

**STATEWIDE OFFICE OPERATIONS NETWORK**  
**Thursday, April 10, 2014**

**Hosting Agency:** Jefferson County Community Corrections  
**Meeting Location:** Jefferson County Adult Community Justice  
75 SE C St, Suite D  
Madras, OR 97741

**In attendance:** Christy Elven, Washington County; Angie Gustafson, Linn County; Mindie Everett, Multnomah County; Kari Garcia, Multnomah County; Lisa Gilbertson, Multnomah County; Emma Bauchet, Multnomah County; Jessica Jaukens, Wasco County; Margaret Hill, Crook County; Roni Hickerson, Grant County; Shannon Winters, Tri-County; Tina Potter, Tri-County; Kerri Humbert, Douglas County; Mary Hunt, DOC; Lee Cummins, DOC; Kurt Symons, Jefferson County; Nola McLennan, Jefferson County; Terri Chandler, Jefferson County; Nicoli R. Taylor, Deschutes County; Robin Filbeck, Tillamook County; Tonya Owens, Tillamook County; Bobby Lenhardt, Jackson County; Diane Ballard, Jackson County; Pam Mathes, Klamath County; Kathy Foltyn, Klamath County; Michael Jackson, Multnomah County; Judy Bell, Benton County.

**Welcome and Introductions:** Kurt Symons welcomed the group and spoke about Jefferson County and the importance of our role within Community Corrections. The group introduced themselves.

**Review Minutes:** Carolyn Knox sent an email regarding the correction that was done last month to the minutes where the language "TPA" was changed to "TPS." Carolyn thought it should be "PTA" (prison term analyst) not TPS. Dianne Erickson with OISC confirmed via email that the correct language should be TPS, as they are the ones who have super-user authority to add crimes into the ORS table.

**OISC:** Members of OISC were unable to attend. Dianne indicated she would have emailed if there was anything to present, but nothing was sent. Michael asked the group if there were any questions for OISC. No.

On Cathy's behalf, Michael reminded the group: **Please put closing summary on top when sending closing documents to OISC!**

During the meeting someone noticed OISC had sent an email asking if five days is enough lead time to perform your duties after Cathy sends the sealing list. The group said that is fine. Tillamook raised concerns regarding if someone is on vacation, and asked if maybe it could be longer. After some discussion the group decided five days is good.

Feel free to email to Dianne Erickson at OISC or Michael with questions any time in between SOON meetings.

**Compact:** Members of Compact were unable to attend. Michael will email Ruby regarding questions raised during the Manual meeting. No questions from the group.

**Parole Board:** Shawna was unable to attend. Michael asked the group if they had any questions for the board.

Christy had an offender going onto board PPS, local PPS, board PPS, back and forth, back and forth; it is all in one cycle so it stays on board control. But then all the board-controlled PPS expired while the offender was in local control custody, and Christy knows she should be seeing Certification of Expiration notices, but they aren't getting them.

She also asked about auto return, when a board case expires but local cases remain. The issue had been previously tabled, is it back on track? Mary thinks it is still on the table and hasn't moved forward yet. Remember you can still petition the board to take control.

Even with the example Christy gave if a request to add the sentence to the board PPS order is sent to the board before the board-controlled PPS expires, and even if the local jail sentence hasn't finished yet, it's okay to stay board and will. Christy is not getting those expiration notices and isn't sending in the new orders prior to expiration, so she should be getting them. Perhaps Denise Sitler can try to find a report to run that will help Christy find these types of cases/problems, for example a query of board-controlled PPS offenders who have no I or O lines open. Someone asked if Shawna could do a report of all clients they monitor per county. Lee just heard from IT that the board system is going to be rewritten, hoping the interface will be much better.

Mary reminded the group that if an offender was board-controlled in a previous cycle and all board-controlled PPS ended, and then they were local control, which prompted an override to be used to make them local-controlled PPS and then that cycle ends, if the offender goes into prison on a new cycle and then back onto board-controlled PPS, the offender will still show local-controlled because the previous cycle override data doesn't disappear; you have to go in and clear it. To clear it do an F15 on the offense screen, delete the override data, and hit enter. That should clear it and return the offender to board-controlled. And then use F14 (recalculate) just to keep everything clean in the background. If that doesn't work there is something wrong in the background and you'll need a super-user to look at it.

Lee talked about board email addresses. They are all in the directory; Shawna keeps that updated.

