



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: June 25–26, 2015

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Courts: Resource Assessment Study Model Interim Complex Civil Caseweight	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	June 25–26, 2015
Recommended by	Date of Report
Workload Assessment Advisory Committee Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair	June 3, 2015
	Contact
	Deana Farole, 415-865-8997 deana.farole@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee requests approving its recommendations to (1) establish an initial interim complex civil caseweight of 2,271 minutes for fiscal year (FY) 2015–2016 budget allocations, and (2) reassess the interim caseweight using preliminary data from the fall 2015 update of the staff workload study and make any needed adjustments for FY 2016–2017 budget allocations.

Recommendation

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) requests that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the interim complex civil caseweight of 2,271 minutes per filing for use in the Resource Assessment Study model for purposes of FY 2015–2016 budget allocations, applying the caseweight to a proxy for filings using the paid complex civil fee data; and
2. Direct WAAC to reassess the interim caseweight using preliminary data from the fall 2015 update of the staff workload study and make any needed adjustments for purposes of FY 2016–2017 budget allocations.

These interim adjustments would remain in effect until the staff workload study results are finalized.

Previous Council Action

At its July 25, 2005, meeting, the Judicial Council approved the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model methodology to allocate resources on the basis of workload need, with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments would continue to be made by Judicial Council staff as the data became available.

The council, at its February 26, 2013, meeting, approved the updated parameters of the RAS model—consisting of new caseweights and new formulas that produce more precise workload estimates—with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments would continue to be made by council staff as the data became available.

Later that year, at its April 26 meeting, the council approved the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) for use in allocating the annual state trial court operations funds. WAFM uses the RAS model as the basis for the trial court budget development process.

Rationale for Recommendation

In March 2015, the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) met to review allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF). To address shortfalls in the fund, TCBAC made a recommendation to eliminate funding for the complex civil litigation pilot programs, along with a companion recommendation to request that WAAC include the complex case fee filings in the RAS computation of workload need and assign to them an interim caseweight, until the advisory committee has the data and opportunity to review the validity of the weighting. TCBAC viewed assigning a separate caseweight that recognizes the additional workload involved in processing complex civil cases as a way to continue to support enhanced case processing in complex civil cases in the absence of the IMF funding. The Judicial Council approved both recommendations at its April 17, 2015, meeting.

In the RAS model, caseweights—the number of minutes per filing for a given case type—are multiplied by the number of case filings to estimate full-time equivalent staff need. However, the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) does not capture complex civil case filings separately from other unlimited civil case filings. Therefore, TCBAC recommended using complex case fee data as a proxy for complex civil filings, dividing the total fees remitted by the fee per filing (e.g., \$30,000 remitted / \$1,000 per filing = 30 filings). This calculation uses the fees remitted on the plaintiff side because only one fee is collected, regardless of the number of plaintiffs, whereas each individual defendant must pay the filing fee, which would result in an overcount of the number of cases. (See Attachment A for more details on the filings data.)

To establish the new complex civil caseweight, WAAC convened a conference call with staff from the 10 courts that handle the highest volume of complex civil cases to identify areas in which complex civil staff workload differs from workload for noncomplex unlimited civil cases. The feedback provided during this call and other data sources, such as the National Center for State Courts' (NCSC's) evaluation of the complex civil litigation pilot programs and the complex civil fee data, were used to adjust the unlimited civil caseweight of 797 minutes per filing upward to 2,271 minutes per filing for complex civil.

The unlimited civil caseweight, broken down into its component tasks by frequency and time per filing, was used as the baseline for developing the complex civil caseweight. If the conference call or other data sources revealed that a given task was more time-consuming or occurred at a different rate for complex civil cases versus unlimited civil cases, corresponding adjustments were made. No adjustments were made to tasks for which workload differences were not explicitly mentioned. Following is a summary of the adjustments (see Attachment B for more details):

