently gone through the audit process and thought it was painless. The emphasis is to make sure employees are completing their re-certifications and that staff with access to CJIS secure data have been fingerprinted. We also ensure agencies are properly shredding LEDS materials.

When I complete an audit I now provide a written summary outlining the audit. Previously I would brief the LEDS representative and then send a letter to your administrator. Well, I found a number of administrators would what does that mean? I do not really understand what being out of compliance means." I now provide an assessment form at the end of the audit. It covers all of the audit areas for the agency. It details areas of compliance and provides an explanation of the issue provides an update on areas which are within compliance.

Some of the other changes which occurred as part of the NCIC audit specifically deal with the LEDS training office. NCIC advised us the recertification compendium process does not meet NCIC's re-certification requirements. The retesting should be part of the process and not just reading the compendium and signing the attached form. Kristine Hume-Bustos, our training manager, is working on the 2011 recertification training and testing. It will consist of the compendium and approximately ten to twelve questions which will be reviewed and answered to a certain level of satisfaction in order to meet NCIC's retesting requirement. The other issue was the timeframe we have allowed for the recertification process. Oregon's recertification window falls outside of the 2 year period, NCIC would like us move inside the 2 year period. So instead of a recertification window that starts in January, it might actually start at a different time of the year, but within the 2 year cycle of your initial certification or your last recertification. In the existing process a person might actually go 2 years and 3 months before they complete their recertification. NCIC stated after the 2 years has lapsed, staff are no longer certified. So, we are looking at the recertification window. Additionally, NCIC also felt the 6 month recertification window we have offered is too much time and have requested the timeline be no more than one month. We are negotiating for a two month window for recertification. This will place the responsibility on the LEDS Rep to ensure the recertification is completed in a timely manner. NCIC also would like to have LEDS turn off staff access to LEDS and NCIC when they do not complete the recertification. We have things set up so the agencies control the access to their systems and we would actually prefer for it to remain that way. LEDS Training staff will be putting in place some quality assurance steps to ensure agencies have done their recertification. The training staff will communicate with the LEDS Rep to identify those who have not completed the recertification.

LEDS operations center manager, Margaret Gregg, is retiring after many years of service. They will be looking for a replacement for her to run our LEDS and LEDS help desk and OERS, Oregon Emergency Response System Operations Center. That is a principle executive management lead position.

Within the last 6 weeks LEDS installed a new message switch. It was probably transparent to everybody, but it was a considerable amount of work and effort for Steve Hathaway. The switch

is a critical part of the LEDS system and provides our connectivity through NLETS to NCIC. Jaime Badow is working with the courts, and the Sheriff's offices around the state on a Violence Against Women Act grant to ensure the no contact orders are entered upon release of the offender from jail. Jaime is working hard to protect victims of domestic violence. We will be hiring a limited duration trainer that is going to be working with Jaime to go around to the Sheriffs' offices and the courts to provide training on entering protection orders.

RTP Code Discussion:

The group discussed the possibility of extending the DOE field while waiting for a sentence to be extended during a revocation process. Dan stated he and Terry O'Connell discussed allowing the PPO to extend to 60 days or possibly creating a new RTP code to ensure the record would not expire from the system. Dan stated the easier solution would to modify the expiration date based on the PPO submitting a written report to the court. This would give community corrections authority to extend the DOE. However, it would be necessary to include officer contact information in the miscellaneous field and a phrase such as "pending revocation/extension". Char stated she used to modify to the court date and enter the PV pending in the miscellaneous field. Vicki Wood will take this issue to the Automation Committee meeting in January. Dan stated there is no validation process for abscond records and the records remain in the system until the status is updated. This could become an issue in the future if a new pending revocation code is created to work like the abscond code. Staff would need to be very diligent in updating and maintaining these records. Dan cautioned the group about creating a new code as these types of records would also remain in the systems until the status is updated. Dan encouraged LEDS Reps to contact operations center to request a list of EPR records if they are reviewing records. If you wanted any type of list of your offenders please contact them. The Operations Center contact information is: 503-378-5565.

Donna stated she checks all her abscond records twice a year. Is this still a county practice? OACCD has recommended counties review all absconds twice a year.

