

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3660

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Fred Miller, Acting Director, Judicial Council Services
Chris Belloli, Senior Research Analyst, Research and Planning Unit
415-865-7651

DATE: October 26, 2001

SUBJECT: Results of statewide assessment of judicial needs including list of recommended new judgeships (Action Required)

Issue Statement

At the August 2001 Judicial Council meeting the council approved the final set of judicial workload standards developed from the California Judicial Needs Assessment Project and directed AOC staff to conduct a statewide assessment of judicial needs using these workload standards. The Judicial Council also directed staff to present at the October 2001 Judicial Council meeting recommendations for an initial 3-year plan and subsequent 2-year plans for obtaining additional judgeships needed statewide as implied by the judicial workload standards.

Staff recommends that the Judicial Council approve a prioritized list of new judgeships for FY 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, the initial 3-year plan for requesting additional judgeships. This list is based on the judicial workload standards approved by the Judicial Council on August 24, and ranked using statistical methods that ensure additional judicial officers will be allocated to those courts with the greatest need.

Recommendation

AOC Research and Planning staff recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the results of the statewide assessment of judicial needs as implied by the judicial workload standards including the ranked list of 150 recommended new judgeships for the initial 3-year plan, contingent on the courts' ability to provide adequate facilities for additional judges and their complement of support staff;

2. Approve the first 50 judgeships on the ranked list of 150 recommended new judgeships for the initial 3-year plan, but defer the decision to sponsor legislation in FY 2002-03 until the Chief Justice and Administrative Director of the Courts can meet with the Governor and the Legislative leadership. A final recommendation concerning new judgeships for FY 2002-03 will be based on these discussions, and this recommendation will be presented to the Judicial Council for their approval;
3. Direct staff to convene a working group made up of representatives from the trial courts that will meet on an annual basis to update specific workload standards and refine the overall judicial needs assessment process; and
4. Direct staff, with guidance from the working group, to prepare a Judicial Council issues meeting agenda to seek discussion of the following issues:
 - A. Options for courts with more judicial officers than are currently needed based on the assessment results;
 - B. Possibility of establishing expected outcomes for courts that receive additional judgeships (e.g., time standards, other qualitative standards); and
 - C. Options to put additional resources in areas within courts (e.g., family and juvenile) that have not been adequately served in the past.

Rationale for Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The new judicial needs assessment process is based on a set of judicial workload standards that represent the average bench and non-bench time (in minutes) required to resolve each case type. These workload standards are multiplied by the number of case filings by case type to arrive at the total judicial workload for each court. Total workload entering a particular court is then divided by the “standard” amount of time each judicial officer has available to complete case-related work per year. This calculation provides an estimate of the number of judicial officers needed in every county and the state as a whole to resolve the number of cases filed.

Results of statewide assessment of judicial needs

Figure 1 on page 4 shows, among other things, the results from the statewide assessment of judicial needs. This table, under the column called “Estimated Judicial Officer Need”, provides an estimate of the number of judicial officers needed in every county and the state as a whole as implied by the judicial workload standards. These results are based on the revised filings for FY 1999-00

provided by the courts as part of the court feedback process conducted through surveys to the courts after the August 2001 Judicial Council meeting.

The results from the statewide assessment of judicial needs are based on the following assumptions:

- 1) Judicial officers have available, on average, 215 days per year for case resolution, which was reached by removing weekends and applying a standard deduction for vacation, sick leave, and participation in judicial conference and education programs from the calendar year.
- 2) California judicial officers are assumed to spend an average of six hours a day on case specific responsibilities and two hours per day on non-case related administration, community activities, travel, etc.
- 3) The judicial workload standards represent a qualitative improvement over what can be done with the current level of judicial resources.
- 4) The approach is not intended to dictate how individual judicial officers spend their time in a given workday or on a particular case.
- 5) The assessment process is also not intended to dictate to a court how judicial assignments should be made, but to measure the overall workload of a court. Within that workload, courts would continue to find the best practices for calendar management and assignments according to their local needs.

The table (Figure 1) on the following page with the assessment results contains the following information:

- Population figures for each county as of 1/1/2000 (Column 2).
- The estimated number of judicial officers needed in each county (Column 3).
- The current number of AJP and JPE, reflecting revisions provided by the trial courts (Columns 4 & 5).
- The need for additional judicial officers (expressed as number of positions and percent increase), based on current AJP (Columns 6 & 7).

