



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

DIRECTOR OF STATE COURTS

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Patience Drake Roggensack
Chief Justice

16 East State Capitol
Telephone 608-266-6828
Fax 608-267-0980

Hon. Randy R. Koschnick
Director of State Courts

RECEIVED

FEB 14 2018 February 14, 2018

RE: Rule Petition 18-01

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
OF WISCONSIN

Dear Justices of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin,

I write to you in response to the claim contained in Judge Paul Curran's Feb. 6, 2018 letter to the Supreme Court concerning the proposed District 6 realignment that, "No judges in District Six were consulted about this proposal." The claim is incorrect. All chief judges were informed of the proposal at the chief judge meeting which took place at the Judicial Conference on Nov. 14, 2017. They were provided with details including a proposed realignment map and a talking points memo for use in their discussions with other judges. Specifically, I asked them to discuss the proposal with the judges in their respective districts and report any feedback to me at or before the chief judge meeting scheduled for Dec. 8, 2017. I informed them that I would be presenting the proposal to the Chief Justice in January, 2018 including any feedback that had been received from the judges. These historical facts are documented in the chief judge meeting minutes from Nov. 14 (enclosed, see item #6):

<http://courtnet.wicourts.gov/committees/chiefjudges/docs/1117minutes.pdf>.

Based on personal discussions with the Chief Judge for District 6, Greg Potter, I know that the proposal was, in fact, presented to the District 6 judges at their district luncheon on Nov. 15 at the Judicial Conference. Further, several District 6 judges approached me at the conference and shared their opinions. Since then, several District 6 judges have also written directly to the court concerning the proposal, some in favor and some opposed. Also, on Jan. 17, 2018 all Wisconsin judges were notified in writing that a formal petition for District 6 realignment had been filed and that written comments were to be filed with the Supreme Court by Feb. 9, 2018 (enclosed). <https://www.wicourts.gov/supreme/docs/1801intpers.pdf>

I do not write today to debate the merits of the proposal. Rather, I write solely for the purpose of correcting the record as it relates to District 6 judges being consulted about the proposal. If I were to not respond, my silence might reasonably be deemed acquiescence to this incorrect allegation.

Sincerely,

Randy R. Koschnick
Director of State Courts

RRK:saf

Encl.

cc: Judge Paul Curran
Chief Judge Gregory Potter
District Court Administrator Ron Ledford

**COMMITTEE OF CHIEF JUDGES & DISTRICT COURT ADMINISTRATORS
MEETING MINUTES**

November 14, 2017, 1:30 p.m.
Grand Ball Room, Chula Vista Resort
Wisconsin Dells, WI

CHIEF JUDGES PRESENT: Judges Gregory Potter (Chair), District #6; Maxine White, District #1; Jason Rossell, District #2; Jennifer Dorow, District #3; Barbara Key, District #4; James Daley, District #5; Robert VanDeHey, District #7; James Morrison, District #8, Gregory Huber, District #9; and Scott Needham, District #10.

DISTRICT COURT ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT: Holly Szablewski, District #1; Louis Moore, District #2; Michael Neimon, District #3; Jon Bellows, District #4; Theresa Owens, District #5; Ron Ledford, District #6; Pat Brummond, District #7; Thomas Schappa, District #8; Susan Byrnes, District #9; and Don Harper, District #10.

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy Koschnick, Director of State Courts; Sara Ward-Cassady, Deputy Director for Court Operations; Dean Stensberg, Deputy Director for Management Services; Bridget Bauman, Children's Court Improvement Program Director; Diane Fremgen, Clerk of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals; Nancy Rottier, Legislative Liaison; Marcia Vandercook, Office of Court Operations; and Sara Foster, Director of State Courts Office.

1. Approval of August Minutes

The draft minutes from August were approved unanimously.

