

FAUG AGENDA

Hood River County

February 19, 2014 - 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

February 20, 2013 - 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Meeting Location:

Hood River County Court House
Sheriff's Training Room
309 State St.
Hood River, OR 97031

Day One:

Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping

Chelo/Group

Present at the meeting: Lily Morgan (Josephine Co); Natalie Reyes (Multnomah Co); Wende Kirby (Multnomah Co); Chelo Ramirez (Hood River Co); Betti Spencer (Yamhill Co); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn Co); Angela Boyer (Polk Co); Susan Sowers (Benton Co); Chris Bell (Deschutes Co); Patricia Rursch (Deschutes Co); Denise Easterling (Jefferson Co); Marco Beitel (Wasco Co); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Larry Evenson (Lane Co); Charles Adler (Multnomah Co); Michael Elkinton (Jackson Co); John Watson (Jackson Co (and OACCD Liaison)); Andie Cortes (Douglas Co); Christopher Swayzee (Washington Co); Allen Bergstrom (Klamath Co); Gina Courson (Marion Co); Marne Pringle (Clackamas Co); Lee Cummins (DOC); Dawn Persels (DOC, ICOTS); Mary Hunt (DOC).

Minute Review

Group

Correction to November 2013 Meeting Minutes – Page 3 (under DOCSUM codes): “Fees owed” should be “Community Service owed”. The remainder of the minutes is accepted.

DNA Samples Update

Heidi Stetson

Heidi updated FAUG as to how DNA samples are going. She said things are going well, with many improvements noted. Heidi brought examples and swabs to do Q&A and training, if need be. Thumbprints on the submission card are important and are sent to ID Services for comparison/verification to be sure that the person named on the submission card/sample is identified as the person on file with that thumbprint. Some issues have arisen where thumbprints come back to somebody other than the named person requiring confirmation from both persons (the person listed and the person printed) and resubmission of the DNA sample. Heidi said that OSP will proceed w/o the prints, but would rather not. The new kits include new inkpads. They seem to do well. Any inkpad can be used, if the inkpad provided is missing our out of ink. Few samples have had to be returned lately and OSP is caught up on the samples. Heidi is contacting Community Corrections agencies through the SOON Reps, if any re-

collections are needed. SOON have volunteered to have the bad samples returned to the collecting POs through them. They will return them to the collecting (or supervising) PO and they will update DOC400 to show that DNA is required again. A request was made by the FAUG group that a chrono be entered by the SOON Rep when backing out the DNA collection data so that it is clear what transpired. Heidi gave the email address to reorder new CODIS kits. It is fulfillment@pchnw.com. Orders should go through that email address and not be requested by calling the lab. Heidi handed out some laminated examples as instructional tools for collecting POs. Heidi's can be contacted by email at heidi.stetson@state.or.us.

Heidi brought some samples that were not valid because of errors; mainly on the submission cards. These errors included:

- evidence tape placed on the submission card (the tape is provided to seal the envelope)
- very light DNA material collected
- abbreviations for collection agencies that are not specific as to positively identify which agency submitted the sample
- collectors using ORS numbers, rather than the name of the crime on the submission cards
- mismatched SID numbers and/or names
- missing info on the submission cards
- Illegible submission cards (please print nicely on the submission card so that the information can be read easily ... and be sure all info is included)

NOTE: The new submission cards include a second area for the thumbprints if the first ones are not good enough.

Heidi got some clarification on some of the crime abbreviations used on the submission cards. FAUG advised her that most POs use the abbreviations that appear in DOC400 for that crime.

OACCD

Tanner Wark / John Watson

Access to eCourt info: John Watson had asked for specific list of issues and got good responses. These responses were sent to Chair of OACCD (Chris Hoy). Chris presented it to the eCourt administration. The administration have emailed to say that possibly tomorrow (2/20/14) we may have answers to some of our issues.

