

**REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL
COUNCIL IN RESPONSE TO
SENATE CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION #91
OF THE 2007 REGULAR
SESSION
OF THE LEGISLATURE
REGARDING
THE DETERMINATION OF
JUDGESHIPS**

March 31, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

Introduction	1
Work of the Committee to Review the Need for Judgeships – 2008	2
Evaluation Criteria	2
Domestic Cases	3
Criminal Cases	3
Juvenile Cases	4
Summary of Work Point Evaluation	5
Ongoing Efforts.....	5
Requests for New Judgeships	7
14th Judicial District Court	7
15th Judicial District Court	7
31st Judicial District Court.....	8
11th Judicial District Court	8
26th Judicial District Court	9
Conclusion	10
 Appendix 1	
Brief History of the Role of the Judicial Council in the Determination of Judgeships	11
 Appendix 2	
Louisiana Juvenile Court Criteria	17
 Appendix 3	
Trial Court Committee on Judgeships Work Point Values – District & City Courts	18

Appendix 4
2008 Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District..... 19

2008 City and Parish Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold..... 25

Appendix 5
Report of the Long-Term Subcommittee 27

Appendix 6
Site Team Report Submitted to The Committee to Evaluate Requests for New Judgeships 29

Appendix A
Filings – 26th Judicial District Court..... 35

Appendix B
Jury Trials (2004 – 2008) 36

INTRODUCTION

Senate Concurrent Resolution # 91 of the 2007 Regular Session authorized and requested the Louisiana Supreme Court through the Judicial Council to maintain a committee to conduct a continuous and ongoing evaluation of the need for judgeships, including the basis for evaluation of this need, and to make an annual report of findings to the Legislature each year.

For many years, the Legislature has relied upon the Supreme Court through the Judicial Council to make recommendations as to pending legislation seeking to create new judgeships. By Act 163 of 2003 (R.S.13:61) this practice was codified, such that the Legislature enacted a practice whereby its applicable committees must consider these findings and recommendations when legislation creating new judgeships is being considered.

After Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Act 16 of the First Extraordinary Session was passed, requesting a comprehensive evaluation by the Court and the Council as to the appropriate numbers of judgeships due to population shifts within the State.

Thereafter, the Court revamped the committee which had been responsible for the evaluation of requests for new judgeships. A comprehensive study was conducted and submitted to the Legislature. An update to this information was submitted to the Legislature in March of 2008, in response to SCR-91.

The work of this committee has continued, and this report is presented in response to this concurrent resolution for the current year.

A more complete history of the project was contained in the March 14, 2008 report, and is attached to the current report as Appendix 1 to this report.

**WORK OF THE COMMITTEE
TO REVIEW THE NEED FOR JUDGESHIPS - 2008**

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The original evaluation criteria utilized in the evaluation of the need for judgeships was developed some time around 1980 by Dr. Hugh Collins, Judicial Administrator of the Supreme Court. This formula was based upon a threshold level of hours of work during a year which it was expected a judge should achieve. The formula then analyzed various activities performed by judges, and placed weights as to average times expected to handle such matters (e.g., so many points to handle a felony case; fewer points to handle a misdemeanor case, etc.) Actual case filings of various types were then collected from the clerks of court. Utilizing the number of filings in particular types of cases, the formula attempts to demonstrate whether a particular judge's or district's case load exceeded that which would be expected in a normal situation.

This same basic formula became a model which was later emulated by a number of other states' courts in their attempts to evaluate their own courts' performance. The formula remained basically unchanged from 1980 until the new effort made in response to Act 16 of 2006. At that time, a comprehensive re-evaluation was conducted by the revamped committee of the Judicial Council. The membership was expanded to include clerks of court, district attorneys, legislators, etc. As a result of these efforts, the points formula has been significantly revised and updated. A number of recommendations for revising work point criteria and for breaking down the categories of cases evaluated was done in prior years and approved by the Council and the Supreme Court.

This work remains ongoing. In 2008, subcommittees assigned to various areas of case loads continued the process of study and evaluation. Each subcommittee met at least four times during the year, and their efforts were quite comprehensive. As a result of their recommendation, the following modifications to the work point formula were recommended, and were approved by the Judicial Council at its December, 2008 meeting.

“Domestic” Cases:

The former work point value assigned to all civil cases for district courts was 1.79. This basically means that, on the average, given all cases, including those which are tried, settled, disposed of through rules or preliminary proceedings, etc., it would be expected that a judge would spend 1.79 hours for each civil filing.

Judges who handle a significant amount of family court cases, divorces, custody disputes, and the like, felt that this value did not adequately reflect the fact that many of these “domestic” cases came back frequently on subsequent matters related to the initial filing, such as modifications of custody, child support, community property, etc.

The subcommittee responded to this issue by conducting further study, and ultimately recommended that the “civil” point value be broken down into “domestic” and “non-domestic” filings, and that the point value for “domestic” filings be increased from 1.79 points to 2.44 points, and, correspondingly, that the values for non-domestic filings be *decreased* from 1.79 points to 1.51 points.

Criminal Cases:

The subcommittee considering these issues was presented with a difference in

point values assigned to misdemeanor cases, whereby these cases earned less points if handled by city courts as opposed to district courts. After discussion and analysis, no rational basis for this differentiation could be given.

As to felony cases, input was received that, given a proliferation in post-conviction matters, multiple offender hearings, etc., thought to result in part from longer sentences and longer minimum mandatory sentences required by law, that the point value given these types of cases might not be adequate.

Given these factors, a recommendation was made and was approved to modify the value given misdemeanor cases to 0.4 from the former value of 1.04 in the district courts, and to make that reduced value the same as that given city courts. The point value for felonies (handled only in district courts) was increased slightly from 3.7 to 3.9 points.

It was likewise determined that there was no significant difference with respect to the time involved in handling traffic cases as between district and city courts, and the point value for traffic cases was reduced in district courts from 0.05 to 0.02 points and made identical in the city courts.

Juvenile Cases:

This case load involves, in part, delinquency (criminal) proceedings, and juvenile traffic offenses. Values for these cases was not changed.

Another type of case load in juvenile matters is Child in Need of Care (“CINC”) cases which involve allegations of abuse and neglect. Recent changes in Federal law have mandated more thorough and punctual hearings in these types of cases. Through other efforts by the Louisiana Supreme Court, standards and best practices for handling these types of cases are being developed, and are presently

being tested through model court programs in various juvenile courts in Louisiana. The recommendation of the Committee, approved by the Judicial Council, was to maintain the current work point total of 2.6 for CINC cases in 2008. Thereafter, different courts could earn additional points through the implementation of best practices procedures, and the points could range to 6.5 for “progressive” implementation, up to 9.5 for “model” courts, provided certification of these practices was obtained from the Court Improvement Program. The specifics of these modified point values is attached to this report as Appendix 2 .

Summary of Work Point Evaluation:

A chart showing the current work point values, as modified by the Council’s actions shown above, is attached to this report as Appendix 3.

An additional chart analyzing the work based on case loads of all district and city courts using the current work point values is likewise attached as Appendix 4.

Ongoing Efforts:

The Committee recognizes that the process of evaluating work loads is never static, and can continue to be refined and improved. For example, the subcommittee dealing with juvenile issues has requested that further study be applied to juvenile delinquency proceedings, to determine whether the present points values adequately reflect the actual time normally expended on such cases.

The Committee also continues to consider whether and to what extent such additional factors as civil and criminal jury trials exceeding what is normally expected, the operation of drug courts, and other such factors may play in determining

the adequacy of judicial resources.

It is obviously vital to any evaluation and assignation of work points that the information upon which such decisions are made is valid and accurate. A separate data improvement committee was created and has functioned to attempt to improve and streamline the quality of the data being received from the clerks of court, and to work with the district attorneys to attempt to come up with data which will accurately reflect true criminal case loads among the districts. A preliminary agreement to implement uniform criminal case billing systems among all district attorneys in the state has been reached, such that cases are given the same weights throughout Louisiana. The Committee which had addressed these concerns has now been subsumed as a new subcommittee of the Trial Court Committee, and work will continue through that body to implement these procedures.

Finally, one sub-committee was assigned to study “long range” factors, under which the courts in Louisiana might function more efficiently and productively. This committee has begun to consider such possibilities as the merger of districts, merging or eliminating city courts, justice of the peace courts, etc. Because this consideration is quite different from the work done by the other committees as described above, it is attached as Appendix 5 to this report.

REQUESTS FOR NEW JUDGESHIPS

As set forth in the first section of this report, an additional function of the Judicial Council is to consider applications for new judgeships and to make recommendations with respect thereto. Requests received for consideration for new judgeships, and the Council's recommendation with respect to each, are as follows:

14th Judicial District Court

The 14th Judicial District Court made an application for an additional judgeship. Case data information was provided, and after dialogue with this district, the chief judge requested withdrawal of the application.

It is therefore the recommendation of the Judicial Council that this judgeship *not* be approved at this time.

15th Judicial District Court

The 15th Judicial District Court made an application for an additional judgeship. Case data information was provided, and after dialogue with this district, the chief judge requested withdrawal of the application.

It is therefore the recommendation of the Judicial Council that this judgeship *not* be approved at this time.