2. Judicial engagement initiative

Judge Rossell said the judicial engagement initiative began four or five years ago when Casey Family Programs approached Wisconsin judges about an effort to reduce the number of children in foster care by 50 percent. Three counties were chosen for a pilot program: Dane, Kenosha, and Monroe. Casey Family Programs met with over 50 stakeholders in Kenosha County to discuss the issues, examine data, and make a number of changes. The county created the Child Welfare Coordinating Committee, and the outcome has been an over 25 percent reduction in the number of days children spent in foster care.

Kenosha County is also looking in to starting a family drug treatment court. Monroe County has been changing their processes, including providing attorneys for parents. Dane County, under the leadership of Judge Gaylord, has created a system that brought the Department of Children and Families on board as an ally. Dane County had visitation issues that resulted in TPRs, so they enlisted social workers in masters program and churches to host visitations.

The Judicial Committee on Child Welfare will be meeting on November 29 to discuss roll outs in three to six more counties. Judges from Dane, Kenosha, and Monroe Counties will be available to come to prospective counties to convene meetings. Judge Rossell asked for the chief judges'

input on what counties in their districts could benefit or may be interested. They hope to continue to roll this out in other counties until eventually all 72 counties have been included. There is a Judicial Toolkit on Child Welfare available, developed by Casey Family Programs, with information on different programs being used around the country.

Judge Needham echoed Judge Rossell's thoughts that this initiative should expand in small steps instead of a broad roll out. In his district, out of home placements are growing exponentially, and the timeliness of getting children back into the home is critical.

Ms. Bauman said that going forward, the Children's Court Improvement Program (CCIP) will take the place of Casey Family Programs to assist with scheduling and coordinating meetings, child welfare and court data, providing trainings requested by counties, and providing resources. Mr. Brummond said the input from the chief judges is important to find the right locations for moving forward. Mr. Schappa asked if the northern counties would be considered. Judge Needham said it would depend on how far Judges Rossell, Ziegler and Gaylord are willing to travel and how they set up mentoring programs, so the logistics of moving the program to the northern parts of the state still need to be worked out.

Judge Dorow asked if they have looked at the correlation between children involved in family court and in CHIPS situations who are later appearing in juvenile court. She said in her county they are asking social workers to be involved in the visitations. Judge Rossell said Kenosha County has been recruiting area colleges to conduct research and statistical analysis.

Judge Morrison asked about the time and number of stakeholders involved. He said Appleton and Green Bay are already involved in similar programs, but Oconto and Marinette may be interested. Ms. Bauman said smaller counties may only need 10-12 stakeholders involved. Judge Rossell said they will have a meeting with all judges selected to give them a preview and discuss how it would best work in each county.

3. Family Court Commissioner ability to preside over enforcement of property division

Judge Needham said a new family court commissioner in his district had inquired about presiding over property division enforcement hearings after reading the statutes and concluding that commissioners do not have that authority. Judge Needham asked what the general practice has been and whether counties need a consistent approach to this issue.

Ms. Vandercook reviewed a memo that was distributed with the meeting materials. She said that the circuit court commissioner statute, §757.69(1)(p), does not specifically include the power to hear post-judgment enforcement of property division. However, Wisconsin appellate courts in recent years have moved away from a strict interpretation that court commissioners have only those powers specifically enumerated by statute. The circuit court form, "Decision and Order for Contempt," is set up for a court commissioner's signature. But that does not necessarily determine the role of the court commissioner, who might hear the matter and then refer it to a judge for action. Ms. Vandercook surveyed the DCAs, who reported a variation in practice: (1) in some counties these matters do not go before the court commissioners at all; (2) in some counties the family court commissioner can hold the hearing to make fact findings and

recommendations; (3) in some counties the court commissioner will work with the individuals to get them back in to compliance without any formal findings or orders; and in one county the family court commissioner does everything short of sending someone to jail.

Judge Potter asked if the committee wanted to take action on this matter. Judge White said no. No action was taken.

