

# FAUG AGENDA

## Multnomah County

November 13, 2013 - 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

November 14, 2013 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### Meeting Location:

Residence Inn Portland Airport at Cascade Station  
Conference Room  
9301 NE Cascades Parkway  
Portland, OR 97220

### Day One:

#### **Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping**

#### **Wende/Group**

John Watson spoke to the group about the bomb that exploded at 4:30am this morning at the Jackson County DA's Office. A second bomb (undetected) was found. The investigation continues at this point.

In attendance: Susan Sowers (Benton Co); Justin Hecht (Clatsop Co); Andie Cortes (Douglas Co); Jim Gravely (Grant Co); Michael Elkinton (Jackson Co); Denise Easterling (Jefferson Co); Lily Morgan (Josephine Co); Larry Evenson (Lane Co); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn Co); Charles Adler (Multnomah Co); Wende Kirby (Multnomah Co); Angela Boyer (Polk Co); Robin Filbeck (Tillamook Co); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Christopher Swayzee (Washington Co); Betti Spencer (Yamhill Co); Lee Cummins (DOC-CC); Mary Hunt (DOC-CC); Shawna Harnden (Parole Board); John Watson (OACCD); Denise Sitler (DOC-CCB); Patty Cress (Release Counselor); Hank Harris (Release Counselor); Mindie Everett (Multnomah Co); Ted Mitchell (DOC-IT); Mark Harris (DOC-IT); Trisha Kenyon (Linn Co).

#### **Minute Review**

#### **Group**

The minutes from the August 2013 Meeting have been approved as submitted.

#### **OACCD**

#### **John Watson**

Update – last meeting was in Bend. John and Tanner will team up to act as liaisons from FAUG to OACCD. Next meeting will discuss HB3194. Each group will put together ideas and John will report back to FAUG at next meeting if there was anything that needs to be presented to the FAUG group. If anything is desired by FAUG Reps to be brought to next week's meeting, let John know. There are 7 subcommittees with the workgroup.

Question raised if the LTD caseload supervision level could be reinstated. This was a request made at a prior FAUG Meeting. John said that Tanner was at the meeting and he doesn't believe that there was discussion about this. **ACTION ITEM: John will take this to next week's OACCD Meeting.** Discussion about the differences between LTD and LOW and the impact on contact-standards. This was discussed at Risk Assessment Workgroup Meeting. This may be worked in Phase II of the PSC.

The cost-study group have met to discuss changing the scoring of the PSC. The snapshot for funding is this year. Therefore, the scores may have to be shifted soon to get accurate funding. Decision will be made next week at OACCD. Following current risk levels of PSC, funding will be cut for next biennium. The recommendation is being made to change to match the workload with the scores of the PSC, so that counties will get paid for what they are truly supervising. The original study took into account the entire population in DOC400, incl. all outcounts. Now, only the active supervision population will be counted; omitting the outcounts.

### **ICOTS**

**Ruby McClorey**

Ruby was unable to attend this meeting. No requests to forward information to FAUG group has been made by her.

### **Parole Board**

**Shawna Harnden**

Staffing changes:

- Sid Thompson is new Board Member (from OYA). Parole Board is fully staffed at this point.
- Candace's term is up in January 2014.

News:

- HB 2549 (Sex Offender tier system) passed – it takes effect Jan. 2017.
- Everyone should have received an email recently regarding Parole Conditions,
- New ASII position being listed to work on the Static 99R assessments on offenders no longer on supervision.
- When the sanction cleanup started, the Parole Board was not interested in Probation cases; however many offenders are on both Probation and Parole. The Board needs to approve the Parole sanctions and they cannot complete a Probation sanction. They cannot use CLNA because it implies that they took no action. The Board cannot vote on those, either, because it will appear as though the Board did an override on the Probation sanction. This has been raised to Lee/Mary for discussion/resolution. This same issue has come up with incoming Parole cases on Interstate Compact. There is not much that can be done because once the offender is made as a Board offender, it becomes a Board offender. If any situations come up, email Shawna and/or CC Mary/Lee. Shawna will work with POs on this. Reminder that Option 15 could be used on a returned sanction, if done carefully, to allow POs to close a Probation sanction. If taking action on the probation case, the Board can lift the warrant on the Parole case; the PO only needs to request this from the Board and it can be quickly done.

