

FAUG AGENDA

Polk County

August 21, 2013 - 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

August 22, 2013 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Meeting Location:

Polk County Courthouse
Commissioner's Conference Room (1st floor)
850 Main Street
Dallas, OR 97338

Day One:

Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping

Angela/Group

Attendance:

Mike Elkinton (Jackson Co) –

Wende Kirby (Multnomah Co) – wende.kirby@multco.us

Leticia Longoria-Navarro (Multnomah Co) – Leticia.longoria-navarro@multco.us

Erin Larson (Coos Co) –

Angela Boyer (Polk Co) – boyer.angela@co.polk.or.us

Christopher Swayzee (Washington Co) – christopher_swayzee@co.washington.or.us

Lily Morgan (Josephine Co) – lmorgan@co.josephine.or.us

Jessica Beach (Yamhill Co) – beachj@co.yamhill.or.us

Gina Courson (Marion Co) – gcourson@co.marion.or.us

Carolyn Knox (Lincoln Co) – cknox@co.lincoln.or.us

Amy Wels (Polk Co) – wels.amy@co.polk.or.us

Justin Hecht (Clatsop Co) – Justin.B.Hecht@cc.doc.state.or.us

Lee Cummins (DOC) – lee.cummins@doc.state.or.us

Mary Hunt (DOC) – Mary.A.Hunt@doc.state.or.us

Larry Evenson (Lane Co) – Lawrence.Evenson@co.lane.or.us

Marne Pringle (Clackamas Co) – marnepri@co.clackamas.or.us

Shaun Anderson (Hood River Co) – shauna@co.hood-river.or.us

Dru VanRiper (Jefferson Co) – dru.vanriper@co.jefferson.or.us

Susan Sowers (Benton Co) – susan.sowers@co.benton.or.us

Andie Cortes (Douglas Co) – andie.r.cortes@doc.state.or.us

Betti Spencer (Yamhill Co) – spencerb@co.yamhill.or.us

Ruby McClorey (Interstate Compact) – ruby.e.mcclorey@doc.state.or.us

Marty Silbernagle – Director Polk Co.

He asked a question about the Service Request queue and how that is driven. Lee advised that the Service Request Governance Group decides which requests get priority over others and push them through as such.

He asked a question about locking chronos. Lee states that the reason must match criteria set forth.

He asked about whether each office is becoming aware of upcoming changes. What is each county going to do about spending the reinvestment monies? County Administrators will decide how to spend the money and must submit a plan to DOC.

Minute Review

Group

Minutes from May 2013 FAUG Meeting are approved.

A question was asked about adding meeting minutes to the DOC website. Minutes are added to the website by Manette Emra; as long as they are sent to her with a request that she add them.

Forensic Scientist for the State Police

Heidi Stetson

Heidi Stetson spoke about the DNA collection/CODIS database system. She also conducted a training on DNA collection; how to get better samples. She also gave out information on statistics/facts of DNA collection.

CODIS = COmbined DNA Index System – FBI are in control of the system. The state lab is in Clackamas, OR. This is the only lab in the state. Heidi is the only DNA Analyst in state of OR. There are 14-15 Casework Analysts. Also employed are Toxicology, Trace and other Techs. There currently is no backlog on samples to be analyzed. All samples are put into a database for matching purposes.

Requirements for collection began in 1990. There was a 2-yr validating period. In 1991, state law required blood samples be taken from offenders convicted of Murderer and sex offenses. Later, Burglary and other crimes added and the samples required were changed from blood to saliva. In 2002, the law required that all felons have their samples collected. Currently, there are 160,000 samples in database. Unknown samples from crime scenes are also entered into the database and once per week, the samples are compared. There is no chain-of-custody to get the sample to the lab, but FBI requires the samples are kept in locked lab. Heidi has meet with the SOON group and has offered that at the next SOON meeting that will be held near the lab, that they can take a tour of the lab. FAUG is also invited to take a tour of the lab.

