

Minutes Jail Study Committee April 29, 2009

Members present: Douglas Winters, Wally Geske, Deloras Vind, Geraldine VanTassel, Ray Seiler, Paul Halderson, and Dick Miller

Also Present: Jane Klekamp, La Crosse County Justice Sanctions Program; Jeffrey McIntyre, Director of Trempealeau County Human Services; Dr. Duane Sackett; Olin Fimreite; Troy Torgerson; Richard Crooks; Bobby Gronemus; Shirley Roberts; and David Suchla.

The meeting was called to order by Halderson at 9:04 a.m. stating proper posting and notification has met open meeting requirements.

Motion by VanTassel and seconded by Seiler to accept the agenda as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

Motion by Seiler and seconded by VanTassel to accept the minutes of the March 26, 2009 meeting as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

La Crosse County Justice Sanctions Program

Jane Klekamp of the La Crosse County Justice Sanctions program spoke about the program in their county. Klekamp advised it is important for each county to decide what philosophical direction they want to take. Klekamp advised that although she does not think jail is the right treatment for everyone who commits a crime, she can think of a lot of people that do belong in jail.

Klekamp stated that La Crosse County has two ways of approaching the Justice Sanctions Program. The two common themes within the Justice Sanctions Program aim to reduce the use of the jail and reduce recidivism through evidence based practices. She then provided the committee with copies of the La Crosse County Justice Sanctions Program Annual Report, which is utilized to demonstrate progress toward those goals.

There are eight components of the evidence based practice; 1) Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs, 2) Enhance Intrinsic Motivation, 3) Target Interventions, 4) Skill Train with Directed Practice, 5) Increase Positive Reinforcement, 6) Engage On-going Support in Communities, 7) Measure Relevant Practices, and 8) Provide Measurement Feedback.

Programs associated with the La Crosse County Justice Sanctions Program include; The Women's Community Based Program, Treatment Courts (Drug Court and OWI Treatment Court), Bail Monitoring and Sentenced Clients and Staff Training.

Klekamp provided a break-down of the 2008 Budget indicating expenditures of \$2,161,540 and revenues of \$563,192 resulting in net-funding of \$1,598,348.

Klekamp states that she did some research of counties similar in size to Trempealeau County. She cautioned that when places build a new jail they often house inmates for other counties which may sometimes skew the numbers.

Seiler questioned the cost per day of \$18.42 and questioned if those costs included wages, etc. Klekamp advised that the cost per day does include wages. Klekamp advised that the thing that is not on there is the cost of the building that they are in. Seiler further questioned if the people in the program have ever been incarcerated. Klekamp clarified that participants in the program have been incarcerated and therefore there are incarceration costs associated with these individuals as well.

The question was raised, if there has been a decrease in jail population, why is La Crosse County expanding its jail facility? Klekamp advised that La Crosse County is building a new jail for a number of reasons. She advised the biggest issue that comes up over and over again is staffing. Klekamp states when the current jail was built it was under estimated how many staff was needed to run it. When the Huber Center was closed no staff costs were saved as Huber Center Staff was transferred to the Secure Jail. Klekamp advised the same process will happen when/and if they open the Women's Jail, there will

be a transfer in staff. There is also a need for space dedicated to individuals with mental health needs, etc. The building that is being remodeled was opened in 1997.

Klekamp advised that the Women's Jail was built in 1968 and is the "old time jail" with a linear type design. The jail has an approximate capacity of 70 inmates. The max number of inmates housed in that jail at this time is 39.

Miller questioned the capacity of the current jail. The most the men's jail can hold is 172 with another 20 beds in booking. Klekamp advised they are currently at capacity in this jail. The new addition will be approximately 100 beds. At this time La Crosse County has in-direct supervision pods. The remodel will change the supervision to direct supervision pods. In-direct supervision means there is a central place where the jailer sits. There are pods around them and the jailer can see into the room where the inmates are housed but the inmates cannot see them. They then do rounds on a scheduled basis to interact with the inmates. Direct supervision means that there is a jailer in the pod with the inmates. La Crosse County is building two direct supervision pods and remodeling some of the current housing pods so there is some flexibility in how they house individuals with mental illness, etc.

