



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on November 30, 2018

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Title  | Agenda Item Type  |
| Judicial Workload Assessment: Preliminary<br>2018 Update of the Judicial Needs<br>Assessment | Information Only  |
| Submitted by   | Date of Report  |
| Khulan Erdenebaatar, Analyst<br>Office of Court Research                                     | November 1, 201   |
|  | Contact   |
|  | Khulan Erdenebaatar, 415-865-7693<br><a href="mailto:khulan.erdenebaatar@jud.ca.gov">khulan.erdenebaatar@jud.ca.gov</a> |

---

### **Executive Summary**

*The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: Preliminary 2018 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment*, a report to the Legislature required by Government Code section 69614(c)(1), shows that 127 new judicial officers are needed based on workload. This analysis is based on judicial caseweights that were established in 2011 and are in the process of being updated; as a result, the workload measures will not reflect many factors that have changed judicial workload since 2011. The analysis will be updated and resubmitted to the council once the new workload measures are finalized in mid-2019. This report also includes information about the conversion of additional subordinate judicial officers to fulfill the reporting requirement of Government Code section 69614(c)(3). And, while not part of the legislative report itself, this report to the Judicial Council shows how new judicial resources might be distributed if any new judgeships were authorized and funded using the council-approved methodology described in Government Code section 69614(b).

### **Relevant Previous Council Action**

The methodology for determining the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts was approved by the Judicial Council in August 2001.<sup>1</sup> At that meeting, the Judicial Council also

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Research and Planning Unit, *A New Process for Assessing Judicial Needs in California* (Aug. 24, 2001), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/judneedsreview.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/judneedsreview.pdf).

directed staff to assess statewide judicial need using workload standards developed by the National Center for State Courts. That initial needs assessment and priority ranking was approved by the Judicial Council at its October 2001 meeting.<sup>2</sup>

At its August 2004 meeting, the council approved technical modifications to the judicial workload methodology and modified the priority ranking of the new judgeships.<sup>3</sup> At its February 2007 meeting, after the state Legislature created 50 new judgeships,<sup>4</sup> the council approved a subsequent re-ranking of the remaining 100 top-priority judgeships to reflect changes in workload since the 2004 report. The council also approved the methodology for identifying the number and location of subordinate judicial officer (SJO) positions that should be converted to judgeships.

In October 2007, Assembly Bill 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722) was enacted, authorizing 50 additional new judgeships; all but two, however, remain unfunded and unfilled. AB 159 also authorized the conversion of 162 vacant SJO positions—identified according to the council-approved methodology—at a rate of no more than 16 per year. Assembly Bill 2763 (Stats. 2010, ch. 690) authorized 10 additional conversions per year if the conversions were to result in judges being assigned to family or juvenile law calendars previously presided over by SJOs.

Updates of the assessed judicial need were approved by the Judicial Council, as directed by statute, in 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.<sup>5</sup>

The council has made a few revisions to the methodology used to calculate judicial need. In December 2011, the council approved updated caseweights that measure the amount of time that judicial officers need for case processing work.<sup>6</sup> At its December 2013 meeting, the council adopted a recommendation that any judgeships approved and funded be based on the most recent judicial needs assessment approved by the council.<sup>7</sup> And finally, in December 2014, the council adopted a revision to the prioritization method used to allocate any new judgeships that would lower the initial qualifying threshold from 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions to 0.8 FTE so

---

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Research and Planning Unit, *Results of Statewide Assessment of Judicial Needs Including List of Recommended New Judgeships* (Oct. 26, 2001), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/stateassess.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/stateassess.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Office of Court Research, *Update of Judicial Needs Study* (Aug. 9, 2004), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/0804item6.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/0804item6.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> In September 2006, Senate Bill 56 was enacted (Stats. 2006, ch. 390), authorizing 50 new judgeships; funding in fiscal year (FY) 2006–07 was provided for one month and ongoing thereafter.

<sup>5</sup> Assessed judicial need updates are available at [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/100808item1.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/100808item1.pdf) (2008), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/20101029infojudge.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/20101029infojudge.pdf) (2010), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-item2.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-item2.pdf) (2012), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf) (2014), and [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20161028-16-161.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20161028-16-161.pdf) (2016).

