

STATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

JUDICIAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS



AUGUST 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Trial Court Judicial Resources Recommendations.....	2
PART I – TRIAL COURT JUDGESHIPS	4
Methodology.....	4
Savings Gained by Eliminating a Judgeship	7
Courts with a Judicial Need.....	8
Extended Analyses	9
PART II – COURT OF APPEALS JUDGESHIPS	63
APPENDICES	67
Appendix A – Counties With First- or Second-Class District Courts	68
Appendix B – Third-Class District Courts	70
Appendix C – Stratum, Day Values, and Judicial Proportions.....	72
Appendix D – Weighted Caseload Results for Counties with First- and Second-Class District Courts.....	73
Appendix E – Weighted Caseload Results for Third-Class District Courts	78
Appendix F – Extended Analysis Questions	79
Appendix G – Judicial Needs Assessment Committee.....	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) recommends that the Legislature eliminate 45 trial court judgeships and 4 Court of Appeals judgeships by attrition for an estimated savings to the state of approximately \$8 million per year. These recommendations are based on the SCAO's most recent biennial review of the judicial needs of the state of Michigan. That review indicates that in many courts the current number of judgeships is not justified by the courts' workload. It also indicates a judicial need of 31 judges in other courts; these courts specifically requested that the SCAO not conduct an extended analysis due to the local costs required to establish and maintain a judgeship. As such, the SCAO is recommending eliminating 45 judgeships, but is not recommending adding 31.

Part I - Trial Court Judgeships

The review of trial court judgeships began with a statistical analysis in which case filings were weighted to reflect the amount of judicial time necessary to handle each case type. For example, a medical malpractice case requires much more judicial involvement than a civil infraction, so the medical malpractice case weight is much greater. In 2010 and 2011, with oversight provided by the Judicial Needs Assessment Committee, the National Center for State Courts conducted a comprehensive study of judicial workload using data from every court in Michigan. This study resulted in an updated statistical methodology to be used by the SCAO. For each court jurisdiction where the statistical analysis indicated a judicial excess, the SCAO conducted an extended analysis. This analysis focused on the particular court or courts, and any factor that was not accounted for in the weighted caseload formula. For example, a reduction in police force would likely result in fewer traffic tickets and civil infractions in the future.

Concurrent jurisdiction plans permit more equitable assignment of cases among judges within a circuit, thereby allowing a judicial excess in one court to offset a need in another court. Because all trial courts within a judicial circuit can take advantage of concurrent jurisdiction plans under MCL 600.401 *et seq.*, and because circuit, probate, first-class district, and second-class district courts receive funding from one or more counties, these courts were combined for analysis purposes. Third-class district courts, which receive funding from cities and townships, were analyzed independently.

The SCAO recommends that the Legislature eliminate by attrition 45 trial court judgeships, consolidate the 25th and 26th District Courts, and consolidate the 45A and 45B District Courts. The recommendations for reduction are summarized on page 2.

Part II - Court of Appeals Judgeships

Because the appellate process differs from case handling in trial courts, the SCAO conducted a separate analysis for the Court of Appeals. This analysis compared the decreasing workload with the number of judges and research attorneys. These attorneys prepare research reports for almost every opinion case; they provide a statement of facts, the parties' legal arguments, an independent legal analysis, and often a recommended disposition. These research reports provide a great assistance to the judges in deciding complex cases.

Over a period of many years, the trend in the Court of Appeals has been a plummeting workload, a dwindling number of research attorneys, and an increased number of sitting judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the SCAO recommended that the number of judgeships on the Court of Appeals be reduced by attrition by four. The SCAO again recommends that the number of judgeships on the Court of Appeals be reduced by attrition by four.

Trial Court Judicial Resources Recommendations

Court Jurisdiction	Current Judgeships	Estimated Judicial Excess			2011 SCAO Recommendation
		2007	2009	2011	
Dickinson, Iron, Menominee	7	-3.6	-3.8	-3.3	-2 Page 10
Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, Oscoda	7	-3.3	-3.5	-2.7	-2 Page 12
Alger, Luce, Mackinac, Schoolcraft	5	-2.8	-3.0	-2.7	-1 Page 14
Gogebic, Ontonagon	4	-2.7	-2.7	-2.6	-1 Page 16
Baraga, Houghton, Keweenaw	4.5	-2.4	-2.5	-2.5	-1 Page 18
Marquette	5	-2.4	-2.3	-2.2	-2 Page 20
Midland	5	-1.4	-1.5	-1.8	-2 Page 22
50th District - Pontiac	4	-1.7	-1.9	-1.8	-2 Page 23
Bay	7	-1.2	-1.2	-1.7	-2 Page 24
Ogemaw, Roscommon	5	-1.4	-1.4	-1.7	-1 Page 25
52nd District - Oakland County	11	-2.0	-1.7	-1.7	-1 Page 26
68th District - Flint	5	-1.4	-1.2	-1.6	-1 Page 28
Antrim, Grand Traverse, Leelanau	8	-1.6	-1.6	-1.5	-1 Page 29
Alpena, Montmorency	4	-1.6	-1.8	-1.4	-1 Page 30
Benzie, Manistee	4	-1.7	-1.8	-1.4	-1 Page 32
Clinton, Gratiot	6	-1.5	-1.7	-1.4	-1 Page 34
Crawford, Kalkaska, Otsego	6	-2.0	-2.0	-1.4	-1 Page 35
Delta	3	-1.2	-1.2	-1.3	-1 Page 37
Huron	3	-1.6	-1.6	-1.3	-1 Page 38
Lapeer	5	-1.1	-1.0	-1.3	-1 Page 39
Lake, Mason	4	-1.8	-1.7	-1.2	-1 Page 40
33rd District - Woodhaven	3	-1.2	-1.2	-1.2	-1 Page 42
Cheboygan, Presque Isle	4	-1.5	-1.6	-1.1	-1 Page 43
Missaukee, Wexford	4	-1.1	-1.2	-1.1	-1 Page 44
Newaygo, Oceana	5	-1.1	-1.3	-1.0	-1 Page 45
54A District - Lansing	5	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0	-1 Page 46
Calhoun	10	-0.9	-0.8	-0.9	-1 Page 47
Hillsdale	3	-0.7	-0.9	-0.9	-1 Page 48
Kalamazoo	15	-1.4	-2.2	-0.9	-1 Page 49
Chippewa	3	-1.1	-1.2	-0.8	-1 Page 51
Sanilac	3	-1.1	-1.1	-0.8	-1 Page 52
26th District - Ecorse, River Rouge*	2	-0.9	-1.1	-0.8	-2 Page 53
25th District - Lincoln Park*	2	-0.8	-0.8	-0.7	-1 Page 55
Shiawassee	4	-0.5	-0.6	-0.7	-1 Page 55
Van Buren	5	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7	-1 Page 56
48th District - Bloomfield Hills	3	-0.9	-0.7	-0.7	-1 Page 57
44th District - Royal Oak	2	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-1 Page 58
45A District - Berkley**	1	-0.7	-0.7	-0.6	-1 Page 59
45B District - Oak Park**	2	-0.6	-0.5	-0.5	-1 Page 59
Wayne	69	-3.6	-4.0	-0.1	-1 Page 61


Total: -45

* Consolidate 26th District (Ecorse, River Rouge) and 25th District (Lincoln Park) and reduce the judgeships from 4 to 2.

** Consolidate 45A District (Berkley) and 45B District (Oak Park) and reduce the judgeships from 3 to 2.

MAP OF JUDICIAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS

For reference purposes only, the numbers in the map reflect the judicial circuit numbers.



*Recommendation to consolidate courts.

PART I – TRIAL COURT JUDGESHIPS

Since 1988, the Legislature has added a net of 28 additional trial court judgeships and converted 13 part-time probate judgeships to full-time.¹ In 1988, the state had 542 full-time and 14 part-time judgeships. This year, the state has 585 full-time judgeships and 1 part-time judgeship.² This represents an increase in judicial resources of 6.3 percent.

Since 2003, new case filings have decreased by 15.5 percent in district court,³ 11.0 percent in the family division of circuit court, 8.6 percent in the circuit civil division, 5.4 percent in probate court, and 3.1 percent in the circuit criminal division.

If the Legislature enacts the recommended reductions of 45 trial court judgeships, there would be 7.7 percent fewer judgeships, for a savings to the state of approximately \$7 million each year.

