

**STATEWIDE OFFICE OPERATIONS NETWORK**  
**Thursday, June 13, 2013**

**Hosting Agency:** Tillamook County Community Corrections  
**Meeting Location:** 2311 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Tillamook, OR 97141

**In attendance:** Judy Bell, Benton County; Michael Jackson, Multnomah County; Shawna Harnden, Parole Board; Heidi Stetson, OSP Forensic Lab; Mindie Everett, Multnomah County; Karen Spieler, Columbia County; Marla Wiese, Multnomah County; Kari Garcia, Multnomah County; Emma Bouchet, Multnomah County; Lisa Gilbertson, Multnomah County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Christy Elven, Washington County; Ruby McClorey, Compact; Vicki Wood, Yamhill County; Mary Hunt, DOC; Lee Cummins, DOC; Melinda Garcia, Jefferson County; Tonya Owens, Tillamook County; Robin Filbeck, Tillamook County; Cathy Snider, OISC; Donna Hemman, Polk County; Eric Pointer, OISC; Carolyn Knox, Lincoln County; Kimberly Losada, Clatsop County.

**Introductions/Welcome:** Sergeant Holly Rico welcomed the group. The group introduced themselves.

**Minutes Additions/Corrections:** none.

**Email Decisions:** Christy had sent an email about criminal forfeiture, an unclassified felony. Eric Pointer helped explain that one. Christy didn't enter it into DOC400. The judgment was more for the record about the forfeiture of property rather than supervision. The court did want supervision on the charge. Christy went back to the court regarding the supervision and they are waiting to hear from the court about that.

Judy had an email about an offender with two SID numbers. The correct procedure is to check with OSIC for sealing and check with OSP for sealing and/or duplicate SID information. In this particular case there was a sealing that only got partially complete, which is why there were some records, but not others. OSP confirmed the original record was to be sealed, sent the sealing information over to OISC, and confirmed that the second SID was the correct one to use.

Clackamas County had an email question about an FTA warrant from their court, and wondered if they should use the date of warrant to move the offender to abscond in CIS or use the date of the PV report as abscond date? Answer: Use the date of the warrant and make sure there is a motion and order to show cause in file. The closure code can be WARR since it's an FTA from the court, but that is a county by county basis to use WARR or ABSC especially since the community correction information is being added to the original warrant.

Mindie sent an email question to manual committee as follows: Multnomah uses administrative warrants when an offender doesn't report to his PO. Then a PO dropped the warrant and the case expired, should she use ABEX or EXPI? The group agreed she should use EXPI because ABEX is only when the DA chooses to drop charges.

**Guest Speaker:** Heidi Stetson from OSP Forensic Lab

Heidi is the only staff who does work with DNA collection samples. She collects and enters the data. CODIS is the database used nationwide. There are some individual state databases that are used and then the information goes into the FBI database (CODIS). Heidi passed around handouts and briefly explained what CODIS is and what she looks for in a DNA sample.

Agencies collect samples from the felons and then send that to OSP by mail or shuttle. These DNA samples are not considered evidence so there is no need to track chain of custody. When she receives the sample, she first checks that the felony conviction is correct, then checks for SID, date of birth, makes sure it's the right person, and that thumb prints are included. When you send the submission card it must be completely filled out including thumb prints.

Heidi also does confirmations. Recently she's been catching up on all old data that hadn't been processed.

Heidi brought and passed around a copy of a printout of a DNA profile to show an example of what it looks like when it's processed. It doesn't show specific traits like hair color, eye color, etc, just the DNA markers for comparison. Those profiles are there so when DNA is collected at a new crime scene it can be compared to DNA on file.

One big problem Heidi experiences is not having thumb prints. Those thumb prints work in conjunction with DNA to match up samples. There is an example in the handouts to see the difference between good prints vs. bad prints. In the DNA kits there are small ink strips that don't work too well and dry out quickly. OSP is thinking about putting about five ink pads into a box of 100 kits. The group likes this idea. Please give Heidi feedback regarding the ink pads when they start going out.

