

Members present: Jeff Bindl, Mike Albrecht, Mindy Mattson, Judge Wendy Klicko, Jeff Weiler, David Susens, Christopher Polzer, Emily Truman, Brenda Yaskal, Dan Brattset

Members absent: Meg Sage, Ryan Ramnarace, Karen DeSanto, Jim Daniels

Others Present: Jamie Catterson, Lewis Lange, Bill Steinhorst, Jeff Spencer

Introductions

The meeting was called to order and certification of Open Meeting compliance was given at 3:02 p.m. Motion by Brattset, second by Albrecht, to adopt agenda with caveat that agenda left off Lewis Lange – DNA testing related to Juvenile Court scheduling. Motion carried.

Motion by Judge Klicko, second by Albrecht, to approve the minutes of the previous meeting. Motion carried.

Public Comment: None

Communications: Sauk County Sheriff Captain Lewis Lange: Discuss DNA collections for juveniles. Mandated DNA collection at arrest for all violent felonies (if juvenile were adult). Required to swab for DNA and collect fingerprints. If there was not a weekly scheduled event, not sure how Sheriff could handle staffing DNA collections. Ability to schedule DNA collection one time weekly is important to Sheriff Department. Juveniles can't go to the jail for DNA collection. Sheriff sends someone to take DNA from adults on Wednesday afternoons. Take arrest DNA at every qualifying event but only need to take conviction DNA once.

Judge Klicko provided context on 1-kid/1-judge policy.

Albrecht/Catterson: Take DNA from a surprising number of kids. Scheduling on multiple days can be difficult.

Yaskal: Columbia County rotated judges each week on Friday afternoons.

Klicko: Potentially shifting court intake schedule – 3 weeks on and 6 weeks off.

Seems like the policy going forward will be: If possible, schedule any plea/disposition that DNA may need to be taken with assigned judge on Wednesday morning so they can have DNA taken while Sheriff already has someone here on Wednesday afternoon.

Juvenile Shackling: Klicko: Differentiate transport shackling and in-court shackling. Today focus on in-court. Some previous discussions have taken place about what criteria would be or should be

Bill Steinhorst: Judges are in charge of courtrooms but anyone who is transported to court falls under responsibility of court security to keep courtroom and courthouse safe. Consensus used to be that when attorney asked to have shackles removed then judge would defer to court security to decide if they should be removed. There was an incident recently with an unshackled juvenile

who got angry and aggressive. Court security sometimes knows in advance that individual may be a problem but often there is no prior indication. It is a liability issue and it is on court security to deal hands-on with any safety issue.

Jeff Spencer: Transport people are not trained to go hands-on with individuals in custody. At times, transport people are only security in court and they would not be trained to be hands-on with aggressive individuals. Juveniles are unpredictable. Courthouse Security Committee is working on ways to make the courthouse more secure in general

Susens: Shackles have psychological impact on juveniles and their decision-making process. De-humanizes. Clients primary concerns is frequently having shackles removed rather than making decisions about case. Many places have a blanket policy against shackling – only shackle if show individual is dangerous.

Klicko: Can we develop a policy finding medium between never shackled and always shackled.

Spencer: Courthouse Security Committee is working on redesign of facilities – entry screening for weapons, etc. – to make the courthouse more secure generally. Part of the issue is that we do not have a secure courthouse with secure entrances and walkways for courtrooms.

Can we come up with policy for circumstances where we should: Always shackle or never shackle without a judicial determination.

Steinhorst: Concerns about county liability.

Can we/should we come up with a policy/practice that gives some leeway to court staff? Are there circumstances when shackling or not shackling should always be default?

Electronic Monitoring Changes.

Mattson: Units currently come from DOC – they are not GPS so can't actually monitor them. Only know where they are not. New monitors are going to be GPS – bracelets will actually monitor and track with GPS.

If there are violations then what? Do kids come back to court? How many chances do kids get? Do you continue to use EM as an option for kids who are violating EM orders. Need some guidelines about when it is used or not. Don't want to place kids out-of-home but what to do if they are violating EM?

Need a broader discussion about sanctions? Creative sanctions? Discussion needs to include discussion about rewards.

Sanctions/Incentives are future topic.

Senate Bill 390 – Grant Money for Treatment Court.

Weiler: Provides grant funding for treatment court for juveniles and parents. Problem is that we are never prepared for grants. We need to be ready to submit a proposal when grant money is available so we actually have a chance to get a grant. Manitowoc closed detention and used

grant to set-up a report center as alternative. There are other grants that come available from time to time and we need to be ready. Who is going to do it?

Need to focus on what we want and how we put it together into a grant proposal. Some specificity on Mental Health and AODA (child or parent) but language of SB 390 is pretty broad.

Weiler: Movement in legislature for 17 year olds to go back into juvenile court. Most people think it will happen and there is now money attached from the legislature. Limited to non-felony, non-repeat offenders. Be proactive about what we do when that happens.

Regular agenda spot for updates on grant? Pick priority programs to retrofit to grant proposals?

Can we utilize BGC space to be a place to go for supervision, activities, etc? Expelled, suspended kids? Outagamie County Truancy Court linked in with BGC.

Update on Committee Membership.

Brenda Yaskal and Ellen Allen will be committee members. Mike Pichler did not respond to outreach.

Next meeting:

Date and Time: January 31, 2017 3:00 PM

Motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Brattset, second by Albrecht.

Respectfully submitted; David Susens, Assistant State Public Defender