<sup>6</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Senate Bill 56 Working Group, *Judicial Workload Assessment: Updated Caseweights* (Nov. 7, 2011), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-121211-item3.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-121211-item3.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Assem. Bill 2745 (Stats. 2014, ch. 311) amends Government Code section 69614.2 to reflect this change.

that courts with fewer judicial officers had a greater opportunity to become eligible for new judgeships.<sup>8</sup>

## **Analysis/Rationale**

Government Code section 69614(c)(1) requires that the judicial needs assessment be updated biennially in even-numbered years. The 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment, which reports on the filings-based need for judicial officers in the trial courts, shows that 127 FTE judicial officers are needed in 17 courts (see Table 2 in Attachment A).<sup>9</sup> Without these needed resources, courts that have been determined to have a critical need for new judgeships will have to continue to try to process their caseloads with an insufficient number of judicial and support staff.

Should the Legislature authorize and fund new judicial resources, the Judicial Council's prioritization methodology would be used to allocate those judgeships in order of need. The methodology first identifies the number of judgeships needed in each court by comparing the number of authorized judicial positions to the most recent judicial needs assessment. Any court needing at least 0.8 FTE of a judgeship becomes eligible per the council policy adopted in December 2014. Next, a prioritization method that accounts both for a court's absolute and relative need is applied to determine the order in which each judgeship needed in each court should be allocated. Courts that need more than one new judgeship to meet workload-based need will appear multiple times on the list until all positions have been allocated.

Attachment B shows the priority list based on the 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment. There are 127 judgeships allocated according to the ranking methodology. Fractional FTE need and courts that have judicial need below 0.8 FTE that are thus not eligible for new judgeships do not appear on the final list.

## **Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications**

An update to the judicial workload study, intended to capture the impact of the changes in laws, policy, and technology, is currently in progress and will result in new caseweights and other model parameters that will reflect current case processing practices. An interim update to this 2018 report will be issued once the model has been updated and the workload need for judges can be computed on the basis of the updated weights and other model parameters. This update is contingent on Judicial Council approval and is anticipated to be made in fall 2019.

There are no costs to the branch associated with production of this report, other than the staff time needed to prepare the report and analyses. The funding associated with any new judgeships

---

<sup>8</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Workload Assessment Adv. Com., *Judicial Workload Assessment: 2014 Update of Judicial Needs Assessment and Proposed Revision to Methodology Used to Prioritize New Judgeships* (Nov. 7, 2014), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf).

<sup>9</sup> The 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment is based on a three-year average of filings from FY 2014–15 through FY 2016–17.

that may be authorized for the judicial branch as a result of this analysis is incorporated into the budget change proposals and/or the legislation that is sponsored to request new judgeships.

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: *The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: Preliminary 2018 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment*
2. Attachment B: Prioritization of New Judgeships Based on 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment



# **The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: Preliminary 2018 Update of the Judicial Needs**

---

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE UNDER  
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION  
69614(C)(1) & (3)

NOVEMBER 2018



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

---

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## **JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA**

**Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye**  
*Chief Justice of California and  
Chair of the Judicial Council*

**Martin Hoshino**  
*Administrative Director,  
Judicial Council*

### **ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION**

**John Wordlaw**  
*Chief Administrative Officer*

### **BUDGET SERVICES**

**Zlatko Theodorovic**  
*Director and Chief Financial Officer*

**Lucy Fogarty**  
*Deputy Director*

**Leah Rose-Goodwin**  
*Manager, Office of Court Research*

**Kristin Greenaway**  
*Supervising Research Analyst, Office of Court Research*

**Khulan Erdenebaatar**  
*Research Analyst, Office of Court Research  
Primary Author of Report*

## **Access to Justice Requires Having Sufficient Judicial Resources**

Government Code section 69614(c)(1) requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature and the Governor on or before November 1 of every even-numbered year on the need for new judgeships in each superior court, using the uniform criteria for the allocation of judgeships described in Government Code section 69614(b). Government Code section 69614(c)(3) requires the Judicial Council to report on the status of the conversion of additional subordinate judicial officer (SJO) positions to family or juvenile assignments.

The public's right to timely access to justice is contingent on having adequate judicial resources in every jurisdiction. The number of judgeships authorized and funded by the Legislature has not kept pace with workload in all California trial courts, leaving some with serious shortfalls—as high as 45 percent—between the number of judgeships needed and the number that have been authorized and filled.

Securing resources to meet the workload-based need for new judgeships has been a top priority for the Judicial Council for many years.

