(608) 266-0486 District: (262) 240-0808 Toll-Free: (888) 534-0023 Rep.Ottj@legis.wi.gov

P.O. Box 8953 Madison, WI 53708-8953

Good Morning Mr. Chairman and committee members. Thank you for holding this hearing today on Assembly Bills 97, 98 and 99.

There is some good news on the issue of drunk driving: Since 1990 in Wisconsin, alcohol-related crashes have declined 61 percent. To me that shows we can make progress in making our roads safer from impaired drivers. But there's still plenty of bad news as well. In 2015 the Department of Transportation reported 5,174 alcohol-related crashes and 2,872 injuries in Wisconsin in alcohol-related crashes in Wisconsin. That amounts to over 14 crashes and nearly eight injuries every single day.

Also in 2015 there were 190 fatalities in alcohol related crashes. Taken together, a person was killed or injured in an alcohol-related crash every 2.9 hours on Wisconsin roadways. In some cases it was the impaired driver who died, but in many cases it was an innocent victim. To me that's unacceptable. Many, many families in our state have been devastated by drunk drivers. You will hear from some of them today.

I will summarize the three bills you are considering today, beginning with Assembly Bill 98, which does not change current law in Wisconsin, but rather correct a serious loophole in 2009 Wisconsin Act 100. Under that law, any driver convicted of first offense OWI with a Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) of 0.15 or higher, and all repeat offenders, must have an ignition interlock device installed on his or her vehicle.

Current law requires that the interlock device be installed at the time the person's driver license is reinstated, and must remain on the automobile until the order expires. The problem is that some drivers choose to drive before their license is reinstated, and if stopped for a traffic violation, the driver will only be cited for driving without a license and not the more serious offense of driving without an interlock.

AB 98 corrects this loophole by requiring that any driver requiring an interlock device cannot drive any vehicle not equipped with the device from the time of conviction until the order expires. The penalty for those convicted of driving without the interlock will remain the same as under current law. The bill also lets the judge set when the interlock device has to be installed, so that people will not be charged for the interlock device in the event they are not capable of driving an automobile. AB 98 has a simple amendment that makes absolutely clear we are closing this loophole.

Assembly Bill 99 increases the mandatory minimum sentence for 5th or 6th offense OWI from six months to 18 months incarceration. This would bring the mandatory minimum more in line with the minimums for 7th, 8th and 9th offenses, which are three years, and would also align more with the maximum possible penalty for 5th and 6th offense, which currently is 10 years incarceration.

AB 97 imposes a mandatory 5 years for committing homicide while OWI. Currently the maximum penalty for homicide while OWI can range from 25 to 40 years depending on the circumstances. However, there is no mandatory minimum.

To be honest, I think 5 years is not a strong enough penalty, and I believe most judges agree with me. That's because a majority of the time the sentences handed out for homicide while OWI exceed five years. However, I have heard of enough instances in which the sentence may be as little as one or two years. This is an outrage.

AB 97 does allow a judge discretion in cases where the person killed was a passenger in the drunk driver's car. In those cases, if the judge finds that the best interests of the community would be served he can sentence for less than 5 years, as long as the judge puts those reasons in writing.

I understand that OWI is a complicated problem often involving addiction, and we are not going to solve the problem by simply passing tougher laws. However, I believe that enforcing tougher penalties is a part of the solution, and it's a part the legislature can work on.

There are plenty of alternatives to driving drunk, including safe ride programs, designated drivers and public transportation. There's no law against driving, or drinking to excess. But when the two are combined the results can be deadly.

My goal in introducing this legislation and other bills I have authored is not to incarcerate more people or impose higher fines. It's simply to make our roads safer. I hope that's a goal we can all agree on.

Again thank you for considering theses bill today. I would be glad to answer any questions.



Co-Chair, Joint Committee on Finance

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Assembly Bills 97, 98, 99 March 23, 2017

Thank you, Chairman Spiros and committee members for holding a public hearing today on Assembly Bills 97, 98, and 99. To save the committee time and allow others to provide testimony, I will testify on all three bills at once. The bills before you today involve Wisconsin's Operating While Intoxicated (OWI) laws.

Getting behind the wheel and driving while intoxicated is a serious problem we face in Wisconsin. According to statistics provided by the Department of Transportation, in 2015 alone we had almost 24,000 OWI convictions. I am sure this number would be even larger if we were to factor in the number of individuals who drove intoxicated but were never caught. In the past, I have worked to address this chronic abuse of driving while intoxicated by working on legislation to provide harsher penalties, while also expanding access to treatment for these individuals. Due to some of these measures, the state of Wisconsin has continued to see a decrease in overall OWI convictions.

Despite our advances in fighting OWI abuse in Wisconsin, there is still more work to be done. Unfortunately, there are instances where an individual's irresponsible act kills someone. In some of these cases, the driver is only incarcerated for two or three years. Assembly Bill 97 creates a mandatory minimum of five years for these instances. When someone takes the life of another, they must be given a sentence that provides justice for the family members who have lost a loved one.

Even though we have seen a decrease in overall OWI convictions in the past few years, one group of individuals that have seen an increase in convictions is 5th and 6th OWI offenders. OWI offenders in this category are at minimum required to be incarcerated for six months. It is my hope that Assembly Bill 98 will deter individuals from getting behind the wheel intoxicated by increasing the mandatory minimum to 18 months in prison. With the expansion of treatment and diversion programs and other alternatives, it is my hope that Assembly Bill 98 will never have to be used.

The last bill before you today, Assembly Bill 99, closes a loophole in the state's ignition interlock law. Currently, first-time OWI offenders whose blood alcohol concentration is 0.15 or higher, and all repeat OWI offenders are required to install an ignition interlock on an automobile registered to them. The law requires that the interlock device is in place on the automobile at the time the driver's license is reinstated and must remain on the automobile until the order expires. However, there is a loophole in current law. Some OWI offenders break the law by driving before their license is reinstated. If this occurs and they are subject to a traffic stop, they will be cited for driving without a valid license, but will not face the more serious offense of violating the court order concerning the ignition interlock. This bill will close the loophole, and the individual will now be cited for driving without the ignition interlock.

I want to thank Representative Ott for his leadership on OWI legislation. It has been a pleasure continuing to work with him on this important matter. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman and members for listening to testimony on Assembly Bills 97, 98, and 99.

I hope to have your support for these important bills.

VICTIM: DYLANTHORNE

•	.1	
,	2	STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT WAUPACA COUNTY
	3	BRANCH III
-	4	
	5	STATE OF WISCONSIN,
	6	Plaintiff, Sentencing Hearing
	7	-vs-
	8	HEATHER D. SCHMIDT, Case No. 14-CF-49
	9	Defendant.
	10	Date: September 30, 2015
	11	
	12	HONORABLE RAYMOND S. HUBER
	13	PRESIDING JUDGE
	14	
	15	APPEARANCES:
	16	
	17	JOHN P. SNIDER, Waupaca County Assistant
· ,	18	District Attorney, appeared on behalf of the State of Wisconsin, Plaintiff;
•	19	TROY L. NIELSEN, Assistant State Dublic D. C.
<u> </u>	20	appeared on behalf of the Defendant, HEATHER D. SCHMIDT, who appeared in person.
	21	
	22	
•	23	
	24	JANNELL M. MINEAU
	25	Official Court Reporter, Br. I (715) 258-6432

1	THE COURT: I will call the matter of State of	
2		
. 3		
. 4	State is represented by District Attorney Snider.	
5	This matter was set for sentencing today. Are	
6	counsel prepared to proceed?	
7.	MR. SNIDER: Yes, Your Honor.	
8	MR. NIELSEN: Yes, Judge.	
9	THE COURT: The State is in compliance with	
10	victim notification consultation?	
11	MR. SNIDER: Yes, we are, Your Honor.	
12	THE COURT: Have counsel both received the	
13	presentence_investigation?	
14	MR. SNIDER: Yes.	
15	MR. NIELSEN: Yes.	
16	THE COURT: Are there any corrections or	
17	additions that need to be noted for the record?	
18	MR. SNIDER: None here.	
19	MR. NIELSEN: No, Judge.	
20	THE COURT: Does anyone wish to present any	
21	evidence of any kind?	
22 [.]	MR. SNIDER: Your Honor, I just want to make	
23	sure the Court has received the same written statements as	
24	counsel.	
25	THE COURT: Go ahead.	