Klekamp advised the process of building the new addition it should address housing of inmates with mental health issues. She further advised that the remodeling is also to deal with the space needed for housing women who are incarcerated in the jail. Miller advised Klekamp's presentation points out the problems that are faced in both small and big jail facilities. The need for housing mental health inmates and women is also an issue in Trempealeau County. Capacity is one thing but, special needs are also important issues that need to be addressed in Trempealeau County. It is the whole system working together with alternative programs and incarceration when necessary.

Seiler questioned how many departments are involved in this program? Klekamp advised that the Justice Sanctions program is one of the sections within Human Services. They work closely with other sections in Human Services, Probation and Parole, Jail and Judges. They were not always part of Human Services but that is where they ended up. The County supports the program providing funding from the general fund. When the Justice Sanctions Program began the Sheriff's budget was not reduced as staff from the Huber Center was transferred to the Secure Jail. Treatment provided to program participants is not necessarily included in the costs of the program.

There are some cases where the program is not appreciated by victims/public. In other cases the view is that if not for this program there would be no supervision of some offenders. For example, if there is concern about an individual who commits a domestic violence crime the judge can assign them to this program. When determining if someone is assigned to the program or information is provided to the Judge but the Judge has the final say on who is placed on the program.

When asked how often clients are checked on Klekamp advised there is staff at the office from 8:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and on weekends from 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Justice Sanctions does not notify victims when an offender is released to their program but the Victim Services Department may.

When asked if anyone has committed a violent crime while on Justice Sanctions. Klekamp advised there was a guy who posted bond and was assigned to their program who committed crimes every time he was released. She advised that she is not sure if there are any other cases. The number and type of violations that a participant is allowed to commit while on Justice Sanctions depends on what type of program they are in.

Of the 237 clients of Justice Sanctions/day many, but not necessarily all of them would be incarcerated in the jail if they were not participating in the program.

If a client commits a violation while on the program, Justice Sanctions has no detention authority. In certain cases they are instructed by the Judge to contact Law Enforcement for certain violations. In most cases a report is forwarded to the Judge and then a decision is made.

When questioned on the relationship with State Probation and Parole Agents, Klekamp advised that they do work with people on Probation. They also work with Probation in Drug and OWI Court.

Clients in the program are charged \$10 per day for sentenced participants and \$5 for other participants. Klekamp advised that they collect approximately 40% of what they bill.

Klekamp advised that the Justice Sanctions Program has replaced the Huber Program. She believes that they save some bed days out of the Secure Jail as well.

Miller advised he believes Klekamp points out the importance of having options in dealing with people who appear before the court for criminal activities and there is need for the jail. We have to provide adequate separation and treatment for individuals while they are in jail. The Justice Sanctions Program serves a certain group of people. It is not an option for all people and all the elements have to be there to make the system work. Some people think the answer to all our problems is an official Justice Sanctions Program. Trempealeau County does not have all of the elements of the La Crosse County Justice Sanctions Program but we do have many of them. Trempealeau County has an inefficient linear jail, lack of program space, and lack of space for mentally ill or special needs inmates. Trempealeau County may be lacking in many areas including jail facilities and alternatives programs to incarceration. The Justice Sanctions Program would be a great help and is an important part of the answer but is not the total answer.

Geske advised that from a philosophical standpoint putting people in jail does not accomplish a great deal. There are some people that need to be in jail to protect society. Geske advised that Justice Sanctions is a program attempting to change attitudes.

For clarification Suchla questioned if the La Crosse County Sheriff's Department could have cut funding. Klekamp advised that they shifted staff.

Sackett advised it is extremely difficult to compare La Crosse County to Trempealeau County as there is a vast difference.

Fimreite questioned, out of the 237 people on the program what percentage is on electronic monitoring? Klekamp advised approximately half of the people are on electronic monitoring.