Lee stated the Automation Committee should review any request for a new status code, and Vicki Wood stated it would be best if SOON presented one recommendation to the committee. There was consensus by the group to ask for a new RTP code of PVP, change the RTP to PVP, and extend the DOE to expire in 60 to 90 days. PVP would NOT be the same as ABS. Dan stated once there is a decision LEDS would like a letter outlining the changes and notification of a start date. Donna suggested we extend the DOE and utilize the miscellaneous field to note the change in status. There was consensus to extend DOE and update the miscellaneous field with the pertinent information. Vicky will take the request for a new PVP status code to the automation committee.

Conditions added to an EPR:

Dan stated when he is reviewing EPR records and sees conditions entered he has words of high praise for those agencies. This provides additional information for law enforcement officer and may assist them when in contact with an offender and may give the officer the opportunity to include his contact in the police report. It is an optional field and not a required field or utilized

as part of the audit process. Dan stated when reviewing the records it does appear the records are more complete. Just one more note on the importance of conditions. Protection orders entered on a person for a no weapon condition: if the correct code is entered it generates an automatic notifier, which means the person is prohibited from purchasing a weapon even when in another state.

There was discussion on entry of EPRs and receiving a duplicate record message. Is there a way to search by OCA field? You can run a QLW by OCA. The group agreed to try it. Terry stated you can also contact the HelpDesk and they can assist you. Karen stated she was trying to enter a record and called the HelpDesk for assistance. The Helpdesk was able to see the transactions and actually run the same transaction while they were on the phone. At the same time, they will be looking at the reject message to determine if it is a database issue or a record issue. The LEDS HelpDesk have been very helpful in assisting Community Corrections.

DOC – CC Update – Mary Hunt/Lee Cummins

Mary wanted to start with the question she received related to the Supervision distribution report: – What are the hours listed at the end of the report? These are the supervision level hours, based on risk and the information is no longer valid. OACCD has requested the data be removed from the report. Mary did receive some emails from a few counties stating their office use the reports to assign caseloads. After the 2007 time study it was determined the caseload hours were lower than they were before and the data on the reports is no longer accurate, and the directors do not want the data to remain in the system. If your director is not in favor of the proposed changes to the report, they should take it to the Automation Committee via their representatives.

Movement History Maintenance:

Mary stated we are experiencing issues with some of the data on the movement history maintenance screen. The County Inmate movements (SB1145 lines) and Sanction movements (SANC lines) are either duplicating or not displaying at all. There has also been a problem with the F10 print function from the Movement History, in that it doesn't always print what is displayed. The F10 printing has been an issue for some time. It was fixed for a short while, but didn't stay fixed and is not working at this time. Sue Blanchard stated that when the F10 print works, the display does not Dave Wells has been working on it and will continue to work on resolving the problem. Mary tested last evening on some of the examples Tina Shippey had sent to the Help desk and the display was working, but the F10 print was duplicating lines again. If you are experiencing a problem, do not immediately begin removing data and re entering the data. Do not report the issue if you have a pending Helpdesk ticket. Call the HelpDesk if new issues arise which are related to the movement history, county inmate movement, or the sanction movement. Reminder: If the basic data is correct and the inmate movement is correct do not back out any of the data - just report it to the HelpDesk.

SR1226 – Duplicate Records/Merge:

The last part of merging records went into production a little while ago. We agreed to retire the service request to allow DOC to work with all the departments within DOC to capture as much information as possible prior to purging any records. The super user's (SUN) can now auto

merge more pieces of the community records. There are 10 programs the super users can now auto merge. A report was also created which can be run on an individual offender and will list all programs where data is stored. This was sent out to the super users to test. The super user can run the report, do the auto merge and provide a copy of the report to the end user. The end user then would manually enter any other data prior to a record being permanently purged. The report will flag the programs that will be included in the auto merge. If a program is not flagged, it will need to be manually entered by the user. Mary asked the group if it would be helpful to have the report available to the end user before they submit a merge/purge request to the super user. Or do you want the super user to run the report and complete the auto merge first? How will the end user know which records are auto merged? The report identifies ten programs which auto merges. The group suggested an **asterisk** (*****) be added next to the program that would indicate to the end user this is an auto merge program. Consensus is the Merge Report will be provided to the users. **Mary will ask the manual committee to update the manual with the list of auto merge programs.** Donna stated the next manual committee meeting is in February. Mary will send this out to a couple of other super users to test as well. The report will be added to the Total office Caseload report menu if there is enough room.