OSP will also be changing the submission card. It will be the same on the front. On the back they will eliminate the felony category because it doesn't matter; the crime can just be put in as something basic - they don't need specifics; for example you could just put Distribution, Assault, PCS, etc. They're also eliminating the felony categories (A, B, C) because those don't matter. They are making two boxes for extra thumb prints in case the prints on the first side get messed up. They will also be adding contact information for OSP if questions arise. They are trying to make the cards easier for everyone to use. They may also list crimes for which fingerprints are needed – all felonies and list out the misdemeanors that qualify.

It appears DNA collection is often taken by people who aren't sure whether or not it needs to be taken. DNA needs to be done on all Oregon convicted felons and qualifying misdemeanors. DNA is not ever needed on incoming compacts; OSP doesn't keep it, so don't collect it. If an offender is Oregon convicted – yes, take those.

Ruby explained Oregon compact a little for Heidi and encouraged Heidi to call compact if an Oregon convicted offender's DNA is needed because it wasn't collected before they left town.

Heidi asked to please fill out submission card neatly! No fancy lettering; please make it legible. Use black or blue ink only! No colored inks!! The ink color is very important. Red is especially bad, because it won't show on the scanner. Green is what they use to make corrections, so green would be very confusing. Some other colors may not show on the scanner, too. Please fill out the card completely, including all requested information: name, date of birth, SID, crime, etc. All questions should be answered. And please remember to SIGN the card – that is required by law!

Michael asked what they do if the crime isn't listed on the card submitted. Heidi answered that she looks them up and fills it in herself.

Ruby asked if Heidi is required to return cards with missing information. No, they look up as much as they can and let the rest go. Although when a card has the wrong thumb prints, those get set aside and OSP will request resubmission. OSP does their best to get all missing information because they are trying to send cards through with as much data as possible.

Christy asked about what happens if OSP can't enter the cards and needs to request resubmission – do they contact community corrections? Yes. Christy's concern is because she enters the "DNA collected? Yes" information in DOC400. Heidi explained that someone at OSP will change that to no in LEDS if the card can't be processed. Heidi is not sure about DOC400 data and thinks that is not altered by OSP. Mary suggests perhaps OSP can contact someone to let them know the DNA card will need to be resubmitted so that can come out of DOC400. We can either give Heidi the SOON rep list or she can use Mary as the main contact. Mary thinks it's a good idea to change the DOC400 back to show the DNA needs to be collected so the PO sees it flagged as needed.

Make sure to write the name and SID on the FTA paper. This is important because that helps keep the paper matched to the card. Write it on the blank lines on the bottom. Last name and SID is good enough.

Heidi asked about SID numbers that start 703, and wondered what those are. The group explained they are called block numbers; the system generates a temporary ID number when no SID exists at the time of entering the record into DOC400. Community corrections then ensures the offender gets printed and gets a SID assigned, and then changes it in the DOC400. Heidi can contact Mary or the individual county to figure out a specific block/SID.

Heidi asked the group to please try for quality thumb prints!

Heidi explained that for a DNA collection to be valid they need the skin cells from inside the mouth not the spit. She brought samples of what cards look like that are usable to

them. She showed the change of color from pink to white on the FTA paper and what it should look like. Don't color in the whole pink circle with spit! And don't make teeny tiny little spot marks. Make sure you get skin cells and run one line of smear onto the paper. Heidi needs enough skin cells to work a second or third time in case a full profile didn't get taken on the first try. Also, a good sample is best for confirmation. It is important for the collector to take the sample from the offender's mouth. Do not just hand the offender the swab and have them do it themselves!

Christy asked about bad hygiene and ugly samples. Can they use those? Yes, pretty much. They are not preferred but they can be processed manually to extract DNA.

Heidi explained to rub up and along gum line and cheek – really rub, then roll back and forth on the FTA paper. Then do again with a second swab stick on other side of the mouth and rub back and forth in other pink circle. Heidi gave swabs and FTA paper for us to all try it.

Fun facts to share: The offender backlog graph: in 2010 there were over 20,000; in 2012 less than 2000. This data is constantly changing. In February of this year the FBI had their 5000<sup>th</sup> hit. In 1998 there were 9 hits, now in 2013 there are over 5000. This means when there are crimes with DNA samples left behind, and those samples are collected and compared to DNA profiles on record they come up a match ("hit") to DNA on file in CODIS.