4. Judges serving as both reserve judge and court commissioner

Ms. Vandercook said she had been asked whether a reserve judge can also serve as a court commissioner in the same county. Judge Needham said this could be an issue in single-judge counties and smaller counties where reserve judges are relied on more.

Ms. Vandercook said that this is an issue that has been raised before. There is a common law doctrine called “incompatibility of office” that analyzes the issue by looking at the potential conflicts of sitting in two positions. On that basis the director’s office has advised a sitting circuit court judge cannot also serve as a municipal judge in that county and a sitting clerk of circuit court cannot also be a municipal court clerk in that county. In 2011 a question was added to the reserve judge questionnaire to let chief judges and the chief justice know if a reserve judge has also been appointed as a court commissioner. The director and chief justice stopped short of deciding that a reserve judge could never be a court commissioner, but they felt that it was important for all to be aware. While the practice wasn’t prohibited, it was strongly discouraged.

In 2013 a judge brought the question to the Judicial Conduct Advisory Committee, asking whether he could serve as a reserve judge in one county and a court commissioner in another county. The committee expressed reservations, saying that if there were a change of venue there could potentially be a conflict and advised him to proceed cautiously.

5. Jail for nonpayment subcommittee

Judge White said the subcommittee is continuing to work with the National Center for State Courts on collecting data. She thanked the DCAs for their assistance in getting the surveys completed. The data gathered is now being used to inform the results, with a team working on quantitative analysis and CCAP providing financial and case data. She believes there was enough response to the survey to provide positive understanding of what the court systems is doing in regards to nonpayment and indigency.

Judge White said District 1 has looked at the problem in one municipality that had much higher numbers than other municipalities. With the support of the district attorney and law enforcement organizations, they have met with the municipal judge, city attorney and officials to explain what they see from the numbers, get their input, and provide assistance. They also hope to work with the people who are in the Milwaukee House of Corrections for nonpayment to determine their reasons for not paying fines.

6. District 6 realignment

Ms. Ward-Cassady said she presented the idea of eliminating a judicial district to Judge Koschnick. Currently we have a situation where a chief judge's term is ending, the district's DCA indicated he intended to retire around the time the chief judge's term ended, and the office lease is ending, which raised this as a possibility.

Ms. Ward-Cassady said she wanted to make it clear that this plan is not an attempt to eliminate the DCAs. Her office looked at data showing how fewer than nine districts would impact the ability to administrate the courts, and they found it was not workable with fewer than nine districts. Ms. Ward-Cassady said that since she supervises all the DCAs, she is well aware of what they do and has a good sense of how they interact with everyone around the state. She believes this is the time to reduce the number of DCAs by splitting up District 6 and equalizing the judge ratio from district to district, bringing districts into better alignment. She is aware there is an identity with judges and clerks in District 6 and it was not an easy decision, but it is her obligation to weigh that against the potential efficiencies.

Judge Koschnick reiterated that there is no secret plan to eliminate the DCAs, and he supports Ms. Ward-Cassady's position that nine is the number of districts needed. This will save money to redirect in other areas, such as Judicial Education, CCAP-provided equipment, and a court system data warehouse. Judge Koschnick said he wanted to introduce the idea now and add it to the agenda for the December meeting. He asked the chief judges to speak to the judges in their districts and report back. He will brief Chief Justice Roggensack on it in January.

Judge Potter said one concern is that the timing, along with elimination of per diems for reserve judge education programs, may give the appearance that the court system is trying to fund judicial compensation at the expense of other parts of the system. He also questioned whether the court system would actually operate more efficiently with fewer people doing the same amount of work. Judge Needham also questioned how increasing the workload of the remaining DCAs would increase their efficiency. Ms. Ward-Cassady said she did an analysis of the mileage, and the restructuring does not create greater distance for the DCAs to travel. The DCAs getting extra counties are able to take on workload. She said that although a workload study could be done, as the person who supervises all the DCAs, she believes the service to counties will not be reduced. Judge White asked if there was outline of the rationale for the realignment that the chief judges could use when explaining it to the judges, and Ms. Ward-Cassady offered to write something.

