



## Memorandum

**To:** Walworth County Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons

**Cc:** Mark Luberda, County Administrator

**From:** Carlo Nevicosi, Director Health and Human Services and Superintendent of County Institutions.

**Date:** July 14, 2021

**RE:** July 15, 2021 Walworth County Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons Agenda

---

The Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons agenda includes the following.

- Nomination of Chair for Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons  
We will be nominating a new chair due to the vacancy of the former chair.
- Election of Chair for Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons We will be electing the new chair based on nomination.
- Introduction of new committee members We have new committee members that will be introduced due to vacancies since last meeting.
- Order of Supervised Release Plan and Community Placement of Anthony Teifke We will discuss the order that was filed on June 14, 2021 from the Clerk of Circuit Court to Walworth County

**DRAFT Walworth County Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons  
May 23, 2019 Meeting Minutes  
County Board Room 114, Walworth County Government Center  
100 W. Walworth Street, Elkhorn, Wisconsin**

---

The meeting was called to order by Health and Human Services Director Elizabeth Aldred at 1:03 p.m.

Roll call was conducted and the following members were present: Information Technology Director John Orr; Deputy Corporation Counsel/Director of Land Use Resource Management (LURM) Michael Cotter, Health and Human Services (HHS) Director Elizabeth Aldred; Deputy Director of LURM/County Conservationist Shannon Haydin, Contract Specialist – Advanced Supervised Release Program Bureau of Community Forensic Services, Angela Serwa, attended the meeting via phone. Corrections Field Supervisor Penny Vogt was absent. A quorum was declared.

Others present: County Administrator David Bretl; GIS Coordinator/Land Information Officer Dale Drayna; GIS Specialist Ben Hostetler; Deputy Director of HHS Carlo Nevicosi

**Information Technology Director John Orr made a motion, seconded by Deputy Corporation Counsel/Director of LURM Michael Cotter, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried by voice vote.**

**Public comment** – There was none.

#### **Election of Chair**

Aldred opened the floor for nominations for the Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons Chair. **Cotter made a motion, seconded by Orr, to nominate Elizabeth Aldred for Chair. Motion carried 5-0.** Aldred asked if there were any other nominations. Hearing none, the nominations were closed. **Cotter made a motion, seconded by Orr, to elect Elizabeth Aldred as Chair. Motion carried 5-0.**

#### **Election of Vice Chair**

Chair Aldred opened the floor for nominations for the Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons Vice Chair. **Chair Aldred made a motion, seconded by Orr, to nominate Michael Cotter for Vice Chair. Motion carried 5-0.** Chair Aldred asked if there were any other nominations. Hearing none, the nominations were closed. **Orr made a motion, seconded by Deputy Director of LURM/County Conservationist Shannon Haydin, to elect Michael Cotter as Chair. Motion carried 5-0.**

#### **Role of the Housing Sexually Violent Persons Committee**

Roles of the Committee are located in the packet. Aldred asked if there were any questions related to this Committee's role and there were none.

**Unfinished Business** – There was none.

#### **New Business**

- Act 184 Sexual Offender Placement Project Demo  
GIS Coordinator/Land Information Officer (LIO) Dale Drayna and GIS Specialist Ben Hostetler presented the demonstration and explained the restrictions that have been put in place, such as schools, parks, daycare centers, places of worship, and youth services. Serwa explained the 1500 foot requirement had been voted out but has since been line-vetoed back in by Governor Evers. Orr confirmed Hostetler included the 1500 foot requirement when setting restrictions. Hostetler presented the different point locations in the overview of the city of Elkhorn. Once these points are selected, a gray parcel appears and

