

**DANE COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE APRIL 16, 2012 MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT: McDonell, Parisi, Foust, Esqueda, Ozanne, Mahoney, Esqueda

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Watson, Faust (for Anhalt)

NON-VOTING MEMBERS EXCUSED: Wray

OTHERS PRESENT: Colleen Clark Bernhardt, Jeff Hook, Jeff Kostelic, Lynn Green, Tim Saterfield, Karl Van Lith, Nick McNamara, Paul Rusk, Karin Peterson Thurlow

Parisi called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. There was no public comment.

Approval of minutes of the March 22, 2012 meeting was before the council. Motion by Mahoney/Foust to approve the minutes. Motion carried, 5-0, with Esqueda abstaining.

Introduction of Dr. Mike Jones of the Institute for Justice Planning was before the council. Jones spoke of his experience with several criminal justice coordinating committees and his work in Jefferson County, Colorado, as well as with the National Institute of Corrections. He spoke of the need to identify major issues and the use of data analysis and best practices. Jones believes that data and research need to be balanced with wisdom and experience. He indicated that councils often need a staffing component and it is important to develop a job description that clarifies reporting relationships.

Jones is also working with Walworth County. He said he offers support and ideas. He helped them to choose priorities.

Parisi indicated that Jones could help the council identify goals such as moving past Huber. Foust wondered if this was the council's agenda. Parisi clarified that there was interest in increased electronic monitoring and day reporting. Mahoney noted that there will still be Huber.

Discussion ensued regarding the relationship between the criminal justice group and the criminal justice council.

Review of Criminal Justice Group activities was before the council. Foust said that the CJC had met on March 23rd. They had 8 to 10 law enforcement officers and had a good discussion of mapping the process. Foust also announced that Judge O'Brien is retiring May 11th. The CJG will meet again on April 27th.

Mission statement on reinvestment of savings achieved through efficiencies was before the council. Parisi distributed a mission statement that included language that "set a goal of utilizing at least 40% of any savings created by the council to create, test and expand evidence-based programs and services for prevention, diversion and reentry programs and services."

Watson suggested a 50% goal rather than a 40% goal. Parisi supported that change.

- Motion by Foust/Esqueda that the CJC approve the mission statement with the following amendment "set a goal of utilizing at least 50% of any savings created by the council to create,

test and expand evidence-based programs and services for prevention, diversion and reentry programs and services.”

Discussion ensued. Foust said that it was a nice goal but that there was no way to control County Board budget amendments. Parisi clarified that the reinvestment was not simply to the council but to services that affect the criminal justice system. Esqueda pointed out that savings may just provide relief to chronically overspent areas. Parisi said that the county was trying to maintain services. This is a general philosophical statement. Esqueda said it was philosophical statement rather than an operational statement.

Parisi said that, strategically, it is better to provide services at the front end of the system. McDonell noted that the last budget tried to plug holes. For example, if mid way through the year there is a surplus, then perhaps slots could be added to Pathfinders.

Ozanne urged talking about real savings. He said the purpose is to expand something that is working. He said it was disheartening to have ideas for savings but then being indirectly affected by budget cuts. In the current budget, lay-offs for the Sheriff resulted in staff being bumped in the DA's office. He said that at some point it is no longer about doing more with less; it is about not meeting constitutional mandates. He said it is not a matter of the criminal justice system versus human services.

Foust indicated that the criminal justice system is personnel-heavy. How does one identify savings without lay-offs? Parisi said that much has been done with attrition. If the county instituted day reporting, there could be savings from operating the facility alone. Ozanne said he wanted \$300,000 for a restorative justice group but that it was cut. If this could be ramped up, then it would result in diversion.

Discussion continued regarding approaches to diversion. Mahoney said there may be agreement on day reporting, but it would not eliminate the need to house or monitor people. One cannot get rid of staff or facilities.

Motion on approval of the mission statement, as amended, carried, 6-0.

Review of analysis of arrests was before the committee. Mahoney distributed a pie chart representing the reasons for the Sheriffs Office 107 misdemeanor arrests for December and January. Of this number, only 14 could have been considered for citation rather than arrest. Over half of the 107 were for domestic, and an additional 26% for traffic – 12 hour hold.

Faust provided similar figures for Sun Prairie. He said there were 28 arrests, 20 for domestic, 4 for danger to self or other, 3 for investigative purposes, and 1 for no ties to the community.

Jones asked why the arrest data were of interest. Mahoney said there was interest in knowing if they needed to arrest and incarcerate misdemeanants. Foust said that generally there is mandatory misdemeanor citation rather than arrest. Esqueda wondered if the Sheriff had 107 custodial arrests. Mahoney said yes, the rest were cite and release.

Jones asked if the purpose of identifying the group who could be cited and released was to save at booking or to save on jail space. Mahoney indicated there was interest in saving throughout the criminal justice system; that the arrest created a push throughout the process. He said that there was early discussion that there were many who could be released, but the analysis shows that this is not the case. McDonell said it was useful to review and that little changes can add up. Parisi wondered about the next step, given the data. Foust clarified that the pie chart represented only arrests by deputies. Hook confirmed that the data did not include the City of Madison or other police departments. He said that,

with the Madison and Sun Prairie data, there were be good representation of county misdemeanor arrests. Watson asked if it were possible that Madison and Sun Prairie present the data in the same format.

Jones asked the best use of the analysis. Would it be more meaningful with context regarding all arrests? Watson asked the total number of misdemeanor arrests; what percentage is not the Sheriff? Hook can identify that figure. Watson said that would inform CJC decisions. Jones asked what percent of total tickets written were the 107 custodial arrests. That would provide information about the scope of cite and release. He urged the council to think about what the data can help them to decide. Hook indicated that Kalmanoff had implied that low level offenders were coming to jail and they should not. The analysis was to answer the question, "why are misdemeanor offenders coming to jail?" Watson wondered if February and March data were available. Hook said the issue was the investment in time to perform the analysis.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of information. There was agreement that the council should discuss priorities.

The council indicated that topics for the next meeting should be priorities and further discussion of the arrest data, focused on misdemeanors. They requested that the Madison Police Department and Sun Prairie provide the same information provided by the Sheriff for the December/January time frame.

Scheduling meetings in May, June, July, and August was before the council. The council decided to meet on May 3rd and May 24th and asked that Jones be present at both meetings.

The council adjourned by unanimous consent at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Karin Peterson Thurlow, Recorder

Note: These minutes are the notes of the recorder and are subject to change at a subsequent meeting of the committee.