Klekamp advised that building jails is a really tough process and if she had to start what she does all over again tomorrow she would spend her first year collecting data. Until you know who your population is and what their needs are there is a lot of speculation of what those individuals need. Klekamp further advised that they still have a problem collecting data in La Crosse County.

Cost of Possible Trempealeau County Alternative Diversions Program

McIntyre advised that one of the differences he wanted to point out is that the participants in the La Crosse County IDIP Program are court ordered. In Trempealeau County IDIP is a voluntary program. Trempealeau County contracts with West Central Behavioral Health to monitor and run the IDIP Program.

The Trempealeau County Drug Court Program is run in a very similar manner to the La Crosse County Program.

Costs associated with current programs in Trempealeau County, for the 2008 budget cycle, equate \$38,064.00 in net costs to operate the Drug Court program and \$9,573.44 in net costs to operate the IDIP Program. McIntyre further advised that in 2008 there was revenue from the Clerk of Courts Office and Arcadia Municipal Court totaling \$45,417. This money is a portion of the funds paid for fines, etc. for certain cases such as alcohol violations.

There are currently ten participants in the Trempealeau County Drug Court Program and twenty participants in the IDIP Program. One person was kicked out of the IDIP Program but he/she has been let back into the program after admitting that he/she did have some issues going on.

Jail Site Options

The committee reviewed four site options, including a list of advantages and disadvantages for each site.

1. Highway 121/Q Site – New 200 Bed Jail & Sheriff's Department
 - a. Advantages
 - Meets 20 year jail inmate projection.
 - Meets Sheriff's Department needs.
 - Staff efficient single story jail.

- County owned site – no land acquisition required.
 - Adequate parking.
 - Site is expandable for future courthouse.
 - Site is expandable for future parking.
 - Site is expandable for future jail expansion.
 - Adjacent to other county departments (Highway and Health Care Center).
 - Visible, easy to find site.
 - Vacated space in courthouse is made available for other county department expansion.
 - Jail/Sheriff parking downtown is made available for courthouse use.
- b. Disadvantages
- Utility extension required.
 - Remote from Courthouse.
2. Schansberg Road Site – New 200 ed Jail & Sheriff’s Department
- a. Advantages
- Meets 20 year jail inmate projection.
 - Meets Sheriff’s Department needs.
 - Staff efficient single story jail.
 - Adequate parking.
 - Utilities available to site.
 - Site is expandable for future courthouse.
 - Site is expandable for future parking.
 - Site is expandable for future jail expansion.
 - Vacated space in courthouse is made available for other county department expansion.
 - Jail/Sheriff parking downtown is made available for courthouse use.
- b. Disadvantages
- Requires property purchase.
 - Not a visible site – okay for jail but not as well suited for civic courthouse functions.
 - Remote from Courthouse.
3. Downtown Site – New 200 Bed Jail & Sheriff’s Department addition and remodel
- a. Advantages
- Meets 20 year jail inmate projection.
 - Meets Sheriff’s Department needs
 - County owner site – no land acquisition required.
 - Connected to Courthouse.
- b. Disadvantages
- Multi story jail is less staff efficient.
 - Multi story jail construction is more expensive.
 - Reduces existing parking downtown.
 - Future jail expansion is upward.
 - Street Closure.
 - No space for future parking expansion.
 - Limited space for future courthouse expansion.
 - Requires demolition of portion of courthouse and temporary relocation of departments.
 - Requires remodel or addition to accommodate dislocated departments.
4. Downtown Site – 100 Bed Jail addition & remodel
- a. Advantages
- County owned site – No land acquisition required.
 - Connected to the Courthouse.
- b. Disadvantages
- Does not meet 20 year jail inmate projection (meets approximately 10 year need).
 - Does not meet jail support needs.
 - Does not meet Sheriff’s Department needs.
 - Multi-story jail is less staff efficient.
 - Multi-story jail construction is more expensive.

- Reduces existing parking downtown.
- No future jail expansion on site.
- No space for future parking expansion.
- Limited space for future courthouse expansion.

