

MINUTES
Justice Coalition
October 16, 2014

Members Present: Judges Flugaur, Finn and Eagon, O. Phillip Idsvoog, Trish Baker, Louis Molepske, Zach Bishop, Shaun Morrow, Ken Wolfe, Ray Przybelski, Dan Kontos, Mike McKenna, Anne Renc, Perry Pazdernik, Stan Potocki, Bo DeDeker, Dave Medin, and Steve Olson

Others Present: Don Jankowski, County Board Supervisor; Dwayne Wierzba, Plover Police Department; Mike Lukas, Portage County Sheriff's Office; Rocky Bolder, Portage County Jail; Martin Skibba and Pat Stanislawski, Stevens Point Police Department; David Knaapen and Jamie Kiener, Justiceworks; Elizabeth Kitzrow, ATTIC Correctional Services; Patty Dreier, County Executive; David Hickethier, Portage County Deputy Corporation Counsel; and Jason Hake, Portage County Finance Department

Staff Present: Kate Kipp, Justice Programs Department, and Gayle Stewart, Planning and Zoning Department.

Judge Flugaur called the Justice Coalition meeting to order at 7:46 am in Conference Rooms 1 and 2 of the County Annex.

1. Approval of the Minutes from the May 2, 2014 Meeting

Flugaur asked for comments regarding the May 2, 2014 minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were accepted by consensus.

Flugaur noted the schedule of meetings for the next year was included in the agenda packets. Flugaur stated he has scheduled all of the Executive Committee meetings for the month before Coalition meetings. This will allow the Executive Committee to go over agenda item for the next full Coalition meeting, as well as review reports from the Justice Programs Department.

2. The Introduction of the new Justice Programs Director, Kate Kipp

Flugaur introduced Kate Kipp, Justice Programs Director, and asked her to provide a brief overview of her background.

Kipp thanked everyone for the warm welcome and added she is very excited to be here. Kipp stated she worked for Marathon County for 11½ years after receiving her Master's Degree in Social Work from UW-Madison. Kipp worked 3½ years in Child Protective Services Intake, and then conducted forensic interviewing in the Child Advocacy Center. For the past seven years, Kipp was a Juvenile Justice Social Worker where she managed caseloads of the highest to lowest risk juvenile offenders and, most recently, juvenile sex offenders. Kipp stated she has a lot of experience in the Courts and working with different treatment providers, and hopes to bring that here, in addition to learning all of the things going on in Portage County.

3. A discussion and update on the implementation of warrants for unpaid forfeitures which began January 1, 2013, including: a) the effects on jail population, and the number and results of Blessinger Hearings, and b) the effects on revenue collection, by Clerk of Courts Trish Baker

Flugaur stated for a number of years they stopped picking up people on warrants for unpaid forfeitures, based on committee recommendation and endorsement by this Coalition. Flugaur stated they went back to picking up individuals for unpaid civil forfeitures on January 1, 2013. The Coalition made a commitment to keep reviewing this, and it has been one year since the last review. Flugaur stated he asked Baker if she could put together some numbers for the Coalition to review.

Baker noted when she became Clerk of Courts, she asked why the County was not doing more to collect on forfeitures. Baker stated she was only talking about tickets for things like underage alcohol, disorderly conduct, urinating in public; things that a lot of college students are given tickets for. Baker stated a couple of years ago they got together and decided they would start issuing warrants for unpaid forfeitures, which is a typical collection procedure used in almost all other types of cases.

Baker said last year, about this time, she informed this Committee that collecting on warrants was a big success; they had made about \$11,000 off collections, but a few months later, she received all of the numbers for 2013 and realized there was a problem.

Baker gave a presentation and the following was covered:

- Of the 483 warrants issued in 2013 for forfeiture cases, 130 were for year 2007 cases, 176 were for year 2008 cases, 155 were for year 2009 cases, and 22 were for year 2010 cases.
- 94 Blessinger Hearings were held in 2013; 53 in the first half, and 41 in the second half.
- 53 Blessinger Hearings have been held this year so far.

Baker stated she is working off of information given to her by Marcella Carlson, Payment Officer, and Jury Clerk. Baker stated the Jail does a better job of counting bed days than she does. Baker reiterated the numbers she is presenting are her numbers, not the jail's numbers.

Baker addressed jail bed days related to commitment warrants, and the following was noted:

- 18 defendants sat in jail a total of 239 days during the first six months of 2013.
- 17 defendants sat in jail a total of 327 days the second half of 2013; for a total of 566 days in 2013.
- 16 defendants have sat in jail a total of 235 days so far in 2014 for unpaid warrants.

Flugaur stated these are individuals that were picked up, had a Blessinger Hearing, and still could not get out of jail. Flugaur added the Court Commissioner tries to set up payment plans with these individuals and most get out, but some cannot come up with any money. The Court Commissioner felt they had ability to pay, were in contempt, and that is why they stayed in jail.

- In 2013, 36 Blessinger Hearings were held for unpaid forfeitures only; 337 jail bed days.
- In 2014, 14 Blessinger Hearings were held for unpaid forfeitures only; 106 jail bed days.

Baker noted while the number of hearings for 2014 is down, it is still a great deal of jail bed days. Baker stated when the Committee met in 2012 they talked about how many jail bed days they were talking about, and they were not able to accurately figure or predict how many jail bed days they would have.

Defendants also sat in jail for other active cases while on Commitment Warrants:

- Defendants sat in jail a total of 207 days on non-forfeiture cases in 2013.
- Defendants have sat in jail 109 days on non-forfeiture cases so far in 2014.

Baker addressed revenues from forfeitures, and the following was noted:

- In looking at total numbers, revenues on forfeitures have not increased.
- Actual total revenue flattened out for 2013 and 2014.
- Projected revenue for 2015 may take a small hit because of the newly developed Municipal Court.

Baker explained the reason for flat total revenue, with forfeitures being down. Baker stated for each warrant, they tack on a minimum \$50 warrant fee, and these fees are helping save the process.

Baker stated in conclusion:

- Revenue from forfeitures is flat.
- Other revenue, such as warrant fees, is up.
- There seems to be a considerable use of jail bed space for warrants only.
- Baker will defer to the jail's numbers for specifics, as figuring out jail bed days attributed to warrants only, is a difficult process.
- Do we want to continue issuing warrants for unpaid fines in forfeitures and other criminal cases?

Baker stated they need to bring the group back together and re-address this issue, and determine if this is the way they want to go. Baker stated in other counties, the Judges and Clerks make this decision together or with the Jail and Sheriff's Office. In Portage County there has been a tradition and history of working together, and Baker believes this is what they need to continue to do. Baker stated if they stop doing warrants as a group, she believes revenue will go down; adding an effective tool for collecting is the threat of having a warrant hanging out there. Baker added she believes another tool just as effective is threatening to take someone's house away for unpaid taxes. Baker reiterated she wants any decision to be made as a group because it will have an impact on the overall revenue of the County.