How samples are processed... The FTA (pink) paper is punched to take out samples. A set of 87 samples are done at once. Each sample is processed 2-3 times if the samples don't pass on first try. The hope is to have samples collected correctly to upload to the system. State system requires 10 loci...and federal system requires 16 loci be identified to allow uploading into the system. Heidi is contacting agencies to ask for recollections when the three tries don't net a result. She is requiring that the flag with DNA collected be removed out of DOC400, if necessary, to prompt recollection. The criteria list includes:

- All convicted Felons (Classes A-C)
- Sex Abuse III
- Public Indecency
- Conspiracy/Attempt to Commit:
 - Rape III
 - Sodomy III
 - Sex Abuse II
 - Burglary II
 - Promoting Prostitution

Conditional Discharges and expunctions are removed by Administrator (upon notification). No incoming compact case samples are accepted. Outgoing compact cases are required, however. If the felony occurred prior 1991, except Murder, DNA collection not required. Heidi states that if you are in doubt, send in the sample and the lab can determine if the sample was required.

New collection cards will be sent out as old cards are used up. On the new cards, there is contact info added, plus the thumbprints are now to be applied to both the front and back. The classification of the crime has been removed...not necessary. Any county that has old collection kits is asked to dispose of them and request new kits will be sent. Kits are sent in batches of 100 pieces. Small counties can request batches of less than 100 kits, if necessary. They are asked to contact Heidi for arrangements for small shipments at heidi.stetson@state.or.us. For traditional requests of 100+ kit batches, use fulfillment@phcnw.com to make arrangements for shipping.

For collection card completion: Use black/blue ink. Red ink won't scan. Green is used for corrections, so please don't use green ink. Other colors of ink are questionable...so please only black or blue. Please be neat...write legibly and do not add swirls to letters/numbers. Most important is a clear thumbprint...it is now asked that collectors take thumbprints are collected using the rolling of thumbs, rather than the prior "tap-down" method. A new ink pad will be included in new boxes of 100 collection kits. The ink strips will be discontinued, as they are inconsistent in their quality.

Oral swab instructions are updated. It is preferred that the collector take the swab rather than the offender doing it themselves. The epithelial cells are needed (a rubbing on cheek/gum)...not the saliva. A swab of saliva will change the color on the sample, but won't include cells. Roll the samples back/forth...don't rub...on the collection paper. You must see a change of color. (Two laminated example cards were passed out to each attendee...one for the collection card and one for the FTA paper).

Please include all info on the collection card; as well as the offender's name/SID on FTA paper.

All counties in Oregon have been submitting samples, except for Sherman County.

A test group of three law enforcement agencies have been submitting samples from Burglary crime scenes. Robots are doing the processing. This test group has netted encouraging results.

OMS Training

Leticia Longoria-Navarro

The goal for OMS is to allow POs to be able to run their caseload almost exclusively out of OMS, rather than using DOC400. OMS brings all of the different modules together. Evidence-based practices are utilized and OMS is designed to bring consistency across the state and aides in efficiency. As of March 1, 2013, it became required that Case Plans in OMS are used in case management. Community Safety and Behavior Change of Offenders are goals in evidence-based practices.

LS/CMI Network Workgroup members need to be made aware of issues with the program. A list of enhancements and bugs has been prepared by Katie Roller (Mult Co). They likely won't come back through FAUG, but are going through the LS/CMI Workgroup. This will include eliminating redundant data-entry points. The issue in which some users are being logged out after less than 10 minutes of idle time was raised. The workgroup is aware of this.

PowerPoint handout given – but it is largely tailored to Multnomah County practices...Leticia says that the handout can be emailed out to users, as well. Refer to PowerPoint handout for details of training.

Scoring guides (LS/CMI) have been recently updated and will soon be added to the "Help" feature in OMS. The next LS/CMI Network Workgroup meeting is in September and this will be addressed at that time.

Case Plans are automatically created when LS/CMI is processed...but it is not a Case Plan that is comprehensive. Users should utilize the Case Plan module to complete a comprehensive Case Plan.

Reminder: Only navigate OMS from menus/lists. Do not use the browser's "Back" button.

OACCD

Tanner Wark / John Watson

Tanner and John did not attend this meeting. No updates have been forwarded to the members of FAUG.

Parole Board

Shawna Harnden

Shawna was unable to attend this FAUG Meeting. She sent an email with updates to Lee and Mike. The email body is attached; stating:

Unfortunately, I will not be able to make it for the FAUG meeting. I have provided below the updates from last meeting and some additional information for everyone.

