



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET
COMMITTEE

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MAY 29, 2019

Meeting Contents

Public Notice and Agenda	1
Public Comment	
Minutes	
Draft minutes from the February 26, 2019 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 Review of 2018 Judicial Workload Study Update to Caseweights	
1A. Update to the Judicial Workload Study 2018: Proposed Caseweights	5
1B. Update to the Judicial Workload Study 2018: Draft Judicial Officer FTE Need	6
1C. Update to the Judicial Workload Study 2018: Workload Complexity Feedback	7
Item 2 2019 Judicial Needs Assessment and Prioritization	
2A. Assessed Judgeship Need: Draft 2019 Prioritization/Ranking	10
2B. Priority Ranking	12
Information Only Item	
Info 1 2019-20 Resource Assessment Study Model (RAS) Need	
I. FY 2019-20 RAS FTE Need	13
II. FY 2018-19 Filing Update	15



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/waac.htm
waac@jud.ca.gov

Request for ADA accommodations should be made at least three business days before the meeting and directed to: JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN IN-PERSON MEETING

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (e))

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: May 29, 2019
Time: 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Location: 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102
3rd Floor, Sequoia Room
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831; passcode 3826880 (Listen Only)

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to waac@jud.ca.gov.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the February 26, 2019, Workload Assessment Advisory Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1)-(2))

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to waac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102, attention: Rose Butler. Only written comments received by 10:00 a.m. on May 28, 2019, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 AND 2)

Item 1

Review of 2018 Judicial Workload Study Update to Caseweights (Action Required)

The committee will review and consider adopting the proposed Judicial Workload Study caseweights which are used as part of the formula for assessing judicial need in the trial courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair
Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Analyst, Office of Court Research, Judicial Council
Ms. Khulan Erdenebaatar, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research, Judicial Council

Item 2

2019 Judicial Needs Assessment and Prioritization (Action Required)

The committee will review and consider adopting the proposed prioritization methodology for new judgeships and the priority ranking list for judgeships based on the new judicial caseweights, updated filings data, and prioritization parameters.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Chair
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Office of Court Research, Judicial Council
Ms. Khulan Erdenebaatar, Senior Analyst, Office of Court Research, Judicial Council

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

2019-20 Resource Assessment Study Model (RAS) Need

The RAS model is used as the basis for budget allocations via the Workload Formula. The 2019-20 RAS FTE need is based on filings from fiscal years 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18; caseweights from the 2017 RAS study update; and two recent modifications to the RAS model: an adjustment to account for the need for court reporters in family law and a work-year value of 98,550 minutes.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Office of Court Research, Judicial Council

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/waac.htm
waac@jud.ca.gov

WORKLOAD ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 26, 2019
12:00–1:00 p.m.
Via Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Lorna A. Alksne, Hon. Charles R. Brehmer, Hon. Joyce Hinrichs, Hon. Kirk H. Nakamura, Hon. Jennifer K. Rockwell, Ms. Stephanie Cameron, Ms. Sheri Carter, Ms. Arlene D. Junior, Mr. James Kim, Mr. Michael Planet, Ms. Bonnie Sloan, Ms. Kim Turner

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Lawrence P. Riff, Hon. Garrett L. Wong

Others Present: Ms.Carolynn Bernabe, Ms. Khulan Erdenebaatar, Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 22, 2018, Workload Assessment Advisory Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Work Year Value to be Used in Resource Assessment Study Model (Action Required)

Review the assumptions (weekends, holidays, sick/leave) behind the work-year value used for determining full-time equivalents or FTEs in the courts.

Action:

Ms. Kristin Greenaway provided an overview on the staff work-year value, which is used to estimate staff full-time equivalents (FTE) needed in the courts. The committee reviewed and approved the following recommendation:

- 1. To replace the current work year value of 1,856 hours and adopt the proposed work year value of 1,642.5 hours based on data collected during the staff time study.*

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Update on the Judicial Workload Study Provide update on the Judicial Workload Study

Provide update on the Judicial Workload Study.

Action:

Ms. Kristin Greenaway provided status summary of the Judicial Workload Study update. Staff is currently in the analyzing and validating phase of the study, working to complete the first update of the study since 2011. Staff will come back to the committee in May 2019 with the preliminary results and to the Judicial Council in July to finalize study results.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:21 p.m..

Pending approval by the advisory body on May 29, 2019.

1A.

2018 Judicial Workload Study Update - Caseweights and Standards

Work Year Value	77,400
3-Year Average Filings	FY2015, FY2016, FY2017
<i>Draft</i>	
Case Type	2018 Caseweights ¹ 1 Caseweight / Median
<i>Criminal</i>	
Felony	204
Misdemeanor - Traffic	17
Misdemeanor - Non-Traffic	45
Infractions	1.2
<i>Civil</i>	
Complex	268
Asbestos	553
Unlimited Civil	109
Limited Civil (without UD)	16
Limited Civil - Unlawful Detainer	20
Small Claims	30
<i>Family Law</i>	
Family Law- Dissolution	120
Family Law- Parentage	127
Family Law- Child Support	45
Family Law - Domestic Violence	66
Family Law - Other Petitions	133
<i>Juvenile</i>	
Juvenile Dependency	244
Juvenile Delinquency	149
<i>Probate and Mental Health</i>	
Probate - Other	73
Conservatorship/Guardianship	134
Mental Health	52
EDD	0.4

2018 Participating Courts

Cluster 1: Calaveras, Lassen, Mariposa, Mono, Plumas, San Benito

Cluster 2: Humboldt, Marin, Mendocino, Merced, Placer, Yolo

Cluster 3: Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Santa Barbara

Cluster 4: Los Angeles, San Bernardino, San Francisco

¹ Caseweights are minutes per filing (from initial filing to post disposition)

1B.

