

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING OF
THE NEBRASKA JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
AUGUST 14, 2026**

Pursuant to the press release issued July 31, 2026, the public hearing of the Nebraska Judicial Resources Commission was held on the 14th day of August 2026, in the Nebraska Supreme Court Courtroom, State Capitol Building, in Lincoln, Nebraska.

AGENDA ITEM I: The Chair called the proceedings to order at approximately 10 a.m. The proceedings included a Zoom videoconferencing option for Commission members. Roll Call by Ashley Jenkins.

PRESENT (* denotes Zoom attendance)

Justice John R. Freudenberg
Judge Travis O’Gorman*
Judge Anne Paine*
Judge Matthew Kahler*
Jane Langan Mach
Kenneth Hartman
Meagan Spomer*
Jacqueline Tessendorf*
Darlene Starman
Nancy McCabe
Cydnianne Hall*
Maria Whitmore*
Brian Phares*
Taylor Gage

EXCUSED

Ron Temple
Robert Parker
Roxanne Kracl

AGENDA ITEM II: The Chair confirmed that all Commission members had received and reviewed the minutes from the May 1, 2026, hearing. It was moved by Jane Langan Mach and seconded by Darlene Starman to approve the minutes. On a voice vote the commissioners unanimously accepted the minutes of May 1st.

AGENDA ITEM III: The following exhibits were received and considered by the Commission, and are attached to these minutes:

Exhibit 1: Hearing Agenda

Exhibit 2: Minutes of the May 1, 2026, hearing

- Exhibit 3: Press release dated April 16, 2026, from Governor Pillen appointing Judge Michael E. Piccolo, District Court Judge, 11th Judicial District, as Court of Appeals Judge, 6th Judicial District
- Exhibit 4: District Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 5: Letter from Hon. John M. Gerrard, NSBA President, dated July 28, 2026, re: NSBA Judicial Resources Committee recommendation


AGENDA ITEM IV: The public hearing was conducted, and the Commission received and considered public testimony from: Judge Patrick M. Heng, 11th District, District Court; Corey Steel, State Court Administrator, and Liz Neely, Executive Director of the Nebraska State Bar Association.

(a): It was moved by Jane Langan Mach and seconded by Taylor Gage to declare a judicial vacancy in the District Court, 11th Judicial District, due to the appointment of Judge Michael E. Piccolo to the Court of Appeals, with the primary location being North Platte, Lincoln County, Nebraska. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM V: The Chair noted that the next public hearing of the Judicial Resources Commission will be held on Friday, November 13, 2026, at 10:00am (CDT).

AGENDA ITEM VI: Under other matters, commission member, Maria Whitmore, requested that the Judicial Resources Commission members be advised of the Nebraska Supreme Court Annual Summer Tour dates moving forward. Commission member, Darlene Starman, followed up to determine the status of the county court vacancy in the 12th Judicial District in Scotts Bluff, and was informed that the vacancy has been filled. There being no other matters, the Commission adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Freudenberg", written in a cursive style.

Justice John R. Freudenberg
Chair

JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION HEARING
Friday, August 14, 2026 – 10 a.m. CST

Exhibit List

This exhibit list is updated as of July 31, 2026, and will continue to be updated as more information is received.

- Exhibit 1: Hearing Agenda
- Exhibit 2: Minutes of the May 1, 2026, hearing
- Exhibit 3: Press release dated April 16, 2026, from Governor Pillen appointing Judge Michael E. Piccolo, District Court Judge, 11th Judicial District, as Court of Appeals Judge, 6th Judicial District
- Exhibit 4: District Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 5: Letter from Hon. John M. Gerrard, NSBA President, dated July 28, 2026, re: NSBA Judicial Resources Committee recommendation

**HEARING AGENDA
JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
Friday, August 14, 2026 – 10 a.m. CDT
Supreme Court Courtroom, State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska**

- I. Call meeting to order; roll call of members.
- II. Approve minutes from JRC meeting held May 1, 2025.
- III. Identify/receive exhibits to be considered by commission during public hearing.
- IV. Conduct public hearing^s concerning the following:
 - a. Whether a judicial vacancy exists in the office of the District Court, 11th Judicial District, due to the appointment of Judge Michael E. Piccolo to the Court of Appeals, and if so, whether to recommend a primary office location.
- V. Adjourn

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING OF
THE NEBRASKA JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
MAY 1, 2026**

Pursuant to the press release issued April 23, 2026, the public hearing of the Nebraska Judicial Resources Commission was held on the 1st day of May 2026, in the Nebraska Supreme Court Courtroom, State Capitol Building, in Lincoln, Nebraska.

AGENDA ITEM I: The Chair called the proceedings to order at approximately 10 a.m. The proceedings included a Zoom videoconferencing option for Commission members. Roll Call by Ashley Jenkins.

PRESENT (* denotes Zoom attendance)

Justice John R. Freudenberg
Judge Travis O’Gorman*
Judge Matthew Kahler*
Jane Langan Mach
Kenneth Hartman
Meagan Spomer*
Jacqueline Tessendorf*
Robert Parker*
Darlene Starman
Nancy McCabe*
Cydnianna Hall*
Maria Whitmore*
Taylor Gage

EXCUSED

Judge Anne Paine
Ron Temple
Roxanne Kracl
Brian Phares

AGENDA ITEM II: The Chair confirmed that all Commission members had received and reviewed the minutes from the February 13, 2026, hearing. On a voice vote the commissioners unanimously accepted the minutes of February 13th.

AGENDA ITEM III: The following exhibits were received and considered by the Commission, and are attached to these minutes:

Exhibit 1: Meeting Agenda

- Exhibit 2: Minutes of the February 13, 2026, hearing
- Exhibit 3: County Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 4: District Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 5: 2021-2026 Judicial Vacancies Data
- Exhibit 6: NSBA Report - Listening Sessions on the Declining Rural Lawyer Population
- Exhibit 7: Number of active members of the bar in each judicial district
- Exhibit 8: Article: The Shrinking Judicial Applicant Pool by Hon. John M. Gerrard.
- Exhibit 9: Maps – Attorneys per county in Nebraska

***Exhibits 8 and 9 received at hearing*

AGENDA ITEM IV: The public hearing was conducted, and the Commission received and considered public testimony from: Chief Justice Funke and Liz Neeley concerning current issues involving judicial vacancies.

AGENDA ITEM V: The Chair noted that the next public hearing of the Judicial Resources Commission will be held on Friday, August 14, 2026, at 10:00am (CST). There being no other matters, the Commission adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:



Justice John R. Freudentberg
Chair

JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION HEARING
Friday, May 1, 2026 – 10 a.m. CST

Exhibit List

This exhibit list is updated as of May 1, 2026.

- Exhibit 1: Meeting Agenda
- Exhibit 2: Minutes of the February 13, 2026, hearing
- Exhibit 3: County Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 4: District Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 5: 2021-2026 Judicial Vacancies Data
- Exhibit 6: NSBA Report - Listening Sessions on the Declining Rural Lawyer Population
- Exhibit 7: Number of active members of the bar in each judicial district
- Exhibit 8: Article: The Shrinking Judicial Applicant Pool by Hon. John M. Gerrard.
- Exhibit 9: Maps – Attorneys per county in Nebraska

****Exhibit 8 and 9 received at hearing**

HEARING AGENDA
JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
Friday, May 1, 2026 – 10 a.m. CST
Supreme Court Courtroom, State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska

- I. Call meeting to order; roll call of members.
- II. Approve minutes from JRC meeting held February 13, 2026.
- III. Identify/receive exhibits to be considered by commission during public hearing.
- IV. Conduct public hearing concerning the following:
 - a. Chief Justice Funke presentation/discussion concerning judicial vacancies.
- V. Adjourn

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING OF
THE NEBRASKA JUDICIAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 13, 2026**

Pursuant to the press release issued January 30, 2026, the public hearing of the Nebraska Judicial Resources Commission was held on the 13th day of February 2026, in the Nebraska Supreme Court Courtroom, State Capitol Building, in Lincoln, Nebraska.

AGENDA ITEM I: The Chair called the proceedings to order at approximately 10 a.m. The proceedings included a Zoom videoconferencing option for Commission members. Roll Call by Ashley Jenkins.

PRESENT (* denotes Zoom attendance)

Justice John R. Freudenberg
Judge Travis O'Gorman*
Judge Anne Paine*
Judge Matthew Kahler*
Kenneth Hartman
Ron Temple*
Jacqueline Tessendorf*
Robert Parker*
Darlene Starman
Nancy McCabe
Roxanne Kracl*
Maria Whitmore*
Brian Phares*
Taylor Gage

EXCUSED

Jane Langan Mach
Meagan Spomer
Cydnianne Hall

AGENDA ITEM II: The Chair confirmed that all Commission members had received and reviewed the minutes from the November 21, 2025, hearing. On a voice vote the commissioners unanimously accepted the minutes of November 21st.

