

## **Jail and Huber Utilization Committee**

**July 21, 2014**

### **Minutes**

#### **Attendance:**

Tom Reed, SPD – Chair  
Carmella DeLucia, CJC  
Sue Eckhart, J2000 (Municipal Court)  
Sheldyn Himle, Milw. Municipal Court  
Nate Holton, CJC Coordinator  
Pete Koneazny, Legal Aid Society  
The Hon. Jeff Kremers, Courts  
Niel Thoresen, DOC  
David Riemer, Community Advocates  
Capt. Williams, MSO  
Capt. Holton, MSO

#### **1) Discussion: Recidivism Definition and Tracking (Nate Holton)**

- Proposal for defining recidivism discussed.
- Nate provided outline of definitions of recidivism and approaches to measurement and management. The definitions are based on a research review of national common recidivism definitions as well as existing local recidivism measures. Copy attached as pdf
- Definition should be relevant to available data.
- Proposal is to start collecting data this year and have data available one year later.
- This discussion pointed to the need for social science research capacity for this work. Nate reported that Prof. Stan Stojkovic was at last CJC Executive Committee and could be a resource for infusing this work with social science expertise.

#### **2) Discussion – Court Appearances by Video Conferencing (Tom Reed).**

- Tom noted that the Exec Committee has delegated to Jail and Huber Utilization Committee the task of looking at video conferencing issue.
- Tom circulated data summary of video conference usage; 559 request for video conferences in first six months of 2014, up considerably over 2013.
- Some judges have used “VC” a lot compared to others
- What are concerns, costs and benefits of increasing video conferencing?
  - o When VC not used, it is costly and jail-congesting to bring inmates to Milwaukee County.

- Judges are usually not the ones who first raise the option of whether to have VC or not; Sheriff, upon receipt of Order to Produce could initiate suggestion of having VC
  - Defense perspective (Tom); sometimes the lawyer may know that the inmate won't be needed (e.g. at a final preconference when an adjournment is likely).
  - Some coordination possible for mitigating appearances vs. VC, e.g. when an office initiates Order to Produce and lawyers actually involved in the case know that nothing's going to happen.
  - Some defendants may prefer to come to court in person. On the other hand, it is sometimes better for the person to remain at a mental hospital and to avoid a stay at the jail.
  - Technology issue; clerk has to locate Michael Pook to arrange the VC.
  - Savings would be in Sheriff's department – should that department bear the cost of upgrades and staffing from potential savings from less transport.
  - Baseline consideration is that an inmate has a right to be in court in person. Lawyers may know nothing's happening in Court, but this may be very frustrating and confusing for the defendant/inmate. These frustrations are one of the “costs” to consider in the overall analysis of streamlining; it should not be at the expense of defendant's rights.
  - Some processing concerns with people brought from the House of Correction and then being held in holding area for long periods of time. Defenders get calls from angry inmates late in afternoon, after being brought to court staging and then never getting to see the court or their lawyer. This poisons the relationship with the defense lawyer.
  - Suggestion: have phone connection from courts to court staging, so lawyer could talk to client in court staging to let them know what's going on (since the lawyer can't visit in court staging, except in rare circumstances).
- Next steps for moving forward on optimizing use of Video Conferencing:
- Potential examination of issue of different treatment of family court vs. criminal cases.
  - Do we know how many family and civil court appearances (from county and state institutions) were by VC compared to how many were physically produced? Sheriff's staff will try to get that information.
  - Will follow up at the next meeting.
  - Possibly invite Mike Pook to next meeting.

### **3. Old Business**

A) **Update by David Riemer**, on last month's presentation on getting inmates enrolled in ACA health insurance.

- Community Advocates has set up four work groups: HOC, Pretrial, Community Corrections, DOC-DHS.

- Initial meeting of 30 one month ago.
- driemermil@yahoo.com; if anyone wants to contact

**B) Data and population analysis**

- Koneazny suggested more attention to shrinking “pie slices” (Jail population categories (pre-trial, VOP, etc.)
- We should gather best quality data by risk and characteristics to weed out lightweights who don’t need to be in jail and people w/ mental illness who should be in community or in more therapeutic setting.
- Next meeting to report on data and will discuss process for addressing population issues.
- “Scorecard” in progress that will provide data to committees.

**C) DOC developments:** Niel reported that there has been legislation that will address custody sanctions for VOPs.

**Next meeting August 18th 8am – Room 609**