

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

MEMORANDUM

To: WA Senate Investigation File
From: Max Hensley
Date: February 13, 2016
Subject: Wendy Stigall Interview

Mark Bartlett and I interviewed Wendy Stigall, the Records Program Administrator for the Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC), in her office at DOC headquarters in Tumwater, Washington for approximately 3 hours beginning at 9:00 am on Thursday, February 11, 2016. The following memo summarizes our discussion.

We explained that we have been hired by the Washington State Senate to investigate the issues surrounding DOC's administration of the sentencing changes caused by the Washington Supreme Court's *King* decision, and told her that we would draft this memo that set forth her comments for her signature. We explained that she would have the opportunity to edit or revise the memo to ensure that it correctly represented her statements, and further encouraged her upon reviewing this memo to add any additional statements or details that she wished to include, even if she had not mentioned them to us in person.

Stigall stated that she was born in Oklahoma, but moved to Washington at a young age; she graduated from high school in South Bend, WA in 1975. Her first jobs were secretarial positions at a doctor's office and a hospital. She joined the DOC in June of 1984 as a typist at the Washington Corrections Center (WCC) in Shelton. Her first position was typing fingerprint cards. Over her time there, she was promoted six times, including positions as Data Entry staff, Clerk/Typist, and Records Technician. All of these positions were within the WCC records department; she worked briefly in another department at WCC, but preferred the faster pace of work in Records and transferred back. In March of 2000, Stigall was promoted to Records Manager at WCC. In total, Stigall worked at WCC for 27.5 years. In February of 2012, she was promoted again into her current position at DOC headquarters.

In this role, she has directly supervised up to 7 staff, was the appointing authority for approximately 65 more staff, has the "dotted line" to prison records staff and continues to do hands-on records work and is responsible for agency records in addition to offender records. She described the key issues for her work as managing the flow of records work which includes managing and applying the changes in sentencing law caused by court decisions and legislation. She stated that some changes are applied prospectively, while others required review of everyone under DOC custody. She works to develop tools for her staff to understand these changes over time, and oversees the records managers who are responsible for inputting data and applying these rules. She described the state of the law in this area as in "constant flux"; she maintains a document setting forth changes over time, and agreed to send us a copy of that document.

To illustrate these complexities, Stigall explained that Washington law generally requires that sentences be based on the law in effect at the time of offense, which means that DOC must continue to understand and apply versions of various statutes and court decisions that may be many years old in some circumstances. Some of the more difficult issues are the application of rules regarding whether sentences are concurrent or consecutive, the accumulation of good time and the date of earned release, and the use of enhancements (which implicate both of the above issues). Further, she said that until 2013, different counties granted good time to prisoners in their custody at different rates. In 2013, the earned time statute changed to direct DOC to apply earned release credits to be consistent with the rate applicable to offenders in the department's facilities. This was applied retroactively which required reviewing the jail credits for all active prison offenders at the time.

We asked her general view of the computer system DOC uses to calculate sentences, known as OMNI. She explained that, in her view, this is one of the major misconceptions surrounding this issue. She stated that there was no computer 'glitch,' as the issue has been portrayed; rather, DOC believed that they were properly applying the *King* decision between 2002 and 2012. In 2012, she was informed of the existence of the error, but between 2002 and 2012 the problem was the interpretation of the law, not the programming. The computer had been properly programmed to meet DOC's understanding of the law which did in turn create the sequencing error. Stigall said that she had been asked if DOC did hand calculations prior to 2012 to check the results from OMNI, but stated that hand-calculations done prior to 2012 would have come out the same because DOC was intentionally applying their understanding of the law at the time. She stated that there are some glitches in the system, but as a whole, she generally trusts it and relies on it.

We asked who Stigall gets legal advice from, and she told us that she would email or call Ronda Larson in the Attorney General's office. She stated that she understood that Larson's last day at work would be March 1 as a result of this issue, and said that she was sad to see that; she believed that Larson had done many good things for DOC over the 12-13 years that she had been with the AG's office. She stated that they had a good working relationship, and would communicate frequently.

We asked Stigall to identify Leora McDonald. Stigall stated that her immediate predecessor as Records Program Administrator had been Carrie Fleming, and that McDonald had worked for Fleming. McDonald retired from the DOC approximately 2-3 years ago. We showed Stigall an email from Larson to McDonald dated October 12, 2007 [Bates Number AG_000238]. Stigall read the email, and stated that she had never seen it before. She advised that we discuss the email with Larson, as Stigall did not think that it was consistent with the advice that Larson had given Stigall. She believed that this email addressed the same issue that Stigall raised with Larson in December of 2012, and was surprised that it had been raised previously. She said this was never flagged for her as an issue when Stigall was promoted to her current position.