31st Judicial District Court

The 31st Judicial District Court made an application for an additional judgeship. Case data information was provided, and after dialogue with this district, the chief judge requested withdrawal of the application.

It is therefore the recommendation of the Judicial Council that this judgeship *not* be approved at this time.

11th Judicial District Court

This matter was brought to the Judicial Council as a result of House Concurrent Resolution No. 103 (Howard) of the 2008 Regular Session. The resolution was an “urge and request” resolution that the Council “. . .study whether the caseload of the 11th Judicial District Court comprised of Sabine Parish warrants the creation of an additional judgeship.”

Data was shared by the Committee with Representative Howard. There were discussions as to this data, and the fact that this district had just been split, and that Desoto Parish was placed into a separate judicial district through action taken in the 2007 Regular Session of the Legislature.

Ultimately, Representative Howard indicated that he was satisfied that the analysis he sought had been adequately performed, and that he did not desire any further action at this time.

While there was no formal request made that an additional judgeship actually be created, the recommendation of the Judicial Council is that no new judgeship be approved at this time for this judicial district.

26th Judicial District Court

The 26th Judicial District Court had made a request for *two* additional judgeships. Data was transmitted to and from the Committee and the Court, and a site visit team was dispatched to the district. This team conducted interviews with the judges and various offices which would be affected by the request, studied other factors bearing on the recommendation, and compiled a written report which was presented to the Judicial Council, which is attached as Appendix 6 to this report.

After consideration of the report and other input with respect to this request, it is the recommendation of the Judicial Council that the request for additional judgeships be denied.

CONCLUSION

The Judicial Council wishes to inform the Legislature that it has taken very seriously the mission of studying the efficient utilization of manpower in the judicial branch of government. While the magnitude of this task is certainly great, the Council commends the exhaustive effort given this task by the Trial Court Committee to Review the Need for Judgeships.

Not only the judge members on the Committee, but clerks of court, district attorneys, legislators, and staff, have all volunteered a very significant amount of time to this study and to these recommendations.

There remain many hard choices to be considered, as illustrated by the report of the Long-Term Subcommittee. While these decisions may be difficult, the prospect of improved delivery of services from the Judiciary of Louisiana certainly merits the continued study of these issues.

Representatives of the Council and the Committee are quite willing to continue these discussions with delegates from the Legislature at any time, and would welcome such a forum.

Section I

Brief History of the Role of the Judicial Council in the Determination of Judgeships

Involvement Prior to 1980.

The Judicial Council was created by Supreme Court Rule in 1950 to assist the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court in the fair and proper administration of justice. From the beginning of its creation until 1980, the Council was involved in the determination of new judgeships whenever information was requested by the Legislature. At that time, the Council used an ad hoc committee to address new judgeships and a variety of situational criteria. In 1978, Chief Justice Joe Sanders appointed a standing committee chaired by Judge Thomas W. Tanner consisting of fourteen judges, one legislator, and one clerk of court to develop written criteria for new judgeships.

The Formal New Judgeship Process, 1981 to the Present.

The formal new judgeship process was developed by the Committee from 1978 to 1980. At that time, the Committee focused on developing only district court criteria. During its meetings, the Committee was presented with a set of procedures and criteria developed by Dr. Hugh Collins, who was then the Deputy Judicial Administrator. Dr. Collins' criteria and procedures included the following steps and components:

- The judicial year was established at 209 days by subtracting weekends, holidays, annual leave, sick leave, and days for continuing legal education from the calendar year;
- Separate surveys were sent to each district court judge requesting information on the amount of time spent on different types of cases and on administrative tasks;
- The data were analyzed by staff to determine the average amount of time spent by judges on certain identified cases and on administration;
- Average administrative days for each type or level of court was then subtracted from the amount of time available for adjudicative work, and then each designated case type was then weighted in terms of time spent per designated case type filing;
- The resulting data were then submitted by staff to a selected group of judges who reviewed the information, using the Delphi method of analysis, and then accepted or modified the average administrative time and case weights developed by staff;
- The agreed-upon case weights were then converted into work point values;
- A threshold of 3,167 total work points per judge was then developed to create eligibility for consideration by dividing total filings by the number of district judges existing at the time plus a margin of lagniappe work points slightly greater than 100% to push the system to handle more cases;
- If a court met the threshold of 3,167 work points per judge and if it could be shown that the court had the capacity to handle at least 5-15% higher work points depending on the number of existing judges available, the requesting court

would not be eligible for a site visit by a team consisting of two judges and one administrator;

- The site team would then comment favorably or unfavorably on the proposal and would forward its recommendations to the Committee. The Committee would then comment favorably or unfavorably on the proposal and would then forward its recommendations and the site visit report to the Judicial Council which in turn would forward its recommendations to the Legislature;
- The work point criteria was then set forth in writing, adopted and published for all to see and understand.

Throughout the period from 1981 to the present, several relatively minor changes were made to the procedures and criteria essentially developed by Dr. Collins and adopted by the Committee and the Judicial Council for district courts. In 1983, criteria and similar procedures were added for the juvenile courts and were incorporated into the district court criteria and procedures. Modifications were also made to district court criteria in 2007. Currently, the work point values per filing are as follows:

- Civil filings - 1.79 work points per filing
- Felonies - 3.7 work points per filing
- Misdemeanors - 1.04 work points per filing
- Traffic - .05 work points per filing
- Juvenile - 2.25 work points per filing*

* Overall work points of juvenile filings are also broken out to provide a more elaborate analysis in terms of Child-In-Need-Of-Care and related cases, Formal Fins and Delinquency cases, and all other juvenile cases. The work points for each of these categories: Child-in-Need-of-Care and related cases, 6.5 work point per filing, Formal FINS and Delinquency case, 2.6 work points per filing, and all other juvenile cases, .76 work points per filing.

Similar processes were used to create procedures and criteria for the courts of appeal and the city/parish courts. A Committee to Evaluate Requests for New Appellate Judgeships was created by Chief Justice John A. Dixon, Jr. in the spring of 1984. The current criteria for the courts of appeal are as follows:

	<u>Civil</u>	<u>Criminal</u>
• Disposition of an appeal*	25	17.2
• Granting of a writ	12	9
• Denial of a writ	9	7
• Writ not considered/writ refused	3	3

*By formal opinion, memorandum opinion, or summary disposition

A special committee adopted criteria and procedures, similar to those developed for the district courts and the courts of appeal, in 1984 for the creation of parish courts. Similar criteria were developed for city courts in 1998. In 2004, the city court and parish court criteria were combined and are currently as follows:

- Civil Filings - .33 work points per filing
- Criminal - .23 work points per filing
- DWI - .83 work points per filing
- Traffic - .03 work points per filing
- Delinquency - .53 work points per filing
- CINC – 4.16 work points per filing
- Juvenile Traffic - .48 work points per filing
- Other Juvenile - .24 work points per filing

Act 163 of 2003 (R.S. 13:61).

In 2003, Act 163 was enacted at the Regular Legislative Session. This Act directed the Judicial Council of the Supreme Court to adopt determinative standards and guidelines to be applied by the Council in determining whether to approve the necessity of creating new judgeships of the Supreme Court, courts of appeal, district courts, city courts, parish courts, juvenile courts, traffic courts, and municipal courts, including the creation of any new office of commissioner, magistrate, hearing officer, or any other judicial officer by whatever other name designated. The legislation not only legislatively expanded the coverage of the new judgeship process to include the Supreme Court and non-elected judicial officers, it also required that the Council provide information to appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate as to the approval of the Council.

Act 16 the First Extraordinary Legislative Session of 2006.

At the First Extraordinary Legislative Session of 2006, legislation was enacted requesting the Judicial Council to conduct a review of judicial districts and, not later than March 1, 2007, to provide information and recommendations on the appropriate number of district court judgeships within each district based upon caseload, population, or other pertinent factors. The legislation also stated that the recommendations could include proposed revisions to specific constitutional or statutory language addressing the number of such judges in each district, the need for district merger or other actions, and the filling of judicial office vacancies in each district.

In response to Act 16, the Supreme Court re-established and reauthorized an existing Committee of the Judicial Council and asked it to assist the Judicial Council in fulfilling its requested mission. The Committee met through sub-committees and as a Committee of the whole several times and presented its findings and recommendations to the Judicial Council which eventually approved the following key recommendations:

- The districts impacted by the hurricanes, in terms of gains and losses in population and cases filed, have not yet reached a level of stability that would enable us to determine the number of judgeships needed.
- We cannot and should not attempt to determine the number of district court judgeships needed without looking at the entire judicial system, including the city and parish courts, and, perhaps, the mayor's courts, and justice of the peace courts as well.