Emma had sent a question via email regarding SC7 (restitution condition). She got three emails with the same response, and then tons of responses that are random and different. The correct data entry is that each condition appearing on a PPS order should be on each case as a condition. Restitution or other outcount measure conditions can be marked trackable on only one of the offenses and mark the rest of the offenses as

non-trackable with a note in the comment line of which sentence it is being tracked on. Mary will talk more about restitution and the new edits a bit later during service requests. The new change will be that if you enter restitution or other trackable outcome measure conditions and leave it trackable you must enter an amount. For PPS cases this only has to be tracked on one offense and it doesn't matter which one, but the suggestion is to pick the longest running offense. Conversely, you *can* track on all offenses, but you **MUST** enter payments or adjust the Balance to all offenses if all are marked trackable. This information relates only to board cases and local control cases (PPS).

Probation is a bit different. Specific amounts should be attributed to each specific case according to the sentencing order. This is the best way to handle probation cases with restitution, but it is a county by county decision whether to specify/track on only one count or put it the same on every case, but restitution must be tracked on at least one open case, even after the balance is zero. Also, on probation cases if the judgment specifies restitution to only one count, you must put it only on that one count. Some judgments will have restitution at the end of the judgment (not specific to any one count) and those can be tracked on every count of the judgment or on just one count. Remember, you must enter payments to all offenses if all have the total amount and all are trackable.

Tracking on specific cases based on the judgment will become more important with the implementation of HB3194, since part of eligibility to terminate a sentence is based on restitution for that sentence being paid in full. And that will be true for probation and local control PPS.

On board and local cases, restitution can appear on a PPS order even if restitution is from other older cases that don't even exist on the open offenses. You can pick whichever sentence you want to track it on. If it's on the PPS order, it needs to be trackable on an open offense.

On probation cases where you track to the specific sentence when that sentence closes, the restitution closes and doesn't get put on a different sentence.

Nola asked about SC9 and SC10 and a no drugs or no substance abuse condition – would those both go on SC9? The group explained if you want a substance abuse condition, SC10 is where the no drug conditions would fall under; SC9 is just a no alcohol condition.

## **DOC:**

### Mary – CC Updates:

It's time for spring clean-up. An important reminder is to please remember your DOC releases/expected arrivals. Your county should do their admission in a timely manner. It seems some are falling behind again, and we're seeing releases hanging out there with

no admission. Whether the offender shows up or not – they still need to be admitted. And remember your trans leave completions, too; when that leave time finishes you must admit to post. And when they're first put on leave, please admit those timely, too. Check your trans leave report to find who's moving from leave to post. Trans leave report can be found by going to menu #23 (CC reports menu), then #4 (total office reports), and finally #15 (transitional leave report). Also please remember to check your Expected arrivals report, which can be found by going to menu #23 (CC reports menu), then #4 (total office reports), and finally #3 (expected arr/rel not admitted).

Someone asked if that affects funding? Yes, it will. If you see a release on your expected arrivals report that has been more than 60 days, you've lost funding. The PSC must be done within the first 60 days of release. Whether you have bothered to admit or not – the time is ticking. That PSC must be done timely to receive funding. The admission date is what is important, not when you actually get around to doing the admission.

Multnomah County found a PPS case they were supervising where an offense had no O line. Is there a way to run a report to identify records like that. Yes, Mary has that report for us. She ran a sample report for Multnomah County to see if these were helpful for Kari before she provides them to everyone; and yes, it was. The data warehouse ran the report, too, and it was a substantially bigger list. This list also includes leave status. Some are from closed / previous cycle sentences with no O line. Mary will send both reports electronically.

Michael asked if this report will include discharged offenders or probation clients. Yes, it includes all statuses, if they have the previous cycles with missing O lines. But they are only active offenders, not totally discharged offenders. Michael wonders if we're cleaning up, should we clean all the data. Mary suggested we start with the current active custody cycle and get this list done, and then worry about clients in discharge status.

Judy asked if this missing O line affects anything. Mary said the missing O line affects funding if it's the only active offense or would have been the longest running offense. Also be aware that supervision fees will not accumulate on that offense, the offender will not show up on expiration reports for that offense, and may not be showing on total office caseload reports.

Nicoli asked who we contact if the I line has not been closed. The group explained you contact OISC, and they will do that immediately. It should be same day that they close the I line or the next day at the latest, but not much more than that. She is seeing some that are a week or more not getting closed.