Regarding the arrest date issue brought forward by Deschutes County: When an offender is arrested, the action taken by the Board while updating the record generates an auto email to notify the PO that the offender has been arrested. There is certain steps that must be taken

during this process in the Board's system. If steps are missed, the email is still sent but the arrest date is invalid. This is believed to be a process error at the Board, which we believe has since been resolved. However, if additional counties are getting the same invalid dates for the arrest date, please notify me and I will look into this further.

Regarding Multnomah's request for the list of open sanctions 120 days or older: Our IT is currently working on this. He is unsure if he can run such a list with the restrictions of time limits or how far back any list he runs will allow him to go back. I will keep everyone posted.

SOON item: Board Orders - When reading a Board Order the offenses are listed by expiration date not by counts. In other words, if the offender has convictions that are the same case number but has multiple counts, the Order will not show the offenses in count order (i.e., CR943016/01, CR943016/02). The offenses will be listed in the order of expiration dates. If count 1 has 3 years PPS but count 5 only has 1 year PPS, the order will show count 5 as the first one listed on the Order due to that expiration date occurring before count 1 expires. Our Orders do not show the count information and due to our system being so old, we are unable to alter the program to show the counts for clarification.

Forwarding sanctions to the Board Hearings Officer: When forwarding a sanction to the Board's Hearings Officer, the sanction must be forwarded in the AS400 to the username BOARDHO. All documentation that needs to be sent to the Board's Hearings Officer, must be either faxed to 503-945-9020 or scanned and emailed to PAROLEBOARDHEARINGSO@DOC.STATE.OR.US<mailto:PAROLEBOARDHEARINGSO@DOC.STATE.OR.US> email.

That email is linked to the username BOARDHO in the AS400. All notifications that are auto-generated regarding sanctions being submitted to BOARDHO gets sent to this email address. The Board Hearings Officer works primarily out of this email. Some confusion on this is that the Board HO works for the Board so the sanction needs to be submitted to the Board (BRD) but here is where the separation is - while the HO works at the Board, their function is as a Hearings Officer and the sanctions must be submitted to HO status. The sanctions do not go to BRD status until they are done and ready for the Board to review and make a final decision on. We recently hired a new Hearings Officer, Fay Stetz-Waters. Fay comes to us from the Office of Administrative Hearings as an Administrative Law Judge for the State of Oregon.

In addition to the generic email for the Hearings Officer desk, the Board has also made generic emails for the Warrants desk and the Records desk.

PAROLEBOARDWARRANTS@DOC.STATE.OR.US<mailto:PAROLEBOARDWARRANTS@DOC.STATE.OR.US> - Please use this email for ALL warrant issues (rescinding, upgrade requests, lifts) and extend/react/inact requests. If you need to speak with someone for an urgent matter at the Warrants desk, then call 503-945-0912. We are currently in the recruitment process for this position.

PAROLEBOARDRECORDS@DOC.STATE.OR.US<mailto:PAROLEBOARDRECORDS@DOC.STATE.OR.US> – Please use this email for any record requests.

If you need to make contact with someone but you don't know who or what their number is, please see our staff directory on our contact page of our website http://www.oregon.gov/BOPPPS/Pages/contact_us.aspx.

As always, I am always available to help if I can. I am currently sitting at the Warrants desk (503-945-0912) but will hopefully be back at my desk (503-945-0914) soon.

Thanks,

Shawna Harnden

Executive Assistant | Oregon Board of Parole & Post-Prison Supervision
2575 Center Street NE, Suite 100 | Salem, Oregon 97301

Phone: (503) 945-0914 | Fax: (503) 373-7558 | Email:

Shawna.M.Harnden@doc.state.or.us<mailto:Shawna.M.Harnden@doc.state.or.us>

Regarding the forwarding of sanctions to Board Hearings Officer: they can now be sent to a generic location that all at the Board can use. The User ID is "BoardHO". There has been a lot of confusion about these sent to the Board HO. Users have historically used Option 10 to send to Supervisor, but if the "send to Board" option is selected, it will result in the sanction being placed in "SUPV" status...and it sends it to the physical Board. This is not where the sanctions need to go. Instead, users should use Option 15. But they have to put an "N" in the first field and then tab to the "Send to HO UserID" field and put "BOARDHO" in the field. When using Option 15, it will put the sanction in "HO" status. This is how the Board prefers the sanctions be sent. It has also been discovered that confusion on where to send warrants has resulted in warrant requests being sent to different User IDs...and these requests have not been addressed.