Mary asked when the law started to require that DNA be collected from offenders. Heidi answered it was either 1991 or 1998. Further, she explained the law does retroactively work for murderers who are still on supervision. **NOTE:** HB 2664 expanded ORS 137.076. This revision to the DNA database law required the collection of DNA from any adult convicted of a felony and certain misdemeanor offenses. The expansion of the law went into effect on anyone who was in custody or on supervision for the listed crimes on January 1, 2002, and anyone convicted of said crimes after January 1, 2002. The law also allows for the collection of DNA samples from juveniles, but the crimes covered by the juvenile law are much more restrictive. Please check the law, with the CODIS Unit, or OYA if you have questions regarding juvenile offenders.

Heidi started as lab tech in 2005. She finally got to be a forensic scientist in CODIS. She doesn't do actual casework, but her work in CODIS is a big part of it. The database she works with includes DNA profiles from 'unknowns from crime scenes', 'felons', 'missing persons' (like remains), and family members who are missing.

Heidi passed around a handout showing hits per county and CODIS hits per agency. Another chart shows CODIS hits by crime type. All the charts and graphs provided are attached to these minutes.

Michael asked about something from the news: he heard about the possibility of collecting DNA on all arrests. Heidi explained this doesn't affect us as of now. They would need to change law and wait for the biennium to change. And the financial impact would be in question. And there would be questions of samples collected on people

whose charges were dismissed, etc. There is a lot to think about and consider before a law like that will be passed in Oregon.

Mary asked when a swab is done and sent in but gets lost for an extended period of time, how long is the sample viable? Heidi says forever unless it's damaged by water or possibly sunlight. The FTA paper retains the DNA sample essentially forever.

The group thanked Heidi for presenting at our meeting.

**OISC/Institution Records:** Cathy brought Eric Pointer.

Cathy was having problems with her program that receives documents sent. You may get an email asking to resend documents because some of it was disappearing. The program is fixed now.

If you sent documents at file closing and then receive a letter for sealing/expungment – don't resend the same documents with the expungment letter if they've already been sent to OISC. And please don't send the whole file! If nothing has been sent to OISC, only the regular documents that OISC maintains should be sent.

Judy asked that although normally conditional discharges don't get sent to OISC, would a file being compact change that? If an offender has compacted out, do they want conditional discharges? Cathy will check with Dianne to be sure. POST NOTE: Do not send conditional discharges even if they are also compact.

Put closing summary on top when sending documents to OISC!

Eric – brought up his email regarding the vacate code language. Did the group decide whether or not to add the proposed language to the VACA closure code definition? The scenario was a felony conviction and the offender served DOC time and then the crime was resentenced to a misdemeanor but given only straight jail. So essentially the original sentence was vacated and resentenced to a jail only misdemeanor. Mindie proposes adding "jail only" to the end of that extra language to be added to the description. Group agrees that's good to have "jail only" and we can add Eric's proposed language to the vacate closure code.

Christy expressed how much she appreciates Eric's expertise and input to the SOON list serve questions. Mary and Judy agreed, as did everyone.

Questions for OISC:

Tina sent an email to Michael to bring regarding compact. When there is no court order coming through ICOTS what kind of paperwork is sufficient for OISC at closing? Ruby says a court order is not mandatory at initial investigation but is required to be provided if requested at acceptance. So this makes Tina's question moot, because if requested they are required to send the judgment and any amended judgments modifying the supervision end date. It is in the rule [ICAOS Rule 3.107(c)] that it is mandatory to

provide the court order if requested. Early terminations are sometimes tricky and we'll accept a CAR notifying of a new end date.

**Parole Board:** Not a lot to report. They are in the process of hiring someone for the Hearings Officer position. Interviews are next week. They hope to have a new officer by the end of month. There will be an opening in the warrants position soon, and that will be posted soon. Jay Scroggins has left the Parole Board and has accepted a position with Multnomah County. Otherwise things at the Board are the same. The office is becoming more stable with more permanent employees in positions and less temp workers. Abbie was offered a permanent position with DOC and accepted that; therefore Debra will stay on permanently as the Board Order Specialist. Debra has done such a great job, so she was offered the position and accepted. Malinda Boyer is now the sanction person and has been offered the permanent sanction position and has accepted.

Questions for the board – none.