Figure 1: Estimating Need for Judicial Officers by County

County/Court	Population 1/1/00	Estimated Judicial Officer Need	Authorized Judicial Positions	Judicial Position Equivalent	Need Minus Actual	Percent Change in Need
		FY 99-00	FY 99-00	FY 99-00	99-00 AJP	99-00 AJP
Alameda	1,454,300	88.5	85.0	91.5	3.5	4.1%
Alpine	1,190	0.3	2.0	1.8	(1.7)	-86.0%
Amador	34,400	2.2	2.3	3.2	(0.1)	-4.2%
Butte	204,000	15.9	12.0	13.8	3.9	32.2%
Calaveras	38,500	2.2	2.3	3.0	(0.1)	-5.5%
Colusa	18,750	2.0	2.3	2.3	(0.3)	-14.5%
Contra Costa	930,000	50.6	45.0	51.2	5.6	12.4%
Del Norte	28,000	3.3	2.1	2.5	1.2	58.2%
El Dorado	152,900	8.3	8.0	9.2	0.3	3.2%
Fresno	805,000	68.7	45.0	46.8	23.7	52.6%
Glenn	27,100	2.5	2.3	2.4	0.2	7.6%
Humboldt	127,600	9.5	8.0	8.6	1.5	19.4%
Imperial	145,300	10.9	10.9	12.3	0.0	0.4%
Inyo	18,200	1.8	2.1	2.6	(0.3)	-13.5%
Kern	658,900	51.5	41.0	41.8	10.5	25.6%
Kings	131,200	10.3	8.5	8.5	1.8	21.6%
Lake	55,700	5.6	4.3	4.9	1.3	30.6%
Lassen	33,950	2.7	2.1	2.9	0.6	29.5%
Los Angeles	9,884,300	630.9	582.0	618.8	48.9	8.4%
Madera	117,100	12.9	7.3	7.1	5.6	76.7%
Marin	249,700	12.9	14.5	16.0	(1.6)	-11.3%
Mariposa	16,150	1.2	2.1	2.1	(0.9)	-44.6%
Mendocino	87,600	7.9	9.0	8.2	(1.1)	-11.8%
Merced	210,100	18.4	9.7	10.2	8.8	90.7%
Modoc	9,800	1.1	2.0	2.2	(0.9)	-43.0%
Mono	10,900	1.1	3.0	3.1	(1.9)	-63.4%
Monterey	399,300	23.6	19.5	18.7	4.1	21.2%
Napa	127,000	7.2	8.0	8.7	(0.8)	-10.0%
Nevada	91,100	5.9	7.3	7.4	(1.4)	-18.5%
Orange	2,828,400	159.5	143.0	153.3	16.5	11.5%
Placer	234,400	16.8	12.0	13.6	4.8	40.1%
Plumas	20,350	1.9	2.3	3.0	(0.4)	-16.2%
Riverside	1,522,900	110.3	69.0	71.6	41.3	59.9%
Sacramento	1,209,500	97.8	64.0	67.8	33.8	52.8%
San Benito	49,800	3.2	2.3	2.7	0.9	37.0%
San Bernardino	1,689,300	135.3	74.0	80.7	61.3	82.8%
San Diego	2,911,500	165.9	152.0	159.9	13.9	9.1%
San Francisco	801,400	56.7	65.0	68.1	(8.3)	-12.8%
San Joaquin	566,600	56.0	30.0	31.3	26.0	86.8%
San Luis Obispo	245,200	16.1	15.0	15.0	1.1	7.1%
San Mateo	730,000	34.0	33.0	35.9	1.0	2.9%
Santa Barbara	414,200	24.8	24.0	24.9	0.8	3.5%
Santa Clara	1,736,700	93.8	89.0	90.7	4.8	5.4%
Santa Cruz	255,000	15.8	13.5	13.5	2.3	17.2%
Shasta	167,000	17.2	11.0	12.4	6.2	56.2%
Sierra	3,140	0.3	2.3	2.2	(2.0)	-88.6%
Siskiyou	44,200	4.6	5.0	5.6	(0.4)	-7.8%
Solano	399,000	27.9	22.0	22.3	5.9	26.7%
Sonoma	450,100	29.8	20.0	20.3	9.8	49.0%
Stanislaus	441,400	33.5	21.4	21.9	12.1	56.4%
Sutter	77,900	7.8	5.3	5.5	2.5	46.8%
Tehama	56,200	5.5	4.3	4.6	1.2	27.5%
Trinity	13,050	1.1	2.3	2.3	(1.2)	-53.5%
Tulare	368,000	31.5	20.0	21.1	11.5	57.7%
Tuolumne	53,000	3.8	4.3	4.5	(0.5)	-11.2%
Ventura	756,500	38.0	32.0	37.2	6.0	18.6%
Yolo	162,900	13.5	11.4	10.8	2.1	18.5%
Yuba	60,700	7.5	5.3	5.2	2.2	40.8%
Total	34,336,380	2,269.5	1,904.3	2,019.4	365.3	19.2%