It should be noted that this report is based on data collected for the 2011 judicial workload study. An update to the judicial workload study is currently in progress and will result in new caseweights and other model parameters that will reflect current case processing practices. Because of this, an interim update to this preliminary 2018 report will be issued in fall 2019 once the study has been completed, the case weights have been approved, and the workload need for judges can be computed on the basis of the updated weights and other model parameters.

## **Quantifying the Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts**

California is a pioneer in the measurement of judicial workload-based need, having been the first state to use a weighted caseload methodology to assess the need for judicial officers, beginning in 1963.<sup>1</sup> Since then, weighted caseload has become a nationally accepted methodology for measuring judicial workload. The current methodology used to assess the need for judicial officers in the superior courts is based on a time study conducted in 2010, in which over 500 judicial officers in 15 courts participated. The time study findings resulted in the development of a set of caseweights that quantify the amount of case processing time needed for different case types, taking into account the full range of possible case processing outcomes and their relative probability of occurrence. The caseweights that resulted from the 2010 time study were approved by the Judicial Council in December 2011.

The caseweights are used to estimate judicial officer need by multiplying each caseweight by a three-year rolling average of filings for that case type and dividing by the available time in minutes that judicial officers have to hear cases. The result is expressed in full-time equivalent (FTE) judicial positions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Harry O. Lawson and Barbara J. Gletne, *Workload Measures in the Court* (National Center for State Courts, 1980).

## **Judicial Workload Measures Must be Updated to Reflect Current Case Processing Need**

California continues to have a critical need for judges, particularly in the Inland Empire which has shown a need for new judgeships for a sustained period of time. However, as previously noted, the figures in this report may not accurately represent the current degree of judicial need because the caseweights used in the current iteration of the judicial needs assessment are based on data collected in 2010. Therefore, the caseweights may not reflect new judicial workload resulting from legislative and other policy changes that have occurred since then. Some of the issues identified by judicial officers that have affected judicial workload since 2010 include, but are not limited to, the following:

- AB 109: criminal justice realignment (effective October 2011): judicial officers now have probation oversight of certain offenders, resulting in increased hearings and supervision;
- Proposition 47 (effective November 2014): changes the weights of the felony and misdemeanor workload; many jurisdictions have reported that changes in the law have eliminated incentives to complete misdemeanor drug treatment programs. With fewer people getting treatment, more are cycling rapidly through the system. A companion issue reported is that more defendants have trailing cases or multiple cases.
- Increase in the number of identified mentally-ill offenders, use of diversion programs and collaborative-type courts. While these measures improve outcomes, they require more judicial supervision and court monitoring.
- Increased use of juvenile diversion programs which have resulted in lower filings, but leave behind in the system the juveniles hardest to reach and who have committed the most serious crimes.
- New protections for non-minor dependents, which have increased the number of juveniles in the social services and court system (AB 12 and AB 212- effective 2012), as well as more juveniles receiving court supervision under special immigrant juvenile status (effective 2014, expanded 2015).
- Expanded use of court interpreters covering more casetypes, resulting in better outcomes for litigants, but more time required in the courtroom.

Such changes may also impact the practices of the court's justice partners, which can, in turn, have unintended consequences for court workload. Although filings have been declining, the workload associated with some types of filings has increased—due to, for example, the need to hold more hearings, more complex cases coming before the court (e.g., increasing mental health and substance abuse issues, larger numbers of defendants with multiple cases), or staff shortages causing some workload to fall on judicial officers. On the other hand, judicial workload in other areas not affected by such law and policy changes may have declined since 2010. The net impact of workload increases vs. decreases is unknown and may vary by jurisdiction depending on each court's unique mix of cases.



## 2018 Statewide Judicial Need Shows a Critical Need for New Judgeships

Consistent with reports submitted in previous years, the 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment shows a shortage of judges relative to the workload needs in California’s trial courts. Table 1, which summarizes the statewide judicial need compared to available resources based on a three-year average of filings from fiscal years 2014–15 through 2016–17, shows that 1,929.9 FTE judicial officers are needed statewide. Although the statewide assessed judicial need has been declining in recent years, many courts, particularly in the Inland Empire, continue to experience chronic judicial officer shortage (see Appendix A). In 2018, two highly impacted courts, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, received two judgeships each, which were reallocated from the superior courts of Alameda and Santa Clara Counties.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the Budget Act of 2018 gave the Superior Court of the County of Riverside two newly funded judgeships.<sup>3</sup> Despite these changes, Riverside and San Bernardino courts continue to have a large unmet need for new judgeships.

