

Review of the Dane County Community Court Final Planning Phase and Implementation Process

Presented to:

Dane County Community Justice Council

June 4, 2026

Presented by:

Brett Taylor

WB Taylor Consulting

Implementation Coach

Index	p. 2
Executive Summary	p. 3
Community Courts and Technical Assistance	p. 4
<u>Community Court Philosophies</u>	p. 4
<u>Technical Assistance Opportunities and Challenges</u>	p. 4
Implementation Analysis	p. 5
<u>Consultant and Dane County background</u>	p. 5
<u>June 2025 site visit</u>	p. 6
<u>District Attorney’s Office/Victim Witness meeting</u>	p. 7
<u>Deferred Prosecution Program meeting</u>	p. 7
<u>Judge and Court Clerks meeting</u>	p. 7
<u>State Public Defender meeting</u>	p. 8
<u>Post-site visit work</u>	p. 8
Conclusion	p. 10
Recommendations for the Dane County Community Court	p. 12
Appendix	p. 17
Timeline of Dane County Community Court	p. 17
Stakeholders List	p. 19
Pictures of the Community Court courtroom	p. 20

Executive Summary

Dane County has been preparing for a community court for more than 10 years. Stakeholders have visited several different models and have spoken to additional community court practitioners and national technical assistance providers in helping to determine the best community court model for Dane County.

County justice system stakeholders have shown a commitment to developing a well-functioning community court even when there are disagreements regarding specific implementation issues such as who will be eligible, operations and timing.

Dane County has invested in developing a thorough planning process and the current justice system partners should reference those reports when refining the processes of the community court to revisit what the the community and system actors want to see in its local community court.

The Dane County Community Court is designed to promote transparency in its processes. Court proceedings will occur on the record and are intended to create a constructive path forward for participants with significant prior justice system involvement who are seeking help to address underlying causes. For this reason, the range of referral-eligible offenses should be expanded to provide more individuals the opportunity to engage in this process in open court.

Community court planners should continue to seek out successful community court models for guidance and to access national technical assistance providers to ensure they are keeping current with best practices.

The justice system actors currently planning the Dane County Community Court have a vision for how they want to see the community court operate and must remember the goal of the community court is to address root causes of a person's criminal behavior and to identify and implement interventions that will allow those people to be in a healthier place and to thrive in their lives.

Community Courts and Technical Assistance

Community Court Philosophies

Community courts have been operating in various iterations for more than 30 years. The philosophy behind the community court movement is to use the power of the justice system to:

- Help people who continually cycle through the justice system learn new behaviors.
- Identify the contributing factors to their behavior and to change that behavior through focused treatment and engaged case management.
- Reduce the cycle of re-incarceration for non-violent offenses.
- Safely integrate people back into their local communities.

The justice system is designed to be an adversarial system; community courts are designed to have those adversarial parties collaboratively design interventions based on the specific person's social service needs.

Community courts focus on providing help and guidance to the program participants and to understand that many of the people in community court have years of unmet social service needs and a distrust of how they have been treated by the justice system. The focus of a community court is to encourage behavioral change, not to threaten punishment.

Technical Assistance Opportunities and Challenges

Providing technical assistance to a jurisdiction as an outsider can be challenging as the consultant will never know the nuances and intricacies of the local system as well as the people who work there every day. Local stakeholders should, and often do, defend the processes that are currently in place. One role of the consultant is to nudge people to consider other options and to try new approaches to their current practices to improve the outcomes of the community court participants. Oftentimes, challenging long-established processes and workflows to achieve the change that the local jurisdiction is seeking is met with different levels of resistance as it is human nature to resist change.

As the consultant on this project, two guiding principles I rely on are:

- a. Finding ways to shorten the time from arrest to engaging in services through the community court
- b. Focus more on the social service needs of the potential program participant and their willingness to acknowledge and accept the services being offered through the community court rather than the crime(s) a person is charged with committing.