The email for the Hearings Officer Desk is paroleboardhearingso@doc.state.or.us

The email for the Warrants Desk is paroleboardwarrants@doc.state.or.us

The email for the Records Desk is paroleboardrecords@doc.state.or.us

If need to contact someone, but don't know who...see the directory on their website...

http://www.oregon.gov/BOPPPS/Pages/contact_us.aspx

Mary brought up an issue that was raised at SOON. When an offender is going to UNSU status, SOON users want to know what date to use...was it the effective date or ASR date. The Board uses the date that is indicated on the letter.

Discussion took place as to whether moving cases to INAC is automatically done by the Board. Some people are hearing that the cases ARE being moved automatically at ASR date, but others are hearing that the cases are NOT moved automatically. Mary said that Shawna told her that this hasn't been done automatically in about 2 years. Mary will check with Shawna to verify.

Lee and Mary spoke to Shawna Harnden (Parole Board) on morning of Day 2 regarding questions in yesterday's meeting. The following came of that conversation:

- Shawna will email out all of the generic email addresses to the CCB/All distribution list.
- The Parole Board IT department can generate a report of sanctions that are 120+ days old. Then the question was raised as to whether FAUG wants periodic reports. Suggestion was that a quarterly report be given to FAUG Reps to take back to their offices to get the open sanctions closed. A concern was raised about inconsistencies in the report. Lee will forward the concern to Shawna. Lee said that she can have the report printed shortly before the FAUG meetings. FAUG approves. The reports can be run using either the creation date or custody begin date. FAUG agrees the creation date is the date to use on the reports.
- Shawna also said that the cases which pass their ASR dates without a Letter to Extend Active Supervision are NOT automatically moved to INAC. The Board must have PO recommendation on the action before they, themselves, can take action. They can then update their system and process the warrants and/or sanctions accordingly. The following actions generate a Board action: extending active supervision, moving a case to INAC or reactivating a case.

Day Two:

ICOTS

Ruby McClorey

Ruby advised that an audit is going to be done soon.

No other updates were brought to FAUG by Ruby/Interstate Compact.

A question asked of Ruby as to whether a "mandatory retake" MUST be retaken. The answer is yes. A followup question was asked whether the PO who wants to keep the case in OR, rather than send the case back to the sending state, can that do so. Ruby says that this is a possibility...said that the PO can call her and they can review the case to determine what action can be taken.

DOC Update

Lee Cummins

Lee explained how to set a user's caseload as their default in DOC400. She also advised that if you notice that your default caseload is not correct in OMS, it is because the default caseload is incorrect in CMS.

Local Release Plan cleanup: The query was done in April. The last of the open plans that were Inmates (which FAUG Reps cannot change) have been done by Lee. The Institution Counselors have been instructed to not change any open plans that have been started on the Community side...they are to call Lee to get those closed. Then, they can start a new plan.

At a prior FAUG meeting, a request was made to add a code for "email" as a "place code" when creating a chrono. The code has been created...it is "EM" and it is now active. See below regarding Mary working on adding a location to enter the email address in DOC400.

Service Request update: FAUG has made a request to have a "Print" function on TCU report. This request has been assigned to Mike Truman and is in process.

Service Request update: OTTO feature. Recently, the Programmer on this request was pulled from this request and put on another high-priority project. However, all business analysis has been done on this feature and the project is ready to go when the high-priority project is done and the Programmer is placed back on the OTTO project. Tracey Cauffman (Malheur Co) took a job with Powder River and is no longer able to test. Question asked if anybody else would do PSC Workgroup and OTTO testing: Mike Elkinton and Justin Hecht volunteered to test.

Service Request: In the Risk Assessment Module, when viewing an Assessment from main screen with "5", the Proxy details cannot be displayed without actually creating a new Proxy. A request was made to have a function created to display the Proxy details.