Table 1 shows the total assessed statewide need for judicial officers has declined by 118.7, or 6 percent, since the 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment.

**Table 1. Statewide Need for Judicial Officers, 2016 and 2018 Judicial Needs Assessments**

| Year                         | Authorized Judicial Positions (AJP) <sup>a</sup> | Authorized and Funded Judgeships and Authorized SJO Positions | Assessed Judicial Need (AJN) |
|------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|
| 2016                         | 2,010.1  | 1,960.1   | 2,048.6                      |
| 2018 <sup>b</sup>            | 2,004.1  | 1,956.1   | 1,929.9                      |
| <b>Change (2016 to 2018)</b> | <b>-6.0</b>                                      | <b>-4.0</b>   | <b>-118.7</b>                |

<sup>a</sup> Includes the 48 judgeships that were authorized by AB 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722) but never funded or filled. AB 159 originally authorized 50 judgeships, but 2 were funded in 2018 and allocated to the Superior Court of Riverside County. See Stats. 2018, ch. 45, § 6.

<sup>b</sup> AJP changed since the last assessment because, in 2016–17, the Superior Court of Santa Clara County had 5 FTE SJO reductions. In addition, the 2018 assessment includes a correction in the number of authorized positions; the 2016 AJN assessment had reported only 3 of the 4 SJO reductions at the Superior Court of Contra Costa County.

<sup>2</sup> Assem. Bill 103; Stats. 2017, ch. 17, § 22.

<sup>3</sup> Stats. 2018, ch. 45, § 6. These two judgeships are part of the 50 unfunded judgeships authorized by AB 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722).

## **127 Judicial Officers Needed Statewide to Meet Workload Demand**

Judicial need is calculated by taking the difference between the assessed judicial need in each court and the number of authorized/funded positions in each court. The assessed judicial need in each court compared to the number of authorized and filled positions is shown in Appendix B. Calculating the *statewide* need for judgeships is not as simple as subtracting the statewide number of authorized and funded positions from the statewide assessed judicial need. This is because the net statewide calculations of judicial need do not accurately identify the court's need for new judgeships because judgeships are not allocated at the statewide level but are allocated to individual trial courts. By way of illustration, the branch's smallest courts are statutorily provided with a minimum of two judgeships and are authorized to have at least 0.3 FTE of a federally funded child support commissioner, for a total of 2.3 FTE judicial officers. This statutory minimum applies even though the workload need in those courts may translate to a much smaller number of judge FTEs. As Appendix A shows, under a pure workload analysis, two of California's two-judge courts—Alpine and Sierra Counties—would need only 0.2 FTE judicial officers but have 2.3 FTE authorized positions. These courts thus show a negative number in the need for new judicial officers. This negative number does not and should not offset the 36 judicial officers that Riverside County needs to meet its workload-based need.

In other words, the fact that some courts may have more authorized positions than assessed judicial need under a pure application of the weighted caseload methodology does not take away from the needs in other courts. As a result, a net calculation of need, adding these positives and negatives, would provide an artificially low estimate of judicial need in California courts.

Therefore, the actual statewide need for new judgeships is calculated by adding the judicial need among only the courts that have fewer judgeships than their workload demands. Judicial officer FTE need—the difference between the assessed judicial need and the authorized judicial positions—is rounded down to the nearest whole number to arrive at the number of judgeships needed for each court.<sup>4</sup> For example, Tulare County has a judicial officer FTE need of 2.6, which rounds down to 2 new judgeships needed based on workload.

Based on the 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment, 17 courts need new judgeships, for a total need of 127 judges (Table 2). The need estimate does not include judicial vacancies resulting from retirements, elevations, or other changes that have not yet been filled.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Per the Judicial Council policy adopted in 2014, an exception is made for courts with judicial FTE need of more than 0.8, but less than 1. For such courts, their actual judicial officer FTE need is reported without any rounding down. In 2018, there were no courts with judicial officer FTEs in the range of 0.8 and 1. See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Judicial Workload Assessment: 2014 Update of Judicial Needs Assessment and Proposed Revision to Methodology Used to Prioritize New Judgeships* (Nov. 7, 2014), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> Judicial vacancies are reported monthly at [www.courts.ca.gov/15893.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/15893.htm).