There are previous reports done in preparation for a community court in Dane County that should be referenced by the planners of this project. The 2021 Community Needs Assessment

conducted by the Center for Justice Innovation, and the 2024 Community Court Summary and Recommendations report conducted by Johnathan Sharrer, JD, University of Wisconsin Law School. Both reports relied heavily on input from community members and local stakeholders and provide insight as to what people hope and want a community court to be able to achieve.

The key theme from both reports is that a well-designed and well-functioning community court should promote behavioral change from the people who are eligible and suitable to have their case(s) sent to the community court. Reducing the racial disparities that exist in the Dane County justice system, connecting people to drug treatment and mental health services, and assisting people in need of permanent housing and employment, and providing support to victims were topics that emerged from these reports. Concern about how much information would be on the state's CCAP (Consolidated Court Automation Programs) system that makes public most information and documentation associated with a criminal court case was also an issue that was discussed.

The content of this report are my opinions and are based on my observations in working with this site and referencing how other successful community justice programs were implemented. My work history includes being the first defense attorney assigned to the Red Hook Community Justice Center and worked there for nearly 7 years before becoming a technical assistance provider for the past 18 years at the Center for Justice Innovation and as a private consultant. I was hired as an Implementation coach but use the term consultant in this paper when describing my work.

Implementation Analysis

Consultant and Dane County background

Although I have periodically worked with Dane County since late 2013, there are always new faces and different agencies involved in any technical assistance engagement that will change the dynamic of any working group. Another unique aspect of this work in that the community court grant that the Office of Justice Reform (OJR) was awarded via the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance included receiving technical assistance from the Center for Justice Innovation. Federal budget cuts in April 2025 and resulting layoffs of the Center's community justice team who had been assigned to the Dane County project was depleted and threatened to negatively impact the implementation of the Dane County Community Court. As one of the people laid off, I was familiar with the federal award and its requirements, including using the CCAT (Criminal Court Assessment Tool), a specific risk/assessment instrument, and focusing on an identifiable population of 17–35-year-olds who were charged with non-violent charges. This allowed me to start the consultant work without needing to learn and understand the background of what had occurred prior to the implementation of the community court.

Consultation calls began on a regular basis on June 11, 2025. In addition to having weekly check-ins with Jael Currie, the Community Court Coordinator, I also attended the Core Team¹ meetings, had regular check-ins with the OJR Director, Colleen Clark-Bernhardt, responded to OJR emails for advice and information, and was available for calls with anyone associated with the Dane County Community Court. An early site visit was held at end of June 2025 to meet the Core Team in individual meetings and to answer their questions about community courts and their operation.

June 2025 site visit

As the site was past the planning phase of the grant², the focus of the visit was on the implementation of the community court and ensuring the workflow would allow the site to identify ideal candidates, formally enrolling them into the community court, identify the appropriate cadence for court appearances/check-ins, and receiving reliable progress reports from the service providers for the court and the attorneys to rely upon. Initially, the OJR team thought early fall was a possible timeframe for a launch date, but no specific date was set. As part of the initial consultant work, a community court checklist was created to help prepare for the launch and documents/forms from other community court projects was shared with the OJR team.

After attending Core Team meetings and on-site meetings with key partners and stakeholders, a few themes began to emerge that would contribute to the launch date being pushed back. Initially, the Core Team was working on a premise that the community court would be post-charge and pre-plea program (meaning a community court participant could enter the program without pleading guilty to any charges) and that eligible charges could include retail theft, disorderly conduct, resisting arrest, and possibly bail jumping³ as initial offenses. OJR had completed an analysis of the charges that had the highest level of disparities and used that list to propose which charges the community court should accept.

The earlier premise of a post-charge, pre-plea model envisioned early interaction and potential admittance to the Community Court. In Red Hook, our focus was getting people into treatment as quickly as possible, and we embraced allowing people to begin treatment without first resolving the charges in the case. We did not want people turning down an opportunity to address the issues that were bringing them into the justice system by having a system that mandated a guilty plea before accessing services. We found that people who began treatment

¹ The Core Team consisted of stakeholders from the Judicial Branch, Court Clerks, Office of Justice Reform, the District Attorney's Office, the State Public Defender, Victim Witness Program, and the Dane County Commissioners.