An issue was raised regarding the PSC. Example: if a PSC scores MED and an LS/CMI is done and also scores MED, there is not a way to display that an LS/CMI has been done from the W/W Risk Assessments screen. A Service Request would be needed to begin working on this. It was pointed out, however that if a particular risk assessment is displayed (Option 5 from the screen), that the LS/CMI score (if completed) will show. FAUG were reminded that Directors want the PSC score to drive supervision...not LS/CMI...so the LS/CMI should not be used as an override reason. This may vary by county (per County Policy). Each county can create a County Policy to allow for an override. PSC overrides are reported to counties to monitor use of "Policy" overrides in the PSC.

Frustrations were raised about the PSC and LS/CMI not accurately reporting the risk level on long-time absconders. Lee invited anybody with concerns to send an email to the workgroup so that the concerns can be heard. Angela Boyer said that the workgroup is waiting to see how everything has progressed after the first year of use. We are approaching the first year of use...and changes/updates are going to soon be considered after review of progress/issues.

The issue was raised about the PSC not being accurate due to the lack of arrest info from local Indian Reservations which refuse to share its arrest/conviction info. Lee said that their county can create County Policy that allows an override based on LEDS hits or other factors.

A concern was raised about the PSC not counting the PV-revocations as being a different (separate) conviction from the original conviction...and that the LS/CMI does count it as a separate conviction. The recommendation was made that the PSC Workgroup have this information as they work forward with the tool.

A demo of the "I-Learn" program will be done at OACCD next month. Lee will be meeting this week to see how this might work as a training tool for non-state agencies. There is also interest in how the training record will be maintained. The non-"I-Learn" trainings can be entered into the training record to keep a more comprehensive record of trainings. Lee said that Jeremiah Stromberg advised that DOC will pay the domain costs.

The CJC website is still behind on PSC scores for Community Justice partners. Lee said that Jeremiah will see about DOC updating the CJC website in next few weeks.

Update to PSC info: FAPA Orders will no longer factor into the PSC. OACCD have authorized this change. It was discovered that the info around FAPA Orders is very inaccurate. Based on that...and the fact that it only makes a very minute difference in the scoring of the PSC, the info is considered very unreliable and negligible and therefore, it will be taken out. It is unknown when this will be done.

A concern was raised that the new eCourts system is very non-user-friendly. Restitution/COFO info is highly lacking. Currently, SOON Reps are reporting that they are having to simply call the Court Clerks Office to get the info from them, since they cannot find the info in eCourts. There is no contact info known to address this concern. It has also been noticed that public views in Court Clerks Records Offices offer more info than the system used in the P/P system. Furthermore, it has been noticed that some forms that have been used for years can no longer be used by those Courts using the eCourts system. New forms have been created.

The name of the LS/CMI training workgroup has been changed to the Assessment and Case Management Workgroup.

OACCD have created a Reports Committee. Mary H. is working on that committee.

SOON Issues

Mary Hunt

OACCD Reports Committee. They have only had one meeting. Initially, Steve Berger (Washington Co) was leading the group; but now, Pat Schriener (Mult Co) is now leading the group. It is believed that his focus first will be on LS/CMI and the Behavior Change Plan. The next meeting is set for Aug 27 and will be held in Dome Bldg. There are several SOON Reps that have volunteered to participate in the committee. Reports for PSC are being looked at (for fixes or creation of new reports). SOSN have asked for updates on reports for the Static 99R. Unknown if FVSN want reports regarding the ODARA tool. The subgroups (FVSN, SOSN, etc) are expected to be working on reports they desire, but they have to approach the Reports Committee to make the requests. Mary asked for volunteers from POs to work on the committee to keep PO-specific perspective.

RE: adding email addresses to CMS: This can be done, however, there is very little real estate left on the main screen. Additionally, there is a limit to the number of characters available...Mary will have to check on this. Mary wants to avoid using the info (F-11, 4, etc) windows...too many linkage errors. One suggestion was made to remove conditions from the screen to free up space on the main screen. Another suggestion was made to add it to the phone fields...won't have to build a new window. FAUG approved the removal of conditions on the main screen and the email address being in its place. Mary said that this update will include the request to change "home" and "work" phone fields to be "phone 1" and "phone 2" fields. There will be a parenthetical after the number to indicate which type of number being listed (i.e. (C), (H) or (W) for Cell, Home, Work, etc). This field can also be data merged. FAUG has approved these changes.

