



**STATE BAR OF WISCONSIN**

*Your Practice. Our Purpose.™*

January 9, 2012

Wisconsin Supreme Court  
110 East Main Street, Suite 215  
P.O. Box 1688  
Madison, WI 53701-1688

RE: Estimated Budget for Proposed SCR 10.10 Committee

Dear Honorable Justices:

I have reviewed the attached cost estimate previously provided to the court for the appointment of a review committee under SCR 10.10. I would like to bring to the court's attention that, of the estimated expenditures, only \$11,330 for items such as catering, postage, printing, court reporter, communication expenses and travel would be new, unplanned expenditures. The remainder of the estimate, or \$70,750 for allocated personnel and overhead, comprise resources that would be shifted from other duties and would not be an actual increase in expenditures for the State Bar.

It has been almost three decades since the last appointment of such a committee, and I am satisfied that another review is justified and would render usable data that would enable the State Bar of Wisconsin to better perform its public functions. Therefore, I support the establishment of a review committee under SCR 10.10.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "James M. Brennan".

James M Brennan  
President

Cc: Julie Rich  
Carrie Janto  
John Voelker

### Summary of State Bar Response to Court Inquiry in re 11-04 (Voluntary Bar)

On December 13, 2011, State Bar of Wisconsin Executive Director George Brown provided information that was requested by the court at the December 5, 2011 open conference. The court asked the State Bar: (1) whether other states have some performance review like SCR 10.10, and (2) to provide a cost estimate for commission appointed pursuant to SCR 10.10, as proposed by the Chief Justice at the previous two prior open conferences.

Other States. In addition to Wisconsin, six of the 33 mandatory bars have some sort of performance review system in place by their appointing authority: Alabama, Alaska, Mississippi, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia. Texas and Virginia are state agencies and they appear to be subject to the same sort of audit process as do Wisconsin state agencies. Texas, in particular, goes through what they call "sunset" every twelve years, as does every state agency, where they spend most of their year justifying their existence. Not included is California, for example, which is mandatory by dint of their legislature and whose budget must be approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor. The State Bar will supplement this response as it receives more information from other entities.

Cost Estimate: The following cost estimate is predicated on a committee with ten members meeting six times over the course of one fiscal year. The estimate assumes all meetings will be held at the State Bar Center so it does not include any extraordinary costs for staff travel, room rentals, etc. The estimate does not include s per diem for commission members.

Catering @ \$12 per person	\$720
AV	\$0
Space Rental	\$0
Postage	\$200
Printing	\$100
Prof Service - Reporter	\$3,000
Conference Calls @ \$40 each mtg	\$240
List Serve	\$170
Vol Mileage @ \$90 per person	\$5,400
Vol Travel for 1/4 of members	\$1,500
	<hr/>
	\$11,330
Allocated Overhead*	\$20,500
Allocated Personnel*	\$50,250
TOTAL	<hr/>
	\$82,080
	<hr/> <hr/>