



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

June 6, 2023

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #530

Treatment and Diversion Programs: Expansion; Program Appropriation Consolidation; Program Administration; and Unencumbered Balance (Justice – Treatment Alternatives and Diversions)

[LFB 2023-25 Budget Summary: Page 378, #1; Page 379, #2; and Page 380, #4 and 5]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Justice (DOJ) administers the treatment alternatives and diversion (TAD) grant program. The TAD program provides grants to counties to establish and operate programs, including suspended and deferred prosecution programs and programs based on principles of restorative justice, which provide alternatives to prosecution and incarceration for criminal offenders who abuse alcohol and other drugs. Projects supported by the TAD program typically follow one of two models: pre-trial diversion or adult drug or treatment court. Grants under the TAD program are awarded as part of a five-year competitive cycle (grants are awarded on a competitive basis in the first year of the cycle, and then on a noncompetitive basis for the remaining four years).

The Department also administers the drug court grant program. Under the drug court grant program, DOJ provides grants to counties to establish and operate drug courts. Grants must be provided to counties that have not established a drug court. Under statute, a drug court is defined as a court that diverts a substance-abusing person from prison or jail into treatment by increasing direct supervision of the person, coordinating public resources, providing intensive community-based treatment, and expediting case processing. Base funding for this grant program is \$500,000 GPR annually.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The TAD program was initially created under 2005 Act 25, while the drug court grant

program was created under 2013 Act 20. Since inception, funding for the TAD program has grown significantly. Funding for the drug court grant program has remained level since its inception. Table 1 identifies funding appropriated for the TAD program and the drug court grant program from 2006-07 through 2020-21.

TABLE 1

**Appropriated Funding for the TAD Program and County Drug Court Grant Program
2006-07 Thru 2022-23**

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>PR Funding Sources</u>
TAD Program				
2006-07	\$0	\$755,000	\$755,000	Drug Abuse Program Improvement Surcharge (DAPIS) and Drug Offender Diversion Surcharge (DODS) (\$755,000).
2007-08	0	755,000	755,000	DAPIS and DODS (\$755,000).
2008-09	0	755,000	755,000	DAPIS and DODS (\$755,000).
2009-10	0	712,500	712,500	Justice Information Surcharge (JIS) (\$705,000); and DAPIS and DODS (\$7,500).
2010-11	0	712,500	712,500	JIS (\$705,000); and DAPIS and DODS (\$7,500).
2011-12	0	1,085,900	1,085,900	JIS (\$1,078,400); and DAPIS and DODS (\$7,500).
2012-13	0	1,085,900	1,085,900	JIS (\$1,078,400); and DAPIS and DODS (\$7,500).
2013-14	2,500,000	1,085,900	3,585,900	JIS (\$1,078,400); and DAPIS and DODS (\$7,500).
2014-15	2,500,000	1,085,900	3,585,900	JIS (\$1,078,400); and DAPIS and DODS (\$7,500).
2015-16	2,500,000	1,084,000	3,584,000	JIS (\$1,078,400); and DAPIS and DODS (\$5,600).
2016-17	2,500,000	3,084,100	5,584,100	JIS (\$1,078,400); one-time transfer from the Department of Health Services institutional operations and charges PR appropriation (\$2,000,000); and DAPIS and DODS (\$5,700).
2017-18	4,650,000	1,339,000	5,989,000	JIS (\$1,078,400); one-time transfer from DOJ's discretionary settlement funds (\$250,000); and DAPIS and DODS (\$10,600).
2018-19	4,650,000	1,339,200	5,989,200	JIS (\$1,078,400); one-time transfer from DOJ's discretionary settlement funds (\$250,000); and DAPIS and DODS (\$10,800).
2019-20	5,650,000	1,089,200	6,739,200	JIS (\$1,089,200); and DAPIS and DODS (\$10,800).
2020-21	5,650,000	1,089,200	6,739,200	JIS (\$1,089,200); and DAPIS and DODS (\$10,800).
2021-22	5,650,000	1,089,200	6,739,200	JIS (\$1,089,200); and DAPIS and DODS (\$10,800).
2022-23	8,150,000	1,089,200	9,239,200	JIS (\$1,089,200); and DAPIS and DODS (\$10,800).
County Drug Court Grant Program, 2018-19 Through Present				
2018-19	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000	
2019-20	500,000	0	500,000	
2020-21	500,000	0	500,000	
2021-22	500,000	0	500,000	
2022-23	500,000	0	500,000	