2018 Judicial Workload Study Update: Draft Assessed Judge Need

Cluster	Court	Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions	2019 ¹			2018 ²		
			Draft Assessed Judgeship Need	Difference Need and Authorized (B-A)	Draft Judicial Officer Need (+)	Preliminary Reported Assessed Judgeship Need	Difference Need and Authorized (E-A)	Preliminary Judicial Officer Need (+)
			A	B	C	D	E	F
4	Alameda*	83	66.8	-16.2		77.1	-5.9	
1	Alpine	2.3	0.1	-2.2		0.2	-2.1	
1	Amador	2.3	2.9	0.6		2.6	0.3	
2	Butte	13	14.5	1.5	1	13.0	0.0	
1	Calaveras	2.3	2.6	0.3		2.4	0.1	
1	Colusa	2.3	1.8	-0.5		1.5	-0.8	
3	Contra Costa	42	41.9	-0.1		39.6	-2.4	
1	Del Norte	2.8	2.4	-0.4		2.3	-0.5	
2	El Dorado	9	8.2	-0.8		7.8	-1.2	
3	Fresno	49	65.6	16.6	16	56.9	7.9	7
1	Glenn	2.3	2.1	-0.2		1.8	-0.5	
2	Humboldt	8	10.2	2.2	2	9.4	1.4	1
2	Imperial	11.3	13.3	2.0	1	12.3	1.0	1
1	Inyo	2.3	1.6	-0.7		1.4	-0.9	
3	Kern	43	62.2	19.2	19	53.5	10.5	10
2	Kings	8.6	11.9	3.3	3	11.0	2.4	2
2	Lake	4.7	6.2	1.5	1	5.3	0.6	
1	Lassen	2.3	2.4	0.1		2.2	-0.1	
4	Los Angeles	585.25	550.0	-35.2		533.3	-52.0	
2	Madera	9.3	11.9	2.6	2	9.4	0.1	
2	Marin	12.7	10.0	-2.7		10.1	-2.6	
1	Mariposa	2.3	1.2	-1.1		0.9	-1.4	
2	Mendocino	8.4	8.0	-0.4		7.0	-1.4	
2	Merced	12	16.0	4.0	3	13.2	1.2	1
1	Modoc	2.3	1.0	-1.3		0.8	-1.5	
1	Mono	2.3	1.1	-1.2		0.9	-1.4	
3	Monterey	21.2	22.1	0.9	1	19.1	-2.1	
2	Napa	8	7.6	-0.4		7.0	-1.0	
2	Nevada	7.6	5.1	-2.5		4.5	-3.1	
4	Orange	144	150.1	6.1	6	135.0	-9.0	
2	Placer	14.5	18.3	3.8	3	17.4	2.9	2
1	Plumas	2.3	1.3	-1.0		1.2	-1.1	
4	Riverside	80	124.3	44.3	44	116.2	36.2	36
4	Sacramento	72.5	97.5	25.0	25	84.3	11.8	11
1	San Benito	2.3	3.0	0.7		2.6	0.3	
4	San Bernardino	88	145.7	57.7	57	126.2	38.2	38
4	San Diego	154	141.4	-12.6		132.3	-21.7	
4	San Francisco	55.9	39.9	-16.0		43.8	-12.1	
3	San Joaquin	33.5	44.1	10.6	10	38.6	5.1	5
2	San Luis Obispo	15	15.9	0.9	1	14.6	-0.4	
3	San Mateo	33	30.2	-2.8		28.6	-4.4	
3	Santa Barbara	24	24.0	0.0		21.8	-2.2	
4	Santa Clara	82	68.9	-13.1		62.2	-19.8	
2	Santa Cruz	13.5	13.4	-0.1		12.2	-1.3	
2	Shasta	12	16.6	4.6	4	14.4	2.4	2
1	Sierra	2.3	0.2	-2.1		0.2	-2.1	
2	Siskiyou	5	3.7	-1.3		3.1	-1.9	
3	Solano	23	23.9	0.9	1	21.5	-1.5	
3	Sonoma	23	23.9	0.9	1	22.4	-0.6	
3	Stanislaus	24	32.0	8.0	8	28.2	4.2	4
2	Sutter	5.3	7.2	1.9	1	6.6	1.3	1
2	Tehama	4.33	6.2	1.9	1	5.4	1.1	1
1	Trinity	2.3	1.6	-0.7		1.4	-0.9	
3	Tulare	23	29.2	6.2	6	25.6	2.6	2
2	Tuolumne	4.75	5.1	0.3		4.6	-0.2	
3	Ventura	33	40.0	7.0	7	36.3	3.3	3
2	Yolo	12.4	13.3	0.9	1	10.9	-1.5	
2	Yuba	5.33	5.9	0.6		5.4	0.1	
		1956	2078	122	225	1930	-26.1	127

* The preliminary 2018 assessed judge need for the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda was based on filings counts that were later amended in JBSIS. The resulting judicial need was higher than if the amended filings had been used.

¹ For 2019, the three year average filings used to estimate need are FY2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18

² For 2018, the three year average filings used to estimate need are FY2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17

1C.

Judicial Workload Study 2018 Impacts to Workload

Staff conducted conference calls with each of the study courts to gather input about what was happening at the court during the time study that may have impacted the data collected. Staff discussed the preliminary time study findings and validated court data to ensure they are accurate representation of the amount of time required by judges to resolve different types of cases.

The calls covered the following topics:

- Areas of work where the court does particularly well and areas where the court could improve
- Changes in the law, court practices, and technology since the last time study (2011) that impact judicial officer workload
- Any court events, special projects, or non-usual activity during the study period that might have impacted the data collection

General

Courts mentioned that judicial workload has been impacted in recent years by:

- New and amended laws, particularly changes made in recent years to reform the criminal justice system in California.
- The difficulties small courts face in getting up to speed on changes in the law, particularly in those jurisdictions with little research attorney support. The Council offers some guidance for new and emerging criminal issues, but no support is available for civil matters.
- Transition to new case management systems (CMS) or technologies such as paperless systems which affect business processing;
- Judicial vacancies and policy changes in the Temporary Assigned Judges Program;
- Business process changes that are a result of moving to new facilities/courthouses,
- Workload and staffing issues from unfunded legislative mandates;
- Courts highlighted the sensitivities around the balance between judicial efficiency and access to justice. Litigants should have their day in court, but excessive speed does not do justice to litigants.
- Evolution of workload towards rehabilitation and less on punishment, corresponding increase in specialty courts

Civil Case Workload

- Statewide trends in court filings for civil cases have increased in recent years. This could be the result of the statewide housing affordability crisis, as well as national trends of high rates of consumer debt in the past few years, which could result in defaults and more collection cases. Courts identified spikes in payday loans and car collateral loans, which could also result in defaults sent to collection along with cases that may seek possession of vehicles. One court identifies this workload as indicative of a coming recession.
- Judges reported that filings in matters where self-represented litigants predominate also seem to take longer. And while new self-help funding received in the 2018 Budget Act has provided some relief, there is still a gap between available funding and services for self-represented litigants and the demand for those services.

- Some jurisdictions mentioned prisoner litigation as a civil workload driver.

Mental Health Workload

- Annual statistical reports show a steady increase in mental health filings. There is greater awareness of mental health issues and more emphasis on mental health treatment. Courts report increases in mental competency cases (IST filings), inclusion of 1368s to review recommendations from criminal proceedings, and increases in LPS mandated treatment programs.
- **AB 1810 Mental Health Diversion** (effective June 28, 2018)– intended to improve outcomes for offenders who have mental health issues that may have contributed to the commission of crime by requiring treatment of the underlying condition. Requires additional court supervision and increases the number of hearings required as the offender proceeds through treatment. Multiple courts reported a backlog of defendants being evaluated and waitlists for treatment facilities as a result of this new legislation.
- **Impact of 1368 workload**

Criminal workload

Various reforms to the criminal justice system have changed the focus of courts from imposing punishment to instituting rehabilitation. Some of the reform measures instituted since 2011 include:

- SB 10 Bail reform imposes strict timelines for review and assessment of defendants; the high profile nature and newness of the issue have led to a slow and deliberate implementation
- SB 1437 felony murder: petitions for resentencing require courts to calendar these matters and then undertake time-consuming review of the original case file in order to understand the underlying case prior to possible resentencing.
- Proposition 47: extension of deadline means that judicial officers continue to have to review these petitions
- Reforms related to Proposition 47 have results in a high Failure to Appear (FTA) rate that creates additional workload for courts and wastes time.
- PC 1170(d)(1) resentencing/recall: the volume of petitions handled under this penal code section far exceeds estimated workload
- Ability to Pay determinations are a new type of time-sensitive workload; litigants can ask for a hearing on the spot.

Over the last several years, these calendars had been on a declining path following the recession and corresponding impacts on law enforcement budgets and associated staffing levels; however, more recently, some jurisdictions report an increase in law enforcement hiring and resurgence in filings.

Juvenile Workload

Proposition 57: juvenile transfer hearings require a hearing before juvenile can be transferred. D.A.s and P.D.s are expending a high amount of resources on these matters because of the gravity of the issue.

One court pointed out that while filings in juvenile have declined precipitously, juvenile caseload—the number of cases on a judge’s docket—is much higher than in the past.

2A.

California Judicial Prioritization Model Parameters

May 2019

The intent of the prioritization method is to consider courts with greatest need relative to current complement and to improve access to courts for the greatest number of users.¹ Also, feedback from courts received at the time that the method was developed suggested that the availability of facilities should be a consideration when determining an allocation schedule for judgeships.²

The model was first approved by the Judicial Council in 2001 and is codified in Government Code section 69614(b).

