

**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 Tuesday, November 12, 2024 in the Karen H. Dorau Memorial Conference Room, Law Enforcement Center, 300 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Members Present: Chair Judge Tammy Jo Hock
Jail Administrator Heidi Michel
Probation and Parole Rep. Aaron Sabel
District Court Administrator Tom Schappa
District Attorney Rep. Jacque Brester
Green Bay Police Chief Chris Davis
Public Safety Chair Andy Nicholson
Deputy Executive Jeff Flynt
Public Defender Rep. Jeff Cano
Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest
HHS Executive Director Erik Pritzl
CJS Manager Mark Vanden Hoogen

Excused: Citizen Representative Tim Mc Nulty

Others Present: Judge Thomas Walsh
CJS Supervisor Laura Hettmann
CJS Intern Kiley Petrie
Family Services Rep. Angela Stueck
Other Interested Parties

1. Call Meeting to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Judge Tammy Jo Hock at 12:00 pm

2. Introductions.

Those present introduced themselves at this time.

3. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Mark Vanden Hoogen, seconded by Jeff Flynt to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Approve/modify minutes of October 15, 2024.

Motion made by Aaron Sabel, seconded by Erik Pritzl to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Jail population numbers (Sheriff).

Jail Administrator Heidi Michel informed the Jail is currently at 97% capacity with a population of 628. There are also 106 on EMP and 54 shipped out to four different counties. Additionally, there are currently eight juveniles housed in the Jail.

6. Report of Mark Vanden Hoogen re: Criminal Justice Services.

Criminal Justice Services Manager Mark Vanden Hoogen informed the TAD grant has been submitted and the state came back with several minor, technical issues and those have been taken care of. The current grant cycle is in year four of five.

Vanden Hoogen continued that there are several treatment court graduations coming up – one in Mental Health Court on November 22 and one each in Veterans Court and Heroin Court on December 6. Vanden Hoogen concluded that the Annual Report should be available for review at the next meeting of this Board.

7. Domestic Violence Intervention docket discussion and mentee court.

Criminal Justice Services Supervisor Laura Hettman recalled at the last meeting it was discussed that there have been some meetings happening to explore the option of a domestic violence docket in Brown County. There are a lot of variations of this throughout the country and Brown County has been selected to be a mentee court and Hettman has sent information to this Board regarding the program and how to implement something without reinventing the wheel.

Judge Hock asked what Criminal Justice Services is seeking from this Board. Hettmann responded they will be observing a mentor court in Winnebago County, Illinois and they would like to do a site visit in January to observe their process and learn how they have improved their efficiencies. Brown County would continue to work with them in a formal fashion through the spring and Winnebago County would then be available for Brown County to reach out to after that. People that have been involved in the early conversations on this include Judge Walsh, District Attorney David Lasee, Public Defender Carrie La Plant and Golden House. Those going to Illinois would be Judge Walsh, DA David Lasee, Hettmann, Mark Vanden Hoogen, Erika Franken from the Victim Witness program in the DA's office and Kelsey Mullins with the DOJ.

Health and Human Services Director Erik Pritzl explained there would be a team of people organized around the docket concept and this means this would have to be assigned to one of the branches. It would not change how offenders are treated. Hettmann added it is designed to improve efficiency of the process. There have been some preliminary conversations that this would change how offenders are treated in terms of the criminal justice system and there have been concerns as to how this would be supported throughout the system. Pritzl would like support from the CJCJ as he feels it is a good model that is being used throughout the country.

Judge Hock asked what is needed from the CJCJ. Pritzl responded he would like CJCJ to support engaging in the mentor/mentee relationship and noted there is funding to support the cost of a site visit.

It should be noted that Carrie La Plant, Jeff Cano, John Vander Leest and Andy Nicholson have joined the meeting.

Public Safety Committee Chair Andy Nicholson asked how this program works. Judge Hock explained this is not a treatment court; it is a court where all cases of a family are consolidated and heard in one court. It would be a different way of handling cases, but it does not change anything other than scheduling.

Probation and Parole Representative Aaron Sabel asked if the entry point for the program would be an initial domestic violence charge. Hettmann responded the eligibility criteria is something that has been discussed and they have settled on participants needing to have a criminal domestic violence case as well as either a restraining order or pending divorce case to make them eligible. In looking at the data, they have found there would be approximately 40 – 50 cases eligible for this. Judge Hock said it seems this would apply to cases that are pending so the family can go to court on all of the issues at the same time.

