



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on October 27–28, 2016

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Workload Assessment: 2016 Update of Judicial Needs Assessment	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	October 28, 2016
Recommended by	Date of Report
Workload Assessment Advisory Committee Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair	October 19, 2016
	Contact
	Leah Rose-Goodwin, 415-865-7708 leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the attached report, *The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2016 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment*, for transmittal to the Legislature and the Governor. This legislative report, which fulfills the requirements of Government Code section 69614(c)(1), shows that nearly 189 new judicial officers are needed to meet the workload-based need for new judgeships. 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).

Recommendation

1. The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, approve the attached report, *The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2016*

Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment (Attachment A), for transmittal to the Legislature and the Governor; and

2. The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the proposed priority ranking for any new authorized and funded judgeships (Attachment B).

Previous Council Action

The methodology for determining the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts was approved by the Judicial Council in August 2001.¹ At that meeting, the Judicial Council also 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.²

At its August 2004 meeting, the council approved technical modifications to the judicial workload methodology and modified the priority ranking of the new judgeships.³ At its February 2007 meeting, after the state Legislature created 50 new judgeships,⁴ 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; these positions, 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, and 2014.⁵

¹ 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.

² 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.

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

⁴ In September 2006, Sen. Bill 56 was enacted (Stats. 2006, ch. 390), authorizing 50 new judgeships; funding in fiscal year (FY) 2006–2007 was provided for one month and ongoing thereafter.

⁵ Assessed judicial need updates available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/100808item1.pdf (2008), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/20101029infojudge.pdf (2010), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-item2.pdf (2012), and www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf (2014).

The council has made a few recent 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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 FTE to 0.8 FTE so that courts with fewer judicial officers had a greater opportunity to become eligible for new judgeships.⁸

Rationale for Recommendation

The ability to have a critical criminal, family law, domestic violence, or civil matter addressed by the court should not be based on the judicial resources in the county in which one happens to reside. Access to the courts is fundamentally compromised by judicial shortages, and securing adequate judicial resources for the courts is a top priority for the Judicial Council. Reports on the critical shortage of judicial officers have been submitted to the council since 2001 and, since that time, have formed the basis of council requests to the Legislature to create new judgeships.

Government Code section 69614(c)(1) requires that the Judicial Needs Assessment be updated biennially in even-numbered years. The 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment, which reports on the filings-based need for judicial officers in the trial courts, shows that 188.5 FTE judicial officers are needed in 31 courts (see Table 2 in Attachment A).⁹ 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.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Assem. Bill 2745 (Stats. 2014, ch. 311) amends Gov. Code, § 69614.2 to reflect this change.

⁸ 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.

⁹ The 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment is based on a three-year average of filings from FY 2012–2013 through FY 2014–2015.

Attachment B shows the priority list based on the 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment. While a statewide total of 188.5 judgeships are needed, there are 173 judgeships allocated according to the ranking methodology. Fractional FTE need and courts that have judicial need below 0.8 FTE are not eligible for new judgeships and do not appear on the final list.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Comments

This proposal was discussed at the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee meeting on October 12, 2016. Since the methodologies for determining judicial need and allocating new judgeships are functions that are statutorily delegated to the Judicial Council, the proposal was not circulated for public comment.

At this meeting, committee members noted that the figures in this report may not accurately represent the current degree of judicial need. It was noted that, because the caseweights used in the current iteration of the judicial needs assessment are based on data collected in 2010, they may not reflect new judicial workload resulting from legislative and other policy changes that have occurred since then. On the other hand, judicial workload in other areas not affected by such law and policy changes may have declined since 2010. An update to the judicial workload study, intended to capture the impact of the changes mentioned above, is planned for 2017 and updated caseweights will be used in the next iteration of this report in 2018.

Alternatives Considered

Production of this report is a legislative mandate and no alternatives were considered.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

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 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.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The Judicial Needs Assessment update is consistent with Goal II, Independence and Accountability, of the 2006–2016 Judicial Branch Strategic Plan.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: *The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2016 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment*
2. Attachment B: Prioritization of New Judgeships based on 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment



The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2016 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment

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

OCTOBER 2016



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*

Jody Patel
Chief of Staff

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Millicent Tidwell
Chief Operating Officer

COURT OPERATIONS SERVICES

Robert Lowney
Acting Director

Leah Rose-Goodwin
Manager, Office of Court Research

Deana Farole
Supervising Research Analyst, Office of Court Research

Peter James
*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, leaving many courts with serious shortfalls—as high as over 60 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.

