

FAUG MEETING MINUTES

August 19, 2020 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

MEETING LOCATION:

Via video conference (WebEx)

DAY ONE:

Introductions/Welcome/Housekeeping

Marion County

Minute Review

Group

The minutes from the prior meeting are approved as submitted with the following correction:

Page 7 (regarding name changes). At this time, Community Corrections is NOT following OISC's practice regarding name changes following legal name changes. This is due to concerns regarding victim notification. If a victim is registered on VINE to receive notifications on a particular offender under their previous name, they may not get notified of the name change and would get notified of activity under the new name. This may confuse victims and create a situation where victim safety could be compromised. When this victim notification piece is addressed, Community Corrections can follow OISC's practice. OISC has implemented their practice.

Attendance

Angela Beier

In attendance: Curran Deede (Benton); Marne Pringle (Clackamas Co); Keith Cokeley (Columbia); McKenzie Davis (Coos); Dona Dotson (Curry); Brad Allen (Deschutes); Freddy Vidal (Douglas); Andie Cortes (Douglas); Roger Stampke (Harney); Denise Easterling (Jefferson); Danielle Dickerson (Josephine); Rachel Frederick (Lake); Reynaldo Ayala (Lincoln); Bonnie Timberlake (Linn); Gina Courson (Marion); Paula Fata (Multnomah); Angela Beier (Polk); Ahnie Seaholm (Tillamook); Jake Howitt (Tillamook); Tina Potter (Tri-County); Christopher Swayzee (Washington); Crystal Bartell (Yamhill); Larry Evenson (Yamhill); Betti Spencer (Yamhill); Judy Bell (DOC); Lee Cummins (DOC); Ruby McClory (Compact); Mark Patterson (Compact); Tracey Coffman (STTL); Jon Hansen (DOC); Dylan Arthur (Parole Board); Jay Scroggin (OACCD):

County Updates

Group

Columbia Co – The Director has recently retired.

Harney Co – Only changes are with the Sheriff Office and Jail.

Josephine Co – preparing to hire two at the moment and with upcoming retirements, may be hiring three more.

Lincoln Co – Had two PPOs just graduate from the academy.

Multnomah Co – Mostly tele-working. IRT/Compact investigations taking place.

Polk Co – There was a PreTrial Services program started, but it was closed down due to the pandemic.

Tillamook Co – Robin Filbeck has retired. PPO Jacob Howitt will take over as FAUG Rep.

Washington Co – Starting field work again for offenders needing to be seen in-person.

Interstate Compact Update

Ruby McClorey

The entire Compact office is telecommuting at this time. Email the Interstate Compact email box to get a quick response.

Nationally, we are still under emergency rule. Delays have been allowed for in some locations as needed. This includes Multnomah County, OR. Additionally, parts of California, Utah and Hawaii are also experiencing delays on transfer investigations. Los Angeles County in California, plus Montana, are not transporting/extraditing offenders at this time. Compact is working on how to handle that.

There have been issues regarding offenders being released from jails on other states' warrants when those warrants are quashed. Some situations can be complicated ... and those situations are being handled on a case-by-case basis.

Regarding adults in custody who are approved for a compact release, but are incarcerated in one of the endemic institutions – they cannot be released directly to the receiving state. They will first release to the Oregon county of record for quarantine. If during the quarantine period, a negative COVID test is received, the offender can release to receiving state.

Parole Board

Dylan Arthur

All staff are generally telecommuting at this time.

Budget cuts have impacted the Board significantly. Some impacts include:

- Three staff have been cut; including: Records; Hearing Scheduler (for SONL program) and an Administrative Assistant position.
- The SONL on Category B offenders (not Static99 eligible) budget has been cut. Only releases and incoming compacts will be done by the Board. Historic cases /and those submitting applications will not be done.

INOP Time: The Board is changing the practice regarding INOP time on withdrawn warrants. INOP time was not historically added when the warrant was withdrawn. This practice is changing. INOP time will be added unless the PPO articulates why INOP time should not be added. This request will be considered by the board.