Molepske asked Baker how she defines a jail bed day. Baker stated she is working off numbers put together by Marcella Carlton who works with the Blessinger Hearings and jail staff determining what people want to do with their fines. In some cases, someone may decide they would rather sit in jail than pay their fine. Carlson will then verify to see if that person

actually stayed in jail for the days assessed. A report is then compiled every six months. Baker stated it is obvious to her that what her office does impacts the population in the jail and that is why she feels this is a global question that needs to be answered in a global way. Baker again stressed she feels the group needs to come together and talk about this issue to see if this is something they want to continue doing.

Idsvoog asked Baker to answer Molepske's question on what constitutes a bed day; an hour, eight hours, 24 hours. Flugaur stated he believes it is a minute, and that when someone serves their sentence, they let them out at 12:01 am. Chief Deputy Kontos stated that was the previous practice and they have gotten away from that; it is now when it is most convenient for the County. Release time can depend on what is going on in the jail and when there is a lull in the action. Kontos added the inmate knows they will be released sometime that morning so they are told to be prepared. It was noted that any part of a day counts as a full jail bed day.

The question was asked on a daily basis how many jail beds are being used for this, and Flugaur stated that is a great question and another reason why the work group needs to get back together. Flugaur stated the work group has studied this in the past and the recommendation was made with the provision that they will keep looking at this issue to see what it is doing to the jail relative to overcrowding, as well as revenue. Flugaur stated another major issue that has developed out of this, is that when someone walks into the courthouse for another offense and there is a warrant for an unpaid forfeiture, they get picked up and walked over to the jail. They are then put in jail and do not have their Blessinger Hearing until the next day. This counts as two more days that are not even counted in these numbers. Flugaur stated this has developed into a huge problem they thought they had worked out, but there is disagreement in terms of whether Clerks can get rid of these warrants; this issue needs to be addressed. Flugaur again reiterated this group needs to get together and come back in January with a recommendation.

Molepske asked how much time in arrears someone must accrue before they are subject to a warrant, and Baker replied 61 days, based on State Statute. Baker stated the reality is probably more like a year; they go through a lot of processes in their collection procedures before they get to issue a warrant.

Flugaur stated unless he hears any objection, he is going to follow Baker's recommendation and get the work group back together.

4. An update from Justiceworks; by the Board President Attorney David Knaapen, and the Family Law and Information Director Jamie Kiener

Knaapen gave an update on Justiceworks Volunteers In Probation (VIP) Program. Knaapen stated they are at capacity with 30 individuals in the program. Knaapen stated he believes this number is misleading because the number only reflects the people in the program at that time, and as one person graduates out of the program, there are other people waiting to get in.

Flugaur asked how many volunteer mentors the program has for these 30 people in the program, and Knaapen stated there is one mentor per individual. Flugaur asked if there are any mentors that have two or three individuals assigned, and Knaapen replied yes, some do. It was noted there are approximately 70 volunteers total. Knaapen stated when they were grant funded they were able to mentor up to 50 people. When the grant funding ran out they went to the County and had to reduce the numbers because that is all they could afford based on the contract with the County. Knaapen stated the value of the VIP Program is that it relates to the issue of reducing bed days. Knaapen stated the VIP Program, in essence, replaces what otherwise may be people being on probation. When you have people on probation, you are talking about people who are not following the rules and may eventually get put back in jail for a number of reasons. By getting people into the VIP Program, they are held more directly accountable because they have that direct one-to-one contact with a mentor. Rather than have them held accountable by throwing them in jail, it is actually meeting with them to discuss what is going on and figure out what they can do to make this more productive. Knaapen stated in his opinion, the VIP Program is a program that reduces jail bed days. Knaapen added when talking about ways to reduce other jail bed days that may not necessarily relate to the forfeiture or unpaid fine, increasing their ability to mentor people in the VIP Program would help. Knaapen stated when people volunteer for something, they do it because they want to be involved. If there are only 30 people to mentor that means they have 40 people sitting around wondering why they volunteered to help. Knaapen believes they are greatly undervaluing the resource. Knaapen believes as a way of saving jail bed days, they need to look at increasing those VIP services.

Knaapen stated another program they run is Shifting Gears, which came about to fill a void the Teamwork and Employment Access Through Mentoring (TEAM) grant left when it was discontinued. Knaapen stated the TEAM grant was a mentor program for employment; getting people who are in the criminal justice system to re-integrate into the

community, but are having a difficult time finding employment. Shifting Gears is a bicycle repair and maintenance shop. The idea is to use that as a program to give former defendants employment opportunities and to reintegrate into the community. The idea is to teach people who have been in the criminal justice system a long time, skills they never learned during their upbringing such as being a responsible citizen, having a job, reporting at regular times for employment, being held accountable for work, and being rewarded for work done by getting paid. In addition to getting paid, Shifting Gears allows the opportunity for workers to get a bike so they have transportation. Knaapen stated one thing that holds these people back from getting employment is lack of a driver's license, vehicle, or they should not be driving. Knaapen stated he believes the Shifting Gears program has been very successful. They have been doing a great job of getting bikes in, selling bikes, and teaching people, which helps them feel better about themselves.

Flugaur asked the number of individuals in the program, and Knaapen replied he does not have specific numbers.

Baker stated she bought a couple of bikes at Shifting Gears this summer and it was a fantastic experience. She spoke with the mechanic and asked him about working with defendants and how it was working out, and she was pleased with the glowing comments.

Knaapen stated a newer component is the Community and Residential Program (CRP), which is a program set up by State funding. Knaapen stated Ron Carlson and Kurt Helminiak are the mentors in that program. They continue to get referrals from that program. Knaapen stated these are 15 week sessions and they work with people from Probation and Parole as mentors. Zach Bishop stated he estimates there are 10 actively participating, and 15-20 have graduated from the program, but still keep contact with Carlson and Helminiak. Bishop stated most of the clients have found this to be a very rewarding connection.

Flugaur asked if the Justiceworks component of the CRP is mentoring for employment, and Bishop stated it is another type of "Life Coach" in their life. Knaapen stated it is the VIP Program, but at a higher level, because of the people they are mentoring. Knaapen stated the value of the program lies with the mentors. Knaapen added Carlson and Helminiak are invaluable and he feels that is reflected in the success of the VIP and CRP Programs.