Race Code Table in CIS: There was an inmate who was a Pacific Islander and somewhere in the process he had been entered into CIS as white and he was very offended; how do we fix that? At the time the race code table didn't have a code available for Pacific Islander. Mary discovered that NCIC was using the A code for

Asian and Pacific Islander, and updated the description in CIS to include both. In 2013, NCIC changed their code table so that A is just Asian, and a new code, P, is for Hawaiian Native and Pacific Islander. When it was suggested to add P to CIS, the DOC policy group asked for an additional code, a “2” code, indicating the person is 2 or more nationalities. Mary just wants to add the P code to match NCIC. A “2” code will not translate into LEDS. Mary asked for a consensus of the group, and the group agrees for now P is all that needs to be added because to put a 2 code we need more information. We want our fields to remain stable so that LEDS can pull that information properly. If the institution wants a “2” code they would need to create a table elsewhere as to not affect our LEDS data pull. Mary will send an email when that P code has been added.

Sanction codes – Mary has a list of offenses where the SANC field is blank. We will get a report with felonies only at first. After the service request to add the CONS (for county – no sanctions) sanction code has been completed, we will run the list with all the misdemeanors. OACCD does not want blanks in the sanction field, but will be okay in the interim if we take care of all the felonies with blanks.

Judy stated her concerns with CONS regarding transfer from county to county, and wanted to ensure that CONS will only be used in lieu of SANC. If the court does not allow sanctions PSSR must be used. Yes, the group agrees that is the way to use it. And for now we can leave it blank. But leaving it blank will only be for misdemeanors where the court allows sanctions but the county chooses not to sanction.

The list Mary has includes felonies and offenses where the old SCCR code is used – group agreed PSSR is accurate now if the offense is convicted after 1993, since that is the date where it changed to PSSR and that’s the code we should use.

The group agreed they want a report with felonies and SCCR for now, and will do misdemeanors later.

Michael asked for service request to edit so we can’t leave field blank. Group likes that to prevent mistakes.

Mary talked about departures. What is the difference between optional probation and downward departure? Kelly Officer from the Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) said there is a dispositional line on the sentencing guidelines grid – above the line is prison, below the line is probation. A downward departure is changing the standard prison sentence for that crime to a probation sentence and an upward departure is changing from the standard probation sentence to a prison sentence. Optional probation is a little different and is only for grid scores 8I, 8H, and 8G, and is about future success on probation. For optional probation, it has to be shown in court that an appropriate treatment is available, and the “probationary sentence will serve community safety interests by promoting offender reformation”. This is the only place where risk assessment is used in sentencing. Someone asked should we capture these like departures. Someone also asked if optional probation can end up in prison due to revocation? Yes, it can – CJC said that both optional probations and downward

departures COULD end in a prison sentence from revocation, because the revocation sentence is the original incarceration sentence. If it's 1 year and a day or more, the person is revoked to prison. If it's 1 year or less, the person is revoked to local control. For optional probation grid blocks the sentences are from 16-22 months, so those revocations would most likely be a prison sentence. SOON recommended we capture these types of sentences separately or at least differentiate downward departure from optional probation. Mary checked with Denise Sitler and was told CJC wasn't sure it was necessary to track separately because they are basically treated the same way. Mary will also check with Jeremiah Stromberg to see how OACCD wants to track downward departures and optional probations – separately or together. Once we have a definite answer a service request will be entered.

Judy asked how 'optional probation' relates to felonies given straight jail vs. local control with no PPS because she often sees that language on straight jail for felonies. No one was totally sure.

Kathy from Klamath talked about how her county is facing these issues and questions because of HB3194 and how they are dealing with optional probations.

The group talked about having one single departure field added to the "New Docket, Offense and Sentence" screen – D for downward, U upward, O for optional probation. The field would default to N – none (or no) – this would be the service request. Michael asked if we could run reports based on this field. That would be the goal, but would need to go to reports committee. Mindie asked about the difference between dispositional and durational departures. Dispositional 'downward' departure – is where you were supposed to go to prison, but you get probation. Durational departure is where you were supposed to get 12 months probation but you get 18 months.

SOON's recommendation is to label the field "dispositional" departure and NOT track durational departure. But if OACCD wants to track durational, it could be a separate field.

Kathy asked about the reports – will the report capture the length of prison term or what score it raises to? No, not if that data isn't entered, and the service request we're recommending does not include fields for adding all that data.