We turned back to the complications of the sentencing process. Stigall stated that one significant issue is caused by sentencing judges, who regularly give sentences that are either unclear as to how they should be applied or are inconsistent with the law on consecutive/concurrent sentences, enhancements, or other areas.

Another key issue is that impact of inmate's behavior in custody; Stigall said that what is known as earned release time is 1/3 based on programming and 2/3 on behavior. The good conduct time can be taken as the result of a disciplinary hearing but can then be restored at the discretion of the superintendent. She stated that data shows that taking large amounts of good conduct time does not change behavior so as a policy matter, many superintendents are now restoring good conduct time when an offender meets outlined and agreed upon criteria. In regards to earned time credits and the prior earned time audit, she explained that the issue from her perspective was that counselors were not regularly entering inmates' lost good time into the system, a process which should be taking place monthly. However, she explained that the system contains a check as files are audited when an inmate is transferred between units, and that the amount of missed revoked time could be small (between 1-5 days per month). The average prisoner is transferred multiple times before release, including often to a work-release program before final release. She walked us through the audit checklist, explaining that each of the numerous categories had a hyperlink to a document explaining the law and policy rules for the application of that category. The audit checklist contains a further section that applies only upon release, and includes a category named "Earned Time Updated." This category requires viewing the Earned Time screen within OMNI to ensure earned time had been earned on a monthly basis if the offender lost earned time for the month or at semi-annual or annual reviews during the prisoner's confinement. Prior to an inmate's transfer/release, she would personally contact the inmate's counselor to ensure that the earned time screen had been completed when she worked at WCC. She said that this audit checklist was constantly being updated and expanded over time. She agreed to provide a copy of the current checklist as well as a copy of the checklist as it existed in October of 2012, prior to the *King* issue arising for her. She added that she had emphasized the need to have consistent data entry to her reports and done extensive work with classification counselors to resolve the data entry issue. Although she has not audited this area since completing that project, she believes that the data-entry issue has largely been resolved.

We asked her whether, given the advantages of hindsight, she thinks that the *King* error should have been discovered sooner. She said no; until 2012, DOC did not believe it was a mistake, but rather believed that they were correctly applying the rules. We asked about the scope of the impact; she said that the average change in sentence was approximately 50 days; many were between 1-10 days, and that the longest was over 600 days. That individual had a multiple consecutive enhancements and a large number of jail time and jail good time credits. Prior to the fix with the sequencing all of the jail credits were applied day for day to the enhancement and since these were separate causes the jail good time credits were applied to the base sentences. We asked her to provide that person's name, and she agreed to do so. We agreed not to release the name publicly unless DOC approved.

We asked about her involvement in audits. She stated that she had only done one, which was focused on the data-entry issue described above. We told her that we had been informed that DOC had conducted a 2010-2011 audit on the application of earned time, and she said she was not aware of that.

We asked about other court cases that impacted her work. She mentioned *Dress*, which altered the law to require that sanctions and DOSA revoke sentences run concurrently rather than consecutively with new sentences; that case required DOC to review over 900 sentences and change how the sentences were sequenced. She also mentioned *Roach*, and said that although

she disagreed with it at the time, it turned out to be helpful in this case. As a result of the *King* error, DOC had to bring back approximately 100 people. She said that all but three of those were successfully returned, and believes that the other two may be deceased. She brought up a spreadsheet on her computer that lists numerous other court cases, and began summarizing some of those. She agreed to share a copy of that sheet with us. We asked how she would handle these changes, and she explained that she would put in a change request to alter OMNI; if multiple changes are required, they needed to be put in one at a time to ensure quality control. She said that there is usually 1 or more court decisions each year, and many legislative changes; they all touch records and all must be put into OMNI.

We turned back to the 2007 email between Larson and McDonald. Stigall said that if that email had come to her, there would have been more follow-up conversations, and that at the least McDonald should have talked to her supervisor Fleming. Stigall said that Larson did not mention the 2007 email to her.

