

**DANE COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 24, 2013 MEETING**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Parisi, Esqueda, Hendrick, Mahoney, Ozanne, Colas

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rusk, Watson

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Gaber, Anhalt

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Richardson, Kostelic, Van Lith, Bauman, Bloch, Widdish, Anday, Green, Anhalt, DeLap, Clark-Bernhardt, Kostelic, McNamara, Saterfield, Thurlow

- Parisi called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
- There was no public comment.
- Consideration of the minutes of the September 26th meeting was before the council. Motion by Hendrick/Mahoney to approve the minutes. Motion carried, 5-0.
- A review and acceptance of the “Findings and Recommendations Resulting from the Mapping Project Presented to the Dane County Criminal Justice Council” by Becky Ney, Center for Effective Public Policy was before the council. Tim Saterfield provided an overview of the report. Discussion ensued.

Watson indicated that clients report a wait list for months for AODA treatment. Green said there is no wait for those who are assessed to need AODA treatment like Hope Haven. She said those with insurance may need to wait. Assessment take place on Mondays. The uninsured with AODA needs get in for an assessment and can go right in to groups while waiting for individual services. There is a six week wait for those with OWI.

Clark-Bernhardt lead an exercise to identify priorities. Members of the council voted for the items from the Ney report that were priorities. The items for priority attention in the next six months are:

- A re-entry coordinator
- Drug court reorganization
- Establishment of a community court
- Discussion of jail-related issues
- Technological efficiencies

Discussion ensued. Parisi pointed out that several initiatives are agency-specific and underway, such as addressing jail needs for specialized populations. Others, like addressing racial disparities in the criminal justice system will be on-going and long term.

Clark-Bernhardt asked the council if they wanted to send their recommendations to a work group. Parisi said he was interested in the Criminal Justice Group taking on gender-specific issues.

Clark-Bernhardt said that the state is working on evidence-based decision making and Dane County can use their work.

Colas noted that many of the topics in the Ney report are broad and that makes it difficult to discern what is next. For example, the re-entry system is not a discrete task and requires more analysis and study. Hiring a data analyst would be a discrete task. Clark-Bernhardt asked if topics grouped around a certain area and could be further fleshed out by other groups. She asked the council how they want to use the report. Ozanne said that this seems like an exercise to complete once the budget is finalized.

Discussion turned to the map itself. Clark-Bernhardt indicated that it is an evolving piece but that she can bring it to the next meeting.

Motion by Esqueda/Ozanne for the Criminal Justice Council to accept the Ney report, with typos corrected. Motion carried, 6-0.

The council turned its attention to a discussion of the role of the Criminal Justice Group (CJG). Van Lith, who facilitates the CJG meetings, addressed the council. He said that re-entry would be a good topic for the CJG because the meetings consist of many players. Parisi said that the right people could be brought in depending on the topic. Saterfield offered that the CJG was formed by the Sheriff and Chief Judge many years ago, prior to the CJC. There is cross over between the two groups, with the CJG having a wider group and informal membership. The CJG invites people based on the topic. Potential ideas would be to 1) change the meeting time so that it is not just after the CJC (which may be affecting attendance), and 2) call the CJG an advisory group or a work group to underscore the difference and relationship to the CJC.

Colas wondered if the CJG had out-lived its usefulness. He asked if the function might be better served with ad hoc teams taking up specific issues.

Parisi suggested a middle ground. If the council provided the CJG with specific tasks, that would identify their role. Hendrick noted that, as the council has become more active, the CJG has declined. Ozanne agreed that the CJG was more important previously. He believed the CJG should meet prior to the council and bring issues to the council. He said there is a lot in the hopper; the CJG has a better ability to analyze and bring ideas to the council. Ozanne mentioned issues involving women and girls and human trafficking. He suggested delegating a project to the CJG.

Van Lith said the CJG has one more meeting this year and will look at timing. DeLap said that this vision will help the CJG with its purpose. Bloch said it was a much bigger group in the past and included members from the UW Law School and others. They could reach out to these people again. Parisi suggested that at the next meeting the CJG identify specific issues.

- An overview of the Wisconsin Council on Children and Families Race to Equity report was before the council. Clark-Bernhardt said there are five working groups that will follow-up on the report recommendations. Racial disparities are a statewide issue and there will be more discussion on this in the future.
- Creation of a formal subcommittee on racial disparities in the criminal justice system was before the council. Parisi asked why there was a need to formalize the work group. Discussion ensued. Ozanne pointed out that it has operated as an ad hoc group. Parisi believed it was more of a work team. Hendrick said that formalizing the work group would result in notice of meetings and minutes. When a supervisor speaks about initiatives being developed, it would be good to be able to point to the minutes of the meeting. Discussion continued regarding whether this work group is different from the others, if budget initiatives were being developed at the meetings, and the

need for transparency. Ozanne pointed out this is a different issue compared to the other and there is great public interest in racial disparities. The council decided to make the decision regarding the work group status the next meeting.

- Updates on agency changes was before the council. Ozanne and Hendrick distributed the amendment to create a community court. Rusk said it would be considered in the Public Protection and Judiciary Committee in the coming week.
- The council directed staff to send emails regarding the next meeting.

The council adjourned by unanimous consent.

*Note: These minutes are the notes of the recorder and are subject to change at a subsequent meeting of the council. Respectfully submitted by Karin Thurlow.*