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 1963.¹ 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 judicial positions (FTEs).

It should be noted that despite the finding that 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, 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, they may not reflect new judicial workload resulting from legislative and other policy changes that have occurred since then, including criminal justice realignment (AB 109), Proposition 47, implementation of the recommendations

¹ Henry O. Lawson and Barbara J. Gletne, *Workload Measures in the Court* (National Center for State Courts, 1980).

of the Elkins Family Law Task Force, the extension of foster care services to age 21 (AB 12/212), and the like. 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 may have 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. An update to the judicial workload study, intended to capture the impact of the changes mentioned above, is planned for 2017 and updated caseweights will be used in the next iteration of this report in 2018.

2016 Statewide Judicial Need Shows a Critical Need for New Judgeships

Consistent with reports submitted in previous years, the 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment shows that there is a critical shortage of judges relative to the workload needs in California’s trial courts. Table 1 summarizes the statewide judicial need compared to available resources based on a three-year average of filings from fiscal years 2012–2013 through 2014–2015, showing that 2,048.6 FTE judicial officers are needed statewide, compared to 1,960.1 FTE authorized and funded positions. There are separate columns showing the number of authorized judicial positions and those that are both authorized and funded. While Assembly Bill 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722) authorized 50 new judgeships for the superior courts, those positions have neither been funded nor filled.

Table 1 shows the total assessed statewide need for judicial officers has declined by 122.7, or 6 percent, since the 2014 Judicial Needs Assessment. Lower overall filings counts in recent years account for the slight decline in statewide assessed judicial need.

Table 1: Statewide Need for Judicial Officers, 2014 and 2016 Judicial Needs Assessments

Year	Authorized Judicial Positions (AJP) ²	Authorized and Funded Judgeships and Authorized SJO Positions	Assessed Judicial Need (AJN)
2014	2,013.2	1,963.2	2,171.3
2016 ³	2,010.1	1,960.1	2,048.6
Change (2014 to 2016)	-3.1	-3.1	-122.7

² Includes the 50 judgeships that were authorized by AB 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722) but never funded or filled.

³ AJP changed since the last assessment because the Superior Court of Contra Costa County applied for a reduction of 3.0 FTE SJOs in August 2016 and as a result of fractional changes in other courts.

Nearly 189 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 A. 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; net statewide calculations of judicial need do not accurately identify the branch'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 47 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.

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. Based on the 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment, 31 courts need new judgeships, for a total need of 188.5 FTEs (Table 2). The need estimate does not include judicial vacancies resulting from retirements, elevations, or other changes that have not yet been filled.⁴

⁴ Judicial vacancies are reported monthly at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/15893.htm>

Table 2: Need for New Judgeships, by Court

	A	B	C	D
County	Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions ¹	2016 Assessed Judicial Need	AJP-AJN (B-A)	% need over AJP (C/A)
Amador	2.3	2.8	0.5	22%
Butte	13.0	14.6	1.6	12%
Calaveras	2.3	2.7	0.4	19%
Del Norte	2.8	3.0	0.2	7%
El Dorado	9.0	9.1	0.1	1%
Fresno	49.0	61.8	12.8	26%
Humboldt	8.0	10.4	2.4	30%
Imperial	11.3	12.9	1.6	14%
Kern	43.0	56.8	13.8	32%
Kings	8.6	11.7	3.1	36%
Lake	4.7	5.5	0.8	16%
Lassen	2.3	2.6	0.3	13%
Madera	9.3	10.3	1.0	11%
Merced	12.0	15.0	3.0	25%
Napa	8.0	8.0	0.05	1%
Placer	14.5	19.2	4.7	33%
Riverside	76.0	122.8	46.8	62%
Sacramento	72.5	82.9	10.4	14%
San Benito	2.3	2.6	0.3	12%
San Bernardino	86.0	134.1	48.1	56%
San Joaquin	33.5	42.2	8.7	26%
San Luis Obispo	15.0	16.9	1.9	13%
Santa Cruz	13.5	13.6	0.1	0%
Shasta	12.0	16.7	4.7	39%
Sonoma	23.0	23.8	0.8	3%
Stanislaus	24.0	31.5	7.5	31%
Sutter	5.3	6.8	1.5	28%
Tehama	4.3	5.8	1.5	34%
Tulare	23.0	27.5	4.5	19%
Ventura	33.0	38.0	5.0	15%
Yuba	5.3	5.9	0.5	10%
Total need:			188.5	

¹ Authorized judicial positions, not including judgeships that were authorized under AB 159.