Drug Testing Labs:

Lee stated she had a question for the group. What laboratories are used for drug testing? DOC is asking for a program to auto download testing results. DOC has no idea how many labs are utilized across the state. What other laboratories may possibly be used by other counties for drug testing results? Most counties utilize Redwood or Legacy, Quest. Redwood already has internet reporting capability.

CIS ReWrite – Lee Cummins:

DOC IT is looking at the NCOMS – National Consortium for Offender Management Systems - as a possible option for the CIS replacement. NCOMS' estimated cost is approximately 2-4 million dollars and IT feels there's a 75-85% chance it could be a good option for the CIS replacement. It has a fairly robust probation and parole module and also a medical records module. At this time, IT does not know if they have the money for NCOMS, but is still looking at possibly testing the system and allowing some community users to test. Oregon is a member of the consortium, but at this time we are not a participating member. Mindie Everett asked if it would allow for electronic file storage and allow us to move from the paper files. Lee stated she is not sure whether it has the capability. Donna wanted to know how many states are utilizing the program. Lee stated approximately 6-8 states are utilizing this for community corrections.

.

Welcome – Ted Smietana, Director:

Ted welcomed the group to Yamhill County and thanked us for traveling to McMinnville for the meeting. He hopes we all enjoy our stay in Yamhill County.

Lee stated that she and Mary have been going out to different county offices, and Vicki and Ted allowed them to visit the Yamhill County office. The hope is to get out to other offices and see what's going on in the field.

CC Training Tutorials –Lee Cummins:
Lee stated she has been working with Char and Judy to update the tutorials. There have never been any tutorials for the support modules. Judy is going to update some of the old FAUG tutorials. Char is here to demo the Admissions tutorial. Char stated Judy assisted with the admission tutorial. Thank you very much to Judy and Char.

To access the tutorials type Menu CCTRAIN on the selection line. Once you're on the menu, page down and up to see the list of available tutorials and make your selection. Char has currently completed the admission tutorial for SOON. The tutorial is automatically set to go at a specific speed while it pages forward. If you want to move forward faster and not wait, you can press the enter key at any time. Lee suggested ten seconds may be too fast for the auto forward and we may want to slow it down, as most staff utilizing the modules will be fairly new to the system. You can use F6=Pause at any time and/or F7=Rewind and F8=Fast Forward while in the tutorial. The rewind goes back one page at a time and will require the user to stop it where they want by pressing F6. F5=Play will resume at the normal system speed. There will also be a reference to the manual section included in each of the training modules. Lee stated when FAUG first saw the tutorials they were very excited.

The work group will coordinate with Char and Judy to test and update the tutorials. Char would like a list of other modules to add to the training tutorials. Char would like to know from the group how to prioritize the modules. Char will ask the work group to review the Admissions and the Fee tutorials. Mindie asked if there was a possibility of having a tutorial for some of the Multnomah County modules. A person asked if a tutorial can be developed on modifying an EPR. EPRs and DOC/CIS are two different systems and this cannot be done. The WebLEDS manual does have a section on modifying EPRs.

Donna asked Char what was on her list as a priority for tutorials. The basics for new users would be great. The following were suggested: Transfers, releases, closures, movement history, and possibly Local Control were the priority.

The following group members are participating on the workgroup:
Vicki Fisher
Karen Rhein
Lisa Gilbertson
Margaret Hill
Tina Potter

Anyone can try the tutorials and email feedback to Char and Judy. Also anyone who wants to test the LC tutorial, please volunteer for this one: Donna, Karen Speiler, Jennifer Adamske, Sue Blanchard, Susan Taylor and Vicki Wood volunteered to test the LC tutorial. If you have someone in your office who is interested in working on a particular tutorial email Char McCarthy. If you have a star PPO who may be interested email Judy Morrison. Lee stated those on the workgroup will be reviewing and approving the tutorials prior to final release. Lee stated

we are grateful to have Char and Judy to work on updating and creating the tutorials for the end users. Awesome job, thank you both so much!

Merge Report – CC Menu –Mary Hunt:
Mary provided a demo of the report so the group could view it and see the different programs which will auto merge data.