Knaapen stated another program is the Deferred Prosecution Program (DPP). Justiceworks is involved by monitoring compliance with the DPP. Knaapen stated these are primarily domestic violence cases typically for people who have no criminal history. Knaapen stated he believes there are approximately 20-25 open cases at any time where people are in DPP being monitored to make sure they are complying with any counseling or services ordered. These people meet face-to-face initially, have periodic phone contact, reviews every three months, and then prior to discharge, have another final face-to-face meeting to make sure everything has been done. Knaapen stated he believes the success rate of DPP, in terms of people who have gone through the program and not re-offended, is approximately 88-92 percent. Knaapen believes this is a hugely successful program in terms of addressing the issues and preventing these people from re-offending.

Knaapen stated Justiceworks has partnered with the 2617 Club, a recovery club for drug addicts and alcoholics. Knaapen stated this came about because the 2617 Club previously held their meetings at a building in Ministry Health on Main Street. That space was no longer available and they were hoping to get a space that could house all their programs under one roof. Knaapen stated they have purchased the old Masonic Lodge located on Strongs Avenue. They are currently conducting a capital campaign to help get renovations and they are organized under the name Central Wisconsin Center for Non-Profits. They will house their offices and run their programs out of that building, and 2617 Club will have their meetings in there as well. Knaapen stated they are creating space so they can rent space to other non-profit organizations, in addition to creating meeting rooms so other organizations can rent space at reduced rates for conferences. Knaapen stated the idea is to find a way to save money so it can be diverted to programs, rather than to expenses. Knaapen stated their target goal was \$350,000 to renovate the building and hopefully start a fund that would be available to do the things necessary when owning a building. At present, both organizations have contributed \$80,000 of their own money towards it, and they have raised about \$140,000 from community organizations and individuals. Once everything is open, they will invite everybody to an open house.

Kiener stated the number he gave about volunteer mentors is a list that probably includes the original mentors from the Retired Seniors Volunteer Program (RSVP), so a number of those may not be available anymore. Kiener stated they are always looking to add to the pool of individuals who are interested in the mentorship component.

Kiener stated DPP may only be compliance monitoring, but it is not only a 15 minute meeting. These meetings usually go on for at least an hour and include a component of offering resources available to them. Kiener stated one of those

resources is the Family Law Information Center (FLIC), which assists to individuals going through Family Court who are unrepresented. At this point in 2014, they have seen over 300 individuals come through the FLIC, and this represents over 110 divorces and about 50 post judgment actions. Kiener stated over the years, they have found this to be a very valuable component for individuals going through criminal proceedings.

Kiener discussed the Restitution Program they have with the City of Stevens Point. They have been working through the new Municipal Court changeover and it has been going very well. Kiener stated this program, over the past seven years, has recovered about \$8,000 in restitution for individuals who have been victims of ordinance violations in the City of Stevens Point.

Flugaur stated saving jail bed days is important, but recidivism is obviously the number one issue when it comes to all programs they run, through either Justiceworks or through the Coalition. Flugaur asked Knaapen if he monitors all these programs as to recidivism, and Knaapen replied yes; adding the numbers they have show the VIP Program has a 95% success rate in terms of people graduating out of the program and not recidivating. Flugaur asked how many years they go back when looking at rates, and Knaapen replied back to 2006 or 2008. Kiener stated he believes that is a generous number, but recidivism is under 10%.

5. A discussion and decision regarding the implementation of a restitution surcharge, by Judge Finn

Finn stated a work group previously studying the implementation of a restitution surcharge came up with no recommendation. Finn read from two parts of the restitution statutes. One says the Court shall impose a 10% surcharge on restitution, and the second says if the person is placed on probation or sent to prison (in which case there will be an extended supervision after that) then the restitution order shall be a condition of probation. Finn stated this means Probation and Parole has to collect. Finn added the statute says if the person is not put on probation or not sent to prison (which means a straight jail sentence or just a fine) the Court may, not shall, direct the Clerk of Courts to collect. Finn stated the statute also says when they do that, the order is in effect the same as a civil judgment. Finn stated there is a 10% surcharge that the statute says shall be assessed on restitution. If sent to the Clerk of Court's Office, there is an additional 5% on the restitution.

Finn stated the issue is the surcharge has not been collected over the years. The problem is he believes the Legislature does not know what is happening in Courts; they want to collect the surcharge from persons that are not paying anyway. Finn stated he believes it is ridiculous, but he does not write the law. Finn stated because the Committee did not come up with a solution, he believes they will have to do something today to figure out what they should do. Finn reiterated he believes it is a waste of time because it will probably not be collected. Finn stated on the other hand, the statute says shall; when the statute says shall, that is a directive to the Court that you have to do it. Finn stated he was asked to attach a surcharge to a case that has already been concluded. Finn stated he is not recommending they do that because it would be overly burdensome to the Clerk of Courts.

Finn asked Morrow if Probation and Parole has its own surcharge, and Morrow replied yes. Morrow stated his office has a 5% surcharge and that is on everything; court costs and restitution as well. Morrow stated he works with Baker on people that do not end up paying. Morrow stated his office spends an inordinate amount of time trying to collect fines and fees. Morrow stated when people claim they cannot pay, they make sure on home visits to check to see if they have cable, game systems, new cell phones, if they smoke expensive cigarettes, etc. Morrow added, by the time cases get to them, people have worked very hard at not paying their fees. Morrow stated another problem is a lot of programs they have were passed because it was believed the offender would pay for it. They have the GPS Program for sex offenders, which offenders are supposed to pay for. Morrow stated the Department of Collections thinks they can collect 5%, but a lot of these people just do not have any money. Morrow added if an offender is homeless and does not pay their fee, he does not believe people want sex offenders without the ankle monitor on. Morrow stated he feels if an offender has the ability to pay, they should be assessed the 10%. Morrow added he does not believe an offender should be put in jail if they do not have the means to pay the charge; this is not an answer. Morrow stated when they do a civil judgment, the surcharge is not included because they will not be collecting it. Morrow stated they charge supervision fees for people on probation or parole, but they do not put offenders in jail for non-payment of fees. Morrow added any money collected is put towards restitution first.

Eagon stated he disagrees with this. He serves on the Crime-Victim Council and they met with people from DOC who stated they get the 5% required by the Legislature. Morrow stated it is assessed; however, when money is sent in, they specify where the money goes. Morrow stated he has not seen their fee collected first. Morrow added offenders do have the option of specifying what the money they pay is put toward.