- Conference call participants said that substantial workload impacts result from the large number of parties in complex civil cases, particularly the upfront data entry, processing of filings, noticing, and service of orders. Calendar management is labor-intensive because of the need to coordinate multiple schedules. Accordingly, the time required for processing new filings was multiplied by the median number of plaintiffs per case (per the NCSC evaluation); the time required for processing subsequent filings was multiplied by the median number of parties per case (per the NCSC evaluation and the complex civil fee data); the time required to set hearing dates was nearly tripled; and order processing time was doubled. The frequency with which hearings are scheduled was increased from 95 to 100 percent of cases because the NCSC evaluation report noted a high level of activity in complex civil cases (e.g., case management conferences, status conferences, settlement conferences, pretrial conferences) due to intensive judicial management.
- Conference call participants reported that research attorney time for complex civil cases is double that of regular unlimited civil cases because of the complex legal issues and the need to manage the cases. Therefore, the time required for case preparation was doubled and the frequency with which case preparation is performed was increased from 50 to 100 percent of cases.
- Conference call participants relayed that complex civil cases carry a heavy workload in terms of exhibits management, general records management, and scanning. The time required for each of these tasks was doubled.
- Conference call participants said that complex civil cases involve more staff time in the courtroom and the jury services office because the jury selection process can be complicated. The time required for courtroom support activities and for jury management was doubled.

- Conference call participants noted that although fee waivers are possible in complex civil cases, they are relatively rare, so the frequency for “other document processing,” of which fee waivers are a major component, was reduced from 20 to 10 percent of cases, with no adjustment to the time per filing.
- The frequency of status conferences was increased from 45 to 98 percent of cases based on findings from the NCSC evaluation. No adjustments were made to the time per filing.
- The frequency of fee- and payment-related work was increased from 80 to 95 percent because the vast majority of cases will have the complex civil filing fee. The time required for this work was multiplied by the median number of parties per case (per the NCSC evaluation and the complex civil fee data).
- The frequency of self-help services was reduced from 10 to 5 percent of cases because the heavy attorney presence on complex civil cases and the intensive judicial management suggests less of a need for self-help services.
- The frequency of mediation was reduced from 40 to 30 percent of cases based on the frequency of alternative dispute resolution orders in the NCSC evaluation.

The original unlimited civil caseweight of 797 minutes necessarily included some case processing time for complex civil cases. However, because complex civil was not examined as a separate case type in the staff workload study, it was not possible to assess how many minutes the complex civil work contributed to the unlimited civil caseweight. Therefore, WAAC decided to maintain the current unlimited civil caseweight at 797 minutes for this interim period.

Although the final results from the staff workload study update slated for fall 2015 will not be available in time for FY 2016–2017 budget allocations, WAAC elected to recommend revisiting the interim caseweight because preliminary data will be available from the staff study update that could potentially be used to refine the initial interim caseweight.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

WAAC voted unanimously to approve the interim complex civil caseweight of 2,271 minutes, maintaining the unlimited civil caseweight at its current value of 797 minutes, and to revisit the interim weighting for FY 2016–2017 based on preliminary data from the staff workload study update.

External comments

WAAC received one public comment from a committee on complex court funding of the Board of the Northern California Chapter of the Association of Business Trial Lawyers during the open meetings related to the development of the complex civil caseweight. Much of the commentary highlighted factors to consider in establishing the caseweight and posed questions related to

complex civil filing fees and revenue. The comments related to fees and revenues were referred to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.

Internal comments

Internal comments were also fairly limited. The most substantive discussion centered around whether to maintain the current unlimited civil caseload of 797 minutes or to reduce it due to some complex civil workload having been captured in the unlimited civil caseload. Concern was expressed that if complex civil work was not adequately captured in the staff workload study, too much time might be removed from the unlimited civil caseload, which could work to the disadvantage of smaller courts in particular. WAAC opted to maintain the current unlimited civil caseload at 797 minutes as a result of this discussion.

Alternatives

In its initial recommendation to the Judicial Council, TCBAC proposed applying the same caseload to complex civil as is used for asbestos cases. The recommendation was amended to request that WAAC come up with an interim caseload, rather than merely adopting the asbestos caseload, because assessing whether the asbestos and complex civil workloads were similar without further study was not possible. WAAC's research revealed that the workload for complex civil cases is distributed differently than for asbestos cases. For example, the courts that participated in the conference call reported that asbestos cases disproportionately go to trial, whereas complex civil cases will most often settle.