² The Center for Justice Innovation report and the Jonathan Sharrer report were excellent planning documents that helped guide the implementation work.

³ See Jonathan Sharrer's report, pp. 12-15 and 23-24, for other charges that were discussed that could be eligible for the community court.

without pleading guilty either were successful in treatment and their case was favorably resolved, or they got rearrested (sometimes more than once) and they ended up with a packed plea deal. In more than 25 years of that model, not once did a person who entered treatment prior to taking a plea end up going to trial. Many times, people who were initially unsuccessful in their treatment eventually took advantage of the opportunity community court provided and building on their initial attempt(s) at treatment, they were able to successfully complete the program

District Attorney's Office/Victim Witness meeting

At the initial meeting with the District Attorney's Office, the visit focused primarily on the role of the office's Victim Witness Unit and that the Wisconsin Constitution created constitutional obligations that the District Attorney's Office had to comply with as part of Marsy's Law. The District Attorney's Office noted that collecting restitution was an important issue and they needed to ensure Chapter 950 compliance. Additional items that were discussed included how the community court could refer cases to the Community Restorative Court and a concern about overwhelming the community court coordinator with too many cases when the community court launched.

Deferred Prosecution Program meeting

A separate meeting was held with the Deferred Prosecution Program (DPP), a program embedded in the District Attorney's Office. That meeting included some comparisons on how the community court would operate in relation to how DPP operates. In my understanding of how DPP operates, the processes DPP followed are not needed for community court as these are two separate and distinct programs that have different goals and target different populations. Additionally, the judicial presence in the Community Court is a key difference.

Judge and Court Clerks meeting

A meeting was held with the court staff and the judge who was volunteering to be the community court judge, Hon. Nia Trammell. Judge Trammell and Jael Currie had recently visited some of the New York City community courts that the initial planning team visited in 2014.⁴ Judge Trammell had many questions about how other community courts operated and often consulted with her court staff during the meeting regarding how they could adapt other community court best practices for the Dane County Community Court. The court staff had many questions regarding the process of having a case enter community court and how cases were ultimately resolved.

⁴ See appendix for full listing of research and peer site visits.

State Public Defender meeting

A meeting was also held with the Regional Director of the State Public Defender. The public defender inquired as to the differences between community court and the DPP and provided guidance to us regarding the best process for identifying and screening people as early as possible, especially for those still incarcerated. Concerns about what was expected of a defendant and why someone would agree to enter community court were also had during this meeting.

Post-site visit work

After the site visit occurred, a proposed launch date of November 18, 2025, was set as a date for the first cases to be heard in community court. The District Attorney's Office wanted to use a notification process for eligible community court participants modeled on how its office notified people of their eligibility for DPP. That process included sending an Offer Letter that explained what community court was and how the person could accept the offer.

Additionally, the District Attorney's Office also requested to have a contract in place with all the obligations the defendant would be agreeing to including any restitution owed under Marsy's Law. Contracts are sometimes used in community courts, but many existing community courts do not require a contract to begin accessing services. Many other treatment courts do require contracts before allowing a defendant to enter the treatment court.

While the Offer Letter and contract were being discussed, ongoing work with the system partners occurred to create an MOU between all the core agencies regarding how community court would proceed. A concern with the contract is that explicit details of a person's community court obligations would be available on CCAP. Instead of a contract that would be part of the court file (and available on CCAP), a participant agreement⁵ was proposed where the program participant would receive as a reminder of their court obligations, but it would not be part of the court file. Instead of a contract, the obligations of the defendant would be put on the court record and that would have the same legal effect of signing a contract.

As the November 2025 date drew close, there had been no referrals and none of the proposed documents had been finalized. In early November, the District Attorney's Office announced that their office would require anyone who wanted to enter community court to plea to the charges and that they would have to take the plea before formally entering community court. The District Attorney's Office also stated that the only charges they would refer to the community court for the first year of operations would be retail theft charges. To my knowledge, these decisions were made without discussions with the Core Team.