Pritzl feels this group needs to decide if there is a judge willing to take this on. Judge Hock said it seems Judge Walsh has been interested in this for a long time and that was conveyed to the group last time we met. Pritzl responded that he would like this group to make a motion to support participation as a mentee court. All they are going to do is coordinate what this response would look like in the criminal justice system; they are not taking on new cases or changing how the outcomes may look in terms of the criminal offense. Pritzl continued that the CJCJ is where all the players of the criminal justice system are and he feels this is the group that should hear these things and indicate whether it is something that should be pursued or not pursued as it needs to be supported across all sections of the criminal justice system. Judge Hock feels it is clear the DA's Office, Public Defender's Office, Judge Walsh, Criminal Justice Services and Golden House are already involved in this discussion.

Nicholson asked what the goal of the mentee court is. Hettmann explained the goal is to streamline the process to make it more efficient for the families involved as well as the court system by putting all the cases of one family before one judge. Nicholson asked what the criteria is. Hettmann responded there are a number of different models and they would begin by implementing a pilot. They have talked about starting with criminal misdemeanor cases as well as a divorce or restraining order. They would start with the smaller population to make sure it is working well and then it could be expanded.

Judge Hock informed Brown County's grant application request was denied, but the mentee court was approved. There is another track to this and at a judge's meeting it was approved to start a pilot program to get this process going in an effort to hopefully be better aligned to receive the grant at the next submission. Vanden Hoogen added that the intention was to bring it to this group so everyone involved in the system has the opportunity to provide input.

Nicholson asked about the cost of this program. Judge Hock responded that the pilot program will not have funding, so they will not be able to implement the same kind of things they might do if they were a domestic violence intervention court with a grant funding a case manager, treatment options and other things. At this point, there will be no additional cost to the county, but there may be additional work.

Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest asked the logistics for making sure all cases that apply to a family are gathered together. Judge Hock feels this is a work in progress and decisions will have to be made after the site visit is done to see what works in that jurisdiction, what may work in our jurisdiction, do we want to include all the criteria and if so, at what level. Vander Leest reminded there are time limits of 10 days on temporary restraining orders. Vanden Hoogen added some of the discussions cannot be had until we know whether this is going forward.

Michel informed she understands the desire to streamline these cases, but she has concerns in that if there is an inmate in custody on a felony charge but they have to wait to get all the court dates on the same day, it could result in having to hold people longer which would impact the jail population. Hettmann noted that is a valid concern and informed one of the things they have discussed is having a recurring day and time every week for these cases which could actually expedite the process. Judge Hock noted Brown County has a huge backlog of cases needing attorneys appointed so whatever they do, they want to be sure it is more efficient internally.

District Court Administrator Tom Schappa informed one of the goals that was not highlighted is to streamline this to get services to victims which he feels is a very keen objective. He also pointed out that generally most misdemeanor cases do not involve someone in custody.

Nicholson asked what would happen if the goals are not accomplished. Judge Hock responded that at this time there is not even grant funding for this. The current goal is to participate in the mentee court and then ultimately apply for the grant and become a domestic violence intervention docket. The goal of that would be better efficiency and better services for families and victims and if those goals are not accomplished, there would be discussion of what could be done differently and then decisions would need to be made.

Motion made by Jeff Flynt, seconded by John Vander Leest to support participation as a mentee court. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED – Nicholson voted nay.

8. Report from the State Public Defender's Office regarding appointment of criminal defense attorneys.

Public Defender Attorney Manager Jeff Cano did not have numbers to present, however, he noted locally there are 20 – 25 private bar attorneys taking cases in Brown County. Judge Hock asked Cano to provide additional information at the next meeting as to the numbers. She feels this is a crisis and has been a crisis for a long time. This not only impacts the Jail, DA's Office and Public Defender's Office, it impacts the courts and the ability to move cases through the system. One of the things clear to Judge Hock is that the 20 – 25 attorneys taking cases in Brown County are also taking a lot of cases in other counties and we need to figure out how to get them to take more Brown County cases.