Because the fee data are not a direct measure of filings, but only a proxy, the possibility of using JBSIS data to establish the number of complex civil filings was explored. JBSIS captures the provisionally complex case filings, which are cases presumed to be complex that involve one or more of the following types of claims: antitrust or trade regulation claims, construction defect claims involving many parties or structures, securities claims or investment losses involving many parties, environmental or toxic tort claims involving many parties, claims involving mass torts, claims involving class actions, or insurance coverage claims arising out of any of the claims listed above. However, these provisionally complex cases represent only a small subset of all complex civil cases, and the data are not reported by all courts, so using the JBSIS data was not feasible.

Policy implications

Applying the recommended complex civil caseload to the paid complex case fee filings in the RAS model results in a net increase in statewide full-time equivalent (FTE) need of 43 positions, with 12 courts showing increased need (see Attachment C). Because additional funding to support the full FTE need is unavailable, allocations would shift proportionally toward those courts with a higher volume of complex civil filings.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

If approved, the new caseweight will be incorporated into the RAS model update for FY 2015–2016, which will subsequently be used for budget allocations. There is no associated cost for implementation.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Three-year filings data for complex civil to be used in the RAS model
2. Attachment B: Caseweight adjustments from unlimited civil to complex civil
3. Attachment C: Updated RAS FTE need using proposed complex civil caseweight

Attachment A: Three-year filings data for complex civil to be used in the RAS model

County	Fiscal Year	Unlimited Civil Filings	Asbestos Filings	Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (Total Fees Remitted/ Fee per Filing)	Non-Asbestos Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (D-C)	Non-Complex Unlimited Civil Filings (B-E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alameda	2012	8,940	116	310	194	8,746
Alameda	2013	8,428	111	300	189	8,239
Alameda	2014	8,441	117	341	224	8,217
Alpine	2012	72		0	0	72
Alpine	2013	14		0	0	14
Alpine	2014	37		0	0	37
Amador	2012	207		1	1	206
Amador	2013	217		1	1	216
Amador	2014	207		0	0	207
Butte	2012	752		0	0	752
Butte	2013	476		0	0	476
Butte	2014	534		2	2	532
Calaveras	2012	287		0	0	287
Calaveras	2013	269		0	0	269
Calaveras	2014	250		1	1	249
Colusa	2012	53		10	10	43
Colusa	2013	62		0	0	62
Colusa	2014	57		3	3	54
Contra Costa	2012	4,646		79	79	4,567
Contra Costa	2013	4,332		46	46	4,286
Contra Costa	2014	4,360		52	52	4,308
Del Norte	2012	320		0	0	320
Del Norte	2013	334		0	0	334
Del Norte	2014	225		0	0	225
El Dorado	2012	1,005		5	5	1,000
El Dorado	2013	887		10	10	877
El Dorado	2014	852		11	11	841
Fresno	2012	4,312		38	38	4,274
Fresno	2013	4,160		4	4	4,156
Fresno	2014	3,823		0	0	3,823
Glenn	2012	40		0	0	40
Glenn	2013	32		0	0	32
Glenn	2014	47		0	0	47
Humboldt	2012	753		0	0	753
Humboldt	2013	682		1	1	681
Humboldt	2014	715		0	0	715
Imperial	2012	719		24	24	695
Imperial	2013	589		10	10	579
Imperial	2014	555		19	19	536
Inyo	2012	87		0	0	87
Inyo	2013	75		0	0	75
Inyo	2014	105		0	0	105
Kern	2012	1,901		47	47	1,854
Kern	2013	1,744		31	31	1,713
Kern	2014	1,722		54	54	1,668
Kings	2012	264		7	7	257
Kings	2013	243		13	13	230
Kings	2014	271		23	23	248

Attachment A: Three-year filings data for complex civil to be used in the RAS model