Methodology

Any estimate of judicial workload and a community's need for judges is a complex and multidimensional process. Most states, including Michigan, consider both quantitative and qualitative factors. The process in Michigan involves two stages. The first stage utilizes a quantitative method, a weighted caseload formula, to estimate the number of judges needed in each court. During the second stage, the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) reviews additional factors, such as judges needing to travel long distances among court locations in a single large circuit. Other factors include specialty courts, trends in filings or population, and any other issue that may affect the need for judges. This is the extended analysis.

Concurrent jurisdiction plans permit more equitable assignment of cases among judges within a circuit, thereby allowing a judicial excess in one court to offset a need in another court. Because all trial courts within a judicial circuit can take advantage of concurrent jurisdiction plans under MCL 600.401 *et seq.*, and because circuit, probate, first-class district, and second-class district courts receive funding from the same county or counties, these courts were combined for analysis purposes.⁴ Third-class district courts, which receive funding from cities and townships, were analyzed independently. The SCAO has strongly encouraged and assisted courts in implementing these plans, and will continue to do so.

Weighted Caseload Formula: The weighted caseload formula is the preliminary quantitative method to identify a potential judicial need or excess in each court. In the formula, a weight for each case type accounts for varying amounts of judicial time required to handle an individual case. The case weight for a medical malpractice case, for example, is much greater than the case weight for a civil infraction. All case weights include postjudgment time. The case weights are applied to the average annual new case

¹ When these probate judgeships were converted to full-time positions, they were given district court jurisdiction (MCL 600.810a). In this report, the term "trial court" refers to circuit, probate, and district, but not municipal courts. Municipal judges are locally funded and all four are located in the Grosse Pointe area.

² Two of these 585 full-time judgeships were temporarily eliminated by the Legislature; one circuit judgeship in Oakland County is to be restored on January 1, 2015, and one circuit judgeship in Macomb County is to be restored on January 1, 2017.

³ District caseload excludes parking cases.

⁴ Because the 7th Probate Court District and the 90th District Court serve both Charlevoix and Emmet counties, the 33rd and 57th Circuit Courts were combined in this report. Although the 52nd District Court is a second-class district court, it was treated as a third-class district court and analyzed separately from the circuit and probate courts in Oakland County due to the severe imbalance in workload and the lack of a concurrent jurisdiction plan to offset the judicial need in the circuit and probate courts.

filings and the judicial proportion to generate an estimate of the total judicial time necessary to process the court's caseload. Judicial proportions reflect the percentage of the case weight workload that was handled by a judge, on average, as opposed to a referee, magistrate, or other quasi-judicial officer. The judicial proportions vary by court type and stratum and are provided in Appendix C. This calculation is divided by the judicial year, which is the average amount of time available to an individual judge each year for case-related activity.⁵ The result is an estimate of the number of judges required to process the court's caseload.

$$\text{Number of Judges Needed} = \frac{\text{Average Annual New Case Filings} \times \text{Case Weight} \times \text{Judicial Proportion}}{\text{Judicial Year}}$$

The weighted caseload formula distinguishes the varying degrees of effort involved in handling different case types at the trial court level, and is far more accurate than an analysis based on unweighted total case filings. The proportions of different case types may vary significantly between different court types⁶ and between different courts. The National Center for State Courts (NCSC)⁷ recommends a weighted caseload methodology above all other methods, such as a simple population analysis or an unweighted case filings analysis. In Michigan, the weighted caseload method has been used by the SCAO since 1998.

The weighted caseload formula was first developed by the Trial Court Assessment Commission (TCAC), which the Legislature created in 1996. The TCAC included representatives from the Court of Appeals, circuit courts, probate courts, district courts, State Bar of Michigan, Michigan House of Representatives, Michigan Senate, and local governments. In 1997, the TCAC conducted a time study for two months to measure the actual time judges spent on cases. The NCSC helped develop the weighted caseload formula.

In 2000, because of implementation of the family division and changes in circuit and district court jurisdiction, the Michigan Supreme Court directed the SCAO to update the weighted caseload formula through a study of the time required to process case types. The SCAO conducted a time study in September and October 2000 and used the resulting case weights for the 2001, 2003, and 2005 Judicial Resource Recommendations. The SCAO conducted another time study in September and October 2006 to update the case weights. The average of the case weights from the 2000 and 2006 time studies were used to generate the recommendations in the 2007 and 2009 Judicial Resources Recommendations reports.

In 2010, the SCAO established a Judicial Needs Assessment Committee (JNAC) comprised of judges, referees, magistrates, and court administrators; JNAC oversaw an extensive review of the weighted caseload methodology. The NCSC, which has extensive experience in workload studies and weighted caseload methods throughout the country and the world, was retained to conduct Michigan's review. The updated methodology is fully described in a technical report issued by the NCSC and presented by the

⁵ The judicial year is the amount of time the average judge has available each year to handle cases, excluding work-related travel, administration, education, vacations and holidays, etc. The judicial day for each court type and stratum is provided in Appendix C.

⁶ For example, a significant portion of district court caseload consists of traffic cases, making the total number of cases processed in district courts significantly higher than in either circuit or probate courts.

⁷ The National Center for State Courts, based in Williamsburg, Virginia, is a nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting the nation's state courts through research and technical assistance.

JNAC this year. The NCSC conducted a time study in October 2010 with all trial court judges and any quasi-judicial officer performing judicial functions. This was the first judicial time study in Michigan that involved every court in the state. Previous studies were based on data from a sample of trial courts. The NCSC also conducted on-site court visits, an online survey of judges, and a qualitative review process with experienced judges. The result was an extensive update of the weighted caseload methodology and the case weights.

History of Judicial Time Studies in Michigan

Time Study	Oversight & Research	Method of Selecting Courts	JRR Reports Issued
1997	TCAC, NCSC, and SCAO	Stratified Random Sample	2000
2000	SCAO	Stratified Random Sample	2001, 2003, 2005
2006	SCAO	Stratified Random Sample	2007, 2009
2010	JNAC, NCSC, and SCAO	All Trial Courts	2011

The policies, practices, and structure of trial courts change over time in response to public need, legislative demands, and funding issues. The SCAO is committed to periodically reviewing and updating its methods of assessing judicial need, as it has in the past to ensure valid results. This evolution, unfortunately, limits some comparisons between JRR reports when based on different time studies.

To ensure that short-term variations in new case filings do not unduly affect judicial resource need estimates, caseload data from the preceding three years (2008, 2009, and 2010) were used in the weighted caseload formula. The weighted caseload results for all courts are provided on pages 73 through 77.

Extended Analysis: Calculating judicial need is a complicated and multifaceted process. Both the TCAC and the JNAC advised that, before recommending an increase or reduction in judgeships, the SCAO should conduct an extended analysis of factors that affect a court's workload. During the most recent review, courts that appear to have excess judgeships were subject to an extended analysis.

The extended analysis considered additional quantitative and qualitative information for the specific court under review. During the extended analysis, the SCAO regional administrators met with each court. Questions focused on other case-related factors that affect judicial resources, court resources, and environmental factors in the court's jurisdiction. These questions are provided on pages 79 and 80.

In 2011, during the extended analysis, the SCAO took into account the constitutional requirements for at least one judgeship for each judicial circuit and at least one judgeship for each probate court or probate court district. The SCAO considered the possibility of consolidating third-class district courts, particularly where such consolidation would result in additional judicial savings.

Other extended analysis factors:

- Travel time for judges whose jurisdiction covers a large geographic area, as in the Upper Peninsula.
- A court’s technological resources, including whether the court has videoconferencing technology and sufficient bandwidth to use it.
- Local prosecutors’ plea-bargaining practices, particularly in counties where those practices result in a greater proportion of cases going to trial requiring a verdict from the judge or a jury.
- Local law enforcement’s current and projected practices and their impact on case filings.
- Whether the court operates a “specialty court” program, such as DWI courts, drug treatment courts, mental health courts, and veterans treatment courts. The SCAO reviewed the number of active participants in each specialty court.
- Filing trends from 2003 to 2010 and population trends from 1990 to 2010. These may indicate an upswing in case filings in the near future.
- The local economic climate of each court jurisdiction, particularly projected growth in business, industry, prisons, or other areas.

Savings Gained by Eliminating a Judgeship

The current method of trial court funding in Michigan requires counties and local municipalities to bear a significant share of the cost of trial court operations. The state pays the cost of judges’ salaries.

State Costs: The state is responsible for the judge’s salary, a retirement contribution up to 7 percent, and the employer portion of FICA taxes (OASI and Medicare), which is \$8,650 for a circuit or probate judge and \$8,627 for a district judge. The salary for a circuit or probate judge is \$139,919; the salary for a district judge is \$138,272. The annual total state cost of a judgeship ranges from \$158,364 for a circuit or probate judge to \$156,578 for a district judge.