Flugaur stated a hypothetical situation was brought up where restitution is ordered and it does not get paid, and the surcharge becomes part of the Court Costs. When a civil judgment is entered for the victim, they are able to try to collect through garnishments; whereas the Court can do a tax intercept. Flugaur stated the Court is more likely to get the surcharge, and the victim will not. Finn stated the bottom line is do they want to discuss whether or not they should order the surcharge. In his opinion, Finn believes they have to. Finn stated they can assess at the time of sentencing what the likelihood is for the person being able to pay, and in some cases they may want to direct the entry of a civil judgment right away. Finn stated he believes the direction they need to move in is should they move to implement the imposition of the surcharge, knowing they will probably not be able to collect it.

Finn asked if there is anyone who thinks they should not order the imposition of a surcharge, and Morrow stated he thinks the problem is that when this surcharge is added on, it is projected money the Court and other outside agencies assume will be coming in as revenue. Finn stated even worse, there will be criticism that there is a statute saying you have to do it, and then it is ignored. Finn reiterated he has a problem with this.

Molepske stated he understands the philosophical issues, but the fact of the matter is that it is the law. Molepske stated he does not like that Portage County is treating defendants differently than in other counties where they are collecting the surcharge. Molepske does not agree with having money go to the County's General Fund to go to any purpose the County determines. Molepske added the District Attorneys in the state originally pushed this through to have the money go back to the Victim Witness Office. Molepske stated the issue is he wants an automated process when the Judgment of Conviction is entered to make sure all applicable fines and surcharges are assessed as required by the law, and he does not believe they should be disagreeing with what the Legislature says.

Molepske stated Wis. Stats. 973.20(14)(b) speaks about the burden on demonstrating the financial resource of the defendant is on the defendant, and at the time of sentencing the issue of being able to pay restitution can be raised. Eagon asked if he is asking the Court to reduce the amount of restitution ordered to the victim because that is the only way the Court can reduce the 10% surcharge, and Molepske replied no. Eagon stated that is exactly what the statute does, and as a Judge they cannot say the fee is 10%, but they will only order 5%. The surcharge is 10% of the restitution that was ordered, and the only way to reduce the surcharge is to tell the victim they will only order the defendant pay half. Flugaur stated this is a tough thing for a Judge to do, but he has to do that all the time in Juvenile Court where it is a bit easier because he is dealing with younger offenders. Eagon stated in adult Court there is consideration on ability to pay, but the Court can order above the ability to pay, which means paying 10% of the full amount ordered. Idsvoog stated to him it is a no brainer and they need to comply with the law; Flugaur agreed.

Baker stated from her office's perspective, whatever restitution surcharge is added on, they look at it as a Court cost and when they start putting people in jail on warrants for unpaid fines and Court costs, which will increase the amount of time people are in jail. This was an issue they had when the Committee originally met; they felt this would get lumped in with all the other money owed and increase jail time. Baker added this is a very complicated issue and she wants to see the County, as a whole, do it the same way. Flugaur added it should be an automated system so that everything is in the computer system, rather than having staff do it case-by-case.

Eagon asked if all the other surcharges that have not been assessed will begin to be assessed. Molepske stated some surcharges are assessed and some are not, and asked Baker if the computer can automatically do this. Baker stated some of the charges are automatically assessed, and some are not. Baker added her staff waits for direction from the Judge before assessing surcharges. Finn stated this is a different issue, and right now they need to stick with the restitution surcharge issue.

6. A discussion and recommendation that the Jail Over-Crowding Committee reconvene to study strategies to minimize the daily jail population, by Judge Flugaur

Flugaur stressed this is not a Committee, but a jail over-crowding work group. Flugaur stated there has not been a meeting in a few years, and believes they need to re-visit these issues. Flugaur stated the jail is busting at the seams and there were a number of things the workgroup looked at in the past; everything from shortening up Pre-Sentence Investigations, the way Judges schedule things, and electronic monitoring. Flugaur added the Judges are going to a new scheduling system next year to help move cases quicker. Flugaur stated there are all kinds of things that can be revisited and he believes the group should revisit those. Flugaur asked if anyone disagrees with getting the work group back together; there were no objections. Flugaur detailed past work group makeup; the Jail Administrator, County Board members, Stevens Point Police Department members, Jail Social Worker, County Executive, Sheriff, District Attorney, and Public Defender. Flugaur stated anyone who wants to serve on the workgroup should let him know; otherwise they will pick the likely individuals who have replaced the above-mentioned members, except the County Board members. Flugaur stated they need volunteers.

Flugaur stated they will have two or three meetings between now and January, and will hopefully have an interim or final report in January on strategies to reduce the jail population. They have done things in the past that have worked to varying degrees, and Flugaur is hoping they can do this again. Flugaur added whether a new jail is built or not, it will not be built for possibly years. In the meantime, they need to do things as a criminal justice system that continues to ensure the public safety, while at the same time becoming more efficient in trying to minimize the number of jail beds.

Idsvoog asked if this is a work group, how many people Flugaur wants, because they can take volunteers. Idsvoog stated if they want to limit the number of people, they can do a recommendation at Executive Operations. Idsvoog asked what parameters he wants and Flugaur responded he would like a group of 15-20 people, with at least one citizen member. Flugaur asked interested persons to get in touch with him, and they will be meeting within the next three to four weeks.

7. A discussion to set the first meeting date and the composition of the work group studying the creation of a Drug/Alcohol/Mental Health/Veterans Court, by Judge Flugaur

Flugaur stated he is very interested in pursuing the idea of a Drug/Alcohol/Mental Health/Veterans Court; adding Waushara County received a grant and they are doing something very similar to this now. Flugaur stated Ross Dick did a lot of foot work and looked at a lot of different Drug Courts. Flugaur stated he intentionally waited until the new Justice Programs Director was in place; adding he has spoken with Kipp and made a commitment that he will meet with Kipp weekly between now and the end of the year to help her get acclimated to Portage County. Flugaur stated this is a very ambitious and new program, and he has already heard from parties interested in participating. Flugaur stated at the first meeting they will do some brainstorming to figure out who else should be part of that group; in addition to the District Attorney, Public Defender, Judges, Law Enforcement, Probation and Parole, and treatment providers. Flugaur stated they will, either as a group or small groups, visit some Drug Courts. Flugaur stated he has already gotten invitations to visit from a number of his colleagues who run Drug/Alcohol/Mental Health/Veterans Courts. Flugaur stated he anticipates this will be a year-long process; adding he is hopeful that a year from now they will be instituting a Drug Court here in Portage County. Flugaur stated they must commit to the standards that have been set that make these types of Courts successful; adding we already have the infrastructure in place with the day report center. Flugaur stated he does not have a date set for the first meeting; he would rather have Kipp schedule what works for everyone involved.

Dreier stated she is excited they are kicking off this next level of planning, and added building on the infrastructure and integrating existing programs may require dollars associated with it. Dreier asked if it would be possible with the year-long planning for them to have some sense of what it would mean for the 2016 budget, and possibly get ballpark figures to be presented by next October.

