BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221
E-Mail BrownCountyCountyBoard@co.brown.wi.us

Judge Thomas Walsh

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING BOARD
Friday, May 8, 2015
8:00 a.m.
Brown County District Attorney's Office
Truttman Room, First Floor
300 E. Walnut Street
Green Bay, Wisconsin

1. Call meeting to order.
2. Approve/modify agenda.
3. Approve/modify minutes of February 26, 2015.
4. Mental Health Court (Judge Zuidmulder).
5. Heroin/Drug Court (Judge Walsh).
6. TAD Grant (David Lasee).
7. Request to present at a future meeting by Measures for Justice (see attached).
8. Adjourn.

Judge Thomas Walsh, Chair

Notice is hereby given that action by Committee may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda. Please take notice that it is possible additional members of the Board of Supervisors may attend this meeting, resulting in a majority or quorum of the Board of Supervisors. This may constitute a meeting of the Board of Supervisors for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to this agenda.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING BOARD

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wisconsin Statutes, a regular meeting of the Brown County Criminal Justice Coordinating Board was held on February 26, 2015 in the Truttman Room of the Brown County District Attorney's Office, 300 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: John Gossage, Don Harper, Lori Richgels, Larry Malcomson, Angela Sparks, David Lasee, Judge Walsh, Judge Zuidmulder, John Vander Leest, Jeff Cano, Tom Molitor
Citizen Reps: Tim Mc Nulty

1. **Call Meeting to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Judge Walsh at 8:08 a.m.

Judge Walsh introduced the new Treatment Court Coordinator, Angela Sparks, to the Board. In turn, the Board introduced themselves to Sparks.

2. **Approve/Modify Agenda.**

Motion made by David Lasee, seconded by Tim Mc Nulty to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Approve/modify minutes of December 17, 2014.**

Motion made by John Gossage, seconded by Tim Mc Nulty to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Mental Health Court (Judge Zuidmulder).**

Judge Zuidmulder reported that the mental health court had been on hold so staffing could be restructured in the treatment courts consistent with the TAD grant. Sparks is now taking over the function of determining who should come into the program which has resulted in the elimination of the Drug Court Coordinator. Judge Zuidmulder continued that Judge Kelley had also asked for staffing for veterans' court and that was resolved by using some of the money to provide the requested staff. The present structure is that there is one full-time case worker, Joe Torres, who has been managing the drug court and the veterans' court and they have also hired long-time County employee Lori Williams from Human Services. Judge Zuidmulder indicated that Williams is very knowledgeable with regard to resources and the various issues involved with addiction. She will start next month and at that point all four treatment courts will be staffed.

Judge Zuidmulder continued that the way the judges are going to divide this is that Judge Kelley will start with veterans' court at 8:30 am on Fridays, followed by Judge Zuidmulder's mental health court and then Judge Hammer's drug court and finally Judge Walsh's heroin court. Court is being held on Fridays because the court participants are usually involved in their treatment programs Monday through Friday and they do not want to destabilize treatment in the event a participant would have to be sanctioned and go to jail. Judge Zuidmulder continued that the treatment courts are currently serving about 50 people and his expectation is that within a year they will probably be serving between 100 – 200 people.

Judge Zuidmulder reported that he will be traveling to Marinette to meet with Judge Morrison and some members of the legislature to talk about the treatment component. Judge Zuidmulder felt it was a question of whether treatment is available geographically anywhere close. He will be advocating that if they try to site something that it be sited here because of the quantity of numbers, but he did not know if this would be successful as there is a lot of treatment money for Marinette and Oconto counties which is good; but the question will then become what to do with the population that requires the intensive treatment program up front and how to accommodate that. Judge Zuidmulder felt the conversation would be about getting a treatment center designed for these people and if that is true, Brown County would definitely want to be

connected to it and it is Judge Zuidmulder's assumption that Brown County's numbers will be substantially equal to or greater than the combined numbers of Marinette and Oconto counties. Judge Zuidmulder will keep this Board advised in this regard.

5. **Heroin Court (Judge Walsh).**

Judge Walsh stated that the first team meeting for heroin court will be held next Friday. They are planning on holding the team meeting at 10:30 a.m. with court following at 11:00 a.m. It has been made clear to the participants that they should make every effort to attend the hearings. There is currently one person ready to go in the heroin court and three more possible participants. Judge Walsh also stated that there is some exciting news concerning up front treatment as Judge Zuidmulder spoke about earlier and he asked DA David Lasee to share the information with this Board.