If your orders don't have the departure language, perhaps your director could ask the court to start getting it in there so we can track and enter the information.

Michael asked about putting the departure info on the Kardex. Mary will take it to FAUG to see if they would find it helpful. There may not be room for it, but Mary will look at that.

Lee explained some POs are using a program in OIS to create a customized Kardex. Perhaps that will be an option for some.

Tina Potter talked about creating a merge document that draws all the data she wants and creates custom field sheets.

#### Lee – CC Updates:

Talked about how the DOC is putting on corrections academy for the POs. There appears to be left over money in that grant and they're looking at training for support staff. Support staff training like this hasn't happened since 2004. Jeff Hanson asked Lee what we would like to see in our training. Lee sent the old format information to Jeff and asked the group if there are topics we'd like to learn about if we had an opportunity for a day or day and a half of training. Asked the group to think about it and send Michael an email and he can gather that information. Please make suggestions now or send an email. We need specifics about what we want to learn. Please send ideas by the end of the month. Michael will email the whole distribution list and ask for ideas. We'll send ideas to Michael and he will coordinate it and provide it to Lee.

Michael asked if it's just CIS or if we could learn LEDS and other things, too. Margaret mentioned she'd like to learn how to interpret CCHs. Kathy said she heard there would be LEDS trainings possibly soon. We could get lessons on OMS modules, TCU modules, etc. Think about what you want, and we'll make a list.

Sanctions – There is some confusion on who can do what and the authorities of users. The FAUG rep has authorities to change sanctions from COMP to PEND only on community status offenders (probation, conditional discharge, post-prison/LC) but not on board statuses (post-prison/BRD, post-parole, and parole). If the board returns a sanction to the PO because it was sent to them by mistake, the FAUG rep can't just complete it. The only thing FAUG can do with a sanction in RETU status is to return it to the board. Any RETU that mistakenly went to board, you'll have to send a request to Lee or Mary and they can either change to COMP or back to PEND. Once it gets that RETU sanction status the system sees it as board, even if the body/status isn't board.

Regarding sanctions on trans leave offenders, you should be able to complete those. Chris Christy took over for Trish Davenport. Don't send the sanction to the board, but you do create it in the structured sanction module, and we can do the movement of the sanction, and we can complete it. Send all questions and sanctions to the general STTL email address ([shorttermtransleave@doc.state.or.us](mailto:shorttermtransleave@doc.state.or.us)). Do these sanctions just like probation sanctions.

If you have an offender on a board case and the PO sanctions just the probation case, the board doesn't require you to send it to them, but they want to know. You would send the sanction via email or fax to notify that you've sanctioned the probation case. If it is sent accidentally and it's in RETU status, the community agency can't deal with it but Lee can.

Lee recently got a list of sanctions in RETU status. It's barely at 200 now, which is much lower than before. The email trigger program that would send the notification that the

sanction was returned wasn't happening. So the POs didn't know that the sanctions were returned. When they discovered the auto-email function didn't work and those emails weren't going out, they released the floodgate of those auto-generated emails but only back to January 2014. Now the emails should be going through. There are still some small quirks. If you notice you're not getting those emails, let Lee know.

There are some things to remember about the new PSC scores and OTTO; auto-scoring was deliberately not done on out-counts. OTTO may not ask for a new score on those unless the level has changed. Be careful and look at those ones that were last scored by the old OCMS program as if these are not risked with the PSC/Proxy when they return to supervision they may not be funded. OTTO will review the record and see if the score prior to the out-count matches the current score. OTTO will not alert you to rescore because you don't have to rescore. Hopefully OTTO is catching the ones where the score was different than it is now – but keep an eye on these, you might see ones that OTTO isn't alerting, but the score has really changed.

There were two situations where the new assessment was removed. When the February 25 autoscoring was done on everyone except out-counts, if the PO had done a proxy because there was no PSC or juvenile or the both out of state and no PSC – then really the new PSC was put on in error. And that was wrong because the proxy score was valid. They thought they could back those out, but really they just got deleted. If at your community level you went in and re-input the Proxy scores after the February 25 autoscoring was done but prior to this clean-up of the PSC/Proxy autoscoring, it remained as you had changed it.

