AGENDA TOPICS:

1. **Check-in and Approval of 9.26.08 Minutes**
   
   Minutes for meeting were approved.

2. **Executive Committee update**
   
   - Main focus was budget issues within the clerk and judge’s budget.
   - Talked about the Homeless Report by way of recap from this group. Pat Bolch mentioned that the report’s title has been changed to the Public Nuisance Behaviors Report so that people wouldn’t think it was just about the homeless.
   - Current sanctions currently available aren’t making a difference. There are some individuals that have so many tickets that one more ticket won’t make a difference. Also, if individuals don’t want to get treatment then that’s not helping either. Judge Foust is the best source for this.

3. **AIM Project update**

   - Workshop being held on 11/20/08 to get a better idea of how this will work. Need more consistent sentencing. We need to learn how to administer the tool so that it is a valid tool.
   - This will be added to future agendas with the Criminal Justice Group.

Anthony Jurek – invited to meeting by Michael Smith. Jurek did a lot of research regarding the need for probable cause paperwork. See issues below.

Probable Cause Issues:

- MPD officers would like to keep the Probable Cause forms and not have to leave them at the Sheriff’s Office – is there a legal reason why the Sheriff’s Office should have to have those in hand?
- Who is liable? Arresting agency or Holding agency?
- Judge Foust would like this question answered: Where the Sheriff’s only role is to hold the body who was arrested by some municipality and there is no probable cause finding –
is the Sheriff simply holding the body liable or is the municipality liable? Anthony Jurek will look into this.

- Jeff Teuscher – Our point is if we have the body at the jail and it’s here for 72 more hours and there hasn’t been a pc review then people are going to ask why the individual is in the jail. Procedurally, if the case detective has the pc form at the scene, they can send it with their uniform and then that’s that. If we don’t have the pc form we can’t tell anyone anything if they ask.
- Judge Foust – MPD says the Sheriff’s Office doesn’t do anything with the pc forms; they just sit in a corner.
- Overall process may need to be reviewed and improved.

4. **Future Issues and Topics Discussion**

*Judy Schwaemle* – Seriously questions the purpose of the CJG and whether we should meet next month or ever again. This group has no money. She feels that she cannot be candid with the group, as issues seem to appear as budget benchmarks that she feels are forced upon her department. Collaboration doesn’t seem to be working within the group. It’s great having outside participants, there have been great contributions from others, and thinks things have been accomplished but the group’s value has diminished over time.

*Jose Sentmanat* – Feels more people should be present to have this discussion and make a decision. Sounds like an attack on the executive and the benchmarks. Feels we have had a lot of collaboration this past year.

*Schwaemle* – Did the systems analysis have anything to do with this group?

*Sentmanat* – ILLP is a moot point.

*Brian Blanchard* – He is now on three different committees where the same topics come up. Feels that meeting on same topics with three different groups is highly inefficient.

*Sentmanat* – Does the CJG have a role to play? We should have this discussion. Keep separate the “roles” and the ILLP and benchmark issues.

*Karl van Lith* – We’re a historic entity and have provided a forum for many topics. Feels we have built bridges between people.

*Judge Foust* – Feels this group does collaborate and is a valuable group.

*Catherine Dorl* – Feels these meetings are more helpful than other meetings she attends. Turnout being low today could be because of the change in the meeting date. Likes the fact that many people from different organizations meet. Thinks the group is valuable.

*Blanchard* – Each County should have a group that gets together that consists of someone from each different organization, which is what this group is.

*Sentmanat* – The EOC wanted to put together a task force regarding racial disparity. Attempts were made to have people from CJG be on this task force. Feels that other group formation is driven by other entity’s specific needs.

*Schwaemle* – Still wonders if it’s worth our time to meet. Loves the fact that we have different representatives from different agencies, but that people are not being totally candid with each other or collaborating well. For example: Notice in Hand – did not feel there was honesty in those discussions. Was solved outside of this group.

*Carlo Esqueda* – This group needs ground rules. Feels the “council” is a more dysfunctional group than this one. This is supposed to be the place where all the ideas get laid out on the table. Agrees with Judy in that there’s a conflict where we don’t want to be so open with our ideas. He sees the CJG as a group that incubates the ideas and the decision-makers get
together to see how to do these things. Wants everyone to trust each other more. We need to have a discussion about our ground rules, our mission, and how we can make this work.

*Catherine Dorl* – It has become clearer in her office, that there’s a violation of rights during the intake process. If an individual is held more than 24 hours then you have to have a probable cause finding. She is seeing more people being held 5-10 days without a warrant and all there is a probable cause form. This is probably a resource issue. The only remedy is to file a writ but doesn’t feel that it’s the best solution. Would like to discuss this at the January 2009 meeting.

5. **Checkout and Adjourn**
   Meeting adjourned at 1:17pm.
   Next meeting is November 21, 2008