

# FAUG MEETING MINUTES

## Wallowa County

August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017– 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

### MEETING LOCATION:

Joseph Center

403 N main St. Joseph OR 97846

### DAY ONE:

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

**Kyle Hacker**

#### **Minute Review**

**Group**

Minutes from May 2017 FAUG Meeting have been approved with the following correction: Page 3 (DOC Update section) (2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph) ... Remove sentence that states “If it was sent to the Board in error (PPS/LC or Probation), send an email to Lee to return it to PEND.” The PO can simply make corrections and send it as appropriate.

#### **Attendance**

**Justin**

In attendance: Kyle Hacker (Wallowa); Abby Sale (Wallowa); Jay Scroggin (Multnomah/OACCD); Angela Beier (Polk); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Charles Adler (Multnomah); Christopher Swayzee (Washington); Tina Potter (Tri-Counties); Justin Bendele (Deschutes); Jay Swope (Lane); Lee Cummins (DOC); Mary Hunt (DOC); Marne Pringle (Clackamas); Tracey Coffman (DOC-STTL).

#### **Parole Board**

**Shawna Harnden**

Shawna was unable to attend, but sent the following email:

#### Staffing:

There hasn't been any movement or information related to the Executive Director position. The Warrants Specialist recruitment was posted as a job rotation prior to the lift of the hiring freeze, and Andrea Fugate was hired. She comes to us from OSCI - Health Services. Marron Easley-Holmes, Board Assessment Specialist for the SONL team took a job rotation with DOC. The recruitment for 1 Board Assessment Specialist was submitted and it has since closed.

Local Control Cases & INOP: (These items were also discussed at SOON last week)

- If the offender is on PPS and receives a new LC sentence. The new sentence documents need to be submitted to the Board via email to [BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us](mailto:BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us). That email needs to advise the release date from the LC sentence and any other information the PO feels is appropriate for the Board's review. Example: if PO wanted to add a condition the offender doesn't currently

have with the PPS cases. The Board will create an amended order to reflect the new LC case(s). INOP will be applied to the LC cases for any warrant issued after it is entered into our system.

*CORRECTION (not included in email): This is not possible ... INOP Time will be added upon arrest.*

- If the offender is on PPS but their current status is ABSC and your office receives the new LC sentence information. Same as above, send it to the Board via email to [BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us](mailto:BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us). This email also needs to advise the release date and any other information the PO feels is appropriate for the Board's review. The LC case will be added but NO amended order will be generated until after the offender is arrested. Once offender is arrested, the PO must submit a sanction report for that warrant. INOP for these situations will be applied to all appropriate open cases including the new LC case (as long as it was entered prior to the offender's arrest). After the sanction report is reviewed/completed by the Board, an amended order is generated and auto emailed to the county. If the new LC case does not display on the order, notify the Board.
- If the offender was on ABSC status, then arrested before your office is notified of a new LC case. Again, submit the sentencing documents to the Board at [BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us](mailto:BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us) and advise the release date and any other appropriate information. Our office will add the LC case and manually adjust the dates to have the all appropriate INOP applied to that case. Your office will also have to manually adjust the INOP to reflect accurately. An amended order for the new LC case will be generated, possibly in addition to the amended/continue order received following the completion of the sanction.
- If the offender received a new LC but the documents are not received until many weeks or months later, again – send copies to the Board at [BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us](mailto:BOPPPS@doc.state.or.us) and advise the release date and any other appropriate information. Our office will add the new case(s) and will manually adjust for any INOP as appropriate.

#### Probation and PPS:

The past direction of the Board was that all probation sanctions were wanted for review. The new Board has decided that practice needs to change. Any probation sanctions no longer need to be submitted to the Board as a NOAC with small paragraph explaining that action was taken on probation cases with no action taken on PPS. The Board doesn't want to see them. If the PO wants the Board to know how the offender has been doing on their probation, they can provide that information in the conformance section of the latest sanction report on Board cases.