**Compact:** Ruby – nothing new to bring today.

Questions for Compact:

Heidi asked what is a Compact? Why do people come to Oregon? Ruby gave some examples of compact transfers and various reasons for people to Compact in or out. Ruby explained the Compact Office covers both incoming and outgoing offenders.

**DOC – CC Updates:**

Mary –

Mary discovered a problem in caseloads and took it to FAUG. The issue was that not all offenders were showing on the PO's Caseload Summary screen, even when using the subset function to include outcounts. We'd had a similar problem a few years ago, but thought it had been fixed. Lane County was moving offenders from one caseload to another when they discovered not all the offenders were showing on the Caseload Summary screen. When they looked at the Primary Caseload History screen, the data was correct, and when they returned to the caseload summary screen the offender was listed. On one of Lane County's caseload it showed only 4 or 5 offenders on outcount status. After running the Parole Officer Caseload Report (with outcounts) there were 60 offenders on outcount statuses that didn't show on the caseload screen. DOC IT ran a query for Lane County to find offenders that were still attached to inactive caseload number. Lane County was then able to use Option 10 from Menu CCSUPPORT (CC Change Primary Caseload) to check the caseload history data. After they had pulled up each of the offenders on the list to verify the data was correct, when they returned to the Caseload Summary screen, all the previously missing offenders were there and they could move them to the new caseload number. Mary then asked IT to run another list to show all offenders attached to discontinued caseload numbers. These lists were handed out so the other counties can fix their records too. Please contact Mary Hunt if

you have questions or need assistance with your list. Mary will contact the offices directly that were not in attendance.

Judy explained she had a similar problem and why she thought she had that issue – she guessed it was because of the linkage errors Mary talks about when changing offenders during the middle of a process. She used to change the offender's caseload on that screen of the admissions process and sometimes forget to F3 back to the beginning before changing offenders. But when she started using menu CCSUPPORT Option #10 (CC Change Primary Caseload) to change caseloads, the problem stopped happening. Mary agrees that is the best way to approach and handle caseload changes. Use that #10 (CC Change Primary Caseload) and *not* in the midst of a process such as #3 Admissions. Note: This is also Option #10 from Menu CCSUPPMULT.

Mary suggests all offices run their PO caseload reports (with outcounts included) to see if you have any issues in your office of offenders not showing up on caseloads. To do this go to the reports menu (23), and then total office reports (4), and then parole office caseload report (7). You can run the reports by individual caseload number. This report will give you everyone that should show on the caseload. Compare the report to the PO caseload screen and be sure to use the subset function to include outcounts here too so you can be sure that everyone is where they're supposed to be. If you find them on the Parole Officer Caseload report but they aren't showing on the caseload, then just go to the Option #10 screen, pull them up, and they should then appear on the caseload screen.

Also, please run the PO Caseload report (including outcounts) on your office's discontinued caseload numbers. When discontinuing a caseload number or moving offenders from one caseload to another be sure to look at primary vs. secondary. You need to remove all secondaries when moving full caseloads or discontinuing a number.

Some of the records listed on the clean-up list Mary handed out are very old records and may require assistance to fix. For example: Crook County has one caseload location 'EAST' which is a really old, discontinued location code. Those offenders need to be moved to CROO but Mary will have to help with that. Harney has two where the caseload numbers aren't theirs at all. Those may be Multnomah caseload numbers. Mary will work with both counties to figure out the correct caseload numbers. Wasco has a caseload number outside of their location too, which looks like another Multnomah caseload number.

Part of this reminded Mary that they have done a lot of hard edits on caseload definition files to avoid problems like these arising in the future. They still need the edit that will only allow the community to create four-digit caseload numbers. They have it narrowed down so each county can only create caseload numbers within their range. Unfortunately counties can still create two or three digit caseload numbers, and release plans disappear when that happens. Mary will also be asking for one more edit to prevent you from discontinuing a caseload number if any offenders are still attached to the number. Mary will put this in as a service request.

Mary implores the group to please run a PO caseload report, including outcounts, when doing caseload movements to make sure everyone is captured.

If you have any problems with these types of issues or need help with fixes, call Mary.