'Cite to Appear' Warrants – The Board has been working with OACCD/DPSST on a different type of warrant. This is in response to situations where there may be times that PPOs do not really want to request a warrant (i.e. for the homeless/transient and mentally ill population). The 'Cite to Appear' warrant is effectively a notifier in LEDS that we want to see this client. If LEOs contact the offender, they will direct the offender to report in-person to PPO within 72 hours.

Some notes regarding use of 'Cite to Appear' warrants:

- It will automatically upgrade to arrest warrant after 30 days.
- If you request a regular warrant, the Board will not downgrade that warrant to a 'Cite to Appear' warrant; however, a 'Cite to Appear' may be upgraded by the Board to a regular warrant.
- The 'Cite to Appear' will not toll the PPS time, only a warrant will do that.
- The Board will not issue a 'Cite to Appear' within 30 days of the offender's expiration.

Other notes regarding implementation of the warrants:

- Admin Rule 255075 being posted for 21 days to allow for comment.
- May be mid-2021 before can be installed in CIS and used.
- Users will click ‘cite to appear’ instead of regular warrant to request the ‘Cite to Appear’ warrant.

Training on new process for sanctions when offender has been booked into jail and released due to COVID: When an offender is arrested, the warrant has been located/cleared in LEDS. But if they are then released due to COVID policy, the previous advice was to create a sanction and hold onto it until the offender was back in custody/contact with PPO. Now, Community Corrections can write the sanction for the amount of time the offender was in jail (“time-served”) and then in the “Sanction Given” section, put ‘NOAC’ and send to the Board. The offender can be sanctioned accordingly when s/he reports to the PPO. If the offender does not report, the PPO can send a warrant request to the Board. When the offender is picked back up, the behavior can be addressed in the subsequent sanction. The INOP time from the warrant will still be added, as if a regular sanction had been done. This process will be mimicked on LC cases.

OACCD Update

Jay Scroggin

Special Legislative Session approved a mid-biennium request for budgeting considerations. All State agencies had to produce their impact with recent budget cuts. Community Corrections was not cut on their Grant and Aid dollars. Additionally, Justice Reinvestment monies are not affected.

The short session in February had a bill to restore \$25M, but this did not get resolved.

There have been reform conversations on a national level that have been brought to state level. This will be looked at in the coming year. Some areas of focus:

- Low supervision – it is felt that over-supervision has been happening on low-risk cases.
- EDIS – The Governor’s Office/OACCD are looking at EDIS and other incentive models that can be implemented.
- Admin Fees – Multnomah County has already eliminated all admin fees (CSWK/SUPV/UA/etc). Some monies were added in at County level to offset the reduction in funding resulting from admin fee elimination. Currently, the statute has the word “shall” regarding certain admin fees. This may be changed to “may” to allow counties/jurisdictions to adjust their practices as needed.
- Domestic Violence (Assault IV/Strangulation/Menacing) and Sex Offense (Sex Abuse III) cases – these are cases that are unfunded. The costs associated with supervising these cases may be offset with Ballot Initiative IP44 (which decriminalizes certain drug-related crimes). This should be going to ballots in November. This would reduce many drug-related cases from supervision (and will necessitate the creation of a new model on how to deal with substance abuse addiction). A workgroup with DOC/OACCD is working on this and will send ideas to Jeremiah Stromberg; who will pass them on to the Governor’s Office.

Transitional Leave

Tracey Coffman

A new process has begun that allows those on STTL some additional rights. The Counties must have the new NOR forms, which were sent out about a week or so ago. There is not a 10-day waiting period option on the new NOR. In the system, however, it is still asked. For now, we should let it default to whatever is the system default. This will eventually be masked over/removed.

Of note: Oregon had the largest number of STTL releases to date last month.

New changes in OMS re: Release Planning went live yesterday. (Judy Bell demonstrated the changes)

The use of electronic monitoring equipment for STTL offenders is approved to be used per county discretion.

OCMN

Larry Evenson

This liaison position is being implemented to bridge a gap between the two systems, as they can impact one-another. Tracey Coffman invited any questions or problems as she is preparing a Service Request regarding enhancements and tool upgrades. She will attend both OMS and FAUG meetings, so she'll be able to address concerns from both sides. (Tracey will move to OCMN and Jon Hansen will move to STTL Liaison).