#### What does this mean?:

- If the offender is on probation and PPS and the PO has requested a Board warrant but following arrest has decided to take action on the probation only. PO needs to submit a warrant lift request to the [ParoleBoardWarrants@doc.state.or.us](mailto:ParoleBoardWarrants@doc.state.or.us) and request a lift due to action being taken on the probation cases. The Board will lift

- the Board hold with the jail. No sanction on PPS (Board) cases needs to be submitted to the Board. The lift resolves the need for a sanction. The warrant status in CIS will reflect WTWT.
- The authorities are tied to the offender's status. If the offender is a Board offender, and the PO enters a sanction report on the probation docket info only, due to the status of the offender, the PO will not be able to complete the sanction. This will have to be submitted to Lee as she has the authorities to complete this sanction. (Lee correct me if I am wrong)
  - If a probation sanction is submitted to the Board, and it is caught by our office, the sanction will be returned to the PO. The note will say something along the lines of this not being a Board case. Again, due to the status of the offender at that moment (being Board), the PO will not be able to proceed. Lee will need to be contacted to have the sanction completed. I have this on my PBMIS 'fix' list to inquire if a new code can be created to use for these instances that would easily identify the return is for a probation case so the permissions/authorities would allow for the PO to proceed with the probation sanctioning process. There is no ETA on this code or fix.
  - Reminder STTL sanctions are not to be entered into CIS, nor should they be submitted to the Board. The offender is considered an inmate until they reach their PRD. The Board issues the Order 3-4 weeks prior to the offender stepping out of the prison. The offender is still an inmate and the Board issued Order is not valid until the PRD. We recently had a case where an offender was out on STTL but the PO believed they were on both STTL & Board supervision. This is not the case. An offender cannot have both. If the offender is on STTL, they are still an inmate and the Board cases have not / will not start to run until the program is completed and they have reached the PRD.

A question was raised about the SRF/PPS Sanction time issue in Shawna's email...what is the cutoff on the PPS case (at what time must the sanction must be submitted ... as opposed to an emailed request to lift the hold)? A phone call was made to Shawna to clarify. The Board have taken the position that they will not take action on the PPS case if action is being taken on the Probation case. Ideally, on the day that the PO is notified of the offender's arrest, the Board should be emailed with a request to lift the hold.

Another question was asked to Shawna about whether an offender with both Probation and PPS/Board can have a sanction done on the PPS case ... as well as ... having the case returned to the Court for the Probation Violation. Shawna says that this is OK, as the Board cannot control the Courts' requirements to return all violations to the Court.

A concern raised to Shawna about if (as an example) an offender is arrested on both Board and Probation warrants ... then given a 5-day sanction on the Probation ... but the PO forgets to request a lift from the Board on the PPS case ... and 10 days have elapsed, the bullet point suggests that a NOAC SRF be submitted to the Board to remove the hold. The question was asked why the PO could not request a 10-day sanction with CTS, which

will release the offender that day. It is legal to take action on both cases. Shawna and Jay will look into this and explore options. Jay will take it to OACCD.

## **Compact**

**Ruby McClorey**

Ruby was unable to attend, but Mary brought the following on her behalf: A list was passed around to verify the Compact Coordinator contact information. Any incorrect info/updates should be noted.

Jay brought a Compact-related item from OACCD. There was a proposed contract to draw from all 36 counties' budgets to create an IT-specific position. This position would address all service requests that prioritize Community Corrections concerns. An alternative way to fund this proposed position relates to the supervision of out-going Compact cases (Oregon convictions being supervised in other states). There used to be a time at which Interstate Compact cases going out of state were supervised by DOC. If the biennium budget is reduced because the counties would no longer supervise the outgoing cases, it could pay for the proposed position. OACCD is considering the options.

## **Transitional Leave**

**Tracey Coffman**

STTL sanctions and violations: POs need to submit NORs every time they are sending violation reports (for either sanctions or revocations). STTL staff want POs interview the offender if they've absconded to find out what the offender was doing during the abscond time. This information is helpful to the STTL staff.