County	Fiscal Year	Unlimited Civil Filings	Asbestos Filings	Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (Total Fees Remitted/ Fee per Filing)	Non-Asbestos Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (D-C)	Non-Complex Unlimited Civil Filings (B-E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Lake	2012	474		0	0	474
Lake	2013	393		0	0	393
Lake	2014	423		0	0	423
Lassen	2012	419		0	0	419
Lassen	2013	332		0	0	332
Lassen	2014	128		0	0	128
Los Angeles	2012	69,087	254	993	739	68,348
Los Angeles	2013	64,819	279	1,517	1,238	63,581
Los Angeles	2014	64,483	246	1,552	1,306	63,177
Madera	2012	1,069		2	2	1,067
Madera	2013	516		9	9	507
Madera	2014	510		8	8	502
Marin	2012	1,686		2	2	1,684
Marin	2013	1,558		3	3	1,555
Marin	2014	1,448		3	3	1,445
Mariposa	2012	52		0	0	52
Mariposa	2013	51		1	1	50
Mariposa	2014	34		0	0	34
Mendocino	2012	654		1	1	653
Mendocino	2013	644		1	1	643
Mendocino	2014	664		0	0	664
Merced	2012	812		9	9	803
Merced	2013	756		8	8	748
Merced	2014	741		17	17	724
Modoc	2012	49		0	0	49
Modoc	2013	57		0	0	57
Modoc	2014	50		0	0	50
Mono	2012	109		20	20	89
Mono	2013	93		2	2	91
Mono	2014	69		2	2	67
Monterey	2012	1,564		0	0	1,564
Monterey	2013	1,401		23	23	1,378
Monterey	2014	1,427		20	20	1,407
Napa	2012	821		3	3	818
Napa	2013	707		2	2	705
Napa	2014	695		1	1	694
Nevada	2012	541		0	0	541
Nevada	2013	450		1	1	449
Nevada	2014	478		0	0	478
Orange	2012	19,004	3	580	577	18,427
Orange	2013	17,392	3	650	647	16,745
Orange	2014	16,564	4	568	564	16,000
Placer	2012	2,229		34	34	2,195
Placer	2013	2,209		28	28	2,181
Placer	2014	1,909		30	30	1,879
Plumas	2012	144		0	0	144
Plumas	2013	91		10	10	81
Plumas	2014	78		16	16	62

Attachment A: Three-year filings data for complex civil to be used in the RAS model

County	Fiscal Year	Unlimited Civil Filings	Asbestos Filings	Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (Total Fees Remitted/ Fee per Filing)	Non-Asbestos Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (D-C)	Non-Complex Unlimited Civil Filings (B-E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Riverside	2012	12,203	2	178	176	12,027
Riverside	2013	10,357	2	162	160	10,197
Riverside	2014	9,759	1	203	202	9,557
Sacramento	2012	7,639	3	168	165	7,474
Sacramento	2013	8,297	3	139	136	8,161
Sacramento	2014	8,024	1	152	151	7,873
San Benito	2012	165		0	0	165
San Benito	2013	167		2	2	165
San Benito	2014	159		1	1	158
San Bernardino	2012	9,464		135	135	9,329
San Bernardino	2013	9,390		4	4	9,386
San Bernardino	2014	9,204		0	0	9,204
San Diego	2012	18,618	13	372	359	18,259
San Diego	2013	17,559	3	329	326	17,233
San Diego	2014	17,041	2	394	392	16,649
San Francisco	2012	7,695	233	856	623	7,072
San Francisco	2013	8,651	86	2,074	1,988	6,663
San Francisco	2014	6,460	115	338	223	6,237
San Joaquin	2012	2,912		63	63	2,849
San Joaquin	2013	2,709		51	51	2,658
San Joaquin	2014	2,771		59	59	2,712
San Luis Obispo	2012	1,255		0	0	1,255
San Luis Obispo	2013	1,153		15	15	1,138
San Luis Obispo	2014	1,068		11	11	1,057
San Mateo	2012	2,382		79	79	2,303
San Mateo	2013	2,092		46	46	2,046
San Mateo	2014	2,098		49	49	2,049
Santa Barbara	2012	1,919		24	24	1,895
Santa Barbara	2013	1,931		8	8	1,923
Santa Barbara	2014	1,783		14	14	1,769
Santa Clara	2012	7,887		374	374	7,513
Santa Clara	2013	7,353		272	272	7,081
Santa Clara	2014	7,023		316	316	6,707
Santa Cruz	2012	1,200		1	1	1,199
Santa Cruz	2013	1,044		6	6	1,038
Santa Cruz	2014	989		7	7	982
Shasta	2012	931	2	15	13	918
Shasta	2013	884	3	7	4	880
Shasta	2014	856	0	4	4	852
Sierra	2012	12		0	0	12
Sierra	2013	23		0	0	23
Sierra	2014	11		0	0	11
Siskiyou	2012	188		0	0	188
Siskiyou	2013	181		0	0	181
Siskiyou	2014	200		0	0	200
Solano	2012	1,948	0	9	9	1,939
Solano	2013	1,872	9	21	12	1,860
Solano	2014	1,854	13	25	12	1,842