DOC Update

Lee/ Judy

Some DOC positions that were at-risk from budget cuts have been spared. Most staff are telecommuting most/all of the week. It is easiest to contact via email, rather than by phone.

A new place code for virtual visits may be created. DOC have been working on how to code that. (NOTE: OACCD/DOC are not holding PPOs to contact standards at this time due to the pandemic). The "Telephone" code is not being used by many counties, as it does not reflect the same in terms of contact standards. One option is using "VV" as a place code for "virtual visit". This is not meant to replace the Telephone place code; but is only meant to refer to conversations via virtual means (telephone, video, etc.) that would otherwise have been done in the office.

A poll was taken during this meeting to decide if we should add a place code for virtual visits and if so, should "VV" be the code. Results:

- More than 50% of those votes were to add "VV" as a place code for virtual visit

Lee will add it to the table.

Contact standards – The OACCD Contact Standard Workgroup has made recommendations and sent them on to OACCD. OACCD have discussed the recommendations (the day before the shutdown occurred), but they have not yet been adopted. There was not a lot of push-back on those recommendations; but due to more pressing concerns, the recommendations have not been revisited. There is an Exec meeting next week and Jay will bring it then. Lee will forward the recommendations to FAUG (attached – see Pages 7-8). Contact standards are generally calculated in a specific timeframe reference. Most counties use a 30-day increment, but some counties don't do contact standards in 30-day increments for various reasons. The program that Lee maintains is capable of doing different increments. A push for a 30 day-date range is being made for simplicity purposes. The Workgroup also requested to remove the Significant Contact (Y/N) field in the chrono header. That term will be replaced, based on concerns around "Significant" contacts v. "Measurable" contacts. Counties will still be able to capture non-measurable contacts as well. This is to address concerns by staff wanting management to see ALL of the work they are doing on a case, as opposed to only those actions that fall under "measurable" contact metrics. It is also linked to evidence-based practices (regarding behavior-change opportunities) in the Community Corrections field. This should not change what the PPOs are doing ... it should only change how it's reflected in terms of contact standards.

Treatment Workgroup – The Treatment Workgroup had barely started to meet when the shutdown happened. However, they will be reconvening in mid-September. More info will be coming soon. Evaluation codes, Treatment codes and Expiration codes will be among the items addressed.

CIS Tools Upgrade Project (CIS Interface) – a Request For Purchase (RFP) will be published, hopefully in September ... and interviews and demos to be done by prospective vendors will be done sometime after that; perhaps October. Jeremiah has asked that an OACCD member or designee attend. Another Policy Option Package (POP) will be made was for funding a position to maintain the program. It was hoped that all systems will be running in the background (OMS/CIS, etc.) and the user would use only one system that will interface with those systems. May need to put a Service Request in for upgrades/enhancements to facilitate the interface.

Encrypted emails – It is becoming more common to receive emails requiring the creation of a UserID and password to open the email attachment (usually containing confidential information). DOC is using this. The subject line will include #secure# to encrypt the email. Treatment agencies are some of the agencies using encrypted emails. Reminder to users: Be careful that you recognize the address this is coming from to make sure that the sending agency and content are legitimate.

The previously-discussed/approved ‘Kardex Print’ option from the caseload screen (F11-4-E) has been added.

SOON Update

Lee/ Judy

Issues with LEDS hits not going to LEDS mailboxes/printers – this has been addressed. Anybody noticing problems should report the the issues to Judy. Judy reminded that settings may need to be changed to dictate where LEDS will go/print. Recommend that settings be reviewed prior to reporting a problem. POST NOTE: This is a WebLEDS limitation. We will not experience the same limitations when we change over to LEDS2020. We will not be asking for a programming change to WebLEDS to address this limit. Expected transition will take place March 2021. Please hang on until then. You can delete your hit responses after you read them (and/or print if necessary) to help with your limitation issue.

We are moving away from WEBLEDS – the contract ends March 2021. The front-end application that Oregon State Police is using (LEDS2020) will then be used. A Service Request was submitted and it has been pushed to the top due to this change being required. Some counties have already moved to that program.

LEDS 50-hit limit – Some users are noticing that when they open LEDS, if they have over 50 responses/notices in their queue, they are getting a notice. Some are noticing that not all of the responses/notices are coming through; potentially due to this. Judy will look into this to see where this comes from and what can be done to ensure that users are getting all of their responses/notices.