There was a case that came from Curry County to a Super User: they'd been supervising an offender for a year then received a new order *nunc pro tunc* that should be bench probation. But it shouldn't have been closed to bench because of the *nunc pro tunc* language. Over the year that he was on probation lots had been done like sanctions, etc, so it was not easy to just back it all out. They asked about getting rid of the chrono history because they weren't supposed to be supervised. Mary deleted the autochrono that was created when a sanction was created. But when Mary does that it creates an autochrono alerting that she's done that. Mary didn't want to have 94 'delete' chronos to replace 94 chronos. So they decided to do one last entry to say, "Please disregard chronos from this date to this date due to new court order."

Judy asked if it needed to be wiped out because of the *nunc pro tunc* language. Mary answered yes; it was an amended order back to original sentencing date which should eliminate the supervision.

Mary asked for ideas regarding that chrono history, are there any other thoughts besides just the one chrono at the end? Someone thought perhaps append with a "please ignore" title on every one. That is a lot of work! This is the first time someone asked to remove all chronos.

Mindie asked Cathy about what they do with chronos when they have a sealing. She asked Dianne, and Dianne said they're okay to leave in there. Chronos don't have to be sealed.

Mary brought up Mindie's issue regarding the social history screen accessed from the caseload screen. This is a screen with "social history" data such as married, smoker, etc. You can't get there from the admission process, but you can get there from the offender information screen. That screen has military information, vets when served, etc. that is of interest to Mindie and her office. Of the data Mindie has access to, she found 30 offenders who had information in there. She's wondering who is putting data in there? Lee remembers a really old discussion regarding the social history screen. Mary did screen shots and one thing she noticed, if county's want to track veterans, is that it won't be useful until they make modifications to it. Right now it acts as a toggle, it takes you back and forth from the description screen to social history screen (when accessed from the offender public information screen by doing an F11, 4, D) or by doing an F16 from the offender public information screen. You can also find it by doing an F11, 4, D from chronoing. But again, you don't necessarily want to enter data through a window (F11, 4, etc) Mary will see if they can add accessibility from the admission process with a toggle. That way we're working in a real screen and not entering through windows. Very few fields on this social history screen have tables attached, meaning they're free text fields and a user can put whatever in there. There is a table attached to sexual

preference and a table attached to assaultive behavior to indicate against inmate, staff, or both.

Mary wonders if this is useful and does anyone use it. IT can run a report to see if/when it's been used. We should decide as a group if we need this. Multnomah wants to track vets to get them services. Mary can start with an analysis ticket to see about making it accessible from the admission process. Mindie would like this to be its own menu item. Mary says since it's a toggle, it's the exact same program as the offender description screen. So the offender description screen can be viable but you'd still have to toggle to this screen. But it would be preferred to access the full program screen rather than through a window, and at least get it added into the admission screen. Lee and Mary will find out whose screen it is and if they will allow us to use it.

If it goes through as available, we'll see about getting into the admission process, and possibly a menu item; it will still be a county by county decision to enter data or not. Then they will probably add a reporting feature.

Donna suggests just adding a "vet" field with a yes or no to the description screen, especially if that's all that Mindie is after from that big screen or adding it onto some other screen to flag the veteran status as such.

Lee –

Lee just resent a survey that IT sent regarding the CMA project, which includes the LS/CMI, case plan, TCU, etc. Please inform your coworkers of what this is about and ask them to do it; it should be quick. The PSC workgroup is still working on an override policy. Lee did the draft recommendation for that with examples of how to use overrides. They are not creating hard and fast rules, but just offering some guidelines to reduce the old "PO discretion" type of overrides. Some counties have been using policy override as a means to hold over until an accepted "Specialty" tool can be done (LS/CMI, Stable, ODARA). OACCD voted at their last meeting to leave the risk score at the PSC tool score until the "Specialty" tool (like LS/CMI etc) is done, at which time the override, if needed, can be done using the tool code. They will add all this to the PSC manual. Lee will also add more information into the manual to help people understand the scoring better. PSC training – currently there is no ongoing training, just the manuals. They are meeting with professional development unit regarding the use of "I-learn" for counties. They are looking into costs and logistics like maintenance, administrators, etc. It would be nice to use as a training resource for the PSC and other training needs as well. There is also a conferencing tool associated with this program. It could open opportunities for teleconferencing to these types of meetings.