1	MR. SNIDER: Bonnie Thorne, Dylan's grandmother,
2	· ·
3	THE COURT: Just do one at a time, because I was
4	frankly concerned I was missing some statements. They're
5	not in the file, and I thought I remembered seeing some
6	come in. I have one from a Bonnie Thorne.
7	MR. SNIDER: Okay. We have Zachary Thorne.
8	THE COURT: That I don't have. I know I
9	remembered seeing it. I called the clerk this morning,
10	because it wasn't in the file.
11	MR. SNIDER: But you have seen it?
12	THE COURT: I've seen it and read it.
13	MR. SNIDER: You can have mine if you like.
14	THE COURT: It probably wouldn't hurt to refresh
15	my recollection. Have you seen that Attorney Nielsen?
16	MR. NIELSEN: Yes. Attorney Snider and I went
17	through the checklist.
18	MR. SNIDER: Tami Thorne.
19	THE COURT: All of those. But as I said, I
20	called the clerk's office because it was not in the file
21	this morning.
22	MR. SNIDER: But you have seen it?
23	THE COURT: I've seen them.
24	MR. SNIDER: Well, I'm going to give you them if
25	you want to refer to them during sentencing. And I also

1	just received an e-mail from some foundry personnel on the	
2		
3	THE COURT: Mr. Nielsen did just provide that to	
4		
5	MR. SNIDER: And other than the written	
6		
7	address the Court followed by his mother Elizabeth.	
8	THE COURT: Okay.	
9	MR. NIELSEN: And then I just have one witness.	
10	I don't know what particular order, how you want to	ļ
11	proceed, but I just have one witness.	
12	THE COURT: Witness in terms of you're	
13	anticipating being sworn?	
14	MR. NIELSEN: Yeah. I think it's just easier	
15	for me to do it that way with her.	
16	THE COURT: Well, perhaps we may as well take	
17	that witness first and then move on to the State's	
18-	witnesses afterwards. Call your first witness.	
19	MR. NIELSEN: Judge, I would call	-
20	Sondra Reierson to the stand.	
21	THE COURT: Come forward, ma'am, and remain	
22	standing.	
23	THE CLERK: Raise your right hand, state your	
24	name and please spell it for the record.	
25	THE WITNESS: Sondra Reierson, S-O-N-D-R-A,	

	l l	
1		R-E-I-E-R-S-O-N.
2		SONDRA REIERSON, being first duly sworn by the
3		clerk, testified as follows:
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. NIELSEN:
5	Q.	Good morning.
6	Α.	Good morning.
7	Q.	May I call you Sondra?
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	Sondra, you have a son by the name of Matthew.
10		Correct?
11	A.	Yes, I do.
12	Q.	And he's an adult; right?
13	Α.	Yes, he is.
14	Q.	How old is Matt?
15	Α.	You put me on the spot. He's like 32, 33. I can't
16		remember.
17	Q.	A grownup?
18	A.	He's a grownup.
19	Q.	And how many children does your son Matt have?
20	Α	He has two.
21	Q.	And what are their names?
22	Α.	Matthew, Jr., we call him M.J., and Kira.
23	Q.	And Kira is a daughter that Matthew has with Heather
24		Schmidt. Correct?
25	Α.	Yes.

		1		
	1	Q.	This is Heather Schmidt seated to my left; correct?	
	2	Α.	Yes.	
	3	Q.	At one point your son Matt and Heather were in a	
	4		relationship. Is that right?	
	5	Α.	Yes; that is correct.	
	6	Q.	Been on again/off again over the years?	
	7	Α.	It has been; yes.	
	8	Q.	Prior to you meeting Heather through your son,	
	9		Matthew, did you know Heather?	
	10	Α.	No, I did not.	
	11	Q.	So, fair to conclude that your knowledge and	
	12		relationship with Heather has grown from her	
	13		relationship with your son Matthew?	
	14	Α.	Yes.	
	15	Q.	Is Heather the mother, biological mother of M.J.?	
	16	Ä,	No; she's not.	
	17	Q.	Over the years how would you describe Heather's role	
*-	18	The second second	in M.J.'s life?	
	19	A	Heather came into M.J.'s life athe was approximately	
	20		six months old. And she has been the solid mother	-
	21		figure through all this time. M.J. is eight years old	
	22	. * •	at this time. So, he calls her mom. She is that	
	23		stability as far as that mother figure.	
	24	Q.	And that relationship has been forged even	
•	25		notwithstanding the fact that there's no biological	

1		relationship?
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	In periods of time when your son Matt and Heather have
. 4		been off, so to speak, has Heather maintained that
5		motherly role to M.J.?
6	Α.	Very much so. She has gone, you know, through the
7		effort to ensure that he gets to spend time with her
8		to maintain that mom connection.
9	Q.	I'm not asking you to identify M.J.'s biological
10		mother by name, but as M.J.'s grandma, which you are
11	Α.	Um hum (indicating the affirmative).
12	Q.	how would you describe M.J.'s relationship with his
13		own_biological_mom?
14	Α.	It's very hit and miss. There have been long periods
15	I	of time. She's supposed to get him every other
16		weekend, and there were long periods of time where she
17		does not take advantage of that. So, there has been a
18		lot of emotional upheaval, because the expectation
19		that he was going to be spending time with her didn't
20		happen. So, as a family, whether he ended up coming
21		to our house that weekend or staying home we've had
22		to, you know, try to, you know, make it okay, so to
23		speak.
24	Q.	In your opinion has Heather been the more stable
25		motherly figure to M.J. than his own biological mom?
	'n	

	ŀ		
1	Α.	Definitely.	
2	Q.	Do you know how many biological children Heather has?	
3	A.	Biological children, four. Five with Kira.	
4	Q.	So, in your experiences has or does Heather treat M.J.	
5		differently than her five biological children?	
6	Α.	No.	
7	Q.	It's like he's one of her kids?	
8	Α.	Yes. Very much so.	
9	Q.	And this is, again, even the case when maybe Matt and	
10		Heather's relationship isn't going well or they're not	
11		even together?	
12	À.	Yes.	
1.3_	Q	Is this the only child, non-biological child that you	
14		know that Heather has sort of cared for as her own?	
15	A.	No. There's another older young lady from Heather's	
16		previous marriage that was not her biological who she	
17		treats as her own. She has attended, you know, family	
18		functions at our house, Christmas at our house and	
19		everything too. So, she's, you know, considered part	-
20		of her family.	<u> </u>
21	Q.	As M.J.'s grandmother do you appreciate the role that	
22		Heather has taken in M.J.'s life?	
23	А.	Very much so. I think he would have been struggling a	
24		lot more with some of his behavioral opportunities.	
25		If it hadn't been that Heather was that constant and	