- The Louisiana Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges has asked that additional factors, other than new filings, be considered in determining the need for judges in juvenile and family courts. This appears to be a reasonable request.
- The quality of the data is still not where it should be. The data received from the clerks this year has, in large part, been accurate and the clerks of court as a whole have made a commendable effort to improve the data as requested. However, more work needs to be done with the clerks, the district attorneys and the courts to make the data more uniform and accurate. Those courts or clerks producing incomplete or inaccurate data can cause unreliable outcomes in the Council's study and analysis which may result in recommendations which are unfair to either the particular court under consideration or other courts.
- Act 621 of the Regular 2006 Legislative Session -- the Orleans Court Consolidation Act -- provides that, if the Judicial Council recommends reductions in the total number of judges in the Orleans courts, the reductions "shall be done by attrition, unless otherwise provided by law".
- Act 621 also extended the terms of office of the judges of the Orleans Parish Juvenile Court until December 31, 2014, another indication of the legislature's intent not to have reductions in judgeships, at least in Orleans Parish and at least with respect to juvenile court judgeships, effectuated through the 2008 elections. Apart from the issue of intent, the extension of terms of office in the Orleans Parish Juvenile Court makes it difficult to reduce judgeships in other Orleans courts.
- The issue of reducing judgeships for the 2008 elections is further complicated by the consent decree authorizing the creation of minority sub-districts.

The Council believes that it is important for the Judicial Council and the Supreme Court to develop a permanent process for determining the appropriate number of judgeships, including reducing judgeships when necessary. However, the Council also believes that any reduction in the number of judgeships should be accomplished primarily by attrition, that is, by the death, resignation, removal, or retirement of judges.

The Council recommends that legislation be enacted as soon as possible to authorize the activation or deactivation of judicial seats as designated by the Supreme Court, perhaps through the Judicial Council. Through the activation/deactivation process, the Supreme Court would, at the time of a vacancy in any judicial office, inform the governor and the Legislature as to whether that seat should be deactivated, that is temporarily eliminated. If the legislature, by a two-thirds vote, agrees with the need to deactivate the seat, the Supreme Court would not appoint a person to fill the vacant seat and the governor would not call an election to fill the vacancy. The seat would be deactivated until, perhaps, reactivated on the basis of a similar process by which the Supreme Court, after careful analysis and the application of established criteria, would determine that the affected court's workload is such to warrant re-

establishing the seat. The process of activation and deactivation would also be used to determine the number of judgeships needed in each election cycle, beginning in 2014.

The Council finds that the methodology employed in its determination of the appropriate number of judgeships is valid and reliable, although some aspects of the methodology, especially with respect to family and juvenile cases, may need further refinement. The objective or quantitative aspect of the methodology uses "work points" based on new case filings, a methodology that is widely used throughout the nation. The Council recommends that the specific work points for district courts be changed as presented below and that further work be done to improve the work-point system. The Council finds that population is not a reliable predictor of the need for judgeships, except in the broadest and most general sense that jurisdictions with large populations have more judges than jurisdictions with smaller populations. The Council finds that the determination of the number of judgeships should be based on multi-year trends rather than a single year's statistics. The Council also finds that the use of site visits is a useful and necessary tool for determining the need for judgeships, especially with respect to the analysis and understanding of qualitative factors and the unusual or unique circumstances existing in a particular court.

The Council recommends that the Legislature authorize the Judicial Council to complete, before the end of 2009, a complete study of all courts or, at least all trial courts. The study should further evaluate the current work point system and should consider supplementing it with a statistical analysis of other factors such as violent crime, bench trials, post conviction activity, complex litigation, and other special factors. The study should also consider and include in its scope the issues raised by the Louisiana Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

The Council recommends that the Legislature also request the Supreme Court to create a committee of judges, clerks of court, and district attorneys, to improve the quality of data currently being collected and to define new data elements that may be needed to support the study and investigation of the need for judgeships.

The Council recommends that the moratorium on new judgeships called for in its Interim Report to the Judicial Council be rescinded and that new judgeships be created with the 2008 election in the 4th JDC, the 21st JDC, and the 22nd JDC as recommended below.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 91.

The resolution consists of two parts. The first part requests the Louisiana Supreme Court in conjunction with the Judicial Council to study and investigate appropriate matters, including case filing data, case weights, court structure and finance, efficiencies in judicial performance and the administration of justice, the use of support personnel, case management standards, the current system of districting, and the relationship of types of courts to one another, as part of the determination of the need for judgeships at all levels of the court system, and to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature no later than March 14 of each year. The second part of the resolution requests the Louisiana Supreme Court in conjunction with the Judicial Council to appoint a committee consisting of judges, clerks of court, district

attorneys, court administrators, technology personnel, attorneys and other appropriate persons to study and make recommendations on improving the identification, definition, quality, and consistency of filing data used by the Judicial Council to determine the need for judgeships and to report on judicial performance.

APPENDIX 2

Louisiana Juvenile Court Criteria

Criteria	Court Status		
	Minimum (2.6 wp)	Progressive (6.5 wp)	Model (9.5 wp)
AFSA and Children's Code requirements met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Continuances managed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Training requirements for judges and court staff met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Juvenile drug court implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
One family / one judge policy or coordinated courts implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Attorneys expected to meet with clients prior to continued custody hearing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Time-certain scheduling implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IJJIS implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CINC and Delinquency Resource Guidelines of NCJFCJ met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
JDAI Guidelines met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Permanency guidelines met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Commitment to diversion and informal processing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
System to evaluate informal processing implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CINC cases are tracked (see measures)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Legend:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Certified or Verified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Certified by the Court
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Verified by the Court Improvement Program

APPENDIX 3

TRIAL COURT COMMITTEE ON JUDGESHIPS WORK POINT VALUES (As revised through December 10, 2008)

DISTRICT COURTS

Civil

Domestic	2.44
Non-Domestic	1.51

Criminal

Felony	3.9
Misdemeanor	0.4
Traffic	0.02

Juvenile

Delinquency	2.25
Delinquency/FINS	2.6
Other Juvenile	0.76
CINC	2.6*

CITY COURTS

<u>Civil</u>	0.25
<u>Criminal</u>	Same as District Courts
<u>Juvenile</u>	Same as District Courts

* * * * *

* CINC cases – this value through 2008; thereafter, 2.6 for “basic” CINC cases; 6.5 for “progressive” and 9.5 for “model”.

Extra consideration may be given to districts conducting active drug courts, and having heavy jury dockets (exceeding 3 civil jury trials per judge)

2008 Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District*

JDC	Parish	NON-DOMESTIC (1,511)			DOMESTIC (2,444)			FELONY (3,919)			MISDEMEANOR (4,141)			TRAFFIC (1,021)		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
1	Caddo	6,487	9,795	3.09	2,423	5,912	1.87	2,241	8,740	2.76	2,411	964	5,346	107	0.03	
2	Bienville	531	802	0.25	68	166	0.05	147	573	0.18	592	237	3,757	75	0.02	
2	Claiborne	276	417	0.13	77	188	0.06	0	0	0.00	946	378	4,501	90	0.03	
2	Jackson	409	618	0.20	118	288	0.09	97	378	0.12	484	186	480	10	0.00	
	Subtotal	1,216	1,836	0.58	263	642	0.20	244	952	0.30	2,002	801	8,738	175	0.06	
3	Lincoln	780	1,178	0.37	198	483	0.15	400	1,560	0.49	1,311	524	2,414	48	0.02	
3	Union	696	1,051	0.33	160	390	0.12	308	1,201	0.38	767	307	910	18	0.01	
	Subtotal	1,476	2,229	0.70	358	874	0.28	708	2,761	0.87	2,078	831	3,324	66	0.02	
4	Morehouse	844	1,274	0.40	36	88	0.03	485	1,892	0.60	923	369	3,853	77	0.02	
4	Ouachita	3,381	5,105	1.61	1,257	3,067	0.97	3,355	13,085	4.13	4,263	1,705	24,747	495	0.16	
	Subtotal	4,225	6,380	2.01	1,293	3,155	1.00	3,840	14,976	4.73	5,186	2,074	28,600	572	0.18	
5	Franklin	634	957	0.30	117	285	0.09	266	1,037	0.33	612	245	1	0	0.00	
5	Richland	526	794	0.25	140	342	0.11	207	807	0.25	945	378	2,365	47	0.01	
5	West Carroll	279	421	0.13	52	127	0.04	128	499	0.16	392	157	707	14	0.00	
	Subtotal	1,439	2,173	0.69	309	754	0.24	601	2,344	0.74	1,949	780	3,073	61	0.02	
6	East Carroll	169	255	0.08	15	37	0.01	163	636	0.20	233	93	4,219	84	0.03	
6	Madison	372	562	0.18	30	73	0.02	204	796	0.25	303	121	2,487	50	0.02	
6	Tensas	190	287	0.09	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	660	13	0.00	
	Subtotal	731	1,104	0.35	45	110	0.03	367	1,431	0.45	536	214	7,366	147	0.05	
7	Catahoula	340	513	0.16	149	364	0.11	133	519	0.16	187	75	767	15	0.00	
7	Concordia	484	731	0.23	291	710	0.22	564	2,200	0.69	708	283	633	13	0.00	
	Subtotal	824	1,244	0.39	440	1,074	0.34	697	2,718	0.86	895	358	1,400	28	0.01	
8	Winn	420	634	0.20	175	427	0.13	278	1,084	0.34	460	184	1,363	27	0.01	
9	Rapides	2,862	4,322	1.36	1,018	2,484	0.78	2,000	7,800	2.46	2,778	1,111	12,327	247	0.08	
10	Natchitoches	1,055	1,593	0.50	292	712	0.22	550	2,145	0.68	710	284	6,045	121	0.04	
11	Sabine	711	1,074	0.34	131	320	0.10	403	1,572	0.50	1,060	424	3,918	78	0.02	
12	Avoyelles	1,500	2,265	0.72	241	588	0.19	749	2,921	0.92	1,552	621	3,399	68	0.02	
13	Evangeline	1,022	1,543	0.49	80	195	0.06	594	2,317	0.73	397	159	2,438	49	0.02	
14	Calcasieu	4,676	7,061	2.23	2,050	5,002	1.58	2,779	10,838	3.42	2,953	1,173	11,774	235	0.07	
15	Acadia	1,663	2,511	0.79	248	605	0.19	885	3,452	1.09	761	304	5,832	117	0.04	
15	Lafayette	994	1,501	0.47	1,470	3,587	1.13	0	0	0.00	0	0	13,751	275	0.09	
15	Vermilion	1,209	1,826	0.58	496	1,210	0.38	1,383	5,394	1.70	1,985	794	5,497	110	0.03	
	Subtotal	3,866	5,838	1.84	2,214	5,402	1.71	2,268	8,845	2.79	2,746	1,098	25,080	502	0.16	

Page 1 of 6
 *Note that determinations regarding the sufficiency of judicial resources must be based on this analysis and other factors, and on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.
 ** Some totals may not add due to rounding.

Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District*

JDC	Parish	NON-DOMESTIC (1,511)			CIVIL DOMESTIC (2,444)			FELONY (3,919)			MISDEMEANOR (.4)			TRAFFIC (.02)		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
16	Iberia	1,922	2,902	0.92	288	703	0.22	994	3,877	1.22	1,504	602	0.19	8,967	179	0.06
16	St. Martin	1,328	2,005	0.63	114	278	0.09	469	1,829	0.58	739	296	0.09	50,398	1808	0.57
16	St. Mary	1,307	1,974	0.62	377	920	0.29	1,057	4,122	1.30	2,465	986	0.31	4,946	99	0.03
	Subtotal	4,557	6,881	2.17	779	1,901	0.60	2,520	9,828	3.10	4,708	1,883	0.59	104,311	2086	0.66
17	Latourche	1,832	2,766	0.87	630	1,537	0.49	1,307	5,097	1.61	3,636	1,454	0.46	10,260	205	0.06
18	Iberville	1,384	2,090	0.66	249	608	0.19	437	1,704	0.54	958	383	0.12	6,985	140	0.04
18	Pt. Coupee	615	929	0.29	145	354	0.11	239	932	0.29	507	203	0.06	1,130	23	0.01
18	W. Baton Rouge	710	1,072	0.34	183	447	0.14	312	1,217	0.38	964	386	0.12	1,941	39	0.01
	Subtotal	2,709	4,091	1.29	577	1,408	0.44	988	3,853	1.22	2,429	972	0.31	10,056	201	0.06
19	E. Baton Rouge	14,098	21,288	6.72	11	27	0.01	3,932	15,335	4.84	4,361	1,744	0.55	32,801	656	0.21
20	E. Feliciana	665	1,004	0.32	221	539	0.17	155	605	0.19	672	269	0.08	1,317	26	0.01
20	W. Feliciana	360	544	0.17	18	44	0.01	105	410	0.13	300	120	0.04	56	1	0.00
	Subtotal	1,025	1,548	0.49	239	583	0.18	260	1,014	0.32	972	389	0.12	1,373	27	0.01
21	Livingston	2,693	4,066	1.28	1,297	3,165	1.00	1,073	4,185	1.32	2,359	944	0.30	9,422	188	0.06
21	St. Helena	331	500	0.16	20	49	0.02	244	962	0.30	587	235	0.07	1,494	30	0.01
21	Tangipahoa	3,052	4,609	1.46	795	1,940	0.61	1,341	5,230	1.65	3,500	1,400	0.44	16,524	330	0.10
	Subtotal	6,076	9,175	2.90	2,112	5,153	1.63	2,658	10,366	3.27	6,446	2,578	0.81	27,440	549	0.17
22	St. Tammany	6,390	9,649	3.05	1,338	3,265	1.03	3,263	12,726	4.02	5,866	2,346	0.74	36,550	731	0.23
22	Washington	1,018	1,537	0.49	306	747	0.24	607	2,367	0.75	793	317	0.10	2,160	43	0.01
	Subtotal	7,408	11,186	3.53	1,644	4,011	1.27	3,870	15,093	4.77	6,659	2,664	0.84	38,710	774	0.24
23	Ascension	2,920	4,409	1.39	875	2,135	0.67	1,652	6,443	2.03	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
23	Assumption	656	991	0.31	62	151	0.05	181	706	0.22	647	259	0.08	2,494	50	0.02
23	St. James	870	1,314	0.41	137	334	0.11	303	1,182	0.37	846	338	0.11	3,211	64	0.02
	Subtotal	4,446	6,713	2.12	1,074	2,621	0.83	2,136	8,330	2.63	1,493	597	0.19	5,705	114	0.04
24	Jefferson	11,312	17,081	5.39	2,274	5,549	1.75	3,818	14,890	4.70	2,770	1,108	0.35	105,054	2101	0.66
25	Plaqueemines	653	986	0.31	279	681	0.21	1,196	4,664	1.47	3,062	1,225	0.39	0	0	0.00
26	Bossier	2,090	3,156	1.00	1,189	2,901	0.92	1,923	7,500	2.37	7,246	2,898	0.92	7,846	157	0.05
26	Webster	1,011	1,527	0.48	296	722	0.23	1,010	3,939	1.24	1,368	547	0.17	4,326	87	0.03
	Subtotal	3,101	4,683	1.48	1,485	3,623	1.14	2,933	11,439	3.61	8,614	3,446	1.09	12,172	243	0.08
27	St. Landry	2,322	3,506	1.11	625	1,525	0.48	1,565	6,104	1.93	890	356	0.11	23,295	466	0.15
28	LaSalle	349	527	0.17	136	332	0.10	147	573	0.18	903	361	0.11	1,598	32	0.01
29	St. Charles	1,093	1,650	0.52	483	1,179	0.37	209	815	0.26	1,641	656	0.21	26,551	531	0.17
30	Vernon	1,067	1,611	0.51	451	1,100	0.35	493	1,923	0.61	1,601	640	0.20	8,999	180	0.06

*Note that determinations regarding the sufficiency of judicial resources must be based on this analysis and other factors, and on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.
 ** Some totals may not add due to rounding.

2008 Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District*

JDC	Parish	NON-DOMESTIC (1.5:1)			CIVIL DOMESTIC (2.44)			FELONY (3.9)			MISDEMEANOR (4)			TRAFFIC (.02)		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
31	Jefferson Davis	553	835	0.26	422	1,030	0.33	312	1,217	0.38	681	272	0.09	11,566	231	0.07
32	Terrebonne	2,253	3,402	1.07	1,229	2,999	0.95	1,524	5,944	1.88	3,672	1,469	0.46	23,364	467	0.15
33	Allen	508	767	0.24	223	544	0.17	227	885	0.28	717	287	0.09	2,159	43	0.01
34	St. Bernard	1,813	2,738	0.86	88	215	0.07	1,296	5,054	1.60	4,762	1,905	0.60	6,612	132	0.04
35	Grant	511	772	0.24	165	403	0.13	209	815	0.26	648	259	0.08	3,273	65	0.02
36	Beauregard	1,314	1,984	0.63	0	0	0.00	237	924	0.29	607	243	0.08	6,304	126	0.04
37	Caldwell	317	479	0.15	88	215	0.07	81	316	0.10	1,020	408	0.13	594	12	0.00
38	Cameron	238	359	0.11	4	10	0.00	199	776	0.25	905	362	0.11	3,421	68	0.02
39	Red River	183	276	0.09	72	176	0.06	121	472	0.15	281	112	0.04	2,613	52	0.02
40	St. John	1,811	2,735	0.86	399	974	0.31	309	1,205	0.38	5,533	2,213	0.70	10,115	202	0.06
42	DeSoto	874	1,320	0.42	222	542	0.17	372	1,451	0.46	1,208	483	0.15	14,754	295	0.09
	Orleans Civil	10,264	15,499	4.89	2,698	6,583	2.08	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Orleans Criminal	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	4,374	17,059	5.39	3,508	1,403	0.44	0	0	0.00
	Subtotal	115,197	173,947	54.92	29,741	72,568	22.91	55,612	216,887	68.48	101,420	40,568	12.81	617,291	12,346	3.90
	Juvenile Courts	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Caddo	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	E. Baton Rouge	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Jefferson	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Orleans	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	EBR Family	0	0	0.00	3,929	9,587	3.03	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Subtotal	0	0	0.00	3,929	9,587	3.03	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	TOTAL**	115,197	173,947	54.92	33,670	82,155	25.94	55,612	216,887	68.48	101,420	40,568	12.81	619,310	12,386	3.91

*Note that determinations regarding the sufficiency of judicial resources must be based on this analysis and other factors, and on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.
 ** Some totals may not add due to rounding.