Attachment A: Three-year filings data for complex civil to be used in the RAS model

County	Fiscal Year	Unlimited Civil Filings	Asbestos Filings	Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (Total Fees Remitted/ Fee per Filing)	Non-Asbestos Paid Complex Plaintiff Filings (D-C)	Non-Complex Unlimited Civil Filings (B-E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Sonoma	2012	2,347		3	3	2,344
Sonoma	2013	2,339		4	4	2,335
Sonoma	2014	2,192		2	2	2,190
Stanislaus	2012	1,842		26	26	1,816
Stanislaus	2013	1,633		31	31	1,602
Stanislaus	2014	1,717		37	37	1,680
Sutter	2012	440		6	6	434
Sutter	2013	433		1	1	432
Sutter	2014	516		6	6	510
Tehama	2012	239		1	1	238
Tehama	2013	291		0	0	291
Tehama	2014	268		1	1	267
Trinity	2012	113		0	0	113
Trinity	2013	102		0	0	102
Trinity	2014	81		0	0	81
Tulare	2012	1,454		6	6	1,448
Tulare	2013	1,493		0	0	1,493
Tulare	2014	1,403		4	4	1,399
Tuolumne	2012	277		0	0	277
Tuolumne	2013	252		0	0	252
Tuolumne	2014	249		0	0	249
Ventura	2012	4,077	1	27	26	4,051
Ventura	2013	3,800	2	41	39	3,761
Ventura	2014	3,494	1	17	16	3,478
Yolo	2012	758		-1	-1	759
Yolo	2013	706		24	24	682
Yolo	2014	680		-3	-3	683
Yuba	2012	360		13	13	347
Yuba	2013	320		2	2	318
Yuba	2014	323		6	6	317

	Unlimited Civil Time per Filing (mins)	Rate of Occurrence	Implied Time (mins)	Complex Civil Adjusted Time per Filing	Rationale
Document Processing					
• New filing	34	100%	296	296	NCSC report showed median of 8.7 plaintiffs, so multiplied by 8.7
• Subsequent filing or petition	100	100%	670	670	NCSC report & fee data showed 6.7 times the parties of a typical case, so multiplied by 6.7
• Other document processing	12	10%	60	6	processing fee waivers is a major task under "other" and fee waivers are rare, so cut the rate of occurrence in half
	146			972	
Calendar Scheduling, Hearing Prep, and Readiness Mngment					
• File preparation	30	100%	30	30	
• Set hearing date	21	100%	61	61	increased occurrence to 100%, a lot of interim activity due to heavier judicial management; nearly tripled time--conference call participants noted difficulty of coordinating schedules with multiple parties, also consistent with random moment data that reflects more calendaring
• Case preparation	117	100%	468	468	increased occurrence to 100% due to need for legal research and case management; doubled time--conference call participants said research attorney time is double
• Tentative ruling	6	20%	30	6	
• Status conference	5	98%	11	11	increased occurrence to 98% based on frequency of status conferences in NCSC evaluation
• Other calendaring	8	60%	13	8	
	187			584	
Courtroom Support and Administrative Support for Judges					
• Minutes	90	100%	90	90	
• Exhibits and subpoenaed docs	12	40%	60	24	doubled time--conference call participants said there is heavy exhibits management
• Order/motion/judgment	15	75%	40	30	doubled time--conference call participants said there is a lot of in-courtroom work due to number of parties
• Other courtroom	28	100%	56	56	doubled time--conference call participants said there is a lot of in-courtroom work and more order processing work due to number of parties
	145			200	

