

**FAUG Minutes
Multnomah County**

November 19, 2008 1:00pm – 5:00pm

November 20, 2008 9:00am – 12 noon

LaQuinta Inn & Suites - 11207 NE Holman St. - Portland, OR 97220

DAY 1

WELCOME / HOUSEKEEPING / INTRODUCTIONS

CHARLES

MINUTE REVIEW

GROUP

The group did not receive the minutes that Charles emailed out and were not available for review at this time.

MEMBERSHIP

KATIE

FAUG Rep list was passed around for corrections and/or additions as well as sign up sheet. In attendance: John Middlesworth (Clackamas), Karen Gross (Columbia), Dennis Shannon (Curry), Chris Bell (Deschutes), Kim McArthur (Douglas), Tina Potter (Gilliam/Sherman/Wheeler), Katie Muirden (Hood River), Michael Elkinton (Jackson), Jeff Pickens (Jefferson), Dan Langfield (Klamath), Larry Evenson (Lane), Mandy Jones (Lincoln), Bonnie Timberlake (Linn), Brian Holt (Multnomah), Wende Hickman (Multnomah), Charles Adler (Multnomah), Cheryl Nelson (Multnomah), Jeffrey Brown (Umatilla/Morrow), Gary Gekeler (Union/Wallowa), Ashley Handley (Wasco), Melqui Arroyo (Washington), Betty Spenser (Yamhill), Lee Cummins (DOC), Mary Hunt (DOC), Denise Sitler (DOC-Compact), Bethany Smith (OISC)

DOC UPDATE

LEE & MARY

CIS Replacement Project:

Lee & Mary met with automation subcommittee yesterday and due to budget constraints, the replacement project is not looking good. It is still a possibility, but it all depends on the legislature approving the current budget proposal. If the proposal does not pass, the state will be looking at an open ware system called NCOMS. It is a web based program that is modifiable. This program has certain modules that the institution would be able to use as well as the community. This program has been out there for awhile and there are currently a few states already using the program, including Idaho. There will be a link made available for those who wish to get online and

take a look at the program. If/when the state starts looking seriously at the program, it will hopefully be possible that a few users may be able to get into it and test it.

OOS (Oregon Offender Search):

This is due to go online in January. A very limited amount of information will be available and only on currently incarcerated inmates. OACCD decided not to add community offenders to this system at this time. This will be real time updated data that is public information.

One potentially very useful aspect of this system would be that it could possibly eliminate the mailing of data to companies who provide backgrounds and criminal history information to paying agencies. This information is public information and DOC is required to release it as requested. Currently, when an agency requests this information from DOC, a "snapshot" of information is obtained and put on a CD and mailed out. DOC does not have the ability to regulate how often these companies are required to request this information and their data can be quite old. There have been instances where this information has caused harm to offenders because the data has not been updated to reflect the most current and accurate information. If this information were available online in real time data and included community offenders as well as incarcerated offenders, there may not be a need to send out CD's and it would be the most accurate data available.

***This also serves as a reminder to everyone to be careful what is put in the system because it is public information, including chrono's.*

Email archival retrieval project:

This is a project that the IT Department will have to start working on due to multiple lawsuits. Email is also public information and DOC may have to provide staff email as part of these lawsuits. Currently, there is only a 28 day backup for email and then it is gone. There is a federal mandate on doing this and with potentially a lot of money on the line in lawsuits, the state needs to find a way to archive email. It is unsure what the affect will be at the county's IT Department or if they are aware of it. This applies to everyone, not just those in State government.

***This serves as yet another reminder to be careful about what is emailed as it is public information.*

Interstate Compact Extraction Project:

This project is in the works to extract data from the DOC400 into the new ICOTS system.

PREA (Prison Rape Elimination Act):

This project is in the works in order to become compliant with a Federal Act of 2003. The system will have the ability to gather data regarding prison inmate assaults and capture predictive data for research analysis.

LSCMI Project:

This project is in the works for the institutions.

Service Requests:

Currently, FAUG has no outstanding service requests. With the uncertainty of the budget and the status of the replacement project, it is unsure of how much time that the IT staff will be able to use for more service requests. It should be known by December 4th if the budget will pass or not.

Service Requests are now put through a ranking system and are scored. There is currently no way to move ahead some of the smaller, less time consuming requests if they are scored low. At the last service request meeting, a discussion took place about a way to capture smaller service requests (2 weeks or less) that could be completed between larger service requests. The small service request process was developed. Not sure if they will be ranked. There are currently a couple of old maintenance service requests for SOON, 2 for FSN and one for the LSCMI Data Project from Multnomah County which involves getting the Multnomah County LSCMI data back into the DOC400.

WebLEDS enhancements:

How much still needs to be done? A lot of these are old and may have already been completed.

ISSUE:

10-day waiting period marked Y on sanctions to the Board has been coming back as this is not showing up and has to be entered again. This seems to be happening when they are sent to the supervisor prior to being sent to the Board. Lee suggested taking a screen print of this screen showing that it is marked and then forwarding it on to the help desk.