**Table 2. Need for New Judgeships, by Court**

|                | A  | B                           | C  | D                                   |
|----------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Court          | Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions | 2018 Assessed Judicial Need | Number of Judgeships Needed*<br>AJN – AJP<br>(B – A) | % Judicial Need over AJP<br>(C / A) |
| Imperial       | 11.3                                     | 12.3                        | 1.0  | 9                                   |
| Tehama         | 4.3                                      | 5.4                         | 1.0  | 23                                  |
| Merced         | 12.0                                     | 13.2                        | 1.0  | 8                                   |
| Sutter         | 5.3                                      | 6.6                         | 1.0  | 19                                  |
| Humboldt       | 8.0                                      | 9.4                         | 1.0  | 13                                  |
| Shasta         | 12.0                                     | 14.4                        | 2.0  | 17                                  |
| Kings          | 8.6                                      | 11.0                        | 2.0  | 23                                  |
| Tulare         | 23.0                                     | 25.6                        | 2.0  | 9                                   |
| Placer         | 14.5                                     | 17.4                        | 2.0  | 14                                  |
| Ventura        | 33.0                                     | 36.3                        | 3.0  | 9                                   |
| Stanislaus     | 24.0                                     | 28.2                        | 4.0  | 17                                  |
| San Joaquin    | 33.5                                     | 38.6                        | 5.0  | 15                                  |
| Fresno         | 49.0                                     | 56.9                        | 7.0  | 14                                  |
| Kern           | 43.0                                     | 53.5                        | 10.0   | 23                                  |
| Sacramento     | 72.5                                     | 84.3                        | 11.0   | 15                                  |
| Riverside      | 80.0                                     | 116.2                       | 36.0   | 45                                  |
| San Bernardino | 88.0                                     | 126.2                       | 38.0   | 43                                  |
|                |  |                             | <b>127.0</b>   |                                     |

\* Rounded down to the nearest whole number.

### **Status of Conversion of Additional SJO Positions to Family and Juvenile Assignments**

As directed by Government Code section 69614(c)(3), this report also addresses the implementation of conversions of additional SJO positions (above the 16 authorized per year) that result in judges being posted to family or juvenile assignments previously held by SJOs.<sup>6</sup>

Conversions of additional positions were authorized for fiscal year 2011–12 (Gov. Code, § 69616), and under this authority four SJO positions were converted to judgeships—one each in the superior courts of Alameda (June 2012), Los Angeles (January 2012), Orange (January 2012), and Sacramento (March 2012) Counties. The courts that converted those positions have confirmed that those family and juvenile calendars are now presided over by judges.


<sup>6</sup> As authorized by Gov. Code, § 69615(c)(1)(C).

Conversions of 10 additional positions have been authorized since fiscal year 2013–14 (Gov. Code, §§ 69617–69619.6), but no additional SJO positions above the 16 authorized per year have been converted under this authority.

### **Lack of Adequate Judicial Resources Is a Barrier to Access to Justice**

The public’s right to timely access to justice should not be contingent on the resource levels in the county in which they reside or bring their legal disputes. All Californians deserve to have the proper number of judicial officers for the workload in their jurisdiction. This report highlights the critical and ongoing need for new judgeships in the superior courts.