2. Under 2021 Act 58, \$2,500,000 GPR in 2022-23 was provided for TAD grants. Further, \$500,000 GPR annually in previously one-time funding was made on-going. A new, competitive five-year grant cycle for TAD grants begins in January, 2027.

3. As funding for the TAD program has grown, so have the number of grants under the program. After its inception under 2005 Act 25, the TAD program supported six TAD projects operated by seven counties and one tribe (there was one joint project operated by two counties and

one tribe). With the increased funding for the TAD program in recent years, DOJ awarded 59 TAD grants totaling \$9,438,900 to projects operated by 55 counties and four tribes.

4. Grants ranged from a minimum of \$22,100 to \$400,800 per grantee with an average award of \$160,000. Given the size of the award, it does not cover the full annual cost of running a treatment court. Typically, the award is used to support the salary of a treatment court coordinator. Attachment I identifies the TAD projects that received a grant award or drug court grant award in 2023. Attachment II identifies the location of TAD-funded and other treatment courts in Wisconsin.

5. The TAD program and the drug court grant program support similar county projects. Projects supported by the TAD program typically follow one of two models: pre-trial diversion or drug/treatment court. Under current law, the drug court grant program provides funding to counties to establish and operate drug courts. The Department may only provide drug court grant funding to counties that have not established a drug court.

6. While the TAD program and the drug court grant program support similar county projects, they are two statutorily separate grant programs. The drug court grant program has few statutory requirements associated with the program. That is, current law only requires that DOJ utilize funding under the program to provide grants to counties that have not established a drug court so that the county may establish and operate a drug court.

7. In contrast, the statutes identify several programmatic requirements associated with the TAD program. These requirements include: (a) establishing requirements that counties must follow in order for their TAD project to be eligible for a TAD grant; (b) requiring counties that receive a TAD grant to provide a 25% local funding match; (c) requiring DOJ to annually prepare a progress report that evaluates the effectiveness of the TAD program; (d) requiring DOJ to prepare a comprehensive report on the TAD program every five years that includes a cost-benefit analysis of the program; and (e) requiring grants be awarded on a five-year competitive grant cycle.

8. It should be noted that while the statutes differentiate between the TAD program and the drug court grant program, DOJ administers these two programs in conjunction with one another. Further, DOJ applies the program requirements established for the TAD program to the drug court grant program, while still adhering to the statutory purpose of the drug court grant program.

9. Also note that some counties may run county specific diversion or drug courts to allow for more flexibility in programming without TAD funding. For example, a county may receive non-TAD funding and use it to provide services to a participant who would be ineligible for state funding under TAD.

10. The Department's Bureau of Justice Information and Analysis (BJIA) and Bureau of Computing Services (BCS) developed a web-based, integrated reporting system for problem-solving courts and diversion programs throughout Wisconsin. This system, the Comprehensive Outcomes, Research, and Evaluation (CORE) Reporting System was funded through one-time federal grants. All sites now use this reporting system. In addition, DOJ makes CORE available at no charge to sites that do not receive TAD grant funding. The Department indicates that the system incorporates performance measures with the National Center for State Courts that can be used by drug and hybrid

courts across the state. The system collects detailed data on treatment court and diversion program participants, which allows sites to monitor the progress of their programs and supports longer-term evaluation of TAD across the state.

11. There are multiple issues regarding TAD that are raised in AB 43/SB 70: (a) the necessity of increased staffing to administer the various programmatic aspects of the existing program; (b) statutory changes to the program which among other changes would expand the scope of the program and reduce the current match requirement; (c) the significant increase in program funding in 2024-25; (d) the two separate GPR and two separate PR appropriations that are in essence identical; and (e) funding left in a PR appropriation with no expenditure authority. Each of these issues is addressed below.