Lasee noted that he and Green Bay Police Chief Tom Molitor recently had a meeting with representatives of Prevea Clinic as well as John Mitchell from the jail regarding a potential partnership with Prevea where they would deliver services to inmates at the jail and foot the bill for the majority of the project. This would be a replacement therapy type of program with Suboxone under the direct supervision of a psychiatrist which would be provided by Prevea. Lasee continued that it is his understanding that Prevea would be willing to provide the technology to work with this. Details have not been worked out yet, but Prevea has expressed a desire to move forward with this as a pilot program and they would like to take in 30 people a year and are open to trying to coordinate with this Board to provide a solution to the upfront need for treatment. Lasee continued that they would obviously also need to coordinate with the jail and the jail's outside provider of medical services, but the discussions have not reached that point yet.

Lasee continued that Prevea is putting together a Power Point presentation that they want to pitch to the Attorney General on March 17 when he is up here for the program on heroin at UWGB. They wish to address the availability of funds for treatment courts that Green Bay does not qualify for because we are not a rural area and to see if there is a way to get around this if a regional center could be established that other areas would be able to utilize. Lasee noted that this would not be inpatient treatment, but rather an alternative way to deal with this. Lasee was excited about the opportunity and willingness of Prevea to put in a substantial amount of resources because they acknowledge that the healthcare community has played a role in the problem as relates to the connection between prescription opiate use and heroin abuse. Lasee felt this was a great opportunity and will keep this Board advised.

Judge Walsh agreed that this would be a great opportunity because treatment will take place right away before there is even an assessment done to determine whether someone is eligible for the heroin court. Judge Zuidmulder stated that he will also try to pitch this idea in Marinette when he meets with Judge Morrison and the legislatures. He would also like to see Prevea maybe step back and wait until we see what happens with the funding that is available in Marinette and Oconto Counties.

Molitor mentioned that one of the key components to this is that there are two aspects involved and that is how do you deliver services right away to people at the jail and secondly, where do they go and live when they get out? Molitor felt there was a strong need for both of these things. He noted that inpatient care is incredibly expensive and having places they can go afterwards such as transitional living under supervision and monitoring is probably much more affordable. Molitor would like to find a way where some of the dollars that go for inpatient treatment could be used for the transitional secondary component instead.

John Gossage stated that his concern would obviously be costs and he would like to know what they are jumping into. He noted that he is not against it, but wants to be aware of the costs.

Judge Zuidmulder stated his grant for the drug court is $175,000 and there is another $85,000 that the Board appropriated for the mental health initiative which means the treatment court budget is $260,000.

From that, they have to pay the costs for the personnel along with drug testing and services needed by the veterans' court. Judge Zuidmulder felt that the sub number could be used for treatment.

6. **TAD Grant (David Lasee).**

David Lasee did not have much to add as this was covered earlier. He noted that the diversion portion is the other wing of the TAD grant and there are a number of people who have been referred to the diversion program. He continued that they have a partnership with ATTIC Correctional to develop two different courses of low dose treatment for people who are being diverted out of the system. The idea is that this is pre-charging, but at the outset they will probably be taking a handful of people who would have qualified for the program had it been available six months ago. They will also be moving some people in on deferred prosecution agreements or even dismissing some very low level cases without prejudice and sending them to the diversion program. There is a six week program and an eight week program and the costs are paid entirely by the participant directly to ATTIC Correctional so there is no contract with ATTIC and the County. Lasee noted that Angela Sparks will also be in charge of supervising these individuals to be sure there are no violations. He felt there would be about 500 people a year going through the diversion program and indicated it was for low risk low offenders. He noted that some of the people may have needs that exceed what the program could allow for, but consideration has to be given to what would happen to the people if they came through the system. The idea is to relieve stress on the system as the participants would not have to be handled by the judges, the DA's office and the jail. Lasee felt this was a good opportunity but will be a work in progress and they will be open to changes to make sure it continues to work. The public defenders' office has been a big part of this and has been very helpful in getting the nuts and bolts in order.

7. **Diversion Program Update.**

This item was covered above.

8. **Treatment Court Update.**

This item was covered above.

9. **System Mapping Follow-up.**

Lasee distributed a Technical Assistance Report to the Board, a copy of which is attached. He indicated that the system mapping is designed to be a work in progress that is reviewed periodically with recommendations made to improve efficiency within the system. Lasee also showed a Power Point presentation to the group which more fully described the mapping.