## Appendix A. Judicial Need Map



## Appendix B. Assessed Judicial Need Compared to Authorized Positions

| <b>Court</b>    | <b>A</b><br><b>Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions<sup>a</sup></b> | <b>B</b><br><b>2018 Assessed Judicial Need</b> | <b>C</b><br><b>AJN – AJP (B – A)</b> | <b>D</b><br><b>% Judicial Need over AJP (C / A)<sup>b</sup></b> |
|-----------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Riverside       | 80  | 116.2  | 36.2                                 | 45  |
| San Bernardino  | 88  | 126.2  | 38.2                                 | 43  |
| Kings           | 8.6   | 11.0   | 2.4                                  | 28  |
| Tehama          | 4.33  | 5.4  | 1.1                                  | 25  |
| Kern            | 43  | 53.5   | 10.5                                 | 24  |
| Sutter          | 5.3   | 6.6  | 1.3                                  | 24  |
| Shasta          | 12  | 14.4   | 2.4                                  | 20  |
| Placer          | 14.5  | 17.4   | 2.9                                  | 20  |
| Stanislaus      | 24  | 28.2   | 4.2                                  | 18  |
| Humboldt        | 8   | 9.4  | 1.4                                  | 17  |
| Sacramento      | 72.5  | 84.3   | 11.8                                 | 16  |
| Fresno          | 49  | 56.9   | 7.9                                  | 16  |
| San Joaquin     | 33.5  | 38.6   | 5.1                                  | 15  |
| Amador          | 2.3   | 2.6  | 0.3                                  | 14  |
| Lake            | 4.7   | 5.3  | 0.6                                  | 14  |
| San Benito      | 2.3   | 2.6  | 0.3                                  | 13  |
| Tulare          | 23  | 25.6   | 2.6                                  | 11  |
| Ventura         | 33  | 36.3   | 3.3                                  | 10  |
| Merced          | 12  | 13.2   | 1.2                                  | 10  |
| Imperial        | 11.3  | 12.3   | 1.0                                  | 9   |
| Calaveras       | 2.3   | 2.4  | 0.1                                  | 5   |
| Yuba            | 5.33  | 5.4  | 0.1                                  | 2   |
| Madera          | 9.3   | 9.4  | 0.1                                  | 1   |
| Butte           | 13  | 13.0   | 0.0                                  | 0   |
| San Luis Obispo | 15  | 14.6   | -0.4                                 | -2  |
| Sonoma          | 23  | 22.4   | -0.6                                 | -3  |
| Lassen          | 2.3   | 2.2  | -0.1                                 | -3  |
| Tuolumne        | 4.75  | 4.6  | -0.2                                 | -3  |
| Contra Costa    | 42  | 39.6   | -2.4                                 | -6  |
| Orange          | 144   | 135.0  | -9.0                                 | -6  |
| Solano          | 23  | 21.5   | -1.5                                 | -6  |
| Alameda         | 83  | 77.1   | -5.9                                 | -7  |
| Los Angeles     | 585.25  | 533.3  | -52.0                                | -9  |
| Santa Barbara   | 24  | 21.8   | -2.2                                 | -9  |
| Santa Cruz      | 13.5  | 12.2   | -1.3                                 | -9  |
| Monterey        | 21.2  | 19.1   | -2.1                                 | -10   |
| Yolo            | 12.4  | 10.9   | -1.5                                 | -12   |
| Napa            | 8   | 7.0  | -1.0                                 | -12   |
| El Dorado       | 9   | 7.8  | -1.2                                 | -13   |
| San Mateo       | 33  | 28.6   | -4.4                                 | -13   |
| San Diego       | 154   | 132.3  | -21.7                                | -14   |
| Mendocino       | 8.4   | 7.0  | -1.4                                 | -16   |
| Del Norte       | 2.8   | 2.3  | -0.5                                 | -18   |
| Marin           | 12.7  | 10.1   | -2.6                                 | -21   |
| San Francisco   | 55.9  | 43.8   | -12.1                                | -22   |
| Glenn           | 2.3   | 1.8  | -0.5                                 | -22   |
| Santa Clara     | 82  | 62.2   | -19.8                                | -24   |
| Colusa          | 2.3   | 1.5  | -0.8                                 | -34   |

| <b>Court</b> | <b>A</b><br><b>Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions<sup>a</sup></b> | <b>B</b><br><b>2018 Assessed Judicial Need</b> | <b>C</b><br><b>AJN – AJP (B – A)</b> | <b>D</b><br><b>% Judicial Need over AJP (C / A)<sup>b</sup></b> |
|--------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Siskiyou     | 5   | 3.1  | -1.9                                 | -37   |
| Trinity      | 2.3   | 1.4  | -0.9                                 | -39   |
| Nevada       | 7.6   | 4.5  | -3.1                                 | -40   |
| Inyo         | 2.3   | 1.4  | -0.9                                 | -41   |
| Plumas       | 2.3   | 1.2  | -1.1                                 | -50   |
| Mono         | 2.3   | 0.9  | -1.4                                 | -59   |
| Mariposa     | 2.3   | 0.9  | -1.4                                 | -61   |
| Modoc        | 2.3   | 0.8  | -1.5                                 | -66   |
| Sierra       | 2.3   | 0.2  | -2.1                                 | -90   |
| Alpine       | 2.3   | 0.2  | -2.1                                 | -93   |

<sup>a</sup> Authorized judicial positions include both judgeships and subordinate judicial officer positions. Authorized judgeships consist of those codified in Government Code sections 69580–69611 plus the 50 judgeships that were authorized and funded with SB 56 (Stats. 2006, ch. 390), but not the 48 judgeships that were authorized with AB 159 but never funded.