The SCAO recommends that 45 trial court judgeships be eliminated by attrition. If the Legislature enacts these recommendations, the state will eventually realize long-term savings of over \$7 million each year. The net savings would be substantially less if some or all of the 31 needed judgeships were added. The following table provides the estimated savings to the state.

Estimated State Savings

SCAO Recommendations for Elimination	State Savings	
	Average Per Judge	Total
45	157,471	7,086,195

Local Costs: Significant local costs are associated with a judgeship, such as judges’ fringe benefits; salaries and fringe benefits of court personnel (i.e., clerk, court reporter, bailiff, legal assistants); computer hardware, software, and other equipment for court personnel; and courtrooms, jury rooms, and judges’ chambers. Because local funding, particularly staffing for the courts, varies greatly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, it is difficult to determine the amount that a funding unit would save through the elimination of a specific judgeship.

Courts with a Judicial Need

There are eight counties and three third-class district courts where the updated JNAC methodology indicates a judicial need of 0.7 or more. These courts asked the SCAO to defer consideration of additional judgeships due to the fiscal difficulties of both the state and local funding units. As such, the SCAO is not recommending additional judgeships at this time. The SCAO is committed to assisting all trial courts, particularly courts with a judicial need, in serving the public and preventing backlogs.

Counties with First- and Second-Class District Courts	Current Judgeships	Judicial Need
Macomb County	17	+6.8
Oakland County	34	+6.5
Kent County	16	+4.1
Genesee County	17	+3.0
Washtenaw County	10	+1.0
Livingston County	6	+0.9
Ottawa County	9	+0.8
Muskegon County	10	<u>+0.7</u>
Subtotal		+23.8
Third-Class District Courts	Current Judgeships	Judicial Need
36th District Court – Detroit	31	+5.1
18th District Court – Westland	2	+1.3
37th District Court – Warren, Center Line	4	<u>+0.7</u>
Subtotal		<u>+7.1</u>
Total		<u>+30.9</u>

One of the 17 judgeships in Macomb County was temporarily eliminated by the Legislature and will be restored on January 1, 2017. One of the 34 judgeships in Oakland County was temporarily eliminated by the Legislature and will be restored on January 1, 2015. When these are restored and filled by election, the circuit, probate, and second-class district courts in each county will likely continue to have a combined judicial need, unless there is a significant reduction in case filings.

In some counties, a concurrent jurisdiction plan could offset the judicial need. For example, in Oakland County, the judicial excess in the 52nd District Court could offset the judicial need in the circuit and probate courts. These plans should also result in savings to the state, counties, and municipalities by increasing the courts' efficiency. The SCAO strongly encourages courts in general, and those with judicial need in particular, to adopt concurrent jurisdiction plans.

Extended Analyses

Dickinson, Iron, and Menominee Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 3.7 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from seven to five.

Current Judgeships	7
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	5

The 41st Circuit Court encompasses Dickinson, Iron, and Menominee counties. There are seven judges: two circuit judges, three probate judges, and two district judges. In March 2005, the part-time probate judgeship in Iron County was converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2003, the SCAO recommended that the part-time probate judgeship in Iron County be converted to full-time with district court jurisdiction, and a circuit judgeship be eliminated through attrition. Although the Legislature converted the probate judgeship to full-time with district court jurisdiction, the Legislature did not eliminate a circuit court judgeship.

In 2005, the SCAO recommended the elimination of one circuit judgeship through attrition.

In 2007, the SCAO and the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of two district judgeships through attrition and that the probate judges in Dickinson and Menominee counties be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one circuit judgeship and one district judgeship. The SCAO also recommended that the 95A District Court be reconstituted to include Dickinson and Menominee counties and that the 95B District Court be reconstituted to include only Iron County. Because the Iron County probate judge already has district court jurisdiction, the SCAO recommended that the reconstituted 95B District Court not have an elected district judge. As an alternative to eliminating a circuit judgeship, the SCAO stated that the counties could create a probate court district of Dickinson and Menominee counties, which would result in the reduction through attrition of one probate judgeship.

The Legislature did not enact any of these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 3.6 and 3.8, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 3.3 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-3.6	-2 by attrition
2009	-3.8	-2 by attrition
2011	-3.3	-2 by attrition

The combined populations of Dickinson, Iron, and Menominee counties increased by 1.6 percent between 1990 and 2000; it decreased by 5.9 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	64,926
2000	65,936
2010	62,014

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings⁸ decreased by 30.3 percent, from 16,987 to 11,848.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	29	321	234	1,540	374	14,489	16,987
2004	37	345	182	1,515	384	13,552	16,015
2005	30	403	181	1,518	392	12,091	14,615
2006	22	390	129	1,420	448	12,351	14,760
2007	19	383	159	1,433	410	12,382	14,786
2008	19	414	144	1,326	367	10,727	12,997
2009	19	388	136	1,283	356	9,871	12,053
2010	20	295	180	1,220	430	9,703	11,848

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

⁸ In every case filing chart in this report, case types UF, UI, UM, UN, UT, UW, and JG are excluded from the family division totals and parking is excluded from the district totals.

Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, and Oscoda Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 4.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from seven to five.

Current Judgeships	7
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	5

The 23rd Circuit Court encompasses Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, and Oscoda counties. There are seven judges: two circuit judges, four probate judges, and one district judge. In March 2003, the part-time probate judgeship in Arenac was converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction. In January 2007, the part-time probate judgeships in Alcona and Oscoda were converted to full-time judgeships with district court jurisdiction.

In 2007, the SCAO recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Iosco County be given district court jurisdiction. In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one circuit judgeship and one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Iosco County be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship and that the probate judge in Iosco County be given district court jurisdiction. Additionally, the SCAO recommended that the counties create a probate court district of Alcona and Oscoda counties, which would result in the reduction through attrition of one probate judgeship.⁹ The SCAO also recommended that separate district courts be created for each county or probate court district.

The Legislature did not enact any of these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 3.3 and 3.5, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 2.7 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-3.3	-1 by attrition	-1 by attrition
2009	-3.5	-2 by attrition	
2011	-2.7	-2 by attrition	

The combined populations of Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, and Oscoda counties increased by 4.1 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 6.7 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	63,127
2000	65,745
2010	61,368

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

⁹ MCL 600.808.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 27.1 percent, from 22,302 to 16,260.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	23	359	207	1,453	606	19,654	22,302
2004	25	416	219	1,481	619	15,855	18,615
2005	23	388	207	1,257	535	15,094	17,504
2006	15	349	217	1,303	490	14,617	16,991
2007	22	380	217	1,136	502	14,480	16,737
2008	27	404	216	1,153	479	14,130	16,409
2009	19	324	188	1,144	540	13,065	15,280
2010	26	339	209	1,224	523	13,939	16,260

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Alger, Luce, Mackinac, and Schoolcraft Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four. While the JNAC methodology indicates that the courts in these counties can operate with fewer than four judges, the SCAO is not recommending a greater reduction due to the large geographical area served by these courts.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 11th Circuit Court encompasses Alger, Luce, Mackinac, and Schoolcraft counties. There are five judges; one circuit judge, two probate judges, and two district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 2.8 and 3.0, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 2.7 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-2.8	No change
2009	-3.0	No change
2011	-2.7	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Alger, Luce, Mackinac, and Schoolcraft counties increased by 11.9 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 5.0 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	33,711
2000	37,732
2010	35,830

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 37.9 percent, from 15,874 to 9,863.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	28	178	129	745	317	14,477	15,874
2004	28	212	118	761	277	12,088	13,484
2005	32	250	133	843	248	13,872	15,378
2006	25	202	128	708	194	11,181	12,438
2007	20	183	122	688	229	10,550	11,792
2008	30	177	123	645	211	9,793	10,979
2009	22	192	124	621	214	8,303	9,476
2010	21	227	101	666	232	8,616	9,863

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Gogebic and Ontonagon Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 1.4 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three. The constitutional requirement for a probate judge in each county or probate district and a circuit judge in each circuit prevents a larger reduction of judgeships unless the counties create a probate court district.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 32nd Circuit Court encompasses Gogebic and Ontonagon counties. There are four judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and one district judge. In March 2005, the part-time probate judgeship in Ontonagon County was converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2003, the SCAO recommended that the part-time probate judgeship in Ontonagon County be converted to full-time with district court jurisdiction upon elimination of the district judgeship by attrition, if Gogebic and Ontonagon counties did not form a probate court district. The counties did not form a probate court district and the Legislature converted the Ontonagon County probate judgeship to full-time with district court jurisdiction. However, the Legislature did not eliminate the district judgeship.