Service Request Update (on behalf of OACCD) regarding SR2574: Adding Community Corrections Offenders to OOS (Oregon Offender Search) website. OOS went public for DOC Inmates several years ago. Back then, Community Corrections Offenders were kept off of the website. Now, they will be added on to the website. DOC have worked with Offenders Rights groups regarding the offenses, but OACCD are not authorizing any exclusions to the info in the website. There are concerns of potential lawsuits in respect to “headhunters” getting info on conviction data and then using that info to not hire the offender for a job (the concern being in the event of the info being outdated/erroneous). When looking up the Community offender; if the offender is discharged from the supervision cycle, they will no longer show on the website. The website will only include active offenders. DOC want all of the offenders’ crimes to be listed (and include the termination date). A question was raised regarding incoming Compact cases being included...yes, they will be included. Mary will allow SOON, FAUG and OACCD know when the website is up. There will not be a public notification of the release of this website by DOC. Each County can decide whether to publicly release news of the website. Mary has been instructed to create an information message to advise public viewers that a Judge can impose multiple types on a single offense.

Office Elections

Mike Elkinton takes over the position of Chairperson.
Angela Boyer has volunteered to take the position of Co-Chairperson.
Christopher Swayzee has volunteered to remain in the position of Recorder.
Lily Morgan has volunteered to take the position of Membership.

FAUG have accepted/seconded nominations and have approved the appointments.

Roundtable

Group

Chris (Washington Co) – Asked whether other counties are using Option 20, in addition to Option 6, to print out Sanctions (Option 20 prints them in a PV-Report format). There are some users that do so. The Judge in Washington County has asked that Option 20 not be used, so the Asst Director has asked to remove it. Because others use that option, it will not be removed and the Asst Director will be asked to just instruct POs to only use Option 6.

Andie (Douglas Co) – The PO that does Prison Releases wants to add more codes to the Person/Place tables when communicating with the Release Counselor (outside of the Reach-In). They also asked to use a code for video-conferencing the Reach-In. The consensus is that all of this communication is part of the Reach-In...so the “RI” code is best for this purpose.

Mary (DOC) – an email had gone out to the SOON DL asking how many offices, when closing files out to Outcount, are requiring that the PO close out the treatment records before closure. This practices appears to be inconsistent throughout the state. Currently, DOC400 doesn’t force the closure of the treatment record when closing a case to Outcount as it does when completely closing out (discharging) the case. FAUG did not agree that the edit should be expanded to disallow the closure to the Outcount status, but recommends that, for good business practice, that the records be closed before closing case to Outcount.

Shaun (Hood River) – Asked whether other counties are tracking conditions during the course of supervision. Some counties only do this upon case closure. Mary advised that the fields are changeable. She also advised that a Service Request had been made by OACCD to create an edit which would disallow a negative amount in the balances.

Dru (Jefferson Co) – Advised that at the next FAUG Meeting, Denise Easterling will be attending in Dru's place. Denise is taking over FAUG duties for Jefferson Co.

Dru – asked about getting access to the statewide email address list. Lee says that Jefferson Co IT can request copy of the global address list (GAL) from DOC IT. Lee gave out the email address to FAUG Reps:

dlitse-mailadmins@DOC.state.or.us

Dru – Said that their IT has advised that there are designations (bronze/silver/gold) assigned to different counties' IT shops...what do these designations mean? Lee said that DOC want the counties to support themselves within their own IT shop. Their level of self-support determines the designation and the designation determines the priority level of help requests. Lee said that Jennifer Bjerke is the Administrator and can be contacted to ask about moving the service levels up.

**NEXT MEETING –
November 20-21, 2013
Multnomah County**

NOTE: The issue was raised that the Advanced Academy in November will take place during the week of the next scheduled FAUG meeting. Provisionally, the next meeting will be moved to November 13-14, 2013.