	Unlimited Civil Time per Filing (mins)	Rate of Occurrence	Implied Time (mins)	Complex Civil Adjusted Time per Filing	Rationale
Judgment/Post-Judgment Activities					
• Appeal of case	14	8%	180	14	
• Orders/judgment	20	100%	40	40	doubled time--conference call participants said there is more order processing work due to number of parties
	34			54	
Jury Management					
• Voir dire	8	2%	800	16	doubled time--conference call participants said jury selection process is complicated
	8			16	
Fees and Payments					
• Payments/fees	16	95%	134	127	increased occurrence to 95% because vast majority of cases will have complex civil filing fee; multiplied by 6.7 because NCSC report & fee data showed 6.7 times the parties of a typical case
	16			127	
Records Management					
• Records request	9	20%	45	9	
• Records management	40	100%	80	80	doubled time--conference call participants said there is more records management
• Imaging	23	50%	90	45	doubled time--conference call participants said the scanning work is heavier
	72			134	
General Assistance/Self Help					
• General Assistance	27	60%	45	27	
• Self-help	10	5%	100	5	decreased occurrence due to heavy judicial and attorney presence on cases suggesting less of a need for self-help
	37			32	
Mediation/Arbitration/ADR					
• Mediation	44	30%	147	44	decreased occurrence to 30% based on frequency of ADR orders in NCSC report
	44			44	
Case Weight	689			2163	case processing time only
				2271	adjusted to add back in non-case processing time