Regarding the local release plan cleanup, Lee handed out a list of local release plans that have not been "completed" at the last FAUG meeting. If there are local release plans that have not been completed, and the offender goes into the institution, county staff can't complete their release plan any more (because the offender status is "inmate"), and the institution can't start a new one. In the past, release/institution counselors were forced to go in and make changes to the local control plan that's open.

Now they have been asked to contact Lee and Mary to close the local plan so that the history is not lost. Please make sure those local plans are completed as soon as possible! Get clean up lists done and start staying on top of that.

Karen from Columbia automatically goes in and 'completes' the release plan at the time she brings them into PPS and admits to POST. Lee thinks completing at the time of opening PPS is a great idea.

Judy asked if the process of PSC scoring on leave then again on admit to POST has changed. For now it's still the same. Lee will know more after testing the OTTO service request maybe around July or so.

Service requests will move to the end of the meeting.

### **Open Agenda/OPS Related Issues:**

#### **LEDS/WebLEDS:**

Lisa Gilbertson asked can we put in a service request for LEDS? What do we want? She's being pushed on efficiencies in her office. Regarding mass mailbox transfer – can we have a chance to clear the MIS field at the same time or add/change the MIS field during MMBX transfer? Mary thinks it's probably feasible to use the \* to clear the field, but to add text to the MIS field or to make text changes might not be possible. Mary thinks we can request that. There were other enhancements the group wanted, so maybe we can add this request to that. Adjustments all have to be made so that all three programs can work together: DOC400, LEDS, WebLEDS. There is also a cost consideration regarding manpower to make changes. A process of approval is necessary. Mary wants to get as many issues together at once before submitting a request. Mary will gather Lisa's information with what she's already got and send it to the group to see where we are and if we are ready to move forward with the LEDS enhancements request. Mary will include a closing date for requests in the email she sends.

Mary – They fixed the RTP for escape – it's fixed but wasn't made nonpurgeable. She sent off the request to LEDS to do that. She will send a reminder inquisition to see where we are with that.

Michael asked on behalf of Maria Favre (Marion County) about the condition fields with text attached. Currently when looking at the EPR just the word "other" shows up when you've used OTH1 or OTH2 plus text. Michael is wondering if it can display the way it's entered, meaning can the EPR display the code rather than the spelled out language like show "OTH1" instead of "OTHER." Michael will ask Maria to send Mary an email and Mary will add that to the request. **POST NOTE:** Maria sent the email and Mary has added the request to our list.

**OPS Manual:** Haven't met since last meeting; next meeting in August. Quite a few chapter revisions have been sent out. Please get those to your staff as needed. Someone stated they think the Manual Committee is great!

**Local Control:** Judy had one she wanted to know about: offender originally sentenced to 18 months prison; resentenced last week to 78 days, which means his sentence is complete because he served all that time already in DOC. So how will the data entry look on that? Eric explain that OISC will close the sentence to LOCL, check on time served and if all the time is totally served then the offender will release straight to POST. Benton will have to enter an L line for 78 days with time served, which means the O line will open the same day. Some expressed concerns about this showing up on a clean-up list since it's got the L line without a local movement, but others thought it may not because it's okay to serve local time in DOC under certain circumstances. With F8 notes available it can be explained and the clean-up list can be ignored. The Institution should be doing the release plan because the offender is institution-controlled and not going into local control at all. The county will need to do the local control PPS order.

Judy had another one that is a PPSVSanc issue. Offender is supervised by Benton, picked up new misdemeanor charges and a straight jail sentence, got a revocation sanction by the Board, Benton entered the offender into local control (LBEN) and entered the PPSVSanc line. Multnomah says they should do it because they did the hearing, so it's theirs. The group consensus is that the supervising county does that revocation sanction entry. Karen at Columbia had same exact problem. The offender can be in LMUL since that is where he actually is, but the supervising county is responsible for all the data entry. Multnomah had gone in and changed the data entry but Judy wants the data to be entered as the manual states it should (using the Parole Board teletype as a guide for the dates entered, time served, etc). Multnomah says they do not do it that way because they use a different manual. Vicki Wood explained the process changed several years ago. The board action date MUST be used. Eric also pointed out that until the board makes the decision the offender is not really in local control or serving that revocation sanction until that decision comes down, so starting their local control location status or the local control sentence line early is simply bad data. Multnomah is working under a really old manual because this is the way it used to be done. The current manual is the accurate way of doing things. **DECISION:** The group agreed that the OPS Manual we work from is the correct way of doing the data entry and that Multnomah County should replace their old manual with the current information and that on revocation sanctions the supervising county does the data entry. Vicki Wood also explained that the supervising county does not have to wait for the other county to release from the L location when the sanction is complete; the supervising county can and should do that release themselves and pick the offender back up.