Molepske stated his new Assistant District Attorney helped draft the Drug Court Policy for the Wood County Drug Court. Molepske added he received notice from the Wood County District Attorney offering that any Wood County resident who commits drug related crimes in Portage County can go through the Wood County Drug Court. Molepske stated he is unsure if the Judges received that notice, and he is curious how that would work.

8. Topics to be considered at future meetings

Flugaur noted this is Plover Police Chief Dwayne Wierzba's last meeting. Wierzba confirmed, stating he is retiring January 16, 2015.

Finn stated the Portage County Space and Properties Committee is looking at a new Jail and Courthouse and has re-hired Venture Architects; they are currently looking at space needs. Finn stated Chief Deputy Kontos is getting together a working committee to assist in the process. Finn suggested future meetings have an agenda item specifically for progress updates.

Jankowski, Space and Properties Committee Chairman, stated Venture is hoping to have a final plan to the County Board in March; adding they hope to have ample time to start looking at where they go for the end of the year for budgeting purposes.

Molepske stated there is potential Bishop may no longer be doing the assessments for Deferred Prosecution Agreements. Molepske would like an agenda item placed to have discussion on Justiceworks conducting the formal review process.

With no further business to come before the Coalition, the meeting adjourned at 8:58 am.

Respectfully submitted, Gayle Stewart, Recording Secretary

MINUTES
Justice Coalition
May 2, 2014

Members Present: Judges Flugaur and Eagon, Trish Baker, Zach Bishop, Cory Nelson, Jeanne Dodge, Ray Przybelski, Dan Kontos, Anne Renc, John Charewicz, Perry Pazdernik, Stan Potocki, Bill McCulley, and Dave Medin

Others Present: Don Jankowski, County Board Supervisor; Dwayne Wierzba, Plover Police Department; Kurt Helminiak, Justiceworks; Denise Ellis, Jail Inspector; Patty Dreier, County Executive; Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director; and Andrew Logan Beveridge, Stevens Point City Attorney.

Staff Present: Ross Dick and Paula Cummings, Justice Programs Department

Judge Flugaur called the Justice Coalition meeting to order at 7:45 am in Conference Room 5 of the County Annex.

1. Approval of the Minutes from the January 16, 2014 Meeting

Flugaur asked for comments regarding the January 16, 2014 minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were accepted by consensus.

2. A Final Report from the Work Group Studying the Current and Future Prosecution of CHIPS (Children in Need of Protection and Services) and TPR (Termination of Parental Rights) Cases in Portage County, by Corporation Counsel Mike McKenna

McKenna handed out a report (original in meeting file) from the CHIPS/TPR Work Group, which met two times after being charged to look at CHIPS/TPR issues. He clarified that TPR cases flow out of CHIPS cases. Throughout the State of Wisconsin, including Portage County, it is preferred to see children out of foster care and into "forever" homes. There is a lot of money tied up in Foster Care. Currently, the District Attorney's Office handles CHIPS and the Corporation Counsel's Office handles TPR. TPR's were transferred to the Corporation Counsel's Office in 2008; prior to that TPR cases were contracted out. The Work Group had a concern as to whether one office could handle both CHIPS and TPR cases because they are large cases and go on for years.

The Work Group came up with the following possible courses of action:

1. Leave the handling of CHIPS and TPR cases status quo, which all agreed is unsatisfactory.
2. Move CHIPS cases to the Corporation Counsel Office (combine with TPR). This would require County Board resolution, a memorandum-of-understanding (MOU) with the District Attorney, and the addition of an attorney and paralegal to the Corporation Counsel Office.
3. Move TPR cases to the District Attorney Office (combine with CHIPS). This would require County Board resolution and an additional attorney in the District Attorney Office.
4. Augment TPR resources in the Corporation Counsel Office to more aggressively pursue those cases.

McKenna reported that a consensus on course of action was not reached by the Work Group. McKenna stated Dodge, as well as he, supports the move of CHIPS cases to the Corporation Counsel Office. There was also support for an additional attorney in the District Attorney Office, if the County would budget money for the addition, which would then support other criminal matters as well. McKenna noted the Corporation Counsel Office has volunteered to do TPR cases with the same resources since 2008. Completing CHIPS and TPR cases quicker and faster does not come without additional resources. Generally, the State will fund 25% of CHIPS costs and 40% of TPR costs. Health and Human Services (HHS) is collecting the 40% for TPR, but CHIPS funding is not collected.

CHIPS and TPR cases are part of a system that is already strained. McKenna stated he spoke to other counties in the State and found the cases are handled differently throughout the State. Rock County is also facing resource issues and they have an attorney in their HHS working on CHIPS and TPR cases. Sauk County's Corporation Counsel Office handles both cases.

Dreier asked why the difference in staffing needs between the Corporation Counsel and District Attorney Offices if each would take on the other case type. Specifically, the report indicates an attorney and paralegal would be necessary if CHIPS cases were added to the Corporation Counsel, and only an attorney is listed as necessary if TPR cases were added to the District Attorney Office. No additional clerical support would be needed in the District Attorney Office? Do they have enough staff available now? Flugaur replied that a paralegal would also be required in the District Attorney's Office.

Flugaur stated if TPR's are handled quicker, children will not be in foster care as long, which equals money saved that could be allocated toward aggressive/timely TPR cases. He further noted, from a legal standpoint, the group felt it would be best to have an expert working on TPR cases, and not having those cases as just a part of someone's job. No cases are more closely scrutinized than TPR cases. When appeals are filed on TPR cases, the transcripts are "fly-specked". It definitely helps Judges when an expert is working on these types of cases. The Corporation Counsel's Office has utilized different attorneys throughout the years; there is not one working and developing the expertise on these types of cases.

McKenna replied that is a fair representation. His office has experienced various deployments over the years causing a shift in workload for the attorneys on staff. McKenna stated the Corporation Counsel's Office is not tasked with doing TPR cases; they volunteered to take on these cases in 2008, and allocated the additional workload amongst the various attorneys. He noted that contested jury trials expound problems. It is not just the sheer number of cases; it is the difficulty of the cases. McKenna also stated there is a big push by Public Defenders to "fly speck" transcripts. Flugaur noted there are appeals as well and felt TPRs have a lot of work involved. Przybelski noted there were 17 TPR eligible cases at this time. Flugaur stated the problem is getting worse and not going away. Families are dealing with mental health issues, drug issues, etc. This is occurring all across the State; not just in Portage County.

Flugaur said the Judges will do what they have to do; they will rotate the cases to keep up. Even though there was no consensus from the Work Group, CHIPS and TPR cases should be done by the same office. He noted it is a political issue; it is a County Board decision as to where the cases are shifted to because each scenario causes the need for additional staff.