OISC/Institution Records- Kyle Page - Sharie VanWells – Sheila Lang – Eric Pointer
Kyle asked if any one is new to sending electronic file records. If you are just starting to send files electronically please send an email or call Kyle and he would be happy to assist you.

Kyle provided an update on the immediate releases due to HB3508. They have finished the majority of the releases. OISC will be hiring some new staff and Merilee will be providing training and will be out of the loop during this time.

Update: OISC will not need the death certificates for offenders on discharge. If an inmate dies while in custody they do require documentation. The Board certificate is already being sent from the board and does not have to be sent by the community supervision offices. All closed file material is still sent to Central Records.

Sealed Records:
What is the process in each county for sealing electronic and paper files? It does not need to also be sent to OISC when sealed. Sealed records should be sealed and kept in a locked cabinet. It requires a court order to seal and unseal a record as allowed in ORS 137.225. The court can also order that only specific convictions be sealed, not necessarily the entire record and/or file. Staff would then need to pull the specific file material related to the record and lock it in a secure cabinet. Kyle stated there could be a petition to reopen a sealed record or file. Currently OISC treats sealed, set aside and expunged records the same, removing and sealing them from release. Karen Spieler just received a court order to seal and has never done one. If the court order states specifically to shred you must shred. If it is in any way vague, you should seal the record in an envelope in secure cabinet. Kyle will follow up with Cathy Snider to determine the OISC process. Once the record/file is sealed the retention schedule is changed as it is no longer a felony.

Corrections File Material:
Kyle stated on occasions additional corrections file material arrives at OISC. If you come across a file where the file material is not very legible, please print the SID# on the first page, top right corner. When OISC goes to publish it makes it easier to batch the records according to the SID number.
Be sure to let them know in your email when you are sending separate documents so they are not batch scanned as one offender file. When sending more than one person's information electronically, please note in the subject field you are doing so.

Auto Closure:

Sharie stated OISC is working with the Release Services Manager and his staff on an auto closure for arson designators. Shari asked the group how many of these they are seeing and how bothersome they are. OISC will keep SOON updated on the progress of the auto-closure programming. Lee stated there are some designators, which are necessary and should not be closed, PSO, SVDO and a few others. Some would auto close at the end of a body closure.

Sharie stated the M57 entry on an I Line was caught by OISC and they weren't sure who made that entry. The system should show the userID on the audit stamp. Sharie stated it could be an isolated incident. Sharie and Lee will look into the issue. Lee asked if anyone had seen the double audit stamp. Lee stated the first audit stamp is the first person who entered the record and the second is the last person who updated entry. Joyce will be changed the titles next to each of the audit stamps to: created and updated.

Admits pending:

Sharie stated they would like an update on practice for when an inmate is released to the field for field admission. Is it a body admission to the field office when you actually see the offender? Sharie asked when the admission takes place. Donna stated technically we are supervising even though the body is not there. There are not a lot of these records; we have four right now from 2008. Sharie asked if it would be okay to call the SOON rep and request the SOON representative take a look at the record? Yes, the group agreed contacting the SOON representative would be appropriate. Mary stated when the offender remains in the admit pending status it adversely impacts research and the institutions. When an inmate is released, the supervising office should be admitting the offender on the day of the release. Compacts and Trans leave admissions would be the only exceptions. Lee stated there have been programming issues in the past where these older files just show as never having been admitted. It may be a merge file which did not fully merge. Run your expected arrivals report for your county and L location when you return to your offices and see what shows up. If something looks odd give Mary or Lee a call.

Violation and Sanction Form:

Tami had a question on the violation and structured sanction form. The institution uses the information to deny credit for time served. Recently had an inmate who had a 20 day probation sanction and was released, did not complete the sanction. In the meantime, he committed a new crime and when he was picked up the remainder of sanction began in the sanction movement screen. Lee stated in the sanction movement screen there is a start and stop function. Donna suggested the issue be taken to the FAUG group. Lee stated there was a FAUG sub-group working on the sanctions module and they are trying to rework the program. Lee reminded everyone the sanction form is the recommendation and not necessarily the sanction imposed or what occurred at the jail. When entering sanction movements (actual servitude), be sure to use both a date and time. Sometimes when the "time" is missing, the SANC movement won't display on the Movement History screen.