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

Christy had a scenario where an offender went to court, was sentenced and was an inmate, completed his prison time, was on POST and then was resentenced to

probation and the court merged count 3 and 4 for sentencing purposes, and on count 3 the offender went back to the institution and posted out last fall. Christy wants to know: what about that count 4 that was merged with count 3? The institution did not enter an I line on count 4. Also, counts 3 and 4 originally started as L lines, then to merged probation, and then count 3 was revoked and sentence 13 months institution time. Christy went in and closed county 4 to VIOL just to get it to stop being on the kardex. There were P lines on both counts 3 and 4 and it's merged, but the institution only put an I line on count 3. Someone said she can close the P line however she wants but probably not to VIOL since that's not considered a permanent closure but needs another line after it. Eric suggests RTNS because essentially it's dead/terminated. That will permanently close the line. Add F8 notes.

Christy has been seeing judgments where the court is adding language that states no medical card or purchase marijuana legally in any other states. Is anyone else seeing this? Christy has been adding extra language to text line of the NOMC condition. Multnomah pretty much does the same. The group agreed to keep the code the same for now and use the text line.

Mindie mentioned it is her understanding that other counties are taking bench probation as courtesy supervision and entering them into CIS; could any county doing this please go to Mindie with information because she will have a need soon to enter those because the court is asking them to do courtesy supervision on lots of bench probations – like thousands of them. Mary says no! No bench probations should ever be entered into CIS. Felonies that are entered into system that are actually bench probation are a huge funding issue. Why wouldn't the court just move them back to supervised? Mindie says it's a political issue. Mary will talk to Jeremiah and see about that going to the executive committee – it's not going to be an easy thing. Those probably need a new sentence type, status, etc. The court is paying for the supervision in part funding Multnomah directly.

Michael raised some thoughts about the kardex, such as the TPD date doesn't match the board order. (TPD stands for tentative parole discharge date) He brought up the idea that some fields on the kardex aren't necessary. Michael asked everyone to please go back, look at the kardex, and see what you don't find useful. Mindie brought up the "from" location not being accurate. Some say regarding probation it is accurate and someone else explained that it is completely accurate in all cases but some misunderstand what it represents. Mary explained that is accurately pulling from the data. Some people find that useful. Some think that should always be the county of conviction, some think that should be the institution, the local location, etc, lots of people think different things. Right now the program pulls the data based on the movement change. Carolyn says bring it to FAUG since the kardex is their document. Please look at the kardex, think about changes, bring ideas to the next meeting, and we can forward them to FAUG.

**Tabled Discussions:** Since time is short, the tabled matter of the menu items will be compiled and discussed at next group. Judy will produce an email to poll the group and compile the data. Please respond to email when received.

## **User Groups:**

**SUN:** no recent meeting.

**FAUG:** met May 15 & 16 in Madras. Next meeting is set for August 21 & 22 in Polk County. Release counselors are starting to come and discuss some of their issues, which has been good for the group. Lots of talk about OMS and how many POs are working in it. Some are staying more and more in OMS instead of CIS, and there is kind of a push to do that. In OMS POs can do case planning, chronos, etc. There was a good discussion among the group varying from people who used it lots and people who didn't even know about it. There will be training in Polk County at the next FAUG on how to use OMS and its features.

**SOSN:** Michael has been watching for minutes (put on the DL) but hasn't seen any. Lee suggests he connect with Jeff Hanson. Currently no issues. Training coming up in August. Next meeting in July in Madras.

**FSN:** Next meeting set for July 25 in Klamath Falls. Met in April. The group expressed they want to be kept in the loop more regarding automation changes, which was mostly as a result of the automation committee being disbanded.

**OACCD:** met in May at DPSST. The biggest issue coming up was the instruction to not use 'policy' to stay your override until another risk tool is used. Leave them at risk score until secondary tool is used. They meet again in July in Astoria.