In 2007, the SCAO and the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Gogebic County be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship. The SCAO also recommended that the probate judge in Gogebic County be given district court jurisdiction. Additionally, the SCAO recommended that two district courts be created, one for Gogebic County and one for Ontonagon County. As an alternative to eliminating a district judgeship and creating two separate district courts, the SCAO stated that the counties could create a probate court district of Gogebic and Ontonagon counties, which would result in the reduction through attrition of one probate judgeship.¹⁰

The Legislature did not enact any of these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 2.7. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 2.6 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-2.7	-1 by attrition
2009	-2.7	-1 by attrition
2011	-2.6	-1 by attrition

¹⁰ MCL 600.808.

The combined populations of Gogebic and Ontonagon counties decreased by 6.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 7.9 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	26,906
2000	25,188
2010	23,207

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 34.3 percent, from 7,015 to 4,607.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	18	117	77	621	175	6,007	7,015
2004	14	121	69	562	211	5,615	6,592
2005	8	93	65	649	157	5,121	6,093
2006	12	119	67	496	184	5,346	6,224
2007	15	116	58	554	202	4,970	5,915
2008	22	119	62	444	204	3,798	4,649
2009	10	79	52	396	152	3,893	4,582
2010	14	90	44	418	167	3,874	4,607

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Baraga, Houghton, and Keweenaw Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.0 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from 4.5 to 3.5. The constitutional requirement for a probate judge in each county or probate district and a circuit judge in each circuit prevents a larger reduction of judgeships unless the counties create a probate court district.

Current Judgeships	4.5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3.5

The 12th Circuit Court encompasses Baraga, Houghton, and Keweenaw counties. There are four full-time judges and one part-time judge: one circuit judge, two full-time probate judges, one part-time probate judge (Keweenaw County), and one district judge. In January 2007, the part-time probate judgeship in Baraga County was converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2003, the SCAO recommended that the part-time probate judgeships in Baraga and Keweenaw counties be converted to full-time with district court jurisdiction upon elimination of the district judgeship by attrition, if Houghton and Keweenaw counties did not form a probate court district. The counties did not form a probate court district and the Legislature converted the Baraga County probate judgeship to full-time with district court jurisdiction. However, the Legislature did not eliminate the district judgeship.

In 2007, the SCAO and the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judges in Houghton and Keweenaw counties be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship. The SCAO also recommended that the probate judges in Houghton and Keweenaw counties be given district court jurisdiction and that two district courts be created, one for Baraga County and one for Houghton and Keweenaw counties. As an alternative to eliminating the district judgeship and creating separate district courts, the SCAO stated that the counties could create a probate court district of Houghton and Keweenaw counties, which would result in the reduction through attrition of one part-time probate judgeship.¹¹

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 2.4 and 2.5, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 2.5 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-2.4	-1 by attrition
2009	-2.5	-1 by attrition
2011	-2.5	-1 by attrition

¹¹ MCL 600.808.

The combined populations of Baraga, Houghton, and Keweenaw counties increased by 4.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 1.2 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	45,101
2000	47,063
2010	47,644

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 19.3 percent, from 8,128 to 6,562.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	25	90	86	654	304	6,969	8,128
2004	14	131	83	667	294	6,191	7,380
2005	15	176	75	591	319	6,122	7,298
2006	23	149	75	594	268	5,689	6,798
2007	18	128	87	591	264	5,751	6,839
2008	13	137	79	520	259	5,072	6,080
2009	13	127	71	449	283	5,285	6,228
2010	21	139	101	477	269	5,555	6,562

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Marquette County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 2.8 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to three.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 25th Circuit Court encompasses Marquette County. There are five judges: two circuit judges, one probate judge, and two district judges.

In 2005, the weighted caseload results indicated a combined excess of 2.1 judges for Marquette County. At that time, the SCAO did not recommend a change in the number of judgeships because a rapid decline in case filings and a historic decline in county population supported the assertion that Marquette County may need to be assigned to a different category of courts in the weighted caseload formula. In 2006, the SCAO reviewed the court categories and Marquette County was appropriately reclassified.

In 2007, the SCAO and the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one circuit judgeship through attrition.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one circuit judgeship or one district judgeship.

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 2.4 and 2.3, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 2.2 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-2.4	-1 by attrition
2009	-2.3	-1 by attrition
2011	-2.2	-2 by attrition

The population of Marquette County decreased by 8.8 percent between 1990 and 2000 and increased by 3.8 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	70,887
2000	64,634
2010	67,077

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 15.5 percent, from 17,356 to 14,668.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	26	160	216	1,180	344	15,430	17,356
2004	34	218	156	1,045	305	13,468	15,226
2005	41	193	176	1,133	357	13,195	15,095
2006	33	212	150	1,128	336	13,512	15,371
2007	37	217	179	1,120	280	13,520	15,353
2008	40	204	168	1,052	280	13,718	15,462
2009	43	241	180	1,013	357	12,925	14,759
2010	42	228	184	1,037	334	12,843	14,668

Additional case filing detail is available within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Midland County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 3.2 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to three.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 42nd Circuit Court encompasses Midland County. There are five judges: two circuit judges, one probate judge, and two district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.4 and 1.5, respectively. On June 15, 2011, the JNAC approved a new methodology for calculating judicial need. The results indicate an excess of 1.8 judges

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.4	No change
2009	-1.5	No change
2011	-1.8	-2 by attrition

The population of Midland County increased by 9.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 0.9 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	75,651
2000	82,874
2010	83,629

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 38.4 percent, from 26,034 to 16,032.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	30	455	338	1,631	381	23,199	26,034
2004	20	384	190	1,575	444	19,542	22,155
2005	20	429	181	1,379	431	18,694	21,134
2006	14	385	281	1,388	406	17,793	20,267
2007	18	523	201	1,356	412	15,621	18,131
2008	20	397	181	1,405	473	15,746	18,222
2009	13	330	199	1,146	465	15,018	17,171
2010	16	372	180	1,210	481	13,773	16,032

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

50th District Court – City of Pontiac

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 2.2 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to two.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 50th District Court is a third-class district court in Oakland County serving the city of Pontiac. There are four judges serving this district court.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one judgeship.

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.7 and 1.9, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.8 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-1.7	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-1.9	-1 by attrition	
2011	-1.8	-2 by attrition	

The population of the city of Pontiac decreased by 6.8 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 10.3 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	71,166
2000	66,337
2010	59,515

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings decreased by 27.3 percent, from 28,725 to 20,869.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	28,725
2004	29,581
2005	21,961
2006	22,358
2007	20,330
2008	21,529
2009	23,102
2010	20,869

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Bay County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 5.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from seven to five.

Current Judgeships	7
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	5

The 18th Circuit Court encompasses Bay County. There are seven judges: three circuit judges, one probate judge, and three district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.2. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.7 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.2	No change
2009	-1.2	No change
2011	-1.7	-2 by attrition

The population of Bay County decreased by 1.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 2.2 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	111,723
2000	110,157
2010	107,771

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 18.6 percent, from 30,828 to 25,090.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	49	646	321	2,162	735	26,915	30,828
2004	44	668	321	2,282	687	23,099	27,101
2005	33	686	287	2,147	712	23,409	27,274
2006	30	899	320	2,146	759	27,035	31,189
2007	34	792	325	2,152	715	25,569	29,587
2008	37	796	302	1,896	705	23,157	26,893
2009	48	770	313	1,931	737	22,530	26,329
2010	53	795	333	1,987	792	21,130	25,090

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Ogemaw and Roscommon Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 3.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 34th Circuit Court encompasses Ogemaw and Roscommon counties. There are five judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and two district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.4. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.7 judges

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.4	No change
2009	-1.4	No change
2011	-1.7	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Ogemaw and Roscommon counties increased by 22.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 2.1 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	38,457
2000	47,114
2010	46,148

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings increased by 14.9 percent, from 21,849 to 25,108.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	15	361	311	1,327	401	19,434	21,849
2004	12	369	209	1,234	410	20,976	23,210
2005	36	495	225	1,172	469	23,697	26,094
2006	28	384	213	1,196	447	22,956	25,224
2007	23	537	191	1,073	478	22,291	24,593
2008	44	417	203	1,148	454	21,876	24,142
2009	27	460	211	1,043	448	20,300	22,489
2010	33	429	172	1,191	448	22,835	25,108

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

52nd District Court – County of Oakland

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 9.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from 11 to 10.

There is a combined judicial need in the 6th Circuit Court of Oakland County and the Oakland County Probate Court of 8.1 more judges. The 52nd District Court should consider entering into a concurrent jurisdiction plan with one or both of these other two county-funded courts to help offset this judicial need. If the district court continues to limit its workload to only district cases, the SCAO is likely to recommend in its 2013 Judicial Resources Recommendations report a reduction of one more judgeship in this district court.