TAD Administration

12. The Department staff for the TAD program have responsibilities to the program that include: (a) grant management; (b) fiscal; (c) data collection; and (d) technical assistance. Grant management responsibilities include: (a) annual grant applications; (b) reviewing and approving quarterly program reports; and (c) a competitive grant application process every five years. The Department indicates that the workload is increased when a new round of competitive grants are going through, since all programs are re-evaluated.

13. Fiscal responsibilities include: (a) approving expenditures and processing payments quarterly; (b) calculating and enforcing local match requirements, and (c) consulting on and approving grant modifications. TAD is reimbursement based funding, which means that after a grant is awarded the county first expends funds and then submit receipts for DOJ to review before a reimbursement is sent back to the program.

14. Data collection responsibilities include: (a) CORE reporting system updates and monitoring; (b) data analysis and reporting; and (c) annual reports and multi-year evaluations. Reporting on individual programs is crucial as it opens up possibilities for program specific evaluations. One example of this is tracking the time between arrest and admission to a program. Generally, less time between arrest and program admission is associated with better outcomes. Reporting abilities will help individual programs track what their times are between arrest and admission to the program and may help them identify bottlenecks in the process.

15. Technical assistance and training responsibilities include: (a) training local programs, (b) conducting site visits; (c) providing program feedback; and (d) coordinating and conducting statewide standards trainings. Trainings are provided on treatment court standards, diversion standards, on topics requested by individual programs.

16. At the November 12, 2014, s. 13.10 meeting 5.0 FTE GPR positions (2.0 research analysts, 1.0 grants specialist, and 2.0 program and policy analysts) were provided for the administration and evaluation of the TAD and Drug Court Grant programs. To support the positions, DOJ was directed to delete 5.0 GPR vacant positions. The Department indicates that the TAD workload has led to high turnover associated with these positions.

17. The "Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) Program 2014-2018 - Participant Outcome Summary and Cost-Benefit Report", indicates, "Given the rapid expansion of the TAD program [as shown in Table 1 above], the resources for both the administration of the program and for evaluation have not kept pace. Consideration should be given to potentially expanding the available staff funded to support the data collection, analysis, and evaluation of this significant program. In addition, while TAD is administered as a partnership with the state agencies, there is no funding attached to the partner agencies to assist in the administration of TAD."

18. In order to provide TAD funded counties with additional technical assistance and timely reimbursements, the Committee could provide the three requested TAD positions. [Alternative A1] This alternative would provide \$238,000 GPR in 2023-24 and \$292,300 GPR in 2024-25 and 3.0 GPR (1.0 program and policy analyst, 1.0 grants specialist advanced, and 1.0 research analyst advanced), to administer and evaluate the TAD grant program and drug court grant program. The positions would perform the following duties: (a) evaluate the TAD and drug court grant program as required under statute; (b) provide grant recipients technical assistance as they develop and implement their projects; and (c) provide fiscal oversight for the TAD and drug court grant program.

19. To provide some support, but at a lower amount than under the bill, the Committee could provide one additional TAD position. [Alternative A2] This alternative would provide \$79,300 GPR in 2023-24 and \$97,500 GPR in 2024-25, and 1.0 GPR position annually.

TAD Statutory Changes

20. The "State of Wisconsin Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC): Treatment Alternatives and Diversion Program Report 2020" states "As a result of the rapid and large expansions of the Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) program, there is a need to review and propose revisions to the TAD statute, which was originally drafted in 2005." This project was coordinated by DOJ and began through the TAD Subcommittee. These recommendations from the TAD Subcommittee were forwarded to the State CJCC for review and approval. [The CJCC is composed of the Attorney General; the Secretaries of the Department of Corrections, Workforce Development, Children and Families, Health Services, the Executive Director of the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (or a designee); the State Public Defender; the Director of State Courts; and the Chair of the Committee of Chief Judges]