The next OACCD meeting is the second week of March – if any issues are desired to be taken to OACCD, forward them to John before that meeting.

ICOTS

Dawn Persels

New ICOTS Rules will go into effect on March 1, 2014. See PowerPoint presentation that Dawn sent out to FAUG Reps on 2/18/14. Some highlights and special notes include:

NOTE: There is a difference between Compact warrants and Fugitive warrants. Compact Offenders have signed waivers of extradition and should not be on a Court docket (where a Judge might release them with bail) – there should be NO Court hearing. A Fugitive Offender, however, may have rights to challenge extradition, and is on a different extradition timeline. A

PPS Offender has waived their rights to extradition simply by signing their PPS Order. Dawn has attended Oregon Transportation Association and Jail Managers Association meetings to review any concerns related to this topic. Dawn is also willing to help in conversations regarding disputes.

NOTE: (rule 3.102) – If an Offender requests to remain in a state they were extradited to, Reporting Instructions can be sent and the receiving state has to accept them and consider the transfer. There must be a plan to be considered. The fees must still be paid and the forms must still be signed. There appears to be no mention of Sex Offenders in this rule. It is not known at this time, but it is believed that the S.O. rules would still apply to those Offenders. Dawn will check into this and advise.

NOTE: (rule 3.104-1) – Use caution about sending Notice of Departure (especially those which are future-dated). The new rule will allow the receiving state to withdraw the request/transfer after 5 days from the date of transmission of the NOD and the Offender has not reported to the receiving state. (NOTE: it is common to see future-date NOD's sent to advise the receiving state when the Offender WILL depart the sending state...but that date will no longer be the date used to determine when the receiving state may withdraw).

NOTE: (rule 3.107 (12)) – HIPAA does not cover info on the new rule regarding Veterans going out of state for treatment services – because this is a confidential system and because we are law enforcement. Disciplinary Records and Mental Health Records should be included, as well. However, if you make a request and cannot get the records, you are compliant with the new rule; as the rule states “if available”.

NOTE: (rule 4.109) – Any rules that are subject to a timeline of 30 days or less will have those timelines measured in BUSINESS DAYS and any rules with timelines over 30 days will be in CALENDAR DAYS.

NOTE: (rule 4.112) – Cases should be closed out (of DOC400) within 10 days of the supervision end date provided in ICOTS. There are a number of records in DOC400 that remain open, but the cases are already closed in ICOTS.

NOTE: (rule 5.101) – A sending state may retake any case at any time for any reason (it used to be on Offender's own volition and only after the 3rd violation, but it is now at any time). The new rule allows the sending state to allow the offender to return on his/her own. If they do not comply, a warrant must be issued; however this rule was modified to allow for the opportunity to have the offender return.

NOTE: (rule 5.101-1) – Pending felony or violent crimes. This rule makes it mandatory to retake an offender of an ADJUDICATED violent offense (but NOT PRIOR to adjudication and completion of ALL criminal matters). FAUG raised concerns about when Offenders are released from custody on pending charges on bail, however, the sending state wants to retake that Offender – does the Offender get taken back to the sending state on the retake after posting bail? Dawn said that it should not happen, and to contact her with questions.

NOTE: (rule 5.105) – If an Offender is in custody SOLELY on a Compact warrant, the sending state has 30 days to retake the Offender. Time starts when the warrant is cleared (marked by

the time the Offender is taken into the custody) and when there are NO OTHER matters pending. The Extradition Officers are usually monitoring this.

Current Docsum Codes

Angela Boyer

Chris Bell created a list of DOCSUM codes. Angela sent out the list for review/consideration. She has communicated with Ted Mitchell (DOC) regarding the codes and where the info pulls from. Ted has sent the following information about issues with some codes to Angela via email:

Email #1:

I don't know if your able to get email or access the DOC400. I wanted to give you a quick update on what I found so far just in case.