We moved to Stigall's timeline, and walked through the timeline itself and the various documents that Stigall had attached to it. She explained that she spoke with Bob Westinghouse twice in person, and had additional phone conversations. She recreated her timeline from emails and other documents that she had viewed. The first contact on the timeline is an email from Larson to Stigall, but Stigall explained that the issue actually arose when Steve Eckstrom, DOC's Victim Services Program Manager, contacted Stigall. Eckstrom stated that a crime victim's family had told him that they believed that an offender was set to be released too early. Stigall assumed that the family presumed that the rules allowed only 1/3 off of a sentence for good time without understanding the various complexities in the system. She explained to Eckstrom that the DOC's calculation was correct. Eckstrom then went to Larson and asked the same question. We showed Stigall an email from Eckstrom to Larson dated December 7, 2012 where he asked that question [Bates Number AG_000179]. That led to Larson's email to Stigall where she informed Stigall that *King* was not being properly applied [Bates Number WS_000005].

Stigall explained that she spoke with Larson, and that Stigall explained that DOC had not erred, but had calculated the sentence in the way it had always been doing it. Stigall said that Larson informed her that the DOC would have to change. Stigall said that Larson's explanation made sense, even though it was a shift from past policy. Stigall was not present for or involved with the original decision on how to apply *King*, and was happy to change the calculations to comply with the new advice. Stigall knew that any fix to OMNI would take some time, and she and Larson discussed whether DOC needed to hand-calculate all affected sentences in the interim. She accepted the AG's advice that the hand-calculation was not needed. DOC did hand-calculate the sentence for the offender whose impending release had caused the initial contact with Eckstrom. In order to put that alteration into the system without an OMNI update, they were required to change the court sentence to achieve an answer that was correct under the new interpretation of *King*. At no time did Stigall consider it a possibility that there had been a substantial over-release of prisoners; to her mind, this was just one more in a long list of changes and fixes that affected sentencing.

The following Monday or Tuesday, Stigall met with her direct supervisor, Denise Doty. Doty had been in state employment for a substantial amount of time, but was relatively new to the Records department. Stigall likes and respects Doty, and noted that Doty had been the

person who had interviewed and hired Stigall for her current position in 2012. She said that Doty had between 10-15 direct reports, but had an open door for her employees. Stigall said that she was confident that this meeting occurred because on Tuesday, December 11, she had emailed Kathy Gastreich [WS_000011]. Stigall believes that she did so on Doty's recommendation, and that she would certainly have at least informed Doty prior to doing so. She explained that she needed to email Gastreich because Gastreich was responsible for risk management and handled lawsuits and L&I claims against DOC and thus needed to be informed about release date issues. Stigall is not sure whether Gastreich is an attorney, and although she has a working relationship with her, they are not close. In this email, Stigall was looking for advice about the impact of the change. After sending this email, Stigall was out of the office for two weeks for surgery; she did not receive a response but did not follow up.

We turned back to a prior email, Stigall's email to Elaine Downey on December 7 [WS_000008]. Downey is the records manager at Cedar Creek, where the inmate in question was being held. She explained that the reference to "manually adjust[ing]" refers to the process described above; she said that she also instructed Downey not to let this inmate transfer as the transfer audit process would have resulted in changing the release date back.

The next email attached to Stigall's timeline is a response to Ronda Larson [WS_000015]. Stigall said that she sent this once she returned to the office after her surgery. She copied Paul Weisser on this email, and stated that she did not often do so on her conversations with Ronda. However, Ronda often copied him on her advice to DOC, in order to make sure that he is aware of the issues that are being raised. Stigall described the content of this email as being her attempt to find the best way to fix the problem that Larson had identified, while also minimizing the programming impacts of the change. She attached examples of the calculation proposals to show how her three applications of the change would work. She explained that she was not the only person at DOC who was able to do these calculations; others, including her replacement as Records Manager at WCC, could have done them as well.

Larson replied to that email the same day [WS_000026]. Stigall thought that Larson's response was a helpful analysis of Stigall's work, and that it explained that at least one proposal wasn't allowed by law. Stigall remembered that a future email from Larson suggested putting all earned time into the base sentence.

The following day, December 27, 2012, Stigall submitted a request to IT to implement the *King* fix [WS_000031]. Stigall explained that over the course of her career, she has submitted hundreds of requests to IT for changes to OMNI; these were not always fixes, but also covered improvements and updates. However, she requested this particular change to be done "ASAP" and said that this was the first time in her career she had ever made that request. The IT request process normally involved sending a request to the IT gatekeeper (Stigall did not remember who that person was in 2012), who would confirm receipt and send the work on to a tech person. Based on her experience with these changes, Stigall expected the process to take about 3-6 months from her initial request to the implementation of the changes; because she had added that this request be done "ASAP" she hoped that this particular project would be closer to 3 months to completion. Once she sent the request, she assumed that IT was working on it.