Some of the major policy considerations embedded in the methodology are as follows:

- 1) **Estimate judicial need using the most recent Judicial Needs Assessment:** the judicial need in each court is calculated by subtracting the number of authorized judicial positions (AJP) from the number of positions needed in each court, as measured by the biennial judicial needs assessment. In December 2013, the Judicial Council adopted a recommendation that the most current judicial needs data be used in making allocation decisions.³
- 2) **Courts with a judicial need of at least 0.8 FTE should be qualified to obtain a new judgeship:** In December 2014, the Judicial Council approved a policy change that lowered the qualifying threshold to obtain a new judgeship to 0.8 FTE (it had been 1.0 FTE previously).⁴ The change was made in response to requests from smaller courts whose judicial need fell just below the threshold level (previously 1.0 FTE) needed to qualify for a new judgeship even though their workload need, expressed as a percent of total available judicial resources, may exceed that of larger courts. To illustrate, a court with 2.3 FTE authorized judicial positions and a judicial workload need equivalent to 3.1 FTE has a need for 0.8 FTE judicial officers. The difference represents a 35% shortfall over the number of authorized positions (0.8 divided by 2.3). Even though the number of judicial positions in this example court is small, the court is operating with 35% fewer judicial resources than the workload model shows that they need.

Generating the Prioritization List

California's methodology uses a mathematical formula to be able to assess judicial need and prioritize needed judgeships in rank order for courts of vastly different sizes. The approach taken is based on the methodology that is used to apportion seats in Congress where similar scale issues exist.

¹ October 2001 report to Judicial Council, <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/stateassess.pdf>.

² Ibid., at page 9

³ <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20131213-itemV.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212-itemT.pdf>

- 1) The first step is to establish a ranking based on the minutes of judicial need multiplied by the ranking scores used in the Huntington-Hill Method.⁵ Each court's judicial need minutes is divided by the rank scores and an allocation number (from 1-to N) is assigned to each needed judgeship in each court.

If allocations were made at this point, only a court's absolute need would be factored into the calculation and courts with the highest numerical need would be prioritized to receive judgeships.

- 2) A second ranking score is calculated based on the percentage need for each judgeship needed in each court. In cases where courts need more than one judgeship, the percentage need for the second judgeship is calculated by assuming that the court has been given the previous judgeship, and so on. At this point, if a ranking were done on the basis of these results, the courts with the highest numbers of judges need and the greatest percentage need would be prioritized for new judgeships.
- 3) The final adjustment takes the second ranking score and divides it by "1" for the first new judgeship needed in a county, and "2" for the second needed judgeship, etc. This adjustment applies more weight to the first judgeship needed in each court; the end result is that judgeships are distributed more widely across the state, which is in keeping with the principles adopted by the council.

The priority list is generated on the basis of this last adjustment by sorting the rank scores across all courts on the list highest to lowest.

⁵ <http://www.census.gov/population/apportionment/about/computing.html> or fairly clear explanation here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Huntington%E2%80%93Hill_method

2B. - Priority Ranking

Court	Priority	Court	Priority	Court	Priority	Court	Priority	Court	Priority
San Bernardino	1	San Joaquin	47	Yolo	93	Sacramento	139	San Bernardino	185
Riverside	2	Sacramento	48	Orange	94	Riverside	140	Stanislaus	186
San Bernardino	3	Riverside	49	San Bernardino	95	San Bernardino	141	Riverside	187
Sacramento	4	Fresno	50	Kern	96	Fresno	142	Kern	188
Kern	5	San Bernardino	51	Riverside	97	Riverside	143	Ventura	189
Riverside	6	Orange	52	Ventura	98	San Joaquin	144	San Bernardino	190
Fresno	7	Kern	53	Sacramento	99	Kern	145	Orange	191
San Bernardino	8	Riverside	54	Tulare	100	San Bernardino	146	San Bernardino	192
San Joaquin	9	Merced	55	San Luis Obispo	101	Sacramento	147	Riverside	193
Riverside	10	San Bernardino	56	San Bernardino	102	Riverside	148	Sacramento	194
Stanislaus	11	Stanislaus	57	Placer	103	San Bernardino	149	Fresno	195
Sacramento	12	Kings	58	Stanislaus	104	San Bernardino	150	San Bernardino	196
San Bernardino	13	Sacramento	59	Kings	105	Riverside	151	Riverside	197
Kern	14	San Bernardino	60	Fresno	106	Sacramento	152	San Bernardino	198
Tulare	15	Placer	61	San Joaquin	107	Stanislaus	153	Riverside	199
Shasta	16	Riverside	62	Riverside	108	Kern	154	Kern	200
Ventura	17	Butte	63	San Bernardino	109	Fresno	155	San Bernardino	201
Riverside	18	Fresno	64	Sacramento	110	San Bernardino	156	Sacramento	202
Fresno	19	Kern	65	Kern	111	Ventura	157	San Bernardino	203
San Bernardino	20	San Bernardino	66	San Bernardino	112	Riverside	158	Riverside	204
Merced	21	San Joaquin	67	Riverside	113	San Bernardino	159	San Bernardino	205
Kings	22	Riverside	68	Monterey	114	Sacramento	160	Fresno	206
Sacramento	23	Sacramento	69	San Bernardino	115	Riverside	161	Riverside	207
Placer	24	San Bernardino	70	Fresno	116	San Bernardino	162	Sacramento	208
San Bernardino	25	Tulare	71	Riverside	117	San Joaquin	163	San Bernardino	209
Riverside	26	Ventura	72	Shasta	118	Orange	164	Orange	210
Kern	27	Riverside	73	Sonoma	119	Kern	165	Riverside	211
San Joaquin	28	Kern	74	Solano	120	San Bernardino	166	San Bernardino	212
Tehama	29	Fresno	75	Sacramento	121	Riverside	167	Kern	213
Madera	30	San Bernardino	76	San Bernardino	122	Tulare	168	San Bernardino	214
San Bernardino	31	Madera	77	Kern	123	Fresno	169	Riverside	215
Riverside	32	Stanislaus	78	Riverside	124	San Bernardino	170	Sacramento	216
Stanislaus	33	Shasta	79	San Joaquin	125	Sacramento	171	San Bernardino	217
Fresno	34	Sacramento	80	San Bernardino	126	Riverside	172	Riverside	218
Sutter	35	Riverside	81	Stanislaus	127	San Bernardino	173	San Bernardino	219
Humboldt	36	San Bernardino	82	Ventura	128	Riverside	174	San Bernardino	220
Sacramento	37	San Joaquin	83	Riverside	129	San Bernardino	175	Riverside	221
San Bernardino	38	Kern	84	Sacramento	130	Kern	176	Sacramento	222
Kern	39	San Bernardino	85	San Bernardino	131	Sacramento	177	San Bernardino	223
Riverside	40	Riverside	86	Fresno	132	San Bernardino	178	Riverside	224
Lake	41	Humboldt	87	Tulare	133	Riverside	179	San Bernardino	225
San Bernardino	42	Sacramento	88	Kern	134	Fresno	180		
Tulare	43	Fresno	89	San Bernardino	135	San Bernardino	181		
Ventura	44	San Bernardino	90	Riverside	136	Riverside	182		
Imperial	45	Merced	91	Orange	137	Sacramento	183		
Shasta	46	Riverside	92	San Bernardino	138	San Joaquin	184		

1.