AGENDA ITEM III: The following exhibits were received and considered by the Commission, and are attached to these minutes:

- Exhibit 1: Meeting Agenda
- Exhibit 2: Minutes of the November 21, 2025, hearing
- Exhibit 3: Retirement letter from Judge Jodi L. Nelson, District Court Judge, 3rd Judicial District, dated December 4, 2025
- Exhibit 4: Press release from Governor Pillen appointing Judge Derek R. Vaughn, District Court Judge, 4th Judicial District, as Associate Supreme Court Justice dated November 10, 2025
- Exhibit 5: Retirement letter from Judge Donna Farrell Taylor, County Court Judge, 7th Judicial District, dated January 16, 2026
- Exhibit 6: Resignation letter from Judge Arthur S. Wetzel, County Court Judge, 9th Judicial District, dated October 2, 2025
- Exhibit 7: Retirement letter from Judge James M. Worden, County Court Judge, 12th Judicial District, dated November 21, 2025
- Exhibit 8: County Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 9: District Courts Weighted Caseload Report Fiscal Year 2025
- Exhibit 10: Letter from Judge LeAnne M. Srb dated November 10, 2025, re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 4th Judicial District, District Court
- Exhibit 11: Letter from Judge Alfred E. Corey, III, dated January 30, 2026, re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 9th Judicial District, County Court
- Exhibit 12: Letter from Hon. John M. Gerrard, NSBA President, dated February 9, 2026, re: NSBA Judicial Resources Committee recommendations
- Exhibit 13: Letter from Judge James M. Worden dated February 2, 2026, re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 12th Judicial District, County Court
- Exhibit 14: Letter from Judge Aaron J. Conn dated February 10, 2026, re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 12th Judicial District, County Court

- Exhibit 15: Letter from Vicky A. Kenney (undated) re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 9th Judicial District, County Court
- Exhibit 16: Letter from Benjamin W. Shanahan (undated) re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 9th Judicial District, County Court
- Exhibit 17: Letter from Marty Klein dated February 12, 2026, re: request to declare judicial vacancy – 9th Judicial District, County Court

AGENDA ITEM IV: The public hearing was conducted, and the Commission received and considered public testimony from: Judge Bryan S. McQuay, 9th District, County Court; Judge Kristen D. Mickey, 12th District, County Court; and Corey Steel, State Court Administrator.

(a): It was moved by Brian Phares and seconded by Darlene Starman to declare a judicial vacancy in the District Court, 3rd Judicial District, due to the retirement of Judge Jodi L. Nelson, with the primary location being Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

(b): It was moved by Ken Hartman and seconded by Nancy McCabe to declare a judicial vacancy in the District Court, 4th Judicial District, due to the appointment of Judge Derek R. Vaughn to the Supreme Court, with the primary location being Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

(c) It was moved by Ron Temple and seconded by Taylor Gage to declare a judicial vacancy in the County Court, 7th Judicial District, due to the retirement of Judge Donna Farrell Taylor, with the primary location to be determined in consultation with the successful applicant. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.


(d) It was moved by Maria Whitmore and seconded by Darlene Starman to declare a judicial vacancy in the County Court, 9th Judicial District, due to the resignation of Judge Arthur S. Wetzels, with the primary location being Grand Island, Hall County, Nebraska. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

(e) It was moved by Maria Whitmore and seconded by Judge Anne Paine to declare a judicial vacancy in the County Court, 12th Judicial District, due to the retirement of Judge James M. Worden, with the primary location being Gering, Scotts Bluff County, Nebraska. On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM V: The Chair noted that the next public hearing of the Judicial Resources Commission will be held on Friday, May 1, 2026, at 10:00am (CST).

AGENDA ITEM VI: There being no other matters, the Commission adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John R. Freudenberg", written in a cursive style.

Justice John R. Freudenberg
Chair

NEBRASKA JUDICIAL BRANCH

County Courts

Weighted Caseload Report



Fiscal Year 2025

July 1, 2024, to
June 30, 2025



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
State Map – Nebraska County Court Judicial Need	2
1 st Judicial District	3
2 nd Judicial District	4
3 rd Judicial District.....	5
4 th Judicial District.....	6
5 th Judicial District.....	7
6 th Judicial District.....	8
7 th Judicial District.....	9
8 th Judicial District.....	10
9 th Judicial District.....	11
10 th Judicial District	12
11 th Judicial District.....	13
12 th Judicial District	14
Court Case Type Categories and Weights - Appendix.....	15

Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska County Courts Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska has a district court in each of its 93 counties, organized into 12 Judicial Districts. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-301.02, the Legislature determines the number of district court judges who serve in each judicial district, and the geographic boundaries of each judicial district. An objective assessment of judicial workload allows informed decisions about district boundaries and the number of judges needed to timely resolve the cases in each judicial district.

To assist in evaluating judicial workloads, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-1007(1) requires the Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOC) to compile judicial workload statistics based on caseloads weighted by category of case. These weighted caseload statistics are used by the Judicial Branch, the Judicial Resources Commission, and the Legislature to evaluate judicial need, and guide decisions and recommendations on how best to allocate judicial resources across the state.

To ensure the validity, uniformity and accuracy of the AOC's judicial workload statistics, a statewide judicial time study was conducted in 2019-2020 under the direction and leadership of the National Center for State Courts. For a full description of the judicial time study and the recommended weighting methodology and standards, see *Nebraska Judicial Workload Assessment Final Report* (October 2020) (this is noted on tables in this report with an asterisk) on the Nebraska Supreme Court Website. Because this Weighted Caseload Report uses the methodology and standards from the 2020 workload assessment, direct comparison to archived reports is not recommended.

Weighted caseload statistics approximate the number of judges a district needs to handle the current caseload based upon the calculations of a three-year rolling average of case filing data. Therefore, when weighted caseload statistics are examined in conjunction with other compelling and critical metrics, they provide a vital part of an objective and standardized assessment of judicial needs and the fair allocation of judicial resources across juvenile courts in the State of Nebraska.



Corey R. Steel

Nebraska State Court Administrator

Nebraska Supreme Court

Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation


Rm. 1211 State Capitol | P.O. Box 98910 | Lincoln, NE 68509

T 402.471.3730 | F 402.471.2197

www.supremecourt.nebraska.gov

Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska County Court Judicial Needs Fiscal Year 2025 (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025)



Note: Differences between the total District Court Need for Judges and the sum of individual counties is due to rounding to the nearest one-hundredth.

Weighted Caseload Report

1st Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 2.48

Current number of judges: 3


Workload per judge: 0.83

NOTE: An additional 0.01 is given due to Judge R. Smith being assigned to Problem-Solving Court cases in Fillmore County (District Court) and Otoe County (District Court).


Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 1st District

L. Bauer
Gaertig
R. Smith



County Court Judicial District 1
Total Workload Minutes
Sum (cases x weight)



13 of 74

Weighted Caseload Report



2nd Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 4.11
 Current number of judges: 4
 Workload per judge: 1.03

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 2nd District

Freeman
 Hutton
 Palm
 Partsch



Weighted Caseload Report



3rd Judicial District –County Court

County court need for judges: 6.44
Current number of judges: 7
Workload per judge: 0.92

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 3rd District

Acton
Dalton
Parsley
Phillips
Reuter
Yardley
Zimmerman



Weighted Caseload Report



4th Judicial District –County Court

County court need for judges: 11.11
 Current number of judges: 12
 Workload per judge: 0.93

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 4th District

Finley
 Forsberg
 Hansen
 Harmon
 Hendrix
 Huber
 Keim
 Kleine (Marcuzzo)
 Lohaus
 McDermott
 Mosby (Lowe)
 Shearer




Weighted Caseload Report

5th Judicial District - County Court

County court need for judges: 4.57
 Current number of judges: 5
 Workload per judge: 0.91


Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 5th District

Homolka
 Kraci
 Lange
 Petersen
 Twiss

County Court Judicial District 5
 Total Workload Minutes
 Sum (cases x weight)




Weighted Caseload Report

6th Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 3.67
 Current number of judges: 4
 Workload per judge: 0.92


Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 6th District

Barron
 S. Bauer
 Klein
 Matney

County Court Judicial District 6
 Total Workload Minutes
 Sum (cases x weight)




Weighted Caseload Report

7th Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 2.59
 Current number of judges: 3
 Workload per judge: 0.86

Predicted judicial resources need by county




Judges Serving the 7th District

Vacant (Long)

Stoffer

Taylor

County Court Judicial District 7
 Total Workload Minutes
 Sum (cases x weight)




Weighted Caseload Report

8th Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 1.83
 Current number of judges: 3
 Workload per judge: 0.61

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 8th District			
Burdick Orr Schendt			
Cherry 0.20	Keya Paha 0.01	Boyd 0.05	
	Brown 0.10	Rock 0.02	Holt 0.29
	Blaine 0.01	Loup 0.03	Garfield 0.07
	Custer 0.45	Valley 0.14	Greeley 0.05
		Sherman 0.19	Howard 0.21
			Wheeler 0.01




Weighted Caseload Report

9th Judicial District – County Court


County court need for judges: 4.07
Current number of judges: 5
Workload per judge: 0.81

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 9th District

Corey
Jorgensen
McQuay
Rademacher
Wetzel



Weighted Caseload Report

10th Judicial District – County Court


County court need for judges: 2.71
 Current number of judges: 3
 Workload per judge: 0.90

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Phelps 0.37	Kearney 0.19	Adams 1.38	Clay 0.17	Fillmore 0.16
Harlan 0.14	Franklin 0.09	Webster 0.10	Nuckolls 0.11	

Judges Serving the 10th District

Burns
 Mead
 Nelsen-Pacey (Hoeft)