As part of this presentation, the issue of OARs came up and whether there is something that can be done to improve how they are handled. Lasee noted that data provided from the jail shows that there are still a substantial amount of jail resources being used on OAR cases and he felt that it was mainly bail and warrant issues. Judge Walsh recalled earlier statistics that showed that OARs are one of the top reasons people are sitting in jail and he would suggest that this issue be put on the next judge's meeting agenda. One of the ways OARs could be handled would be for the judges to have an on-call system for the days that initial appearances are held so that if defendants would desire, they could come upstairs and appear before a judge and plead following their initial appearance. He noted that what happens many times is that people show up the first time and would like to plead, but do not show up at the next court appearance and then a warrant is issued. Judge Zuidmulder indicated he would be on board with this, but noted that details would need to be worked out since the judges all have different calendar management situations. Lasee stated that it would make sense to do it during calendar calls if it can be fit in but he noted that some judges move through their calendars more quickly than others.

Lasee encouraged this Board to look at other areas where improvements may be able to be made. One of his concerns is the area of bond and the use of evidence-based practices in setting bail.

Judge Zuidmulder stated that with regard to the revocations, the issue is that there is a right to a hearing on revocation, but there seems to be a lot of diddling around with adjournments and other things and he asked Jeff Cano to provide information as to how many attorneys are being appointed for this and how long it typically takes the attorneys to resolve this to see if the process can be improved. Cano responded that his office cannot move forward on these cases until Probation and Parole gets paperwork back from Madison and this sometimes causes delays.

Judge Walsh noted that at the next meeting he would like to get a progress update on the jail population issue and go over the list of items that were to be addressed and whether goals are being met and whether there are any items that can be moved on now that the TAD grant is in.

Judge Zuidmulder asked if this Board would consider having a speakers group. He felt that what is happening is a dramatic change in the way the criminal justice system is operating in Green Bay. He would like to see members of this Board going out to different organizations and service clubs to explain what this is all about and the direction we are moving and why. Judge Zuidmulder felt that this is the kind of thing that should be built up in the community. He felt that a lot of citizens are used to a different process and we owe it to ourselves to go out and talk to the community leaders and answer questions so that if something goes wrong, there are people who know what we are trying to accomplish and can have an intelligent conversation with about the cost benefit to everything that is being done. Judge Zuidmulder noted that he did this when he started the drug court a number of years ago and he felt it was very helpful. Given all that has been going on and all the new information that we have, Judge Zuidmulder felt that speaking at service groups would be a good idea. Judge Walsh agreed and indicated that service groups are always looking for speakers. He will try to put a list of service organizations together.

10. **Adjourn.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT TO THE BROWN COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

The following report reflects the observations of Center for Effective Public Policy Principal, Becki Ney, who provided onsite assistance to the Brown County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council on December 16-17, 2014 to map their criminal justice system. Several Brown County criminal justice practitioners and policymakers participated in several small group meetings throughout the day on December 16th; and the preliminary map was reviewed by the CJCC at their meeting on the 17th. A list of those individuals who participated in the mapping sessions is attached.

The following provides some brief observations, recommendations and resources for consideration by the CJCC as they implement the TAD grant and consider additional improvements to their current criminal justice system processing and decisionmaking.

RECOMMENDATIONS SPECIFIC TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM MAP AND NARRATIVE

1. ***Generally, the map should be displayed prominently and used ongoing as a planning tool.*** It should be referred to at CJCC meetings and in discussions about the opportunities to enhance existing criminal justice functions and operations. The map should be updated at regular intervals to reflect the implementation of new strategies. Over time, if the map is used as an ongoing planning tool, it will establish baseline information about the individuals coming in contact with and offenders in the Brown County criminal justice system and help the CJCC to:

   - Educate others about the defendants/offenders in the criminal justice system;
   - Assess the impact of new or proposed changes;
   - Assess points in the system that are duplicated, needlessly long, or not working at peak potential; and
   - Identify gaps in information at key decision points that could be addressed.

2. ***Review the Brown County map and mapping narrative for accuracy and revise as appropriate.*** As a first step, the CJCC may consider a thorough review of the draft map and narrative that accompany this report to assure their accuracy and level of detail desired to gain a detailed understanding of current criminal justice decisionmaking.

   - Overall, what are the strengths and challenges of the current system?
   - With respect to each decision point, what are the opportunities to improve operations and functions in terms of efficiency and effectiveness?
   - What are the decision points where the CJCC feels it may need additional information (both qualitative and quantitative) to be more fully informed of the formal and informal decisionmaking that occurs?
   - Are there specific decision points or issues that the CJCC may want to focus on as a result of reviewing the map? Issues may include focusing on gaps in current processing

minutes - 9

or areas where the CJCC feels there could be enhancements or improvements (for example, the use of a prescreening tool earlier in the system to determine initial risk levels of defendants entering the system).