<sup>b</sup> Percentages shown here slightly differ from the percentages shown in Table 2, Need for New Judgeships. Percentages in Appendix B are calculated based on the actual differences between AJN and AJP, whereas the percentages in Table 2 are based on rounded-down differences between AJN and AJP, as explained on pages 4–5.

**Attachment B: Prioritization of New Judgeships Based on 2018 Judicial Needs Assessment**

| Allocation Order | Court          | Allocation Order | Court          | Allocation Order | Court          |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1                | San Bernardino | 44               | Sacramento     | 87               | Stanislaus     |
| 2                | Riverside      | 45               | San Bernardino | 88               | Kern           |
| 3                | San Bernardino | 46               | Riverside      | 89               | Sacramento     |
| 4                | Riverside      | 47               | Placer         | 90               | Riverside      |
| 5                | Kern           | 48               | Kings          | 91               | San Bernardino |
| 6                | Sacramento     | 49               | Imperial       | 92               | Riverside      |
| 7                | San Bernardino | 50               | San Bernardino | 93               | San Bernardino |
| 8                | Riverside      | 51               | Riverside      | 94               | Riverside      |
| 9                | Fresno         | 52               | Shasta         | 95               | San Bernardino |
| 10               | San Bernardino | 53               | Kern           | 96               | Sacramento     |
| 11               | Riverside      | 54               | San Bernardino | 97               | Riverside      |
| 12               | San Joaquin    | 55               | Riverside      | 98               | San Bernardino |
| 13               | Stanislaus     | 56               | Ventura        | 99               | Kern           |
| 14               | Kern           | 57               | Sacramento     | 100              | San Joaquin    |
| 15               | San Bernardino | 58               | San Joaquin    | 101              | Fresno         |
| 16               | Kings          | 59               | Fresno         | 102              | Riverside      |
| 17               | Riverside      | 60               | San Bernardino | 103              | San Bernardino |
| 18               | Placer         | 61               | Riverside      | 104              | Riverside      |
| 19               | Sacramento     | 62               | Tulare         | 105              | San Bernardino |
| 20               | Shasta         | 63               | Stanislaus     | 106              | Sacramento     |
| 21               | San Bernardino | 64               | San Bernardino | 107              | San Bernardino |
| 22               | Riverside      | 65               | Riverside      | 108              | Riverside      |
| 23               | Ventura        | 66               | Kern           | 109              | San Bernardino |
| 24               | Fresno         | 67               | San Bernardino | 110              | Riverside      |
| 25               | San Bernardino | 68               | Riverside      | 111              | Kern           |
| 26               | Tulare         | 69               | Sacramento     | 112              | San Bernardino |
| 27               | Riverside      | 70               | San Bernardino | 113              | Riverside      |
| 28               | Sutter         | 71               | Riverside      | 114              | San Bernardino |
| 29               | Kern           | 72               | Fresno         | 115              | Sacramento     |
| 30               | Tehama         | 73               | San Bernardino | 116              | Riverside      |
| 31               | Humboldt       | 74               | Riverside      | 117              | San Bernardino |
| 32               | San Bernardino | 75               | Kern           | 118              | Riverside      |
| 33               | Riverside      | 76               | San Bernardino | 119              | San Bernardino |
| 34               | Sacramento     | 77               | Sacramento     | 120              | Riverside      |
| 35               | San Joaquin    | 78               | San Joaquin    | 121              | San Bernardino |
| 36               | San Bernardino | 79               | Riverside      | 122              | Riverside      |
| 37               | Riverside      | 80               | San Bernardino | 123              | San Bernardino |
| 38               | Stanislaus     | 81               | Riverside      | 124              | Riverside      |
| 39               | San Bernardino | 82               | San Bernardino | 125              | San Bernardino |
| 40               | Kern           | 83               | Riverside      | 126              | Riverside      |
| 41               | Riverside      | 84               | Ventura        | 127              | San Bernardino |
| 42               | Fresno         | 85               | San Bernardino |                  |                |
| 43               | Merced         | 86               | Fresno         |                  |                |