2008 Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District*

JDC	Parish	JUVENILE						TOTALS						
		CINC (2.6)			DELINQUENCY (2.6)			OTHER (.76)			TOTALS			
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Actual Judges
1	Caddo	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	18,908	25,519	8	11
2	Bienville	13	34	0.01	15	39	0.01	26	20	0.01	5,149	1,946		
2	Claiborne	5	13	0.00	12	31	0.01	166	126	0.04	5,983	1,243		
2	Jackson	14	36	0.01	45	117	0.04	346	263	0.08	1,973	1,895		
	Subtotal	32	83	0.03	72	187	0.06	538	409	0.13	13,105	5,084	2	3
3	Lincoln	27	70	0.02	250	650	0.21	259	197	0.06	5,639	4,711		
3	Union	34	88	0.03	116	302	0.10	164	125	0.04	3,155	3,482		
	Subtotal	61	159	0.05	366	952	0.30	423	321	0.10	8,794	8,193	3	3
4	Morehouse	21	55	0.02	73	190	0.06	407	309	0.10	6,642	4,254		
4	Ouachita	70	182	0.06	267	694	0.22	1,465	1,113	0.35	38,805	25,447		
	Subtotal	91	237	0.07	340	884	0.28	1,872	1,423	0.45	45,447	29,700	9	11
5	Franklin	19	49	0.02	62	161	0.05	173	131	0.04	1,884	2,867		
5	Richland	8	21	0.01	52	135	0.04	115	87	0.03	4,358	2,612		
5	West Carroll	6	16	0.00	41	107	0.03	65	49	0.02	1,670	1,390		
	Subtotal	33	86	0.03	155	403	0.13	353	268	0.08	7,912	6,869	2	3
6	East Carroll	3	8	0.00	39	101	0.03	83	63	0.02	4,924	1,277		
6	Madison	26	68	0.02	5	13	0.00	153	116	0.04	3,580	1,798		
6	Tensas	0	0	0.00	23	60	0.02	8	6	0.00	881	366		
	Subtotal	29	75	0.02	67	174	0.06	244	185	0.06	9,385	3,442	1	2
7	Catahoula	10	26	0.01	8	21	0.01	26	20	0.01	1,620	1,552		
7	Concordia	19	49	0.02	70	182	0.06	282	214	0.07	3,051	4,382		
	Subtotal	29	75	0.02	78	203	0.06	308	234	0.07	4,671	5,934	2	2
8	Winn	9	23	0.01	21	55	0.02	10	8	0.00	2,736	2,442	1	1
9	Rapides	160	416	0.13	227	590	0.19	895	680	0.21	22,267	17,650	6	7
10	Natchitoches	37	96	0.03	180	468	0.15	2,095	1,592	0.50	10,964	7,012	2	2
11	Sabine	29	75	0.02	79	205	0.06	191	145	0.05	6,522	3,893	1	1
12	Avoyelles	33	86	0.03	165	429	0.14	312	237	0.07	7,951	7,215	2	2
13	Evangeline	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	577	439	0.14	5,108	4,701	1	2
14	Calcasieu	261	679	0.21	542	1,409	0.44	1,187	902	0.28	26,202	27,299	9	9
15	Acadia	69	179	0.06	26	68	0.02	308	234	0.07	9,792	7,470		
15	Lafayette	523	1,360	0.43	1,040	2,704	0.85	1,015	771	0.24	18,793	10,198		
15	Vermilion	74	192	0.06	130	338	0.11	123	93	0.03	10,897	9,957		
	Subtotal	666	1,732	0.55	1,196	3,110	0.98	1,446	1,099	0.35	39,482	27,625	9	13

*Note that determinations regarding the sufficiency of judicial resources must be based on this analysis and other factors, and on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.
 ** Some totals may not add due to rounding.

2008
Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District*

JDC	Parish	JUVENILE						TOTALS					
		CINC (2.6)			DELINQUENCY (2.6)			OTHER (.76)			TOTALS		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
16	Iberia	10	26	0.01	64	166	0.05	135	103	0.03	13,884	8,557	
16	St. Martin	43	112	0.04	7	18	0.01	209	159	0.05	93,307	6,505	
16	St. Mary	39	101	0.03	113	294	0.09	433	329	0.10	10,737	8,825	
	Subtotal	92	239	0.08	184	478	0.15	777	591	0.19	117,928	23,887	8
17	Lafourche	64	166	0.05	398	1,035	0.33	318	242	0.08	18,445	12,503	4
18	Iberville	40	104	0.03	151	393	0.12	93	71	0.02	10,297	5,492	
18	Pt. Coupee	5	13	0.00	81	211	0.07	58	44	0.01	2,780	2,708	
18	W. Baton Rouge	17	44	0.01	64	166	0.05	11	8	0.00	4,202	3,379	
	Subtotal	62	161	0.05	296	770	0.24	162	123	0.04	17,279	11,578	4
19	E. Baton Rouge	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	55,203	39,050	12
20	E. Feliciana	14	36	0.01	2	5	0.00	126	96	0.03	3,172	2,580	
20	W. Feliciana	4	10	0.00	22	57	0.02	45	34	0.01	910	1,220	
	Subtotal	18	47	0.01	24	62	0.02	171	130	0.04	4,082	3,800	1
21	Livingston	137	356	0.11	215	559	0.18	488	371	0.12	17,684	13,834	
21	St. Helena	10	26	0.01	43	112	0.04	0	0	0.00	2,729	1,903	
21	Tangipahoa	96	250	0.08	109	283	0.09	535	407	0.13	25,952	14,448	
	Subtotal	243	632	0.20	367	954	0.30	1,023	777	0.25	46,365	30,185	10
22	St. Tammany	184	478	0.15	258	671	0.21	1,297	986	0.31	55,146	30,852	
22	Washington	86	224	0.07	70	182	0.06	291	221	0.07	5,331	5,638	
	Subtotal	270	702	0.22	328	853	0.27	1,588	1,207	0.38	60,477	36,490	12
23	Ascension	57	148	0.05	521	1,355	0.43	33	25	0.01	6,058	14,515	
23	Assumption	81	211	0.07	0	0	0.00	94	71	0.02	4,215	2,438	
23	St. James	19	49	0.02	163	424	0.13	114	87	0.03	5,663	3,792	
	Subtotal	157	408	0.13	684	1,778	0.56	241	183	0.06	15,936	20,745	7
24	Jefferson	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	125,228	40,729	13
25	Plaquemines	14	36	0.01	63	164	0.05	17	13	0.00	5,284	7,769	2
26	Bossier	86	224	0.07	839	2,181	0.69	741	563	0.18	21,960	19,580	
26	Webster	25	65	0.02	0	375	0.00	285	285	0.09	8,411	7,172	
	Subtotal	111	289	0.09	839	2,181	0.69	1,116	848	0.27	30,371	26,752	8
27	St. Landry	49	127	0.04	64	166	0.05	595	452	0.14	29,405	12,703	4
28	LaSalle	18	47	0.01	23	60	0.02	132	100	0.03	3,306	2,032	1
29	St. Charles	11	29	0.01	232	603	0.19	133	101	0.03	30,353	5,564	2
30	Vernon	79	205	0.06	20	52	0.02	279	212	0.07	12,989	5,924	2

Page 5 of 6
 *Note that determinations regarding the sufficiency of judicial resources must be based on this analysis and other factors, and on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.
 ** Some totals may not add due to rounding.

2008
Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3.167 Work Point Threshold by Judicial District*

JDC	Parish	JUVENILE												TOTALS			
		CINC (2.6)				DELINQUENCY (2.6)				OTHER (7.6)				Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Actual Judges
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed					
31	Jefferson Davis	7	18	0.01	23	60	0.02	81	62	0.02				13,645	3,725	1	1
32	Terrebonne	59	153	0.05	0	0	0.00	603	458	0.14				32,704	14,892	5	5
33	Allen	31	81	0.03	153	398	0.13	102	78	0.02				4,120	3,082	1	2
34	St. Bernard	11	29	0.01	3	8	0.00	161	122	0.04				14,746	10,203	3	5
35	Grant	26	68	0.02	51	133	0.04	125	95	0.03				5,008	2,609	1	1
36	Beauregard	36	94	0.03	41	92	0.03	72	55	0.02				8,611	3,518	1	2
37	Caldwell	13	34	0.01	34	88	0.03	52	40	0.01				2,199	1,591	0.5	1
38	Cameron	2	5	0.00	27	70	0.02	67	51	0.02				4,863	1,702	1	1
39	Red River	5	13	0.00	40	104	0.03	94	71	0.02				3,409	1,277	0.4	1
40	St. John	34	88	0.03	183	476	0.15	749	569	0.18				19,133	8,462	3	3
42	DeSoto	35	91	0.03	49	127	0.04	240	182	0.06				17,754	4,491	1	2
	Orleans Civil	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00				12,962	22,082	7	14
	Orleans Criminal	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00				7,882	18,462	6	12
	Subtotal	2,917	7,584	2.39	7,614	19,782	6.25	19,399	14,743	4.66				949,191	558,426	176.33	217
	Juvenile Courts																
	Caddo	308	801	0.25	1,441	3,747	1.18	1,181	898	0.28				3,379	5,454	2	3
	E. Baton Rouge	199	517	0.16	1,800	4,680	1.48	3,279	2,492	0.79				5,900	7,702	2	2
	Jefferson	487	1,266	0.40	1,730	4,498	1.42	3,198	2,430	0.77				5,996	8,206	3	3
	Orleans	141	367	0.12	733	1,906	0.60	1,112	845	0.27				2,353	3,125	1	6
	EBR Family	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00				3,929	9,587	3	4
	Subtotal	1,135	2,951	0.93	5,704	14,830	4.68	8,770	6,665	2.10				21,557	34,074	11	18
	TOTAL**	4,052	10,535	3.33	13,318	34,612	10.93	28,169	21,408	6.76				970,748	592,499	187.09	235

Page 6 of 6
 *Note that determinations regarding the sufficiency of judicial resources must be based on this analysis and other factors, and on a jurisdiction by jurisdiction basis.
 ** Some totals may not add due to rounding.