**Question:** Was there a backlog on the Active/Inactive Status case? Shawna said that there were some coverage changes, but they are current at this point. The Parole Board cannot extend Active Supervision unless they receive documentation from the PO. Some POs are reporting that they are told by the Parole Board that a warrant will not be issued until the Active Supervision is extended (on cases where an offender has passed the ASR date, but no action taken to extend Active Supervision). Shawna states this should not be the case. Shawna will take this back to the Board to be sure that the language being sent via email is accurate...which is that the Active Supervision should be extended, but that the warrant can still be issued.

### **Current Docsum Codes**

**Angela Boyer**

The Docsum Codes are being reviewed for the Reports Committee.

**Issue:** Docsum Codes from other counties' offenders are being sent in Option 24. Discovered that if two POs are requesting Docsum files at the same time, the system can merge the info. If the Data-Mirror product gets slow or goes down, it can also cause problems with the Docsum process. It is all being worked on by Mark Harris. If there are any problems, please advise DOC IT immediately...so that the issues can be resolved ASAP.

Issue with Docsum codes: When doing closing summaries, the fees owed come across as dollar signs. The type is not sent in the Docsum value (hours or money). This has been fixed, but has not been implemented yet.

Issues with Docsum codes: Chris Bell did test and found a few glitches; including:

- Risk score – it will pull the risk level, but not the correct total (score). How do we want this to read? Can we drop the numerical value and leave only the risk level? FAUG Group agree that the Risk Assessment Total code can be dropped; but only if no county relies upon the number to conduct county business. **ACTION ITEM: Angela will send a query to the counties to see if any county relies upon this number and will report back to FAUG.**
- Sex Assessment Total/Level – Not consistent with the Static 99 total, level. Unknown where these values are to be pulled from. May have to send this issue to SOSN to see where they come from and whether they need it.
- Supervision Fee – Not consistent with results. The information is in DOC400, but isn't being pulled across consistently (some cases work...others don't).
- Restitution (amount, victim name and victim address) – never has worked...either at all or properly (the names of multiple victims just string along, rather than creating a separate record). Discussion about whether to put victim's info in DOC400. In Parole records, it is present, but it is withheld as confidential information.

Ted Mitchell said that if we send the information to him, he will investigate to see where the discrepancies are coming from...where the data pulls from...etc. **ACTION ITEM: Angela will send examples to Ted to investigate.**

Request for new codes:

- (Fee System Network) – request for all fee accounts (CSWK Fees, MISC Fees, etc).
- When the Svc Rqst goes in for the “e-mail” field, the Docsum code can be created to accompany the rollout of the new field.
- Local Control Release Date – this could be variable...plus on the community side, it is not necessarily entered. A field could be created in DOC400 where someone could enter in project release dates...but due to too many variables, not feasible.
- For female offenders, all are pulled over as “Mrs.”, should be “Ms.”.
- Place of Birth – this was approved by FAUG.

Ted says that these should be included in a Service Request (including any deletions of no-longer-used codes).

IRT requests and any other reports that use any deleted codes should be modified to avoid crashing when the codes are deleted.

## Reports

Diane Routt has run usage reports to determine which reports have been used and those that aren't being used. This usage report can be used to make recommendations as to which reports can be deleted.

The use of SAS, rather than COBAL reports is being reviewed. DOC owns SAS, so it's not a cost issue, but may be a workload issue for DOC IT. This will be discussed at our next meeting. The Reports Committee Group is still considering which reports are desired and which system to have them run in.

Angela said that the reports were sectioned and run to see if they work and also were considered to see if they are even being used. She has some reports that they've identified that can be deleted. She asked for input on any reports that are needed. A report can be considered for creation or checked to see if one is similar, and then this info can be passed along.

A lot of the PPO special reports need to be rewritten. Nothing will be deleted until a replacement is created.

Question as to whether there is a report for open sanctions. Not at this time. **ACTION ITEM:** Shawna said that she can get reports prior to our next meeting of open sanctions over 180 days old.

Ted said that a request was made to have only one place for the reports to go. This is being looked at.

Request to have counties be able to upload photos into OMS has been made...but due to inconsistency on how large the photo files coming in are, this is not feasible at this time. Mark suggests that this be included in a Service Request so that it can be formally looked at. FAUG agrees that enough interest exists to create a Service Request. **ACTION ITEM:** Bonnie T. will inquire into creating a Service Request.

Various counties gave input on reports being used in their offices and reports desired.

The next Reports Committee Meeting is December 2, 2013. FAUG members are asked to give requests to Angela by then.

Mark has been working on request from OACCD to include Community Corrections offenders to the OOS (Oregon Offender Search) website. This will go live on November 26, 2013. For DOC inmates, it shows current active offenses. On Community side, it will show past crimes (for current custody cycle) with termination dates, but if only the offender is currently being supervised or on an outcount. Offenders on discharge status will not show. A message will show that if an abscond status shows, the local county office should be contacted. A public announcement will not be made by DOC...it will be up to each individual county as to what announcement will be disseminated.