Programming/Future Projects:

Lee informed that the contract with programmer Joyce Hammerschmith is about up and that she may want to retire. There is hope that she will continue to contract back as there are some desired projects; two of which are the automation of the ODARA that the director's would like to see, and SOSN would like an automated polygraph module.

Transitional Leave Eligibility Report:

Gina Raney from DOC has been working on a transitional leave eligibility report that will be available and she wanted to know if the community would want that report. The automation subcommittee answered yes. This report would provide a list of inmate who would be legally eligible for transitional leave. When it goes into production, it will be located on the Reports Menu under the PO reports.

TL Question: Does an offender need stable housing in order to be eligible for transitional leave?

Answer: Yes, if no stable housing is available the offender will finish their sentence in the institution.

Designators (Mr. Blinky):

Lee noted that they will be working with OISC to clean up all of the old open designators that cause unnecessary blinking on the PO's screen. They are looking at a clean up program that will take care of all the current open detainers and BM10 notifiers. They will also be looking at either business changes in how OISC does closures or programming that will auto close these designators when an offender is released from the institution.

Training:

Judy Morrison sent a reminder to the group that she and Char McCarthy are available for field training at no charge to the county. They can come out and provide whatever training a county may need for either support staff, PO's and also for management regarding reports, etc. Please contact either Judy or Dawn Persels to coordinate.

Mary may also be providing future training at FAUG for the CIS reports. It is on the list for possibly February. Mary also reminded the group about the reports manual that Char has completed.

NOTE: This manual is available online by going to the DOC Community Corrections homepage and selecting Networking Groups. The link to the CIS Reports Manual is at the bottom of the page.

Restitution Tracking Issue:

An issue was brought forward regarding a report that was run that showed offenders with negative restitution balances. This is a data entry error. Mary explained how the support staff enters this data and that if the condition is marked 'trackable Y' then there needs to be an amount there. As PO's there are 2 ways to track payments in the condition tracking module: 1) A payment amount can be entered in the "amount this month" and it will recalculate the balance due, or 2) the balance can just be changed to reflect the new/current balance due. On the cases that are negative, there was no amount entered for restitution and the PO's were entering payment amounts in the condition tracking screen thus creating a negative balance. On multiple counts of the same case number, support staff need to make sure that the condition is tracked on only one count and that on the other counts are marked 'trackable N'.

Reminder: This is an outcome measure issue and will reflect an error in CMIS and will show as a red light. Directors do not like red lights!

Scenario: When a PPS case closes but the offender still owes restitution on it and continues to pay, what is the recommended way to track this without going in and "un-expiring" that old condition?

Answer: The Board has ruled that restitution can be collected on any case, no matter if the supervision has expired. There is really no good clean way to do this, but it was suggested that the amount due at the time of closure be brought forward to an open case and to note in the comment section which case the money belongs to. Mary explained that this will not affect the outcome measures as the amount owed is only entered once and the system only tracks the percentage paid.

Wende informed the group that a Data Exception report can be ran in CMIS for restitution that will give a list of offenders with no amounts ordered or negative amounts on the closed cases. She also brought up a clean up issue regarding community service. If an offender works more hours than ordered, do not enter a negative amount! This will also cause data errors in CMIS.

Note: Log in to CMIS, go to 'Community Outcomes' and select 'Data Exceptions'. You can choose which outcome measure that you would like a report on.

Mary brought an issue forward from Tina Shippey from Coos County regarding these cleanup efforts. She found some cases that did not have an amount on a condition and when she went in to the closed case and made the data corrections, it either did not save the data or it locked her out of the system. Not sure if this is an issue on her side or with the program. Mary stated that changes should be able to be made on any closed cases. Tina stated that the system will only lock her out if she does not make all of the changes at one time. If she went in and made a change and then tried to go back in to make another change, she would be locked out. Things would be fine the next day after the system refreshed.

Request to add the 'R' location to the county reports table:

DOC currently houses some offenders in rental beds at the county level and these offenders show at an 'R' location for 'rental bed'. Klamath, Grant and Deschutes counties are some that have rental beds. Klamath County requested a report that would show a list of offenders currently at their 'RKLA' location. Currently there are no community reports available that will show 'R' locations, they only show county locations. The 'R' location is an institution location. Mary wanted to know if any of the other offices had a need for this report as the request has never been made before. These offenders are DOC inmates and the county is not responsible for them.

Mary checked out the institution reports and found one that would show this. If you have access to the institution counselors menu, they have an option for institution reports and with in that there is a report for inmates. Mary tried it and found that you could put in the 'R' location report that you want and it listed all of the offenders at that location. Since the institution already has that report, maybe we do not want to mess with our community reports. If the county's interested in this report do not have access to the 'INCOUNS' menu, it may be possible to get this report added to the community menu with the transitional leave report. A pole of the group did not reveal a need for this report.

Note: From the 'INCOUNS' menu, go to 'Institution Reports' (option 7) and choose 'Inmate List' (option 2). You then will need to enter the 'R' location that you want to look at (i.e. RKLA).

AUTOMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

LEE & MARY

Treatment Module:

Earlier in the year, members of the group had been working on the criteria for putting a new program into the treatment module. This set of criteria has been approved by the Automation subcommittee. There are 4 criteria points: it has to be during the term of supervision, it has to be in response to an identified need (not jail, csw, etc.), it cannot be a program that is already funded, and someone at the program has to be certified in that particular area. A program must meet at least 3 out of the 4 points.

Note: Charles stated that he would email this out to everyone.

Transfer of fees from county to county:

Issue: Do we continue with the current practice of sending any balance due on supervision fees along to the next county when an offender transfers, or should we keep them in the supervising county where the charges were accrued? This issue came about from an auditor in Deschutes County who contacted DOC stating that this practice does not follow any normal accounting rules.

As per DOR, when one office is supervising an offender and the offender wants to transfer to another county with fees still owing, that county can send any and all fees owed to DOR for collection at that time. This includes the supervision fees. All fees owed would then be zeroed out and moved to a DOR account in the fee module. (This is the only fee that does not transfer with the offender.)

Answer: This went to OACCD, who then sent it to FSN to review and to make a recommendation. After much discussion, FSN recommended to just keep the current practice of transferring the supervision fees. This recommendation went back to OACCD, but not sure if it has been adopted yet.

It is still an office by office decision as to whether or not they send other fees owed to DOR at the time of transfer; to include UA fees, day reporting, treatment costs, etc.

SOON ISSUES

LEE & MARY

Fingerprinting incoming compact cases:

Issue: Should incoming offender's be fingerprinted every time they come to Oregon on a supervision, whether or not they already have an Oregon SID number? Some county's only fingerprint an offender if they do not already

have a SID number so that they can enter an EPR; and some county's fingerprint on the new charge even if they have an Oregon SID number so that the new charge will show up on the Oregon CCH.

Answer: This question was taken to Kathy Cea, a supervisor at OSP, and she responded that OSP does NOT require that an offender be fingerprinted for a compact case if the offender already has a SID number. When an offender is printed, it is very important that the fingerprint card be filled out correctly. *This cannot be done with the new automated fingerprint system as it will show as an Oregon conviction; it must be done on the old hard card.* The SOON group will have an example going into their manual on exactly how to fill the card out so that OSP will know that it is another state's conviction. OSP also requests to be notified when the supervision in Oregon ends so that they can remove that record from the Oregon CCH.

**Decision:* It was the consensus at SOON to only fingerprint incoming offenders who do not already have an Oregon SID number. The issue of notifying OSP when a compact supervision ends was not discussed or decided upon, as OSP currently does not require that this be done. FAUG members present agreed with this consensus.

SOON Manual:

The SOON manual committee is currently in the process of combining both of their manuals into one. This will make it easier to find information, especially for new users.

New Board/LC override reason code:

There was a discussion at SOON regarding offenders who have both a board and local control PPS cases. There is currently a status code that shows the offender as either 'BD' or 'LC' status. When there is both an open board case and a local control case, the board retains jurisdiction over that offender and it will show 'BD'. When the board case closes and the local PPS case is still open, the board will continue to retain jurisdiction over that offender. There are two instances where the jurisdiction would return to the local supervisory authority: 1) if the supervising county petitions to have that offender returned to the county, or 2) if the local PPS is revoked, upon re-release the authority will return to the county. If one of these two things happen and the offender is transferred from the board to local control supervisory authority, there is an override that the SOON rep will need to do to correct the status so that it will show 'LC'. There are only

two override reasons to choose from, depending on which of the above apply.

There have been instances where an offender is in jail serving a local control sentence and while in custody the board case has expired. If the board is notified of the new local sentence, they will retain jurisdiction over that offender. If the board is not notified by the county that there is a local control sentence, then the board will close interest in that offender, but the status of the offender in the DOC400 will still show them as being a board case. If that happens, this will cause problems when the PO tries to send a release plan to the board to get a new order. There is currently not an override reason for this, therefore the SOON rep cannot do an override to correct the status of the offender changing it from 'BD' to 'LC'.

SOON is recommending a new reason code on the override for "board closed interest". The FAUG group did not oppose this, all voted in favor.

COMPACT / ICOTS UPDATE

DENISE

The group voiced appreciation for Denise for all her work for getting the new ICOTS up and going in Oregon. ICOTS has been online for about a month and a half at this point and the system has not gone down yet! Things are going well. Denise informed that there are still over 10,000 users that have not signed on to the system yet. Oregon has 800 users.

Case assignments/notification emails:

The legacy file is the file of Oregon offenders who were actively supervised out of state at the time of the ICOTS launch and that has been uploaded into ICOTS. All of these cases were initially assigned to the compact office. For the past two weeks, Char McCarthy has been working on assigning all of these cases out to the county and the appropriate PO. A notification email was supposed to go out to the PO to let them know that a new case has been assigned to them, but this is not happening and no one is getting notified. Denise has sent in a ticket to the vendor to get this fixed.