Dodge noted she felt a resistance to add legal staff to the District Attorney Office while on the Work Group. The Corporation Counsel's Office can be evaluated better. She also felt there may be no political will to add an attorney, with County tax dollars, to the District Attorney's Office.

Dreier referred back to the fact the State will pay 25% of CHIPS related costs. Przybelski noted you must file with the State for the 25% in January of odd numbered years and it would take effect in September. McKenna added that it could be done sooner, if there is an agreement and MOU in place. Dreier noted, from a cost/revenue standpoint, Portage County is not currently gathering 25% CHIPS funding in the District Attorney's Office, but is collecting 40% on TPR cases. Dreier encouraged obtaining the 25% funding as soon as possible. We need to move quickly and resolve key children/family issues. Dodge noted her position relates to financial aspects as well. Flugaur encouraged County Board members on the Coalition to educate their County Board colleagues on CHIPS and TPR issues.

Potocki noted the District Attorney Office is funded by the State and asked if we need the State to commit funds to move forward with an additional attorney. Flugaur responded that the State has not put new attorneys in District Attorney Offices for several years. He noted the caseload has doubled in the Portage County District Attorney's Office with the same number of attorneys in place. Counties around the State have allocated money to District Attorney Offices to hire an attorney; not the State. Counties have moved forward on their own good will. Baker noted Waushara County recently had an attorney added and paid for by the State. Eagon noted Marathon County has added and funded three attorneys in their District Attorney's Office. Flugaur felt if our District Attorney's Office would gain an additional attorney, they could process CHIPS and TPR case, and have needed time for other cases. Dreier felt if that was the case, why not remove CHIPS cases from the District Attorney's Office to free up time they need for other cases. Renc noted the District Attorney's Office also processes juvenile delinquency cases and Juvenile In Need of Protection or Services (JIPS) cases. McKenna felt no matter where these cases go people will have to grow expertise.

3. An Update on the Implementation of the Department of Corrections Project; n/k/a Community and Residential Program (CARP), by Ross Dick

Dick explained CARP has been operational for approximately 4 months and various groups are up and running. Service provisions for the various groups are of different lengths. Consensus of service providers is that groups are going well. Offenders have reported positive program impacts as well.

Bishop noted they continue to work on billing and reconciliation issues with the State. Dick added that several County staff met with a State Policy Analyst regarding this issue. The reconciliation process is being redefined. The County does not want to "chase a deficit". Jossie noted the philosophy is that rates are set on the proposed budget, you then settle on previous year, and recalculate any profit/deficit and roll it forward. This compounds the deficit and the County does not want to do that. She suggested we settle on who owes who what.

Jossie further noted an issue with the number of beds at Portage House being put toward CARP. Dick clarified that since the traditional half-way house model (Portage House), the State has changed things on reimbursing Portage House expenses. The Department of Corrections considers Portage House an outdated model and would like to devote 12 beds to CARP and programming. This doesn't necessarily impact the County, but it impacts offenders. Hard to place prisoner releases, such as sex offenders, were brought to Portage House while seeking appropriate living arrangements. This would no longer be the case, if all beds were devoted to CARP, and would change the way of doing business for Probation/Parole.

Dick noted it is premature to bring forward figures on recidivism as relates to CARP. He added that offenders are more engaged than he thought they would be. Some have even asked for certificates of program completion. Helminiak stated he felt participants are responding well. Even though the first group is done, they continue to come to programs voluntarily. This points to a need for follow-up and adjunct programming. He has seen some individuals engaged for the first time in their lives. He has high hopes for CARP and believes it is successful because mentors relate to them differently than their Probation Officer. He felt this success also speaks to the ability of Bishop and other program providers.

Dick stated Community Corrections have been very helpful with referrals. In time, referrals from Court can be taken as well. They have found those resistant to the program or present problems, but once their agent is contacted, they do better.

4. A Final Report and Recommendation from the Work Group Studying the Implementation of a Restitution Surcharge, by District Attorney Louis Molepske

Eagon stated the Work Group met to discuss the ability to order a 10% restitution surcharge payable to the County Treasurer. The District Attorney would like the surcharge money to be put directly in the Victim Witness budget to help fund the program. The Work Group met a final time with no recommendation coming forward on imposing the 10% surcharge.

Eagon stated they felt the 10% surcharge really does not exist; it would be an uncollectable debt owed the County. At the Work Group, Molepske reported with a 10% surcharge, approximately \$9,000 a year could be generated to help support the Victim Witness program. When computing that to jail bed days on executions issued for the uncollected surcharge, it totals 180 jail bed days and could cost the County more money to impose than not impose, said Eagon. Eagon felt there would also be the perception that if the money went into the District Attorney's budget, the District Attorney could have the incentive to inflate that amount.

Eagon reported that ultimately, there were no strong feelings on this surcharge. Often, the people being imposed the surcharge have no money to pay. If the person completes their sentence and does not pay, the County issues an execution warrant and can collect; whereas, the victims get nothing because the County cannot collect for the victim on a warrant.

Baker felt this is a complicated topic. She further noted that the County can collect the 10% through tax intercept, but the victim does not get the money. Baker stated the Work Group also talked about adding a 5% surcharge if the individual is not on probation and the Clerk of Courts would collect this. This surcharge would pay for costs related to the Clerk of Courts processing expenses. Baker stated she will be asking the Judges to add this 5% across the board for those not on probation.

5. A Discussion and Update on the Creation of Drug Court in Portage County, by Judge Flugaur and Ross Dick

Flugaur stated a lot of counties have drug courts. Portage County had considered applying for a drug court grant back when Kathy King was Justice Programs Director, but later backed out because there was a lack of drug court standards. At a recent conference, it was indicated there are now standards and criteria in place, and drug courts can be successful.

Dick provided two handouts; one depicting a map of Wisconsin highlighting Treatment and Diversion (TAD) grant eligibility, as well as various types of specialty courts throughout the State; and the other providing facts about offender requirements and drug court operations (original in meeting file). Dick noted the State put an additional \$1.5 million dollars into TAD grants this spring.

Flugaur stated the last round of TAD grants came with a 3-4 week notice; too short for us to respond. Dick added that we could not meet that short deadline. The State reports that developing drug courts across the State is moving along. There are 3,000 drug courts nationwide and many were developed within the last 2-3 years. Dick then read through his second handout as noted above.

Przybelski stated previous discussion today included the inability to collect money from offenders and asked how drug courts collect money from offenders. Dick replied they must pay to be part of the drug court program; if not paying, they are out of the program and back to the regular court process. Przybelski asked what motivates the offender to pay and participate in drug court. Dick answered the probability of jail time. He further noted the County would decide the offender's incentive, which could include withholding jail, etc.