2008

City and Parish Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3167 Work Point Threshold

City/Parish	CIVIL (.25)				CRIMINAL (.4)				TRAFFIC (.02)				CINC (2.6)				DELINQUENCY (2.6)				OTHER JUVENILE (.76)				TO TALS							
	Work Points		Judges Needed		Work Points		Judges Needed		Work Points		Judges Needed		Work Points		Judges Needed		Work Points		Judges Needed		Work Points		Judges Needed		Total Filings		Work Points		Judges Needed		Actual * Judges	
	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points	Filings	Points		
Abbeville	456	114	811	324	3,236	65	0.02	18	47	0.01	835	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,842	1,385	4.842	1.385	0.44	1			
Alexandria	2,818	705	7,223	2,889	12,929	259	0.08	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22,970	3,852	22,970	3,852	1.22	1		
Ascension	483	121	5,347	2,139	14,504	290	0.09	61	159	0.05	177	460	0.15	12	9	0.00	0.00	12	9	0.00	0.00	20,584	3,178	20,584	3,178	1.00	1	1.00	1			
Baker	415	104	765	306	6,899	138	0.04	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	548	0.17	548	0.17	0.17	1	0.17	1		
Bastrop	1,044	261	862	345	2,450	49	0.02	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4,356	655	4,356	655	0.21	1	0.21	1		
Baton Rouge	12,415	3,104	39,115	15,646	158,371	3,167	1.00	0	94	0.03	254	660	0.21	39	30	0.00	0.00	39	30	0.00	0.00	209,901	21,917	209,901	21,917	6.92	5	6.92	5			
Bogalusa	422	106	1,458	583	2,143	43	0.01	2	5	0.00	958	2,491	0.79	911	692	0.22	30,296	5,390	1.70	1	1.70	1	4,352	1,515	4,352	1,515	0.48	1	0.48	1		
Bossier City	2,212	553	2,959	1,184	23,254	465	0.15	0	0	0.00	153	398	0.13	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3,116	902	3,116	902	0.28	1	0.28	1			
Breaux Bridge	427	107	912	365	1,624	32	0.01	0	0	0.00	47	122	0.04	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1,051	350	1,051	350	0.11	1	0.11	1			
Burke	99	25	264	106	526	11	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	
Crowley	404	101	3,758	1,503	6,786	136	0.04	22	57	0.02	255	663	0.21	13	10	0.00	11,238	2,470	0.78	1	0.78	1	1,234	464	1,234	464	0.15	1	0.15	1		
Denham Springs	1,690	423	2,062	825	14,250	285	0.09	254	660	0.21	374	972	0.31	17	13	0.00	18,647	3,178	1.00	1	1.00	1	18,647	3,178	18,647	3,178	1.00	1	1.00	1		
Eunice	467	117	2,763	905	3,563	71	0.02	0	0	0.00	270	702	0.22	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5,563	1,795	5,563	1,795	0.57	1	0.57	1	
Franklin	437	109	966	386	1,950	19	0.01	0	0	0.00	246	640	0.20	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2,599	1,154	2,599	1,154	0.36	1	0.36	1	
Hammond	2,250	563	3,552	1,421	13,464	269	0.09	70	182	0.06	383	996	0.31	402	306	0.10	20,121	3,736	1.18	1	1.18	1	20,121	3,736	20,121	3,736	1.18	1	1.18	1		
Jeanerette	3,178	795	3,992	1,597	6,826	137	0.04	0	0	0.00	1,370	3,562	1.12	517	393	0.12	15,883	6,483	2.05	1	2.05	1	15,883	6,483	15,883	6,483	2.05	1	2.05	1		
Houma	175	44	630	252	3,069	29	0.01	0	0	0.00	198	515	0.16	141	107	0.03	2,613	947	0.30	1	0.30	1	2,613	947	2,613	947	0.30	1	0.30	1		
Jeff. 1st Parish	3,069	767	5,820	2,328	73,265	1,465	0.46	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	82,154	4,561	1.44	2	1.44	2	82,154	4,561	82,154	4,561	1.44	2	1.44	2		
Jeff. 2nd Parish	3,887	972	5,824	2,330	53,759	1,075	0.34	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	63,470	4,377	1.38	2	1.38	2	63,470	4,377	63,470	4,377	1.38	2	1.38	2		
Jennings	504	126	371	148	1,635	33	0.01	0	0	0.00	84	218	0.07	24	18	0.00	2,510	307	0.10	1	0.10	1	2,510	307	2,510	307	0.10	1	0.10	1		
Kaplan	97	24	433	173	589	12	0.00	7	18	0.01	84	218	0.07	24	18	0.00	1,234	464	0.15	1	0.15	1	1,234	464	1,234	464	0.15	1	0.15	1		
Lafayette	3,192	798	4,056	1,622	19,753	395	0.12	0	0	0.00	246	640	0.20	0	0	0.00	27,247	3,455	1.09	2	1.09	2	27,247	3,455	27,247	3,455	1.09	2	1.09	2		
Lake Charles	3,418	855	3,336	1,334	11,958	239	0.08	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	18,712	2,428	0.77	2	0.77	2	18,712	2,428	18,712	2,428	0.77	2	0.77	2		
Leesville	185	46	1,693	677	2,625	53	0.02	15	39	0.01	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	35	27	0.01	4,553	842	4,553	842	0.27	1	0.27	1	0.27	1			
Marksville	717	179	973	389	1,439	29	0.01	0	0	0.00	59	153	0.05	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3,188	751	3,188	751	0.24	1	0.24	1	
Minden	566	142	1,289	516	1,289	26	0.01	0	0	0.00	114	296	0.09	0	0	0.00	3,258	979	0.31	1	0.31	1	3,258	979	3,258	979	0.31	1	0.31	1		
Monroe	3,671	918	7,636	3,054	28,954	579	0.18	26	68	0.02	640	1,664	0.53	0	0	0.00	40,927	6,283	1.98	3	1.98	3	40,927	6,283	40,927	6,283	1.98	3	1.98	3		
Morgan City	538	135	1,299	520	1,925	39	0.01	0	0	0.00	108	281	0.09	63	48	0.00	3,933	1,021	0.32	1	0.32	1	3,933	1,021	3,933	1,021	0.32	1	0.32	1		
Natchitoches	771	193	1,804	722	3,651	73	0.02	6	16	0.00	243	632	0.20	39	30	0.01	6,514	1,664	0.53	1	0.53	1	6,514	1,664	6,514	1,664	0.53	1	0.53	1		
New Iberia	1,125	281	2,129	852	5,263	105	0.03	0	0	0.00	405	1,053	0.33	0	0	0.00	8,922	2,291	0.72	1	0.72	1	8,922	2,291	8,922	2,291	0.72	1	0.72	1		
N.O. 1st City	7,461	1,865	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	7,461	1,865	0.59	3	0.59	3	7,461	1,865	7,461	1,865	0.59	3	0.59	3		
N.O. 2nd City	1,651	413	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	1,651	413	0.13	1	0.13	1	1,651	413	1,651	413	0.13	1	0.13	1		
N.O. Municipal	0	0	44,260	17,704	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	44,260	17,704	5.59	4	5.59	4	44,260	17,704	44,260	17,704	5.59	4	5.59	4		
N. O. Traffic	0	0	3,806	1,522	145,638	2,913	0.92	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	145,638	2,913	0.92	4	0.92	4	145,638	2,913	145,638	2,913	0.92	4	0.92	4		
Oakdale	277	69	440	176	1,263	27	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Opelousas	991	248	3,048	1,219	5,326	107	0.03	88	229	0.07	347	902	0.28	41	31	0.01	9,841	2,736	0.86	1	0.86	1	9,841	2,736	9,841	2,736	0.86	1	0.86	1		
Pineville	909	227	5,318	2,127	3,868	77	0.02	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	10,095	2,432	0.77	1	0.77	1	10,095	2,432	10,095	2,432	0.77	1	0.77	1		

*Not all city court judges and parish court judges are full-time.