1. Victim Name and Address not displayed.

a. I lead you astray. The Victim information reported in DOCSUM comes from the NOTF DESIGNATOR, not the VICO DESIGNATOR we were looking at. Further the Notification must be of Type VIC3 and have no Discontinue Date or the Discontinue Date less than Today. The Offender we were using as an example had an Discontinue Date of 1/4/2012 and a Type of STAT.

b. To View Notifications use the CCSUPPORT menus item 37 W/W Notifies. To see discontinued notifications enter Subset enter *ALL for Display Discontinued Notifies.

c. I tested several with active NOTF DESGNATORS and DOCSUM Reports their Name and Address as expected.

2. Court Order Restitution Total and Balance do not display. This is a BUG I found it has not been tested yet but will soon.

3. Total Fee Balance is not correct:

a. The DOC400 Supervision Fees Screen displays all the fees regardless of Admission Number. The Fees Total at the top is the summation of those fees.

b. DOCSUM only considers only the current Admission Number. The Offender example we were using had three fees from Admission Number 1, and two fees from Admission Number 3. DOCSUM only reported the total of fees from Admission Number 3.

4. Still working on Sex Assessment Total

5. I suspect Community Service Balance may be a similar issue as Total Fee Balance but haven't gotten to that yet.

Summary:

- Number 1 is an understanding issue.
- Number 2 is a genuine bug will resolve soon
- Number 3 need a decision from your group. Is the Admission Number significant or not?
- 4 and 5 still researching.

Email #2

I have fixed all the DOCSUM issues you reported but one in the Test System. While at FAUG identifying volunteers to test these changes would be good.

The final issue is the “Sex Assessment Total” and “Sex Assess Level”. The most current data for these values point are from 1/2/2009. I suspect this is not a current Assessment. Further I cannot yet connect this old data to Stable/ Acute in any way. I suspect the business of Assessing these folks has changed and DOCSUM has not. We’ll need to figure out what should be reported, and make it correct.

NEW DOCSUM CODES

The following DOCSUM codes have been requested as part of the code list review:

- Place of birth – the addition of this code was approved by FAUG.
- Local Control Release Date (It was noted that this date could change prior to the actual release date) – FAUG doesn’t see a need for this code, as it should be the same as the “Admit Date”.

A new request was made for a merge code for the “zone” field in the address screen. Angela will talk to Ted about that to see if it is possible to do.

A question came from Ted as to whether FAUG like the ability to launch DOCSUM from OMS? FAUG strongly agrees.

Parole Board

Shawna Harnden

Shawna was unable to attend, but sent an email to Chair Michael Elkinton. The email states:

Sorry I couldn’t make the meeting this month. If there is anything for the Board, please advise and I will try to get back to you before the meeting is over. We do have a few updates to advise of:

- 1) A new Board member has been confirmed that will start in March. Michael Wu, comes to us from Clackamas County and will be Candace Wheeler’s