1	having the temperament to be able to talk him through
2	some of his behavioral opportunities.
3	MR. NIELSEN: Nothing further, Judge.
4	THE COURT: Mr. Snider.
5	MR. SNIDER: Nothing. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: You may step down then, ma'am.
7	You have no other witnesses then?
8	MR. NIELSEN: That's correct.
9	THE COURT: You have some individuals who
10	wish to make statements?
11	MR. SNIDER: Yes.
12	TAMI THORNE: Hi, Your Honor. Dylan John
-13-	Thorne was my nephew and godson. I was there the day
14	he was born and helped his parents Tim and Liz named
15	him. I loved being an aunt to Dylan and to my other
16	nieces and nephews. I was also there the day when
17	Dylan's parents got the news that Dylan was killed in
18	a crash.
19	Just that morning I was with Dylan's mom, and
20	she was talking to Dylan, and he was trying to learn
21	how to do laundry. So, she was coaching him through
22	that. And he shared with us that he passed his
23	accuplacer at Fox Valley Tech, and he was now enrolled
24	in the criminal justice program.
25	As a family we were celebrating this for

Dylan. Our whole family at the time was on vacation up in Hayward, five hours away. And Dylan was not able to come with us because he had to work. We were going to be gone for two weeks camping, and after the first week of camping Dylan was going to try to make it up on that weekend and join us for a couple of days. We always went on vacations together as families. We were very close.

Just a few hours after we had found the news

1.3_

Just a few hours after we had found the news of Dylan and passing his accuplacer and all, we were so proud, we were notified of the crash. Our world as we knew it would never be the same.

Dylan. Dylan had a smile that would light up a room. People often commented on his million-dollar smile. And he had a personality that could win anyone over. He just had a gift. He gave the best hugs ever, and I would give anything to have a hug from him now.

As Dylan grew up we celebrated birthdays, watched him play baseball, basketball, football, went on vacations together and everything in between. I was always so proud of him and so proud of being his godmother. I loved watching him play sports. It's something that we definitely shared together. We both have a competitive fire in us, and there was always

times where we would get the basketball out and play each other on the court, trying to school each other on our moves that we had mastered.

July 19th of 2012 rocked my world and my family's. When we were notified of what had happened we tried to get all of our troops together. And my husband and I had to figure out how do we comfort Dylan's parents, Dylan's brother, our children, Dylan's cousins, Dylan's grandma. How do you comfort them? How do you comfort parents when they have lost their son at such a young age? What do you say? What do you do? All we can do is be there with them.

My husband and I were with Dylan's parents all the way through the process of them planning his funeral. We were with his parents the first time they saw him at the funeral home. As we entered that funeral home I can still see him to this day, lying lifeless. Nothing we could do, nothing we could say could bring him back. I wanted to hug Dylan so bad but couldn't. He just laid there. As we helped Tim and Liz plan their son's funeral we had some very difficult decisions to make.

And I don't know how Tim and Liz have been able to stay as strong as they have throughout all of this. This is their 18-year-old son who had just

graduated high school, just gotten into Tech, had his whole life ahead of him. He never had a chance to discover the world. He never had a chance to be a parent, to be a good role model to his children, because he was robbed of that part of his life. and Liz will never see their son Dylan get married. They'll never have grandkids from Dylan. Nothing. Tim and Liz were robbed of their son. was robbed of his brother. His grandma was robbed of her grandson. My children were robbed of their My husband and I were robbed of our nephew. This has been a very difficult time for us. I know no words, no acts can bring Dylan I do know this though. That July 19th of 2012 a decision could have been made to have changed this outcome. Heather Schmidt made the decision that day to consume alcohol and get behind the wheel. that choice. Dylan had no choice in this matter. He had no prior things against him. Nothing. He was a good boy. And in one poor decision that may or may not have been made several times before, Heather decided to get behind the wheel and drive, and that day she decided to take Dylan's life. She sits here today and is able to see her children.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13-

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The only thing we have left are pictures.

The love that there is for this young man has come out of the walls. We have found people that have our backs more than ever before, and we appreciate all of them and all of their support through this.

I pray for our healing, and I pray that other families do not need to go through this. And I pray that our family can start healing and that my son, who Dylan was his best friend, will be able to actually start talking about Dylan and celebrating the short life that he did have, and that my daughter will be able to continue moving on without her rock, that Dylan's brother as he looks at getting married will be able to figure out how to fill the hole of his brother not being able to be there at his wedding. And I pray for Tim and Liz. No matter what we do we can't bring their son back. No words can comfort. There's just no words.

So we are here today, Your Honor, to put the decision into your hands as to what's going to be done. And I pray that you have comfort in your decision making. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Snider, we didn't catch her name.

> MR SNIDER: Tami Thorne.

ELIZABETH THORNE: Your Honor, my name is

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13-

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Elizabeth Thorne. I go by Liz. Dylan Thorne is my son. 1 2 Now he's my angel. I don't even know where to begin. 3 Dylan was compassionate, caring, funny, cared 4 deeply for his friends, his family and anybody else that 5 he came into contact with. He loved sports, and I was his biggest fan. I loved to watch him out on that football 6 7 I would make my husband drive us to the football 8 field so we could see him get off the bus. 9 He had a smile that would just melt my heart. 10 could never stay angry with him. Dylan was my life. 11 was my baby. We had the connection we were both the 12 youngest of our family. 13 The day Dylan died I died too. It has been a 14 constant struggle to get through each day. I pray to God every day for strength, energy, patience and courage. 15 16 The only thing that keeps me going is my husband and my 17 other son Derek. I try to be strong for them, but inside I'm an emotional wreck. I used to be a happy, carefree -18 19 I've changed, and I don't even like who I have person. 20 become. I don't tolerate a lot of things like I used to. 21 I was told I had a lot of patience, and my patience has been wearing thin throughout this whole thing. 22 It has been over three years of hell for me and my family. Birthdays, anniversaries and holidays are very

hard. Everyone wishing everyone else a happy birthday,

23

24

happy anniversary, photos on Facebook of their families, I just go through more pain. It's very hard to see that, because I know our family will never have that again with Dylan.

Seeing all of his friends on their way to college and getting on with their life is also a constant struggle, knowing that Dylan will never be able to do anything. Gatherings are supposed to be happy, but those bring me pain. I just want my Dylan back.

He wasn't even out of high school for two months when he was killed. We will never have any more photos of Dylan other than his last graduation picture. The one photo is of him and his first best friend that he had met when we moved to Iola. And at graduation I was so happy to see that those two were walking down the aisle together. And as you can see, they were hand in hand.

Dylan will never be the best man in his brother's wedding. Dylan will never be an uncle, never be a father, a husband, never know what true love is. He had his whole life ahead of him.

The pain hurt so bad that at night at times when I've gone to bed I have told God that I am not afraid to die. I want to be with Dylan again. But I don't want my husband and Derek to hurt either. So, I have wished that God would take us all so we could be a family again.

I can't take Derek's pain away. After we had the news and made the four-hour trek back home, Derek was still in denial that his brother was dead. When we pulled in the driveway and I got out of the car Derek ran to me crying and said, "It should have been me." And I told him, "No." Where the crash happened, Derek has to drive by it every day on his way to work. Derek was caught after the crash had happened, because Dylan worked second shift where we work. Dylan worked second shift, Derek was on first. Derek was on his way home and had to get rerouted. He didn't even know his brother was killed in a crash.

7.

And, Your Honor, not that I have a say in her sentence and others may not think it's fair, but I would be overjoyed to see her incarcerated for ten years. I pray to God that she does not do what she did to our family to another young family. With her being out in public for the last three years and running into her is extremely painful. I pray to God that she does not get behind the wheel after drinking again and cause somebody else more pain.

She is still able to see her loved ones no matter what length of time she ends up serving. Even after serving the years that you give her she will be able to spend the rest of her life with her family.