Weighted Caseload Report

11th Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 4.78
 Current number of judges: 5
 Workload per judge: 0.96


Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 11th District

Jay
 Paine
 Roberts-Connick
 Vacant (Steenburg)
 Wightman

County Court Judicial District 11
 Total Workload Minutes
 Sum (cases x weight)




Weighted Caseload Report

12th Judicial District – County Court

County court need for judges: 4.10
 Current number of judges: 5
 Workload per judge: 0.82


Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 12th District

Conn
 Mickey
 Roland
 Wess
 Worden

County Court Judicial District 12 Total Workload Minutes Sum (cases x weight)



Weighted Caseload Report

Court Case Type Categories and Weights – Appendix

District Court Case Types	Case Weight* (minutes)
Problem Solving Court Cases	683
Protection Orders	32
Civil	219
Class I Felony	367
Other Criminal	149
Domestic Relations	97
Appeals	343
Administrative Appeals	540
County Court Case Types	Case Weight* (minutes)
Protection Orders	32
Felony	26
Misdemeanor	23
District Court: Adult Problem-Solving Court	683
Traffic	1
Civil	8
Probate	61
Guardianship/Conservatorship	133
Small Claims	30
Adoption	92
Domestic Relations	97
Juvenile: 3A Children	487
Juvenile: Delinquency	100
Juvenile: Status Offender 3B	37
Juvenile: Mentally Ill and Dangerous 3C	265
Juvenile: Bridge to Independence (B21)	58
Juvenile: Interstate Compact Hearings/Filings	2
Juvenile: Problem-Solving Court Cases	654
Separate Juvenile Court Case Types	Case Weight* (minutes)
Adoption	49
Domestic Relations	26
Juvenile: 3A Children	487
Delinquency	136
Status Offender 3B	54
Mentally Ill and Dangerous 3C	265
Bridge to Independence B21	36
Interstate Compact Hearing/Filings	2
Problem Solving Court Cases	654

25 of 74



Research and Data

**Operations Division
Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation
Chief Standing Bear Justice Administration Building
521 S. 14th Street Suite 300 | Lincoln, NE 68508
T 531.739.8100 | F 402.471.2197**

26 of 74

18 of 18

District Courts

Weighted Caseload Report



Fiscal Year 2025

July 1, 2024, to
June 30, 2025



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
State Map – Nebraska District Court Judicial Need	2
1 st Judicial District	3
2 nd Judicial District	4
3 rd Judicial District.....	5
4 th Judicial District.....	6
5 th Judicial District.....	7
6 th Judicial District.....	8
7 th Judicial District.....	9
8 th Judicial District.....	10
9 th Judicial District.....	11
10 th Judicial District	12
11 th Judicial District.....	13
12 th Judicial District	14
Court Case Type Categories and Weights - Appendix.....	15

Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska District Courts Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska has a district court in each of its 93 counties, organized into 12 Judicial Districts. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-301.02, the Legislature determines the number of district court judges who serve in each judicial district, and the geographic boundaries of each judicial district. An objective assessment of judicial workload allows informed decisions about district boundaries and the number of judges needed to timely resolve the cases in each judicial district.

To assist in evaluating judicial workloads, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-1007(1) requires the Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOC) to compile judicial workload statistics based on caseloads weighted by category of case. These weighted caseload statistics are used by the Judicial Branch, the Judicial Resources Commission, and the Legislature to evaluate judicial need, and guide decisions and recommendations on how best to allocate judicial resources across the state.

To ensure the validity, uniformity and accuracy of the AOC's judicial workload statistics, a statewide judicial time study was conducted in 2019-2020 under the direction and leadership of the National Center for State Courts. For a full description of the judicial time study and the recommended weighting methodology and standards, see *Nebraska Judicial Workload Assessment Final Report* (October 2020) (this is noted on tables in this report with an asterisk) on the Nebraska Supreme Court Website. Because this Weighted Caseload Report uses the methodology and standards from the 2020 workload assessment, direct comparison to archived reports is not recommended.

Weighted caseload statistics approximate the number of judges a district needs to handle the current caseload based upon the calculations of a three-year rolling average of case filing data. Therefore, when weighted caseload statistics are examined in conjunction with other compelling and critical metrics, they provide a vital part of an objective and standardized assessment of judicial needs and the fair allocation of judicial resources across juvenile courts in the State of Nebraska.



Corey R. Steel

Nebraska State Court Administrator

Nebraska Supreme Court

Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation

Rm. 1211 State Capitol | P.O. Box 98910 | Lincoln, NE 68509


T 402.471.3730 | F 402.471.2197

www.supremecourt.nebraska.gov

Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska District Court Judicial Needs

Fiscal Year 2025 (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025)



Note: Differences between the total District Court Need for Judges and the sum of individual counties is due to rounding to the nearest one-hundredth.

Weighted Caseload Report

1st Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 3.11
Current number of judges: 3
Workload per judge: 1.04
Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 1st District

Bergen
Schreiner
J. Smith



District Court Judicial District 1
Total Workload Minutes
Sum (cases x weight)




Weighted Caseload Report

2nd Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 4.81
Current number of judges: 4
Workload per judge: 1.20

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 2nd District

Cox
Martinez
M. Smith
Thompson




Weighted Caseload Report

3rd Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 8.91
 Current number of judges: 8
 Workload per judge: 1.11

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 3rd District

Ideus
 Jacobsen
 Maret
 McManaman
 Mellor
 Nelson
 Post
 Strong



Weighted Caseload Report


4th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 19.16
 Current number of judges: 18
 Workload per judge: 1.06

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 4th District

Alioth
Bataillon
Benson
T. Burns
Derr
Dougherty
Engleman
Keane
Lindberg (Bowie)
Lux
Masteller
Miller Pankonin
Polk
Vacant (Retelsdorf)
Srb
Stratman
Vaughn
Wheelock




Weighted Caseload Report

5th Judicial District - District Court

District court need for judges: 3.67
Current number of judges: 4
Workload per judge: 0.92

Predicted judicial resources need by county




Judges Serving the 5th District

Vacant*

(Judge Doele was sworn in July 17th, 2025 – after caseloads were calculated)

Daugherty
Marroquin
Stecker




Weighted Caseload Report

6th Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 2.39
Current number of judges: 3
Workload per judge: 0.80

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 6th District

Hall
Meisner
Blackman



Weighted Caseload Report


7th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 1.98

Current number of judges: 2

Workload per judge: 0.99


Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 7th District

Long (Johnson)

Kube





Weighted Caseload Report

8th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 1.19
 Current number of judges: 2
 Workload per judge: 0.60

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Weighted Caseload Report

9th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 3.60
Current number of judges: 4
Workload per judge: 0.90

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 9th District

Butler

Lee

Marsh

Ramsey (Carson)



Weighted Caseload Report


10th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 1.98
Current number of judges: 2
Workload per judge: 0.99


Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 10th District

Farquhar
Hoeft



District Court Judicial District 10
Total Workload Minutes
Sum (cases x weight)



Weighted Caseload Report

11th Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 3.69
Current number of judges: 4
Workload per judge: 0.92
Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 11th District

Heng
Vacant (Neher)
Piccolo
Volkmer



District Court Judicial District 11
Total Workload Minutes
Sum (cases x weight)



Weighted Caseload Report



12th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 3.48
 Current number of judges: 4
 Workload per judge: 0.87

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 12th District

Dobrovolny
Miller
O’Gorman
Weimer



Weighted Caseload Report

Court Case Type Categories and Weights – Appendix

District Court Case Types		Case Weight* (minutes)
Problem Solving Court Cases		683
Protection Orders		32
Civil		219
Class I Felony		367
Other Criminal		149
Domestic Relations		97
Appeals		343
Administrative Appeals		540
County Court Case Types		Case Weight* (minutes)
Protection Orders		32
Felony		26
Misdemeanor		23
District Court: Adult Problem-Solving Court		683
Traffic		1
Civil		8
Probate		61
Guardianship/Conservatorship		133
Small Claims		30
Adoption		92
Domestic Relations		97
Juvenile: 3A Children		487
Juvenile: Delinquency		100
Juvenile: Status Offender 3B		37
Juvenile: Mentally Ill and Dangerous 3C		265
Juvenile: Bridge to Independence (B21)		58
Juvenile: Interstate Compact Hearings/Filings		2
Juvenile: Problem-Solving Court Cases		654
Separate Juvenile Court Case Types		Case Weight* (minutes)
Adoption		49
Domestic Relations		26
Juvenile: 3A Children		487
Delinquency		136
Status Offender 3B		54
Mentally Ill and Dangerous 3C		265
Bridge to Independence B21		36
Interstate Compact Hearing/Filings		2
Problem Solving Court Cases		654



Research and Data

Operations Division

Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation

Chief Standing Bear Justice Administration Building

521 S. 14th Street Suite 300 | Lincoln, NE 68508

T 531.739.8100 | F 402.471.2197

44 of 74

2021

Public Hearing Date: Type		
	Total Applied	Total Nominated
01/29/2021: County, 5 th	4	2
01/28/2021: District, 3 rd	4	2
02/17/2021: County, 1 st	4	3
03/25/2021: District, 4 th (Two vacancies)	10	6
07/21/2021: Juvenile, Sarpy	8	3
08/18/2021: District, 4 th	7	5
10/18/2021: District, 9 th	3	2
10/21/2021: District, 4 th (Two vacancies)	7	4
10/26/2021: District, 11 th	6	2
10/27/2021: County, 11 th	3	3
TOTALS	56	32