⁵ Now referred to as a Participant Handbook.

Communication and collaborative working styles are significantly different in various agencies. Developing a shared terminology and regular staffing schedules may help build greater rapport and mitigate further communication challenges.

The community court's revised post-plea model will require participants to enter a plea in a different criminal branch before being admitted to community court. Because Judge Trammell has volunteered to assume the additional workload of presiding over the Community Court, the judicial stakeholders agreed that pleas for community court should occur in a separate criminal branch and the stakeholders do not believe this will add any significant delays to the process.

By early October 2025, various forms of the contract, participant agreement, and the MOU were circulating and being edited by each agency. Although they requested having an Offer Letter to start the process, the District Attorney's Office had not provided a version of what they would propose using for community court as the November 18, 2025, launch date approached. It was agreed to push back the launch date to finalize the paperwork.

Conclusion

Dane County has all the components for a very successful community court that, in time, could be a national model for others to follow. Despite the issues identified in the previous section, the Core Team continues to meet and work towards getting the community court started.⁶ Each stakeholder, including the Community Court Coordinator, Jael Currie, OJR Director Colleen Clark Bernhardt, Judge Nia Trammell, District Attorney Ismael Ozanne, and SPD Peter Middleton have continued to work through the above articulated challenges and delays. Every community court project will change once operations begin. The system stakeholders must continue meeting, discussing, and advocating their respective positions in creating a community court that best serves the needs of Dane County.

Other positive aspects that will allow the Dane County Community Court to be successful include the strong social service network in Dane County and the community has been unwavering in its support for a well-functioning community court to become operational.

Judge Trammell has created a warm and welcoming environment in her courtroom⁷ and has a vision of how she wants to engage with community court participants. She has stated that she wants the community court to do things differently and she has modeled that behavior with her leadership during the implementation phase of this project.

The District Attorney has been an early champion in creating a community court since 2014 and has supported other diversion programs such as DPP, Community Restorative Court, and Drug Court. The District Attorney's Office will provide information, unavailable to the Office of Justice Reform, to complete the necessary CCAT assessment. Staff that work within the District Attorney's Office have worked with other diversion programs within the County and should broaden their efforts around referral recommendations to the prosecutors, if possible.

The State Public Defender's Office is supportive of the Community Court and would like to see services provided to their clients at the earliest opportunity. They are in favor of finding pathways to identifying potential community court participants occurs post-arrest and before Initial Appearance.

The Office of Justice Reform is situated to be the conduit between the court process and the receiving of social services. Many community courts struggle to be successful as prosecutors and defenders must play multiple roles in ensuring a community court is identifying the right

⁶ Dane County did have its first case on May 26, 2026.

⁷ See page 21-22 for photos of the community court courtroom.

candidates, putting them in the right treatment modality, and ensuring that there is reliable and trustworthy progress reporting occurring. Dane County has the OJR team to do all those things.

Dane County is well known in nationally in justice improvement organizations as a County that imbues data, research, and unrelentingly seeks solutions for systemic issues that have impacted Dane County—as well as the rest of the United States.

Community courts are designed to get to the root causes of the behavior that brings people into the criminal justice system. Changing a system is hard—even when all the data, research, and stakeholders agree with the program’s general philosophy. However, without evolution and system changes being made, the same results will continue to occur.

The Dane County Community Court offers a possible solution to some of its criminal justice problems while providing its users with an opportunity to thrive in a supportive environment.

Recommendations for the Dane County Community Court

The following recommendations are broken into the following categories: Court operations, personnel decisions, document creation, training opportunities, and advisory guidance. After each recommendation is a suggested timeframe of implementation of 0-3 months, 3-6 months, 6-12 months, and ongoing.