If a PO had overridden the risk score to low due to a completed LS/CMI, the auto-scoring didn't redo overrides. So they sent the email asking to look at them. The program wouldn't let them override with LS/CMI to low again, because it said the LS/CMI wasn't valid (because it was too old) but these people were on case-bank correctly in the first time; so they shouldn't have to redo the case-bank LS/CMIs just so that the date of the LS/CMI was current enough to make the override requirements happy.

There may be a list of offenders with no PSC or proxy because of their attempts to fix the issues these two glitches caused.

OTTO is working, whether the POs are using it or not. If there is an R in the OTTO line, you can put an R on that line and read the message. Two kinds of notifications: informational used for new admit or back from the institution or local; then at the 30-day mark it turns into "action" type of notification – every day the R code will be there until it's done.

There is a delay for the R to go away. If you do a PSC score the R won't go away until the next day. The system reads and clears notifications at approximately 6 to 6:30 a.m.

For a while there were scores different in CIS and CJC; then they thought it was fixed, but people were saying it was still different. People were going into the judges' site and putting in the ORS and if the sentence hasn't been entered yet or the day waiting requirement in CIS hadn't occurred there was a discrepancy. Once they waited overnight it matched up, which is how it should work.

The PSC manual was sent out by Lee. The manual talks about the variables used to create the scores. This manual contains lots of good information to answer your questions about the PSC. It is very comprehensive. Angie asked about the link to reference this PSC manual in our OPS manual. Lee explained that it's not uploaded to the web yet, but when it is, we'll be able to add the link to our reference section in the OPS manual.

Also, the R code in OTTO does not translate into OMS. Lee asked for that update, but it's not there yet.

#### Service requests –

Earned discharge code – Mary thanked the testers. They tested the edits on the code itself on how and what type of offenses it can be used on. On the sentence begin date – must begin sentence on or after August 1, 2013. This code will work for felony probation, no conditional discharge or diversion because it must be a felony conviction. It is also valid for Local PPS for offenders on local status. August 1, 2013, or later is the date they need to be sentenced to local control and begin their jail sentence. It doesn't matter what the probation conviction date is, once it is revoked it's the L sentence that is used to calculate eligibility. Judy asked if the offender is convicted prior to August 1 and sentenced into local but doesn't show up for jail until after August 1 does that qualify. Yes, that's fine – they qualify because that L sentence line is entered the date they enter jail, and that's the sentence line that has to be August 1 or later, so it's fine. These scenarios of delaying entry are probably going to be only a few rare cases, so we won't worry about it.

The first edit is related to the Begin Date of the sentence. If there is a P line then an L line, the system only looks at the L line.

Another edit looks at the length of the sentence served. If the sentence begin date is okay, but not 50 percent of time served, the system will block you from using the EDIS code.

The rest of the edits are based on sentence type. Only FPR or local PPS on local status will qualify. No local control sentences if the offender on board status will qualify.

Michael confirmed all this information will be sent when EDIS goes live. Edits are in place, tested, and we were going to move into production, but the code will not be available until the OAR language is written and approved by the DOJ and the process for the POs are in place. Mary will send notice when the whole thing rolls out.

There is no edit on body closure. The current practice is that you close the body to whatever is the last sentence closure and that is also true for using EDIS. The system will not prevent you from closing the body to EDIS whether you have any sentences closed to EDIS at all. Mary suspects there will be no problem, but if that becomes an issue we'll look at it.

Judy suggests adding language to the body closure description that the last open offense must be closed to EDIS to close the body to EDIS. The group agreed and Mary will update the description on the code table.

They are getting close to finalizing OAR draft.

Service Request #2512 - edit on caseload definitions to allow four-digit caseload numbers only. We've done a prior edit to only create caseload for your location. When this SR is completed you will only be able to create a four-digit caseload number. There is also an edit where you cannot delete a caseload number— you'll see the option but when you try to use it, you'll get an error message. If you need a caseload deleted, Mary can help with that. When you use Option 6=discontinue on a caseload, it removes all active users and changes the description to "Discontinued", but it doesn't tell you if there are active or outcount offenders attached to the number. We've also asked for an edit so that if you use a 6=discontinue it will stop you and tell you there are offenders attached. If only secondaries, it will automatically remove those. The system will only stop you if there are primaries attached. Check the Subset for all out-counts if you can't figure out why it is stopping you.

If you want to reassign a discontinued caseload, use option 2 to reactivate, update the description field and add an active user. Mary asked for an edit that if you just change the description it won't let you save that, you have to add at least one active user ID as a primary. That way you can't have a caseload with no PO or staff attached.