Judge Koschnick asked that concerns be sent to him prior to the December chief judges meeting so he can provide answers at the meeting. Judge Dorow asked if he is affirmatively making a recommendation to the Supreme Court and the chief justice at this point, or if the chief judges will be asked to vote on the recommendation at the December meeting. Judge Koschnick said he would be reporting to Chief Justice Roggensack in January and would like to present the feedback from the chief judges at that time. He said he will not be asking the chief judges to vote on the matter.

7. Updates

a. Making the Record Committee

Ms. Vandercook said the Making the Record Committee was last active 10 years ago. The new committee was created in response to a well-documented decline in the number of qualified stenographic reporters available to the courts. At the first meeting, the committee learned that the number of current court reporters who are close to retirement age is high and the graduation rate for new stenographic court reporters is very low. They discussed expanding the use of digital audio recording (DAR) equipment and greater use of DAR reporters, who need less formal training. The second meeting included a visit to the federal courthouse in Madison to view their blended system of real-time steno court reporters and DAR machines in every court room. The court reporters are not assigned to judges and the judges are not assigned to court rooms, which frees up their resources to move people around according to the type of proceeding. The two court reporters look at the cases scheduled for each week and cover the ones that are most likely to need transcripts; they rely on the digital audio to record the rest.

The DCAs on the committee have talked about the problems in their district, which have resulted in cancelling court, denying vacation time, and scrambling to find coverage. Ms. Vandercook said that several people will be visiting Rockford to see how the digital audio recordings in several courtrooms can be monitored remotely by a single court reporter. The committee will continue to meet in 2018, and one outcome may be adding more DAR machines in more courthouses.

Judge Huber said his court reporter, who is a past president of the Wisconsin Court Reporters Association, told him the association is working to increase supply of court reporters by encouraging more people to pursue the career. Ms. Vandercook said that the stenography program is difficult and has a low pass rate. A DAR reporter position can be filled by someone with a background as a legal secretary or other paraprofessional, which makes it more feasible to find people in tough markets.

Judge White offered her assistance in promoting the advantages of the DAR systems, saying the sound quality is good and they provide relief for court reporter workloads. Judge Rossell asked if Illinois border communities are having similar problems, as he has heard they offer a better compensation package. Ms. Ward-Cassady said it is a national problem. Judge Koschnick said one concern is that if the court system does not resolve the situation itself, the Legislature could step in and mandate a solution that may not be one the court system would choose.

Judge Morrison asked about the cost of setting up a DAR courtroom. Ms. Ward-Cassady said the cost of the DAR system is about \$5,000, with additional costs for installation and maintenance. Judge Rossell noted that during a recent court construction project, the architect at NCSC was surprised that they wanted to include offices for court reporters, since the national trend is to build courtrooms that plan for DAR or a blended system. The price tag for these courtrooms can run \$150,000 to \$200,000 just for audio-visual alone. Mr. Neimon said remote monitoring is where money can be saved and more coverage provided.

Judge Dorow commented that real-time reporting is invaluable. Ms. Ward-Cassady said most people agree that real-time reporting is a very high value profession, but having enough people to take the record in the future is a reality that needs to be addressed.

b. Judicial compensation

Judge Koschnick introduced the committee to Dean Stensberg, the deputy director for Management Services, and Diane Fremgen, who will replace Ms. Ward-Cassady as deputy director for Court Operations on January 2. Mr. Stensberg said the judicial compensation situation has been quiet lately, but work has been going on behind scenes. Chief Justice Roggensack has met with Gov. Walker, members of his staff, and the Department of Administration. The Division of Personnel Management will put together a compensation plan to present to the Joint Committee on Employment Relations. If the joint committee approves the plan, it does not need to be signed by the governor. Mr. Stensberg said they are hopeful that it will be approved by end of this year. The raises will not take effect until June of next year, so there is no urgency to adopt the compensation plan. The reception that Chief Justice Roggensack has received has been favorable on the matter.