Court Operations

1. Allow more charge types to be eligible for Community Court

Currently, only retail theft charges are eligible for community court. By limiting the eligibility to only one charge, and accounting for the number of people who will not accept community court, there may not be enough people agreeing to enter community court. Some areas to consider for expansion are:

- a. Disorderly Conduct charges. It is the most frequent charge of people booked into the county jail. There are many DC charges only (with no enhancers), and many of them are experiencing housing insecurity as well as being frequent utilizers of the jail.
- b. Resisting Arrest charges and Obstructing Justice charges (with a criminal history). The community courts that accept these charges have had success using restorative justice programs like the Community Restorative Court to successfully resolve these cases. **0-3 months**

2. Community Court charge restrictions should be presumptive and not automatic

Most community courts use a list of specific charges to determine eligibility. To ensure the community court is reaching as many people as possible, allow people with charges not on the eligible list of charges to be considered for community court if the situation warrants inclusion. For example, a person stealing something from a store who pushes a security guard as they run from the store could be charged with retail theft by one prosecutor whereas another one could charge it as a robbery. The same person, doing the same act, with the same needs is either community court eligible or ineligible based on the random draw of who made the charging decision, and specific to Dane County, if the case gets deferred or filed. That would be a case where, absent any other circumstances, could be considered a community court case regardless of which crime they are charged. Community courts are designed for individuals who need and are open to intervention – the focus is on people, not charges. **0-3 months**

3. Identify ways to minimize time between arrest and connection to services

Acknowledging that every case is unique and that some cases will take longer than others for the District Attorney's Office to decide to make a community court offer, research clearly shows that the sooner a person is connected to treatment from the point of arrest, the more likely the person will be successful in completing a treatment program. This recommendation is not trying to rush the charging decision but is urging planners to seek opportunities to quicken the process, when possible, to treatment. Law enforcement and jail staff are two resources that could provide early identification of potential community court participants to the District Attorney's Office and the OJR Community Court Coordinator. Delaying treatment only guarantees that the behavior of the potential community court participant will not change and it increase the likelihood that their behavior will harm more people and create more victims. **3-6 months**

4. Review in-custody people awaiting their Initial Appearance (IA) for Community Court eligibility

Many frequent utilizers of the county jail would be ideal candidates for community court. By including in-custody people for community court eligibility, early screenings could speed up connecting participants to needed social services. Some cases will need longer review from the District Attorney's Office, but many cases could be identified as community court eligible at this stage of the proceedings. Even in instances where a person is screened/assessed but the case is not filed, the person who was screened and assessed can still meet with the community court coordinator after release to discuss their treatment options. **3-6 months**

5. Implement a hybrid plea model for the Dane County Community Court

To ensure as many people as possible can benefit from being in community court, the community court team should develop a model that allows some people to enter community court and to begin accessing treatment immediately without taking a plea. Identify the class of cases/people that would need to plead guilty to enter the community court. **3-6 months**

6. Develop additional referral options/entry points for the Community Court

Although the District Attorney's Office will be the referral source for most of the cases in the community court, there should be a process where other agencies should be able to refer a case to community court. The defense bar, other court branches, law enforcement, and jail social workers should all be able to refer a person to community court. Some potential community court participants may be missed at Initial Appearance for a variety of reasons: a person could be off their medications, could be having a

mental health episode, may still be under the influence of drugs/alcohol, or they may have had time to reflect and realize they should take the opportunity that community court could offer them. **6-12 months**

Personnel Decisions

7. Identify permanent prosecutors and public defenders to staff the Community Court

The success of a community court relies on having a judge and attorneys that are familiar with the goals of the community court, understand that the adversarial process is held in abeyance during the pendency of the community court case, have trust amongst each other, and understand that the path to success in community court is not always a straight line and often comes with missteps. By assigning permanent staff, they can attend conferences and trainings to keep current on best practices and emerging practices. **3-6 months**

8. Identify and train a back-up for the Community Court Coordinator

As the community court continues to grow and evolve, there will be situations when having an additional person to conduct screenings/assessments and case management is needed. Some community courts use staff from partner agencies to fill the back-up role, and others use people from city/county agencies. **3-6 months**

9. Continue Core Team meetings

The Dane County Community Court has launched because of the commitment from the system partners to take an idea and nurture it into an operating project. The Core Team should continue to have regular meetings that allow all partners to voice concerns with any operational issue as well as proposing new ideas for the community court. These meetings should have a regular cadence that can eventually become quarterly meetings.