I am not asking for life. She sentenced Dylan to death, and she sentenced us to life without him. After all of this is said and done she can just push all of this back deep into her brain and act like nothing has happened after she serves her time. Us, on the other hand, will never forget July 19th, 2012. That is the date that is burned into our memory. We will forever live in this nightmare. We have life without Dylan. Our hearts will never be whole again.

I pray that you don't let Dylan's life mean nothing by giving her less than ten years incarceration. No parent wants to hear that their child's life was only worth-three or five years.

I don't want any family to go through the pain that Dylan's family and friends and community have gone through. Everybody says that I've been strong through this whole thing. I do what I have to do for my family. I try and stay strong for them. I don't want my husband and my other son to try and have to take care of me or worry about me. I've just been coping these last over three years. It's hard every day. I do my crying at night. I do my crying when I'm by myself just to release some of the stress that I go through.

And all of this could have been prevented if Heather Schmidt didn't sit in the bar that day and then

choose to get behind the wheel. She still gets to see her 1 family. I can only see Dylan not even in my dreams, 2 because he hasn't even come to me in my dreams. 3 4 look at this box. 5 You never think you're going to bury your child. We were not prepared. My sister-in-law Tami and my 6 brother-in-law Steve were pretty much the ones that did 7 the whole funeral, because I could not function. 8 up having him cremated because we had no plot. We had 9 nothing. We thought Dylan's future, he had his whole 10 11 future ahead of him. 12 And I ask that you take into consideration he 13was only 18 when he was killed. She was 37. She should have had more responsibilities. She was at the bar, not 14 15 home with her children. He was on his way to work in the afternoon, being a responsible young adult who had his 16 whole future ahead of him. 17 18 Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Any other statements? 20 MR. SNIDER: I don't believe so. 21 Do you wish to make an argument? THE COURT: 22 MR. SNIDER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 23 We've reviewed the presentence. And of course, 24 it describes the defendant as a 40-year-old mother of five 25 We've heard that she's a de facto mother to

more. The presentence describes her as having a good employment history. The Court has the e-mail from a supervisor, I believe, at her place of employment.

I want to thank the Thornes and their extended family for acquainting the Court with who Dylan was and what he meant to his family and what he meant to his friends and to his community. The Court now has a better sense of what this defendant took forever from Dylan's community. But we can't fully grasp what the Thornes and their community have gone through.

The presentence describes the defendant speaking to the agent as though she understands as a mother what she has taken from the Thornes and their community. But I don't think anyone in this room can begin to fully grasp what they've been through and what the defendant has put them through. She's described as expressing remorse for her actions and empathy for the Thornes. She's described in the presentence as making no attempt to minimize her crime and there is no minimizing her crime. She did take the life of a responsible, loved young man.

Looking back, this defendant spoke to the agent about the choices she could have made. She could have gone home after work. She could have left the bar earlier, drank less. She could have gotten a ride home. She didn't mention that she could have stopped anywhere

between Waupaca and the crash site. I just, when I think of the driving behavior described, I just can't imagine why she didn't stop. And looking back, it's too late. This defendant made very poor choices, and she killed Dylan Thorne.

1-8

And in spite of killing this young man and in spite of injuring herself severely, it's reported that she hasn't stopped drinking. It's reported in the presentence, and family and friends who loved and miss Dylan have had to experience that firsthand in public.

And I can't imagine what anyone who has been going through what they have felt when they saw her at a bar with a bottle of beer in her hand, drinking. That concerns me.

It suggests perhaps a lack of sensitivity at the very least. It suggests perhaps an ongoing danger to the public.

But most importantly, it suggests that the defendant needs to be punished for killing Dylan Thorne. Society can not tolerate and rightly expects punishment for those who drive drunk and kill. When recommending a prison sentence the agent wrote, "All other sentences seem insufficient." And in a way, no sentence is sufficient when a life is taken.

This defendant told the agent she and her co-workers went to double bubble, two for one, but she

apparently had no exit strategy. She then chose to stay at the bar for hours and take that next drink and that next drink, and then she chose to drive at over twice the legal BAC, and she killed Dylan Thorne.

2-0-

As I say, no sentence the Court imposes today can really salve the hurt, the injury. But the State would recommend a sentence of 15 years imprisonment with five years of initial confinement and ten years of extended supervision.

This Court's been through too many occasions like this. But having been through it, I am confident that you will impose extended supervision conditions that will maximize protection of the public. I would specifically request that the Court order restitution as submitted and that the Court order costs. I'm aware that courts are not taxing costs of service of law enforcement witnesses, but I would ask that costs of service of non-law enforcement witnesses be taxed. I'd ask that the Court order supervision fees. Certainly require absolute sobriety. No taverns.

I'm concerned that the defendant is prescribed a very powerful narcotic. I'd ask that the Court order that if, in fact, that continues she take that only as prescribed, that she limit herself to one pharmacy and that she advise her agent of any health care or

prescriptions within 48 hours.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Nielsen.

MR. NIELSEN: Before I go through the prepared comments I have, Judge, I just sort of want to preface what I'm going to say with this. The impact of this case on my client and her family and friends is not but a drop in the bucket compared to the impact on the Thornes. know, I know that. My client absolutely knows that. family and friends know that. So, if through the comments I make I talk about how this case has impacted Heather, the feelings that she has from this situation or her family's impact, in no way are we trying to compare or measure impacts. Like I said, the Thornes have had to suffer I suspect the worst feeling in the world. not it's got to be right at the top. And so I don't want the comments to be construed as though my client has suffered in any way that's even comparable to, in particular, Mr. and Mrs. Thorne, Dylan's parents. But as we know, the law requires the Court to take everything into consideration. So, these things need to be discussed. Even if they're uncomfortable, it's not an effort to compare. It's just an effort to convey. To state the obvious, this was a very, very terribly tragic day. July 19th, 2012, was, as is today.

Nobody wanted this day to happen. Nobody wanted July 19th, 2012, to happen either. Certainly not the Thorne family. Certainly not Dylan. Certainly not Heather. Certainly not her family and friends. But it happened.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13-

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the description in the PSI that Heather gave to the PSI writer I thought was very honest and very candid and very insightful. We so routinely see in non-death OWI cases drivers say, "I've had two." It's sort of a point of chuckling at this point. I think everybody says that. Heather said that when she was interviewed by the police for the first time in the hospital in July of 2012. But she's, of course, bright enough and smart enough to understand that while that might be all that she recalls having, she clearly had And she doesn't try to suggest that, you know, some crazy idea that she only had two, and "I have no idea how I got so drunk." She was there. She was there for hours. She was there with co-workers. From my understanding a co-worker of hers was, I think, switching positions within the foundry, and they were kind of going to the bar to celebrate or whatnot. And things got way out of hand and way out of control, and Heather knows that. I mean, she's smart enough to realize that she didn't just have two, even if that's all that she can remember.

The fact that she can look back and think about all the other choices that were available to her that day other than the choice that she made, I think is also a rare piece of insight, at least rare in my experiences.

Because I think a lot of times OWI offenders, in particular the repeat OWI offenders, don't really think of that. They don't realize that even after the fact.

. 17

So, the facts of the case are terribly egregious. There's no way around it. There's nothing that I can say or that Heather can say that's going to change that. But she has a level of insight and understanding that I think is rare and unique and speaks volumes, I think, about her chance of maintaining a lawful existence for the rest of her life.