Current Judgeships	11
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	10

The 52nd District Court is a second-class district court in the county of Oakland.¹² There are 11 judges serving this district court.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 2.0 and 1.7, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.7 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-2.0	No change
2009	-1.7	No change
2011	-1.7	-1 by attrition

The population within the jurisdiction of the 52nd District Court increased by 22.9 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 7.6 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	430,527
2000	529,135
2010	569,176

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

¹² The 52nd District Court includes the entire County of Oakland except for the cities of Madison Heights, Ferndale, Hazel Park, Royal Oak, Berkley, Huntington Woods, Oak Park, Pleasant Ridge, Southfield, Lathrup Village, Farmington, Farmington Hills, Northville, Sylvan Lake, Keego Harbor, Orchard Lake Village, Birmingham, Bloomfield Hills, and Pontiac and the townships of Royal Oak, Southfield, West Bloomfield, Bloomfield, and Waterford.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings decreased by 17.4 percent, from 159,700 to 131,879.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	159,700
2004	155,913
2005	164,609
2006	157,273
2007	150,159
2008	142,654
2009	138,652
2010	131,879

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

68th District Court – City of Flint

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 3.4 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 68th District Court is a third-class district court in Genesee County serving the city of Flint. There are five judges serving this district court.

In 2005, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one judgeship.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the reduction through attrition of one judgeship.

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.4 and 1.2, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.6 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-1.4	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-1.2	No change	
2011	-1.6	-1 by attrition	

The population of the city of Flint decreased by 11.2 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 18.0 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	140,761
2000	124,943
2010	102,434

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings decreased by 51.3 percent, from 47,801 to 23,268.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	47,801
2004	44,071
2005	44,635
2006	47,083
2007	52,609
2008	40,129
2009	29,496
2010	23,268

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Antrim, Grand Traverse, and Leelanau Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 6.5 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from eight to seven.

Current Judgeships	8
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	7

The 13th Circuit Court encompasses Antrim, Grand Traverse, and Leelanau counties. There are eight judges: two circuit judges, three probate judges, and three district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.6. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.5 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.6	No change
2009	-1.6	No change
2011	-1.5	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Antrim, Grand Traverse, and Leelanau counties increased by 23.1 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 8.5 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	98,985
2000	121,883
2010	132,274

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 18.8 percent, from 35,255 to 28,611.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	71	489	475	2,586	823	30,811	35,255
2004	84	479	495	2,344	757	29,000	33,159
2005	86	453	499	2,246	803	30,686	34,773
2006	72	447	512	2,425	865	32,142	36,463
2007	58	364	574	2,401	867	30,856	35,120
2008	68	365	514	2,452	792	27,377	31,568
2009	55	367	600	2,363	722	26,137	30,244
2010	57	329	529	2,081	821	24,794	28,611

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Alpena and Montmorency Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.6 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 26th Circuit Court encompasses Alpena and Montmorency counties. There are four judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and one district judge. In January 2007, the part-time probate judgeship in Montmorency County converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Alpena County be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship. The SCAO also recommended that the probate judge in Alpena County be given district court jurisdiction. Additionally, the SCAO recommended that two district courts be created, one for Alpena County and one for Montmorency County. As an alternative to eliminating a district judgeship and creating two separate district courts, the SCAO stated that the counties could create a probate court district of Alpena and Montmorency counties, which would result in the reduction through attrition of one probate judgeship.¹³

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.6 and 1.8, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.4 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-1.6	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-1.8	-1 by attrition	
2011	-1.4	-1 by attrition	

The combined populations of Alpena and Montmorency counties increased by 5.3 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 5.4 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	39,541
2000	41,629
2010	39,363

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

¹³ MCL 600.808.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 33.4 percent, from 12,215 to 8,135.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	9	287	135	945	413	10,426	12,215
2004	11	247	96	908	406	7,824	9,492
2005	24	300	128	826	401	8,246	9,925
2006	14	256	89	738	353	7,659	9,109
2007	19	212	113	765	322	7,381	8,812
2008	25	255	99	750	336	7,065	8,530
2009	25	266	114	774	306	7,596	9,081
2010	34	267	129	703	341	6,661	8,135

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Benzie and Manistee Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.6 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 19th Circuit Court encompasses Benzie and Manistee counties. There are four judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and one district judge. The district judgeship is currently vacant. In January 2007, the part-time probate judgeship in Benzie County was converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Manistee County be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship. The SCAO also recommended that the probate judge in Manistee County be given district court jurisdiction. Additionally, the SCAO recommended that two district courts be created, one for Benzie County and one for Manistee County. As an alternative to eliminating a district judgeship and creating two separate district courts, the SCAO stated that the counties could create a probate court district of Benzie and Manistee counties, which would result in the reduction through attrition of one probate judgeship.¹⁴

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.7 and 1.8, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.4 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-1.7	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-1.8	-1 by attrition	
2011	-1.4	-1 by attrition	

The combined populations of Benzie and Manistee counties increased by 21.1 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 4.3 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	33,465
2000	40,525
2010	42,258

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

¹⁴ MCL 600.808.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 16.6 percent, from 10,810 to 9,011.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	25	125	128	951	327	9,254	10,810
2004	36	159	116	830	287	9,601	11,029
2005	29	164	116	845	311	9,401	10,866
2006	34	130	120	909	309	9,066	10,568
2007	19	141	118	802	285	10,511	11,876
2008	30	104	131	751	300	8,037	9,353
2009	31	132	129	814	307	7,705	9,118
2010	44	123	112	735	282	7,715	9,011

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Clinton and Gratiot Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 4.6 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from six to five.

Current Judgeships	6
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	5

The 29th Circuit Court encompasses Clinton and Gratiot counties. There are six judges: two circuit judges, two probate judges, and two district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.5 and 1.7, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.4 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.5	No change
2009	-1.7	No change
2011	-1.4	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Clinton and Gratiot counties increased by 10.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 10.1 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	96,865
2000	107,038
2010	117,858

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 11.5 percent, from 48,058 to 42,555.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	36	372	205	1,801	583	45,061	48,058
2004	40	373	207	1,814	561	41,462	44,457
2005	35	461	203	1,929	521	39,629	42,778
2006	42	428	216	1,702	501	41,445	44,334
2007	24	317	237	1,769	565	43,061	45,973
2008	24	354	227	1,601	553	39,876	42,635
2009	31	381	244	1,601	559	39,351	42,167
2010	52	381	207	1,557	582	39,776	42,555

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Crawford, Kalkaska, and Otsego Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 4.6 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from six to five.

Current Judgeships	6
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	5

The 46th Circuit Court encompasses Crawford, Kalkaska, and Otsego counties. There are six judges: two circuit judges, three probate judges, and one district judge. In 2003, the part-time probate judgeships in Crawford and Kalkaska counties were converted to full-time judgeships with district court jurisdiction. In 2009, the district court was separated into three one-county courts.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Otsego County be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one circuit judgeship.

The Legislature did not enact any of these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 2.0. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.4 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-2.0	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-2.0	-1 by attrition	
2011	-1.4	-1 by attrition	

The combined populations of Crawford, Kalkaska, and Otsego counties increased by 23.9 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 2.3 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	43,714
2000	54,145
2010	55,391

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 20.3 percent, from 23,515 to 18,746.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	17	371	265	1,556	458	20,848	23,515
2004	14	391	252	1,385	439	19,564	22,045
2005	20	434	231	1,393	413	19,631	22,122
2006	14	522	239	1,402	439	20,934	23,550
2007	22	503	226	1,437	383	17,524	20,095
2008	21	389	188	1,348	497	15,170	17,613
2009	13	457	177	1,236	431	17,071	19,385
2010	15	446	225	1,206	481	16,373	18,746

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Delta County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 1.7 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from 3 to 2.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 47th Circuit Court encompasses Delta County. There are three judges: one circuit judge, one probate judge, and one district judge.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.2. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.3 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.2	No change
2009	-1.2	No change
2011	-1.3	-1 by attrition

The population of Delta County increased by 2.0 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 3.8 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	37,780
2000	38,520
2010	37,069

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 12 percent, from 10,492 to 9,233.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	19	280	119	784	189	9,101	10,492
2004	15	154	99	721	175	7,545	8,709
2005	10	177	106	868	188	8,690	10,039
2006	16	178	86	865	165	9,070	10,380
2007	12	156	83	801	164	7,899	9,115
2008	12	192	94	726	158	7,711	8,893
2009	16	159	93	644	180	7,176	8,268
2010	21	147	80	616	165	8,204	9,233