Immediately afterward, Stigall sent a copy of the request to Sue Schuler in the IT department [WS_000034]. Stigall explained that she did not always follow up with Schuler, but had done so previously on other IT requests. She said that she did so this time because she viewed this change as important.

Later that morning, Stigall received an email confirmed her request had been received and stating that it would be reviewed in the IT department's triage meeting on 12/31/2012 [WS_000039]. Stigall said that she did not have a clear understanding of what happened in those meetings, but believed that the IT department would look at and prioritize the various requests that they were receiving. She explained that at the time she believed that DOC had some sort of oversight over the IT group's workflow that would focus on the potential future impact of the changes; she now understands that is not so.

The next attachment to Stigall's timeline is an agenda and minutes for the Administrative Services Division's Management Team Meeting on January 2, 2013 [WS_000040]. Stigall said that this was a weekly meeting, and explained that the minutes were generally minimal as they were not widely distributed. She confirmed that the reference to her update involved the *King* issue, but could not remember the exact conversation. She believes that she would have informed the team generally about what had happened, but can't remember the amount of detail that she would have gone into. She said that the same was true for the following weekly update, as she wouldn't have had any news to report until the programming was complete [WS_000047].

We asked Stigall about the reports she had pulled around this time which contained lists of the inmates potentially impacted by this issue. She said that she did not remember doing that until recently when she had pulled documents for this investigation. Those documents reminded her that she was attempting to get numbers of how many people would be impacted and for how long; she did not believe that it would involve thousands of inmates as she was looking only at those currently incarcerated, although she understood that there were a lot of inmates serving sentence enhancements. We asked her whether she viewed continuing to monitor this issue as a priority, and she said that she raised it in meetings but did not, in her words, "keep shouting about it."

The next document is a January 2, 2013, email from Stigall to Clela Steelhammer, the DOC's legislative liaison [WS_000042]. We asked why this email was sent, and Stigall explained that Sarian Scott, DOC's budget director (who is referenced in the email), suggested it during the weekly team meetings described above; Scott is involved in many areas of the DOC's work. Stigall was not surprised by Scott's request, and wouldn't have thought to include Steelhammer as Stigall was still relatively new to DOC headquarters at the time. Stigall noted that before joining DOC, Steelhammer had worked at the state's Sentencing Guidelines Commission. Stigall had not previously alerted Steelhammer to important issues in her work, but would discuss things when Steelhammer raised them. Stigall said that both Steelhammer and Scott were still at DOC today.

On March 25, 2013, IT developed and sent Stigall an "IT consultation form." [WS_000050]. Stigall said that this form was generated by IT without any new contact from Stigall. She said that these forms were used when IT did not understand a request or needed clarification on some issue; however, here the 'clarification' was simply cut-and-pasted by

Schuler from Stigall's initial request, and she compared the text of this document to her original submission to IT (WS_000037). Stigall said that she had had conversations with IT over the three months since her request, and that they had always had some reason why the work was being pushed out. Stigall said that she had issues with the time they were taking to complete the job, and that she stated her concerns to IT.

Approximately a week later, Stigall received confirmation that work would begin [WS_000052]. We asked whether Doty had ever asked about the delays in implementing this change, and Stigall said that she didn't remember any questions along those lines; she said that Doty likely assumed that it was being handled. We asked whether Larson ever had any follow up, and Stigall said that she did not; she explained that Larson usually did not follow up on her past advice, and was more focused on new problems that may arise.

The final attachment to Stigall's timeline that we discussed was her September 26, 2013, email to programmer Mark Ardiel [WS_000053]. This conversation started with a message from DOC IT employee Sue Davis; Stigall noted that it would have generally expected such an email from Schuler, but that Davis' involvement was not unusual. At this point, based on this conversation Stigall believed that the final output would now be forthcoming.

Moving on from Stigall's timeline and its associated documents, we asked whether in the course of reviewing prisoner records during the 2012-2015 timeline Stigall ever considered that the records were wrong because of the delayed implementation of the *King* fix. Stigall said that she didn't think of it that way as she had never been directed by management to proceed differently; she was focused on a lot of tasks as the roles and responsibilities of the Statewide Records Program Administrator are many and varied, and was not always thinking about the application of this particular issue.

