

**Selected Municipal Courts  
Judicial Need Estimates by Full-Time Equivalents, 2010 Projected Filings<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Court</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Commissioners and Magistrates</b>	<b>Total Judicial Officers</b>	<b>Total Estimated Judge Need<sup>2</sup></b>
Aberdeen	0.75	0.00	0.75	0.79
Airway Heights	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.44
Anacortes	0.00	0.15	0.15	0.56
Auburn/Algona	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.94
Bainbridge Island	0.52	0.00	0.52	0.48
Battle Ground/La Center/Ridgefield	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.90
Bellingham	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.57
Black Diamond	0.30	0.00	0.30	0.45
Blaine	0.21	0.00	0.21	0.46
Bonney Lake	0.80	0.00	0.80	1.17
Bothell	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.84
Bremerton	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.34
Buckley	0.13	0.00	0.13	0.54
Burlington	0.00	0.20	0.20	0.56
Centralia	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.66
Chehalis	0.75	0.00	0.75	0.44
Cheney	0.10	0.15	0.25	0.48
Cle Elum	0.10	0.05	0.15	0.37
Colfax	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.34
College Place	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.43
Connell	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.36
Cosmopolis	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.35
Deer Park	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.37
Des Moines	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.90
East Wenatchee	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.71
Edmonds	0.53	0.00	0.53	0.96
Elma	0.13	0.00	0.13	0.40
Enumclaw/Maple Valley	0.13	0.00	0.13	0.67
Everett	1.80	0.00	1.80	2.29
Everson-Nooksack	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.39
Federal Way	2.00	0.00	2.00	1.99
Ferndale	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.51
Fife	0.85	0.00	0.85	1.26
Fircrest	0.12	0.00	0.12	0.63
Gig Harbor	0.41	0.00	0.41	0.52
Granger	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.36
Hoquiam	0.19	0.00	0.19	0.55
Kent	2.00	0.00	2.00	2.59
Kirkland/Clyde Hill/Medina/Hunts Point/Yarrow Point	1.00	0.20	1.20	1.33
Lake Forest Park	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.50
Lakewood	0.73	0.00	0.73	1.50
Lynden	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.57
Lynnwood	1.50	0.00	1.50	2.23
Marysville	1.00	0.50	1.50	2.00
Medical Lake	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.35
Milton	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.52

<b>Court</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Commissioners</b>	<b>Total Judicial Officers</b>	<b>Total Estimated Judge Need<sup>2</sup></b>
Montesano	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.43
Mount Vernon	0.00	0.33	0.33	0.72
Napavine	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.34
Ocean Shores	0.90	0.00	0.90	0.39
Olympia	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.87
Orting	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.47
Pacific	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.77
Pasco	0.75	0.00	0.75	1.39
Port Orchard	0.60	0.00	0.60	0.56
Poulsbo	0.40	0.00	0.40	0.49
Puyallup	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.81
Raymond	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.42
Renton	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.78
Roy	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.38
Ruston	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.42
SeaTac	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.73
Sedro Woolley	0.28	0.00	0.28	0.53
Selah	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.41
Shelton	0.75	0.00	0.75	0.54
South Bend	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.40
Spokane	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.45
Steilacoom	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.43
Sumas	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.38
Sumner	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.60
Sunnyside	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.73
Tacoma	3.00	1.60	4.60	4.17
Tenino	0.28	0.00	0.28	0.37
Toppenish	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.62
Tukwila	0.75	0.09	0.84	0.91
Tumwater	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.67
Union Gap	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.79
Wapato	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.47
Westport	0.15	0.00	0.15	0.41
Yakima	2.00	0.50	2.50	2.17
Yelm	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.46
Zillah	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.36

1. Year 2010 projected filings are based on the previous five year filing trends of the various case types in a given court. Any vehicle-related violations (parking, photo-radar and toll citations) that were not entered into the statewide Judicial Information System (JIS) are excluded from filings counts.
2. Need estimates are based on the previous five years of data for the number of total judicial officers and case resolutions.

## **Description of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Judicial Needs Estimation**

In August 2002, a new methodology for estimating judicial needs of the courts of limited jurisdiction was adopted by the Administrative Office of the Courts in conjunction with the District and Municipal Court Judges' Association. Beginning with the 2002 Annual Report, a yearly table is published displaying court-level judicial needs estimates using this methodology, along with a brief description of the process.

The district and municipal court model for estimating judicial needs is workload based. The estimates are derived from a statistical model with two primary data components: (1) the observed caseload processed, and (2) the number of available judicial officers. The caseload measure is represented by case resolutions, and the judicial officer measure is represented by judge and commissioner FTEs. In order to ensure that a good representative sample underlies the estimation, the data are drawn from courts across the state and from the past several years. Estimates are presented for selected municipal courts.

This type of approach has wide usage in a number of diverse applications and so provides a well-established base model. An inherent advantage of this methodology is the facility to capture changes in practice over time.