But when trying to really evaluate the gravity of this offense, you know, I have struggled a little bit with trying to assess it because of the odd sentencing structure that the state of Wisconsin has for OWIs. If everything on July 19th, 2012, had been the same but for the fact, just using some of the comments from the Thornes, Dylan's aunt and mother, if Dylan had gone to the family retreat in Hayward and everything was the same and my client crossed the center line and was arrested that day for OWI, it was her first offense. What would have happened, Judge? We know she would have gotten a

citation. Her license would have been revoked for seven months. She would have gotten a fine. Nothing else.

But what changes this from a citation, an ordinance violation to a homicide conviction, a potential imprisonment in the Wisconsin state prison system, is the fact that somebody was on the other side of the center line when Heather crossed it. That's terrible. I mean, there's no word to put to it but terrible luck for everybody. But more importantly for Dylan. It was just tragic luck.

But when you're trying to assess, in my opinion, the gravity of the offense we routinely get into a situation where we're results orientated. I mean, what happens dictates the punishment one gets imposed. But really, in my opinion, when we're trying to assess the gravity of the offense we need to look at the actual behavior. Consequences or results are important, but they shouldn't control.

At the end of the day, Heather's behavior on July 19th, 2012, is behavior that unfortunately is all too common and all too accepted in our community and in our state, going to the bar after work, drinking to excess and driving home, or maybe for the younger crowd going out to the bar or nightclub or whatever drinking until bar close and, you know, playing rock, paper, scissors about who

drives home. When you look at the terrible decisions that Heather made on July 19th and the poor behavior that she's exhibited, it's unfortunately all too common and in my opinion accepted within the state of Wisconsin. count how many times I've seen people or been a part of conversations or dialogs where people are online looking at people who tragically fail field sobriety tests to the point that they're falling over or vomiting on the officer's shoes. And everybody laughs and it's funny or It's not funny. It's not cute. That just exacerbates this problem which is acceptance of drinking and driving. And unfortunately, Heather lives in these communities. She grew up in this state. She grew up, you know, in a situation where that behavior is fine. okay to drink and drive. Just don't get caught. you get caught, well there's a small price to pay. And except for these tragic situations where it's not just crossing the center line, correcting and going home and getting a ticket, it's a kid dying. So, it's hard when you really sort of analyze Heather's behavior, which you have to do in trying to assess how grave it really was when at the end of the day, unfortunately, her behavior on July 19th, 2012, is behavior that I dare to venture a guess that a fair amount of us in this courtroom has done in the past and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

unfortunately will continue, and unfortunately and sadly. So, while her behavior was unlawful, her behavior was unfortunate, tragic and sad, it's not behavior that's out of the ordinary, unfortunately, Judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

An additional problem when we have these OWI homicide cases is the randomness of it all. When I look back doing sort of my preparation for today I looked back at some older OWI homicide cases in the communities that we live in and the county we live in, and you know, victims' age ranges run the gamut from unfortunately 18-year-old Dylan to unfortunately elderly men. that's just the randomness of it all. Heather didn't pick to kill Dylan on July 19th, 2012. It's random. happened. And I don't know if that makes it any more grave or not. I don't think it does, because Heather didn't do anything to pick Dylan. Would this have been less grave if Dylan was a sixty-year-old male? I don't It is what it is. The impact on the family has think so. been great, of course. And age has that effect, on how old someone is. But when we're trying to assess how grave the crime actually is, you know, it's really hard, to me at least, to put a lot of stock or consideration into Dylan's age only because Heather didn't pick Dylan. It It could have been a 50-year-old mother. was random. could have been a 75-year-old grandma. So, the gravity of

the offense, it is whatever the Court thinks it is. And I don't know if it shifts at all dependent upon who the victim is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13-

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Drinking and driving, as I've said, is a significant problem. And I don't have the answer. not pretending that I do. But much like the war on drugs for the last 30 some years, in my opinion you can't incarcerate your way out of this problem. You need to educate. You need to teach from as early as we can when kids are getting ready to take their driver's test. There's no circumstance I can think of where there's too much education on this topic. But incarceration, incarcerating all of these people isn't simply going to solve the problem. We know that. We have to consider We have to. And I think there's a push and a education. movement to do that. In fact, there's an article in the Post-Crescent today. It was entitled something about repeat drunk drivers are a hazard to the community. I think the education is starting to filter out more and more heavily to educate people in the dangers of drinking and driving, whether it's after work, after a night with your buddies.

Shortly, I shouldn't say shortly, after the crash on July 19th, Heather went and sought and obtained an assessment for her alcohol use. That information was

discussed to some degree in the PSI. And the diagnosis that the assessor had come up with was that she suffered from alcohol abuse. It might be the most obvious diagnosis, but she wasn't diagnosed or defined as an alcoholic or suffering from alcoholism. She completed a six-week intensive out-patient program as recommended by the assessor. The PSI writer expresses some frustration or concern that Heather failed to complete the after care component of that treatment. Heather reports to me that it's because insurance stopped paying for it, which is an all too familiar refrain from clients. In talking to her about the after care program she said it wasn't doing a whole heck of a lot for her anyway, because she was sitting there with people who have been convicted of five, six times of OWIs which she hasn't. She has no plans on continuing to drink and drive. Or with individuals suffering from substance abuse, marijuana, cocaine, maybe I doubt back then it was as huge as it is now. So, she wasn't really gathering a whole lot of information, because the peers in these groups weren't people that were similarly situated to her.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13-

14.

15

16

17

18

19

2-0-

21

22

23

24

25

But there is, of course, a significant concern raised by the PSI writer, raised by Attorney Snider, that Heather continues to drink. You know, I would acknowledge on the surface that looks like a very bad decision, and

maybe it's not the best decision. But I don't know how much ultimately it matters for purposes of today. was reference by Attorney Snider about my client drinking in public. I can't remember his exact words, but something to the fact that to the point that some of the Thorne family and friends, some of Dylan's family and friends witnessed this. I just want to give some context to the Court about that. In December of 2013 my client went to Silver Lake Lanes in Scandinavia as part of a work Christmas party. She was there. She had a couple beers. She had a driver. Someone drove her to and from. the only event that I'm aware of where she's been witnessed by the Thorne family and friends directly drinking. But she admits in the PSI to the PSI writer that she has continued to use alcohol. I commend her for her honesty to the PSI writer. I think a lot of people may have tried to, again, minimize or deflect that issue. But she acknowledged it and admitted it. You know, it's a little bit, I think a little bit disingenuous and concerning that the State makes a big deal about it. Because when Heather appeared at her initial appearance on March 14th, 2014, there was no request for an absolute sobriety requirement. has been pending now for, give or take, 18 months. There's never been a request to modify the conditions of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2-0-

21

22

23

24

the signature bond. So, I'm not saying it's not concerning. But the State's had the opportunity for the last year and a half to try to seek a court order preventing Heather from drinking, and they haven't. So, you know, I'm not saying it's not a concern. I'm just saying I think it's a little unfair for the State at this point to suggest that it puts the community in peril or danger when it had all this opportunity to try to limit that.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When, gosh, I think I was a brand new attorney appearing in front of a now retired judge in Wood County, I had a client whose name I still remember being sentenced for an OWI fourth. And I remember preaching on and on and on how my client was an alcoholic and she's trying, you know, kind of giving a standard speech in that situation. And Judge Zappen stopped me in my tracks and taught me a very quick lesson that being an alcoholic doesn't mean you have to drive while drunk. Drinking doesn't mean you have to drive while drunk, that what makes drinking and driving dangerous, what makes drinking and driving illegal is not the drinking. It's the driving after drinking. And it was a quick lesson that he had taught me that I've taken with me in all these years and still remember. remember that back and forth with him on that.

And that's, you know, that's the issue, Judge.