- replacement. Candace has served two full terms, her last day will be February 28th.
- 2) The Board is officially fully staffed. (YAY) Our Records position has been split into a job share where Amanda Bennett and Kathleen Hill share the position. Each of them only work four hours each day. We conducted interviews for the Hearings Officer position and are happy to advise that the position was offered to and accepted by Fay Stetz-Waters. Fay has been doing the position since July 2013 on a job rotation. We interviewed for the Assessment Specialist positions, which are the result of passing HB2549 Sex Offender Notification and Leveling System. Offers were made and accepted by Cindy Rogers and Debbie Wade.
 - 3) We are currently working on the next Hearings Officer training for this spring, which is right around the corner! More information will be sent out soon.
 - 4) Feedback from the Board Hearings Officer as reminders:
 - a. For the Board offenders that are returned via extradition process, once notified, the PO needs to start the sanction report immediately. Our hearings officer cannot proceed at all until that initial sanction is created.
 - b. It is very important that the PO submit the sanction to the appropriate person in the appropriate manner in the DOC400. If it is being sent to the Hearings Officer, then it needs to go to BOARDHO. It cannot be submitted to the BRD status. The hearings officer process is prior to the BRD status. BRD status means all the appropriate people (PO, supervisor & HO) have reviewed the sanction and taken their appropriate action, NOR has been administered, and the sanction is ready to be voted on by the Board. **** We have been seeing quite a few of these lately which puts a major delay in the process ****
The extradition process can be lengthy. Once the offender is returned to Oregon and are at Coffee Creek Correctional Facility, it takes approximately a week to process a release. Although they are not DOC inmates, the process for a release is the same and it is very difficult and taxing on the institution for immediate releases. A majority of the immediate releases that we have encountered on extradition offenders are from the sanction not being created or the sanction not being submitted to the appropriate person for the process.
 - 5) Here is the list of general email addresses. A new staff roster will be sent out in March once Mr. Wu starts.
 - a. Hearings Officer : ParoleBoardHearingsO@doc.state.or.us
 - b. Records Specialists: ParoleBoardRecords@doc.state.or.us
 - c. Warrants Specialist: ParoleBoardWarrants@doc.state.or.us

Again, if anyone has questions about these items or something else, please feel free to contact me.

OTHER PAROLE BOARD INFO:

Lee has communicated with Fay Stetz-Waters. Fay asked that POs be instructed to send the Sanctions to BOARDHO and not prompt the Sanction be sent to the Board (by putting "Y" in the box). It should be done as follows: Board "N" and User "BOARDHO". Lee has asked that the Fay contact the FAUG Reps in the counties that are problematic in this to address ongoing issues.

Question asked about most up-to-date sentencing grid. This can be sought out through CJC website.

DOC Update

Lee Cummins
Mary Hunt

SANCTIONING/SANCTION MODULE ISSUES:

Lee had asked about sanctions returned from the Board in RETU status. At one time, an automatic email notification would be sent to POs; however these no longer appear to be going out. Lee asked if anybody runs across an auto-email notification re: RETU status, please send to her. She said it would be too much to ask the Board to email the POs when a Sanction is returned (but Lee will check with Shawna to confirm). It would take a Service Request to get the automatic email notifications back.

IT have set Lee up with the ability to run a report of Sanctions currently in RETU status. She ran the report and passed it around for FAUG Reps. Lee will email that list to FAUG Reps for cleanup.

A request was made today (and had been made in past meetings) for quarterly reports containing lists of open Sanctions. Lee said that the RETU was the first type being looked at. However, Lee will ask for a new query for open Sanctions be run.

A suggestion was raised to bring the Warrants/Sanctions into OMS. A service request would be needed to have this done. Perhaps one of the workgroups (i.e. Risk Assessment Workgroup) could sponsor the service request.

Mary brought an issue from OACCD. They want to know how many cases exist that are not sanctionable. Denise Sitler ran a report. She found that a lot of cases were accidentally left as non-sanctionable. This happens because a Docket entry must have SANC be entered to make it sanctionable. Without this, the Docket entry defaults to non-sanctionable. This issue was taken to SOON. The current code table (regarding sanctioning ability) has 6 codes, but only about 2 or 3 are needed. Some are duplicates in meaning. This needs to be taken to Denise for consult. The Directors want this cleaned up. They do not want any blank entries in this field. There should be SOME code entered. It was noted that on Offender records where the Offender went straight to prison, that the institution does not enter the sanctioning ability into DOC400 ... so those records will lack info. Those cases are usually manually fixed upon admission to PPS when the Offender posts.

A question has been raised by SOON regarding dispositional departure cases being made trackable (at request of OACCD). SOON will enter a service request to have a new field added to DOC400. This field will indicate whether a Docket entry is a departure case. The proposed codes for that field will be:

- D = Downward departure case
- N = Not a departure case
- U = Upward departure case

John Watson states that OACCD have discussed cases in which the Offender could be sent back to prison ... noting that HB3194 is designed to reduce prison population. Therefore, dialogue needs to happen with the Courts to educate the Courts ... in the hopes that some numbers can be reduced through the Courts not revoking as many Offenders and allow for sanctioning of the Offenders instead.