Attachment C: Updated RAS FTE need using proposed complex civil caseweight

Court	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need										Program 90 (Administration) Staff				Total RAS Need (J+M)	Total RAS Need (Approved by WAAC 5-12-15)	% change from 5-12-15 FTE Need to 5-21-15 FTE Need	FY 14-15 RAS FTE Need	% change from FY 14-15 to FY 15-16
	Infractions A	Criminal B	Civil C	Family Law D	Pr/MH E	Juvenile F	Total Program 10 Need (A thru F) G	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster) H	Manager/Supervisor Need (G/H) I	Total Program 10 Need, Rounded up (G+H) program10 J	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)* K	Program 90 ratio (by cluster) L	Program 90 Need, Rounded up ((J+K)/L) M	Total RAS Need (J+M) N					
Alameda	76.3	121.2	122.7	103.4	31.9	18.0	473.5	11.1	42.6	517	85.6	7.2	84.0	601	596	1%	626	-5%	
Alpine	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.4	6.9	0.2	2	0.4	5.7	1.0	3	3	0%	3	0%	
Amador	2.1	7.0	2.6	3.9	1.2	0.8	17.6	6.9	2.5	21	2.3	5.7	5.0	26	26	0%	25	4%	
Butte	10.1	34.4	12.1	24.8	12.4	7.3	101.0	8.6	11.7	113	16.5	6.4	21.0	134	134	0%	139	-4%	
Calaveras	1.5	5.3	3.4	4.8	1.9	1.9	18.7	6.9	2.7	22	2.5	5.7	5.0	27	27	0%	27	0%	
Colusa	3.7	4.8	0.9	1.5	0.5	1.0	12.4	6.9	1.8	15	1.5	5.7	3.0	18	18	0%	18	0%	
Contra Costa	30.3	64.4	71.4	81.9	25.6	20.5	294.1	8.6	34.1	329	18.9	6.8	52.0	381	380	0%	395	-4%	
Del Norte	2.1	6.0	3.2	4.8	2.6	1.9	20.7	6.9	3.0	24	3.0	5.7	5.0	29	29	0%	33	-12%	
El Dorado	7.9	17.5	12.7	15.7	4.7	7.0	65.5	8.6	7.6	74	4.9	6.4	13.0	87	86	1%	89	-3%	
Fresno	29.3	169.0	67.4	93.4	23.5	30.3	412.9	8.6	47.9	461	27.4	6.8	72.0	533	533	0%	535	0%	
Glenn	4.0	4.0	1.1	3.6	1.4	1.2	15.3	6.9	2.2	18	4.5	5.7	4.0	22	22	0%	25	-12%	
Humboldt	7.5	28.6	9.3	13.4	7.2	3.1	69.2	8.6	8.0	78	2.0	6.4	13.0	91	91	0%	91	0%	
Imperial	22.6	33.1	10.5	27.6	5.0	5.5	104.4	8.6	12.1	117	15.3	6.4	21.0	138	138	0%	142	-3%	
Inyo	4.3	3.9	1.1	2.4	0.8	0.8	13.3	6.9	1.9	16	3.2	5.7	4.0	20	20	0%	20	0%	
Kern	42.6	170.8	45.0	99.1	28.6	25.1	411.1	8.6	47.7	459	51.0	6.8	76.0	535	535	0%	543	-1%	
Kings	10.1	34.1	6.6	16.3	4.0	4.3	75.4	8.6	8.7	85	4.6	6.4	14.0	99	98	1%	102	-4%	
Lake	2.2	13.9	5.9	7.7	3.2	1.7	34.5	8.6	4.0	39	1.6	6.4	7.0	46	46	0%	46	0%	
Lassen	2.8	6.1	3.6	4.5	1.4	1.2	19.5	6.9	2.8	23	2.3	5.7	5.0	28	28	0%	31	-10%	
Los Angeles	436.6	1,210.6	1,029.2	826.2	248.8	388.1	4,139.5	11.1	372.3	4,512	471.0	7.2	690.0	5,202	5,181	0%	5,490	-6%	
Madera	5.7	26.6	11.7	18.9	4.2	5.7	72.9	8.6	8.5	82	6.1	6.4	14.0	96	96	0%	99	-3%	
Marin	17.2	17.8	18.7	16.3	7.0	2.8	79.8	8.6	9.3	90	6.7	6.4	16.0	106	104	2%	109	-5%	
Mariposa	0.8	3.6	0.8	1.5	0.7	0.6	8.1	6.9	1.2	10	3.4	5.7	3.0	13	13	0%	13	0%	
Mendocino	5.5	18.1	7.7	10.1	3.7	4.9	49.9	8.6	5.8	56	3.7	6.4	10.0	66	66	0%	66	0%	
Merced	17.3	37.1	14.9	27.6	7.8	9.5	114.3	8.6	13.3	128	11.7	6.4	22.0	150	150	0%	159	-6%	
Modoc	0.6	2.3	0.6	1.7	0.6	0.4	6.2	6.9	0.9	8	2.0	5.7	2.0	10	10	0%	9	11%	
Mono	2.6	3.5	1.2	0.9	0.2	0.3	8.7	6.9	1.3	10	1.8	5.7	3.0	13	13	0%	14	-7%	
Monterey	20.2	58.3	22.2	31.0	8.0	8.9	148.6	8.6	17.2	166	13.4	6.8	27.0	193	193	0%	202	-4%	