It's not just whether or not Heather is continuing to drink, because the problem with drinking and driving isn't so much--isn't just the drinking. It's the terrible decisions one makes after drinking. But what, you know, what we try to teach young people who are drinking is it's okay to drink. It's okay to go to a bar and drink, but you have to come up with a plan before you start drinking. How are you getting home? Who's driving you home? How are you getting home or wherever you're going after the bar safely without driving under the influence?

And that's what Heather has done, Judge. Every situation where she's consumed alcohol has either been at her house pursuant to a family gathering, or if it's been away from her house, at another family member's home or Silver Lake Lanes or elsewhere she's always had a driver there. She's always had a driver back. So, while I get the sort of initial response that it's bad form, she's taking the steps to make better decisions much like the decisions she wished she had taken on July 19th which she mentions to the PSI writer.

So, the question that I have asked my client and asked many of my clients is sort of, "Who are you? Who is Heather Schmidt?" Heather Schmidt is the person that killed Dylan Thorne on July 19th, 2012. That's part of who she is. Undoubtedly, that's part of who she is. But

that day, that block of time, that five, six-hour block of time is just a sliver in the life of Heather, who presents herself today here as a 40-year-old woman. So, we can't just say that is who she is. That's all that she is, and lock her up and throw away the key. We have to know who she is.

Some of this has been talked about, but I feel it's important to discuss. She's a mother of five biological children. She's essentially raised those children as a single mother with very limited involvement from the respective fathers. I've met with the two adult girls I think a couple of times. They seem well adjusted and well on their way to becoming good, law-abiding women in their communities.

As Ms. Reierson testified, Heather has essentially become the mother figure to two non-biological children. The reason I had Sondra testify about that information is two-fold. One, it wasn't in the PSI. It wasn't anywhere else. The Court didn't have that information. And I felt it would be more compelling and powerful, in all honesty, to hear from M.J.'s grandma. And I think Heather's decision and willingness to mother these two non-biological children the way that she has speaks volumes for her character, because I don't know of a lot of people that would necessarily do that.

I could have had one of her children speak on her behalf today, and I know they would have said that she's a great mother. And that's good. But being a great mother, a great father, great parent isn't all that exciting. We're supposed to be good parents. supposed to be good at that. Your children are supposed to love you, and you're supposed to be good to them. it's these unique situations that present themselves in life that really test the real character of a person. it may have been easy, so to speak, for Heather to mother M.J. when she was in a relationship with M.J.'s father. It's not so easy, in my opinion, to maintain that commitment to M.J. even when she's not with M.J.'s father. She continues to parent M.J., and has probably had a life-changing impact on M.J. according to Ms. Reierson's testimony.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

And that speaks volumes of who Heather is.

She's not just the person that drove drunk and killed

Dylan. She's a mother of five wonderful children. She's

mothering two children that aren't hers, even though she
has no legal requirement but, I mean, no relationship-type
requirement to these children. That speaks volumes of who
she is.

She's a hard worker, which matters when trying to decide her character and who she is. That e-mail

details that. Also, through the preparation process I've had interviews and met with two of Heather's co-workers, both coincidentally happen to be younger women who were hired after Heather was hired at the foundry. And talking to them was insightful and enlightening, because they spoke glowingly of Heather. They were well aware of what's going on. They knew that Heather had driven drunk and killed Dylan. But these were woman that, when they were hired as new hires, part of the training process was to be mentored and taught and trained by Heather in how to do their jobs. And they spoke well of her ability to teach them and communicate to them and help them. And I think that's significant.

What's significant to me is to the point that it impacted one of the aspects of what would ultimately be our recommendation today, Judge, the issue of remorse and empathy and sorrow has come up. I don't think that it has been presented that anybody believes to the contrary about Heather that she is remorseful. I can't put into words how she feels. Maybe she can here when she has the opportunity to speak.

And I would agree with Attorney Snider. I mean, if Heather, the PSI writer said, anybody else said that "I can understand where Mr. and Mrs. Thorne come from", nobody can. I can't. Nobody can. Only people that have

lost younger children in an OWI accident can have any understanding what Mr. or Mrs. Thorne are going through. That's it. But she's trying to feel the right thing. She's trying, Judge. And there's no way she's ever going to feel exactly how they feel.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And this hasn't been suggested, so I'm not saying anybody suggested it, but I want to talk about this. I mean commonly defendants express remorse at the time of sentencing, which of course is always a nice convenient time to express remorse. But Heather's remorse and sorrow and sadness from this whole event has been in place since this happened. I know that in talking to her I know that she's wants to comment on this a little bit, so I don't want to belabor it. But in meeting with Heather in preparation for today she brought to myattention that she had sent a letter, an apology letter, to Mr. and Mrs. Thorne, and I didn't know that. heard that. Never saw that in any of the discovery, of course, and when I read the victim impact statements there's no suggestion to that. So, it caught me completely off guard. And Heather indicated to me that she still had a copy of that letter at home. I said, "Okay. Well, e-mail it to me." So, that night she scanned and e-mailed it to me. What I realize or what she realizes, she didn't have an actual copy of the letter

because it was handwritten. But she had the draft of the letter that had some scribbling in it that she rewrote without the scribbling and sent it. I don't know if Mr. and Mrs. Thorne ever got it. There's no suggestion that they have. I don't know ultimately how much it matters, only because this helps exemplify to the Court that this sadness and sorrow and remorse isn't being presented to the Court today because she wants you to be lenient with her, because that's really how she feels.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1-3-

14

15

16

17

18

19

2-0-

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to read this letter. She doesn't know exactly when she sent it, because the draft isn't dated. Her recollection it would have been late 2012, early 2013. But the letter reads as follows. It's a handwritten letter by Heather and it says, "Dear Mr. and Mrs. Thorne and Family, I don't know where to begin to express how sorry I am for the pain I have caused you and your family. I have five children of my own that range from three years to 18 years old and cannot imagine how I would make it through if one of them was taken from me because of someone else's actions. I am so sorry for what I have I pray for forgiveness every day. I don't expect to be forgiven, nor do I deserve to be forgiven for all the pain and suffering I've caused you and your family. I'll never be able to find the words to express the pain and sorrow that I feel for you and your family and for

what I have done. It should have been me that died that day, not Dylan."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, this is a letter authored by Heather within months of her killing Dylan and long before a criminal complaint was filed, long before September 30th, 2015. This has impacted Heather. And again, I'm not trying to say it even comes close to level with Mr. and Mrs. Thorne and family and friends about the effect it has. But as much as it can, when I've met with the two older daughters of Heather, you know, I've asked them and I met with them individually. I didn't meet with them collectively. I definitely didn't meet with them with Heather in the room. And I just asked them, you know, if they've learned anything. "Heather's children, have you learned anything? Has this impacted you?" And they both expressed, "Absolutely, of course it has." I believe Sabrina is 21. I think Ashley is 20. And I have the name of the others. I forgot the name of the others. There's five of them. But, I mean, they're in their years of drinking. I mean, if they're going to consume alcohol this is kind of the time they're going to do it, and they have learned that they need to come up with a plan of attack. As Attorney Snider said, an exit plan if they're going to drink. Heather's situation has impacted her children already in a very positive way.

The last point I want to make before moving on to our recommendation, Judge, is this. One of the factors the Court has to consider is protection of the community. I don't view Heather as an ongoing threat to the community. Her criminal record doesn't suggest that. Her behavior and the time that's passed between July 19th, 2012, and today hasn't exhibited that.