FY 2019-20 RAS FTE Need

(Updated 03-22-19)

Court	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need											Program 90 (Administration) Staff Need				FY 18-19 RAS FTE Need	% change from FY 18-19 to FY 19-20
	Infractions	Criminal	Civil	Family Law	Pr/MH	Juvenile	Total Program 10 Need (A thru F)	Court interpreter FTE	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster)	Manager/Supervisor Need (G+GG/H)	Total Program 10 Need, Rounded up (G+I)	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)	Program 90 ratio (by cluster)	Program 90 Need, Rounded up ((J+K)/L)	Total FY 19-20 RAS Need (J+M)		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	GG	H	I	J	K	L	M	N		
Alameda	40.4	150.2	109.7	96.8	46.4	16.8	460.3	33.5	11.4	43.3	504.0	84.1	7.6	78	582	510	14.1%
Alpine	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.2	-	7.5	0.2	2.0	1.5	4.3	1	3	3	0.0%
Amador	2.0	8.1	2.2	3.4	2.0	1.0	18.6	-	7.5	2.5	22.0	2.3	4.3	6	28	24	16.7%
Butte	6.6	39.7	16.9	21.2	11.7	6.4	102.5	0.9	7.8	13.3	116.0	17.3	5.9	23	139	130	6.9%
Calaveras	1.2	5.8	3.0	4.1	2.4	1.5	18.0	0.2	7.5	2.4	21.0	2.6	4.3	6	27	24	12.5%
Colusa	2.4	5.6	0.9	1.4	0.9	1.1	12.2	-	7.5	1.6	14.0	1.6	4.3	4	18	17	5.9%
Contra Costa	17.4	71.5	75.0	71.2	38.9	21.7	295.8	13.5	8.6	36.0	332.0	19.8	7.6	47	379	349	8.6%
Del Norte	2.1	5.3	1.6	3.6	1.8	2.1	16.5	-	7.5	2.2	19.0	3.0	4.3	6	25	23	8.7%
El Dorado	4.4	15.7	12.3	13.2	6.4	5.3	57.4	1.1	7.8	7.5	65.0	3.5	5.9	12	77	74	4.1%
Fresno	18.0	175.1	73.5	96.2	32.2	26.5	421.5	9.4	8.6	50.1	472.0	21.2	7.6	65	537	473	13.5%
Glenn	2.4	5.8	1.2	2.8	1.8	0.9	14.8	-	7.5	2.0	17.0	6.3	4.3	6	23	20	15.0%
Humboldt	5.2	28.7	8.6	12.1	8.4	5.3	68.4	1.0	7.8	8.9	78.0	3.0	5.9	14	92	83	10.8%
Imperial	18.3	34.9	8.8	21.5	5.7	5.7	94.9	3.5	7.8	12.6	108.0	12.3	5.9	21	129	121	6.6%
Inyo	4.6	5.2	0.8	1.7	0.9	0.6	13.8	0.0	7.5	1.8	16.0	3.0	4.3	5	21	18	16.7%
Kern	26.9	195.5	56.3	87.6	31.3	21.3	418.8	20.0	8.6	51.0	470.0	60.0	7.6	70	540	489	10.4%
Kings	6.4	38.4	7.1	14.8	3.8	6.1	76.5	2.0	7.8	10.1	87.0	4.6	5.9	16	103	94	9.6%
Lake	2.1	19.4	6.9	7.9	4.8	1.4	42.5	-	7.8	5.4	48.0	2.0	5.9	9	57	51	11.8%
Lassen	1.8	7.3	1.5	2.8	1.2	1.0	15.5	-	7.5	2.1	18.0	1.3	4.3	5	23	21	9.5%
Los Angeles	217.6	1,084.8	973.1	745.4	326.1	343.6	3,690.6	263.0	11.4	346.8	4,038.0	481.0	7.6	595	4,633	4,199	10.3%
Madera	5.0	26.2	10.3	19.2	5.3	6.5	72.3	3.0	7.8	9.7	82.0	5.3	5.9	15	97	90	7.8%
Marin	12.5	19.8	15.5	13.2	11.1	3.2	75.3	2.5	7.8	10.0	86.0	4.3	5.9	16	102	90	13.3%
Mariposa	0.8	4.3	0.6	1.3	1.0	0.4	8.3	-	7.5	1.1	10.0	2.5	4.3	3	13	12	8.3%
Mendocino	4.4	23.5	7.3	9.5	4.5	4.4	53.6	1.8	7.8	7.1	61.0	3.0	5.9	11	72	68	5.9%
Merced	11.9	43.8	17.3	25.3	8.4	6.4	113.1	3.9	7.8	15.0	129.0	12.0	5.9	24	153	137	11.7%
Modoc	0.4	2.6	0.5	1.5	0.7	0.5	6.3	-	7.5	0.8	8.0	2.0	4.3	3	11	10	10.0%
Mono	3.2	4.6	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.2	9.8	0.6	7.5	1.4	12.0	1.8	4.3	4	16	14	14.3%
Monterey	13.3	65.8	25.0	29.2	13.4	9.4	156.1	9.5	8.6	19.3	176.0	13.2	7.6	25	201	186	8.1%
Napa	4.5	19.5	7.8	9.7	6.9	3.5	51.8	2.0	7.8	6.9	59.0	5.3	5.9	11	70	63	11.1%
Nevada	5.3	13.1	6.3	8.1	4.5	1.3	38.5	-	7.8	4.9	44.0	8.7	5.9	9	53	50	6.0%
Orange	55.1	405.9	233.4	202.1	83.2	44.2	1,023.9	73.7	11.4	96.3	1,121.0	188.2	7.6	173	1,294	1,125	15.0%
Placer	8.8	47.1	20.2	27.4	11.8	8.3	123.5	2.0	7.8	16.1	140.0	8.0	5.9	26	166	145	14.5%
Plumas	1.0	3.6	1.1	1.9	1.2	0.9	9.6	0.1	7.5	1.3	11.0	1.1	4.3	3	14	13	7.7%
Riverside	50.5	283.0	162.9	204.8	72.0	56.6	829.7	41.8	11.4	76.5	907.0	132.6	7.6	137	1,044	950	9.9%
Sacramento	35.1	248.2	122.4	128.0	58.1	27.0	618.9	28.0	11.4	56.7	676.0	61.4	7.6	98	774	638	21.3%
San Benito	1.6	9.5	3.4	4.1	1.5	0.9	21.1	-	7.5	2.8	24.0	1.3	4.3	6	30	28	7.1%
San Bernardino	35.0	396.6	172.3	213.6	60.2	78.1	955.9	45.0	11.4	87.8	1,044.0	94.3	7.6	150	1,194	1,054	13.3%
San Diego	71.1	314.8	223.7	230.0	70.2	36.3	946.1	39.2	11.4	86.4	1,033.0	94.0	7.6	149	1,182	1,043	13.3%
San Francisco	25.3	59.3	73.0	41.8	36.5	21.1	257.0	19.9	11.4	24.3	282.0	31.9	7.6	42	324	294	10.2%
San Joaquin	21.4	124.5	48.2	60.2	28.1	17.2	299.6	7.0	8.6	35.7	336.0	11.9	7.6	46	382	339	12.7%
San Luis Obispo	14.4	57.1	12.4	16.2	13.1	5.1	118.2	5.0	7.8	15.8	134.0	8.5	5.9	25	159	139	14.4%
San Mateo	21.4	85.9	32.1	36.9	28.0	14.5	218.7	8.5	8.6	26.4	246.0	13.5	7.6	35	281	271	3.7%
Santa Barbara	20.3	76.9	23.1	25.4	15.0	11.0	171.7	12.1	8.6	31.4	194.0	34.8	7.6	31	225	204	10.3%
Santa Clara	28.6	200.5	84.9	88.6	53.4	17.8	473.8	27.0	11.4	43.9	518.0	38.2	7.6	74	592	522	13.4%
Santa Cruz	11.1	42.3	13.1	16.5	7.7	4.9	95.6	6.5	7.8	13.1	109.0	19.6	5.9	22	131	121	8.3%
Shasta	11.7	52.8	13.8	18.6	11.0	6.2	114.1	-	7.8	14.6	129.0	57.5	5.9	32	161	149	8.1%
Sierra	0.2	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.6	-	7.5	0.2	2.0	1.3	4.3	1	3	3	0.0%
Siskiyou	4.2	10.0	2.7	4.6	2.9	1.5	26.0	0.1	7.8	3.3	30.0	4.0	5.9	6	36	30	20.0%
Solano	14.1	58.9	33.9	40.8	16.2	6.1	170.1	2.0	8.6	20.0	191.0	7.0	7.6	27	218	197	10.7%
Sonoma	16.6	67.4	23.9	29.7	20.0	9.6	167.1	7.2	8.6	20.3	188.0	19.8	7.6	28	216	194	11.3%
Stanislaus	13.0	84.7	36.3	52.7	23.1	11.2	221.1	2.5	8.6	26.0	248.0	8.6	7.6	34	282	260	8.5%
Sutter	3.6	20.8	5.8	10.5	4.1	2.8	47.6	1.5	7.8	6.3	54.0	6.8	5.9	11	65	58	12.1%
Tehama	3.8	19.7	5.1	7.3	3.5	2.9	42.3	1.3	7.8	5.6	48.0	3.3	5.9	9	57	54	5.6%
Trinity	0.5	4.1	1.2	2.2	0.9	0.7	9.5	-	7.5	1.3	11.0	4.0	4.3	4	15	14	7.1%
Tulare	15.7	85.7	30.4	36.8	13.4	17.2	199.4	3.0	8.6	23.5	223.0	18.5	7.6	32	255	240	6.3%