- With respect to the TAD grant and the establishment of the Heroin and Mental Health Court and pretrial diversion program, where on the map are additional assessments, decisions and referrals likely to occur? How will this enhance or change current decisionmaking?
- Are there opportunities to "realign" key criminal justice decision points within an evidence-based framework? (Go to http://ebdmoneless.org/framework to review the Evidence-based Decisionmaking Framework for Local Criminal Justice Systems and more information on NIC's Evidence-based Decisionmaking Initiative.)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESSING AND DECISIONMAKING

The following are a few of the issues that were raised during the mapping and CJCC meetings. They are provided here as examples of areas the CJCC may consider for further exploration and action. Steps to address these issues—or other areas determined by the CJCC—could form the basis of a Brown County criminal justice system strategic plan.

- ***Resolve O.A.R. cases as quickly as possible***: During the mapping session, the DA noted that several cases could be resolved more quickly at initial appearance IF the defendant agrees to waive his/her rights and accept an offer. According to CCAP report, in 2013 there were 1,130 O.A.R. cases disposed of in Brown County. Virtually all (1,126) were resolved or dismissed prior to trial. If these cases are being resolved any way, there may be some merit to further exploring the potential to dispose of/resolve these cases sooner; thus saving, considerable court time and assuming that these agreements can be made in a way that is also satisfactory to the defense and defendants.
- ***Meet regularly as a bench to discuss opportunities to improve court functions and operations:*** During the mapping sessions, it was noted that individual judges each conduct their branches as they see fit. This is perfectly appropriate, however, there may be some benefit to considering where there are opportunities for greater consistency across all branches; for example, in scheduling cases, strategies for resolving cases more quickly, assuring that similarly situated offenders receive similar sentences regardless of which branch they appear in, the pros/cons of using imposed and stayed sentences, and other issues.
- ***Consider the opportunities for introducing more pretrial release options:*** The jail population on any given day is about 65% (or more) pretrial. Considering options to reduce the pretrial population (even by hours or days) can have a dramatic effect on the overall jail population. The implementation of a simple risk assessment tool at jail intake may identify low risk defendants who can be safely released pending their court appearance; a risk assessment tool may also identify higher risk defendants who would

minutes-9

not be good candidates for release from a public safety perspective. Conducting a bail review of those in jail beyond 2-3 days who may be good candidates for release, but are unable to post bail is another strategy that can have a dramatic effect on the jail population. Another issue discussed during the mapping sessions was the number of warrants the courts issue due to failure to appear. Automated court notification programs have been shown to increase court appearance rates. Like doctor appointment reminder systems, court notification systems are typically automated, contact defendants/offenders (via telephone, email, text, etc.) to remind them of their court dates.

- ***Expand and improve treatment court operations:*** One issue that came up during the CJCC meeting was whether there were resources and opportunity to expand the existing drug court. This should be explored more fully. It was also reported during the mapping sessions that the treatment court referral process can be an onerous one for defendants who need to apply to participate. It was reported by the TAD Coordinator that the application had already been revised and simplified. The TAD grant is timely for Brown County and provides the opportunity to reflect on what is working well and what can be improved with respect to existing treatment courts as well as the addition of the new treatment courts.
- ***Pursue assistance to provide trauma-informed care training for treatment court staff (including judges, case managers, probation, treatment providers and others):*** Resources for requesting assistance for training are listed below.
- ***Consider opportunities for reducing/maintaining the jail population***: Consider asking the jail staff to provide a regular jail population report to the CJCC. The purpose of the report would be to monitor the jail population on a regular basis – Is the population going up or down? Is there additional data that could be provided that would enhance the CJCC's understanding of who is in the jail and how long they stay? Are individuals being released from jail in the most timely fashion? Are there bottlenecks in the criminal justice system that impact the jail? Are there opportunities to introduce more pretrial release options? In particular, continue to monitor the impact on the jail of certain subpopulations (for example, probation/parole holds, OWI offenders, pretrial defendants).
- ***Incorporate universal screening into the criminal justice system process:*** As a CJCC, begin to discuss the benefits/challenges of incorporating a risk assessment process at key decision points. For example, can a brief risk assessment be conducted at jail intake? Would this information be useful to decisionmakers and if so, how? The CJCC is discussing the use of additional risk/needs assessments for the new treatment courts (RANT, CAGE) as well. How will these be used in conjunction with the COMPAS? Several counties in Wisconsin have/are in process of implementing risk assessment processes throughout their systems. The Brown County CJCC may benefit from discussions with Eau Claire, LaCrosse, Outagamie, and/or Milwaukee Counties (to name a few) about the benefits and challenges of implementing universal screening. Each of these counties