EPR Crystal Reports – These EPR reports are sent out once per month by a volunteer from Multnomah County. These are encrypted and sent out to support staff. SOON have been asked what should be done with these reports; what’s their role in using the reports. SOON have asked for input from FAUG. The reports contain a list of all offenders (that have an EPR) on each caseload that are expiring in the following month. This is to give the PPO an opportunity to decide if they want the EPR to fall off in the following month. This can be used as a check to verify upcoming expirations and can avoid having to reenter EPRs when they drop off (i.e. if there was an extension that was not captured). This appears to be a county-by-county process. Many counties don’t have PPOs reviewing these lists.

A poll was conducted to see if FAUG wants to see these upcoming expiration reports. Results:

- It was almost evenly split between yes/no.

We will leave it as a county-by-county process.

Primary email addresses – Emmanuel Olivares sent an email to Judy regarding email addresses (primary and secondary) in the system. He says:

“Right now if a user tries to F6=Create a new primary or secondary email address the program will close the previous primary or secondary email address.

If there is a primary and a secondary email addresses, and the user decided to make the secondary a primary, the users can do this and as part of the work flow is they are supposed to change the previous primary by either changing it into a secondary or closing it. This is what may cause some issues right now. If the process flow is not followed, there can be cases where an AIC will have more than 1 primary and/or secondary email addresses.

These cases where an AIC may have multiple primary and/or secondary email addresses are not causing any problems in the DOC400 screen but they are affecting the OMS CMA application since they are querying the email address table differently from how we are doing it in DOC400. Another issue the might arise is that it will cause confusion to the users which one is the actual primary email address to use if there are multiple primary email addresses showing up.

So the question is : Do you want to add an edit to the programs to prevent the users from creating multiple primary or secondary email addresses based on the 2nd scenario that I’ve mentioned above? If yes then we will need a Service Request for this.”

It was brought up by FAUG that part of the problem may be due to action plans being emailed to clients from OMS. Could they go to multiple email addresses if there are multiple primary email addresses in CIS? The answer to this may make a difference on how to handle the situation. It was suggested that a test be done to see if this is what’s causing the problems. We need to know more before recommending a Service Request on this. POST NOTE: Based on FAUG consensus via email, SR 2991 was entered on September 1, 2020, regarding the email edit described above.

Abscond subcommittee (from 2004) – (See document attached on Pages 9-15) – This document was created to implement a process for handling of Abscond cases. This has been reviewed by SOON earlier this year. There is a process (Attachment A on the attached document). Other approaches recently discussed in SOON include looking in other areas to find warrants from different sources.

November meeting location

Group

The next meeting will be conducted by video on Nov 18, 2020

Roundtable

Group

Clackamas County – How to code SRF when offender wants a Hearing. There is an override section that the info can be added into after the Hearing. Include in the PO text details of what happened.

NEXT MEETING:

November 18th - to be done virtually

Tentative 2021 Schedule:
TBD

CONTACT STANDARDS WORKGROUP

Scope of Problem:

The definition of 'significant contact' is inconsistent not only through the state, but by individual users due in part to the arbitrariness of the term. During the recent County Compliance Reviews (CCR) process, it was discovered that reports were not accurately capturing 'significant contacts'. The CCR's reported contacts were identified through the use of the significant contact designator (Y/N), which was later determined to not be working as originally thought/designed. The significant contact flag was not a factor in the number of contacts reported as originally thought. The reported contacts included things such as home visits and office visits, but also included entries such as collateral telephone contacts. A workgroup was put together to make recommendations to address contact standards, 'significant contacts', and, in general, evidenced-based supervision.

Rule 78 language identifies that counties must notify the State with what their individual contact standards are. This list is maintained by Lee and is programmed into CIS.

Workgroup Recommendations:

- Remove the significant contact flag in CIS and OMS as its utility has been compromised since virtually every chrono entered has this flagged tripped to "Y". *Identified as a simple service request.
- Discontinue use of 'significant contact' language and replace it with '**measurable contact.**'
- Measurable contacts would be utilized as the statewide measure for CCRs and identifies what is measured under Rule 78 for these reports.
- Non-measurable contacts would still be captured and reported to counties as well; distinguishing the difference between direct contact the offender to affect behavioral change versus all other case mgmt contacts.