We asked Stigall about the Statewide Records Managers Meeting held August 15, 2013. Stigall stated that these records were generally scheduled annually, although they only took place when the budget allowed and that they had actually only occurred twice during her tenure. They are designed to update the records managers at the individual facilities around the state on legislative and court changes; and generally last for a full day. These meetings are supplemented by constant email and phone contact throughout the year, both on an individual basis and as a group. She stated that she had drafted the PowerPoint presentation [Senate Subpoena 000436]. The meeting took place at DOC headquarters. Although the agenda states that then-DOC Secretary Bernie Warner was present, Warner and Doty merely welcomed everyone to the meeting and then left. Stigall included a slide on the *King* fix [Senate Subpoena 000462] because, at the time, she believed that the fix was about to be completed and wanted to make the managers aware of it.

Stigall said that she had monthly one on one meetings with Doty, which generally lasted about 30 minutes. These were designed so that Stigall could give Doty a relatively quick update on issues Stigall was working on. We asked whether Doty ever followed up with Stigall on the *King* issue, and Stigall said that she did not. We asked whether Stigall raised the issue herself, and Stigall said that she did not. Stigall stated that her biggest mistake in this process was relying on IT; she believed that someone at IT or an IT governance committee was analyzing the

various requests and had concluded that something else was a higher priority; she now understands that was not the case.

We showed Stigall an email that she had sent to Lori Leigh. Stigall said that Leigh was a records technician (an entry-level position) at Coyote Ridge. Stigall did not recall the specifics of their interaction, but stated that Leigh would not have been at the August manager's meeting.

We asked whether Stigall received any input on the *King* issue from anyone that Denise would have reported to. Stigall said that she did not. She explained that although she is one of about 70 employees in the extended departmental leadership (meaning employees with appointing authority), she is not in the leadership circle. She had no relationship with the former DOC secretary, as the general practice was for issues to follow the department's chain of command. Since this issue broke in December of 2015, she has had some contact with Secretary Dan Pacholke. She believes that he is a good person who did a very good job of managing this particular crisis and would have been a good leader for the department; she is sad to see him go. As for her direct supervisors, she told us that since Doty transferred to another agency, she initially reported to Brian Tinney, who just recently left the DOC, and now reports to Julie Martin.

We asked what Stigall recalled occurring after her emails with Ardiel. She said that she knew he was out on leave for four months, and that she had wanted to get someone else to do the work but believed that no one with the proper skills was available. She was aware that Ardiel had extended his leave to 8 months. Stigall understood that either DOC's IT department or its contractor, Sierra Cedar, was afraid to have anyone else working on OMNI sentence structure issues during the time that Ardiel was out. During this time, she was always aware that the issue existed, but did not do any further hand recalculations, nor did she re-consult with Larson.

We turned briefly back to the attachments to Stigall's timeline, and asked her to explain the report at Attachment 16 [WS_000057]. She said that these are commonly generated, and that she doesn't read them closely. She presumed that her requests were in progress.

We turned the conversation to more recent events, and asked how Stigall became aware that the fix was ready to be implemented. Stigall said that she was aware that people were working on the fix in November of 2015 because she had received questions about certain details. She also stated that she would have 2-3 conversations per day (generally by phone) with Schuler, and that this topic would have come up. Given the history of delays, she did not trust that it would actually be completed until it was very close to final. She did not have any conversations with Ardiel about when he actually started the work; he does not work on site, and she is not sure if OMNI fixes are his only job.

At some point in December, she understood that it was planned to roll out in January of 2016. Stigall wanted to inform the various prisons so that they could prepare their planned releases to comply with this fix. At that point, she met with Julie Martin, DOC's Assistant Secretary for the Administrative Services Division, Steve Sinclair, Rob Herzog and Scott Russell, of the Prisons division and informed them of the coming change. The group thought that the change was very important, and informed Secretary Pacholke.

Stigall stated that she was somewhat surprised by that reaction; her initial view had been that the primary concern would be prisoner behavior problems caused by delaying release dates, and thought that this fix was more of a forward-looking issue rather than something that would require the DOC to pull people back into custody. A meeting was set with Pacholke and his executive team where she informed them of the issue, and Pacholke decided to halt all releases and hand-calculate the changes as required.