2008

City and Parish Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3167 Work Point Threshold

City/Parish	CIVIL (.25)			CRIMINAL (.4)			TRAFFIC (.02)			JUVENILE						TO TALS						
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	DELINQUENCY (2.6)			OTHER JUVENILE (.75)			Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Actual * Judges			
										Work Points	Judges Needed	Work Points	Filings	Work Points	Filings					Work Points	Judges Needed	
Plaquemine	456	114	0.04	481	192	0.06	1,014	20	0.01	0	0	0.00	95	247	0.08	0	0	0.00	2,046	574	0.18	1
Port Allen	315	79	0.02	424	170	0.05	7,974	159	0.05	0	0	0.00	52	135	0.04	0	0	0.00	8,765	543	0.17	1
Rayne	527	132	0.04	745	298	0.09	1,667	33	0.01	0	0	0.00	67	174	0.06	0	0	0.00	3,006	637	0.20	1
Ruston	1,682	421	0.13	1,064	426	0.13	2,476	50	0.02	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	5,222	896	0.28	1
Shreveport	10,825	2,706	0.85	12,418	4,967	1.57	37,662	753	0.24	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	60,905	8,427	2.66	4
Slidell	1,726	432	0.14	3,750	1,500	0.47	9,770	195	0.06	70	182	0.06	375	975	0.31	29	22	0.01	15,720	3,306	1.04	1
Springhill	395	99	0.03	1,449	580	0.18	1,312	26	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	3,439	1,308	0.41	1
Sulphur	962	241	0.08	3,128	1,251	0.40	10,572	211	0.07	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	14,662	1,703	0.54	1
Thibodaux	818	205	0.06	2,263	905	0.29	3,140	63	0.02	2	5	0.00	304	790	0.25	43	33	0.01	6,570	2,001	0.63	1
Vidalia	29	7	0.00	202	81	0.03	782	16	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	3,970	986	0.31	1
Ville Platte	652	163	0.05	1,604	642	0.20	1,657	33	0.01	0	0	0.00	15	39	0.01	0	0	0.00	1,028	143	0.05	1
West Monroe	1,678	420	0.13	2,744	1,098	0.35	4,348	87	0.03	0	0	0.00	33	86	0.03	0	0	0.00	8,803	1,690	0.53	1
Winnfield	108	27	0.01	941	376	0.12	380	8	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1,429	411	0.13	1
Winnboro	773	193	0.06	591	236	0.07	555	11	0.00	0	0	0.00	29	75	0.02	0	0	0.00	1,948	516	0.16	1
Zachary	266	67	0.02	612	245	0.08	1,942	39	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	2,820	350	0.11	1
TOTALS	83,633	20,908	6.60	202,890	81,156	25.63	720,795	14,416	4.55	677	1,760	0.56	8,490	22,074	6.97	2,513	1,910	0.60	1,018,998	142,224	44.91	73

*Not all city court judges and parish court judges are full-time.

APPENDIX 5

Report of the Long-Term Subcommittee

At its 2007 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 91 was passed. In this resolution, the Legislature urged and requested the Supreme Court of Louisiana, in conjunction with the Judicial Council, to study and investigate appropriate matters, including case filing data, case weights, court structure and finance, efficiencies in judicial performance and the administration of justice, the use of support personnel, case management standards, the current system of districting, and the relationship of types of courts to one another, as a part of the determination of the need for judgeships at all levels of the court system. The Legislature also requested the Court, through the Judicial Council, to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature no later than March 14th of each year.

To assist the Judicial Council and the Supreme Court in responding to this Legislative request, the Judicial Council's Trial Court Committee to Determine the Need for Judgeships met through subcommittees, and as a committee of the whole, from December, 2007 to March 4th of this year. One of the subcommittees was asked to identify long-term issues relating to structure, finance and other long-term matters.

The Long-Term Subcommittee met on January 22, 2008 at the First Circuit Court of appeal and Judge James Genovese chaired the meeting, and with the assistance of the staff, priorities were identified by the subcommittee members concerning the range of matters for consideration to include:

- Developing a master plan for improving the structure, financing and processes of the judiciary;
- Eliminating unneeded judgeships;
- Developing new judgeship criteria;
- Exploring the possibility of creating a unitary trial court system;
- Reviewing the role of justices of the peace;
- Increasing state financing;
- Creating transparency in funding throughout the system.

After these priorities were identified, a discussion ensued on the ways the subcommittee should proceed. Judge Genovese summarized the results of the discussion by requesting that the full Trial Court Committee, and then the Judicial Council, then the Supreme Court, and ultimately the Legislature be asked to establish the parameters of this undertaking,

expanding the involvement of other appropriate stake holders on the subcommittee or creating a completely separate committee to oversee the development of the master plan and contracting with appropriate consultants to assist in developing this master plan.

This request is made in light of the obvious significant political policy and personnel issues that would be involved in such a substantial task.

Judge Genovese concluded that this Long-Term Subcommittee must have additional guidance, instruction and authority to proceed with what we perceive to be our mission.

D R A F T

Site Team Report submitted to
The Committee to Evaluate Requests for New Judgeships

**REQUEST BY THE HONORABLE JUDGES
TWENTY-SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
PARISHES OF BOSSIER AND WEBSTER
FOR THE CREATION OF TWO (2) ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS**

February 6, 2009

BACKGROUND

The 1921 Constitution of Louisiana, Article VII Section 31, provided for 25 judicial district courts. The parishes of Caddo and Bossier shall compose the First District and the parishes of Webster, Claiborne and Bienville shall compose the Second District.

In 1926 the Constitution of Louisiana was amended by Act 79 to provide for the creation of the 26th Judicial District. The parishes of Bossier and Webster shall compose the 26th Judicial District and shall have one judge elected from the newly created 26th Judicial District Court.

In 1959 R.S. 13:621.26 was amended by Act 109, to provide for one additional judge for a total of two judges. Section 4 of the revised statute reads, "There are created in the Twenty-Six Judicial District of Louisiana two divisions to be known as Division "A," of said district shall be a resident of and a qualified elector in the parish of Bossier, and the presiding judge of Division "B" of said district shall be a resident of and qualified elector in the parish of Webster.

In 1970, Act 230 of 1970 a third judge was added to run at-large thereby creating Division "C."

In 1975, Act 733 added a fourth judge and created Division "D" to run at-large. Act 733 also appears to repeal the provisions of Act 109 of 1959 regular session.

In 1989, Act 174 added the fifth judgeship creating Division "E" at-large.

In 2002, the First Extraordinary Session, Act 61 added the sixth judgeship creating Division "F" at-large to begin his term effective January 1, 2004.

Population of Bossier Parish:

July 1, 2007, is estimated to be at 108,705
July 1, 2002, is estimated to be at 100,937.

Population of Webster Parish:

July 1, 2007, is estimated to be at 40,924
July 1, 2002, is estimated to be at 41,264.

Total estimate population in the 26th Judicial District Court as of July 1, 2007 is estimated to be 149,629, and as of July 1, 2002, it is estimated to be 142,201, an estimated increase in population of 7,428..

The Parish seat of Webster is Minden, the largest city in the parish. The parish seat of Bossier is Benton where the courthouse is located.. The largest city in the parish is Bossier City.

The jurisdiction of the 26th Judicial District Court consists of civil, criminal domestic, traffic, and juvenile matters. There are 3 city courts: Bossier City Court, Minden City Court, and Springhill City Court, each having one part-time judge. There are also numerous justices of the peace within the jurisdiction.

THE REQUEST

Pursuant to a request submitted to the Office of the Judicial Administrator of the Louisiana Supreme Court dated July 2, 2008, the honorable judges of the 26th Judicial District Court requested that consideration be given for the creation of 2 additional judgeships. The letter of request was signed by all 6 members of the court. A site visit team composed of Judge Robert Morrison of the 21st Judicial District and Chair of the Trial Court Committee to Review the Need for New Judgeships. , Judge H. Stephens Winters of the 4th Judicial District Court, Judge David Bell of Orleans Juvenile Court, Scott Griffith, Deputy Judicial Administrator of the Louisiana Supreme Court, and Darryl Schultz, Deputy Judicial Administrator of the Louisiana Supreme Court, visited the 26th Judicial District Court on Thursday, January 29, 2009.

SITE VISIT

The 26th Judicial District Court is a two-parish Judicial District consisting of Bossier and Webster Parishes. There are courthouses in both parishes. There are presently six district court judges, two hearing officers, and one Court Administrator.

In Bossier Parish, there are six court reporters, two secretarial/clerical positions shared by the six judges, one receptionist, and four law clerks shared by all six judges.

Webster Parish has two court reporters, one clerical assistant, and one part-time secretarial/clerical position. There is at least one to two judges in Webster parish every day and two or more judges in Bossier Parish every day. There is both an Adult and Juvenile Drug Court in the 26th Judicial District.

There are three city courts located within the Judicial District, each having one part-time city court judge.

The Site team met with the following individuals:

Ms. Suzanne Stinson, Court Administrator
Mr. Jimmy Cochran, Bossier Police Jury
Mr. Charles Walker, Webster Parish Police Jury President
Ms. Pam Smart, 26th Judicial District Public Defender
Ms. Cindy Johnston, Bossier Parish Clerk of Court
Mr. Schuyler Marvin, District Attorney 26th JDC
Judge Michael Craig, Judge Division "A"
Judge Graydon Kitchens, Jr., Retired 26th JDC Judge /Assistant District Attorney
Judge Ford Stinson, Division "B"
Judge Jeff Cox, Division "C"
Judge John Robinson, Division "D"
Judge Tommy Wilson, Bossier City Court
Judge Bruce Bolin, Division "E"
Mr. Ryan Gatti, Esq., Bossier Parish Bar Association
Sheriff Larry Deen, Bossier Parish Sheriff
Ms. Holli Vining, Webster Parish Clerk of Court
Judge Parker Self, Chief Judge, Division "F"

A brief tour of the courthouse was also provided.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Private interviews were conducted with all the above mentioned individuals. All persons who were interviewed were very cooperative and quite forthcoming, and seemed quite willing to discuss the workings of the court. Almost all person interviewed were complimentary as to the work ethic and diligence of the judges and staff of the Court.