After all of the cases have been assigned out, Denise will send out a spreadsheet with all of the outgoing compact cases and to who they have been assigned to. This will go out to all ICOTS users.

IMPORTANT REMINDER: Not all users have signed on to ICOTS and set up their work flow. It is important that this be done as soon as possible in order for the compact office to properly assign cases!

Data entry issues:

A couple of data entry issues have been discovered during the assigning of these cases. One is that the addresses are not being updated and some cases that have been transferred out of state are still showing an Oregon address. Denise noted that this kind of thing can be fixed by the PO in the receiving state. They can go into ICOTS and enter the correct address.

Another issue is offenders being released to the wrong state. The compact office has found 17 offenders so far that have been transferred to one state, but the data in the DOC400 shows them being released to a different state. This has resulted in the offender being assigned to the wrong state. Compact would not know to catch this error. So far they have transferred 1565 offenders to other states in ICOTS.

There were also a couple of cases that Oregon had been supervising at one point, and according the data entry in the DOC400 Oregon was still supervising when in fact had not been for some time. One case had returned to the sending state 3 years ago but a closure notice had not been completed and compact had never been notified. Another case had been sitting in prison for the past 2 years and had never been closed out. A closure notice had been completed but he was not closed out of the DOC400.

ICOTS Forms:

Reporting Instructions:

There have been several RI's submitted as probationer returning home after sentencing when they do not qualify as that. When Denise sends the RI back to the PO to fix, it is not letting them fix it. Denise has sent in a ticket to the vendor on that to try to get it fixed. Denise will send out an email to remind people who qualify as a probationer returning home after sentencing.

Criminal case information:

If this is not entered properly the very first time, once you hit the 'submit' button it is locked in and it is unchangeable and cannot be removed! Everything BUT the criminal case information can be changed prior to the request leaving the Oregon compact office. This is causing a lot of problems because if a PO withdraws that activity and submits a new one, it will still put in this bad information.

When entering case information, it needs to be entered like we enter information into the DOC400 listing each count of every case, not just one case number. For example: case number 070045CR/01, 070045CR/02, and so on. Then you can enter the conditions for each count, as they are often different.

Reminder: Be very, very careful about entering information into ICOTS and make sure everything is accurate the first time! Also, do not include any non-compactable misdemeanor offenses when entering criminal cases.

Conditions:

Denise suggested that when entering conditions on the RI or TIR, instead of hand entering each condition one at a time, select "Special Condition" from the drop down menu and in the description field enter "See attached Oregon General and Special Conditions" and then scan and attach the signed conditions. This will save time and make the entry easier. Under the conditions is also a good place to attach the Judgment. ICOTS no longer requires that a Judgment be part of the packet, however Oregon still requires that it be included in the packet as it is a very important document.

An issue was brought up regarding the status of conditions and the fact that there is no space in the TIR for this. It would be very helpful to know this information. Denise suggested that if a PO feels the need to be more specific in the conditions that each condition can still be entered individually with more specific detail to include status.

Delete/Withdraw Button:

Denise reminded the group that she sent out an email a couple of weeks ago stating: "Don't use the withdraw button, use the delete button" There was a delete button in an activity and when she would return an activity to a user, the user could hit the delete button to remove the activity. She informed at that time to not use the withdraw button because that was causing problems.

ICOTS has since disabled the delete button on everything! This happened because users were deleting things that they should not have been deleting. For example: after a user submits a *transfer request*, a *reply to transfer request* automatically gets generated and shows up on the workload because this is the next activity in the transfer request process that needs to be completed. Users were going into their compact workload

and finding a reply to transfer request that they had not created and hitting the delete button; which would permanently lock up that transfer.

Note: Remember that ICOTS is used by everyone, so everyone is looking at the same thing. All required actions show up on the workload for that offender, some needing action by the sending state and some by the receiving state. On your compact workload screen under 'Action Item', it lists the next pending action item and which state/PO it is awaiting completion by. If it is awaiting completion by you, it will be in blue with a link to take you to that action item.

Not having the delete button and having to use the withdraw button has caused some problems. For example: if you pull up an offender's case, it can show when it was opened, when it was accepted, or when it was withdrawn. Prior to this programming change, if a user hit the withdraw button, you could withdraw an activity but not the case itself. It would show as withdrawn. Now, if you hit the withdraw button, it will close the case altogether.

A new issue as of yesterday regarding this; is that the system will show the case as closed, but the activity that the user said to withdraw is remaining out there and the system is saying that it still needs to be worked on.

Denise reminded the group to be very careful about what is entered into the ICOTS system and to be very careful about using the delete button. If in doubt, please call the compact office prior to acting.

Block Numbers:

Denise had sent out an email to FAUG regarding block numbers and not to use them. Once a number is entered into ICOTS and the 'submit' button is hit, that number remains a permanent number in ICOTS. A block number is only a temporary number and should not be entered in either incoming or outgoing cases. The permanent Oregon SID# can be entered later.

On an incoming case, an offender will be entered into the DOC400 with a block number while the investigation is in process. Once they have been accepted and fingerprinted for an Oregon SID number, it can then be entered into ICOTS.