Napa	6.2	17.9	9.5	12.6	4.9	3.4	54.5	8.6	6.3	61	7.3	6.4	11.0	72	72	0%	73	-1%	
Nevada	6.6	13.3	6.8	8.1	3.3	1.9	40.0	8.6	4.6	45	6.9	6.4	9.0	54	54	0%	55	-2%	
Orange	106.9	328.3	267.0	228.5	59.1	46.9	1,036.7	11.1	93.2	1,130	178.0	7.2	181.0	1,311	1,300	1%	1,350	-4%	
Placer	13.5	36.1	27.6	30.9	8.5	11.5	128.2	8.6	14.9	144	7.0	6.4	24.0	168	167	1%	169	-1%	
Plumas	1.0	2.9	1.5	2.3	0.9	0.6	9.4	6.9	1.4	11	1.1	5.7	3.0	14	14	0%	15	-7%	
Riverside	84.0	254.0	189.3	232.2	45.4	67.8	872.6	11.1	78.5	952	117.7	7.2	148.0	1,100	1,097	0%	1,125	-2%	
Sacramento	54.0	166.0	136.8	151.6	44.2	27.9	580.6	11.1	52.2	633	59.1	7.2	96.0	729	727	0%	739	-2%	
San Benito	1.9	6.9	3.3	4.8	1.1	1.3	19.2	6.9	2.8	22	1.3	5.7	5.0	27	27	0%	29	-7%	
San Bernardino	70.2	351.4	182.9	238.6	55.9	59.9	958.9	11.1	86.2	1,046	73.3	7.2	155.0	1,201	1,200	0%	1,267	-5%	
San Diego	123.6	278.3	257.7	257.5	55.3	43.5	1,015.9	11.1	91.4	1,108	110.1	7.2	169.0	1,277	1,270	1%	1,298	-2%	
San Francisco	51.5	52.7	107.6	49.0	31.8	17.8	310.4	11.1	27.9	339	25.8	7.2	51.0	390	372	5%	395	-6%	
San Joaquin	25.7	112.5	48.9	61.2	22.4	15.4	286.0	8.6	33.2	320	12.2	6.8	49.0	369	368	0%	375	-2%	
San Luis Obispo	14.7	51.0	16.0	18.7	10.9	6.5	117.9	8.6	13.7	132	7.5	6.4	22.0	154	154	0%	160	-4%	
San Mateo	37.3	59.3	35.7	47.1	13.3	22.4	215.2	8.6	25.0	241	17.8	6.8	39.0	280	278	1%	294	-5%	
Santa Barbara	28.8	59.7	26.5	28.7	10.3	10.0	164.0	8.6	19.0	183	28.3	6.8	32.0	215	215	0%	222	-3%	
Santa Clara	55.6	144.6	107.9	101.7	36.0	17.0	462.8	11.1	41.6	505	45.7	7.2	77.0	582	576	1%	603	-4%	
Santa Cruz	17.5	34.6	15.3	20.0	4.7	7.1	99.3	8.6	11.5	111	19.7	6.4	21.0	132	132	0%	134	-1%	
Shasta	10.7	46.3	13.4	21.4	7.6	7.6	107.0	8.6	12.4	120	55.4	6.4	28.0	148	148	0%	149	-1%	
Sierra	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	1.5	6.9	0.2	2	1.1	5.7	1.0	3	3	0%	4	-25%	
Siskiyou	5.9	8.1	2.8	5.3	1.9	1.6	25.6	8.6	3.0	29	4.6	6.4	6.0	35	35	0%	36	-3%	
Solano	18.5	52.6	32.3	46.4	14.6	7.2	171.6	8.6	19.9	192	6.0	6.8	30.0	222	222	0%	233	-5%	
Sonoma	26.5	58.3	30.2	37.1	16.5	7.9	176.5	8.6	20.5	198	21.5	6.8	33.0	231	230	0%	245	-6%	
Stanislaus	18.7	86.6	32.4	57.2	18.6	9.2	222.7	8.6	25.8	249	7.6	6.8	38.0	287	287	0%	293	-2%	
Sutter	5.1	16.7	6.8	10.9	4.6	2.2	46.3	8.6	5.4	52	9.7	6.4	10.0	62	62	0%	63	-2%	
Tehama	5.3	16.4	4.7	8.8	2.6	2.7	40.5	8.6	4.7	46	3.3	6.4	8.0	54	54	0%	54	0%	
Trinity	0.7	3.6	1.0	1.9	0.7	0.9	8.7	6.9	1.3	10	4.0	5.7	3.0	13	13	0%	15	-13%	
Tulare	24.1	70.6	26.3	40.3	11.2	14.2	186.6	8.6	21.7	209	21.9	6.8	35.0	244	244	0%	239	2%	
Tuolumne	2.5	10.7	3.5	5.9	2.3	2.9	27.9	8.6	3.2	32	2.0	6.4	6.0	38	38	0%	38	0%	
Ventura	35.3	72.4	57.7	64.5	24.4	23.5	277.8	8.6	32.2	310	74.5	6.8	57.0	367	367	0%	380	-3%	
Yolo	10.4	29.9	10.5	16.5	5.1	5.2	77.6	8.6	9.0	87	13.0	6.4	16	103	103	0%	105	-2%	
Yuba	5.0	14.3	5.2	9.9	3.1	3.2	40.7	8.6	4.7	46.0	2.0	6.4	8.0	54	54	0%	53	2%	
Statewide	1,634.4	4,558.7	3,154.5	3,262.8	958.4	1,002.1	14,570.9	1,438.6	16,040.0	1,711.9	2,563.0	18,603	18,519	0.5%	19,261	-4%			

*Reported on FY 14-15 Schedule 7A; non-RAS staff include categories such as SIOs, Enhanced Collections Staff, and Interpreters