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.⁵

Conversions of additional positions were authorized for fiscal year 2011–2012 (Gov. Code, § 69616), and under this authority four SJO positions were converted to judgeships—one each in

⁵ As authorized by Gov. Code, § 69615(c)(1)(C).

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.

Conversions of 10 additional positions were authorized for fiscal years 2013–2014 (Gov. Code, § 69617), 2014–2015 (Gov. Code, § 69618), and 2015–2016 (Gov. Code, § 69619), 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: Assessed Judicial Need Compared to Authorized Positions

	A	B	C	D
County	Authorized and funded Judicial Positions ¹	2016 Assessed Judicial Need	AJN-AJP (B-A)	% need over AJP (C/A)
Alameda	85.0	67.7	-17.3	n/a
Alpine	2.3	0.2	-2.1	n/a
Amador	2.3	2.8	0.5	22%
Butte	13.0	14.6	1.6	12%
Calaveras	2.3	2.7	0.4	19%
Colusa	2.3	1.6	-0.7	n/a
Contra Costa	43.0	40.9	-2.1	n/a
Del Norte	2.8	3.0	0.2	7%
El Dorado	9.0	9.1	0.1	1%
Fresno	49.0	61.8	12.8	26%
Glenn	2.3	1.6	-0.7	n/a
Humboldt	8.0	10.4	2.4	30%
Imperial	11.3	12.9	1.6	14%
Inyo	2.3	1.5	-0.8	n/a
Kern	43.0	56.8	13.8	32%
Kings	8.6	11.7	3.1	36%
Lake	4.7	5.5	0.8	16%
Lassen	2.3	2.6	0.3	13%
Los Angeles	585.3	573.3	-12.0	n/a
Madera	9.3	10.3	1.0	11%
Marin	12.7	10.6	-2.1	n/a
Mariposa	2.3	1.0	-1.3	n/a
Mendocino	8.4	7.5	-0.9	n/a
Merced	12.0	15.0	3.0	25%
Modoc	2.3	0.9	-1.4	n/a
Mono	2.3	1.0	-1.3	n/a
Monterey	21.2	20.5	-0.7	n/a
Napa	8.0	8.0	0.0	1%
Nevada	7.6	4.9	-2.7	n/a
Orange	144.0	144.0	0.0	n/a
Placer	14.5	19.2	4.7	33%
Plumas	2.3	1.2	-1.1	n/a
Riverside	76.0	122.8	46.8	62%
Sacramento	72.5	82.9	10.4	14%
San Benito	2.3	2.6	0.3	12%
San Bernardino	86.0	134.1	48.1	56%
San Diego	154.0	142.9	-11.1	n/a
San Francisco	55.9	48.4	-7.5	n/a
San Joaquin	33.5	42.2	8.7	26%
San Luis Obispo	15.0	16.9	1.9	13%
San Mateo	33.0	29.1	-3.9	n/a
Santa Barbara	24.0	22.4	-1.6	n/a
Santa Clara	89.0	66.9	-22.1	n/a
Santa Cruz	13.5	13.6	0.1	0%
Shasta	12.0	16.7	4.7	39%
Sierra	2.3	0.2	-2.1	n/a
Siskiyou	5.0	3.2	-1.8	n/a
Solano	23.0	22.6	-0.4	n/a
Sonoma	23.0	23.8	0.8	3%
Stanislaus	24.0	31.5	7.5	31%
Sutter	5.3	6.8	1.5	28%
Tehama	4.3	5.8	1.5	34%
Trinity	2.3	1.5	-0.8	n/a
Tulare	23.0	27.5	4.5	19%
Tuolumne	4.8	4.5	-0.2	n/a
Ventura	33.0	38.0	5.0	15%
Yolo	12.4	11.0	-1.4	n/a
Yuba	5.3	5.9	0.5	10%

¹ Authorized judicial positions include both judgeships and subordinate judicial officer positions. Authorized judgeships consist of those codified in Gov. Code, §§ 69580–69611 plus the 50 judgeships that were authorized and funded with SB 56 (Stats. 2006, ch. 390), but not the 50 judgeships that were authorized with AB 159 but never funded.