Donna asked if anyone from the group had questions for OISC. Christy stated she had a question on a case with two sentences which are consecutive. One is 13 month and the other is for seven

months. Would they be entered separately or on the "I" line? When the court orders a DOC sentence to be served consecutively to a felony county sentence that is imposed in the same proceeding, the person must serve the entire county sentence and the DOC sentence in DOC custody and OISC will enter an "I" line.

Parole Board:

Mary stated there have been questions still on the LC/PPS, ASR/SSR reports. FAUG asked what type of cases are excluded from the reports? The following are excluded from the reports; Outstanding parole board warrant, compact out, or a died action code. The compact out are not allowed to go to unsupervised status. Then there is also OAR 255 094 005 – the rule which covers the period of active parole and post prison supervision for certain crimes. In effect it states these offenders who have been convicted of a listed crime shall serve active supervision until the determinate sentence. These offenders do not qualify for inactive (UNSU) supervision. There is no programming to exclude all of those impacted by the OAR from the report because it is not just crime but also based on the convicted date. When the parole board initially reviews the crime and date of conviction they immediately set the ASR/SSR date to the maximum date on the Board order and in their system.

These offenders will still show on the report even though technically excluded, but the Board does not expect a letter to extend on their cases. If the PO looks at the order and the ASR/SSR date already matches the max date there is no need to send the extend letter unless there are other circumstances which warrant an extension. Mindie wondered if there was any discussion on a field in DOC to indicate when the case should be closed to inactive (UNSU) status. Lee stated when we were in discussions around the rewrite we considered it. Any time there is a manual entry field it can create problems in other screens, such as InOp time, etc. Every office would have to enter the data if a new field were created. The only way to make it work for the report would be to have everyone be consistent and enter the data.

DOC may run a query to determine how many offenders should have remained on active status and did not, and how many should be on inactive (UNSU) status and are not.

Clackamas is maintaining a spreadsheet to track the ASR dates and are reviewing monthly. It does require you go through all your files and check the ASR dates. Mary included this in the email to the FAUG reps and asked if they were pushing out the ASR/SSR dates? Christy asked Mary if there is a way the Board can run a report to do a comparison on the review dates. Mary stated she will ask Shawn to take a look at it and get back to the group. Mary will forward the email she sent to FAUG to the SOON representatives.

Compact – Mary Hunt

Mark Cadotte sent an email to the directors regarding the new Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) on the compact application fee. A copy of the OAR was distributed to the group. The fee is to be collected by the supervising office from the offender and mailed to the State of Oregon, Governor's Office. **This is not part of the DOC Fee system**. Denise stated if a county decides to not collect the fee and mail it to the state and the offender is in compliance during the

supervision period there is not problem. However, if the offender is out of compliance and extradited, the supervising office will be held accountable by the Governor of Oregon, for not collecting the fee. The compact office will not be verifying that application fees are collected. Per Denise, each time a new compact application is submitted a new application fee will be required. When an application fee has been paid and the compact request is rejected, if the compact office finds the rejection is not appropriate they will resubmit and no additional fee will be required. Questions concerning the new fee can be emailed to Denise Sitler.

Please Note: This is not the same as your office's compact processing fee.

OPS Related Issues:

Local Control – Sue had a question on who is responsible for Local Control PPS orders being sent to the Board. The Board is not included as part of the distribution.

Susie stated they received a court order related to active duty. The court order stated active supervision is on hold until return from active duty. What code is used? The offender was sentenced effective the date he returns from active duty. Mindie stated you can not enter the supervision begin date until the offender returns. It was suggested the office may need some type of tickler system to track such these cases.

Sue - Why the original report is not sent to the DA. Practice in Lane County is original to courts and copy to the DA. Charlene Rapley stated the original is always sent to the DA in Josephine County. Donna stated it would be important to update the general information pages to reflect the county agreement with the court and DA. In some counties the DA receives the original, court receives copy. This is a county-by-county agreement and is not a consistent throughout the state.

When entering sentence data on the offense screen why does it not automatically tab to the grid score field after entering the letter? Because it is a two-digit field, if you enter two digits, such as (01 or 06) it will then auto tab to the next field.