Tuolumne	1.7	14.8	4.6	5.3	2.8	3.4	32.7	0.3	7.8	4.2	37.0	2.1	5.9	7	44	41	7.3%
Ventura	24.2	108.7	46.8	61.9	25.5	18.2	285.2	8.0	8.6	34.1	320.0	86.3	7.6	54	374	327	14.4%
Yolo	7.1	47.4	10.1	14.8	6.0	7.3	92.8	1.0	7.8	12.0	105.0	12.0	5.9	20	125	109	14.7%
Yuba	2.1	17.4	4.6	8.0	3.0	3.5	38.6	-	7.8	4.9	44.0	5.0	5.9	9	53	49	8.2%
Statewide	961.1	5,068.5	2,896.2	2,916.4	1,255.5	938.4	14,036.2	713.8		1,456.8	15,519.0	1,763.1		2,401.0	17,920	16,054	11.6%

II.

RAS FILINGS
FY 2016-2018

county	fyear	felony	misd_tr	misd_ntr	infr	ud	limit	sml_clm	complex	unl	edd	asbestos	fam_dis	fam_cs	fam_dv	fam_prt_g	fam_ot_h	cons_gr_dn	est_trst	mental	juv_del	juv_dep	total	
Alameda	2016	7,283	5,884	11,862	185,816	4,857	4,976	4,840	357	8,659		45	4,946	3,979	2,987	523	1,084	442	1,366	1,376	875	628	252,785	
Alameda	2017	6,658	5,472	9,765	172,728	4,275	5,286	4,879	393	8,656		70	4,939	3,719	2,787	484	1,054	438	1,344	1,190	803	567	235,507	
Alameda	2018	5,807	6,019	9,514	184,260	4,123	6,401	5,131	399	9,155		69	4,569	3,391	2,695	371	926	508	1,434	1,026	742	530	247,070	
Alpine	2016	17	42	24	1,256	1	1	4	-	8			2	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	3	2	1,363	
Alpine	2017	12	73	37	1,495	6	8	3	-	9			1	3	1	-	-	2	3	1	3	-	1,657	
Alpine	2018	11	61	24	1,539	1	2	5	-	9			3	3	3	1	-	1	3	-	1	5	1,672	
Amador	2016	478	624	356	4,648	114	127	88	-	167			138	111	92	12	43	21	60	48	21	57	7,205	
Amador	2017	470	453	343	4,900	111	155	125	-	179			197	101	102	35	39	21	63	36	24	36	7,390	
Amador	2018	516	513	456	5,958	100	196	120	-	184			187	93	120	28	37	24	62	26	30	32	8,682	
Butte	2016	1,688	2,213	3,873	17,736	916	1,033	426	2	984			978	738	664	97	410	206	296	168	206	324	32,958	
Butte	2017	1,506	2,732	3,232	16,336	874	1,387	401	1	1,027			917	754	720	79	412	168	314	133	140	303	31,436	
Butte	2018	1,611	2,575	3,457	17,588	837	1,667	419	-	1,103		1	923	691	760	90	444	212	289	157	120	258	33,202	
Calaveras	2016	230	494	528	3,590	122	137	87	13	247			182	168	69	31	76	36	76	6	74	62	6,228	
Calaveras	2017	242	520	514	3,360	130	171	102	2	259			163	145	94	32	89	37	75	9	42	63	6,049	
Calaveras	2018	243	413	410	2,624	150	240	112	2	267			185	138	128	39	70	33	67	14	26	74	5,235	
Colusa	2016	288	310	368	8,305	41	53	26	-	60			72	31	9	20	12	10	24	15	59	23	9,726	
Colusa	2017	287	379	358	5,508	39	75	23	-	85			71	17	21	25	17	12	21	12	38	63	7,051	
Colusa	2018	281	359	403	5,076	61	110	21	-	67			75	52	23	16	29	12	36	18	38	40	6,717	
Contra Costa	2016	3,855	2,391	4,313	83,350	3,517	4,025	2,727	62	4,725			3,592	1,418	2,691	605	992	543	1,164	213	736	997	121,916	
Contra Costa	2017	3,773	2,684	5,610	72,759	3,209	5,312	2,645	62	4,586		1	3,522	1,287	2,634	533	980	534	1,179	225	867	889	113,291	
Contra Costa	2018	3,895	1,928	4,458	77,970	2,842	6,471	2,682	62	4,514		1	3,443	1,134	2,539	566	829	603	1,260	205	803	781	116,986	
Del Norte	2016	246	248	343	6,217	110	81	55	-	105			112	222	106	56	62	17	53	109	84	84	8,310	
Del Norte	2017	283	307	327	4,776	133	122	37	-	129			105	177	94	49	23	19	27	77	146	59	6,890	
Del Norte	2018	247	418	440	5,171	116	143	48	-	130			95	209	94	62	32	20	39	74	142	45	7,525	
El Dorado	2016	721	1,168	1,043	12,250	536	589	497	4	817			750	419	388	29	146	100	167	24	269	190	20,107	
El Dorado	2017	810	1,124	1,085	9,795	497	666	386	3	798			649	395	386	39	182	87	197	28	239	191	17,557	
El Dorado	2018	947	922	760	12,528	437	874	414	3	806			752	370	426	41	188	129	188	32	212	196	20,225	
Fresno	2016	7,373	24,766	14,145	80,232	4,492	5,353	2,723	25	5,308		14	3,556	6,098	2,748	1,057	853	580	589	952	1,345	905	163,114	
Fresno	2017	6,587	17,683	12,906	64,825	4,197	6,482	2,909	72	5,625		1	3,587	4,730	2,689	1,035	867	492	699	1,191	1,378	946	138,901	
Fresno	2018	7,151	16,635	13,677	96,713	3,815	8,372	2,857	71	5,807		2	3,622	4,497	2,379	1,024	950	518	684	1,193	1,237	955	172,159	
Glenn	2016	320	270	348	7,423	48	195	47	6	124			111	133	13	24	60	30	38	25	37	41	9,293	
Glenn	2017	319	255	449	5,916	83	163	36	2	57			98	131	75	8	96	36	38	33	30	29	7,854	
Glenn	2018	290	254	368	5,230	73	214	37	2	39			98	185	136	12	19	38	37	16	27	42	7,117	
Humboldt	2016	1,369	1,713	2,613	13,840	570	403	300	1	642			1	486	390	433	87	220	120	216	210	149	232	23,995
Humboldt	2017	1,152	1,738	2,145	12,881	538	542	362	3	717		2	467	463	410	135	178	116	214	305	118	250	22,736	
Humboldt	2018	1,358	1,745	2,076	13,888	418	580	320	5	796			467	389	430	112	204	85	214	302	119	301	23,809	
Imperial	2016	1,619	2,577	3,188	53,749	359	917	454	10	504			750	1,067	283	240	1,120	123	130	113	160	232	67,595	
Imperial	2017	1,515	2,303	3,026	46,578	388	1,200	445	14	678			758	1,061	240	162	747	105	112	102	167	256	59,857	
Imperial	2018	1,390	2,041	2,467	42,129	394	1,373	449	14	540			714	948	247	145	260	118	96	122	216	273	53,936	
Inyo	2016	172	292	475	10,238	47	48	33	-	79			69	57	66	36	6	15	18	1	43	15	11,710	
Inyo	2017	180	336	501	12,219	27	65	37	-	59			55	37	84	25	4	15	37	1	46	12	13,740	
Inyo	2018	180	340	616	13,098	30	81	45	-	61			59	41	58	31	4	19	24	-	48	7	14,742	
Kern	2016	7,074	12,314	22,615	125,998	4,703	3,966	2,913	57	3,137			3,492	3,964	2,862	837	880	556	627	1,125	1,028	870	199,018	
Kern	2017	7,117	11,584	18,931	117,514	4,492	5,163	3,343	66	3,297		1	3,345	4,111	3,048	916	1,004	446	382	1,515	1,039	685	187,999	
Kern	2018	7,220	10,770	15,161	117,728	4,486	7,165	3,360	66	3,367		1	3,321	3,445	2,877	814	989	537	733	1,294	958	658	184,950	
Kings	2016	1,853	1,319	2,724	13,903	515	815	192	3	444			564	758	282	139	316	29	101	133	137	292	24,519	
Kings	2017	1,628	848	2,142	18,326	508	962	194	7	415			608	608	287	144	309	45	104	124	194	242	27,695	
Kings	2018	2,189	2,642	3,429	17,842	534	1,141	208	7	453			578	652	314	150	247	43	121	3	180	268	31,001	
Lake	2016	785	716	1,405	4,607	415	229	167	1	417			308	386	255	131	60	58	111	71	74	45	10,241	
Lake	2017	940	818	1,751	5,577	442	289	198	1	472			276	255	267	109	56	65	157	111	58	51	11,893	
Lake	2018	955	624	1,805	6,176	419	238	219	1	483			247	280	287	123	63	60	140	116	56	65	12,357	
Lassen	2016	425	330	401	4,985	108	57	81	-	113			104	155	56	29	16	6	40	19	23	41	6,989	
Lassen	2017	493	259	303	4,312	89	86	68	-	92			104	101	66	33	24	13	40	15	32	49	6,179	
Lassen	2018	424	267	355	4,708	112	105	68	-	137			145	101	69	38	27	18	39	18	28	49	6,708	
Los Angeles	2016	38,861	96,240	110,197	975,154	51,203	55,754	58,418	1,507	67,578			152	34,757	23,805	22,191	8,124	8,546	3,812	8,624	9,482	6,522	16,987	1,597,914