Note: Each offender entered into ICOTS is assigned an ICOTS number; therefore the state's ID numbers are not required.

Other States Offender ID Number:

Also, please do not enter the other state's offender ID number. Most people are using the SID# from LEDS and in many cases this is not the offender number that the other state uses. It just happens that Oregon does use the SID# as the offender number. For instance, Washington has a DOC number that they use for the offender number instead. The other state can enter their offender ID number. *Again, once a number is entered it becomes permanent and cannot be changed or removed!* Denise will follow this up with an email out to everyone.

Miscellaneous issues pertaining to ICOTS:

- Denise sent out an email called "ICOTS Elements" that explains to the user where to attach certain documents like the Judgment, police reports, etc. and what to name the document in order to help the other states find it.
- The police reports should be attached in the section for Pre-Sentence Investigations. This heading is supposed to get changed to "Investigative Reports". This is also in the 'ICOTS Elements' sheet that Denise emailed out to everyone.
- When attaching large documents, they will have to be broken up into separate files no larger than one megabyte.
- The CCH is no longer a required document in the TIR packet.
- The PDF forms are not always pulling the information correctly. For example, an offender has multiple cases, but it is only listing one of them. The information is all there in ICOTS, just not showing up on the printed form. Denise has already reported this issue to the vendor.
- On discretionary requests, when you enter the narrative for the justification it is only printing one line of it on the PDF. Also, on the packets for offenders released from the institution, it is not populating the institution release date. Denise has reported these issues.
- Financial obligations are not showing up anywhere, this has also been reported.

- It was requested that the font be made bigger. Denise did not think that this is an enhancement that will probably not be considered for quite some time, until other more important issues are fixed.
- Denise informed the group that they are still developing processes within their office for doing business as everything has changed. Everything is now being done in ICOTS instead of being funneled through the compact office and notifications are going out to everyone at once. Denise informed the group to not wait for notification from her anymore when RI's are received before contacting the offender and notifying them of where they need to report. She is getting notification the same time as the field officer. When the field gets the notification email that there is a reply to RI, they should go ahead and go into ICOTS and look at it and notify the offender.
- If there is a denial to an RI that an officer does not agree with, the officer needs to contact Denise for further review and action.
- People have been confused about where to find information. The 'compact workload' tab is a 'to do' tab, not where you go to look for offenders. This is where you can find work that is pending action by the officer. If you want to look at an offender, you would go to the 'offender' tab. This is where you will find any requests, reports or responses for that offender. You would then select 'compact cases' and choose the correct one. You will then see links for the different activities associated with that case and you will choose what you are looking for. You will not find this on your workload tab.
- Another issue has been when a PO gets kicked out of ICOTS and they think that the information did not go so they enter it again. If you get kicked out, DO NOT RE-ENTER THE OFFENDER! Once the information is created and entered it is there forever! This is how duplicate records have been entered and they cannot be taken out!

Reassigning cases:

There has been some confusion about how a case is reassigned. The first couple of weeks during the ICOTS launch, anybody could reassign cases. This is not how Denise trained the users. She trained that only supervisors could reassign a case. ICOTS has changed this. The only users who can forward or reassign cases are those who are set at the supervisor user

level in ICOTS and only for their own workload and for those who report to them. (This is all set when a user sets up their work flow.) In the case of transfer of a compact case from one county to another, a supervisor in the sending county can transfer to a supervisor in the receiving county.

Denise has requested one central contact person from each county and is compiling a list to assign cases to when a transfer request is pending at the time of an inmate release from prison and the case needs to be transferred from the institution to the field.

'Vacation' status in ICOTS:

When a user is set to vacation status in ICOTS, the only thing that happens is that when an activity is assigned to that user, it will kick back an email stating that the user is on vacation. It does not stop the process of any activity.

It was asked if ICOTS could consider changing this so that when a user is set to vacation status, their cases could be reassigned to another designated user. For instance, if a violation report came through while a user was on vacation, it could get dealt with right away instead of sitting there until the user returns. At the least, this enhancement is requested for supervisors.

Denise reminded the group that supervisors do not always get all of the notifications as the case is assigned to a specific user, not the supervisor. It is the users who will get notifications at set intervals when an activity is overdue.

Workflow:

Denise again reminded the group that it is very important that everyone get their workflow set up in ICOTS. She sent out an email and cc'd the supervisors last week regarding this issue. There are currently about 20 users that the compact office has tried to assign cases to that have not set up their workflow. Some users think that this is done when they sign on and get their password. This is not the case. The user needs to actually log in to ICOTS, go to the 'User' tab, select 'Workflow' and then select either "reports to compact office" or "reports to supervisor". If "reports to supervisor" is selected, the supervisor's information will need to be entered. Then hit 'Submit' and the workflow will be set. *Cases cannot be assigned to a user until this is done!!*

Legacy Data upload issues:

Oregon uploaded their legacy data on October 24, 2008. When the data was uploaded, it gave every offender lifetime supervision. The compact office has had to go into each offender and change the max date before assigning the case out to the county. What the users will find it that this change is not reflected everywhere. If a user goes to the 'Offender' tab and selects 'Compact Cases', they will see a supervision end date. This date should be correct. However, if you select 'Criminal Cases', the supervision end date will say "lifetime supervision". There is currently no way to change this. Denise has asked for this to be changed and ICOTS said no.