Toni stated Clackamas County would like the financial conditions added to the conditions table rather than using the "Other" code. Mary stated any changes to the conditions table has to be requested and approved by FAUG. Lee stated there would need to be approval statewide – have your PO take this to the next FAUG meeting.

Angie – We had a PPSVSANC line which ended in July 2000 and then an O line was entered. After twelve months and one day it was expired. The offender should have an "I" line and only has an "L" line. Carolyn stated this is an old matrix case. Contact OISC for assistance in cleaning up the offense data.

Kim – We were missing three or four release plans when we ran our list about a week ago. Donna stated her release plan list was short. Mary stated someone has submitted a ticket related

to missing records from the release plan modules. Dave copied Mary to explain what happened to each record. Dave stated if the plan is completed it will not show on the report, also if the inmate is released to another county at the last minute the release plan will be sent to the other county. Lee stated there have been problems with staff deleting release plans and this deletes them completely from the system. DOC is looking at removing the delete function. In the meantime please remind staff to not delete release plans. FAUG has agreed to take over the delete authority.

Bethany Smith from OISC states that community staff have been re-sequencing sentences on DOC inmates including I lines. Please do not re-sequence offenses without first calling OISC if this is a DOC inmate. This affects the inmate's face sheet. There have been counties skipping the offenses where offense number one came up as offense number five. Mary stated the offense number is auto generated by the system. If someone enters offense 01 and 02 and then deletes offense 01, when they forget to resequence, the offense screen starts with 02. Please contact the SOON representative if this occurs in the future.

User Groups:

SUN – Mary stated there is no update and a new schedule will be emailed. Mary asked for volunteers. In leaving Community Correction, Brenda Borders will no longer be a SUN Rep. Please let Mary know if you're interested.

FAUG – FAUG met on January 18th and 19th in Clackamas. Lee stated FAUG will be on a two-year rotation for Chair and Co-Chair. FAUG discussed Measure 57. The group participated in an interesting diversity training. It was on how you deal with diverse offender populations. The group really enjoyed the training. Next meeting is in February 2010.

SOSN – Lee spoke with Dawn. Dawn stated SOSN would like the 2010 SOON calendar and the SOSN representative from the hosting county would attend the SOON meeting. Karen R. will forward the calendar to Michael Albers.

FSN – Mary stated FSN met in October and their next meeting is in Linn County in January. FSN is keeping Mary busy with service requests. There were two service requests that went into production in October. One was the auto closure of fee accounts: FSN discovered there were over eighteen thousand open accounts on discharged offenders. It will now auto close when the body is closed to discharge status. There are two to three service requests still being worked on.

Manual
Donna stated there is always room for new members. The next meeting will be held February 10th, 1:30pm, Washington County. Michael Jackson has expressed interest in participating. Tina Shippey will send the agenda to the group.

OACCD – Lee stated OACCD met November 18 and 19th in conjunction with Association of Counties. Mary and Lee did not attend this meeting. The next meeting is January 13th and 14th in

Clackamas County.

Open Agenda –

Co-Chair – Donna stated if there is no volunteer the hosting county will be responsible for assisting.

Multnomah County moved some staff to different offices and the MTCE office code and phone number have been discontinued. The domestic violence staff (MTDV) moved into this location. You are more than welcome to contact the MTDC (Intake) office if you are trying to locate and offender or a PPO. There was an email update sent to the SOON representatives.

Carolyn Knox - The phone system is being upgraded, the main number will stay the same, but the extensions will be changed for all Lincoln County staff.

Angie – FMP files, how long do we keep the file material? The local file may be destroyed after two years. The file material is to be sent to Central records at closure.

What RTP code is used for second look cases? TPL would be used (temporary leave). LEDS should be removed from the file prior to transfer.

Drug Court orders are not to be sent to central records unless they are unsuccessful and it results in a formal conviction.

Tonya: Roscoe Fertick is retiring at the end of 2009. Best wishes to Roscoe!

Charlene: We have completed phase two, we no longer have a SA office and are now one office. Do not mail anything to the D Street address. Charlene will send an update email to Tina Shippey.

Donna: There are three types of cases which cause some confusion: diversion, deferred and conditional discharges. These felonies are fully funded in Polk County.

Next Meeting:
February 11, 2010
Washington County