there can be one parcel to each point, multiple points to each parcel, etc. Vice Chair Cotter asked why the County Fairgrounds were not included with the parcel points. Hostetler said it did not strictly qualify as a park. Hostetler continued the demo, showing when the buffer is run. It is possible to see what gets included within 1500 feet of every selected parcel. Parcels can also be selected that do not qualify for an offender to live. Serwa said other counties do not define fairgrounds as parks, but this Committee may be able to assign which areas are included. Discussion will need to ensue in this Committee's future meetings as to what areas are included in the parcel points. Hostetler showed how to select where offenders may live and this area will show up as green. This also includes a list of Tax Keys that fit outside the 1500 buffer and a joint table of the ownership and mailing addresses. Aldred asked if it shows if there is a dwelling facility within that area. Hostetler said it does not currently include that information, but a query can be added in the future. Drayna added there can also be a query added to exclude any open farmland, as that would narrow down living spaces. That would not preclude someone from building a house on farmland, however. He said any time a buffer area touches a parcel, it will include the whole parcel, but the one next to it will still be available for placement. Hostetler showed the option of selecting a special adult abuse case that would allow for extra point features such as nursing homes and assisted living centers, but he pointed to a parcel that can be available in the middle of a buffered area. Vice Chair Cotter asked if there have been any changes to open records laws from the State and Serwa said in most counties, they have created a private GIS map that is only used for this Committee and not made public. Serwa said she is unaware of any reason this information would have to be public as it is being used to negotiate potential home sales. Vice Chair Cotter added if too much discussion on the maps took place during this Committee's meeting when press is present, those maps could be available to them. Serwa said because the information at this point is generic, there is no need for concern, but once specific people and houses are being discussed, that portion of meetings will need to be held in closed session. Haydin asked how often Walworth County has placed offenders and Chair Aldred said in the past 12 years, only two people have been placed. Chair Aldred thanked Drayna and Hostetler for their work.

- Discussion of Membership Status

Aldred said a quorum issue with the current membership structure could arise because many of this Committee's members go to other committee meetings together on a regular basis. She asked if the membership could be expanded by two members for a total of 8. This would change the quorum from four to five. County Administrator David Bretl said expanding would be the best potential option to avoid accidental quorums taking place in other meetings. Discussion ensued. **Vice Chair Cotter made a motion, seconded by Orr, to add two members to the Committee on Housing Sexually Violent Persons; an Administrative Analyst from Health and Human Services and a GIS Supervisor/LIO from Information Technology. Motion passed 5-0.**

- Establish Criteria for Assumptions in Project GIS Mapping

Discussion revolved around the document regarding assumptions. Serwa said specific restrictions on the victim are typically not included. Victims must be enrolled in a victim registration program if they would like to keep informed on their offender's status, but many do not want their information connected to the offender if possible. Orr asked if we would know if there had been a victim registered in our area if an offender came into our county. Serwa said both the victim and the County involved would be notified when an offender came into the area. Cotter pointed out each township is six miles by six miles so if there was a limit of three miles that could wipe out an entire township as a possibility. Orr asked Drayna if it would be possible to build something into the GIS layers that would put a three mile buffer around a victim's residence once we know who they are. Discussion ensued on variants. Orr asked Serwa if there is a no-contact issue. She said there is a rule of no-contact with the victim and each victim puts together safety plans. **Orr made a motion, seconded by Haydin to add a three mile buffer around a victim's**

**home.** Discussion ensued as to victim's privacy and it was confirmed the buffer would be temporary to enable the Committee to see the available area for placement. Serwa said this would be the first buffer of this type in the State as far as she is aware of. **Motion carried 5-0.**

Chair Aldred addressed the possibility the state removing the 1500 foot standard for proximity. Orr asked Serwa why the State is considering removing the 1500 feet standard. She said in some areas of the state, the restriction is making placement very difficult. There are other aspects of this proposal, including requiring offenders to be removed to their county of residence. There are a lot of different proposed changes. Aldred clarified that this may not go through and then we would not need to make a decision; if something does come up, we could address it at that time. Drayna said knowing what the requirement is makes it much easier for planning purposes. Discussion ensued and it was decided the distance could be changed at a future meeting if a difficult placement occurred. **Orr made a motion, seconded by Haydin, to keep the 1500 feet standard even if the State gets rid of their requirement. Motion carried 4-0, Serwa abstained.**

The Committee discussed the definition of a park and possible issues related to housing offenders near areas such as state parks. Drayna said the Committee will have to take a list of the County nature areas and decide which, if any, should be included in the buffer area for each case. Serwa added that these offenders are the most intensely supervised in the state and even after a year, they are still not allowed to travel at free-range. Individuals in the program generally live independently or in a group home rather than with family members. Orr asked if there is a statistic on how many have re-offended and Serwa said three have re-offended since the inception of the program in the early 2000s. Discussion continued as to areas such as summer camps and it was decided this item will be left until a situation arises when this needs to be considered.