Ongoing

Document Creation

10. Continue to review and update the Participant Handbook and the Procedures and Policies Guide

Procedural Justice principles include making sure that community court participants understand what is expected of them and what they can expect from the justice system if they participate in community court. By having a Participant Handbook that is a living document, it can adapt to changes in the field and embrace best practices. The Participant Handbook should acknowledge that recovery is not linear and that missteps will occur. Likewise, a community court participant should feel like they are being supported and not being put under increased surveillance. A Participant Handbook also

expressly tells community court participants what can be expected when there are positive drug tests, missed meetings, and even new arrests. If the goal of the community court is to enact behavior change in people, a Participant Handbook guide will provide community court participants with a document that encourages their success.

Similarly, the Procedures and Policies Guide gives all the system partners an understanding of how community court operates and what each agency's role and expectations are in the operation of the community court. These documents should be reviewed on a regular cadence to ensure they are consistent with how the court operates and are using best practices in the field. **Ongoing**

11. Create and implement a data collection protocol

By developing a data collection plan early in the community court process, planners will know what the goals of the project are and be able to track the metrics that an independent evaluator will eventually be able to use to evaluate the success and impact of the community court. **Ongoing**

Training Opportunities

12. Identify training opportunities for the Community Court team

There are many trainings and conferences that occur locally, regionally, and nationally that the Office of Justice Reform should identify as possible training opportunities for the community court team. By attending the same trainings and conferences as a team, everyone will keep current on best practices as well as creating a better understanding of each other's roles and obligations. **Ongoing**

13. The Office of Justice Reform must continually educate and communicate to its system partners and the local community about the positive impact of the Dane County Community Court

The Office of Justice Reform cannot become complacent with its initial success of the launching of the community court and must continually train and update the justice system partners about the community court. Staff change and new leaders emerge, and they may not know about the community court. Likewise, the community court will change and evolve and when major changes occur, the OJR team should make sure that the justice system partners are aware of the changes. Similarly, OJR should be in the community updating local leaders about the positive impact the community court can have on its participants and the community. **Ongoing**

Advisory Guidance

14. Revisit foundational documents that helped guide the planning process of the community court including the Community Court Needs Assessment from 2021 and Jonathan Sharrer's 2024 Community Court Summary & Recommendations

Dane County self-funded a very thorough Community Needs Assessment in 2021 that included extensive community outreach and input regarding what the community wants to see its local justice system implement when a community court is launched. That was followed up by Jonathan Sharrer's 2024 Community Court Summary and Recommendations report. As the Dane County Community Courts moves beyond its pilot phase, those documents should guide planners in the inevitable expansion of the community court. Some of the overarching highlights from those reports were: creating a theory of change model, addressing racial disparities in the justice system and local jail, reduce the reliance of using jail as a response to non-violent crimes, and use the power of the justice system to connect people to drug and alcohol treatment, mental health services, housing, and employment support. **0-3 months**

15. Create an advisory board

As the community court matures and grows, hearing different perspectives from other system partners and community organizations could provide invaluable insight to the community court planners as they make decisions about how to evolve the community court. The advisory board should include non-justice system partners as well as community advocates who have an interest in local justice-related matters. Additionally, past community court participants and crime victims should be part of the community court advisory board. **6-12 months**

Appendix:

Timeline of Dane County Community Court

2010-12: Initialize research and seek national thought partners to address recommendations of the 2009 Task Force on Racial Disparities

2014: Won national BJA National Training and Technical Award to take team to NYC to visit CCI, Red Hook Community Justice

2014: Dane County Community Restorative Court (CRC) is created. This program has successfully served individuals aged 17-25 in criminal and municipal cases as a restorative justice diversion program. The CRC is largely a pre-charge model with a proven record of successful completions for over a decade. The Dane County Community Court is seen as an outgrowth of the CRC, expanding into post-charge criminal cases that are non-violent.