2022

Public Hearing Date: Type	Total Applied	Total Nominated
01/10/2022: District, 10 th	6	3
03/24/2022: District, 5 th	4	2
04/05/2022: District 1 st	3	3
06/02/2022): District, 4 th (New. LB922 (2022))	3	3
07/20/2022: County, 1 st	3	2
07/20/2022: County, 5 th	4	2
07/28/2022: Juvenile, Sarpy	6	2
08/18/2022: District, 11 th	5	2
08/31/2022: County, 2 nd	7	3
10/27/2022: County, 6 th	7	3
10/27/2022: County, 12 th	4	3
TOTALS	52	28

2023

Public Hearing Date: Type	Total Applied	Total Nominated
02/01/2023: District, 3 rd	3	2
07/07/2023: County, 9 th	6	2
07/27/2023: District, 4 th	7	4
10/26/2023: County, 4 th	7	4
08/09/2023: County, 6 th	7	4
10/26/2023: District, 11 th	2	2
TOTALS	32	18

2024

Public Hearing Date: Type	Total Applied	Total Nominated
03/26/2024: District, 6 th	6	4
03/26/2024: Workers' Comp	4	2
07/16/2025: District, 10 th	5	2
10/04/2024: Supreme, Chief Justice	4	4
10/17/2024: County, 10 th	9	3
12/12/2024: Supreme, 5 th	3	3
TOTALS	31	18

2025

Public Hearing Date: Type	Total Applied	Total Nominated
01/24/2025: District, 9 th	7	2
01/24/2025: County, 4 th	8	5
02/21/2025: County, 4 th	6	4
02/27/2025: District, 4 th	7	4
03/20/2025: Appeals, 4 th	5	3
03/14/2025: District, 7 th	2	0
04/23/2025	3	2
05/16/2025: District, 5 th	6	3
06/03/2025: County, 11 th	3	2
06/02/2025: District, 11 th	3	0
07/22/2025	6	2
09/17/2025: County, 2 nd	7	2
09/24/2025: County, 3 rd	7	4
09/30/2025: District, 4 th	7	4
10/16/2025: Supreme, 2 nd	2	2
10/02/2025: County, 7 th	2	0
11/18/2025	7	3
Totals	88	42

2026

Public Hearing Date: Type	Total Applied	Total Nominated
01/05/2026: District, 7 th	2	2
01/16/2026: County, 5 th	8	5
03/20/2026: County, 9 th	3	2
03/24/2026: District, 4 th	7	4
03/26/2026: County, 7 th	5	4
03/27/2026: Appeals, 6 th	5	2
03/23/2026: District, 3 rd	2	0
05/07/2026	4	<i>Not held yet</i>
03/17/2026: County, 12 th	4	0
04/17/2026	3	0
06/12/2026		
Totals	43	19

Nebraska State Bar Association

Listening Sessions on the Declining Rural Lawyer Population

Introduction

In 2026, the Nebraska State Bar Association (NSBA) convened a series of Rural Listening Sessions to better understand the challenges facing lawyers, courts, and communities in rural Nebraska due to a declining lawyer population. These sessions were designed to gather practitioner-level insights into the declining rural lawyer population and to discuss potential strategies for increasing access to legal services in rural Nebraska. Sessions were held in Nebraska City, Broken Bow, Hastings, Kearney, Norfolk, North Platte, O'Neill, South Sioux City, Beatrice, Columbus and Scottsbluff. Approximately 150 lawyers and judges participated in the listening sessions.

Core Themes and Findings

1. Court-Appointed Work and Compensation

A dominant theme across all sessions was the declining number of lawyers available to take court appointments in criminal and juvenile cases. Many lawyers emphasized that court appointments are essential for training new lawyers, yet the low compensation discourages participation and contributes to burnout among those who remain on appointment lists. While many jurisdictions have recently increased the court-appointment rate, participants consistently reported that current rates are often so significantly below market value that it is a financial burden to take court appointments and that with developments in the areas of electronic/cell phone evidence, immigration consequences, and adolescent brain development, these cases have become more complex.

Many lawyers further observed that County Boards are resistant to increases in court-appointed counsel rates. As a result, some participants questioned whether addressing compensation on a statewide basis by statute, rather than at the county level, would be a more effective approach.

Several sessions raised concerns about the lack of uniformity statewide, including differences in whether mileage and/or drive-time would be reimbursed and whether attorneys can bill for paralegal time related to court appointed cases. When the court appointed counsel rate is already low, instances where judges reduce lawyers' bills without adequate justification, erodes willingness to remain on the list for court appointments. Ethical concerns were also raised regarding review of local court appointed counsel bills by county attorneys in a few jurisdictions, which is currently allowed by statute.

Currently, to be appointed as a Guardian ad Litem (GAL) in Nebraska one is required to complete a 6-hour training and 3 additional CLE hours specific to GAL issues each year thereafter. Some participants indicated that the additional training requirement was a real barrier to having more GALs. Others encouraged the NSBA to offer more CLEs in this area, stating that with few options available, they take the same OnDemand CLE program year after year. In some districts, lawyers believed individuals remained on GAL appointment lists despite not meeting ongoing CLE requirements, while other districts applied stricter standards.

2. Access to Family Law Lawyers

Across rural Nebraska, participants consistently described a significant and growing shortage of lawyers willing to handle family law matters. Particularly contested matters, matters involving custody and situations involving domestic violence. Many communities reported that for family law matters, litigants frequently had to hire lawyers located hours away. Firms reported that if they were able to hire someone willing to do family law or if someone opened a practice to do family law, they would have a full case load upon starting. Participants noted that this shortage has led to higher numbers of self-represented litigants.

3. Hiring, Retention, and Workforce Pipeline

Every session reported persistent challenges with recruiting and retaining lawyers. Participants described interviewing candidates for years without successful hires, losing associates after

significant investments in training, and, in some areas, competing with government offices that offer higher or more stable compensation and benefits.

Housing availability, spousal employment opportunities, and the difficulty of integrating solo practitioners who are not originally from the community were repeatedly identified as barriers. Several sessions also noted a perception that lawyers with personal or family ties to rural Nebraska are the most likely to remain in practice, while new graduates without those connections are more likely to leave. For this reason, participants emphasized encouraging more rural Nebraskans to consider careers in the law as a critical long-term strategy for sustaining the rural legal workforce.

Pipeline and Outreach

The Rural Law Opportunities Program (RLOP) and Kearney Law Opportunities Program (KLOP) were widely viewed as among the most promising efforts to expand the pipeline of future rural lawyers. Early data indicate that more than 70 percent of RLOP/KLOP students who complete law school return to rural Nebraska to practice. Participants discussed ways to strengthen and support the program, including increased promotion, expanded scholarship opportunities, and the availability of additional internship placements for RLOP/KLOP students.

Participants also noted a significant decline in mock trial programs across Nebraska and questioned whether designating mock trial as an official NSAA activity could help encourage broader participation by schools. Sessions highlighted opportunities to leverage existing civic education programs—such as Girls State, Boys State, and County Government Day—to introduce students to the legal profession and the court system. Several participants suggested pairing Nebraska Supreme Court and Court of Appeals traveling oral arguments with attorney panels or educational programming to increase student exposure to legal careers.

Law Clerk Housing

Participants noted that firms reporting greater success with hiring often begin building relationships early through summer law clerkships. Many participants identified the availability of temporary, affordable housing as a significant barrier to hiring summer law clerks, particularly when students are

not from the area or do not have local family connections. Strategies discussed included promoting summer housing options available through universities and colleges located in rural parts of the state. In at least one session, participants noted that a local chamber of commerce provides housing specifically to support recruitment of professionals to the area. Participants suggested that identifying and promoting similar housing opportunities could be a valuable resource for employers seeking to hire summer law clerks.

Expanding the Candidate Pool

Participants observed that many current recruitment efforts focus primarily on attracting new graduates from Creighton University School of Law and the University of Nebraska College of Law. While those efforts were viewed as very important, participants emphasized the need for the Nebraska State Bar Association to build stronger relationships with law schools in neighboring states, particularly to reconnect with students who are originally from Nebraska. Participants also questioned whether additional strategies could be developed to engage lawyers who have been in practice for several years and may be seeking a change, and to encourage those practitioners to consider returning to rural communities.

Incentives

There was uniform and strong support across sessions for expanding student loan repayment assistance as a recruitment and retention tool for legal employers in rural areas. At the urging of the NSBA, legislation was passed in 2026 that expands the number of counties eligible for the program by increasing the population threshold from counties with populations of less than 15,000 residents to counties with populations up to 75,000 residents.

Participants also shared examples of community-based incentives that have supported recruitment efforts in the past. For example, one participant described receiving a \$5,000 relocation incentive to move to North Platte, which was matched by the hiring law firm. Others reported financial incentives that enabled them to purchase buildings for law offices.

The Nebraska Relocation Incentive Act (NRIA), enacted through LB 1023 in 2024, offers refundable tax credits for employers and income tax exclusions for employees who relocate to Nebraska for jobs

paying between \$70,000 and \$250,000, effective January 1, 2025. It aims to attract talent by supporting relocation expenses and offering income tax breaks for up to two years.