From the inception of these discussions, it appeared that the primary interest of the persons interviewed was the creation of a judgeships to address juvenile case issues. In most cases, these observations were quite general, but a few of the persons interviewed were very specific that their concerns involved concentrated delivery of adequate court services to children. Some of the judges expanded the statements of perceived need to include the application of additional services to family law cases as well as juvenile case load.

The information provided to the site team revealed several areas which the team found problematic as to the ultimate recommendation to be made with respect to the request from this District. Initially, it is noted that in the 26th Judicial District, the District Attorney employs a practice wherein practically each criminal charge is instituted through the filing of an individual bill of information. While this practice is within the District Attorney's discretion, it is beyond the contemplation of the application of the work points formula utilized in the analytical process,

and requires some degree of adjustment in order to present an accurate picture of work load in this District compared to other districts in which bills of information include multiple counts and multiple defendants.

The site team employed several different means of attempting to place a reasonable discount factor to the criminal filings, so as to make them more comparable to the filing method employed in other districts. These means included analysis of randomly-selected dockets supplied by the Court. While admittedly an estimate, the site team believes that a conservative discount figure of 40% applied to the criminal and juvenile filings is a fair and probably conservative method of reconciling that type of case load in this District to those districts employing means of charging more in line with the attribution of work points derived in the formula.

A second area of analysis with which the site team struggled involved the allocation of judicial resources presently attributed to juvenile cases. It was noted from the interviews at the site visit that this District has negligible or insignificant case delay issues with respect to *all* types of case loads, including juvenile and family cases. The Court did provide materials indicating criminal case delays in the year 2006 exceeding guidelines established by the American Bar Association. However, the site visit team feels that any such analysis should be conducted over a multi-year period in order to be statistically significant.

The scheduling assignment of case load employed by this District is fairly unique, and somewhat hard to understand from an outsider's perspective. However, based upon the information provided the site team, it would appear that under current practice and scheduling, a period of one-half day or less in each parish during each week is devoted to the Court's juvenile case load, including both CINC and delinquency cases. With this being the case, it is difficult to make out a need for a separate judge assigned solely to such cases, or possibly both to juvenile and to family cases. It further appears from the methodology and current scheduling that the judges in the District are able to schedule multiple weeks per year undesignated for actual in-court work, but rather to be utilized for preparation of opinions and other office issues. Additionally, it would appear that, under the schedule as the site team understands it, when compare with the reported jury trials during the year, that many weeks devoted to jury trials end up with cases being settled or continued, providing additional available time to the existing judges for tending to their assignments. Again, this observation is not in any way intended as criticism of this Court - it is again commendable that the judges are able to schedule and handle their case load promptly and efficiently - but it does not appear to underscore any demonstrable need for an additional judgeship as opposed to a possible reallocation of assignments and schedules among the existing judges.

Finally, it should be noted that this District enjoys excellent support from those agencies with which it interacts. All affected parties expressed their willingness to supply the personnel and facilities necessary to support an additional judgeship. The courthouse facility in Bossier Parish is first rate, and can provide this additional space, and apparently, there is not an issue with adequate courtroom space in Webster Parish. The assistant Public Defender felt that her office could provide staffing for an additional judgeship with no increase in personnel; the District Attorney did believe that he would require some additional assistant(s) to staff the judgeship.

Applying the Guidelines developed by the Trial Court Committee, the site team makes the following further observations and findings with respect to this request:

- Criterion 1.** The court must be able to document that its judges are, on the average, engaged in working on “judicial activities” 209 work days per year. All indications are that the 26th Judicial District Court satisfies Criterion 1. The site visit team feels that the judges of this District are working diligently and are engaged in judicial activities for at least if not more than the requisite amount.
- Criterion 2.** The court must have a case load which by application of efficient docket management cannot be handled without undue delay. As noted above, the site visit team did not find that this Court experienced any undue delay, and on the contrary, appeared to handle its case load promptly. Accordingly, the Site Visit Team does not find that this Court meets this criterion.
- Criterion 3.** Through the application of work points adopted by the Judicial Council, the court must have a heavy enough work load to support the need for an additional judgeship. As discussed above, with respect to the method of billing criminal and juvenile cases in this District, there was some question on the part of the Site Visit Team as to assigning accurate work points in this District. Utilizing the discount discussed above, this Court would have a statistical need for 6.97 judges in 2006, 7.24 judges in 2007, and 6.87 judges in 2008, on the base numbers. However, applying the 15% higher threshold for consideration for new judgeships as previously adopted by the Judicial Council, this need would drop to 5.92 judges in 2006, 6.16 judges in 2007 and 5.84 judges in 2008. (See Appendix A. Filings) (See Appendix B. Jury Trials.) Therefore, utilizing these formulae, the Court would not satisfy this criterion.
- Criterion 4:** The court must have assurances that parish government, the sheriffs, and the clerks of court will provide courtroom space and support personnel to the new judge. As above stated, the other agency heads were, on the whole, very supportive of this Court and the request for this new judgeship. The Court has satisfied this criterion.
- Criterion 5 :** The court must meet such other requirements as the Judicial Council may deem appropriate. Not applicable as no other requirements were deemed appropriate.

CONCLUSION

A decision as to this request has been difficult, for reasons cited above in this report. The biggest problem, as stated, was in attributing what the site visit team considered a reasonable discount to the criminal and juvenile case filings.

The team recognizes the hard work of the judges in this District, and the fruits of these efforts which have resulted in a current docket. The team also agrees with the proposition advanced through the request that utilizing a single judge to handle the juvenile and domestic case load would have the beneficial result of uniformity in the treatment of these cases over a protracted period of time. The benefits to be derived are certainly a legitimate basis for the request for such a judgeship.

On the other hand, however, the information reported to and gathered by the site visit team does not indicate that there is adequate case load confined to juvenile and domestic cases and the apparent time necessary to service this case load in the Judicial District to fill a docket for a separate, additional judge. Further, all accounts indicate that the judges in this District, through diligent effort, and to their credit, are managing to maintain a very current docket. Additionally, there is at least the possibility that revisions in calendaring and scheduling might yield additional court time for handling the case load in this District. Finally, the work points calculation under the format applied by the site visit team does not reach a sufficient total to warrant an additional judgeship.

After careful consideration of all of these factors, it is the recommendation of the site visit team that this request not be approved. It is noted that there is some population growth in the District, although current case filings may not yet have caught up with this growth. It is further felt that future analysis of case filings under revised criteria might result in a different recommendation as to this request in some future year.

However, at the present time, for the reasons stated in this report, the site visit team does not recommend approval of an additional judgeship for the 26th Judicial District Court.

APPENDIX A

<i>Filings</i>				40% Discount*	40% Discount*	40% Discount*	
YEAR	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	
Non-Domestic Civil	3,753	4,022	4,183	3,747	4,022	4,183	
Domestic	1,965	1,561	1,436	1,965	1,609	1,436	
Felony	3,053	3,257	2881	1,832	1,954	1,729	
Misdemeanor	7,973	8,631	8381	4,784	5,179	5,029	
Traffic	11,290	10,286	11,990	11,290	10,286	11,990	
Juvenile	1,498	1,953	1880	899	1,172	1,128	
Total Filings	29,532	29,710	30,751	24,516	24,222	25,494	
<i>Work Points</i>							<i>Pt. Value</i>
YEAR	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	
Non-Domestic Civil	5,667	6,073	6,316	5,658	6,073	6,316	1.51
Domestic	4,795	3,809	3,504	4,795	3,926	3,504	2.44
Felony	11,907	12,702	11,236	7,144	7,621	6,742	3.9
Misdemeanor	3,189	3,452	3,352	1,914	2,071	2,011	0.4
Traffic	226	206	240	226	206	240	0.02
Juvenile	3,895	5,078	4,888	2,337	3,047	2,933	2.6
Total Work Points	29,678	31,320	29,536	22,073	22,944	21,746	
<i>Judges Needed at Threshold</i>							
YEAR	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	
Non-Domestic Civil	1.79	1.92	1.99	1.79	1.92	1.99	
Domestic	1.51	1.20	1.11	1.51	1.24	1.11	
Felony	3.76	4.01	3.55	2.26	2.41	2.13	
Misdemeanor	1.01	1.09	1.06	0.60	0.65	0.64	
Traffic	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.08	
Juvenile	1.23	1.60	1.54	0.74	0.96	0.93	
Total Judges	9.37	9.89	9.33	6.97	7.24	6.87	
Current Judges	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Judges Needed at 15% Higher Threshold	w/out discount			w/ discount			
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	
	7.97	8.41	7.93	5.92	6.16	5.84	

* This discount factor was applied to felony, misdemeanor and juvenile cases only

APPENDIX B

JURY TRIALS

<u>Year</u>	<u>Civil</u>	<u>Criminal</u>
2004	5	22
2005	4	23
2006	6	28
2007	3	19
2008	1	13