Lately, there have been POs not making recommendations (deferring to the STTL office for action) on sanctions. The STTL staff want the PO to make a recommendation, as they don't know the offender as well as the PO.

There is a 5-day rule for violations to be submitted.

Lately, STTL have noticed that there have been POs waiting a longer time to get a warrant for absconding STTL offenders/inmates. The longer the PO waits to get the warrant out, the shorter the available sanction time that is available upon apprehension.

STTL has expanded to 120 days. This will be available to offenders sentenced on/after 1/1/18.

There is no update on automation at this time.

## **Time Study**

**Marne Pringle**

Marne presented the Time Study training materials at the FAUG Meeting.

## **DAY TWO:**

### **DOC Update**

**Lee/Mary**

At the last FAUG Meeting, the issue was raised regarding Interventions being sent to the Parole Board. This is problematic for the PBMIS/DOC400 systems. Some options presented include: 1) to auto-close the Intervention (either when the PO exits the Intervention screen or at some other designated time); 2) prevent the Intervention from being sent at all; or 3) prevent the Intervention from being sent to Board. FAUG approved that Interventions would be auto-closed overnight, and approved an edit to block the ability to send Interventions at all. This will be taken to OACCD for approval.

NOR Date on SRFs: At the last FAUG Meeting, FAUG had approved making this display-only and requiring that the POs enter the NOR screen to continue through to the body of the SRF. This is because users were just putting the date on the main screen and not going into the NOR screen to complete required information (waiver of 10-day waiting period and whether the offender had to be extradited). However, the sanction has to be created first and this is not done in the system until the user hits 'Enter'. There is an issue that causes the sanction being worked on to be lost if the user leaves the screen prior to hitting 'Enter'. A proposed option would be to create "process steps" by which the user would hit 'Enter' to move on to a new screen for the NOR and then can either enter the NOR information or bypass the screen to start the body of the sanction. By hitting enter to progress to the next screen, it will "create" the sanction in the system. The issue of POs not entering information below the 10-day waiting period item on the NOR screen was mentioned again, but the 'extradition' portion of the NOR screen must be able to be used by the users. FAUG have approved the proposed "process steps" resolution and that users can access the extradition item, as well as the previously-mentioned items on the screen. A Service Request is already in that would make the NOR field on the main screen a display-only field.

Reminder on Sanction Authorities: Lee really needs the FAUG Reps to thoroughly review the sanction before sending a request to her or Shawna to complete open sanctions. If the sanction was done on a Board case (the docket number/count was a PPS/BRD at the time the sanction was created), then it does not need to go to Lee ... only to Shawna. If it was on a Probation or PPS/LC case (at the time the sanction was created), it needs to go to Lee (and not Shawna).

A question had been sent to Lee by Linn Co support staff. The 'Person' header has "OJIN" as one of the options, but now that OJIN is no longer used, they want it changed

to “eCourts”. Jay Scroggin proposed to change ‘OJIN’ to ‘ECRT’. FAUG have approved.

Some email problems have been reported by SOON ... in which Jackson County is not getting emails sent out to the Distribution List (DL). The tightened security on email servers in some counties have been blocking some emails sent to a DL. A suggestion was made to include the Jackson Co FAUG Rep specifically in order to ensure that s/he gets the email. A demo on List-Serve program was supposed to have been done, but there are some concerns about the integrity of the program.

FYI: Lee had received an email from a county that states that a support staff person had received an email from a staff member at Powder River that was encrypted ... and the support staff member would have to create a login and password to read the email. This made the support staff person nervous (that it could have been some sort of virus/spam email). This was forwarded to Lee, but it was noticed that it also caused some other issues with responses, wherein the responses also requiring creating a password to be created.

Lee asked if the manuals that were being worked on were done. Charles Adler states the FAUG Rep Manual is done. The other manuals are not yet done.

## **SOON Update**

**Lee/Mary**

Mary’s position has been reposted to open it to Community Corrections staff, which had been left off the original job announcement. The posting will close soon.