Participants suggested that identifying and promoting financial incentives currently available through the state, county economic development offices, and/or chambers of commerce—whether aimed at recruiting professionals to a community or supporting new law firms or satellite offices—could be a valuable resource for lawyers considering rural practice. Participants also recommended exploring the creation of new incentives such as tax incentives, housing stipends, or financial support for hiring law clerks (like what was formerly provided through the Intern Nebraska program which recently lost funding).

4. County Attorney and Public Defender Vacancies

Participants consistently reported persistent vacancies and staffing instability in county attorney and public defender offices, particularly in rural districts. Across several sessions, participants described positions remaining unfilled for extended periods, limited applicant pools, and an increase in counties with no candidates for elections for these positions. In some districts, offices that previously attracted dozens of applicants now receive only a handful of applications when vacancies arise.

These vacancies have significant downstream effects. In multiple communities, unfilled public defender positions have led to increased reliance on court-appointed counsel, placing additional strain on already limited private-practice capacity and increased cost to the county. Understaffed county attorney offices place strain on existing staff and can affect decisions on what cases will be pursued by the office.

Several sessions emphasized the need to revisit statutory frameworks that make it difficult for attorneys to serve multiple counties, negotiate salaries, or structure part-time public service roles alongside private practice. Some sessions perceived the coroner duties associated with county attorney offices as a deterrent for candidates.

Pressure on county budgets means that many county attorney and public defender positions are receiving minimal annual salary increases (1-2%) compared to those in private practice. The Nebraska Association of County Officials salary survey for county attorneys and public defenders is a useful

resource but would be more helpful if it were condensed or summarized in a way to help counties make appropriate comparisons based on size or community and/or staff.

5. Law Schools

Participants expressed concern that Nebraska's law schools are not producing a sufficient number of graduates interested in rural practice. Noting an increase in out-of-state enrollment, several participants commented that law schools should place greater emphasis on recruiting and supporting students who are likely to remain in Nebraska to practice. Participants also described a perception that law school career services offices are primarily focused on placement with metro-area firms, and that law students increasingly expect to specialize in a particular area of practice rather than pursue the generalist model common in rural communities. Many participants expressed a willingness to engage directly with law students and emphasized that rural practitioners should be included on a broad range of law school panels—not only those specifically focused on promoting rural practice.

There was support for exploring hybrid or part-time educational models—such as the University of Denver Sturm College of Law's program—as a way to make legal education more accessible to candidates from rural areas who may be unable or unwilling to relocate for a traditional, full-time program. Interest was also expressed in the concept of a satellite campus, like the University of Nebraska Medical Center offers at the University of Nebraska-Kearney.

Participants also supported developing additional opportunities to expose law students to rural practice through clinical programs and externships. Examples cited included Washburn University School of Law's Third Year Anywhere and Rural Externship Programs, which allow students to immerse themselves in rural practice while earning academic credit and receiving financial support to offset living expenses. The South Dakota Knutson School of Law offers a Tribal Wills Clinic where students spend their spring break consulting with clients and assisting with estate planning on Indian reservations across the state. It also offers a supervised practice experience where students spend a semester working in public sector law offices across the state. Participants viewed these types of programs as effective tools for increasing familiarity with rural practice and strengthening the pipeline of future rural lawyers.

6. Technology and Virtual Hearings

Technology was widely viewed as a double-edged sword. Many participants acknowledged that virtual hearings improve efficiency, reduce travel, and expand geographic coverage, particularly for uncontested matters. At the same time, lawyers raised concerns that virtual hearings may erode professional relationships (with both clients and other lawyers) and make it easier for lawyers from metro-area districts to take work from rural practitioners. Conversely, some rural lawyers noted that they are frequently required to travel to Omaha for routine matters, such as status hearings, that could be more efficiently handled through remote appearances.

There was broad consensus that virtual hearings work well for non-evidentiary matters, and most lawyers and judges reported being comfortable conducting proceedings such as status hearings and bond reviews virtually.

When asked about barriers to virtual hearings, participants reported that some Nebraska judges are unwilling to permit virtual hearings, even for non-evidentiary matters. In addition, participants described recurring connectivity and hardware challenges in certain courthouses. For example, it was reported that there is no cell service in the Frontier County Courthouse and no internet access in the Loup County Courthouse. Technology issues were also routinely reported in Nance County and sometimes Boone County. Participants expressed a perception that challenges in some counties could be mitigated through additional training or technical support for court staff.

Numerous sessions called for uniform statewide rules governing virtual appearances and the use of electronic exhibits. Participants noted inconsistency across districts, with some judges accepting electronic exhibits while others do not, and with varying requirements for filing motions to appear virtually in advance. One participant observed that the primary benefit of requiring an advance motion for a virtual appearance is to determine whether opposing counsel intends to appear in person, noting that some lawyers believe they should also appear in person if opposing counsel does so. Others sought clarity on existing rules. Does "submit to the court" mean the lawyer should send documents to the judge, bailiff or clerk and should opposing counsel be included when submitted?

Lancaster County was frequently cited as a model for replication. In Lancaster County Court, judges maintain a standing "Zoom room," allowing lawyers to appear without advance notice. Participants

perceived this approach as less burdensome for judges and court staff, as it eliminates the need to review motions, distribute links, and manage ad hoc requests. Participants recommended that any uniform rules governing virtual hearings also include guidance on appropriate conduct for both lawyers and self-represented litigants (it was noted that Keith County has a good model where they clearly provide instructions and expectations for appearing virtually).

Participants also discussed whether and how law firms are utilizing artificial intelligence in their practices, and whether AI could enable firms to serve more clients through increased efficiency. A number of participants were hesitant about the use of artificial intelligence, and several reported not using artificial intelligence. Participants noted that, from a cost perspective, artificial intelligence is less accessible to smaller and rural practices. Several participants expressed concern that this disparity could affect rural firms' ability to recruit and retain new lawyers, as smaller practices are less likely to be able to offer the technology tools and resources that recent graduates are increasingly trained to use during law school. Several indicated that this divide needs to be addressed.

7. Judicial Applications and Resources

Participants discussed a decline in the number of applicants for judicial vacancies and noted that recent prior service on a Judicial Nominating Commission had rendered some otherwise qualified candidates ineligible to apply. Participants also questioned why the Judicial Resources Commission (JRC) convenes only quarterly and only after a judicial position has officially been vacated. For example, some asked whether, once a letter of resignation has been received, the JRC could hold a hearing before the position is formally vacant. Alternatively, participants suggested that the JRC could meet more frequently—either in person or through remote technology—to reduce the length of time a jurisdiction is without a permanent judge.

While there was broad appreciation for the willingness of retired judges to provide interim coverage during vacancies, participants noted that reliance on temporary judges can be disruptive to the affected judicial district. This disruption is compounded in situations where a vacancy must be reposted due to an insufficient number of candidates advancing from the nominating process.

8. Regulatory Reform

Across sessions, there was significant interest in regulatory reform. Participants stressed that reforms should maintain professional standards. Participants had questions about whether and how malpractice insurance would be affected if firms employed individuals licensed under any proposed regulatory reforms.

Extending Senior Certified Status

There was support for extending senior certified status for law school graduates who either elect not to take the bar examination immediately after graduation or do not pass the bar exam on their first attempt. Several firms shared examples of having extended employment offers to graduates who did not initially pass the bar exam. Given the ongoing challenges recruiting and retaining lawyers in rural Nebraska, participants viewed extending senior certified status as a practical tool that would allow firms to maintain employment relationships with these graduates while they prepare to take or retake the bar examination.

Bar Admissions

Most sessions included discussion of the NextGen Bar Exam, the concept of adopting a regionalized cut score—intended to reduce the risk of Nebraska losing potential lawyers to neighboring states with lower cut scores—and alternative pathways to bar admission. Across sessions, there was consistent agreement that any reforms related to bar admission should be applied statewide; participants emphasized that there should not be a lower standard to practice law in rural Nebraska.

In discussions of diploma privilege, including diploma privilege paired with a period of supervised practice (often described as an apprenticeship), practitioners noted that the law school curriculum may need to be reevaluated to ensure graduates are adequately prepared for practice. Participants also questioned whether supervised practice requirements could be structured to encourage placements in public interest or rural settings, as a way to expose more graduates to those career paths and help address gaps in rural legal services.

Allied Legal Professionals

Across several rural listening sessions, participants expressed measured but recurring interest in exploring the use of allied legal professionals (ALPs) as one potential tool to improve access to legal

services. Discussions focused on the possibility that ALPs could assist with discrete, high-volume, and uncontested matters, including paternity actions, uncontested divorces, evictions, protection orders, child support enforcement, collections, and uncontested probates. There was also interest in the potential use of ALPs to support court-appointed work, such as assisting with certain guardians ad litem responsibilities. Participants emphasized that any expansion of ALPs should require educational standards, be carefully regulated and require supervision by a licensed Nebraska attorney.

In at least one session, participants discussed pathways for certifying allied legal professionals and emphasized that educational and certification requirements must be accessible to individuals in rural areas. Specifically, participants noted that training should not require individuals to quit their jobs or relocate and suggested that certification programs be offered online or build upon existing rural educational offerings, such as the Chadron Legal Studies program.