minutes-9

has taken a slightly different approach, however, each has recognized the importance of using risk and needs assessments to inform their decisionmaking at each point in the criminal justice system – for pretrial release decisions, for pleas and sentencing decisions, for referrals to programs and services, etc.

- ***Consider opportunities to expand citation release:*** Is citation release being used uniformly across all law enforcement agencies in the county? Are there opportunities to increase citations rather than arrest?

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The following are a few suggested resources for the CJCC's use:

- The GAINS Center, http://gainscenter.samhsa.gov/judgescourts/courtsjudges.asp. According to the GAINS Center, there are two mental health courts in WI that includes Eau Claire and Outagamie Counties who may be of assistance to Brown County as they implement their mental health court. The GAINS Center also provides training on trauma-informed care and is an excellent resource related to mental health courts.

- The National Center on Trauma Informed Care, http://www.samhsa.gov/nctic. During the CJCC meeting, we discussed the benefits of conducting trauma training for Brown County criminal justice practitioners. Like the GAINS Center, the NCTIC also accepts requests for training and technical assistance for trauma training. In addition, their website contains many relevant written/video resources that may of interest to the CJCC.

- The Evidence-based Decisionmaking in the Local Criminal Justice Systems Initiative (http://ebdmoneless.org/) – for more information about the EBDM initiative.

- The National Resource Center on Justice-Involved Women (www.cjinvolvedwomen.org) for resources pertaining to justice-involved women.

- The Vera Institute of Justice Cost Benefit Analysis (http://www.vera.org/centers/cost-benefit-analysis-unit) for resources in conducting criminal justice cost benefit analyses.

- The Urban Institute for information regarding the Justice Reinvestment at the Local Level initiative (http://www.urban.org/center/jpc/justice-reinvestment/) and the Transition from Jail to Community initiative (http://urban.org/projects/tjc/index.cfm).

minutes - 9

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT TO THE BROWN COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BROWN COUNTY MAP

Paul Burke, Court Commissioner
Todd Delain, Chief Deputy, Sheriff's Office
Dave Konrath, Captain, Sheriff's Office
Leigh Neville-Neil, Public Defender
Mark Henozel, Pulaski Police Dept
Brian Amenson, Lieutenant, Ashwaubenon Public Safety
Jason Demerath, Officer, Ashwaubenon Public Safety
Karl Ackermann, Lieutenant, Green Bay Police Department
Derek Wicklund, Green Bay Police Department
Angela Sparks, TAD Supervisor
Diana Lawler, Investigator, Ashwaubenon Public Safety
John Mitchell, Work Release/Jail, Sheriff's Office
Brian Lavrant, Juvenile Superintendent, Sheriff's Office
Phil Steffen, Security Lieutenant, Sheriff's Office
Larry Malcomson, Jail Captain, Sheriff's Office
David Lasee, District Attorney
Kim Woulf, Classification/Jail, Sheriff's Office
Michele Conard, Interim Clerk of Courts
Lori Hanson, Deputy Clerk of Courts
Ali Winiecki, Deputy Clerk of Courts
Don Zuidmulder, Circuit Court Judge, Branch 1
Joseph Torres, Treatment Courts Case Manager
Carrie LaPlant, Public Defender
Marc Hammer, Circuit Court Judge, Branch 5
Michelle Timon, Supervisor, WIDOC/DCC/ Probation and Parole
Jeremy Denuth, Supervisor, WIDOC/DCC/Probation and Parole
Laura McDermott, Drug Court Agent, WIDOC/DCC/Probation and Parole
Chelsea Balzan, Heroin Court Agent, WIDOC/DCC/Probation and Parole
Jessica Haines, Mental Health Court Agent, WIDOC/DCC/ Probation and Parole
Lori Richgels, Supervisor, WIDOC/DCC/ Probation and Parole
Shannon Viel, Public Defender
Jeremy Muraski, District Captain/CIT Coordinator, Green Bay Police Department
Sarah Belair, Assistant District Attorney
Beau Liegeols, Assistant District Attorney

minutes - 9

MEASURES FOR JUSTICE

2 Brunswick Street, Rochester, NY 14607 | 646.337.8993 | measuresforjustice.org

April 21, 2015

Dear Honorable Thomas Walsh,

Measures for Justice (MFJ) is a non-profit criminal justice research organization that works with government and professional organizations to develop and implement performance measures to assess local criminal justice systems.