Judge Potter asked if success is being defined as a two plus two percent increase or four plus four. Judge Koschnick said they were seeking four plus four percent, or the equivalent, to result in an eight percent raise by the end of two years.

c. Reserve judges

Ms. Ward-Cassady noted that a question has been added to the reserve judge questionnaire regarding their comfort level with technology and their willingness to be trained on technology. Most districts feel strongly that reserve judges need to function in the paperless environment. Ms. Lamb will inform DCAs of the responses to the questionnaire so it can be decided if training will be provided.

Mr. Stensberg addressed the issue of per diem payments no longer being provided to reserve judges when they attend judicial education programs. He distributed copies of the minutes from the January 10, 2014, chief judges meeting, where the chief judges voted unanimously to discontinue the payment of per diems to reserve judges attending judicial education programs. He could not find a record of why the per diems were not discontinued at that time. A cost analysis revealed that in one year approximately \$60,000 in judicial education per diems were paid to reserves who took no cases.

d. eFiling

Judge Koschnick said that a press release was sent out announcing that eFiling is now mandatory in all 72 counties for civil, small claims, family, paternity, criminal, traffic, and ordinance cases. He congratulated CCAP on this huge undertaking, which was completed ahead of schedule and within budget. He thanked the judges and clerk of court staff for their high levels of cooperation. The target date for full implementation of all case types is December 2019.

8. DCA meeting

Mr. Brummond said the DCAs met on October 26 to discuss complaints against interpreters and when the court system should be involved; real-time versus CART services for ADA accommodation needs; and interpreter rates and reimbursements. They talked about the announcement of the Court Security Conference; they encourage judges not to sign up for it until the grant is in place. They also received an update from CCAP about installation of dual monitors, server upgrades, and an email retention plan. Management Services provided an update on the transition to the STAR system, which they hope will not require extensive training. They also discussed the pilot projects in Districts 3 and 5 to create paperless storage for court reporters to retain their notes in a more efficient way.

9. Legislative report

Ms. Rottier distributed a summary of the fall session. She said most of the activity this fall has taken place over the past few weeks, and there are over 60 bills awaiting the governor's signature. Among those is the bill that will give court commissioners authority to issue warrants for first offense OWIs. She also provided a comparison chart for the two competing expungement bills, saying AB 133 has not been considered yet. She said Chief Justice Roggensack has requested that the new judgeship bill proposal be tabled until the judicial compensation issue has been resolved.

Ms. Rottier reported that there will be three special elections in January to replace Rep. Gannon, Rep. Mason and Sen. Harsdorff. Sen. Harsdorff had been the lead author of the judgeship bill. She said there are two bill drafts circulating relating to criminal justice transparency. One requires that the Director of State Courts ensure that CCAP has a searchable form related to criminal matters. Ms. Ward-Cassady said most of the items required by the bill are already searchable on CCAP. The only item listed that is not currently searchable is the ability to search by penalty.

Ms. Rottier said she would be providing a longer summary of legislation the following week. There have been rumors that the Legislature will have limited floor days in the coming months.

Judge Dorow asked if there has been any movement on a bill related to mandatory bail. Ms. Rottier there was an informational hearing in October before the Senate Judiciary and Public Safety Committee where the issue of bail was raised and where multiple members of the state CJCC presented an update on EBDM. Later, a bill was introduced that would require Department of Corrections to make a mandatory recommendation for revocation in every case in which a person on probation, supervision or parole was charged with a new crime. DOC provided a fiscal estimate of \$150 million per year. The bill was then amended to only include felonies or violent crimes.

Judge White asked about the crime victims' rights constitutional amendment. Ms. Rottier said it passed in both houses, so now it will need to pass in identical form in the next session.

