



Waukesha County
Criminal Justice Collaborating Council
Evidence-Based Decision Making Case Processing Workgroup Minutes
Monday, June 5, 2017

Team Members Present:

Sue Opper

Chris Ehrfurth

Hon. Ralph Ramirez

Molly Jasmer

Kathy Madden (via phone)

Katie Kegel

Team Members Absent:

Michael Neimon

Others Present:

Frank McElderry

Rebecca Luczaj

Monica Paz

Janelle McClain

Mimi Carter

Opper called the meeting to order at 7:34 a.m.

Approve Minutes from May 18, 2017

Motion: Madden moved, Ramirez second, to approve the minutes of May 18, 2017. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss & Consider Workgroup Membership Additions

Motion: Ramirez moved, Jasmer second, to approve the addition of Monica Paz and Frank McElderry as members of the EBDM Case Processing Workgroup. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss Pretrial Conferencing Impact on Sheriff's Department and Discuss Pros/Cons of New Process for Referrals from Intake Court for Tuesday Pretrial Conferencing

Paz distributed and reviewed a document titled "Summary Data of Branch 3 Pretrial Pilot."

Kegel arrived at 7:37 a.m.

McElderry stated that the volume of traffic from the pretrial conferencing for the Sheriff's Department has increased, and they are having a difficult time accommodating the increased workload, as they have limited correctional staff in the afternoons.

Ramirez stated that on May 16, pretrial conferences had to be condensed into a half-day, and the number of in-custody defendants created additional difficulty.

Currently, Sheriff's deputies are checking people in for pretrial conferencing. The workgroup agreed that this task is administrative in nature and could be handled by the Clerk's Office moving forward, reducing the deputies' workload.

There are 121 cases and 87 defendants scheduled for the June 13 Pretrial Conferencing.

Kegel commented that it would be detrimental to exclude in-custody defendants, and McElderry stated that it would be better for scheduling if the in-custody cases were heard only in the morning.

Madden left the meeting (via phone) at 8:00 a.m.

The workgroup would like the summary data to include the number of in-custody defendants, how many are taken into custody, and how much time is spent conducting the plea and sentencing.

Walk-in defendants should go to the I.D. Bureau first prior to reporting to the courtroom for pretrial conferencing.

Madden rejoined the meeting (via phone) at 8:05 a.m.

Kegel suggested that we wait until the other judges handle the pretrial conferences in July and August before deciding our next step, such as considering each branch handle their own pretrials each month. Opper agreed that the workgroup needs to decide how we are going to grow the pretrial conferencing program.

Ehrfurth left at 8:12 a.m.

Kegel left at 8:13 a.m.

At this time, the workgroup determined that there would no longer be pretrial conferencing for walk-ins from Intake Court.

Discuss Plan for Merging Data from SPD and Pretrial Conferencing Pilots to Determine Total Impact on Time to Disposition of Cases

Paz distributed and reviewed a document titled "State Public Defender Screening Pilot."

Jasmer commented that the Commissioners are hesitant about sending all defendants to the State Public Defender's (SPD) Office, especially those who indicate they do not want an attorney, or they do not want to drive to the SPD's Office and come back.

Opper stated, and Ramirez agreed, that the process needs to happen at some point – either with the Commissioner with everyone, or with each separate defendant and the judge 30 or more days later. The latter option unnecessarily delays the processing of the case.

Madden suggested discussing sending defendants to the SPD's Office at the next C/T Judges' meeting next week Tuesday (6/13).

Review Revised OAR Information Sheet

This item has been tabled until a future meeting.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 a.m.