21. Some of the final recommendations of the CJCC were included in AB 43/SB 70. These recommendations would modify the TAD grant program as follows:

a. Remove the specification that TAD grants be used only for on alcohol and other drug treatment. Instead, allow grants to be used on programs that operate within the continuum from arrest to discharge from supervision and provide an alternative to prosecution, revocation, or incarceration through the use of pre-charge and post-charge diversion programs or treatment courts and community-based corrections. In connection with the broadening of the grant purposes, remove specific references to "mental health services" (for example, programs would be designed to "integrate all services" rather than "integrate all mental health services.") Specify that programs employ evidence-based practices targeted to the population served by the program.

b. Specify that programs be designed not only to promote, but also facilitate the implementation of effective criminal justice policies and practices that maximize justice. Further, specify that programs not only promote public safety, reduce prison and jail populations, reduce prosecution and incarceration costs, and reduce recidivism, but also victim safety. Delete the requirement that TAD grants improve the welfare of participants' families by meeting the comprehensive needs of participants.

c. Specify that, if the program is administered by a tribe, the criminal justice oversight committee must consist of a representative of the judiciary, a representative of criminal prosecution and criminal defense, a social services provider, a behavioral health treatment provider, a law enforcement officer, a representative of corrections, and other members that the oversight committee determines are appropriate to the program.

d. Change the match requirement from 25 percent to 10 percent.

e. Allow, instead of require, an eligible program to charge participants a fee for their treatment.

f. Eliminate specific statutory requirements pertaining to exposure of genitals during drug testing.

g. Specify that if a person is participating in any evidence-based substance use disorder treatment program as determined by DOJ, regardless of its status relating to the TAD program, the court does not need to order a substance use assessment.

h. Beginning in 2026-27, change the competitive grant process from a five-year cycle to a four-year cycle. The modification is intended to better align the grant cycle and program reporting and evaluation timelines with the biennial budget.

i. Specify that modifications to TAD would first apply to grants awarded on or after the effective date of the bill.

j. Provide that the appropriation that was formerly limited to providing a TAD grant to a county that had not received one as of September 23, 2017, may be used to provide a TAD grant to a county that is not a recipient of a TAD grant on the effective date of the bill.

22. *Technical Changes.* In order to align grant cycles with the budget cycle, the Committee could make the grant cycle four years instead of five as described in section h, but specify that this modification would first apply to grants awarded on or after the effective date of the bill as specified in section i. Further, in order to update the date as of which a county does not have a TAD grant, the Committee could provide the update as in section j. [Alternative B1 h, j, and i] This alternative would adopt the provisions h, j, and i as listed above.

23. *Expansion Statutory Changes.* The Department believes that there are limited opportunities to expand the TAD program within the current statutory construction. Thus, allowing for other types of treatment courts to be funded, is intended to increase the number of programs that the state could potentially fund. As shown in the attachment, some counties are already have more

than one type of treatment court.

24. Counties currently not funded with state TAD funding include: Calumet, Florence, Fond du Lac, Forest, Green Lake, Iron, Juneau, Kewaunee, Lincoln, Menominee, Oconto, Price, Vernon, Waupaca, and Winnebago. Note that Fond du Lac was previously funded in calendar years (CY) 2014-2016 and Winnebago was funded in CY 2017, but discontinued the program in CY 2018. Further, the Lac du Flambeau Tribe in Vilas and the Menominee Tribe also received funding. In the 2016-17 competitive round, Price County applied but is currently unfunded.

25. Regarding the current match requirement, the "CJCC: Treatment Alternatives and Diversion Program Report 2020" states "The original intent of this match requirement was to ensure local jurisdictions (counties or tribes) provided financial support for the programs the state had agreed to fund. However, this local match requirement has been difficult for some programs to meet, especially rural counties and tribes."