RAS FILINGS
FY 2016-2018

county	fyear	felony	misd_tr	misd_ntr	infr	ud	limit	sml_clm	complex	unl	edd	asbestos	fam_dis	fam_cs	fam_dv	fam_prt_g	fam_ot_h	cons_gr_dn	est_trst	mental	juv_del	juv_dep	total	
Los Angeles	2017	38,587	66,304	97,152	936,517	47,966	67,795	62,302	1,367	70,386		128	33,783	22,240	21,765	8,200	9,317	3,969	8,562	10,241	6,148	16,614	1,529,343	
Los Angeles	2018	38,547	65,597	103,630	1,013,627	44,031	83,666	60,438	1,361	76,225		134	32,330	18,407	21,737	8,129	9,786	4,196	8,677	11,868	5,558	16,441	1,624,385	
Madera	2016	1,261	3,031	1,309	12,478	431	874	242	7	579			547	671	296	85	1,244	107	125	54	398	272	24,011	
Madera	2017	1,363	2,563	1,317	13,757	416	966	305	2	569			549	684	294	61	1,122	93	138	57	307	211	24,774	
Madera	2018	1,503	2,907	1,573	12,301	386	1,330	413	2	673			542	589	281	60	1,208	87	134	55	304	181	24,529	
Marin	2016	920	1,534	1,750	31,653	409	691	804	5	1,510			860	136	263	90	153	100	318	175	335	48	41,754	
Marin	2017	821	1,346	1,559	30,328	349	761	867	3	1,494			901	127	215	119	142	160	358	173	240	57	40,020	
Marin	2018	717	1,468	1,630	34,938	347	884	809	3	1,441			818	122	194	107	129	129	348	193	225	62	44,564	
Mariposa	2016	168	259	449	1,892	41	96	26	-	27			56	50	41	5	18	12	33	4	18	28	3,223	
Mariposa	2017	111	265	433	1,946	45	104	25	-	31			49	53	57	4	24	10	28	3	3	12	3,203	
Mariposa	2018	155	310	442	2,157	36	148	28	-	28			68	55	55	1	23	14	37	7	9	12	3,585	
Mendocino	2016	1,005	1,722	1,873	10,908	289	318	179	1	554			378	381	284	119	100	47	112	78	232	184	18,764	
Mendocino	2017	1,305	1,189	1,835	12,142	287	281	189	4	458			345	389	290	110	147	57	135	102	227	122	19,614	
Mendocino	2018	952	1,154	1,802	11,483	289	369	218	4	513			389	331	278	96	110	78	144	73	280	121	18,684	
Merced	2016	1,749	4,435	3,698	28,155	1,006	984	855	8	817			922	1,649	649	277	159	145	218	27	206	261	46,220	
Merced	2017	1,805	4,883	3,288	28,912	1,029	1,320	921	14	877			871	1,227	821	268	152	157	212	38	250	265	47,310	
Merced	2018	2,063	4,143	3,169	35,568	950	1,926	989	14	946			919	1,399	834	249	205	149	246	22	268	256	54,315	
Modoc	2016	94	88	217	1,000	13	43	4	-	40			44	35	42	5	75	5	23	4	21	16	1,769	
Modoc	2017	120	122	215	1,096	20	47	22	-	44			49	39	43	2	78	6	24	-	16	26	1,969	
Modoc	2018	166	130	215	1,088	28	52	37	-	59			54	41	37	7	83	12	24	2	13	21	2,069	
Mono	2016	107	393	968	6,657	25	20	43	2	59			42	10	11	11	2	2	7	-	14	5	8,378	
Mono	2017	80	314	417	7,408	14	25	39	-	69			40	14	20	9	16	4	14	2	18	7	8,510	
Mono	2018	102	448	315	10,725	31	33	55	-	62			43	16	11	11	12	2	15	4	16	3	11,904	
Monterey	2016	2,511	6,180	5,701	36,305	922	1,845	1,090	33	1,238			1,428	1,159	570	389	128	217	327	228	781	152	61,204	
Monterey	2017	2,398	6,131	5,580	31,166	876	2,149	1,312	30	1,439			1,366	1,053	716	460	133	173	347	193	745	213	56,480	
Monterey	2018	2,550	5,574	6,007	36,357	793	2,399	1,337	30	1,537			1,236	873	634	409	138	219	358	595	719	213	61,978	
Napa	2016	928	1,546	1,453	10,927	245	447	409	2	644			493	256	273	85	94	61	226	129	236	95	18,549	
Napa	2017	886	1,295	1,308	11,703	211	514	459	4	677			532	234	243	94	74	65	202	192	259	86	19,038	
Napa	2018	904	1,337	1,512	12,549	219	669	405	2	712			500	225	283	83	106	62	240	193	170	114	20,287	
Nevada	2016	589	1,720	1,046	16,614	238	261	289	1	391			417	227	230	73	79	62	140	33	71	45	22,526	
Nevada	2017	540	1,358	915	12,085	207	328	287	2	398			403	228	234	51	101	57	135	43	62	43	17,477	
Nevada	2018	478	1,308	1,019	12,531	197	395	245	2	466			414	226	214	41	166	74	137	19	53	48	18,033	
Orange	2016	12,104	31,155	43,844	254,266	10,816	14,860	14,725	311	16,492			2	11,105	6,265	5,053	1,990	1,446	906	1,969	2,272	2,266	1,483	433,330
Orange	2017	12,021	32,879	44,414	231,150	10,385	18,188	14,117	443	16,887			1	10,581	5,592	4,700	1,930	1,603	987	2,371	2,324	2,359	1,530	414,462
Orange	2018	11,936	25,283	45,483	255,749	9,661	22,670	14,447	439	17,845			5	10,440	4,992	4,553	1,977	1,584	1,131	2,394	2,566	2,243	1,541	436,939
Placer	2016	1,949	2,809	3,837	22,736	740	1,272	909	17	1,817			-	1,503	595	814	108	415	115	315	363	437	307	41,058
Placer	2017	1,697	3,444	4,231	20,570	686	1,507	811	12	1,793			-	1,431	549	719	202	433	155	318	282	505	225	39,570
Placer	2018	1,778	2,479	4,910	25,175	646	2,084	775	11	1,674			1	1,405	597	846	240	385	152	362	271	396	218	44,405
Plumas	2016	103	259	405	2,108	51	53	49	-	98			92	46	47	4	59	14	38	2	9	58	3,495	
Plumas	2017	104	248	354	2,505	60	42	35	-	79			78	63	63	6	63	13	43	4	14	45	3,819	
Plumas	2018	93	307	426	2,977	45	89	32	-	123			79	62	78	4	31	17	45	-	20	40	4,468	
Riverside	2016	11,959	15,864	22,082	223,673	11,147	11,360	10,477	226	9,994			8,780	8,062	6,950	2,325	1,676	912	1,869	855	2,867	2,497	353,575	
Riverside	2017	13,081	14,576	20,375	220,451	10,458	14,769	10,823	158	10,904			8,666	7,196	6,703	2,299	1,772	979	2,261	914	2,863	1,719	350,967	
Riverside	2018	13,447	15,843	23,219	235,165	9,759	13,044	10,127	158	11,362			8,768	6,135	6,735	2,292	1,184	1,131	2,281	883	2,446	1,428	365,407	
Sacramento	2016	12,561	14,204	20,470	150,837	8,380	8,036	4,951	79	8,219	17,734		1	5,680	4,963	3,872	798	2,516	769	1,059	2,360	1,151	1,308	269,948
Sacramento	2017	11,438	12,576	19,472	159,053	7,822	9,441	4,825	93	8,613	35,014		1	5,562	4,095	3,995	821	2,422	746	1,205	2,906	929	872	291,901
Sacramento	2018	13,072	11,031	16,546	162,574	7,163	11,583	5,059	93	9,345	38,783		1	5,432	4,055	3,936	792	2,497	714	1,333	3,970	1,035	1,046	300,060
San Benito	2016	346	736	930	4,436	111	296	408	4	168			180	126	45	44	89	27	32	45	38	30	8,091	
San Benito	2017	303	1,010	1,206	4,939	89	399	184	9	198			199	107	57	59	87	27	26	22	39	45	9,005	
San Benito	2018	215	751	773	3,376	91	423	445	9	206			193	133	67	52	90	31	40	20	48	25	6,988	
San Bernardino	2016	14,232	29,987	35,809	150,640	13,023	10,737	13,669	612	8,795			-	8,296	12,297	5,794	1,876	1,999	898	1,521	1,004	2,474	3,343	317,006
San Bernardino	2017	14,666	32,766	38,059	160,159	12,141	13,857	13,743	212	9,823			2	8,214	11,761	6,209	1,997	1,820	991	1,350	1,020	2,231	3,897	334,918
San Bernardino	2018	14,341	33,495	37,321	159,832	11,350	19,051	11,044	212	10,533			2	7,911	10,359	6,449	2,061	1,905	1,009	1,677	1,324	1,931	3,528	335,335
San Diego	2016	12,502	17,055	31,006	319,648	10,656	13,274	11,949	262	16,909			4	13,081	5,872	7,456	1,145	2,011	898	1,903	1,436	2,170	1,274	470,511
San Diego	2017	12,584	14,347	28,799	302,233	10,162	16,800	12,146	260	17,735			4	12,690	5,113	7,265	1,212	2,359	901	1,975	1,512	1,895	1,194	451,186