Several sessions underscored that ALPs should not be viewed as a replacement for attorneys, but rather as a means of extending legal services capacity under attorney oversight. Participants also emphasized that any ALP framework should be uniform statewide, rather than limited to rural areas.

Allowing Lawyers with Inactive Licenses to do Pro Bono

Participants also discussed the possibility of allowing lawyers with inactive licenses to engage in pro bono work, noting that many states permit this practice. When asked whether there would be interest among retired lawyers, participants suggested that one barrier to participation is the continuing legal education (CLE) requirement associated with active licensure. Participants indicated that interest in pro bono service could increase if CLE obligations for this category of lawyers were reduced and provided at no cost by sponsoring civil legal service providers.

9. Additional Feedback

If you have additional feedback to provide on Nebraska's declining rural lawyer population or would like to become more involved in these efforts, please feel free to contact the Executive Director of the Nebraska State at Lneeley@nebar.com.

Recommendations

Based on the feedback received from its membership, the NSBA's recommendations are below.

Expand the Pipeline of Future Rural Lawyers

- Recommendation 1: Develop a power point presentation for Nebraska lawyers in rural communities to present at local schools about careers in the law, the need for lawyers in rural communities and availability of the RLOP, student loan forgiveness and any other incentives designed to support lawyers practicing in rural communities.
- Recommendation 2: Promote the availability of the Nebraska Lawyers Foundation's LSAT Prep Scholarship for students from underserved rural communities.
- Recommendation 3: Encourage the Nebraska State Bar Foundation to establish mock trial programs in underserved areas of the state and explore other ways to promote law related education into existing civic education opportunities.
- Recommendation 4: Encourage rural colleges and universities to offer a 1 credit Intro to Law course to expose undergraduate students to careers in the law.
- Recommendation 5: Consider how the Nebraska Lawyers Foundation could support the RLOP/KLOP.

Law Schools

- Recommendation 6: Encourage law schools to consider a hybrid option for providing legal education in Nebraska as a means of making a legal education more accessible to rural Nebraska residents.
- Recommendation: 7: Encourage law schools to improve representation of rural lawyers on law school panels.
- Recommendation 8: Encourage law schools to consider clinical models and externship models focused on rural areas of the state.

Support Placement of Summer Interns and Law Clerks in Rural Nebraska

- Recommendation 9: Coordinate and promote summer housing options within state, private and community colleges to provide affordable housing options for summer law clerks in and around those communities.
- Recommendation 10: Explore other opportunities to support housing options within local communities including options that may be available through local Chambers of Commerce and/or County Economic Development Offices.

- Recommendation 11: Support stipends for law students who secure unpaid rural practice positions, particularly in public interest positions.

Support Rural Legal Employers Hiring Efforts

- Recommendation 12: Establish relationships with law schools in neighboring states to better connect candidates, especially those originally from Nebraska, with employment opportunities in rural Nebraska.
- Recommendation 13: Work with the law schools in Nebraska to disseminate resume books of students interested in rural practice by judicial district.
- Recommendation 14: Develop a resource for solo practitioners on the financial considerations for hiring an associate.
- Recommendation 15: Make information, either from the law schools or the NSBA Economic Survey on starting salaries for new associates available so that rural firms are familiar with current salary expectations and educate law firms on the information they should include in job postings to attract potential candidates.
- Recommendation 16: Identify and promote financial incentives currently available through the state, county economic development offices and/or chambers of commerce aimed at recruiting new professionals to rural communities.
- Recommendation 17: Explore the creation of new incentives such as tax incentives, housing support or hiring law clerks (like what was formerly provided through the Intern Nebraska program which recently lost funding).
- Recommendation 18: Examine ways to promote job opportunities to lawyers with several years of practice who may be interested in relocating to a rural area.

Protect and Expand Student Loan Forgiveness

- Recommendation 19: In light of LB 935 (2026), which increased the number of lawyers eligible for student loan repayment assistance by increasing the current population threshold for an underserved rural area (15,000 residents), promote legislation that increases the type and amount of funding available for law student loan repayment.

- Recommendation 20: Consider recommending that the Commission on Public Advocacy amend its Loan Repayment Assistance Fund Rules to provide a preference for loan forgiveness for lawyers who take court appointments or provide family law representation.
- Recommendation 21: Advocate for continuation of the federal Public Student Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program as an important tool for recruiting public interest lawyers to rural areas of the state.

Provide Support for Lawyers Taking Over or Establishing New Firms in Rural Nebraska

- Recommendation 22: Develop a Rural Law Firm Legal Incubator program to provide resources, mentors and training to lawyers taking over or establishing new firms in rural Nebraska.
- Recommendation 23: Establish a mechanism to connect lawyers who would like to transition out of practice with lawyers who may be interested in taking over an existing practice.
- Recommendation 24: Identify and promote financial incentives currently available through the state, county economic development offices and/or chambers of commerce aimed at supporting new law firms or satellite offices.
- Recommendation 25: Explore new financial incentives that can be provided to support new firms or the addition of satellite offices in rural Nebraska.

Fill/Support Public Service Roles in Rural Nebraska.

- Recommendation 26: Work with stakeholders to address the large number of vacancies for county attorney and public defender vacancies by supporting legislation that allows counties more flexibility to improve fair and equitable compensation and benefits for county attorney and public defender positions.
- Recommendation 27: Advocate for adequate court appointed counsel rates and clarity in rules related to billing (e.g., compensation of windshield time, mileage and paralegal time).

- Recommendation 28: The NSBA should improve availability of CLE offerings that qualify for GAL credit.
- Recommendation 29: Ask the Nebraska Supreme Court to reexamine the number and type of CLE hours required for Guardians ad Litem in Nebraska.
- Recommendation 30: Ensure adequate funding for the Commission on Public Advocacy to continue its work in rural Nebraska.
- Recommendation 31: Support funding for civil legal service organizations.

Expand Access to Legal Services through Technology

- Recommendation 32: Provide appropriate expanded statutory authority for virtual hearings and legal proceedings;
- Recommendation 33: Propose uniform rules/procedures related to requesting and conducting virtual hearings and legal proceedings;
- Recommendation 34: Provide training for lawyers and judges regarding the use of technology for conducting virtual hearings, legal proceedings and confidential client consultations; and
- Recommendation 35: Exploring the expanded use of technology, including artificial intelligence, to assist self-represented litigants with successfully completing court forms.

Regulatory Reforms

- Concept 1: Study the extent to which a regionalized/uniform cut score for the bar exam would assist Nebraska employers with attracting applicants from neighboring states and prevent losing potential applicants to neighboring states with varying cut scores;
- Concept 2: Explore alternate pathways to bar admission.
- Concept 3: Develop a pilot proposal to create a licensed and regulated category of Allied Legal Professionals in Nebraska who would be authorized to provide limited legal services in designated areas of the law.
- Concept 4: Explore rule changes that would allow lawyers with inactive law licenses to do pro bono under the supervision of a qualified civil legal services organization.


- Concept 5: Explore alternatives for the provision of GAL services.
- Concept 6: Propose rule changes that would extend senior certified status to 12 months following graduation.

**Active members of the bar (including active judges) in
each of the 12 judicial districts**

District 1:	108
District 2:	521
District 3:	1,250
District 4:	2,697
District 5:	182
District 6:	105
District 7:	82
District 8:	63
District 9:	169
District 10:	75
District 11:	139
District 12:	97

Total: 5,488

The Shrinking Judicial Applicant Pool



Hon. John M. Garrard

A vigorous and engaged practicing bar and a high quality bench are crucial to upholding this state's rule of law and fostering the public's trust and confidence in our system of laws. And a top quality bench requires judicial applicants with a high degree of integrity, impartiality, and competence. The quality of the judiciary is a cornerstone of a healthy democracy, because every judge's decisions affect the fundamental rights and liberties of the citizens they serve.

Over the past 10 years Nebraska has seen a continual decline in the number of lawyers applying for state appellate and trial court judicial vacancies. This trend raises important questions about the factors influencing lawyers' decisions to apply—or not apply—for these vital positions. In partnership with the Nebraska Judicial Branch, the NSBA conducted a survey of its membership to obtain their feedback.

The survey was distributed to all active, licensed lawyers in Nebraska, including judges (5,530), and received 802 responses. Of those 802 respondents, 63.5% (509) reported that they have considered applying for a state appellate or trial court judicial vacancy at some point in their career. Among those who considered applying, 35.15% (155) ultimately applied for a judicial vacancy.

What follows is an initial look at the data. The NSBA and Judicial Branch will take a deeper dive in the next weeks to determine whether changes to the judicial selection process may be helpful.

Motivating and Detering Factors for Lawyers that have Considered Applying

Respondents were asked to identify the factors that influenced their decision to apply and indicate whether each factor had a positive, neutral, or negative impact. The most common positive motivators for applying were: personal fulfillment from serving as a judge (65.12%), level of experience at the time of the vacancy (56.95%) and state benefits and retirement compared to their current position (42.92%). (See Table 1.) These findings suggest that the majority of respondents believe a career as a judge would be personally rewarding, that the lawyers who consider applying felt that they had the experience for the position, and that the Nebraska Judicial Branch provides competitive benefits and retirement.