Shortly thereafter, on a Thursday, Jody Becker-Green, Ira Feuer (the current IT director), Jeremy Barclay (DOC's communications director), and Alex MacBain at DOC headquarters and Stigall met with some of Governor Inslee's staff members at the Governor's office. Stigall stated that Sandy Mullins of the Governor's office (previously an Assistant Secretary at DOC headquarters) was the only person in that group who remembered that this issue had been raised previously, and that Mullins thought she remembered hearing about it from Steelhammer. Stigall spoke with Nick Brown, Governor Inslee's general counsel, and explained the error and the fix. Two days later, on a Sunday, the Governor came to DOC to meet with the key people involved.

Stigall explained that the list of impacted prisoners contained approximately 3700 names, but stated that widely quoted number actually mischaracterizes the scope of the impact. She said that list included every potentially impacted prisoner since 2002, but that approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of those names could not actually have been impacted, either because they had enhancements which were governed by pre-1995 law (which required a different set of calculations) or because they were not actually released based on their early release date. Her team actually hand-calculated all of the eligible inmates who had been released since January of 2012, which was approximately 1500-1700 names. The initial calculations required a group of 6-10 people who worked nights and weekends over Christmas and New Years'; a second group audited those results and a third group did quality assurance work. The first two reviews took a total of 4-6 weeks and were completed several weeks ago. The QA process is still ongoing today. In total, approximately 40-50 people worked on the entire process which included running criminal history checks, creating packets, printing Case Management screens and hand-calculations for those offenders who had already been released. The hand calculations were a time-consuming process because they require screening district and superior court records for subsequent misdemeanors and felonies, which impact the accumulation of good time, as well as a criminal history check and a case management check (to ensure compliance with field requirements). Stigall noted that they cannot rely on these hand-calculations on a forward looking basis because they are one-off changes to the system which would appear as errors in future transfer or release audits. She also stated that she was very impressed by the willingness of her team to give up their holidays to ensure that this could be done properly and in a timely manner.

The OMNI fix was released on January 12, 2016. Stigall stated that it was originally set for January 7, but there were some unintended consequences around the new application of credits that needed to have the details worked out so the release was pushed back by a few days. She noted that there were a few outstanding glitches, including one issue relating to juveniles who were convicted of aggravated murder who received mandatory minimum sentences and had an who had additional time added to their sentences by the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board, but that those were minor (the example she gave involved 2 inmates), and that the fix was generally working well.

We showed Stigall a set of spreadsheets that she had run in January of 2013 (one dated January 7 and the second dated January 21). She explained that she had created those in an attempt to see how many people would be impacted by the *King* fix. Without more closely analyzing them, she could not tell us the difference between the two. She said that she regularly runs reports like those to analyze issues that arise; for example, she just finished looking at approximately 700+ cases involving the Special Sex Offender Sentencing Act (SSOSA) as a result of an error on the standard SSOSA Judgment and Sentence that is posted by the administrative office of the courts. This error allows the offenders to be sentenced to a shorter period of supervision than the SSOSA statute allows. OMNI entries needed to be updated and letters sent to the sentencing courts to make them aware of the error and request the Court correct the error.

We showed Stigall a series of documents and emails, but Stigall explained that they each had to do with issues related to but not identical to the *King* fix. This includes:

- An email dated 11/15/13 relating to a switch that permitted periods of supervision to run consecutively at the count level, which was enabled by OMNI and had not been permitted by its predecessor system OBTS;
- An email dated 6/21/13 to the records manager at Everett relating to human error in OMNI application; Stigall would regularly circulate these kind of issues broadly to alert other records managers of the kinds of issues that they needed to be careful with;
- An email exchange dated 2/7/13 with Larson relating to the application of jail good time credits. This is related to *King* but is caused by a different problem; the statutes governing jail good time and prison good time do not allow for the accumulation of time at the same rate. This is exacerbated by the fact that prior to 2013 each county would award good time at a different rate, and they were not always cooperative with DOC's efforts; in 2013 DOC was given the power to standardize that rate and did so;
- An email dated 1/28/13 relating to another human error that was caught by use of the audit checklist;
- An email dated 12/18/12 regarding the application of consecutive causes. This unique situation requires a manual override, which is done by the hearings unit, and that unit is aware of the universe of offenders to whom it could potentially be applied.

I have reviewed this memorandum, have been given the opportunity to revise it for accuracy, and agree that it correctly summarizes my statements to investigators.

Signature: Wendy Sigall

Name: Wendy Sigall

Date: 2/18/12