

**DANE COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2012 MEETING**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Esqueda

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Ruck, Watson, Wray, Anhalt

OTHERS PRESENT: Colleen Clark-Bernhardt, Lynn Green, Jeff Kostelic, Jeff Teuscher, Mike Jones, Karin Peterson Thurlow

The meeting was called to order at 12:08 p.m. There was no public comment.

Approval of minutes from the April 16 meeting was before the council. Motion by Foust and seconded by McDonell to approve the minutes. Motion carried, 4-0.

Review of the Criminal Justice Group activities was before the council. Watson explained that the mapping is continuing (have a solid 3-page start on the process). There is also assistance being provided from a law school person. Nick McNamara will be the presiding judge of criminal court.

Gail Richardson is working on putting the results of the mapping meeting on paper. The results got through the DA's Office and now are waiting for the court commissioner's input.

The council is working on setting priorities and agreed to focus on this. The council will look at arrest data later. Mike Jones stated that he has met/is meeting with all of the council members and is discussing the following:

- What are ideas that get the group/system to where they want it to be?
- Groups like this come and go sometimes; others have been long-standing (Louisville Metro's committee has been around for about 43 years)
- What are things that can be put in place?
 - Collaborate more effectively
 - Have common goals
 - Not work at cross purposes

Mike Jones distributed a draft 2-page "Operating Document" that has draft objectives and a two-pronged approach for focusing the council on (1) process and (2) content items. He will insert the council's mission statement.

Criminal Justice Group was established about 10 or so years ago. Watson stated there has been some frustration along with the lack of staffing assistance. Mike Jones explained that when groups come together it is important to get the major decision-makers together.

The 2007 study by A. Kalmanoff recommended an executive committee for the CJG. This is how the CJC was formed. It was noted that when groups grow they gain inclusiveness but can

sacrifice effectiveness and that the priorities of the council will vary over time. The CJC existed for a while and then stopped and began again this past fall.

Questions were raised about:

- What the relationship should be between CJC and CJG?
- What are the roles/responsibilities of each?
- What is their authority and direction?

Do not want the two groups working at cross-purposes. There are many good pieces in place but it remains unclear as to how it all is connected.

Discussion ensued regarding the relationship between the CJC and the CJG.

Wray stated that CJG should have a mission involving: re-entry, revocation, warrants, the Latino population, and racial disparities. The focus was to get people into a room and look at everything systemically.

Foust explained the problem needs to be identified and dealt with and the council should think outside the box. This council is important because it has the three keepers of budget: PPJ chair, Co-Exec., and the Co-Board Chair, which is critical to advance anything that costs money.

Parisi indicated that the CJG can give the CJC suggestions and inform priorities. The CJC has policy goals, and information can be flowing back and forth with the CJG doing the work.

Anhalt asked if the group should form a resolution. This was briefly discussed. Foust noted that it was created by the Sheriff and the Chief Judge at the time. Wray explained that at the time there was some resistance to it.

Mike Jones stated that the resolution states the CJC is the executive committee of the CJG. If that is the model, then the CJC should set the priorities and the CJG would work on and implement them. Or, working groups could be formed to work on specific priorities, either as part of or separate from the CJG.

McDonnell noted that most CJC members won't be attending the CJG meetings on a regular basis. Mike Jones stated one option is for the CJG to meet six times/year or quarterly, with the CJC meeting monthly. Working groups for specific issues could meet monthly. It will be difficult to figure out how to help the CJC and CJG if they are working independently of one another.

Parisi stated there are subgroups working on day reporting and that the sheriff and DHS are talking about the Huber center. Mahoney noted that this has just started so they are working out who to report back to. Mike Jones inquired about which group it would get reported to. The information should go to both the CJC and the CJG. Foust stated that the information needs to be sold to the judges and defense bar, as they may not agree with recommendations. Parisi felt the information should go to CJC first but was concerned that the judges would feel left out. Foust stated that the six criminal judges would decide based on the idea. Ozanne added that all the 17 judges would discuss the issue.