2015: Center for Court Innovation Site Report [dane-county-site-visit-report-final.pdf](#)

2020: Identifying new opportunities for deflection/diversion in non-violent misdemeanors: <https://cjc.danecounty.gov/documents/pdf/DaneCountyDiversion-DeflectionAnalysisandRecommendations.pdf>

2021: Community Justice Center Final Needs Assessment

Report: <https://cjc.danecounty.gov/documents/pdf/CCI-Final-Report-DaneCounty-9.10.21-.pdf>

2022: Dane County was awarded a Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) grant for Planning and Implementation of a Community Court for \$600,000. The award allows Dane County to join a national cohort of Community Court planning sites, as well as best practice sites. Working with national leaders, Dane County has been able to learn and observe community court practices from across the nation. Community Courts address local justice issues, ranging from quality – of- life offenses, to felonies—all designed with a problem-solving purpose, individualized justice, community partnerships, and strong outcome measures. Additionally, Community Court can offer participants additional pathways into the program by expanding possible referral sources and an opportunity for diversion at later post-charge points in the criminal justice process. Ultimately, the Community Court intends to be a springboard for the longer-term vision of development of a full community justice center.[10-10-22 CJC Press Release](#)

2023: Community Court Advisory Committee members visit Chief Judge Tim Evans and the RJCC, Cook County, IL

2024: The Dane County Office of Justice Reform (OJR) is established and names its first director. OJR will staff the Community Court.

2024: Site visits to Community Courts: Eugene, OR; Reno, NV; Austin, TX.

2024 Recommendations for the Community Court Report : [Community-Court-Summary-Recommendations.pdf](#)

2025: CJC authorizes OJR to contract for Implementation Coach-Brett Taylor, JD.

2025: Judge Nia Trammell announced as first Community Court Judge.

2025: Community Court Coordinator is hired, and operational planning begins.

2025: Site Visits by Community Court Coordinator and Community Court Judge to New York City (Red Hook Community Justice Center, Manhattan Justice Opportunities); Cook County-Restorative Justice Court of Cook County, IL

2026: Dane County Community Court begins: May 2026

Stakeholder List (people who met with or spoke with consultant, listed alphabetically)

Nathan Alwin, Bailiff, Dane County Sheriff's Department

Jill Anderson, Criminal Court Manager, Dane County Clerk of Courts

Brooke Barcena, Deputy Director, Crime Response Program, Victim Witness Unit

Carousel Bayrd, Executive Assistant to County Executive Melissa Agard

Sarah Breckling, Branch 6 court reporter, Dane County Circuit Court

Amy Brown, Director, Victim Witness Services

Sha-Ron Buie, Data and Evaluation Coordinator, Office of Justice Reform

Colleen Clark-Bernhardt, Director, Office of Justice Reform

Jael Currie, Community Court Coordinator, Office of Justice Reform

Rebekah Jones, Deferred Prosecution Case Manager, Deferred Prosecution Program

Melvin Juette, Director, Deferred Prosecution Program

Shelly Justiliano, Victim Witness Case Manager, Victim Witness Services

Signé Mbainai, Dane County Court Commissioner

Peter Middleton, Regional Director, State Public Defender

Andrew Miller, Assistant District Attorney, District Attorney's Office

Jeff Okazaki, Dane County Clerk of Courts

Ismael Ozanne, Dane County District Attorney

Andrea Raymond, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office

Krista Stewart, Branch 6 Judicial Clerk, Dane County Clerk of Courts

Nia Trammell, Dane County Circuit Court Judge

Dane County Community Court photos – May 2026



Community Court discussion area



Courtroom Signage



Courtroom Entrance



Courtroom Entrance



OJR Office