***Definition of a Measurable Contact: Contacts with the offenders that are demonstrative of compliance with OAR & IGA, support public safety, and aim to provide opportunities to affect behavior change.**

Measurable Contacts

- Office (O) - O (Offender)
- H (Home Visit) - O (Offender)
- COURT (Court) - O (Offender)
- DAYR (day reporting) - O (Offender)
- E (employment) - O (Offender)

Definitions - Location Codes

- O (Office) - Office
- H (Home) - Location where the Offender currently resides
- COURT (Court) - Judicial proceedings
- DRC (Day Reporting Center) - Day Reporting Center
- E (Employment) - Place of Employment

- FLD (Field) - O (Offender)
- J (jail) - O (Offender)
- TX (treatment) - O (Offender)
- FLD (Field) - Community contact that is not otherwise measured
- J (Jail) - Jail
- TX (Treatment) - Location treatment services are provided

- Measurable contacts were identified to be *Reflective of the work we are doing with the offender to affect behavioral change but not all work and attempts to make contact by the PO. It is recognized all work conducted by the PO is essential; however, chrono entries made outside of the aforementioned list would not meet the definition of a measurable contact for the purpose of rule 78.
- Modifications should be made to statewide county contact standards by each individual county. It is the recommendation of the workgroup to ask counties to identify the total number of contacts required every 30 days by risk level. Any of the Measurable Contacts identified previously in this document would fulfill that requirement. Counties may still require a set number of *specific* types of MCs such as Home Visit and/or Office Visit, which is the current practice. For example, if the county requires 4 total contacts per month for their High risk offenders, the county could require that up to 4 are office visits, or any combination of the MCs that equal the total. If the county wants a Home Visit due list generated, they would need to identify HV as a specific type and number required so the program can continue to generate it.

OACCD ABSCOND SUBCOMMITTEE

Problem: There are currently over 15,000 abscond records in CIS going back many years. OACCD created the Abscond Subcommittee at the July 2004 meeting and tasked the members to come up with methods to reduce that number, and related other issues such as closing cases and coding such as WARR.

Approach: Cleanup absconds, review rules for closing cases to abscond, manage Fail to Report cases, and review definition and use of WARR or other coding

I. Cleanup of Absconds

1. OACCD supports using a process to regularly review the status of abscond cases and asked SOON to discuss and develop a recommended process. **Please See Attachment 'A'**.
2. On 11/18/04 OACCD determined the dividing line between current and historical absconds as 5 years.
3. OACCD supports a process wherein historical absconds are reviewed by each office and recommendations for warrants to be dismissed are forwarded to the DA and Judicial Department. Currently we are working on an abscond discharge procedure to be presented to OACCD at a later date, which will also include any consideration from the Board on their historical warrants.

II. Closing Abscond Cases in CIS

1. OACCD discussed whether counties are following the previously agreed upon process for closing cases in CIS, and if not, what are they doing. The discussion gave cognizance to the potential liability under VINE of not closing cases in a timely manner, which triggers notification; as well as failure to supervise liability; but also to viable processes in each jurisdiction, which do seem to work.
2. On 11/18/04 OACCD reaffirmed a previous OACCD decision that abscond cases be closed in the system no longer than 30 days from the receipt of a warrant.
3. On 11/18/04 OACCD voted on adopting the Board's definition of abscond:

When an offender has stopped reporting and changed residence without permission and where a Warrant has been issued (or could have been issued if the PO hasn't had a chance to obtain a warrant prior to the offender's arrest). It is also recommended that the PO conduct a home visit and employment/schooling check prior to requesting a warrant.

4. On 11/18/04 OACCD voted to retain the ABSC code for use only for true abscond cases as defined above.
5. On 11/18/04 OACCD voted for the creation of a Fail To Report indicator in CIS to mark identified abscond cases as 'Fail to Reports'. This will require a service request and will be announced when completed.
6. OACCD discussed, as Directors and Managers, to work with their staff to set standards to avoid moving Fail To Report Cases to Abscond Cases without doing appropriate follow up to reengage the

offender. The purpose is good supervision and ‘what works’ practices, and keeping the abscond list restricted to those who have truly disappeared or truly made themselves unavailable for supervision.