Day Two:

DOC Update (cont'd)

**Lee Cummins
Mary Hunt**

REACH-INS

There was an issue with institutions trying to find out how many reach-ins have been done. Problem is with how counties are coding. Should be "I" (place code = institution) or "T" (place code = telephone) and "RI" (person code = reach in). Some have transposed those codes. Suggestion made to remove "RI" as a code in the 'place code' field. FAUG Reps should take this back to their offices. This should be standardized as it is clear that it is not being done consistently.

A question was asked whether communication between the Release Counselor and the PO regarding the release plan constitutes a "reach in" event. There is still some question as to whether this should be documented as a "reach in" event or if it is documented as simple communication between PO and Release Counselor.

OPEN LOCAL RELEASE PLANS

These plans are still not getting closed. Release Counselors cannot work with the Offenders/Inmates and their plans when this happens. They often change the existing open Local Plan which alters "history". Lee/Mary have been working with Release Counselors; asking they contact them to close the open plans and not change them. A clean-up list was sent out again. The institution staff are wanting to do a service request to have the Release Plan part re-written. Suggestion made that the whole process of a Local Control Release Plan be reviewed to determine if even necessary.

TREATMENT MODULE

Training issue still exists regarding the naming of treatment programs in the module. There is a naming convention which dictates how they should be named (to keep them alphabetical and easily found). It is as follows

CCCC-XXXXXXXXXX (C=county code, followed by a "dash" and followed by the name of the program (up to 12 characters) – all with NO spaces in between). i.e. CLAC-ABCPROGRAM

For out of state programs, the naming convention is:

OOS-XX NNNNNNN (OOS = Out Of State, followed by a "dash", followed by the 2-digit state code, followed by a "space ", followed by the name of the program).

This has all been corrected, but was brought up to advise FAUG Reps for training purposes.

FAUG REP AUTHORITIES

The issue was raised about former FAUG Reps still having FAUG authorities. Lee will send out a list of those who currently have FAUG authorities.

FAUG MANUAL

The manual is on the DOC website on the groups page or under manuals. Meeting minutes are also on the website on the FAUG page.

OMS-TO-DOC400 PROCESSING

Issue raised that chronos out of OMS are not tripping a Home Visit Attempt/Complete event. IT has looked at this and it will require a service request. Jeff Hanson's group is working on all bugs in the OMS-to-DOC400 processing revamping the case management/risk assessment duties. They will put in the service request. NOTE: This is also invalidating the audit ("25" in DOC400).

OTTO

The new OTTO functionality goes live on Tuesday, February 25, 2014.

The new OTTO message will put an "R" on the W/W Offenders screen (to prompt using to review the messages). The user will put an "R" beside the person's name to see the message. There are currently about 7 messages. Lee will send out a message to FAUG Reps with info/tips on using the OTTO messages. The caseload can be subset to include only records with messages to review.

There are 2 types of notifications. One is an "Action" notification and the other is the "Review" notification. The Action Notification will have an asterisk under "ACTION" when reviewing the message. The action items have to be completed in order to have that message removed. The message can be deleted without completing the action item, but the message will reappear. The user does not have to delete the message if they complete the action item.

OTTO will run a little after 6:30am to allow for the update on the PSC. The first day of production, Diane will manually run a PSC update. Afterward, it will be subject to the OTTO running each morning.

There is a tracker program (created for the institutions) under the management reports on menu item "16". This report can be run to see the OTTO codes that have not been addressed. The report will say who is not addressing the OTTO action items and how long they've gone without being addressed.