Flugaur noted that in Outagamie County the Drug Court serves as an Alternative to Revocation (ATR) and they did not receive a TAD grant. If Portage County had a Drug Court that operated in that fashion, it would be small because there are not many. Some questions to be answered include whether Portage County would have its Drug Court serve as an ATR, would participants be post charge, pre-trial, or a hybrid? Portage County would need to reach a consensus before moving forward.

Dick said in Wood County, the Drug Officer conducts spot-checks at the homes of drug court participants, which they must allow in order to be in the program. Law enforcement is also involved in the drug court process in Wood County. Drug court participants who attend AA meetings can have attendance sheets

stamped, which serves to certify they attended. In addition, all drug testing is observed. Recently, a Siemens representative visited Dick to discuss equipment used for drug testing in a drug court program. The County would purchase the re-agents/chemicals, not the machine, and samples meet clinical/legal standards. Drug courts have a high level of accountability. Judges act/interact differently than usual (meet participant weekly) and practice motivational interviewing with drug court participants. Dick relayed that both Wood and Outagamie Counties had good things to say and their Drug Officers/Law Enforcement would come to Portage County to answer any questions.

Flugaur noted that Portage County was under a bit of pressure to apply for TAD money, which gives reason to believe we were targeted and would receive funding. When a drug court possibility was discussed with County Board Chair Phil Idsvoog, he asked what the County's match would be. It is 25% and can be in-kind, which includes the Judges' wages, Day Report Center, etc. With that being the case, Portage County can meet that match in-kind and probably would not have to pay anything additional. This answer needs to be substantiated. With the number of drug court questions remaining to be answered, Portage County needs to be further along before applying for a TAD grant.

Flugaur suggested looking at a hybrid OWI/Drug Court Program. Portage County's post- and pre-trial program is an OWI Court and we have never received credit for it. We need to officially call it that and be eligible for money for specialty courts.

Flugaur stated he would like to put together a Drug Court Work Group and be able to apply for the next round of TAD grants. He asked those interested in being a member of this Work Group to contact him.

Potocki asked about existing TAD recipients and the number of jail bed days they have saved. Dick replied he does not have that information for other counties.

6. Topics to be Considered at Future Meetings

Flugaur made those present aware that Dick will be retiring on July 7. He would like to invite Dick back to the July 17 Justice Coalition meeting to receive a recognition gift. Flugaur stated he appreciates all Dick has done.

With no further business to come before the Coalition, the meeting adjourned at 9:02 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Paula Cummings
Recording Secretary

MINUTES
Justice Coalition
January 16, 2014

Members Present: Judges Finn and Eagon, Trish Baker, Zach Bishop, Louis Molepske, Jr., Cory Nelson, Mike McKenna, John Charewicz, Perry Pazdernik, Stan Potocki, Steve Olson, Shaun Morrow, Phil Idsvoog, Bo Dedeker, Dan Kontos, and Ken Wolfe

Others Present: Dwayne Wierzba, Plover Police Department; Tracy Springer, ATTIC Correctional Services; Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director; Andrew Logan Beveridge, Stevens Point Attorney; Martin Skibba, Stevens Point Police Department; and Karla Campion, ATTIC Correctional Services

Staff Present: Ross Dick and Paula Cummings, Justice Programs Department

Judge Finn called the Justice Coalition meeting to order at 7:45 am in Conference Rooms 1 and 2 of the County Annex.

1. Approval of the Minutes from the October 17, 2013 Meeting

Finn asked for comments regarding the October 17, 2013 minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were accepted by consensus.

2. An Update from the Work Group Studying the Current and Future Prosecution of CHIPS (Children In Need of Protection and Services) and TPR (Termination of Parental Rights) Cases in Portage County, by Corporation Counsel Mike McKenna

Finn explained the basic difference between children in the CHIPS program versus those in the juvenile detention facility as children under CHIPS have done nothing wrong. CHIPS children need protection, and if the rules of protection are not followed, those children move on to TPR. CHIPS cases are handled through the District Attorney Office and TPR cases are handled through the Corporation Counsel Office.

McKenna explained the CHIPS/TPR Work Group met on November 14, 2013. All parties involved redefined their roles within the system and a discussion of best practice moving forward took place. McKenna clarified the backlog of TPR cases has been taken care of by the Corporation Counsel Office. He noted there is a lot of State and agency pressure for permanent adoptive homes. The County Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has double the number of TPR cases than usual.

McKenna brought forward two proposals: 1. the District Attorney Office would take on the TPR function; or 2. the Corporation Counsel Office would take on the CHIPS function, which would result in a needed staffing increase. The HHS Director is working up costs figures relating to the District Attorney Office taking on TPR cases. He also noted that Supervisor Dodge, Chair of the HHS Committee, is very interested in this process.

McKenna said the Work Group will be meeting again and will bring its recommendation forward to the Justice Coalition at a future meeting.

3. An Update on the Implementation of the Department of Corrections Project; n/k/a Community and Residential Program (C.A.R.P), by Ross Dick

Finn noted the Community and Residential Program (CRP) is now underway and has been a long time in coming.

Dick stated programs/groups are happening. The State will receive its first CRP billing at the end of the month. To date, there have been 12 intakes on participants. Thinking for Change (T4C) programming is being held at

the Portage House. Participants are being introduced to their mentors as well. Mike Champion is running the Interpersonal Communication Education (ICE) program, while ATTIC Correctional Services (ACS) is running a substance abuse program. Group sizes differ; accommodation size versus State code. Approval may need to be sought from the State to allow more groups. CRP will work closely with Probation/Parole to obtain participants. As they are working through a potential participant group, some reoffend and are then dropped from the list. Dick noted that how well or how poorly participants respond to the programming will be found as the database builds.

Finn asked if participants are on probation/extended supervision or parole. Dick replied some participants are just out of prison and Bishop added some are solely on probation. Finn explained that extended supervision means those individuals out on parole, while those on probation have yet to be sentenced.

Finn asked where the State money will come from. Dick replied the Portage House had been funded by State (\$300,000) and County (\$60,000) tax levies for the past 40 years. Within the last year, the State funding portion was switched to utilizing Becky Young Funds (BYF), which is not a tax-levied fund and must be used for offender programming. The Department of Corrections (DOC) has wider latitude for BYF, which is why the State came to Portage County for the CRP. Currently, CRP and Portage House are on the same contract utilizing approximately \$650,000 in BYF. Dick explained there is more money on the table with the DOC watching our program and its results. This is a substantial investment by the State.