7. On 11/18/04 OACCD voted to adjust the definition of the WARR outcount code to “Change offender’s status to outcount (WARR) when another agency (judge) issues a warrant for non-compliance just prior to the close of supervision”. Examples are because the offender hasn’t paid fees, or non-completion of drug treatment.

Note: This will limit use of this code and will also prevent the use of WARR for Fail To report cases. FTR cases will either be open, or closed to abscond.

Note: Please see Attachment ‘B’ handed out at the OACCD meeting. This is a copy of Multnomah County’s Abscond Reduction, Warrant Request Guidelines, as well as their prevention, arrest, and return strategies. They have also included a piece on chronic absconder strategy.

Attachment A

Process Re: Warrant Checks

1. Every six months run office caseload of absconders. |
2. Run each offender in LEDS to see if there is an active warrant.
3. If no active warrant, check OJIN to see why.
 - a. Sometimes arrested and dealt with by Court and Corrections not notified.
 - b. Sometimes the Court, on it own through its own checks, has dismissed the warrant and not notified us (approx 6 per year).
 - c. Sometimes LEDS has purged the warrant (LEDS purges misdemeanor warrants after two years).
 1. If LEDS has purged, cases are brought to Director for decision
 2. If want to stay dismissed, letter to DA to dismiss the warrant (approx 24-30 per year).
4. Run QLW inquiry to see if there are other warrants in-state.
5. Irregularly (not within 6 month warrant check), check Social Security Death Index.

Facts and Numbers:

Typically, LEDS does not purge felony warrants.

LEDS purges misdemeanor warrants every two years or so

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF THE ABSCOND REDUCTION WORK GROUP STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDATION

The Abscond work group focused on three areas involved in managing offenders who abscond. **(See Attachment #1 for detail)**

1. Defining an Abscond and Warrant Request process
2. Strategies for prevention
3. Abscond return strategies

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The work group, in recognition that getting a warrant issued as quickly as possible is also a tool in locating the offender, would like not to be forced to close all warranted offenders to abscond within 30 days.
 - a. Recommend that negotiations between DCJ/ASD upper managers and OACCD begin to allow keeping offenders that fall into the Failure to Report category in an open status and separate from those that have truly absconded even when a warrant has been issued.
 - b. That the time limit requirement that cases are to be closed to abscond within 30 days of receipt of warrant be extended as long as the offender is actively looking for the offender.
2. Each unit is to prepare a plan specific to how they intend to implement the strategies to reduce the number of absconded offenders. See attachment #2 for example developed by Local Control.

Note:

The group recommends against having an abscond return unit.

Other Plan examples:

1. The What Works Lead is assigned the abscond return process for those offenders who frequently abscond.

WARRANT REQUEST GUIDELINES

ABSCOND	ACTION
<p>Confirmed and documented in the Warrant Request report by detailing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department correspondence returned marked “no longer at this address/moved; no forwarding address <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Conduct and investigation of offenders whereabouts including interviewing individuals or researching systems that may provide information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Last known Address b. Employment c. Treatment Facility d. Relatives e. Past residences f. Other Law Enforcement systems for potential address <p>NOTE: This investigation should confirm that the whereabouts of the offender is unknown and that all means to locate the offender have been exhausted.</p> <p>The detailed information about efforts to locate the offender is to be articulated in the Warrant Request report.</p>	<p>If the offender poses an immediate threat, request warrant immediately after verification of abscond and efforts to locate have been unsuccessful.</p> <p>Abscond investigation and warrant request are to be conducted up to 30 days from all missed appointment or supervision contact with the offender.</p> <p>Generate an Abscond/Locate flyer for Police.</p>
<p>FAILURE TO REPORT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whereabouts is known b. Repeated instructions have been delivered through written instructions, verbal by phone or in person. c. The offender is willfully avoiding contact with the PPO. 	<p>Warrant request from 30 to 45 days after missed supervision appointment or last supervision contact.</p>

A. ABSCOND PREVENTION STRATEGIES

1. Do complete file review, paper and electronic to determine if offender has history of frequent abscond history.
3. Assess potential for abscond behavior through interview with offender, and review of prior abscond events.
4. Use appropriate case planning and interventions to address underlying causes of this offender's pattern of absconding.