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Huron County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 1.7 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 52nd Circuit Court encompasses Huron County. There are three judges: one circuit judge, one probate judge, and one district judge.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.6. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.3 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.6	No change
2009	-1.6	No change
2011	-1.3	-1 by attrition

The population of Huron County increased by 3.2 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 8.2 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	34,951
2000	36,079
2010	33,118

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 22.7 percent, from 8,055 to 6,229.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	13	64	77	450	390	7,061	8,055
2004	13	54	63	407	400	6,872	7,809
2005	11	72	76	380	318	6,722	7,579
2006	11	70	103	397	394	5,900	6,875
2007	9	66	73	415	394	6,312	7,269
2008	9	56	90	360	356	5,308	6,179
2009	12	133	76	341	455	5,065	6,082
2010	17	116	88	353	370	5,285	6,229

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Lapeer County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 3.7 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 40th Circuit Court encompasses Lapeer County. There are five judges: two circuit judges, one probate judge, and two district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.1 and 1.0, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.3 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.1	No change
2009	-1.0	No change
2011	-1.3	-1 by attrition

The population of Lapeer County increased by 17.6 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 0.5 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	74,768
2000	87,904
2010	88,319

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 17 percent, from 19,540 to 16,225.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	61	338	281	1,652	409	16,799	19,540
2004	51	328	326	1,562	379	15,634	18,280
2005	70	315	324	1,489	414	15,478	18,090
2006	48	391	334	1,527	396	16,465	19,161
2007	50	392	318	1,455	407	16,362	18,984
2008	65	376	313	1,347	384	16,843	19,328
2009	54	387	316	1,316	370	15,741	18,184
2010	59	331	285	1,279	343	13,928	16,225

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Lake and Mason Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.8 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 51st Circuit Court encompasses Lake and Mason counties. There are four judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and one district judge. In March 2003, the part-time probate judgeship in Lake County was converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition and that the probate judge in Mason County be given district court jurisdiction.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship. The SCAO also recommended that the probate judge in Mason County be given district court jurisdiction.

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.8 and 1.7, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.2 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-1.8	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-1.7	-1 by attrition	
2011	-1.2	-1 by attrition	

The combined populations of Lake and Mason counties increased by 16.1 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 1.6 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	34,120
2000	39,607
2010	40,244

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 30.7 percent, from 12,250 to 8,489.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	22	314	126	919	289	10,580	12,250
2004	8	285	130	926	265	9,302	10,916
2005	9	280	116	1,032	275	8,459	10,171
2006	12	257	105	922	289	7,873	9,458
2007	10	274	135	1,026	319	7,964	9,728
2008	12	279	105	897	286	8,272	9,851
2009	11	236	106	886	291	7,339	8,869
2010	11	219	101	937	287	6,934	8,489

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

33rd District Court – City of Woodhaven, et al.

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 1.8 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 33rd District Court is a third-class district court within Wayne County serving the cities of Woodhaven, Trenton, Gibraltar, Rockwood, and Flat Rock, and the townships of Brownstown and Grosse Ile.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.2. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.2 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.2	No change
2009	-1.2	No change
2011	-1.2	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of the cities of Woodhaven, Trenton, Gibraltar, Rockwood, Flat Rock, and the townships of Brownstown and Grosse Ile increased by 15.3 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 4.0 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	75,537
2000	87,077
2010	90,549

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings decreased by 12.4 percent, from 24,361 to 21,343.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	24,361
2004	28,926
2005	29,847
2006	28,231
2007	26,030
2008	24,843
2009	21,168
2010	21,343

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Cheboygan and Presque Isle Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.9 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 53rd Circuit Court encompasses Cheboygan and Presque Isle counties. There are four judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and one district judge. In January 2007, the part-time probate judgeship in Presque Isle County converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.5 and 1.6, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.1 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.5	No change
2009	-1.6	No change
2011	-1.1	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Cheboygan and Presque Isle counties increased by 16.3 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 3.3 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	35,141
2000	40,859
2010	39,528

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 31.8 percent, from 12,567 to 8,573.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	38	265	163	869	288	10,944	12,567
2004	27	293	168	844	284	9,578	11,194
2005	27	294	175	877	315	9,027	10,715
2006	25	311	159	827	298	8,825	10,445
2007	19	299	170	749	233	8,043	9,513
2008	11	239	163	787	287	6,965	8,452
2009	13	274	129	714	270	7,506	8,906
2010	21	257	142	686	265	7,202	8,573

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Missaukee and Wexford Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 2.9 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 28th Circuit Court encompasses Missaukee and Wexford counties. There are four judges: one circuit judge, two probate judges, and one district judge. In January 2007, the part-time probate judgeship in Missaukee County converted to a full-time judgeship with district court jurisdiction.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.1 and 1.2, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has an excess of 1.1 judges.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.1	No change
2009	-1.2	No change
2011	-1.1	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Missaukee and Wexford counties increased by 16.8 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 5.8 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	38,507
2000	44,962
2010	47,584

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 10.9 percent, from 12,794 to 11,394.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	12	365	163	1,069	369	10,816	12,794
2004	14	379	152	1,069	333	11,462	13,409
2005	20	332	138	1,026	304	11,983	13,803
2006	8	334	140	1,111	352	11,832	13,777
2007	6	358	139	1,020	339	10,663	12,525
2008	10	315	132	1,038	303	10,877	12,675
2009	15	299	136	1,033	306	9,472	11,261
2010	10	331	131	1,030	389	9,503	11,394

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Newaygo and Oceana Counties

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in these counties can operate with 4.0 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 27th Circuit Court encompasses Newaygo and Oceana counties. There are five judges: two circuit judges, two probate judges, and one district judge.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.1 and 1.3, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 1.0.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.1	No change
2009	-1.3	No change
2011	-1.0	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of Newaygo and Oceana counties increased by 23.2 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 0.4 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	60,656
2000	74,747
2010	75,030

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 17.3 percent, from 19,844 to 16,416.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	21	466	275	2,042	428	16,612	19,844
2004	27	427	210	1,964	463	14,170	17,261
2005	26	353	202	1,887	592	15,356	18,416
2006	23	372	170	1,843	483	13,788	16,679
2007	27	310	238	1,682	442	14,137	16,836
2008	27	323	170	1,761	515	14,164	16,960
2009	27	346	221	1,495	539	14,993	17,621
2010	17	333	189	1,625	520	13,732	16,416

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

54A District Court – City of Lansing

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 4.0 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 54A District Court is a third-class district court within Ingham County serving the city of Lansing. There are five judges in this district court.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.1. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 1.0.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.1	No change
2009	-1.1	No change
2011	-1.0	-1 by attrition

The population of the city of Lansing decreased by 6.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 4.1 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	127,321
2000	119,128
2010	114,297

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings decreased by 39.6 percent, from 57,842 to 34,944.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	57,842
2004	49,334
2005	52,696
2006	54,948
2007	47,573
2008	45,929
2009	42,460
2010	34,944

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Calhoun County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 9.1 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from ten to nine.

Current Judgeships	10
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	9

The 37th Circuit Court encompasses Calhoun County. There are ten judges: four circuit judges, two probate judges, and four district judges. A probate judgeship in Calhoun County is currently vacant.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.9 and 0.8, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.9.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.9	No change
2009	-0.8	No change
2011	-0.9	-1 by attrition

The population of Calhoun County increased by 1.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 1.3 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	135,982
2000	137,985
2010	136,146

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 8.1 percent, from 58,849 to 54,090.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	38	1,346	477	3,498	1,561	51,929	58,849
2004	41	1,239	379	3,753	1,288	49,055	55,755
2005	56	1,258	377	3,921	1,145	60,391	67,148
2006	54	1,186	411	3,852	1,165	52,270	58,938
2007	41	1,079	498	3,985	1,149	51,324	58,076
2008	44	1,096	467	3,682	1,176	49,350	55,815
2009	33	994	369	3,530	1,192	50,324	56,442
2010	28	949	334	3,427	1,188	48,164	54,090

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Hillsdale County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 2.1 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 1st Circuit Court encompasses Hillsdale County. There are three judges: one circuit judge, one probate judge, and one district judge.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.7 and 0.9, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.9.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.7	No change
2009	-0.9	No change
2011	-0.9	-1 by attrition

The population of Hillsdale County increased by 7.1 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 0.3 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	43,431
2000	46,527
2010	46,688

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 24.6 percent, from 13,082 to 9,861.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	8	138	121	1,103	273	11,439	13,082
2004	6	155	124	960	292	10,932	12,469
2005	13	363	113	1,016	279	10,764	12,548
2006	8	172	102	1,002	218	11,113	12,615
2007	10	143	115	976	238	10,587	12,069
2008	10	165	114	930	260	9,313	10,792
2009	9	139	101	962	241	9,465	10,917
2010	4	142	112	959	205	8,439	9,861

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Kalamazoo County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 14.1 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from 15 to 14.