But what I would say, Judge, is that the community does need to be protected from drunk drivers. There's no doubt about that. But as we sit here today, moving forward, I don't think Heather poses a significant or even a slight risk to the community. And history is what we can look at to try to make those determinations, and she's 40. The criminal record that's discussed in the PSI is, I mean, I don't want to say insignificant, but not all that impressive is the best way I can characterize it. And she's a single mother, and she's fully employed, and she's stable. So, I don't think she poses a risk, but drunk drivers do. And as I've said before, to solve this problem of drinking and driving is best done through education and not incarceration.

Which moves me to our recommendation, Judge.

What we're asking the Court to do today is impose a prison sentence for Heather, but stay execution of that sentence, placing Heather on probation for a period of eight years.

As conditions of probation, other than those that have been discussed in the PSI and those that have been discussed by the State, we're recommending the following. We're recommending ten months of conditional jail time commencing today with Huber release privileges.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20-

21

22

23

24

25

The reason I came up with ten months, Judge, as opposed to maybe an easy simple 12 months, which of course is the maximum period of incarceration that one can be ordered to serve as a condition of probation, is for this There are seven days throughout the year that I think Heather should be ordered to serve in jail notwithstanding the ten months of conditional jail time. January 26th, which is one of her daughters' birthday. February 10th, which was Dylan's birthday. March 27th, which is her other daughter's birthday. April 9th, which is her son's birthday. May 21st, another daughter's birthday. July 19th, the obvious anniversary of this crash. And September 18th, the other daughter's birthday. Those are seven days that I think she should have to serve the entirety in jail on over the course of the eight years on probation. Seven times eight is 56. Essentially, two months added to the ten that she's already serving, we're at a year.

As everybody has commented and as everybody knows and understands there's never a way that Heather is

going to understand what it's like to lose a child unless she's ever the unfortunate—ends up being in the unfortunate situation the Thornes are. But taking her away from her children on her children's birthdays, again, a drop in the bucket. I know Heather knows that. But it's a way to remind her over the course of probation what she has caused, what the Thornes have lost.

And lastly, as an additional condition, Judge, I'm asking that the Court somehow structure a condition that requires Heather twice a year to meet with, in some organized setting, young teenage or young adults to discuss the dangers of drinking and driving. I hadn't thought of this condition until I met with these two co-workers about two weeks ago, and it really resonated with me that Heather has this ability to teach and mentor and help the young people in situations. She's better served, in my opinion, to help move the issue, because the issue here, Judge, is how do we stop drinking and driving. How do we stop it?

The Thorne family, I know, are trying their damndest to do that from their perspective in various ways. And that's great. That's awesome. That's wonderful. But we shouldn't forget or lose sight of the fact that Heather can help push this cause too. Heather can help push this issue. She's bright, articulate,

intelligent. She has a history of mentoring and teaching 1 2 younger people how to do things. She's setting an example for her children. She's setting examples for her 3 co-workers, and I think she can set an example for others. 4 5 Because at the end of the day can Heather solve this Absolutely not. But I think if she's speaking 6 7 to these young adults about the behaviors of drinking and driving she'll connect. Something will. 8 She'll reach even if it's only one person, Judge. That's better than 9 no people. But my guess, based on the way as reflected, 10 Heather will reach and connect with a lot of people and 11 push this issue forward, combating the dangers of drinking 12 1:3 and driving. 14 So, for those reasons, Judge, taking all the sentencing criteria into consideration, we think the Court 15 should follow our recommendation. 16 17 Ms. Schmidt, anything you wish to tell the Court before I pronounce sentence? 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I just want to tell Dylan's family and friends how sorry I am for everything 20you had to go through for the last three years and the 21 rest of your life. You won't have birthdays and holidays, 22 and I've taken that from you. And I was in the hospital 23 for probably about a week before I got an honest answer 24 25 what had happened that day. And I was never so horrified

in my life. And it was because it was something I had done. And when I was released I looked Dylan up on Facebook, because I wanted to know who he was, not just a name. And I can never give that back to any of you. And I don't expect forgiveness from anyone. I can't even give it to myself. But I will think of Dylan, and my guilt will carry with me for the rest of my life. I'm so sorry.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: This is a tragic case. among the most difficult cases for the courts to handle. And the courts have recognized the consequences of drunk driving for years. Back in 1986, Justice Louis Ceci of the Wisconsin Supreme Court noted that drunk driving is indiscriminate in the personal tragedy of death, injury and suffering it levies on its victims. It may transform an innocent user of a highway into a victim at any time with no advance notice and no opportunity to be heard. is a tragedy where the intoxicated driver and the victim are often unwittingly the same person. It is also a scourge on society. Drunk driving exacts a heavy toll in terms of increased health care and insurance costs, diminished economic resources and lost worker productivity. It is an affliction which produces no offsetting human or economic benefits. It engenders no positive human or economic incentive. It destroys and

demoralizes personal lives and shocks society's

conscience. It has no legitimate place in our society.

1.3

In Wisconsin, though, we are somewhat schizophrenic in the way we deal with drunk driving offenses. Certainly, the Wisconsin culture has a tradition of the bar, the family get-together, all of which alcohol consumption takes place. Clearly, consumption of alcohol is legal and condoned by the vast majority of Wisconsin residents.

However, the problem arises when someone who's consumed alcohol gets behind the wheel and drives a motor vehicle. The legislature has struggled with this problem and has increasingly exacted more severe penalties over the years. However, Wisconsin is still the only state in the nation where a first offense operating while under the influence of an intoxicant is not a criminal offense.

But for Ms. Schmidt's striking Dylan's vehicle on this occasion, had the police stopped her in response to the calls that they had been receiving that she was crossing the center line she would have at that time faced the \$754.50 forfeiture, an eight-month revocation of license, requirement that she operate vehicles equipped with an ignition interlock device for a period of one year and that she submit to and comply with alcohol assessment. But for the crash here, this case would have been long disposed of and that would have been the penalty.

So, when a court is asked to sentence on these kinds of cases it is very difficult. The courts are directed to look at a number of factors and go through an analysis when making a sentencing decision.

.13

This Court has a personal significant concern about the consequences of driving while under the influence of intoxicants. Shortly after taking the bench I created the Waupaca County Victim Offender Impact Panel that is still being run to this day. I don't know if it helps. I can only pray that it does. But what we do need as a society is to recognize that driving after consuming alcohol is the same as getting behind a gun after consuming alcohol. You lose an ability to control it and adverse and significant consequences can follow. As I indicated, the legislature has over the years consistently increased the penalty, including now the consequences of a Class D felony for which Ms. Schmidt is now facing sentencing.

I've had the benefit of arguments of counsel,
the presentence writer's recommendation, had the benefit
of hearing orally the stories of Dylan's aunt and his
mother. I've had the benefit of the written victim impact
statements that had been made. I've heard the benefit of
Ms. Reierson's testimony today. And I believe all of
those reports and collateral sources just demonstrate the

true tragedy of this situation.

1.3

I'm satisfied from the statement of Ms. Schmidt that she recognizes the true tragedy of the situation, and she seemed very sincere to the Court when she was expressing her apologies today. In the presentence investigation she indicated that she regrets getting in that vehicle that day. "Using better judgment, it would have never happened. I could have gone home after work. I could have left earlier. I could have gotten a ride. There's a whole lot of things I could have done."

That's why this is such a tragic case. There are so many things that could have been done on that day that would have prevented us being here today. I think when Tami Thorne indicated there are no words that can comfort from a loss of Dylan, that's absolutely true. There's nothing that I can say today that, unfortunately, is going to make Dylan's family and friends feel better.

When Ms. Thorne indicated that we need to demonstrate that Dylan's life had worth, there's no question that Dylan's life had great worth. He was a bright young man on his way to school to study law enforcement. His life was just beginning. It's tragic, absolutely tragic, that just when his world was beginning to start he was taken away. And there's no amount of

money, no amount of prison, no amount of words that I can say that's going to demonstrate his real value. His value was infinite.