26. In order to provide counties with increased funding and flexibility associated with running treatment courts and updating TAD statutes and given the limited possibilities for expansion under the program as it is currently administered, the Committee may include the TAD statutory changes associated with expanding funding to treatment courts and lowering the match requirement from 25% to 10%. These modifications would first apply to grants awarded on or after the effective date of the bill as specified in section i. [Alternative B1 a, d, and i] This alternative would adopt the provisions a, d, and i as listed above.

27. *All Other Statutory Changes.* In order to adopt the other recommendations from the CJCC, the Committee could make any of the modifications identified in Alternative B1, b., c., e., f., g., or i. Under these alternatives, any of the statutory changes listed above as b, c, e, f, g, and i could be adopted.

TAD Technical Appropriation Structure

28. Under current law, six appropriations provide support for TAD grants (two GPR appropriations and four PR appropriations). However, there is no statutory distinction between the two GPR appropriations or the two PR appropriations; both provide funding for TAD grants.

29. In order to simplify TAD fiscal structure, the bill would repeal two TAD appropriations: the GPR appropriation for "Alternatives to incarceration grant program" (s. 20.455(2)(ek) base funding \$500,000); and the continuing PR appropriation "Alternatives to prosecution and incarceration for persons who use alcohol or other drugs; grants" (base funding \$0, with a revenue balance of \$106,200). Further, the bill would transfer balances in these appropriations to other TAD appropriations: the GPR appropriation to the main TAD appropriation (s. 20.455(2)(em) \$500,000 GPR annually); and the PR revenue balance to the PR "Alternatives to prosecution and incarceration grant program" (identified above in point 21 j.). Concurrently, the bill would increase the Alternatives to Prosecution and Incarceration Grant program appropriation by \$106,200 PR in 2023-24 only to fully utilize available revenue.

30. Given that both the GPR appropriations and both the PR appropriations are

administered in the same manner, the Committee could choose to consolidate the appropriations. [Alternative C1] This alternative would result in one GPR TAD appropriation and three PR appropriations.

TAD Unencumbered Balance

31. The PR TAD appropriation to which the \$106,200 PR identified above is transferred (the Alternatives to Prosecution and Incarceration Grant program appropriation) is an annual appropriation with an unencumbered revenue balance of \$126,000. Current base expenditure authority, however, is \$0. The appropriation was originally funded with a one-time transfer specified in 2017 Act 59.

32. In order to access these unencumbered funds, the Committee could provide expenditure authority. [Alternative D1] This alternative would provide \$126,000 in increased expenditure authority in 2023-24 for the TAD program. If combined with the other transferred revenue, PR funding of \$232,200 PR would be available for TAD grants in 2023-24.

TAD Funding Expansion

33. Assembly Bill 43/Senate Bill 70, would provide \$12,500,000 GPR in 2024-25 to expand the TAD program. The proposed statutory change to the TAD program to allow grants to be used for programs that operate within the continuum from arrest to discharge from supervision and for alternative to prosecution, revocation, or incarceration through the use of pre-charge and post-charge diversion programs or treatment courts and community-based corrections, would expand the types for grants that TAD could fund, and increase the volume of grant applications DOJ would need to review and oversee. As a result, in order to increase funding for TAD programs, the Committee could provide \$12,500,000 GPR in 2024-25 to TAD. [Alternative E1]

34. The \$12.5 million TAD program expansion is not based on specific identified demand for expanded TAD grants. Nonetheless, the TAD program has been widely used by Wisconsin counties and tribes. In order to allow for further expansion of the program (with or without the proposed statutory expansion), increased funding for TAD could be provided, but at the level of increase provided in the 2021-23 budget. [Alternative E2] This alternative would provide \$2.5 million in 2024-25.

35. On the other hand, a large increase in funding year three into the four or five grant cycle may be disruptive to the overall TAD grant program and more information about what new types of treatment programs the counties are interested in may be warranted. Further, with 55 counties and four tribes already participating, the program may not need adjustment in any way at this time. Note also, that in DOJ's 2023-25 budget request, while the Department did request increased TAD staffing and did propose the creation of a number of new grant programs, it did not request increased TAD grant funding. Therefore, the Committee could take no action at this time. [Alternative E3] Under this alternative, no funding expansion of TAD would occur.