The SR has been assigned, and they're working on it.

Some edits will be the same for community corrections and the institution, some will not. Mary has already sent out clean up lists, but she hasn't heard back from many people. The first list was a list of caseloads with users who are not active users. The program removed all inactive users from the caseloads, so in some cases it left caseloads with no users attached at all.

For the counties you must have a XX99 caseload, because the institution uses your 99 caseload as the release plan caseload and sends an email with release plans to whoever is listed as the primary user of that caseload. You can have more than one user as primary.

Margaret asked about a caseload number where they have no PO to put on it anymore; can she "keep" that caseload. Mary explained yes, she can "discontinue" it if there will

be no active user at this time, and at any later date they can reactivate it and use it again.

Mary is also hoping they can create a table listing each county's caseload range. That way a county can only work with numbers that are within their range.

Judy explained that OPS manual chapter 23 is a resource to help with caseload maintenance changes. Lee reminded the group to make sure the primary active users are the ones who need to receive emails when the board/institution sends them. If the user ID is incorrect, they won't get the emails.

Mary's second email with the caseload clean-up list was a little more extensive. It had offenders attached to a non-existent caseload because the caseload had been deleted prior to the edit that wouldn't allow us to delete caseloads. You have to recreate the deleted caseload number, find the offenders attached to that number, and get them moved onto another caseload. Remember you may need to subset to see the offenders. It is important to have historical records kept intact, which is why we don't delete caseloads anymore. There are orphan records when offenders are attached to a caseload that was deleted. The record has no home (caseload) that it's attached to. So recreate those caseload numbers, move the offenders, and then discontinue the caseload if you don't want to use it.

This is mostly pre-conversion data (this second list) and may be really old records. After you put them on a valid caseload, look at the records to determine if they need to be closed – check for warrants, check for deceased, etc.

Service Request Edit to help get better outcome measure condition data (an OACCD request). When you enter a trackable outcome measure condition – the edit will force you add an amount/unit ordered. The second part of the request is we don't want negative balances, so there will be an edit to block that. And it will stop a person from entering an amount paid if there is a zero balance – to prevent the negative balance. And there will be no way to put an "amount this month" if there is a zero balance.

On the support staff/entry side there is enough spaces to put a million dollars or more, but on the PO side they can't see the full number. So they are going to ask that the display screen be fixed on both sides.

You can run the condition measure report. Use 23 (CC Reports Menu), then 4 (Total Office Reports), then 17 (Offender Condition Report).

If no amount has been ordered on the judgment and it says may be ordered later – you can either not add the condition at all until you see it's been ordered, or you can enter it as non-trackable.

**OPS Related Issues:** none

**OPS Manual:** The manual committee met yesterday. More changes are coming to the chapters. Judy has created one PDF document with all the chapters – some counties can't get it via email because of the file size, so we are trying to getting it uploaded to the web. Hopefully everyone finds that useful.

Mindie talked about her offender who was supervised for three years on a crime that had been changed from being a crime prior to his conviction. Emails went around regarding using the dismiss code or vacate or delete the record all together. This case was closed to VACA to keep the historical record.

Emma had a case the offender was convicted of a sex offense but years later found the crime wasn't valid. What is the proper way to close that? Or would it be deleted?

Lee suggests for individual cases check with your county counsel if you are unsure, but for the most part if you actually supervised someone for any period of time the historical record should remain. Mary also pointed out the offender can request a sealing if they want.

**Local Control:** Diane brought a question from Glenda who wants to be able to run a report with the escape code who are on the JACB location. It appears that out-count is only allowed for the L location, but they have local 'LC' offenders in their JACB location who have escaped because they left the work center. Mary will see if the report can be fixed.

An offender was sentenced to local control in March, but did not report to jail as directed, was arrested in April, how to do the data entry? Michael explained you admit the date she was arrested and L line starts the same date she was admitted, because Local Control starts the date the offender enters the jail, not necessarily the date they are convicted. Sometimes those are two different dates.

Michael brought up the LSA manual and asked if that is an ongoing thing or maintained by anyone. There was an old Bill Penney "frequently asked questions" manual – but that is old and outdated and isn't available any more. After that the the LSA manual was created. But it hasn't been updated since October 2007. That manual is a process / policy piece. Our manual focuses on data entry, so any data entry questions regarding local control would be in our OPS manual.