**Reports** – There were none.

**Correspondence** – There was none.

**Announcements** – There were none.

**Next meeting date and time:** The next meeting will be held on an as-needed basis in Room 114 of the Walworth County Government Center.

### **Adjournment**

**On motion by Vice Chair Cotter, seconded by Orr, Chair Aldred adjourned the meeting at 2:41 p.m.**

---

Submitted by Betsy Stanek, Administrative Clerk II. Meeting minutes are not considered final until approved at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

FILED  
06-14-2021  
Walworth County  
Clerk of Circuit Court  
2019CI000001

DATE SIGNED: June 14, 2021

Electronically signed by David M. Reddy  
Circuit Court Judge

**STATE OF WISCONSIN, CIRCUIT COURT, WALWORTH COUNTY**

State of Wisconsin, Petitioner

Amended

-vs-

ANTHONY TEIFKE  
Respondent's Name

06-27-1991  
Date of Birth

**Order for Supervised Release Plan  
 and Community Placement Report**

Case No. 2019 CI 01

The respondent filed a Petition for Supervised Release.

- A hearing on the request for supervised release was held on [Date] \_\_\_\_\_, or
- Upon stipulation of the parties.

**THE COURT FINDS:**

- 1. The respondent has proven by clear and convincing evidence all of the following:
  - The person is making significant progress in treatment and the person's progress can be sustained while on supervised release.
  - It is substantially probable that the person will not engage in an act of sexual violence while on supervised release.
  - Treatment that meets the person's needs and a qualified provider of the treatment are reasonably available.
  - The person can be reasonably expected to comply with his or her treatment requirements and with all of his or her conditions or rules of supervised release that are imposed by the court or by the department.
  - A reasonable level of resources can provide for the level of residential placement, supervision, and ongoing treatment needs that are required for the safe management of the person while on supervised release.
- 2. The Supervised Release Plan previously submitted is inadequate because
  - the treatment options in the Plan do not meet the treatment needs of the individual.
  - the residential option in the Plan does not meet the safety needs of the community. The respondent's county of residence is to identify and arrange another residential option and prepare a new community placement report.
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The court directs the Department of Health Services to submit another Supervised Release Plan for court review.

**THE COURT ORDERS:**

- 1. A report identifying an appropriate residential option for community placement be prepared by the county of the respondent's residence as determined by the Department of Health Services. The county shall submit its report to the Department of Health Services within 120 days of the date of this Order.
- 2. The Department of Health Services shall submit a supervised release plan to the court within 30 days after the county submitted its report to the department.

3. The supervised release plan shall include the residential option the county identified in its report. The plan shall also address:
- The respondent's mental history and present mental condition.
  - The respondent's need, if any, for supervision, counseling, medication, community support services, residential services, vocational services, and alcohol or other drug abuse treatment.
  - The treatment and services, if any, that the respondent will receive in the community.
  - Who will be responsible for providing the treatment and services.
  - The arrangements available to ensure that the respondent will participate in necessary treatment.
  - The respondent's need for pharmacological treatment using an antiandrogen or the chemical equivalent.
  - How the respondent will support him/herself.
  - The distance between the respondent's placement and any school premises, child care facility, public park, place of worship or youth center.
  - If the person committed a sexually violent offense against an adult at risk or an older adult at risk, the distance between the respondent's placement and a nursing home or an assisted living facility.
  - If the person is a serious child sex offender, the distance between the respondent's placement and a property where a child's primary residence exists.
4. The sheriff shall transport the respondent to and from the secure facility designated by the Department of Health Services for the purpose of the supervised release hearing.
5. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**THIS IS A FINAL ORDER FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPEAL.**

DISTRIBUTION:

1. Court
2. Attorney for the county or state (whichever applicable)
3. Defense Attorney
4. Department of Health Services (Institution)
5. Department of Corrections
6. §51.42 Board (county of residence)
7. Sheriff (county of residence)
8. Municipal police department
9. Other: \_\_\_\_\_