ALTERNATIVES

A. Administration

1. Provide \$238,000 GPR in 2023-24 and \$292,300 GPR in 2024-25 and 3.0 GPR to provide program development and technical assistance services and administer grants issued to local agencies for criminal justice diversion and treatment programs, including the provision of additional online resources and data.

ALT A1	Change to Base Funding	Positions
GPR	\$530,300	3.00

2. Provide \$79,300 GPR in 2023-24 and \$97,500 GPR in 2024-25, and 1.0 GPR position annually, to administer and evaluate the TAD grant program and drug court grant program.

ALT A2	Change to Base Funding	Positions
GPR	\$176,800	1.00

3. Take no action.

B. Statutory Changes

1. Some of the final recommendations of the CJCC were included in AB 43/SB 70. These recommendations would modify the TAD grant program as follows:

a. Remove the specification that TAD grants be used only for on alcohol and other drug treatment. Instead, allow grants to be used on programs that operate within the continuum from arrest to discharge from supervision and provide an alternative to prosecution, revocation, or incarceration through the use of pre-charge and post-charge diversion programs or treatment courts and community-based corrections. In connection with the broadening of the grant purposes, remove specific references to "mental health services" (for example, programs would be designed to "integrate all services" rather than "integrate all mental health services.") Specify that programs employ evidence-based practices targeted to the population served by the program.

b. Specify that programs be designed not only to promote, but also facilitate the implementation of effective criminal justice policies and practices that maximize justice. Further, specify that programs not only promote public safety, reduce prison and jail populations, reduce prosecution and incarceration costs, and reduce recidivism, but also victim safety. Delete the requirement that TAD grants improve the welfare of participants' families by meeting the comprehensive needs of participants.

c. Specify that, if the program is administered by a tribe, the criminal justice oversight

committee must consist of a representative of the judiciary, a representative of criminal prosecution and criminal defense, a social services provider, a behavioral health treatment provider, a law enforcement officer, a representative of corrections, and other members that the oversight committee determines are appropriate to the program.

- d. Change the match requirement from 25 percent to 10 percent.
- e. Allow, instead of require, an eligible program to charge participants a fee for their treatment.
- f. Eliminate specific statutory requirements pertaining to exposure of genitals during drug testing.
- g. Specify that if a person is participating in any evidence-based substance use disorder treatment program as determined by DOJ, regardless of its status relating to the TAD program, the court does not need to order a substance use assessment.
- h. Beginning in 2026-27, change the competitive grant process from a five-year cycle to a four-year cycle. The modification is intended to better align the grant cycle and program reporting and evaluation timelines with the biennial budget.
- i. Specify that modifications to TAD would first apply to grants awarded on or after the effective date of the bill.
- j. Provide that the appropriation that was formerly limited to providing a TAD grant to a county that had not received one as of September 23, 2017, may be used to provide a TAD grant to a county that is not a recipient of a TAD grant on the effective date of the bill.

2. Take no action.

C. TAD Appropriation Structure

1. Repeal two TAD appropriations: the GPR appropriation for "Alternatives to incarceration grant program" (base funding \$500,000); and the continuing PR appropriation "Alternatives to prosecution and incarceration for persons who use alcohol or other drugs; grants" (base funding \$0, with a revenue balance of \$106,200). Transfer balances in these appropriations to other TAD appropriations: the GPR appropriation to the main TAD appropriation (\$500,000 GPR annually); and the PR revenue balance to the PR "Alternatives to prosecution and incarceration grant program" (identified above in j.). Provide \$106,200 PR in 2023-24 in increased expenditure authority.