Discussion continued about the best way to be the most effective and inclusive. Foust stated that the judges need to be included and that Foust and Mahoney should chair/co-chair. Wray stated that sometimes the topic should go to the CJG first and other times to CJC - the chairs would have to work it out. McDonnell stated that the agendas would need to be coordinated. Ozanne explained that Foust is the best person to talk to the judges.

A concern was raised over the amount of people in/out of the CJG group and if a relationship should be formalized. Mike Jones explained that there would be pros and cons to making it formalized. Ozanne suggested leaving the group as is and let the co-chairs direct the group since they are part of the CJC. Wray added that CJG should be able to add to the agenda and work on something; however, the CJC may be working in a different direction and it will be difficult to coordinate. Parisi said the CJG should be working on items that the CJC is not working on. McDonnell explained that the committees should “sync up” as far as timing for tasks.

Mike Jones explained for policy reasons it first should be determined what to work on and why and then discussion of how that could be done would follow. There needs to be a process and infrastructure for decision-making and information sharing. An example would be that if the judges aren't involved in the process, then it won't be implemented; strategies have to be employed to have success. Parisi provided another example using day reporting. Mike Jones asked what problem is trying to be solved with making changes to the Huber center. Anhalt asked for a specific CJG example.

Watson explained that there are issues that don't require a CJC. However, she believes the CJG would be receptive to this process and direction and that it should be agreed to from the top down. Also, it was noted that if a new proposal needs funding, it would go to the CJC anyway.

Mike Jones explained that an example should be taken and then applied. For example, if the CJC had a meeting about the what and why of a system improvement, then the CJG could have a task force or work group to discuss “how.” For the CJC, about 20% of time should be for updates and about 80% should be for removing barriers and making decisions.

Wray suggested doing a discrete project to get some success. The right people are at the table and if the appropriate structure/topics were in place it wouldn't fall apart. There is only a small window to get this accomplished and he doesn't want the CJC to fall apart. Wray stated this seemed like the best way to go and wondered if the CJG would accept this. Foust stated that the CJG's existing work would not be affected at all if it got direction from the CJC. Parisi reiterated that the mapping would be very helpful and would have a strong effect. Wray stated that they need to get the CJG support and at some point strong involvement of the law school for support. Mike Jones agreed that the law school is a strong asset. McDonnell explained that Kalmanoff stated the importance of staff to the CJC and to look at UW-Madison Law School. Mike explained that starting small with one person was fine and the number of staff may eventually increase. He noted that Eau Claire County has only one person, with the hopes of hiring an analyst next year.

Any data or analyses the CJC receives should pass the test, “If we knew the answer, what decision would that help us make?” Watson asked if the DOC should be on the council because

that is a huge part of the criminal justice system. Mike Jones explained that most groups have probation/parole and DOC on the bigger group but not typically on a smaller, more executive group like the CJC. There could be an inter-government agreement to support staff or it could be through the county general fund.

It was discussed as to what would be useful the next time. Parisi stated a few topics: (1) Huber/electronic monitoring and (2) computer systems that communicate better with each other. Mahoney suggested making a list of objectives that address the what/why/how:

- Video Conferencing
- Records Management
- Day reporting/Huber (there is a committee for this now)
- Using metrics (e.g., a dashboard of indicators on how the system is functioning)
- Looking at average length of stay
- Getting information on regular basis
- List of what the CJG has been doing for the last 2 years

Mike Jones suggested that the homework before the next meeting would be to think about potential strategic priority areas or projects the CJC can focus on for the rest of this year. Mike Jones will send out an email soliciting input. McDonnell stated he wants to make choices at the next meeting.

Anhalt said the information will be shared with the other police chiefs. The prioritization is usually done by a consensus. Parisi indicated a desire to discuss priorities and to see the list in advance of the next meeting. Mike Jones explained the importance of being able to articulate reasons why also. Metrics can be set up to measure progress.

Foust noted that the statewide council meeting is May 8th in Eau Claire.

The June and July meetings will be scheduled by an online scheduling program.

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 1:22pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Jones

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