9. Issues to be addressed by Consultant.

Deputy Executive Jeff Flynt informed moving forward with a consultant will not be happening. The challenge at this time is to get everyone on the same page with how to address the backlog of cases and the overfilling of jails. To that end, the Executive's Office has gotten the WCA to make court funding one of its top priorities in the next biennial budget and they are currently lobbying the legislature and the Governor's Office to put \$70 million dollars into the budget. It is not known how that would ultimately impact Brown County, but anyone who has the opportunity to advocate on behalf of Brown County getting a good chunk of that funding would be hugely helpful. This is a bipartisan issue and there is support on both sides. Judge Hock asked where funding would be applied and Flynt responded it would be used in a myriad of ways, including for interpreters and other staff. Judge Hock responded that what is needed is DA's and Public Defenders.

Clerk of Courts John Vander Leest said the biggest three cost drivers the counties are paying for that are really the State's responsibility are interpreters, the county's reimbursement for guardian ad litem and county's having to appoint attorneys on Public Defender cases. Judge Hock recognizes these things are expensive to counties, but addressing interpreters and GAL fees are not going to make the county more efficient or address the backlog of cases.

Vander Leest feels funding attorneys to take cases would have to be a separate initiative. If the county feels we need more DA's for Public Defenders, that is a separate ask from what they are trying to cover in terms of county responsibilities. Flynt responded this is wide open at this point and he does not know the talking points WCA is using, but reiterated WCA has taken this up as one of their top issues and they are pushing both the Governor's Office and the legislature.

District Court Administrator Tom Schappa noted WCA will be partnering with the Criminal Justice Coalition on this which is a work group that involves defense attorneys, SPD, DA, and the court system. That group will form at the beginning of 2025 and he will keep this group updated.

Judge Hock feels this is really two issues – first would be the state figuring out a way to pay for what the counties believe they are supposed to pay for and secondly, how to address the other issue where cases are stagnating.

10. Changes to Criminal Justice Coordinating Board membership

Judge Hock informed she has spoken with Sheriff Delain and he agreed that the Sheriff's position and the Jail representative position could be combined. She also recalled past discussions regarding putting this on the Chiefs of Police agenda to see if anyone in that group was interested in being a part of this Board but it was noted that on the list of members for the CJC that it is the GB Police Chief or designee and the discussion was if the Chief believes that is appropriate or if there was a desire to have a designee from all of the police departments. Davis responded that if this group is having representation from other agencies in the County, he is agnostic about that. Speaking as the Police Chief, Green Bay is the largest consumer of criminal justice services in the county and he is happy to be part of the group, but he is not opposed to broader representation either.

Family Services Representative Angela Stueck asked for clarification as to her role on this Board, specifically whether she is a voting member or not. She informed the County Executive has her application to be a citizen representative and she was advised she would be appointed at the next vacancy. She is very interested in this and feels strongly in representing Family Services as the area's largest nonprofit and noted that many of their service areas touch the criminal justice system, either by prevention or intervention.

The issue of adding a Court Commissioner to the group was also discussed and Judge Hock noted that if the Sheriff and Jail Captain position are combined, there would be room to add someone. Judge Hock indicated she will constitute Stueck's comments as a request to add Family Services to the membership. Nicholson asked if Judge Hock is looking to increase or decrease the membership. Judge Hock responded

she is not looking to increase this, but to make sure we have an understanding of who the membership is and that those people understand they are listed as members as well.

Pritzl pointed out HHS also has two representatives and he feels those positions can be combined. He suggested CJS still attend the meetings, but there should only be one vote for HHS. Judge Hock agreed that the same situation would apply to Court Commissioners in that two votes from the Court may not be the right thing to do.

Motion made by Erik Pritzl, seconded by John Vander Leest to consolidate the Health and Human Services Director position and Criminal Justice Services representative position into one position and also consolidate the Sheriff and Jail Captain position into one position. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A resolution to change the membership of this Board would have to be approved by the Public Safety Committee as well as the County Board.

11. Future Agenda Items, if any.

There were no suggestions for future agenda items.

12. Other such matters as authorized by law.

The next meeting date was discussed and February 11, 2025 at 12:00 pm was selected.

13. Adjourn.

Motion made by Andy Nicholson, seconded by Mark Vanden Hoogen to adjourn at 12:55 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Legislative Specialist