Current Judgeships	15
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	14

The 9th Circuit Court encompasses Kalamazoo County. There are 15 judges: 5 circuit judges, 3 probate judges, and 7 district judges.

In 2003, the SCAO recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition.

In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court recommended the elimination of one district judgeship through attrition.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of one district judgeship.

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.4 and 2.2, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.9.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Michigan Supreme Court Additional Recommendations
2007	-1.4	No change	-1 by attrition
2009	-2.2	-1 by attrition	
2011	-0.9	-1 by attrition	

The population of Kalamazoo County increased by 6.9 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 4.9 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	223,411
2000	238,603
2010	250,331

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 16.9 percent, from 88,557 to 73,634.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	72	1,591	620	6,002	976	79,296	88,557
2004	82	1,914	621	6,201	1,024	80,608	90,450
2005	58	2,131	547	5,425	994	82,326	91,481
2006	55	2,051	638	5,831	940	79,257	88,772
2007	77	1,782	609	5,363	965	80,670	89,466
2008	56	1,827	691	6,028	973	73,210	82,785
2009	57	1,910	632	5,993	980	67,143	76,715
2010	69	2,053	642	5,886	950	64,034	73,634

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Chippewa County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 2.2 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 50th Circuit Court encompasses Chippewa County. There are three judges: one circuit judge, one probate judge, and one district judge.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.1 and 1.2, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.8.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.1	No change
2009	-1.2	No change
2011	-0.8	-1 by attrition

The population of Chippewa County increased by 11.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and remained relatively stable between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	34,604
2000	38,543
2010	38,520

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 16.4 percent, from 9,514 to 7,949.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	37	215	129	817	165	8,151	9,514
2004	31	225	129	895	212	7,732	9,224
2005	24	201	112	776	205	7,633	8,951
2006	25	216	96	775	184	7,265	8,561
2007	38	238	104	762	180	7,160	8,482
2008	32	249	89	584	218	7,107	8,279
2009	37	247	99	716	182	6,979	8,260
2010	38	259	80	692	221	6,659	7,949

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Sanilac County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 2.2 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 24th Circuit Court encompasses Sanilac County. There are three judges: one circuit judge, one probate judge, and one district judge. The probate judgeship in Sanilac County is currently vacant.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 1.1. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.8.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-1.1	No change
2009	-1.1	No change
2011	-0.8	-1 by attrition

The population of Sanilac County increased by 11.6 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 3.2 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	39,928
2000	44,547
2010	43,114

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 31.7 percent, from 10,372 to 7,089.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	12	170	143	689	232	9,126	10,372
2004	28	136	150	733	219	8,036	9,302
2005	13	146	154	717	240	8,191	9,461
2006	17	145	152	792	249	8,073	9,428
2007	18	143	162	711	223	7,732	8,989
2008	23	150	152	604	237	7,827	8,993
2009	14	150	131	588	226	6,385	7,494
2010	15	115	129	588	213	6,029	7,089

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

**25th District Court – City of Lincoln Park
26th District Court – Cities of Ecorse and River Rouge**

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that these two courts can operate with 2.5 judges. The SCAO recommends that the courts be combined and the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to two.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-2 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 25th District Court is a third-class district court in Wayne County serving the city of Lincoln Park. There are two judges serving this court. The 26th District Court is a third-class district court within Wayne County serving the cities of Ecorse and River Rouge. There are two judges serving this district court. A judgeship in the 26th District Court is currently vacant.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.8 for the 25th District Court. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.7.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.9 and 1.1, respectively for the 26th District Court. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.8.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.8 25th District	No change
	-0.9 26th District	
2009	-0.8 25th District	No change
	-1.1 26th District	
2011	-0.7 25th District	-2 by attrition
	-0.8 26th District	

The population of the city of Lincoln Park decreased by 4.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 4.7 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	41,832
2000	40,008
2010	38,144

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

The combined populations of the cities of Ecorse and River Rouge decreased by 10 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 17.6 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	23,494
2000	21,146
2010	17,415

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings increased by 3.7 percent, from 29,969 to 31,070.

Year	25th District Court Filings	26th District Court Filings	Total Case Filings
2003	16,767	13,202	29,969
2004	16,249	11,902	28,151
2005	14,314	9,079	23,393
2006	14,557	11,382	25,939
2007	13,304	13,782	27,086
2008	12,767	14,832	27,599
2009	12,572	11,917	24,489
2010	17,132	13,938	31,070

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Shiawassee County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 3.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from four to three.

Current Judgeships	4
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	3

The 35th Circuit Court encompasses Shiawassee County. There are four judges: one circuit judge, one probate judge, and two district judges.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.5 and 0.6, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.7.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.5	No change
2009	-0.6	No change
2011	-0.7	-1 by attrition

The population of Shiawassee County increased by 2.7 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 1.4 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	69,770
2000	71,687
2010	70,648

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 20.8 percent, from 19,098 to 15,135.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	20	307	209	1,614	410	16,538	19,098
2004	18	282	199	1,696	420	16,449	19,064
2005	21	343	184	1,619	372	17,668	20,207
2006	19	367	193	1,534	402	15,884	18,399
2007	19	310	232	1,595	381	16,098	18,635
2008	17	309	193	1,564	401	13,623	16,107
2009	23	304	165	1,387	408	14,002	16,289
2010	26	304	210	1,345	445	12,805	15,135

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Van Buren County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the courts in this county can operate with 4.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from five to four.

Current Judgeships	5
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	4

The 36th Circuit Court encompasses Van Buren County. There are five judges: two circuit judges, one probate judge, and two district judges. A circuit judgeship in Van Buren County is currently vacant.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.3 and 0.6, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.7.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.3	No change
2009	-0.6	No change
2011	-0.7	-1 by attrition

The population of Van Buren County increased by 8.9 percent between 1990 and 2000 and remained relatively stable between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	70,060
2000	76,263
2010	76,258

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 22 percent, from 24,291 to 18,941.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	District Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family			
2003	26	677	237	1,920	474	20,957	24,291
2004	23	604	262	1,784	453	21,971	25,097
2005	29	572	253	1,891	418	22,007	25,170
2006	48	473	238	1,720	421	20,001	22,901
2007	45	504	225	1,694	372	20,188	23,028
2008	29	480	226	1,445	419	19,205	21,804
2009	22	488	194	1,470	364	17,371	19,909
2010	37	526	237	1,600	380	16,161	18,941

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

48th District Court – City of Bloomfield Hills, et al.

Based on the JNAC methodology, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 2.3 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 48th District Court is a third-class district court in Oakland County serving the cities of Bloomfield Hills, Birmingham, Sylvan Lake, Keego Harbor, Orchard Lake Village, and the townships of Bloomfield and West Bloomfield. There are three judges serving this district court.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.9 and 0.7, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.7.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.9	No change
2009	-0.7	No change
2011	-0.7	-1 by attrition

The combined populations of the cities of Bloomfield Hills, Birmingham, Sylvan Lake, Keego Harbor, Orchard Lake Village, and the townships of Bloomfield and West Bloomfield increased by 7.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and decreased by 0.8 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	128,367
2000	137,833
2010	136,797

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings increased by 24.3 percent, from 38,986 to 48,455.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	38,986
2004	41,612
2005	46,717
2006	52,572
2007	53,097
2008	48,725
2009	48,805
2010	48,455

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

44th District Court – City of Royal Oak

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that this court can operate with 1.4 judges. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships in this jurisdiction be reduced by attrition from two to one. In addition, the SCAO recommends that the Legislature also seriously consider merging this court with the 43rd District Court for Hazel Park, Ferndale, and Madison Heights. Not only would the state and cities realize savings by eliminating a judgeship, but the cities could also save by consolidating these courts into fewer facilities.

Current Judgeships	2
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	1

The 44th District Court is a third-class district court in Oakland County serving the city of Royal Oak. There are two judges serving this district court.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.6. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.6.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation
2007	-0.6	No change
2009	-0.6	No change
2011	-0.6	-1 by attrition

The population of the city of Royal Oak decreased by 8.2 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 4.7 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	65,410
2000	60,062
2010	57,236

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the case filings decreased by 29.3 percent, from 28,130 to 19,897.