B. ABSCOND ARREST STRATEGIES

1. Create flyer for distribution to Police
2. Attend precinct roll call
3. Continue periodic community contacts with known family or associates

C. ABSCOND RETURN INVESTIGATION GUIDELINES

1. Interview the offender as soon as possible upon notification that the offender is in custody. This interview can be done in person or by telephone.
 - a. Determine if there has been any new criminal activity
 - b. Determine where the offender has been while not reporting
 - c. Determine who the offender has been with while on abscond
 - d. Determine if relapse behavior caused or influenced the abscond
 - e. Discuss programs or interventions that might be linked to offender while in custody, i.e., can DRC involvement while in custody be helpful.
 - f. Contact family members who may assist in ensuring the offender will report upon release
 - g. Develop plan with the offender to help ensure that the abscond behavior does not reoccur upon release from custody.
 - h. Determine if program staff and PPO should contact the offender prior to release.
2. Gather all information available to verify where the offender has been and what activities the offender has been engaged in during abscond
 - a. Recog. Information
 - b. Police Reports
 - c. Hearings Officer Report

Attachment #2

LCSU 's Chronic Absconder Strategy

As part of LCSU's "What Works" strategies, LCSU will target chronic absconder population, specifically from Parole/PPS revocations (Chronic absconders defined as having 2 or more episodes of absconding within one supervision cycle.)

- I. Supervisor will identify the target population (R-45) during the review of Parole/PPS Hearings Reports.
- II. Case will be assigned a release planner.
- III. LCSU staff will meet with offender (planned intervention) 30-45 days prior to release.
- IV. Goal 1: Determine main reasons why not reporting.
- V. Goal 2: Increase % that report initially upon release.

1) Planned intervention to include interview with offender while in custody and identify needs (reason for absconding).

a) Use Motivational Interviewing Skills.

- i) *I imagine that you want to get off or complete supervision. Can we talk about factors that result in you not doing it?*
- ii) *Are there barriers to keeping you from reporting upon your release?*
- iii) *What are factors that cause you not to report (result in you absconding)?*
- iv) *What are your plans?*
- v) *What resources would you need that would help you to reports and complete supervision?*
- vi) *What can we do to assist you in initially reporting to your parole officer?*

b) Use Reflective Listening Skills.

- i) *I hear you saying that the main reason why you are not reporting is....*

c) Listen and Note.

2) Initiate Needs Assessment

- a) Housing Risk Level
- b) Physical Health Risk Level
- c) Mental Health Risk Level

3) Develop first domain (Stability) of Case Plan

- a) Housing: Does the residence meet the needs of the offender and supervision requirements (is the address verifiable, adequate, and stable)? Housing problems may include: no housing resources, chronic unstable housing, transient, or living with friends until they are able to secure housing. Note reasons of instability.
 - i) *How many times have you moved in the last year?*
 - ii) *What is your longest period of continuous housing (not including jail time)?*
- b) Physical Health: Addresses Offender's health. Are they in good health with no physical limitations? Does the offender suffer from a serious physical conditions or illness that interferes with functioning (Examples: cancer, HIV [follow Policy #410], MRDD, brain damage, paralysis, etc.)? Do the health problems limit offender's ability to complete supervision?
 - i) *Do you have any health problems that may limit your ability to complete supervision?*
 - ii) *Are you on SSI or Disability?*
 - iii) *Do you have any health concerns?*
- c) Mental Health: This area focuses on whether or not there are any clinical diagnosis or psychological behavior that occurs in that offender that is associated with distress or impairment in one or more areas of functioning (I.e., thinking, feeling or behaviorally). Is the offender's condition stabilized, do they need medication and are they willing to comply with prescribed or indicated medications. (Are there any anger management issues excluding domestic violence)?
 - i) *Are you currently taking any medications?*
 - ii) *Do you have any concerns about you mental health?*
 - iii) *Have you ever thought about or tried to commit suicide?*