RAS FILINGS
FY 2016-2018

county	fyear	felony	misd_tr	misd_ntr	infr	ud	limit	sml_clm	complex	unl	edd	asbestos	fam_dis	fam_cs	fam_dv	fam_prt_g	fam_ot_h	cons_gr_dn	est_trst	mental	juv_del	juv_dep	total
San Diego	2018	12,200	14,087	28,808	334,466	9,230	20,693	11,140	263	18,132		1	12,342	4,996	7,386	1,311	2,263	952	2,025	1,509	1,670	1,053	484,527
San Francisco	2016	3,802	1,249	2,395	143,418	3,004	2,651	2,683	155	5,978		83	2,421	1,272	1,164	175	450	240	777	2,637	380	1,134	176,068
San Francisco	2017	3,873	986	2,912	113,074	3,144	3,372	2,894	193	6,088		68	2,340	1,079	1,121	158	555	261	798	2,612	489	973	146,990
San Francisco	2018	4,293	806	2,793	83,527	3,128	3,999	2,725	146	6,201		115	2,256	1,154	1,181	160	342	245	759	2,557	523	1,051	117,961
San Joaquin	2016	4,916	9,653	11,375	66,433	3,527	3,630	2,430	39	2,958			2,475	2,302	1,612	457	904	344	635	1,194	745	720	116,349
San Joaquin	2017	4,684	10,835	10,218	45,823	3,563	4,579	2,388	36	3,122			2,450	2,209	2,011	826	864	349	631	1,118	803	593	97,102
San Joaquin	2018	4,689	11,962	11,323	54,574	3,201	6,097	2,617	36	3,212			2,243	2,016	2,004	655	797	321	775	932	848	577	108,879
San Luis Obispo	2016	1,541	3,551	6,592	37,949	455	914	605	6	918			987	490	383	67	241	78	268	928	206	212	56,391
San Luis Obispo	2017	1,590	2,590	6,785	34,622	502	1,094	549	5	1,007			912	412	375	54	224	91	296	1,046	180	212	52,546
San Luis Obispo	2018	1,559	2,914	6,797	39,423	500	1,416	562	5	1,083			888	376	346	61	231	85	290	1,037	217	196	57,986
San Mateo	2016	2,666	5,566	13,519	101,604	1,399	2,254	1,582	81	1,736		1	2,228	773	903	146	1,255	125	1,048	158	1,081	249	138,374
San Mateo	2017	2,512	4,465	7,784	90,708	1,204	3,071	1,684	53	2,712		-	2,129	523	796	160	573	276	948	455	934	193	121,180
San Mateo	2018	2,494	4,448	7,530	95,244	1,175	3,703	1,767	53	2,712		-	2,036	346	854	132	543	237	1,052	427	1,008	176	125,937
Santa Barbara	2016	2,792	3,534	8,250	60,604	1,022	1,524	1,229	23	1,908		-	1,418	903	408	299	119	144	447	545	1,129	203	86,501
Santa Barbara	2017	2,637	3,664	8,707	47,644	986	1,951	1,058	11	1,817		1	1,276	842	470	318	126	140	421	513	873	196	73,651
Santa Barbara	2018	2,232	3,631	7,650	49,431	917	2,316	972	12	1,887		-	1,296	742	584	286	161	146	435	448	784	168	74,098
Santa Clara	2016	7,142	15,471	20,974	141,339	3,133	5,556	4,273	215	6,409		-	5,191	2,149	1,542	1,034	558	571	1,780	745	899	544	219,525
Santa Clara	2017	6,858	12,683	18,951	110,022	2,806	6,696	4,550	164	6,427		-	5,086	1,717	1,923	996	688	617	1,643	696	1,053	522	184,098
Santa Clara	2018	6,792	13,228	19,944	133,265	2,800	8,994	4,496	160	7,097		4	4,826	1,499	1,904	883	623	555	1,790	819	1,261	585	211,525
Santa Cruz	2016	1,481	2,568	4,511	32,622	482	783	754	8	1,091		-	908	202	367	256	161	76	237	154	312	195	47,168
Santa Cruz	2017	1,425	2,339	4,256	25,028	412	1,035	924	7	1,052		-	888	241	363	258	137	83	231	136	234	156	39,205
Santa Cruz	2018	1,552	2,263	4,058	28,637	407	1,163	858	6	1,002		1	884	205	324	197	151	79	276	130	185	134	42,512
Shasta	2016	2,772	1,415	4,873	32,610	651	890	486	4	761		-	886	720	495	77	407	167	277	265	298	254	48,308
Shasta	2017	2,349	1,497	3,974	30,001	711	1,089	395	4	841		1	878	586	519	77	427	184	268	286	283	228	44,598
Shasta	2018	2,317	1,327	4,267	28,534	659	1,394	442	5	859		-	826	540	445	96	445	209	256	327	242	196	43,386
Sierra	2016	38	33	78	470	5	12	4	-	11		-	6	6	2	-	2	2	10	2	2	1	684
Sierra	2017	39	26	56	509	7	13	3	-	4		-	8	7	6	3	4	3	8	-	1	-	697
Sierra	2018	54	30	48	490	10	15	1	-	13		-	9	13	8	2	3	7	1	-	2	1	707
Siskiyou	2016	537	442	571	10,468	214	269	78	-	181		-	167	225	167	6	106	39	77	5	24	94	13,670
Siskiyou	2017	550	542	545	9,469	173	257	77	-	200		-	180	193	187	10	94	30	98	2	34	64	12,705
Siskiyou	2018	560	690	762	13,056	196	244	64	-	246		-	173	212	187	15	103	54	105	3	39	60	16,769