- Based on the revised filings data provided by the trial courts the judicial needs assessment methodology suggests a statewide need for 2,269 judicial officers, slightly higher than the total presented to the Judicial Council in August 2001.
- This represents a 12% increase from the current number of judicial positions used statewide (as measured by Judicial Position Equivalent, or JPE) and 19% increase from the current number of authorized judicial officers (as measured by Authorized Judicial Positions, or AJP).
- There are 34 courts that show a need for at least 1 additional judicial officer, ranging in size from Los Angeles to Del Norte, a 2-judge court.
- Sixteen courts currently have a sufficient number of judicial officers as implied by the workload standards.
- There are 8 courts, several of which are small 2-judge courts, which currently have more judicial officers than are currently needed based on the assessment results.

Recommendation 2

Staff presented a recommendation to the Judicial Council at their August 24 meeting for an initial 3-year plan for obtaining additional judgeships followed by subsequent 2-year plans. In order to develop a list of new judgeships recommended for the initial 3-year plan, staff ranked the courts that showed a need for additional judicial resources using statistical methods recommended by the National Center for State Courts as the most effective and equitable way to allocate judicial resources.

Ranking methodology for prioritizing list of new judgeships

The ranking methodology is based in part on the Equal Proportions Method, which has been used by other states in their assessment of judicial needs and is also used by the United States Congress to determine how a fixed number of seats should be assigned in the House of Representatives after a new census is taken. Some minor adjustments to the Equal Proportions Method have been made to provide consideration for courts with the greatest need relative to their current complement of judicial officers, as well as to ensure improved access to courts for the greatest number of the public.

First, the ranking score derived from the Equal Proportions Method for each needed judgeship is multiplied by a percentage factor based on the number of *additional* judgeships needed for each court as a percentage of the *total* number of judicial officers needed in each county (Figure 1, Column 3). This adjustment, for example, would prioritize a court needing one additional judgeship with 10 existing judicial officers over a court also needing one new judgeship but currently

with 50 judicial officers. The final adjustment takes this new ranking score and divides it by “1” for the first new judgeship needed for each county, by “2” for the second (if applicable) new judgeship for each county, and so on. This adjustment will give more weight to a court’s first new judgeship and less weight to a court’s second and subsequent other additional needed judgeships. The list of needed new judgeships by county is sorted by this final ranking score from highest value or judicial need to the lowest value to generate a prioritized list of new judgeships.

The table on the following page (Figure 2) shows the number of new judicial officers recommended by county based on their priority ranking for FY 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, the initial 3-year plan for requesting additional judgeships. Figures 3-5 at the end of this report show the actual ranked list of recommended new judgeships for each year of the 3-year plan. This table (Figure 2) is based on a staff recommendation that the Judicial Council request 50 new judgeships in each year of the 3-year plan.

At this time, staff recommends that the Judicial Council defer the decision to sponsor legislation in FY 2002-03 for the creation of the first 50 judgeships until the Chief Justice and Administrative Director of the Courts can meet with the Governor and the Legislative leadership. A final recommendation concerning new judgeships for FY 2002-03 will be based on these discussions, and this recommendation will be presented to the Judicial Council for their approval.

The prioritized lists of recommended new judgeships for year 2 and year 3 (FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05) are preliminary and subject to change based on the refinements to the assessment process recommended by the court working group next year. Staff will present an updated list of new judgeships for FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05 to the Judicial Council in the fall of 2002, following the approval of the working group’s recommendations by the Judicial Council.