The most frequently cited deterrents were, "The level of political involvement in the application process" (78.27%), "Whether my political party was the same as the Governor's" (58.15%), "Seeing Judicial Nominating Commissions where qualified candidates did not make it out of Committee" (57.96%), "How it would be perceived by my colleagues or clients if the Judicial Nomination Commission does not find me sufficiently qualified" (40.0%), and "My familiarity with the appointment process" (29.27%). (See Table 2.)

Motivating or Detering Factors for Those Who Have Not Previously Considered Applying for a Judicial Vacancy

For respondents who had not previously considered applying for a judicial vacancy, the survey asked which factors might influence their decision. This group generally expressed less strongly held views, as reflected in the higher percentage of neutral responses across many factors. Overall, their responses were similar to those of respondents who had previously considered applying.

The most common positive motivators were similar to those who had considered a judgeship: "Personal fulfillment from serving as a judge" (37.3%), "State benefits and retirement compared to my current position" (35.91%), and "My ability to earn full retirement benefits (20-year vesting schedule) compared to my current role" (30.59%). (See Table 3.)

The most frequently cited deterrents for future applications are: "The level of political involvement in the application process" (71.28%), "Whether my political party was the same as the Governor's" (60.4%), "Seeing Judicial Nominating

Commissions where qualified candidates did not make it out of Committee" (51.36%), "the need to relocate" (45.41%), "I practice in an area that is not typically selected for judgeships" (42.86%), and "How it would be perceived by my colleagues or clients if the Judicial Nomination Commission does not find me sufficiently qualified" (41.82%). (See Table 4.)

Themes From Open-Ended Responses

The survey also asked respondents for their opinion on what deters more applicants from applying for a judicial vacancy and for their recommendations on how to increase the number of applicants.

Political Affiliation

There is a widely held perception that candidates who do not share the Governor's political party are unlikely to be appointed as judges in Nebraska. Many respondents indicated that this belief is a significant deterrent to applying.

Salary, Benefits and Support

Respondents frequently recommended improving judicial compensation. Many noted that current salary levels may attract candidates committed to public service but are less competitive for those coming from private practice.

Table 1: Motivating Factors for Those Who Have Considered Applying

	Positive Impact	Neutral	Negative Impact	Don't Know	Total
Personal fulfillment from serving as a judge compared to my current or previous role	65.12%	19.82%	7.28%	7.73%	453
My level of experience at the time of the judicial vacancy	56.95%	18.76%	18.32%	5.96%	173
State benefits and retirement compared to my current position	42.92%	31.19%	7.30%	18.58%	452

Table 2: Detering Factors for Those Who Have Considered Applying

	Positive Impact	Neutral	Negative Impact	Don't Know	Total
The level of political involvement in the application process	2.88%	11.09%	78.27%	7.76%	451
Whether my political party was the same as the Governor's	10.79%	19.82%	58.15%	11.23%	454
Seeing Judicial Nominating Commissions where qualified candidates did not make it out of Committee	2.43%	19.03%	57.96%	20.58%	452
How it would be perceived by my colleagues or clients if the Judicial Nomination Commission does not find me sufficiently qualified	1.11%	29.78%	40.00%	29.11%	450
My familiarity with the appointment process	10.67%	33.33%	29.27%	27.94%	450

68 of 74

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

Additionally, respondents suggested that the Judicial Branch should clearly publicize salary details, benefits (such as retirement and health insurance), and onboarding/training opportunities in job announcements to better inform potential applicants.

Several respondents also expressed concern that the current 20-year vesting schedule for retirement discourages lawyers over the age of 45 from applying. Many recommended revisiting the vesting schedule to encourage more experienced attorneys to consider judicial positions.

Qualified Candidates' Names Not Being Forwarded to the Governor

When lawyers who are perceived as being qualified by the practicing bar are not forwarded to the Governor by the Judicial Nominating Commission, it erodes trust in the process and discourages other candidates from applying. Respondents noted variability in how commissions interpret their role—whether to advance all qualified candidates, or only those deemed the highest quality.

Several respondents suggested that clarifying the role of Judicial Nominating Commissions and establishing more objective criteria for determining qualifications could improve consistency and confidence in the process.

Communications about Vacancies and the Application Process

Respondents recommended that notices of open judicial vacancies be published more prominently and more frequently, and some suggested extending the application timeline. Additionally, respondents emphasized the need for improved communication and education about the judicial nominating and application process, including offering CLEs on the topic.

To that end, the NSBA is now offering a CLE titled *Applying for a Judicial Vacancy*, available through the NSBA's OnDemand CLE platform. The seminar materials include valuable feedback from the Governor's Office regarding the Governor's role in the process.



Table 3: Motivating Factors for Those Who Have Not Previously Considered Applying

	Positive Impact	Neutral	Negative Impact	Don't Know	Total
Personal fulfillment from serving as a judge compared to my current or previous role	37.27%	38.64%	17.27%	6.82%	220
State benefits and retirement compared to my current position	35.91%	44.00%	10.00%	9.09%	220
My ability to earn full retirement benefits (20-year vesting schedule) compared to my current role)	30.59%	43.38%	18.26%	7.76%	219

Table 4: Detering Factors for Those Who Have Not Previously Considered Applying

	Positive Impact	Neutral	Negative Impact	Don't Know	Total
The level of political involvement in the application process	1.82%	20.45%	71.28%	5.91%	220
Whether my political party was the same as the Governor's	6.36%	27.27%	60.45%	5.91%	220
Seeing Judicial Nominating Commissions where qualified candidates did not make it out of Committee	1.82%	32.27%	51.36%	14.55%	220
The need to relocate	1.83%	44.95%	45.41%	7.80%	218
I practice in an area that is not typically selected for judgeships	10.71%	38.84%	42.86%	7.59%	224
How it would be perceived by my colleagues or clients if the Judicial Nomination Commission does not find me sufficiently qualified	0.91%	48.48%	41.82%	9.09%	220

69 of 74

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

Residency Requirement

Some respondents expressed a desire for greater flexibility in the residency requirement, suggesting that eligibility could extend to individuals living in an adjacent district or within a specified distance from the home court. As one respondent noted, *"There are judges who live in neighboring districts and would have a shorter commute than if they relocated within their own judicial district."*

Alignment of Practice Areas

There is a widely held perception that historically, governors prefer to appoint prosecutors, and many respondents indicated that this belief significantly discourages lawyers from other practice areas from applying. In point of fact, a number of private practice lawyers have recently been appointed to the bench by the governor; nonetheless, the perception remains.


Relatedly, numerous respondents expressed concern about lawyers with exclusively criminal court experience being appointed to judicial vacancies where more than 70% of the docket consists of domestic relations cases. To address this, several respondents recommended creating specialized dockets or dedicated family court positions. It is thought that these changes may help attract highly qualified family law practitioners and ensure better alignment between judicial experience and case types.

Next Steps

The survey results provide valuable insight into the factors that influence whether Nebraska lawyers apply for judicial vacancies, as well as numerous recommendations for improving the judicial application process.

In the coming months, the NSBA will work with the Judicial Branch to review the data and membership feedback and identify areas for meaningful improvement. I extend my sincere thanks to all who took the time to respond and share their perspectives. Your input is critical to ensuring that Nebraska maintains a fair, transparent, and effective judicial selection process—one that attracts highly qualified candidates and upholds the integrity of our judiciary.

Finally, I'll add a personal note, as a veteran of the judicial appointment process—there's no doubt that applying for a judicial vacancy can be intimidating and even exasperating. But so too is running for elective office, or serving in the executive or legislative branch. Government of every kind is messy and often frustrating—but very little in the practice of law is as satisfying as doing an important job well. And the perception that certain experience or political affiliation is preferred should not become self-fulfilling prophecy. Even simply applying for a position—*participating* in the system—changes the conversation and raises the bar for everyone. So, I encourage *all* well-qualified lawyers to seriously consider a judicial career. If you think this is your calling, don't be afraid to take the leap. The payoff can be extremely rewarding to both you and the State of Nebraska. 



Hon. John M. Gerrard, President
(402) 437-1660
jgerrard@ned.uscourts.gov

2026 Judicial Evaluation Poll

The Nebraska State Bar Association's 2026 Judicial Evaluation Poll will be conducted as an online survey. The poll has been recently updated and is designed to gather lawyers' feedback on key qualities expected of judges, including judicial competence, impartiality, clarity of communication, judicial temperament, and administrative capacity. Your participation is essential. Thoughtful responses provide meaningful feedback to judges, offer valuable information to voters, and help strengthen the judicial system. Aggregate results will also guide future training and resources available to the judiciary. Eligible participants will receive an email with a secure survey link on April 7, 2026. The deadline to complete the survey is May 16, 2026.


70 of 74

Counties with Zero and Counties with Three or Fewer Attorneys



NEBRASKA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
April 2025


Attorneys Per County in Nebraska



Note: These figures include lawyers with active law licenses. Judges are not included.

NEBRASKA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
April 2025


Average Age of Attorneys by County



Note: These figures include lawyers with active law licenses. Judges are not included.