Other states legacy data:

There are a few other states that have also uploaded their legacy data and the compact office has been assigning incoming cases out as this happens. The following states have uploaded their data: Colorado parole & probation both, District of Columbia, Georgia probation, Illinois probation, Indiana parole, Iowa, Massachusetts parole, Minnesota, Rhode Island, South Dakota parole, Texas, West Virginia probation and Hawaii parole.

Florida, North Dakota and Pennsylvania loaded but they are pulling them back because there were some issues with them. These states should be loading again sometime this week.

Once all of these incoming offenders have been assigned out, Denise will send out a spreadsheet listing all of the offenders and who they have been assigned to.

All states are supposed to have their offender data uploaded by December 5, 2008. It is unsure at this time if all states will be able to meet this deadline due to problems loading the data. A big issue for all of the states has been the NCIC codes.

Switching from old way to ICOTS:

Until all states have their data loaded, some cases will need to be done the old way and some the new way. How do you know which?

- If a transfer request was initiated in ICOTS, everything will be done in ICOTS.
- If the transfer request was initiated and accepted by the other state and the offender was actively supervised in the receiving state prior

to ICOTS, then things will be done the old way until the offender is loaded into ICOTS. Once the offender is loaded, everything from that point will be done in ICOTS.

- If the transfer request was pending at the time ICOTS started and had not been accepted yet or the offender was not yet in the receiving state, things will be done the old way until the offender is loaded into ICOTS. Once the offender is loaded, everything from that point will be done in ICOTS.

This will remain this way until all states have loaded their data. Once that happens, the national office will no longer accept any business outside of ICOTS.

Oregon, as well as several other states, will be sending a second upload of offender data at some point. It is important that we clean up our data before we send this second load in order to avoid some of the problems incurred during the first upload.

California:

Denise reported that California did not train any of their staff on ICOTS. California Parole did not give ICOTS to any of their parole agents; everything is being done in the compact office. This means that the compact office has to enter everything by hand into ICOTS. This is causing a bottleneck in the compact office. Denise is not sure what is going on with California Probation and how they are using ICOTS and if their agents are getting it or not. Do not anticipate things moving any quicker with California.

Training:

ICOTS website at www.interstatecompact.org has training demos that users can go in and watch. These are approximately 5 minute demonstrations that have been taped from previous trainings. For example, there is one on how to set up your workflow, how to sign on for the first time, etc. Denise also reminded everyone that Char McCarthy is available to train users on ICOTS. There are plans to go out in the field and do some follow up training at some point as the test environment is still available to the compact office.

Miscellaneous questions from group:

Q: When it asks on the form if an offender is currently in an institution, are local jails considered as being in an institution?

A: No

Q: Is there a way to print everything, all of your attachments and everything else that was entered for outgoing transfer investigations, all at one time by hitting just one button?

A: No, they have to be generated and printed individually.

Q: On transfer requests, some PO's were checking resident of receiving state as well as resident family and now it will not let you do that. Should this be fixed?

A: No, it will only let you choose one. You should choose whichever is greater and put more information in the justification if needed.

Q: If there is a case being supervised out of state and you are waiting on that state to do the closure notice due to a warrant, do we close them out in the DOC400 and wait for the closure notice to arrive in ICOTS or should we keep that offender open in DOC400?

A: Nothing says that the offender cannot be closed out in the DOC400. Denise stated that it makes her nervous to closing it out in the DOC400 and not making sure that the receiving state closes the offender out in ICOTS as well.

Day 2

OISC (Offender Information & Sentence Computation) BETHANY

Bethany Smith from OISC/[DOC](#) was invited to the meeting to help clear up the ongoing confusion regarding the decision date on the structured sanction forms. Her hope coming in is to learn more about our processes to help her better understand the issues relating to this topic, and then to take the discussion back to their ~~board~~ legal counsel to help resolve any pending issues. It is hoped that a consensus can be reached soon about how this should be working.

The relevance of the decision date for the purpose of ~~the parole board~~ OISC is [the impact it has on time served credits](#) for inmates sitting in a county jail on pending charges that later become DOC sentences. ~~who Inmates~~ are ineligible per statute for any pre-sentence time served credit if, while sitting [in](#) the county jail, they are serving a previously imposed sentence. For ~~the OISC's board's~~ purposes, a previously imposed sentence are the

obvious things where the offender goes to court and the judge gives them so many days in jail, or the parole board revokes the offender and gives them so many days in jail. But it also includes the probation jail sanctions and the local supervisory authority post-prison supervision revocations.