4.

20-

And I suspect if there were any sentence that this Court could impose that would bring Dylan back today, I'd do it. And from Ms. Schmidt's comments I think she would certainly agree. But unfortunately, that's not a possibility.

When a Court imposes a sentence the Court has to look at a number of factors. Contrary to what many people think, we don't just pick numbers out of the air. We are given guidelines and strictures by the statutes, by prior case law, and we have to apply those to the facts that are before the Court at the time of sentencing. The Court has to consider the gravity of the offense, the protection of the community, the need for punishment, the rehabilitation needs of the defendant and general deterrence of other individuals as well as a whole host of secondary factors.

It's difficult to envision an offense that has more gravity than an offense that results in the loss of life. The strictures on the Court when considering sentencing direct that the Court must consider probation as the preferred and first choice if it's appropriate. It would appear to this Court that of all the other factors, gravity of the offense is the one that causes perhaps the

most difficult restriction on a probation sentence in this case.

1

2

3

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Schmidt has her five natural children plus apparently two other children that she has become emotionally responsible for. She maintains steady employment throughout most of her life. She is employed at the Waupaca Foundry at the present time. She is in a training position there. Her employer, certainly in the report that I received today, views her as a very positive contributor to the business. The presentence writer while using COMPAS - and the Court is certainly aware that there are some concerns about the utilization of the COMPAS in sentencing decisions - basically reaches the decision that Ms. Schmidt's a very low risk to cause any trouble ever again, that she's a positive, basically, contributor to her family and the community, that she lives a stable lifestyle and noted it is difficult to recommend a hard working single parent be sentenced to prison. writer concluded that all other sentences seem insufficient.

This Court, as I indicated, has the stricture that probation is to be the decision if the needs of sentencing can be met. Clearly, protection of the public is important. The presentence writer thinks the risk is low for any reoffense. I am concerned, frankly, by the

stories that I hear she's consuming alcohol, although there was no restriction on her utilization of alcohol when Branch I set the original bond in this matter. I'm told that she, if she does use alcohol, has altered the drivers, and obviously that's the most important issue in this Court's mind for protecting the public.

With regard to rehabilitation of the defendant, the presentence investigation seems to indicate she's not in need of much. Perhaps some counseling to deal with the stressors she's feeling from the incident itself.

The deterrence of others. I would hope that no matter what type of sentence this Court were to impose it will have some general deterrent effect. What people need to understand and recognize is that anyone can get behind the wheel after consuming alcohol and be sitting where Ms. Schmidt is sitting today.

The majority of operating while under the influence homicides that occur in this state are not committed by individuals with prior OWIs. Basically, it's a first-time individual, which again is reflective of the culture of this state and perhaps the lack of recognition of the seriousness of the consequences of drinking and driving.

Certainly, because of the seriousness of the conduct here, I think it is certainly appropriate to

impose a sentence to the state prison system of five years, and five years of extended supervision. However, I am going to stay that and place her on ten years of probation, because I'm mandated to give her probation if I think the needs of sentencing can be fulfilled by that probation.

2.0

There's nothing I can do with any type of sentence, I'm afraid, that's going to make the Thornes feel better. What I have to do is punish and protect the public, and I think that probation can accomplish that.

As conditions of her probation I will direct that she pay the costs of the action, including appropriate restitution surcharges. I will direct that she pay restitution in the amount of \$11,419.70 to Timothy and Elizabeth Thorne. I will direct that she pay the costs of supervision. I will direct that during the ten years she's on supervision that she not operate a motor vehicle unless authorized to do so by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation Division of Motor Vehicles.

Outside of the conditions of probation I will revoke her driving privileges for a period of five years. As a further condition of probation I will direct that she operate vehicles equipped with ignition interlock devices. That's the one way I can absolutely assure she's not going to drive after consuming alcohol.

As a further condition of probation, though, I am going to direct that she not possess or consume any alcohol. I am imposing an absolute sobriety requirement. I would hope that that's not going to be an issue, ma'am. But for the next ten years you will not consume any alcohol. You will not possess any illegal substance or drug paraphernalia as defined in Chapter 961. You will take prescription medications only in a manner and method as prescribed by a physician. You will obtain all prescriptions from one pharmacy. You will report any change of prescriptions to your agent within 48 hours.

2-0

As a further condition of supervision I am going to direct that at least twice annually you do some type of education to the public of the consequences of driving after consuming alcohol. I think Mr. Nielsen's suggestion that it be to the youth would be wise, but I'm not going to restrict it to that. I will allow you to do it in the form of participating in impact panels for impaired drivers. I will allow it to be fulfilled by putting an ad in a local paper indicating that, "I know the consequences of drinking and driving. I killed someone." I don't care how you do it, but you do something to help educate people of the consequences. As a further condition I will direct that you participate in an impact panel for impaired drivers.

As a further condition of supervision I am going to require conditional jail time. I think to not impose any would significantly and unduly depreciate the seriousness of the conduct. This is the type of case where it is very easy to send someone to prison, ma'am. But for the decision that the legislature has decided probation is appropriate in this case you would probably have gone to prison. But when I weigh the various types of these cases you fell on the probation side barely.

1-3-

20-

But I'm going to give you the maximum period of confinement in the county jail as a condition of probation, that being one year. I'm going to direct that the last five weeks of that sentence be served each and every Christmas Eve and Christmas Day for the next nine years after you're released from your initial confinement. I want and I believe it's necessary you suffer punishment. There's nothing I can do that's ever going to adequately deal with the tragedy of this situation. But I think you need to suffer at least a little bit. And the punishment is those 18 days.

Additionally, on every February 10th, Dylan's birthday, you are going to report to jail. And finally, on July 19th of every year you are going to report to the county jail. Those days are going to be served straight time without any work release. The other roughly

11 months you will be entitled to work release.

You should be aware, ma'am, you are a convicted felon. You may not possess a firearm. Possession of a firearm by you will be a felony offense that would expose you to a fine and imprisonment. You may not exercise the right to vote until such time as all of your civil rights are restored. I think I neglected to tell you, but you do have to provide a sample of biological material for DNA purposes as well.

Do you have any questions about the sentence? THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: You do have a right to seek post conviction relief either in this court or the Wisconsin State Court of Appeals. To perfect the right, though, you would need to file a notice of intent to seek relief within 20 days of today's date. Mr. Nielsen will continue to represent you for the next 20 days and assist you in the process. You will be going straight to jail right now, ma'am.

I guess I should indicate for the record that I have Mr. Snider's copies of the victim impact statements. I'm going to direct that the clerk make copies again and return them to his office just so we have a complete record.

Anything else for today, counsel?

-1-3-

2-0-

			_
	1	MR. SNIĐER: No, nothing here.	
	2	MR. NIELSEN: We do not.	
	3	THE COURT: We will recess then.	
	4	(Whereupon, the proceedings ended.)	
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11		
	12		
	13		6
11). WW	14		
	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		,
	23		
	24		
	25		.0
Az			
* • • *	L.		

:	STATE OF WISCONSIN)	
2) ss.	
	WAUPACA COUNTY)	
4		
6	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
7		
. 8	I, JANNELL M. MINEAU, certify that I am the	
9		
10	!	
11	i	
12	· i	
13	i · ·	
. 14		
15	Dated and signed in the City of Waupaca, on the	
16	and day of Mobel, 2015.	
17		
18		
19		
20-	JANNELL M. MINEAU	
21	Registered Professional Reporter (715) 258-6432	
22		
23		
24		
25		
	<u>L</u>	