Molepske asked how the money will come to Portage County and Dick replied billing procedures established for Portage House will be utilized for CRP as well. This entails monthly bills to the State. A per-offender-rate had to be established for CRP participants. Each participant was assumed to have the same needs and costs, which is not quite the case. It is complicated to add another group to the set cost per participant; costs would need to be revised. Jossie clarified there will be a reconciliation period as well, with true costs being provided every six months.

4. An Update from the Work Group to Study the Formation of a Mental Health Team to Respond to the Needs of Mentally Ill Inmates in the County Jail, by Captain Cory Nelson

Finn stated there is an issue with mental illness in the Portage County jail. There is a difference between a Chapter 51 commitment and the crime committed. To be considered for Chapter 51, there is a set of criteria to be met that includes a documented illness, being a danger to themselves or others, and the person can be rehabilitated with medication. Others do not meet those Chapter 51 requirements. There are numerous inmates within the jail with mental health illness.

Nelson reminded those present that at the last meeting, he reported the Jail Social Worker position was vacant. A new Social Worker has been hired for the jail, Ken Wolfe, who comes to us from the Marathon County area. He is reaching out to community members and groups.

Nelson stated the Mental Health Work Group met, but did not identify a focused problem area. It was noted during the meeting that many groups and programs exist in Portage County, and many offered by HHS were identified. The Work Group will meet again and bring information forward at the next Coalition meeting.

Baker felt the meeting also identified two separate, distinct groups of people. People with mental health issues coming into the jail and those who are jailed and then their mental health issues are exacerbated. She felt representatives from HHS had good suggestions at the meeting as well.

Molepske felt the issue came to light during an appearance before Judge Flugaur. He stated the Work Group had good discussion on what is out there for programs versus coming out with a focused goal for the group. The District Attorney Office and agents work together and sometimes jail is appropriate even for those under Chapter 51 in the County.

Finn noted he has experienced these same cases. The individual is non-compliant with rules, has a disorderly conduct arrest, and has possible bail jumping charges, etc. He felt Flugaur is looking for a policy on how to proceed so law enforcement can look at the mental health issues during arrest.

Dick felt the Work Group had good discussion about mental health, behavioral challenges, and acting out while inside the jail. Nelson stated temper tantrums are evident and provided various scenarios as an explanation. Nelson said the jail can handle behavioral issues in the jail, while it is the actual mental health illness inmates that they have the most difficult time dealing with.

Charewicz asked those present to remember they have nothing in the jail facility for those individuals. Staff has adapted the best way possible within the jail facility we have. Many man hours are taken by these individuals because there is not an environment in the jail for them. Wolfe noted some individuals need to see a doctor and they have been able to coordinate that for medications.

5. A Discussion of Creating a Work Group to Study the Volunteers in Probation Program, with Regard to Accountability, Outcomes, and Future Funding, by Judge Flugaur

Finn noted the County Executive asked that a work group be created to study the Volunteers in Probation (VIP) program, as a response to a request by Justiceworks for 2014 County tax levy dollars to fund a portion of VIP. The County Executive wants to address this and discuss accountability, outcomes, and future funding.

Dick said during the 2014 budget process a question about funding VIP came up, and \$50,000 in tax levy was put toward VIP in 2014 with the caveat that performance measures would be put in place. Dick has talked with Kurt Helminiak of Justiceworks and performance measures should not be complicated to work out.

6. A Discussion and Request to Appoint a Work Group to Study the Creation of Drug Court in Portage County, by Judge Flugaur

Finn stated when a Drug Court was discussed years back, there was no standard model at that time. Judges became supervisors of those participating in the Drug Court. Portage County did not take that approach, and instead, created pre and post sentence programs, which have been very successful. Three years ago, the Attorney General disbursed money for Drug Courts and Portage County did not receive any funding because our programs were not considered Drug Courts. At a recent judicial conference, it was noted that new Drug Court standards have resulted in relatively successful Drug Courts. The question is whether our programs can be incorporated into that.

Dick provided those present with a copy of "Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components", as prepared by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance (in original meeting file). There were 10 key components listed on the document, which Portage County has with its pre and post-trial programs. Drug Courts are distinguished as a non-adversarial process. Dick will be visiting with Wood and Outagamie Counties' Drug Courts. The program has offenders meet with Judges weekly in court to monitor treatment and provide accountability, which differs from the traditional approach to sentencing. Dick felt there is fairly rigorous testing of Drug Court participants.

Idsvoog questioned additional costs to Portage County with a Drug Court in place. Dick replied a Drug Court in Portage County has not been explored that far. There would be set up and large equipment costs, which could be covered by a Treatment and Diversion (TAD) grant, which does not require matching funds when related to a Drug Court. Dick will view this equipment as he visits others counties. Dick felt the County's Day Report Center may be able to take on additional man hours. Dick again referred to the hand side which also describes "Eligibility for Drug Court Involvement – Outagamie County" and read through the various requirements.

Potocki asked who would be trained to run the needed equipment. Karla Campion, ATTIC Correctional, stated they provide case management services for Wood County's Drug Court, which is running well. ATTIC employees run the needed equipment. They also provide this service for Wisconsin Rapids and Marshfield. Dick asked Campion if she was aware if those Drug Courts were substantially funded by TAD grants. Campion did not know. She went on to note that Drug Court case management has three court phases: 1 = 1X week; 2 = 2X month; and 3 = 1X month appearances for participants.

Baker asked if Portage County's pre and post-trial programs could be reorganized to qualify as a Drug Court. She felt we probably met most requirements. She also expressed curiosity about the process because it could impact the courts and her office.

Those volunteering for the Work Group were: Baker, Morrow, McKenna, Campion, Molepske, and Beveridge, with a reach out to Anne Renc (Public Defender).

7. Topics to be Considered at Future Meetings

Molepske suggested a discussion on the Municipal Court as being developed by the City of Stevens Point and Village of Plover. Qualifying criteria, such as expanding possession of THC, may affect the District Attorney's Office. The County ordinance addresses 5 grams of THC. He noted the State brings most THC tickets to the courts.

Finn would like landlord/tenant small claims cases discussed at the next Coalition meeting. Legislators have changed the law regarding evictions. Currently, the individual is sent a notice with an opportunity to comply, and if they fail to comply, eviction goes to small claims court once the individual is personally served the notice of summons and complaint. Beginning March 1, the notice of small claims can be sent certified mail rather than personal delivery. Finn said he would like to seek guidance from the Coalition on this philosophy and how to handle this. There are 7-10 eviction cases in small claims court, which takes place every other week.

Idsvoog stated he would like to be a member of the VIP Work Group.

Molepske would like to see restitution surcharges, and other restitution and costs, on the next Coalition agenda.

With no further business to come before the Coalition, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Paula Cummings
Recording Secretary