10. Other business

Judge Potter brought up the issue of journalist Eric Litke reporting on a survey he sent to attorneys requesting their feedback on judges. Judge White said that Judge Kremers sent a note to Mr. Litke evaluating his methodology, and she offered to share what he wrote. Ms. Ward-Cassady pointed out that Mr. Litke wrote a similar article three years ago that did not receive much notice. It was suggested by the committee that the Director respond on behalf of all the judges. The chief judges agreed to speak to the judges in their districts during the conference and see if there could be consensus. Judge Needham moved that Judge Koschnick draft a response to send out if consensus was reached. Judge Morrison seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. [Note: a response was sent by Judge Koschnick to Mark Treinen, news director at Gannett Media, on November 22.]

With all matters being discussed, the meeting was adjourned.



Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF COURT COMMISSIONERS

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 440

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53703

Nancy A. Kopp
Julie A. Rich
David W. Rumke
Mark A. Neuser
Commissioners

Telephone (608) 266-7442

January 17, 2018

To: Interested Persons – See Attached List

Re: Rule Petition 18-01, Judicial Administrative Districts

Greetings:

I am assisting the Wisconsin Supreme Court with its consideration of rule petition 18-01 filed January 9, 2018, by Judge Randy R. Koschnick, Director of State Courts. The petition proposes certain changes to the Wisconsin Statutes and Supreme Court Rules in order to eliminate the sixth judicial administrative district and redistribute the counties that presently constitute the sixth judicial administrative district. This will entail repealing sections Wis. Stat. §§ 753.06 (6) (title) and 757.60 (6), and Supreme Court Rule 70.17(6), amending Wis. Stat. §§ 13.525 (1) (e), 757.60 (3), (4), (5), (7), and (9), amending Supreme Court Rules 70.17(3), (4), (5), (7), and (9), and renumbering Wis. Stat. §§ 753.06 (3) (a), (5) (a), (6) (a) to (k), and (7) (a). This proposal is intended to reduce overall administrative costs and increase the efficiency of the judicial system. A copy of the petition can be found on the court's website at <https://wicourts.gov/scrules/pending.htm>.

At the closed rules conference on January 16, 2018, the court conducted a preliminary discussion of this matter and voted to obtain written comments. The court will decide whether to conduct a public hearing on this petition after reviewing the written comments it receives. Please note, the court may take any action on a rule petition it deems appropriate, including any of the following:

- (a) Adopt the rule proposed, or a modified version, without further comment.
- (b) Reject the rule proposed without further comment.
- (c) Schedule the rule petition for public hearing.
- (d) Refer the rule petition to another entity for its review and recommendation.
- (e) Request further information or analysis from the petitioner or interested persons or entities.

Any comment to the rule petition should be filed by February 9, 2018, with the Clerk of Supreme Court, Attention: Deputy Clerk-Rules, P.O. Box 1688, Madison, WI 53701-1688. If possible, email a Microsoft Word version of your response to clerk@wicourts.gov. See comment guidelines at the court's website at <https://wicourts.gov/scrules/petitioncomment.htm>. The petitioner shall file any response to the comments by February 16, 2018.

You might wish to consult the court's website at <https://www.wicourts.gov/scrules/supreme.htm> to follow this rule petition. Court communications on the petition and any written comments filed with the clerk's office will be posted on the website.

If you have specific questions or other comments regarding this matter, please contact me by mail at P.O. Box 1688, Madison, WI 53701-1688, by telephone at 608-261-6642, or by email at julie.rich@wicourts.gov.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Julie Anne Rich

Supreme Court Commissioner

cc: Chief Justice Patience Drake Roggensack
Justice Shirley S. Abrahamson
Justice Ann Walsh Bradley
Justice Annette Kingsland Ziegler
Justice Michael J. Gableman
Justice Rebecca Grassl Bradley
Justice Daniel Kelly
Judge Randy K. Koschnick, Director of State Courts
Diane M. Fremgen, Deputy Director for Court Operations