Please address inquiries to:

Judicial Council of California
Office of Court Research
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

research@jud.ca.gov

Attachment B: Prioritization of New Judgeships based on 2016 Judicial Needs Assessment

Allocation order	Court	Allocation order	Court	Allocation order	Court
1	Riverside	61	Riverside	121	San Joaquin
2	San Bernardino	62	Madera	122	Sacramento
3	Riverside	63	San Bernardino	123	San Bernardino
4	San Bernardino	64	Shasta	124	Riverside
5	Kern	65	Humboldt	125	San Bernardino
6	Fresno	66	Fresno	126	Riverside
7	Riverside	67	San Joaquin	127	San Bernardino
8	San Bernardino	68	Placer	128	Fresno
9	San Joaquin	69	Riverside	129	Riverside
10	Stanislaus	70	San Bernardino	130	Kern
11	Shasta	71	Stanislaus	131	Stanislaus
12	Riverside	72	Kern	132	San Bernardino
13	Sacramento	73	Riverside	133	Riverside
14	San Bernardino	74	San Bernardino	134	Sacramento
15	Placer	75	Sacramento	135	San Bernardino
16	Kern	76	Riverside	136	Riverside
17	Kings	77	San Bernardino	137	San Bernardino
18	Riverside	78	Fresno	138	San Joaquin
19	San Bernardino	79	Riverside	139	Riverside
20	Tulare	80	San Bernardino	140	San Bernardino
21	Fresno	81	Tulare	141	Fresno
22	Ventura	82	Ventura	142	Kern
23	Merced	83	Kern	143	Riverside
24	Riverside	84	San Joaquin	144	San Bernardino
25	Humboldt	85	Riverside	145	Riverside
26	San Bernardino	86	San Bernardino	146	San Bernardino
27	San Joaquin	87	Kings	147	Sacramento
28	Stanislaus	88	Stanislaus	148	Riverside
29	Riverside	89	Riverside	149	San Bernardino
30	San Bernardino	90	Sacramento	150	Riverside
31	Kern	91	San Bernardino	151	San Bernardino
32	Tehama	92	Shasta	152	Riverside
33	Sacramento	93	Fresno	153	Kern
34	Sutter	94	Riverside	154	Fresno
35	Riverside	95	San Bernardino	155	San Bernardino
36	San Bernardino	96	Kern	156	Riverside
37	Fresno	97	Placer	157	San Bernardino
38	Shasta	98	Riverside	158	Riverside
39	Placer	99	San Bernardino	159	San Bernardino
40	Riverside	100	Riverside	160	Sacramento
41	San Bernardino	101	San Bernardino	161	Riverside
42	San Luis Obispo	102	San Joaquin	162	San Bernardino
43	Kern	103	Fresno	163	Riverside
44	Riverside	104	Riverside	164	San Bernardino
45	San Bernardino	105	Sacramento	165	Riverside
46	San Joaquin	106	San Bernardino	166	San Bernardino
47	Imperial	107	Kern	167	Riverside
48	Kings	108	Riverside	168	San Bernardino
49	Stanislaus	109	San Bernardino	169	Riverside
50	Butte	110	Stanislaus	170	San Bernardino
51	Tulare	111	Ventura	171	San Bernardino
52	Fresno	112	Riverside	172	Riverside
53	Riverside	113	San Bernardino	173	San Bernardino
54	San Bernardino	114	Tulare		
55	Ventura	115	Riverside		
56	Sacramento	116	San Bernardino		
57	Riverside	117	Fresno		
58	San Bernardino	118	Kern		
59	Kern	119	Riverside		
60	Merced	120	San Bernardino		

Note: fractional judgeships in Appendix A are rounded down to the nearest whole judgeship for the purposes of prioritization.