### **Day Two:**

#### **Short Term Trans Leave**

**Denise Sitrler**

Also present (part of committee on this project):

Patty Cress – Release Counselor

Hank Harris –

Trish Kenyon– PO

In Jan/Feb, DOC formed a group w/ reps from Operations, CC, POs, to look at STTL. Where can the process be streamlined/made easier (to address concerns)? Currently, 9-12 mo prior to PRD, application submitted by offender to counselor with release plan. Cannot have Level 1, 2, 3 major DRs prior to applying or extensive history...cannot have refused AIP or programming during incarceration...couldn't have failed out of a program and have had to proposed a well-thought-out RP. The plan would be reviewed and investigated by community. The field would be asked whether the plan would appear appropriate. Inmates were entered into Tx earlier to accommodate. The most difficult part was getting a solid address for the RP.

New timeline being proposed (and will be implemented Jan 1, 2014) is disseminated. Have to be MIIN custody at time of release. No Level 1, 2 DR in past year prior. No failure on other caseplans. Refusal to engage in Tx on front end of incarceration would not exclude the inmates, however, failing out of Tx would affect eligibility. Have to be statutorily eligible (no detainers). No out of state addresses (cannot IC when in Inmate status). **ACTION ITEM: Denise will send out a list of eligibility criteria.** Existing detainers will try to be addressed prior to STTL to make offenders eligible. This issue is being addressed with OACCD.

Process: At 13 mo prior to PRD, Inst. Counselor will meet w/ Inmate to advise they are eligible and explain what it means, the expectations and how they can remain eligible. The application will be given to inmate. This application has been recently reworked to get better information from the inmate. If anybody has any input, they can forward that to Denise. The Multi-Disciplinary Team (one in each institution) will meet to review the application. At 6 mo prior to PRD, the Institution Counselor will work with Inmate to discuss the plan. At 5 mo prior to PRD, the Inst. Counselor will introduce the inmate to MDT. The Counselor will identify the risks, strengths and needs of the inmate. The MDT members will give input and fill out an Approval/Denial Form. The Release Counselor will send out the STTL Form with the Release

Plan. Only one investigation will be required. The comments by the Counselors and Inmates are sent with the RP. Hank asked that the field use the Accept/Deny function in the program on the RP. Automation is ideal for streamlined process.

**Question:** Can an edit be created to the RP to preclude the plan from being returned to the Institution without the Accept/Deny function having been used. The problem is that some counties do not return the plan to the institution and the institution has to pull the plan back, rather than waiting for the county to send it back. There is a statutory requirement to have the plan sent to the Parole Board within a certain period of time prior to release (now 75 days prior).

The PO needs to send the plan back to the institution and will need to email the counselor (address will be on the application). The steps are on the application for the investigating PO. The timeline is based on the STTL eligibility date. There will be 30 and 90-day eligibility dates for Inmates. There are some Inmates that could be eligible for release on a 90-day STTL as early as late-December.

Sanctioning on STTL Inmates – The current max is 3 days and this could be done several times. OACCD is working on this to work out sanction/violation/return process. There have been 8 returns, so far. The sanctions don't go to the Board, the Court or Community Corrections Office...they have to go to Jeremiah Stromberg. This is also being looked at. Currently, if a PO wants to do a local sanction, they can do so as normal. If the PO wants to return the inmate, the Director and Jeremiah staff this to determine whether return is appropriate.

Some of the HB3194 monies were intended to assist counties with additional workload, managing the inmates in the community instead of the institution and also provide housing options.

**Question:** Can disabled inmates come out on STTL (they are still considered inmates and are not eligible for Disability benefits as inmates). Hank said they are in contact with Social Security Administration to work this out.

A person on STTL can have a PSC run by the PO. Another PSC will have to be run upon the inmate's release onto PPS.

## **DOC Update**

**Lee Cummins**

A cleanup list was distributed showing Release Plans (Local Control) that have not been completed. These are problematic when the offender goes to the institution because the institution cannot complete them and cannot create new ones when an old one still is open. Currently, institution staff are trained to contact FAUG Reps to close the open plans. The request is to complete the open local plans. Future discussion will be had regarding what can be done in the future to prevent that (perhaps an auto-closure when the offender is admitted to the institution). Contact Lee on current open plans where the offender is currently in the institution. FAUG Reps can complete those where the offenders are currently in their location. Lee will re-run the report to include the creators' user ID to aid Reps in knowing who to contact to resolve the issue.