FYI: One of the staff at OISC is working with eCourts on profiles for eCourt access. Eventually, the DOC\*\*\* eCourt profiles will go away. Each county will be required to have certain profiles. The county can designate a group of people to share a profile, which will require a password. ECourts want the password for any profile to change when one of the persons in that group leaves the group and would no longer be using that profile. Mary brought a list that contained current eCourts profiles. She will contact each county to verify the profiles on the list are up-to-date.

*CORRECTION: Each county will need to contact Oregon Judicial Court Information Network themselves.*

Mary showed a demo of the new email address field and phone types in DOC400 Offender screen. There is still testing to be done before this can go live as there are still some issues noted. FAUG approved the look and proposed functionality of those fields.

On the address screen, a concern was raised that users are not seeing the asterisk that indicates that there is a mailing address in the system. She will put a ticket in to fix that.

From SOON and FSN: On intake packets, there needs to be a statement on every county's intake packet that the information collected on that form can be used for collections purposes. An offender can choose not to give certain pieces of information (such as a Social Security Number). It was previously thought that if a SSN was noted in LEADS, that this could be used for collections purposes. However, a new Senate Bill (SB1067, which becomes effective 7/1/18), is interpreted in that a SSN cannot be used from LEADS unless it can be determined that the offender specifically gave permission to LEADS to allow for the information to be used for collection purposes.

*CORRECTION: Only State agencies are subject to SB1067. County agencies are not.*

### **FAUG Elections**

### **Group**

A special election may be necessary, as it appears there may be changes in the Chair and Co-Chair positions. This will be discussed at the November meeting.

### **OACCD Update**

### **Jay Scroggin**

The recent budget has been completed and approved. Grant/Aid dollars have been funded at \$273M (fully funded). The Justice Reinvestment was funded at \$40M (a reduction from the original budget proposal). There was a \$7M cut in the JR funds, but this \$7M can be competitively applied for by counties for programs in the form of grants. Priority will be given to counties that don't already have "416" (JR) programs. For those counties that already have such programs, they will have to prove that the grant monies would be used for programs that the counties don't already have. AIP Funds went away. The M57 monies are still available.

STTL lengths have been extended to 120 days (for sentences after 1/1/18).

Possession of a Controlled Substance crimes have been approved to be made a Misdemeanor, but will continue as funded cases. The bill hasn't been signed yet, but some counties' courts are already starting to sentence them as Misdemeanors, nevertheless. Denise is aware of this situation.

From SOSN regarding the combined risk score for sex offenders: the treatment programs' research is showing it is better (evidence-based) to have five different risk classifications (1, 2, 3, 4a and 4b), rather than simply H/M/L. This issue has been brought to SOSN to weigh in on. It appears that they approve. Jay brought this to FAUG to see how difficult it would be to accomplish this change in DOC400. Lee says this will have to be put into a Service Request, which will need to be authored by SOSN.

## Roundtable

## Group

Jay Scroggin (Multnomah) – Multnomah County is going to hire for a Criminal Justice Manager. The position will be open for the next 3 weeks.

Angela Beier (Polk) – They have a new Director (Jody Merritt) and they are hiring for new POs. They are also moving into a new building.

Charles Adler (Multnomah) – Requested to add the PO's email address as a DOCSUM code (enabling it to be merged into mail-merge forms). Lee can add this to a pending Service Request.

At the previous FAUG Meeting, there was a question discussed. This issue was raised at a SOON Meeting and is regarding new case transfers and the dates entered. SOON wanted to have the date be the transfer date, but FAUG said that, historically, it was the date of conviction and recommended it stay as such. This issue has been raised again ... and a concern about the appearances that the receiving county had been supervising the case since the conviction (when in reality, it received the case at a later date). The new request is to make the date be the date that reporting instructions were given (if within the first 30 days of supervision). FAUG approve this change.

NEXT MEETING:  
November 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>  
Hood River County

February 2018  
TBD  
(Benton or Douglas as backup)