At the end of 5 years (initial 3-year plan and subsequent 2-year plan), the California trial courts will have a significant number of the needed additional judicial officers as implied by the workload standards, and will be within 5 percent of the total statewide need.

Figure 2: Number of new judicial officers for FY 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05

County	New Judgeships for 3-year plan			
	<i>FY 2002-03</i>	<i>FY 2003-04</i>	<i>FY 2004-05</i>	<i>3-year total</i>
San Bernardino	8	6	8	22
Riverside	5	5	5	15
Sacramento	5	4	4	13
San Joaquin	5	3	4	12
Fresno	4	3	3	10
Los Angeles	3	2	4	9
Stanislaus	2	3	1	6
Tulare	2	2	2	6
Merced	2	2	1	5
Sonoma	2	2	1	5
Kern	2	1	2	5
Orange	1	2	2	5
Madera	1	2	1	4
Shasta	1	2	1	4
San Diego	1	1	2	4
Placer	1	1	1	3
Solano	1	1	1	3
Ventura	1	1	1	3
Butte	1	1	0	2
Monterey	1	0	1	2
Contra Costa	1	0	1	2
Kings	0	1	0	1
Santa Clara	0	1	0	1
Santa Cruz	0	1	0	1
Sutter	0	1	0	1
Yolo	0	1	0	1
Yuba	0	1	0	1
Alameda	0	0	1	1
Del Norte	0	0	1	1
Humboldt	0	0	1	1
Lake	0	0	1	1
Statewide total	50	50	50	150

Recommended new judgeships for FY 2002-03

- There are 21 courts that are on the recommended list of new judgeships for FY 2002-03, the first year of the initial 3-year plan.
- Many courts on the prioritized list for multiple new judgeships have a considerable overall need for additional judicial officers, which also represents a significant need relative to their current number of judicial officers.
 - San Bernardino, 8 new judicial officers
 - Riverside, 5 new judicial officers
 - Sacramento, 5 new judicial officers
- Other courts also showing a considerable overall need, but a relatively small need compared to their current number of judicial officers, are also on the recommended list to receive additional judicial officers for FY 2002-03.
 - Los Angeles, 3 judicial officers
 - Orange, 1 judicial officer
 - San Diego, 1 judicial officer
- The minor adjustments to the Equal Proportions Method resulted in many courts appearing on the prioritized list for FY 2002-03 that would not have been included absent the adjustments, thereby providing these courts the additional judicial resources that are critically needed to serve the public.
 - Solano, 1 judicial officer
 - Madera, 1 judicial officer
 - Placer, 1 judicial officer

Expected impact of adding new judgeships

Staff recommends that the Judicial Council consider establishing some expected outcomes for courts that receive additional judgeships. These outcomes should be based on an expected increase in the quality of justice and service to the public as well as in other areas consistent with the goals of the Judicial Council such as:

- Improvements in case processing, such as time to disposition
- Greater assistance to pro per litigants
- Increasing the coordination of all family and juvenile cases
- Expanding the availability of collaborative justice courts (e.g., drug, teen, domestic violence courts) to the public

Court feedback process

A set of materials was sent to the trial courts that included a description of the new judicial needs assessment process and a court feedback form, requesting both verification and feedback on several pieces of information related to this new judicial needs assessment process. Staff outlined this feedback process in a presentation to the Presiding Judges and Court Executives at their joint issues meeting in September 2001. The feedback form provided courts the opportunity to (1) comment on the results of the judicial needs assessment for their court and on any unique circumstances that significantly affect ongoing judicial workload, and (2) provide recommendations to staff and a court working group who will address future refinements.

Given the scheduling of the Judicial Council meetings in August and October, the trial courts had less than three weeks to provide their feedback on the new judicial needs assessment process. Staff recognizes the limited amount of time courts were given to provide their feedback, and would like to thank the 45 courts that responded for their input.

Court comments on results of judicial needs assessment

Courts that provided feedback were almost unanimous in their agreement and support of the judicial needs assessment results for their court. In several instances, however, courts indicated that it would be difficult to accommodate any new judicial officers with current facilities.