A SR for a print button on the TCU drug screen has been done and will be released with next OMS release (in about 4-6 weeks). It will be a 2-page report.

On the DOC website, Manette said there were some problems with links and other issues and some info was lost. She is working through it. If any links are not working, let her or Lee know.

Re: I-Learn: The OACCD Risk Assessment Group are looking at I-Learn. A presentation was handed out and some Directors brought that info back to their staff, resulting in some locations creating profiles in the system...but there is no curriculum or other infrastructure up. This was premature...there is still a lot of work on how to build the infrastructure on this process. FAUG Reps may be responsible for maintaining the profiles. Lee will keep us informed as to progress.

Re: OTTO: Rosa is again working on OTTO. Projected date is in December. A lot of applications can be added, but will start with the PSC (level change) first. It will start out with a testing phase first. A caution was put out there to not put too many reminders in OTTO (with new applications) so that they don't become ignored. OACCD can monitor the number of reminders/applications being created.

**Mary Hunt**

A ticket went to Development with a glitch in the system on Release Plans that are created both in DOC and LC...but not a consistent glitch. The Plan is created with (for example) 2014, but when it was sent out, it changed to 1914 with a message that it is an old Plan. Mary is checking to see if it is a Y2K-related issue because the year is only a 2-digit field. It was reported that it was fixed in the past, but it appears that it is broken again. The date can be corrected (it is an editable field), but it should be reported if this glitch comes up.

Wende and Mary are on the Earned-Discharge group that is creating proposals for the OARs and the reports (similar to inactive supervision reports). Needed a new termination code. The SR has been submitted for the new code (EDIS – Earned Discharge). Because this started on August 1, 2013, we will start seeing this coming up in February 2014. A report will be generated to advise POs of the cases needing review. SOON have asked that there be edits put in place that will prevent a case from being closed if it doesn't meet the criteria. OACCD will review the proposals for the OARs.

**SOON Issues**

No SOON issues at this time.

**Lee Cummins**

**Mary Hunt**

**Roundtable**

**Group**

Lily (Josephine Co) – Still have very limited patrols and this is having impact on numbers of cases prosecuted and therefore, assigned. Max sanctions are to 15 days in beds. New PO has been hired. Hoping for support from community partners.

Betti (Yamhill Co) – A PO had a question about the To Do List. A PSC needing updated wasn't on the list. This may be resolved with the rollout of OTTO.

Betti – eCourt and Odessey programs don't have a lot of detailed info or documents. The Yamhill Co Juv Dept has sent a letter with request for better info. Betti emailed Lee and Mary to see if individual counties should make requests or whether the FAUG group should. FAUG feel it would be better for the Directors to do so. A "Public View" shows the documents but the logins for the counties don't. Justin says that one of their defense attorneys has paid for the "Public View", but not sure if counties can do so.

Bonnie (Linn Co) – To Do List has been deleting tasks out of the list (that have been added to the list). Recommendation to bring this to IT with DOC and to email FAUG with the results.

Christopher (Washington Co) – Multnomah County has created a caseload (ADP 6300 – Monitored Misdemeanor Program) and adds offenders as Primary to that caseload. Recently, an offender was convicted and placed on Formal Probation in Washington County and the clerical staff in Washington County P/P added the conviction to DOC400. The staff saw the case was a Primary on 6300; added the case and shipped the paperwork off to Multnomah Co. The offender was directed to report to Multnomah County. Once there, the staff in Multnomah Co told the offender that she was on Bench Probation and sent her away. The clerical staff in Multnomah County then closed out the cases (including the Washington County Formal Probation) as Bench Probation (BNPB). The offender returned to Washington County; asking what to do. Her Formal Probation case was reopened in DOC400 and Formal supervision resumed. Concern is that Multnomah County is using DOC400 as a database to house cases that are not on Formal Probation or PPS ... and they are assigning cases as Primary to that caseload. This causes clerical staff in other counties to assume that the offender is already supervised in Multnomah County and staff are sending new Formal Probation cases to Multnomah County when entering them. Wende will look into this.

John Watson (AD Jackson Co) – his neighbor works for FBI and can train for investigations on cyber-crimes. At the next Jackson Co meeting, he can possibly

#### **FAUG Meeting Locations 2014**

February 2014 – Lane Co

May 2014 – Deschutes Co

August 2014 – Clatsop Co

November 2014 - Washington Co/Yamhill Co/Clackamas Co

**NEXT MEETING –**  
February 19-20, 2014