We are contacting you as part of our grant from the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Under this grant, MFJ has been working with data from several Wisconsin data sources to create a set of performance measures examining court processes in Wisconsin counties. With assistance from BJA, we have identified Brown County as a Wisconsin county with a robust criminal justice coordinating board and a commitment to using data for policy development and performance management. **As such, we would like to include your county in our current project.**

Now MFJ is embarking on a new project to engage practitioners in a discussion of the performance measures created by MFJ. The project will involve a series of focus groups with local criminal justice stakeholders during which MFJ will present the performance measures created during the original pilot study and engage stakeholders in a guided discussion about the interpretation of the measures, the usefulness of the measures as diagnostics of system functioning, and the obstacles to and opportunities for using such measures for data-driven policy formation and decision making.

Initially, we would like to work with you, as the chair of the Brown County criminal justice coordinating board, to discuss including your county in our project. After that, we would like to schedule focus groups with individual criminal justice agencies in the county and one large focus group with either the criminal justice coordinating council or with the heads of several county criminal justice agencies.

To help you understand the types of performance measures MFJ has created, we would like to have a conversation with you and a Webinar, if you so desire to share more details, including some of the measures. We have included an overview slide with the major categories of interest for your reference. During the focus groups, we will present data on these measures for your county and the state and will seek feedback from stakeholders in a guided discussion.

Would you be available to discuss this opportunity the week of April 27 or May 4? We can be flexible as to the date/time to best accommodate your schedule.

We would like to thank you in advance for your contribution and cooperation with this important project. Please feel free to contact us for any additional information on the scope of the project or

any other area of interest related to our organization. We can be reached via email at bach@measuresforjustice.org or stemen@measuresforjustice.org or via phone at 646-337-8993

We look forward to working with you as we embark on this critical effort.

Sincerely,

Amy Bach
President

Don Stemen
Director of Research

The Measures for Justice

Crime & Arrest	Pre-Trial	Case Resolution	Consequences
Crime rates Clearance rates Arrest rates	Bail decisions Indigent defense Case processing	Case dispositions Case processing time Attorney caseloads	Sentences imposed Court assessments Recidivism

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Washington, D.C. 20531

March 31, 2015

SENT VIA EMAIL ONLY

RE: Measures for Justice

Dear County Stakeholder:

I am the Senior Policy Advisor for a division of the Department of Justice called the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) that works with state, local and tribal jurisdictions across the U.S. I've been at BJA for 10 years and have been fortunate to fund a lot of great work in areas promoting justice. Measures for Justice is one of our promising new initiatives. They are piloting a series of performance measures for local criminal justice systems that we hope can be used nationwide.

Now the Department of Justice has provided Measures for Justice with a grant to deliver the results of its work to a select number of counties in Wisconsin. We have chosen your county as a potential audience to hear the results based on the apparent openness to using data in guiding the decision-making process. So I am writing to introduce you to Measures for Justice and ask if you would please meet some of its researchers. At these meetings you will: (i) receive some information on the quality and applicability of data stored in CCAP (Consolidated Court Automation Programs) for research and performance measurement; (ii) receive data/analyses on your county's justice system as compared to others throughout the state of Wisconsin; and (iii) be asked to give feedback on the work that Measures for Justice has done. In the process, we will both learn a lot!

When you meet with Measures for Justice, researchers will explain how they have developed a series of performance indicators to assess the functioning of the criminal justice process from beginning to end: from arrest, to pre-trial release and detention, to court processing and final disposition, to release and recidivism. The indicators, in total, depict what is transpiring in the criminal justice system, which will necessarily draw attention to problem areas, generate best practices, and bedrock reform initiatives.

We at BJA have seen the data and believe it will provide rigorous debate regarding appropriate measures and ways in which these data can be effectively utilized by policymakers and practitioners. We urge you to take the time to meet with these researchers and in the process learn about criminal justice performance in the state. We hope that you will appreciate the free consultation!

Thank you for your consideration and please do not hesitate to call me with any questions.

Kim A. Ball
Senior Policy Advisor for Adjudication
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Kim.Ball@usdoj.gov
(202) 307-2076