Several courts indicated that problems or inaccuracies in the filings data raise some concerns about the results of the judicial needs assessment. Given that staff from the National Center for State Courts also raised this issue during their work on the Judicial Needs Assessment Project, this concern about filings data has some merit. As outlined in greater detail below, staff recommends that the working group seek ways to improve the accuracy of court-reported filings data when they meet in calendar year 2002.

Recommendation 3& 4

The Judicial Council approved a staff recommendation presented at the August council meeting to create a working group made up of representatives from the trial courts that will meet on an annual basis to update specific judicial workload standards and refine the overall judicial needs assessment process. This review process will serve to identify areas in which specific research may be needed to quantify the impact of new laws, policy, or court procedures on the standards for specific types of cases.

Based on the results from the Judicial Needs Assessment Project and information provided by the trial courts as part of the recently completed court feedback process, staff recommends that the working group consider the following areas for study in calendar year 2002:

- Seek methods to improve the accuracy and standardization of court-reported filings data, particularly in the Other Civil Complaint and Other Civil Petition case types.
- Review studies assessing the impact of Proposition 36 on judicial workload.
- Conduct an assessment of the additional workload associated with drug, teen, domestic violence, and other collaborative justice courts.
- Consider refining the process to account for the additional time required to handle cases involving a court interpreter or pro per litigants.
- Study the impact of having multiple court locations within a county on the need for judicial officers.
- Develop a set of recommendations concerning how the state's existing judicial resources could be allocated more efficiently, including courts with more judicial officers than are currently needed based on the assessment results.

This working group will be made up of judicial officers and court managers from across the state, and staff will schedule an orientation session for the group in early 2002. The working group will report back to the Judicial Council in the fall of 2002 on their recommendations for refining the assessment process including any workload standards that should be updated.

Alternative Actions Considered

The Equal Proportions Method is used by the United States Congress to determine how a fixed number of seats should be assigned in the House of Representatives after a new census is taken. Because this allocation method is intended for a fixed amount of resources (i.e. seats) and also allows these resources to be distributed from one jurisdiction to another, staff made minor adjustments to this method in order to be consistent with the current practices in allocating judicial resources in the California trial courts. Without these adjustments to the Equal Proportions Method, staff concluded that new judicial resources would not necessarily be allocated in the most equitable manner and to those courts with the greatest need.

Comments From Interested Parties

Beyond the feedback received from the courts that is summarized earlier in the report, no additional comments were requested.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

Upon approval of recommendation 2 by the Judicial Council, staff will prepare a detailed budget change proposal (BCP) for the creation of 50 new judgeships for FY 2002-03. This BCP will include the costs associated with the support staff for each new judgeship as well as any facilities or capital outlay considerations, which are not known at this time and will require additional analysis.

Figure 3: Ranked list of new judgeships for FY 2002-03, year 1 of 3-year plan

Rank	County	Recommended New Judgeships for 3-year plan	
		<i># in Year 1</i>	<i>Total for 3-year plan</i>
1	San Bernardino	1 of 8 total	22 judgeships
2	Riverside	1/5	15
3	San Joaquin	1/5	12
4	Sacramento	1/5	13
5	Fresno	1/4	10
6	San Bernardino	2/8	22
7	Riverside	2/5	15
8	Stanislaus	1/2	6
9	Tulare	1/2	6
10	Los Angeles	1/3	9
11	Merced	1/2	5
12	San Bernardino	3/8	22
13	San Joaquin	2/5	12
14	Sacramento	2/5	13
15	Sonoma	1/2	5
16	Fresno	2/4	10
17	San Bernardino	4/8	22
18	Madera	1/1	4
19	Riverside	3/5	15
20	Kern	1/2	5
21	Shasta	1/1	4
22	Orange	1/1	5
23	San Joaquin	3/5	12
24	Sacramento	3/5	13
25	San Bernardino	5/8	22
26	Riverside	4/5	15
27	Placer	1/1	3
28	San Diego	1/1	4
29	Stanislaus	2/2	6
30	Los Angeles	2/3	9
31	Solano	1/1	3
32	Tulare	2/2	6
33	Fresno	3/4	10
34	Merced	2/2	5
35	San Bernardino	6/8	22
36	Sacramento	4/5	13
37	San Joaquin	4/5	12
38	Ventura	1/1	3
39	Sonoma	2/2	5
40	Riverside	5/5	15
41	Butte	1/1	2
42	San Bernardino	7/8	22
43	Monterey	1/1	2
44	Fresno	4/4	10
45	Sacramento	5/5	13
46	San Joaquin	5/5	12
47	San Bernardino	8/8	22
48	Contra Costa	1/1	2
49	Kern	2/2	5
50	Los Angeles	3/3	9