OTTO will notify users one time for review-types (risk assessment needed when there is a new admission/custody cycle ... or ... when the Offender is admitted from DOC or LC (reminding the user that the assessment is needed at the 30-day mark). The notification will stay for 4 days and then fall off ... until the event becomes an action item after the 30-day timeframe has elapsed. If the assessment is run in the meantime, the notification is not necessary and will not appear. There was discussion about having the notification for review items stay until the item notified of has been completed. Decision made to see how it goes and review it at a later time.

OTTO will run and will notify users of an action needed if:

- the PSC score changes up or down
- the PSC score changes and matches an override level
- a PSC score becomes available (if originally a Proxy was done based on "NPSC" code)

- the PSC hasn't yet been run after the 30-day timeframe has elapsed (on new admits or recent PPS releases)

OACCD has been asked to remove the disclaimer about arrest info. The feeling is that the data is more reliable than the Proxy.

The query of records with PSC changes will be sent out with the announcement for OTTO...but will only go out to the OACCD, SOON and FAUG DLs.

Currently, outcounts are not included in the PSCs automatically run. It may be suggested to review that rule to have them run, as well. OTTO will require a new PSC be run on Offenders come back from an outcount, but ONLY if the level changes. OCMS-scored cases will not go away if the Offenders are on outcount. A query will be run at 3 or 6 months to see how many have come off of outcount, but still have OCMS scores.

A question was raised about Offender OCMS scores moved to LOW/LTD upon the Offender being closed to outcount and upon returning, the override cannot be removed because OCMS system has been retired. The sanction can be done on a prior level (if moved to LOW/LTD upon moving to outcount), but ALL dates in the sanction must be entered.

ILEARN

OACCD Exec said that based on current budget concerns, there may not be money for ILEARN funding. Currently, ILEARN funding is on hold.

SOON Issues

Lee Cummins
Mary Hunt

EARNED DISCHARGE – (HB3194)

Most counties have offenders who have reached their date. Offices cannot do anything until the Earned Discharge Workgroup (responsible for OARS) completes the rules in applying it. We have learned that a component was missed. There has to be a process for granting, retracting and restoring Earned Discharge time. This is being worked on so that the OAR can be created and the rule approved. Another meeting is set for next week in Clackamas Co. Info will be distributed as soon as it is known.

Only Offenders on Felony Probations and Local PPS (not Misdemeanors or Board PPS cases) can have those cases terminated early via Earned Discharge.

Lists will be delivered (similar to the Active Supervision Review lists).

Coos Co discovered a problem with a "chono loop" that only goes back through the last 6 months. The Programmers checked it and found the chrono header had a time field typo with a "dash" instead of a "colon". The system will convert it to the colon, but the bug starts there. The Programmers found 52 other chrono headers with similar problems. They've been fixed. The question was asked if an edit should be put in place or if the FAUG Reps should be notified of any events. The edit may require a service request. Decision by FAUG was to see if it could be fixed without a service request, to do so...and if it requires a service request, that it is not a big enough issue for a service request.

OOS

On December 16, 2013, OOS went live in the community. Since that time, there have been 2 instances where Offenders have contacted Government Efficiencies. In both cases, the Offenders said that they talked to their PO and got no resolution...so they went to Government Efficiencies. The Offenders threatened legal action. The info was sent to Mary and she sent it to the appropriate POs and SOON Reps and both cases were resolved immediately. The closure of the case in DOC400 will cause the removal of the case from OOS (when the report runs overnight).

Roundtable

Group

We ran out of time for roundtable at this meeting. There will be an agenda item first on the list for the next meeting for any non-emergent roundtable issues. Anything that is more urgent can be sent to the FAUG Reps via email.

John Watson asked that Lily forward the recent attendance lists for FAUG meetings to him. John will talk to the Directors of the counties not sending FAUG Reps to the meetings in the hopes of encouraging FAUG attendance.

NEXT MEETING –
May 21-22, 2014
Deschutes County