Solano	2016	2,815	2,298	4,265	36,464	2,128	2,091	1,172	16	1,758		3	1,782	1,304	1,468	551	279	233	370	427	372	253	60,049
Solano	2017	3,179	3,028	4,709	33,489	2,002	2,553	1,227	16	1,852		9	1,674	1,261	1,351	572	221	231	399	535	332	146	58,786
Solano	2018	2,717	2,706	4,114	39,554	1,842	3,582	1,214	20	1,962		5	1,691	1,202	1,352	549	275	224	409	517	259	192	64,386
Sonoma	2016	3,067	4,958	6,029	51,529	1,165	1,696	1,171	12	2,061		-	1,841	649	412	357	286	181	638	660	533	283	77,528
Sonoma	2017	2,763	4,569	5,555	39,741	1,133	2,049	1,118	16	1,857		-	1,679	573	474	319	262	182	571	300	450	325	63,936
Sonoma	2018	2,417	4,237	5,973	37,994	1,081	2,382	1,124	16	1,700		-	1,639	578	562	300	262	186	580	743	407	482	62,663
Stanislaus	2016	3,824	5,637	7,699	30,996	2,210	2,301	1,563	13	1,869		-	2,393	2,087	1,932	211	816	369	432	668	485	433	65,938
Stanislaus	2017	3,209	5,649	7,208	33,443	2,062	3,118	1,784	16	2,047		-	2,381	1,854	2,002	189	852	353	514	919	377	507	68,484
Stanislaus	2018	3,596	5,103	6,382	36,741	1,743	3,790	1,603	14	1,927		2	2,307	1,696	1,917	192	935	351	551	932	432	472	70,686
Sutter	2016	850	595	1,604	9,270	305	424	176	5	429		-	423	485	311	45	130	81	94	113	86	102	15,528
Sutter	2017	1,059	548	1,725	8,002	331	549	186	3	452		-	378	485	475	27	127	73	92	88	76	125	14,801
Sutter	2018	979	582	1,840	11,089	327	688	199	3	490		-	406	388	718	21	172	51	101	81	68	169	18,372
Tehama	2016	905	1,744	1,487	10,769	373	235	417	-	253		-	270	406	192	21	139	58	91	44	86	161	17,651
Tehama	2017	797	1,359	1,477	9,498	238	305	352	-	253		-	294	338	189	24	185	49	97	65	54	137	15,711
Tehama	2018	866	1,538	1,688	9,458	266	405	337	-	234		-	323	342	187	29	186	60	86	98	60	110	16,273
Trinity	2016	260	177	169	1,082	50	72	26	-	91		-	74	93	63	26	109	8	27	18	19	36	2,400
Trinity	2017	232	252	210	1,129	35	117	27	-	116		-	62	53	74	27	47	12	24	13	24	17	2,471
Trinity	2018	274	299	187	1,473	38	51	30	-	130		-	73	30	59	24	57	24	24	9	23	30	2,835
Tulare	2016	3,275	3,812	9,126	44,068	1,773	2,445	1,209	17	1,489		-	1,699	1,367	1,110	231	815	192	285	360	806	680	74,759
Tulare	2017	3,261	3,755	7,961	39,592	1,728	3,017	1,512	28	1,479		-	1,652	927	1,130	210	748	221	288	492	649	605	69,255
Tulare	2018	3,701	3,857	6,956	38,718	1,600	3,772	1,507	28	1,467		-	1,608	945	1,191	194	789	214	289	693	668	715	68,912
Tuolumne	2016	713	843	1,126	5,355	230	164	173	-	269		-	247	188	191	42	85	45	86	31	49	190	10,027
Tuolumne	2017	788	841	996	4,402	202	210	167	-	312		-	214	158	200	46	67	40	70	61	30	177	8,981
Tuolumne	2018	767	623	978	3,769	171	260	166	-	347		-	219	152	191	29	76	43	57	107	60	183	8,198

RAS FILINGS
FY 2016-2018

county	fyear	felony	misd_tr	misd_ntr	infr	ud	limit	sml_clm	complex	unl	edd	asbestos	fam_dis	fam_cs	fam_dv	fam_prt g	fam_ot h	cons_gr dn	est_trst	mental	juv_del	juv_dep	total
Ventura	2016	3,162	3,709	12,865	111,602	2,278	3,546	2,643	18	3,502		6	4,545	1,823	952	750	391	391	574	736	1,541	575	155,609
Ventura	2017	2,870	4,493	14,541	106,931	2,180	4,258	2,468	10	3,550		3	3,060	1,390	1,008	774	396	357	597	708	995	504	151,093
Ventura	2018	2,522	4,480	13,051	106,360	1,974	5,433	2,515	11	3,466		2	2,974	1,247	1,016	751	462	384	593	794	915	349	149,299
Yolo	2016	1,361	2,719	5,335	21,022	533	660	419	15	684			629	728	362	70	255	107	129	23	260	229	35,540
Yolo	2017	1,334	2,711	5,324	17,813	544	855	515	17	776			682	660	451	65	200	113	161	16	268	361	32,866
Yolo	2018	1,222	2,302	6,162	16,537	503	1,137	477	17	792			665	626	442	69	248	132	163	20	215	395	32,124
Yuba	2016	867	500	1,805	7,418	361	306	102	3	336			343	346	331	28	123	77	60	14	58	188	13,266
Yuba	2017	795	508	1,390	3,810	330	428	92	2	361			314	312	316	20	129	57	52	6	103	104	9,129
Yuba	2018	653	496	1,276	4,967	404	499	93	2	345			334	316	322	17	170	77	82	10	140	155	10,358