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

SR #2497 is the edit regarding the LC/Board designation override feature – the new edit will not allow you to use BRD as an override reason. You shouldn't ever do an override from LC to board, but the system allowed it. This hard edit will block you if the record is PostPrison/LC and not allow you to override to BRD. The edit will also give you a message asking if you've done the F14 recalculate if the status does not indicate board or local and you're trying to change it. Remember to do the F14 first to recalculate and see if that fixes the status, but if it does not then go back to do the override if you still need to. Mary has a list of current cases (32 discharged offenders whose status is board but an override was used to get there). She will go in and fix those if everyone's okay with it. Everyone is okay with that.

Mary has a second list of active offenders who have been overridden to board. Each county will need to fix these. To fix them go into the override screen, remove/clear all three fields, Override location, reason and date. When you hit enter the record will go back to the default of local control. Then go back to offense screen and do an F14 to recalculate. If that doesn't change the status then you need to look at the data. If it doesn't work, there is something wrong with the data. Call Mary for help or put in ticket to CCSUN if you can't figure it out. These lists have the override date and user who did it. Please clean these up. Mary will send the list electronically to the counties not

present. Please clean this up within the next month so the edits can go in. After the edits go live they'll run them again.

SR #2513 will not allow a user to delete a docket/sentence that has INOP days attached. You'll have to deal with INOP days first. If it's attached to an I line, talk to the institution first. If there are no issues, Mary will send it out for testing.

Three requests have recently been assigned but no work has started yet.

SR #2560 is the edit regarding closing sentences with incomplete data in the outcome measure conditions. It will make it so the system won't allow you to save trackable outcome measure conditions if an amount hasn't been entered.

### **Roundtable:**

Kimberly Losada, asked about a new intake living in residential treatment facility in another county – what do the different counties do? Her county does not accept a residential treatment facility as an address, but their new problem is that one of the residential facilities opened a transitional housing facility, which is long-term housing ranging from six months to one year. What do other counties do regarding this kind of housing? Someone asked if she has looked at the transfer rule? Yes, and it doesn't say anything about that. Judy thinks the inpatient residential would be different than transitional-housing program. Mary said some counties will do a courtesy type of thing where they would agree to accept the IRT, but with the understanding that if the offender leaves the transitional housing, they could automatically be returned to the sending county. Maybe the directors can work out an agreement between two specific counties.

Carolyn asked why some counties would list anything other than special conditions when entering a record, for example general conditions, supervision fees, etc. Judy explained why she does it: because she enters exactly what her court order lists under "special conditions" which often includes several general conditions.

Tonya – thanked Christy for the print size email because now she fixed her printer.

Lee – remember there is a CCTrain menu – use it if you need it.

Christy has been getting higher numbers of files transferred in with PO's name and number appearing in LEDS. Please remember to blank those out before transferring. Christy's Intake PO wanted her to bring an item for discussion: regarding the intake long form packet, can we have one form standardized among all counties, rather than making transfers fill out a different long form in each county. She should suggest her FAUG rep take it to FAUG or even up to OACCD; it's a good idea, but may not be feasible. Let the POs decide that.

Michael asked regarding the IRT transfer forms that some counties send, why is the mailbox filled in when we can't put someone else's mailbox into LEDS. Different servers

allow different things; some counties can enter other agencies mailbox numbers in when transferring LEDS.

Emma – asked about the directions in the manual regarding what we should be sending to OISC, hers says to send conditional discharge documents. The group explained we are not sending those anymore; she must be working from an old form. Emma asked if she should still send conditional discharge sealings? Yes. Emma asked about sending extra stuff regarding the sex offenders - is that useful? Cathy says any documents not on the list that are sent are kept for three years.

Mindie – there are lots of Multnomah County people retiring and moving around, they can help find them if you need to reach someone.

Heidi thanked the group for having her. She found it very enjoyable. Please feel free to call with questions - she's here!

Shawna issued a reminder: if sending to the warrants desk use the general parole board warrants email, do not send directly to specific people. If you need to send extends, inactives, reactivates, etc. use the general hearings officer email and do not send to specific people. Shawna thanked the group for dealing with all the changes over the last year and a half.

Next meeting August 8, 2013, Deschutes County.

*Meeting adjourned.*