Judy asked if people are putting something in the MIS field when this scenario happens (an offender not reporting for a local control sentence). Mary said you can put something in the MIS field, but don't use the escape RTP because that's not accurate. Michael suggested if we wanted we could change RTP to PVP. Christy updates the EPR to local status (FLC) and puts in MIS field "1145 client."

Kari asked if all counties modify the EPR RTP to show FLC – some do, some don't, some wait to change it when it goes to PPS.

Michael reminded the group when an offender goes to prison, but waivers out to another county, please forward your files to the new supervising county. The group agrees that the same cycle files need to stay together, with the supervising county, and not be sent to OISC in sections. Please don't destroy or archive files of people who go to prison on an open cycle.

Nola asked if a county sent another county a cycle one file when the offender is on cycle two, why would/should we send it back, especially if it has been sent to OISC. Nola asked if she could just send the appropriate documents to OISC and destroy the file if the retention period has passed. Yes, if you have the manpower available for that and want to do another county's work. Otherwise, it's fine to send it back to the county who sent it to you, so they can send documents to OISC and retain or destroy as appropriate.

Angie brought up the email about the predatory designator on the EPR and in CIS and asked who uses the designator. Mary explained the predatory designation does appear on their CCH. If the offender is in CIS then check the designator there and it should be in there. Those are two places you should be able to see that an offender is designated predatory.

Kerri had a girl on probation who had 10 days work crew; got revoked and reinstated and given 60 more days of work crew; would she add that to the total? Yes, and put in the comment line that the 60 were ordered on PV judgment dated x.

Judy asked if we are supposed to put an offender out to REVP while they are pending deportation, since the immigration holding facility is technically federal custody. No, just leave them active until they are deported.

### **User groups:**

SUN – haven't met for a while. Tina and Mary will get together and update manuals. No date set yet. Michael offered to help with the manual as well. Nicoli from Deschutes County will be signing up soon, after she completes training a new employee. That will make nine users in the CCSUN group.

FAUG – met February 19 & 20 in Hood River. They worked on the PSC and OTTO. Will meet again May 22, 23.

SOSN – haven't heard anything. Jeff Hanson is the SOSN liaison – Michael should check in with him for SOSN updates.

FSN – will meet this month in Astoria, April 24. DOC IT department is seriously looking for a new billing package to fit in the CIS to replace whole fee system.

OACCD – met March 13, 14 in Douglas. More PSC issues and 3194 work groups. Meet again May 14, 15. Archiving minutes email sent, but the issue was not discussed. Lee will follow up.

Regarding the open co-chair position: Jessica Jaukens from Wasco County has offered to step up and take over Judy's position. Judy will send Manette the new co-chair information.

### **Round Table:**

Angie – Roxie asked how release plans are being sent to supervising counties. Do a 6 to send the plan and pick the release plan caseload. It seems they are not being sent. Michael suggests to contact the actual county and ask how they did it. Mindie wondered if it was part of the 'stuck' emails. Lee said it probably would have pushed through when they fixed the glitch and all those emails flooded through. Jessica follows up manually because the one she did didn't work by sending the email.

Lisa had something but couldn't remember details, something about compact and incarcerated out of state, Oregon only warrant, abscond, had a phone hearing with a Multnomah County judge, supposed to be on post-prison here, released four months ago but hasn't reported. She's confused. Not sure what's going on. Compact? Margaret thinks the warrant hasn't been served, Christy says telephonic hearing clears the warrant, PPS should be running. Do the due diligence, and then request a warrant.

Emma wanted to poll the group regarding a scenario: she had a Compact offender who is here from Idaho; Idaho didn't do a notice of departure, but say they're working on it; no notice of arrival has been done yet because no notice of departure has been done; the PO wants clerical to admit the offender but she can't/won't with no notice of arrival. Would people just admit him anyway or wait for the notice of arrival? The group agrees to wait. Perhaps check with Compact to make sure we're doing it right by using date of arrival that appears on the notice of arrival.

Margaret Hill wants to retire.

Lee spoke about the mistaken rumor that circulated regarding Mary's retirement, which is actually occurring in 30 months, but someone misunderstood and thought it was happening in 30 weeks.

Judy thanked Jessica Jaukens for stepping up and volunteering to take over the co-chair position and do minutes.

Michael thanked Judy for all her work as co-chair and doing minutes for the past two years.

Next SOON meeting is June 12, 2014, in Coos County.

*Meeting adjourned.*