NEBRASKA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
April 2025

Number of Attorneys and Percent Change between 2012 and 2025 by County [n = 93]



Gov. Pillen Appoints Piccolo to Court of Appeals in the Sixth Judicial District

April 16, 2026

CONTACT:

Laura Strimple, (402) 580-9495

Gov. Pillen Appoints Piccolo to Court of Appeals in the Sixth Judicial District

LINCOLN, NE - Today, Governor Jim Pillen announced his appointment of Michael E. Piccolo of North Platte to the Court of Appeals in the Sixth Judicial District. The Court of Appeals Sixth Judicial District consists of Arthur, Banner, Blaine, Brown, Box Butte, Buffalo, Chase, Cherry, Cheyenne, Custer, Dawes, Dawson, Deuel, Dundy, Frontier, Furnas, Garden, Gosper, Grant, Hayes, Hitchcock, Hooker, Keith, Keya Paha, Kimball, Lincoln, Logan, Loup, McPherson, Morrill, Perkins, Red Willow, Rock, Scotts Bluff, Sheridan, Sherman, Sioux, Thomas, and Valley counties.

Since 2010, Piccolo has served the 11th Judicial District, first as a county court judge and then as a district court judge. Prior to his judicial appointment, Piccolo was an attorney with multiple firms in North Platte. Since 2020, he has also presided over the Midwest Problem Solving Court in Lincoln County and more recently has presided over the drug courts in both Dawson and Lincoln counties.

Piccolo has been involved in the Nebraska Lawyers Referral Program, which provides pro bono legal services to qualified individuals. He has also been selected as a fellow by the Nebraska State Bar Foundation

Piccolo received his undergraduate degree from the University of Nebraska -- Omaha. He earned his juris doctor from the Creighton University School of Law.

The judicial vacancy is due to the retirement of Judge Frankie J. Moore.

District Courts

Weighted Caseload Report



Fiscal Year 2025

July 1, 2024, to
June 30, 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
State Map – Nebraska District Court Judicial Need	2
1 st Judicial District	3
2 nd Judicial District	4
3 rd Judicial District.....	5
4 th Judicial District.....	6
5 th Judicial District.....	7
6 th Judicial District.....	8
7 th Judicial District.....	9
8 th Judicial District.....	10
9 th Judicial District.....	11
10 th Judicial District.....	12
11 th Judicial District.....	13
12 th Judicial District.....	14
Court Case Type Categories and Weights - Appendix.....	15

Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska District Courts Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska has a district court in each of its 93 counties, organized into 12 Judicial Districts. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-301.02, the Legislature determines the number of district court judges who serve in each judicial district, and the geographic boundaries of each judicial district. An objective assessment of judicial workload allows informed decisions about district boundaries and the number of judges needed to timely resolve the cases in each judicial district.

To assist in evaluating judicial workloads, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-1007(1) requires the Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOCB) to compile judicial workload statistics based on caseloads weighted by category of case. These weighted caseload statistics are used by the Judicial Branch, the Judicial Resources Commission, and the Legislature to evaluate judicial need, and guide decisions and recommendations on how best to allocate judicial resources across the state.

To ensure the validity, uniformity and accuracy of the AOCB's judicial workload statistics, a statewide judicial time study was conducted in 2019-2020 under the direction and leadership of the National Center for State Courts. For a full description of the judicial time study and the recommended weighting methodology and standards, see *Nebraska Judicial Workload Assessment Final Report* (October 2020) (this is noted on tables in this report with an asterisk) on the Nebraska Supreme Court Website. Because this Weighted Caseload Report uses the methodology and standards from the 2020 workload assessment, direct comparison to archived reports is not recommended.

Weighted caseload statistics approximate the number of judges a district needs to handle the current caseload based upon the calculations of a three-year rolling average of case filing data. Therefore, when weighted caseload statistics are examined in conjunction with other compelling and critical metrics, they provide a vital part of an objective and standardized assessment of judicial needs and the fair allocation of judicial resources across juvenile courts in the State of Nebraska.




Corey R. Steel
Nebraska State Court Administrator
Nebraska Supreme Court
Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation
Rm. 1211 State Capitol | P.O. Box 98910 | Lincoln, NE 68509
T 402.471.3730 | F 402.471.2197
www.supremecourt.nebraska.gov

Weighted Caseload Report

Nebraska District Court Judicial Needs

Fiscal Year 2025 (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025)



Note: Differences between the total District Court Need for Judges and the sum of individual counties is due to rounding to the nearest one-hundredth.

Weighted Caseload Report

1st Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 3.11



Current number of judges: 3

Workload per judge: 1.04

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 1st District

Bergen
Schreiner
J. Smith



Weighted Caseload Report


2nd Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 4.81

Current number of judges: 4


Workload per judge: 1.20

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 2nd District

Cox
Martinez
M. Smith
Thompson



Weighted Caseload Report


3rd Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 8.91

Current number of judges: 8


Workload per judge: 1.11

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 3rd District

Ideus
Jacobsen
Maret
McManaman
Mellor
Nelson
Post
Strong



Weighted Caseload Report

4th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 19.16



Current number of judges: 18

Workload per judge: 1.06

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 4th District

Alioth
 Bataillon
 Benson
 T. Burns
 Derr
 Dougherty
 Engleman
 Keane
 Lindberg (Bowie)
 Lux
 Masteller
 Miller Pankonin
 Polk
 Vacant (Retelsdorf)
 Srb
 Stratman
 Vaughn
 Wheelock





Weighted Caseload Report

5th Judicial District - District Court

District court need for judges: 3.67
 Current number of judges: 4
 Workload per judge: 0.92

Predicted judicial resources need by county




Weighted Caseload Report

6th Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 2.39
Current number of judges: 3
Workload per judge: 0.80

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 6th District

Hall
Meisner
Blackman




Weighted Caseload Report


7th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 1.98
Current number of judges: 2
Workload per judge: 0.99

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 7th District
Long (Johnson)
Kube



Weighted Caseload Report

8th Judicial District – District Court


District court need for judges: 1.19

Current number of judges: 2

Workload per judge: 0.60

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 8th District					Kozisek Noakes
Cherry .10	Keya Paha .01		Boyd .04		
	Brown .08	Rock .03	Holt .26		
	Blaine <.01	Loup .01	Garfield .02	Wheeler .02	
	Custer .28		Valley .16	Greeley .03	
			Sherman .05	Howard .10	



Weighted Caseload Report

9th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 3.60

Current number of judges: 4

Workload per judge: 0.90

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 9th District

Butler

Lee

Marsh

Ramsey (Carson)



Weighted Caseload Report



10th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 1.98
 Current number of judges: 2
 Workload per judge: 0.99

Predicted judicial resources need by county

Judges Serving the 10th District

Farquhar
Hoelt



Weighted Caseload Report

11th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 3.69

Current number of judges: 4

Workload per judge: 0.92

Predicted judicial resources need by county


Judges Serving the 11th District

Heng

Vacant (Neher)

Piccolo

Volkmer



Weighted Caseload Report

12th Judicial District – District Court

District court need for judges: 3.48

Current number of judges: 4

Workload per judge: 0.87

Predicted judicial resources need by county



Judges Serving the 12th District

Dobrovolny

Miller

O’Gorman

Weimer



Weighted Caseload Report

Court Case Type Categories and Weights – Appendix

District Court Case Types	Case Weight* (minutes)
Problem Solving Court Cases	683
Protection Orders	32
Civil	219
Class I Felony	367
Other Criminal	149
Domestic Relations	97
Appeals	343
Administrative Appeals	540
County Court Case Types	Case Weight* (minutes)
Protection Orders	32
Felony	26
Misdemeanor	23
District Court: Adult Problem-Solving Court	683
Traffic	1
Civil	8
Probate	61
Guardianship/Conservatorship	133
Small Claims	30
Adoption	92
Domestic Relations	97
Juvenile: 3A Children	487
Juvenile: Delinquency	100
Juvenile: Status Offender 3B	37
Juvenile: Mentally Ill and Dangerous 3C	265
Juvenile: Bridge to Independence (B21)	58
Juvenile: Interstate Compact Hearings/Filings	2
Juvenile: Problem-Solving Court Cases	654
Separate Juvenile Court Case Types	Case Weight* (minutes)
Adoption	49
Domestic Relations	26
Juvenile: 3A Children	487
Delinquency	136
Status Offender 3B	54
Mentally Ill and Dangerous 3C	265
Bridge to Independence B21	36
Interstate Compact Hearing/Filings	2
Problem Solving Court Cases	654



Research and Data

Operations Division

Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation

Chief Standing Bear Justice Administration Building

521 S. 14th Street Suite 300 | Lincoln, NE 68508

T 531.739.8100 | F 402.471.2197

Nebraska State Bar Association

"Helping lawyers help people"



July 28, 2026

Hon. John R. Freudenberg
Nebraska Supreme Court
State Capitol, #2210
Lincoln, NE 68509

Dear Justice Freudenberg:

On behalf of the NSBA Judicial Resources Committee ("the Committee"), I wish to convey to the members of the Judicial Resources Commission our recommendation regarding the vacancy being taken up by the Judicial Resources Commission at their August 14, 2026, hearing.

After reviewing the Judicial Weighted Caseload Reports ("Judicial Workload Assessment") for FY 2025, the Committee concluded that the State's justice system will not have adequate judicial resources available unless the current vacancy is filled expeditiously. Therefore, the Committee recommends declaring a vacancy in the District Court, 11th District, with a primary office location in Lincoln County.

Thank you for your consideration of our recommendation. Please include this letter with the materials provided to Judicial Resources Commission members before your August 14, 2026, hearing.

Sincerely,

Hon. John M. Gerrard
NSBA President

Cc: Corey Steel
Liz Neeley