When an inmate comes through intake, it is [the board's OISC's](#) process to take a look at the information in CIS to see if there are any structured sanctions that reflect a probation jail sanction or an LSA PPS revocation, and if there are, do they fall during relevant time periods. If they do, then the structured sanction form is printed out and if the decision date is included on the document then [the board OISC](#) simply uses that information and will deny credit for time served [as appropriate](#) for incoming inmates.

If there is not decision date provided on the structured sanction form, or if there are questions because sometimes the narrative of the sanction might reflect something that seems to contradict the decision date provided, then [the board OISC](#) will need to obtain further information from the field. This is done by sending a form requesting the decision date to the SOON rep in the last supervising county who is then requested to forward this to the last supervising PO. [The board OISC](#) then waits for that response to come back from the field. At times there has been confusion by [the board OISC](#) about the information that gets returned on those forms.

Q: If the issue revolves around credit for time served, why would the decision date not just be the custody begin date?

A: Because the way the statute reads, it very specifically says if they are '*serving a sentence*' then they can't get pre-sentence credit for another case. When an offender is just taken in on an arrest, they are not yet serving a sentence. If the [boards DOC](#) sentence is consecutive to that jail sanction or PPS revocation, then any days applied to it would also be denied which would include that arrest time. If it is a concurrent sentence, then [the board OISC](#) could only deny the days from when it became a sentence and that would be from when it was officially ordered.

Q: It is generally the case in the field that the offender will get any credit for time served since initial arrest and placement into custody. Is it true that [the board OISC](#) does not give an offender credit for time served since their arrest, even if the court does?

A: The relevant date for [the board OISC](#) is the date that he was sentenced. The county and [the board OISC](#) calculate sentences differently. The county

calculates the sentence from the arrest day and ~~the OISC board does not care~~ is not involved in this calculation. Where it is relevant to ~~the board~~ OISC is once the offender is serving a DOC sentence, they cannot apply pre-sentence credit to the ~~board~~ DOC sentence.

Q: If a PO is doing a basic sanction for say 5 days and it is not served until the third day, would the decision date be the first day that the PO decided to sanction the offender or the third day when the offender accepts the sanction?

A: This is the big question. When an offender is brought in on a violation, at some point a decision is made that the offender will serve a certain sanction. What ~~the board~~ OISC needs to know is at what point it is official. Is it official when he accepts it, or what if he does not agree and challenges it? At some point the jail has to be notified that the offender is doing so many jail days so that they know when to let him out.

Q: Each county has different levels of where a PO can impose a sanction and when it has to go higher up for approval. If it has to go to a supervisor for approval, would the decision date be when the offender says that he will accept the sanction or would it be when the supervisor approves the sanction?

A: It should be when the supervisor approves the sanction. This would be the official date.

FAUG's recommendations regarding decision date:

- When the PO has the authority to impose sanction, the decision date will be the date the offender accepts the sanction and it is officially imposed.
- When an offender accepts a sanction but supervisor approval is required, the decision date will be the date the supervisor approves the sanction.
- When the supervisor approves the sanction prior to the offender accepting it, the decision date would be the date that the offender accepts the sanction and the PO officially imposes it.
- When it is a local post-prison revocation case and the offender has a hearing in front of the hearings officer, the decision date will be the date that the LSA approves the decision of the hearings officer.
- If a PO has the authority to impose a sanction and the offender does not accept it, it would then go before the hearings officer and the

decision date would be the date that the hearings officer approved the sanction.

- If a sanction is sent to the board or the judge and it gets overridden, the decision date would be the date that the final authority imposes the sanction, either the court or the board.
- In a nutshell, the decision date is the very *final* date when the sanction is officially approved; no matter how many people or steps that it has to go through in the review process; and fully completed.

Even though everyone in attendance is in agreement, Bethany wanted to know how to handle a situation where there still may be some confusion on this subject. The SOON Rep gets the form and they turn it over to the last supervising PO. It was decided not to change this process; however this decision should go to the directors as well so that they can also take it back to their offices and disseminate it to their staff.

Charles will write something up and sent it to OACCD.

SAT MODULE

GROUP

Angie from Polk County requested that the SAT Module be added to our agenda. She submitted some requests for the substance abuse tracking module that Charles brought to the group for discussion and decision.

1. Add a drug code for Oxycodone.

Oxycodone will show as an opiate. If an offender abuses Oxycodone only and uses nothing else, this code would allow it to be entered as Oxycodone instead of as just an opiate. There was concern about opening the door to entering every prescription drug that a person may abuse and this would not be possible. Right now the codes are generic to avoid this problem. This can be added in the comment line for the opiate code. The group decided against this addition as this can be documented in the current system.

2. Add an EtG or EtS option in the SAT log

These are new tests that are now available that is different from alcohol, but is an indication of alcohol use. This is a longer range test that is more accurate than a regular alcohol test. It would have to be a new drug code. Some counties are already using the EtG and EtS tests and they are putting it under alcohol with a comment that it is from EtG or EtS. The group decided against this addition as this can be documented in the current system.