List of Interested Persons for Supreme Court Rules Matters

Badger State Sheriffs Association, Attention: Executive Director
Board of Bar Examiners
Chief Circuit Court Judges
Christian Gossett, Winnebago County District Attorney
Circuit Court Judges
Court of Appeals, Attention: Chief Staff Attorney
Court of Appeals Judges
Deputy Director for Court Operations, Diane Fremgen
Court Operations, Marcia Vandercook
Court Operations, Peggy Hurley
Court Operations, Ann Olson
Dean Dietrich, Attorney (Wausau)
Diane M. Fremgen, Acting Clerk of Supreme Court
Director of State Courts, Honorable Randy K. Koschnick
Eastern District of Wisconsin Bar Association, Attention: Katy Borowski, Executive Director
Legal Action of Wisconsin
Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee, Attention: Mike Gonring, Executive Director
Marquette Law School, Attention: Joseph D. Kearney
Office of Lawyer Regulation, Attention: Keith Sellen, Director
Office of State Public Defender, Attention: Kelli S. Thompson
Office of State Public Defender, Attention: Jeremy C. Perri
Office of the Attorney General, Attention: Brad D. Schimel
State Bar of Wisconsin, Attention: Larry Martin, Executive Director
State Bar of Wisconsin, Attention: Lisa Roys, Public Affairs Director
State Bar of Wisconsin, Attention: Paul G. Swanson, President
Steven Levine, Attorney
U.W. Law School, Attention: Margaret Raymond
Western District Bar Association of Wisconsin, Attention: Ann Peacock
Wisconsin Asian Bar Association, Attention: Robin Dalton
Wisconsin Association for Justice, Attention: Bryan Roessler, Executive Director
Wisconsin Association of African American Lawyers, Attn: Steven DeVougas
Wisconsin Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, Attention: Peter McKeever
Wisconsin Association of Judicial Court Commissioners, Attention: Susan Schaubel
Wisconsin Bankers Association, Attention: Attorney John Knight
Wisconsin Bankers Association, Attention: Rose Oswalk Poels, CEO
Wisconsin Clerks of Circuit Court Association, Attention: Theresa Russell
Wisconsin Counties Association, Attention: Marcie Rainbolt
Wisconsin Defense Counsel, Attention: Jane Svinicki, Executive Director
Wisconsin District Attorneys Association, Attention: Greta Mattison, Executive Director
Wisconsin Family Court Commissioners Association, Attention: David Pruhs, Exec. Secretary
Wisconsin Hispanic Lawyers Association, Attention: Cain W. Oulahan
Wisconsin Judicare, Inc., Attention: Kimberly Haas, Executive Director
Wisconsin Judicial Commission, Attention: Jeremiah VanHecke
Wisconsin Judicial Council, Attention: Thomas W. Bertz
Wisconsin Juvenile Court Clerks Association, Attention: Jody J. Bartels
Wisconsin Municipal Judges Association, Attention: Honorable Jason Hanson
Wisconsin Newspaper Association, Attention: Beth Bennett, Executive Director
Wisconsin Registers in Probate Association, Attention: Julie Kayartz
Wisconsin Sheriff & Deputy Sheriff Association, Attention: David Graves, Exec. Director
Wisconsin State Attorneys Association, Attention: John Gelhard

Wisconsin Trial Judges Association, Attention: Honorable Mary M. Kuhnmuench
Wisconsin Tribal Judges Association, Attention: Eugene White-Fish, President

List of Additional Interested Persons

Holly Szablewski, DCA, District I
Louis Moore, DCA, District II
Michael Neimon, DCA, District III
Jon Bellows, DCA, District IV
Theresa Owens, DCA, District V
Ronald Ledford, DCA, District VI
Patrick Brummond, DCA, District VII
Thomas Schappa, DCA, District VIII
Susan Byrnes, DCA, District IX
Donald Harper, DCA, District X