Figure 4: Ranked list of new judgeships for FY 2003-04, year 2 of 3-year plan

Rank	County	Recommended New Judgeships for 3-year plan	
		<i># in Year 2</i>	<i>Total for 3-year plan</i>
51	Riverside	1/5	15
52	Sutter	1/1	1
53	Madera	1/2	4
54	Stanislaus	1/3	6
55	Shasta	1/2	4
56	Orange	1/2	5
57	Tulare	1/2	6
58	San Bernardino	1/6	22
59	Merced	1/2	5
60	Sacramento	1/4	13
61	Riverside	2/5	15
62	San Joaquin	1/3	12
63	Yuba	1/1	1
64	Fresno	1/3	10
65	San Bernardino	2/6	22
66	Sonoma	1/2	5
67	San Diego	1/1	4
68	Los Angeles	1/2	9
69	Riverside	3/5	15
70	San Bernardino	3/6	22
71	Sacramento	2/4	13
72	San Joaquin	2/3	12
73	Solano	1/1	3
74	Placer	1/1	3
75	Stanislaus	2/3	6
76	Fresno	2/3	10
77	Tulare	2/2	6
78	San Bernardino	4/6	22
79	Kern	1/1	5
80	Riverside	4/5	15
81	Santa Clara	1/1	1
82	Santa Cruz	1/1	1
83	Orange	2/2	5
84	Sacramento	3/4	13
85	Merced	2/2	5
86	Ventura	1/1	3
87	San Bernardino	5/6	22
88	Los Angeles	2/2	9
89	San Joaquin	3/3	12
90	Yolo	1/1	1
91	Riverside	5/5	15
92	Shasta	2/2	4
93	Fresno	3/3	10
94	Madera	2/2	4
95	Sonoma	2/2	5
96	San Bernardino	6/6	22
97	Kings	1/1	1
98	Sacramento	4/4	13
99	Stanislaus	3/3	6
100	Butte	1/1	2

Figure 5: Ranked list of new judgeships for FY 2004-05, year 3 of 3-year plan

Rank	County	Recommended New Judgeships for 3-year plan	
		<i># in Year 3</i>	<i>Total for 3-year plan</i>
101	San Joaquin	1/4	12
102	San Bernardino	1/8	22
103	Riverside	1/5	15
104	Tulare	1/2	6
105	San Diego	1/2	4
106	Los Angeles	1/4	9
107	Contra Costa	1/1	2
108	Fresno	1/3	10
109	Sacramento	1/4	13
110	San Bernardino	2/8	22
111	Monterey	1/1	2
112	Kern	1/2	5
113	Riverside	2/5	15
114	Orange	1/2	5
115	San Joaquin	2/4	12
116	Alameda	1/1	1
117	San Bernardino	3/8	22
118	Merced	1/1	5
119	Humboldt	1/1	1
120	Sacramento	2/4	13
121	Los Angeles	2/4	9
122	Riverside	3/5	15
123	Fresno	2/3	10
124	San Bernardino	4/8	22
125	Solano	1/1	3
126	Sonoma	1/1	5
127	Stanislaus	1/1	6
128	San Joaquin	3/4	12
129	Del Norte	1/1	1
130	Lake	1/1	1
131	Tulare	2/2	6
132	San Bernardino	5/8	22
133	Riverside	4/5	15
134	Sacramento	3/4	13
135	Placer	1/1	3
136	Los Angeles	3/4	9
137	San Diego	2/2	4
138	San Bernardino	6/8	22
139	Fresno	3/3	10
140	Ventura	1/1	3
141	Shasta	1/1	4
142	Orange	2/2	5
143	San Joaquin	4/4	12
144	Riverside	5/5	15
145	Kern	2/2	5
146	Sacramento	4/4	13
147	San Bernardino	7/8	22
148	Madera	1/1	4
149	Los Angeles	4/4	9
150	San Bernardino	8/8	22