Seiler questioned if the two-story building downtown would be vulnerable for additional staff. Poweleit advised that a two-story facility is more staff intensive. There may be additional costs for excavation of the Schansberg Site but water and sewer would be closer in vicinity. The Trempealeau County Health Care Center also needs some updates to their sewer system and the Highway 121/County Road Q site would provide them with an opportunity to update their sewer system as well. The TCHCC also provides food services for the Jail and this location would be closer for providing those services.

Sackett advised it is his understanding that the Mayor of Independence suggested building the facility in the City of Independence. The Sheriff's Office must remain in the County Seat of Whitehall.

Vind questioned the costs for each site. The County presently owns the Highway 121/County Road Q site. There would be a cost to purchase the Schansberg Road site. Sheriff Anderson advised he spoke to the City of Whitehall Clerk who advised they sold land at the Schansberg road site for approximately \$5,000 per acre. Without a site survey and soil boring the budget proposals will only be estimates.

Gronemus advised the committee is looking at a building but she would like to know what programming is going to be provided to inmates incarcerated in this building. Gronemus further questioned who is going to pay for this building.

Vind advised that she thinks the County needs to spend time collecting data to determine what the needs are for our community. She further advised that we need to be concerned about what the tax payers can afford.

Possible Action on Site Survey and Soil Boring Resolution

Motion by VanTassel and seconded by Winters to move forward in planning, to include Site Survey and Soil Boring, with the Highway 121/County Road Q building site. Roll call vote: Winters, yes; Gekse, opposed; Vind, opposed, VanTassel, yes; Seiler, yes; Halderson, yes; and Miller, opposed. Motion carried 4-3.

Vind advised that she objects to the motion, as she believes the downtown site may be much better for the community.

Status of Jail Study Sub-Committee

Halderson advised he sees the Sub-Committee as an opportunity to gather detailed information. It originally began to gather information for the Cash Flow Analysis. Once the detailed budget and design have been developed another Cash Flow Analysis will be completed. Jail Study Sub-Committee is similar to how sub-committees work with the full County Board. They gather information and then the full Jail Study Committee has the opportunity to vote on the information gathered.

Vind advised she feels the Jail Study Sub-Committee makes all the decisions before they are presented to the committee. VanTassel advised she feels that her opinion is not wanted and she has had no say in the facts that are gathered.

Sheriff Anderson advised that he feels the information gathered by the sub-committee has been beneficial and they have spent a lot of time gathering this information. The information gathered for the Jail Study Committee has also taken up a lot of time for staff within the Sheriff's Department. Sheriff Anderson further advised that VanTassel is the Chair of the Law Enforcement Committee and it would be beneficial for her to be part of the sub-committee. Miller stated that he is not opposed to assigning new members to the sub-committee.

Motion by Vind and seconded by VanTassel to abolish the Jail Study Sub-Committee at this time. Motion carried 5-2.

Public Input – Alternatives to Jail Incarceration (Limited to Two Minutes Per Person)

Suchla advised that there is a lack of communication. Suchla advised one of the things that have been suggested would be to make the Trempealeau County Jail a male only jail and send female inmates out of county. Suchla advised that there has also been discussion with Phil Borreson for OWI and Mental

Health Programs at the TCHCC. Suchla advised there has also been discussion about the Justice Sanctions Program. Suchla feels that it is more cost effective to continue to house inmates out of county as it is cheaper than building a new facility.

Fimreite advised he appreciated having Jane Klekamp speak with the committee today. He believes this is a program that should be seriously looked at as reducing the number of inmates housed in Trempealeau County. He further questions the twenty-year projection.

Sackett suggests taking one year of the jail population and finding out all the information that you can about each inmate to determine what programs were provided and what programs would be beneficial.

Set Next Meeting Date/Time

The next meeting will be scheduled in approximately one month.

Motion by Miller and seconded by Vind to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 7-0. Meeting adjourned by Halderson at 11:23 a.m.

Rebecca M. Suchla
Administrative Assistant