3. Have the cursor default to TYPE

The reason would be so that UAIN can be entered as it seems to be the most used type. (Currently the cursor defaults to the sample date field and you have to go back to the TYPE field.) There was discussion about how often the instants will be used due to the budget issues as they are more expensive. The group decided against this change.

TRAINING SESSION – RELEASE PLANS

GARY

As a prior institution release counselor, Gary Gekeler gave a brief presentation about the steps in the release plans and the PO's involvement in this process.

At about 180 days out, the inmate will meet with the release counselor who goes through all of the things that the inmate needs to do prior to release. This includes making sure that they have their social security card and birth certificate so that they can get identification. The counselor will also see if they are AIP qualified.

At about 120 days out, the counselor should be sending out a preliminary release plan to the county with the proposed address of the inmate upon release. The assigned PO will begin the investigation process at that time. The institution is requesting that the field complete this investigation as soon as possible in the event that an alternative plan needs to be looked at. The PO needs to make sure that the proposed residence is suitable and that there are services to address the offenders needs and conditions. Any concerns about the plan should be brought to the attention of the release counselor as soon as possible.

At about 90 days out, the institution needs to be sending the release plan to the parole board. They include information from all police reports, information from OJIN, sentence orders, criminal history, etc. and make recommendations for conditions.

Note: If the plan has not been accepted by the field at this time, it will still go to the board but will be as unapproved.

At about 30 days out, the final release plan is submitted to the parole board.

Reach-ins can be done at any time during the release process and is encouraged. This can be done either in person or by phone with the inmate and other concerned parties.

When the release plan looks good and the PO accepts the proposed plan, the plan needs to be changed electronically to accept. All plans initially go to the **99 caseload number and should be changed to the caseload number of the investigating and assigned PO.

The release counselor is the person reviewing everything in the inmates file and recommending conditions. If a PO has questions regarding the rational for any of the conditions, they may contact the release counselor at any time and discuss them. The issue raising the most questions seems to be regarding victims and victim contact. Lee reminded the group that there will be the new VICO designator coming out soon that will also help with this.

Counselor Case Management- There may be a central unit that will help to deal with counselor paperwork in order to help free up some of their time. The time that it takes to obtain a police report has been an issue for the release counselors. They are also looking into a possible central depository for police reports.

Lee mentioned that it may be possible to talk to Heidi Stewart about having a couple of release counselors attend FAUG. Some counties have had release counselors come out and spend time with the PO's. Some counties have also had PO's go and spend a day with a release counselor. The institution encourages this.

There were questions about inmate eligibility for temp leave. An inmate needs to have stable housing in order to be eligible for temp leave; otherwise they will finish their sentence in the institution.

Several counties are having problems getting information including polygraphs and assessments from OYA. It was suggested that the PO contact the juvenile department in their county to help with getting information from OYA.

Next training session

Mary will provide the next training session on reports at the February meeting. She will not provide copies of the reports manual for the group but will provide the link to the manual on the DOC website. If those who attend the next meeting would like to have a copy they will need to print it

themselves and bring it to the meeting. Charles will provide the laptop with an air card for the training session and he will email Roscoe to let him know that an InFocus will be needed for this meeting.

The following link will take you to the reports manual located on the Doc website:

http://www.oregon.gov/DOC/TRANS/CC/docs/pdf/CIS_Reports_Manual.pdf

TIPS & TRICKS

GROUP

No one had any new tips and tricks to share.

OTHER BUSINESS

GROUP

Charles reminded the group that the May meeting will be the time again for elections and to decide the meeting locations for the next year and to start thinking about it now. John Middlesworth will become the Chairman. We will need to elect a Vice-Chairman and Membership person. The group was also reminded that the meeting change to the third week of the month instead of the fourth is a permanent change. This will avoid changing the date during November. This also works around OACCD.

The group moved on ahead and decided meeting places through November 2009.

February 18-19 2009 Tillamook County

Roscoe Fertick

May 20-21 2009 Klamath County

Dan Langfield

August 19-20 2009 Curry County

Dennis Shannon

November 18-19 2009 Clackamas County

John Middleton

MISCELLANEOUS

GROUP

Charles made an executive decision to remove this topic item from the agenda as we have Roundtable.

ROUNDTABLE

GROUP

Ashley Handley - Wasco County denied a waiver from another county and wanted to go into the chronos and look to make sure that the denial had been received by the other county, but they were unable to get into the chronos. Nothing happened when they attempted to view them, not even an error code. They did not think that this is a case where they were locked. They tried multiple ways to view them and were unsuccessful each

time. If they were locked, an error code should appear saying that they are locked. There may be a problem on that record. They need to send in a ticket to development.

John Middlesworth - Wanted to know about status of LSCMI improvements that were decided on a couple of meetings ago. They have now been combined with the institutions project. The LSCMI enhancement pieces of the project are waiting as they are looking at Multnomah County's LSCMI.

Melqui Arroyo - Wanted to know if the auto print on sanctions could be turned off so that it will only print if the user sends it to print. No one seems to know why this was set up this way. The group was in agreement that this function could be taken away.

Minutes submitted as written by Tina Potter.