ALT C1	Change to Base
PR	\$106,200

2. Take no action.

D. TAD Unencumbered Balances

1. Provide \$126,000 in increased expenditure authority in 2023-24 for the TAD program.

ALT D1	Change to Base
PR	\$126,000

2. Take no action.

E. TAD Funding Expansion

1. Provide \$12,500,000 in 2024-25 to expand the Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) program.

ALT E1	Change to Base
GPR	\$12,500,000

2. Provide \$2,500,000 in 2024-25 to expand the Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) program.

ALT E2	Change to Base
GPR	\$2,500,000

3. Take no action.

Prepared by: Sarah Wynn
Attachment

ATTACHMENT I

Treatment Alternative and Diversion Grant Projects, 2023

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Project Type</u>	<u>Award</u>
Adams County	Hybrid Court	\$97,989
Ashland County	Diversion Program	135,000
Barron County	Hybrid Court	150,000
Bayfield County	Hybrid Court	150,000
Brown County	Drug Courts (Drug, Heroin, Youth Adult); Diversion Program	384,712
Buffalo/Pepin County	2 Diversion Programs	210,286
Burnett/Washburn County	2 Hybrid Courts	115,231
Chippewa County	Diversion Program	119,817
Clark County	Drug Court	127,492
Columbia County	OWI Court; Drug Court	204,124
Crawford County	Hybrid Court; Diversion Program	217,101
Dane County	Diversion Programs (includes evaluation project)	344,931
Dodge County	OWI Court; Drug Court	244,620
Door County	Drug Court	177,895
Douglas County Health and Human Services	Drug Court	108,031
Dunn County	Diversion Program	166,577
Eau Claire County	Drug Courts (Drug, Mental Health, Alternatives to Incarcerating Mothers)	137,213
Grant County	OWI Court; Drug Court	150,000
Green County	Hybrid Court	150,000
Ho-Chunk Nation	Healing to Wellness Court	63,536
Iowa County	Drug Court; OWI Court	75,046
Jackson County	Diversion Program; Drug Court	63,307
Jefferson County	Drug Court; OWI Court	262,673
Kenosha County	Drug Court	134,500
La Crosse County	Diversion Programs	141,000
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Healing to Wellness Court	123,294
Lafayette County	Hybrid Court	150,000
Langlade County [New Grantee]	Diversion Program	94,000
Manitowoc County	Drug Court	150,000
Marathon County	Drug Court	150,000
Marinette County	Drug Court	203,770
Marquette County	Hybrid Court	139,000
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	Diversion Program	98,148
Milwaukee County	Diversion Program	400,782
Monroe County	OWI Court; Drug Court	69,401
Oneida County [New Grantee]	Diversion Program	75,000
Outagamie County	Drug Courts (Hybrid, Mental Health, Veterans); Diversion Program	178,343
Ozaukee County	Diversion Program	124,999
Pierce County	Hybrid Court; Diversion Programs	215,777
Polk County	Drug Court; Diversion Programs	174,400
Portage County	Drug Court; Diversion Program	221,187
Racine County	Alcohol & Drug Court	124,975
Richland County	OWI Court; Drug Court	130,000

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Project Type</u>	<u>Award</u>
Rock County	Drug Court; Diversion Program	\$275,000
Rusk County	Hybrid Court	123,144
Sauk County	Hybrid Court; Diversion Program	242,778
Sawyer County	Hybrid Court; Diversion Program	225,000
Shawano County	Drug Court	107,347
Sheboygan County	Hybrid Court	103,079
St. Croix County	Drug Court; OWI Court; Diversion Program	179,017
Taylor County	Hybrid Court	110,000
Trempealeau County	Hybrid Court; Diversion Program	160,000
Vilas County [New Grantee]	Diversion Program	125,000
Vernon County	OWI & Drug Court	22,135
Walworth County	OWI Court	150,717
Washington County	Diversion Program; Drug Court	200,000
Waukesha County	Drug Court	149,680
Waushara County	Hybrid Court	111,182
Wood County	Drug Court	200,664

ATTACHMENT II

Calendar Year 2023 Wisconsin Counties and Tribes Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) Funded Programs

The Healing to Wellness court in Vilas is operated by the Lac du Flambeau tribe. The Ho-Chunk tribe operates the Healing to Wellness court in Jackson county. The diversion program in Menominee county is operated by the Menominee tribe.