Year	District Case Filings
2003	28,130
2004	29,167
2005	31,795
2006	33,891
2007	29,766
2008	26,990
2009	24,874
2010	19,897

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

45A District Court – City of Berkley
45B District Court – City of Oak Park, et al.

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that these two courts can operate with 1.9 judges. The SCAO recommends that the courts be combined and the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from three to two.

Current Judgeships	3
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	2

The 45A District Court is a third-class district court in Oakland County serving the city of Berkley. There is one judge serving this district court. The 45B District Court is a third-class district court within Oakland County serving the cities of Oak Park, Huntington Woods, Pleasant Ridge, and township of Royal Oak. There are two judges serving this district court.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.7 in the 45A District Court. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.6.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 0.6 and 0.5, respectively, in the 45B District Court. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.5.

Year	Judicial Excess (-)	Recommendation
2007	-0.7 45A District Court	No change
	-0.6 45B District Court	
2009	-0.7 45A District Court	No change
	-0.5 45B District Court	
2011	-0.6 45A District Court	-1 by attrition
	-0.5 45B District Court	

The population of the city of Berkley decreased by 8.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 3.6 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	16,960
2000	15,531
2010	14,970

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

The combined populations of the cities of Oak Park, Huntington Woods, Pleasant Ridge, and the township of Royal Oak decreased by 1.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 7.9 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	44,667
2000	43,984
2010	40,502

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased 0.2 percent from 29,208 to 29,141.

Year	45A District Court Filings	45B District Court Filings	Total Case Filings
2003	6,981	22,227	29,208
2004	7,421	18,961	26,382
2005	6,018	23,812	29,830
2006	6,582	29,134	35,716
2007	6,353	25,702	32,055
2008	6,656	25,358	32,014
2009	7,389	23,055	30,444
2010	6,815	22,326	29,141

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

Wayne County

Based on the JNAC methodology and an extended analysis, the SCAO estimates that the circuit court and the probate court in Wayne County can operate with 68.9 judges. Due to the economic situation in Wayne County, the circuit court has requested that the vacant judgeship be eliminated. The SCAO recommends that the number of judgeships be reduced by attrition from 69 to 68.

Current Judgeships	69
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-1 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	68

The 3rd Circuit Court encompasses Wayne County. There are 69 circuit and probate judges: 61 circuit judges and 8 probate judges. A circuit judgeship in Wayne County is currently vacant.

In 2005, the SCAO recommended elimination of one probate judgeship through attrition.

In 2007, the SCAO recommended elimination of two circuit judgeships through attrition. In 2007, the Michigan Supreme Court also recommended elimination of two circuit judgeships and one probate judgeship through attrition.

In 2009, the SCAO recommended the reduction through attrition of two circuit judgeships.

The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

In 2007 and 2009, the weighted caseload results indicated a judicial excess of 3.6 and 4.0, respectively. In 2011, using the new methodology approved by the JNAC, the SCAO found that the court has a judicial excess of 0.1.

Year	Judicial Excess	Recommendation	Additional MSC Recommendation
2007	-3.6	-2 by attrition	-1 by attrition
2009	-4.0	-2 by attrition	
2011	-0.1	-1 by attrition	

The population of Wayne County decreased by 2.4 percent between 1990 and 2000 and by 11.7 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Year	Population
1990	2,111,687
2000	2,061,162
2010	1,820,584

Source: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Between 2003 and 2010, the combined case filings decreased by 16.2 percent, from 107,327 to 89,966.

Year	Circuit Case Filings				Probate and Ancillary Case Filings	Total
	Appeals	Criminal	Civil	Family		
2003	907	16,082	17,610	55,670	17,058	107,327
2004	778	15,553	16,003	59,559	16,530	108,423
2005	891	15,459	15,141	57,663	16,042	105,196
2006	852	17,451	14,578	62,601	16,274	111,756
2007	996	18,067	14,511	61,185	15,711	110,470
2008	1,132	17,002	14,705	56,559	15,388	104,786
2009	992	15,441	14,804	48,512	15,061	94,810
2010	931	14,268	14,485	45,856	14,426	89,966

Additional case filing detail is within the statistical supplement of the Michigan Supreme Court Annual Report, available at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/resources/publications/reports/summaries.htm#statsupp>.

PART II – COURT OF APPEALS JUDGESHIPS

The State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) continues to recommend that the number of judgeships on the Court of Appeals be reduced by attrition by four. Two of the 28 judgeships on the Court of Appeals are currently vacant.

Current Judgeships	28
2011 SCAO Recommendation	-4 by attrition
Remaining Judgeships	24

In 2007, the SCAO reviewed the judicial needs at the Court of Appeals after a 13-year hiatus. This review was prompted in part by the fiscal circumstances confronting Michigan state government, as well as by the continued decline in new case filings. In both its 2007 and 2009 Judicial Resources Recommendations reports, the SCAO recommended reducing the number of judges from 28 to 24. The Legislature did not enact these recommendations.

Continued Decrease in Workload

Since the SCAO issued its 2007 report, the number of filings, cases disposed by opinion, and estimated days spent preparing research reports have decreased at the Court of Appeals by 22 percent.

Case filings have decreased by 22.3 percent, from 7,951 in 2006 to 6,177 in 2010.


Cases are disposed of either by order or opinion. Dispositions by order are typically short statements granting or denying the litigants' requests with little or no explanation; by contrast, dispositions by opinion generally contain full written explanations of the rulings. These opinions are based on or assisted by analytical reports prepared by research attorneys. Opinion cases require the vast majority of human resources and, therefore, determine the need for both judges and attorneys. Dispositions by opinion have decreased by 22.8 percent, from 3,494 in 2006 to 2,699 in 2010.

In both 2006 and 2010, the average number of days spent preparing a research report was estimated to be four days. The total days spent preparing research reports decreased by 22.8 percent, from 13,941 days in 2006 to 10,769 days in 2010.¹⁵

Opinion Cases

Opinion cases are processed by the Court of Appeals in four major steps: intake, warehouse, research, and judicial chambers.

Process for Opinion Cases



Intake – Cases begin when the initiating documents, such as a claim of appeal or an application for leave to appeal, are filed with the clerk's office. At that time, a file is opened and a docket number is assigned. The documents are reviewed for conformance with the court rules and for jurisdiction.

¹⁵ For each year, the number of dispositions by opinions multiplied by the average day evaluation yields the total number of days spent preparing research reports.

Warehouse – Following intake, the case is “warehoused” in the clerk’s office until the research division is ready to prepare a research report or until it can be assigned, in limited circumstances, directly to a judge on a case-call panel. Before leaving the warehouse, a case screener evaluates the size of the lower court record, the number of transcript pages in the case, and the issues raised on appeal to estimate the number of days it should take a research attorney to prepare a report. This is called the case “day evaluation.” Approximately 89 percent of all screened cases are evaluated to take between one and six days.

Research – The research attorney prepares a report that provides the judges with an objective statement of facts, the parties’ legal arguments, an independent legal analysis, and, in 90 percent of the cases, a proposed opinion. A supervising attorney reviews the complexity of the case and assigns a “difficulty level” to the case. This difficulty level is used to balance the workload among the three judges on the case-call panel.

Judicial Chambers – Each month, the clerk’s office assigns cases to the three judges on each case-call panel. At present, each judge is assigned approximately six to eight cases that contain research reports and at least one case that does not contain a research report.¹⁶

The Last 22 Years

From 1989 through 1998, the Court of Appeals received an average of 10,889 cases per year. It disposed of an average of 10,973 cases per year; 5,038 of these were by opinion. Each research report was estimated to take an average of 3.5 days to prepare; resulting in an annual average of 18,062 research days per year. During this period, the Court of Appeals increased from 24 to 28 sitting judges and used an average of 5 visiting judges per year. An average of 66 attorneys worked in the research division.

Over the next 12 years (1999-2010), the Court of Appeals received an average of 7,207 cases per year. It disposed of an average of 7,468 cases per year; 3,181 of these were by opinion. Each research report was estimated to take an average of 4.2 days to prepare; resulting in an annual average of 13,307 research days per year. During this period, the Court of Appeals essentially eliminated the use of visiting judges. An average of 55 attorneys worked in the research division.

When comparing these two time periods, workload decreased at rates ranging from 26 to 37 percent. Average annual filings decreased by 34 percent, from 10,889 to 7,207. Dispositions decreased by 32 percent, from 10,973 to 7,468. Opinion cases decreased by 37 percent, from 5,038 to 3,181. Research days decreased by 26 percent, from 18,062 to 13,307.

The number of research attorneys decreased by 17 percent (11 attorneys) and the use of visiting judges was essentially eliminated. The number of sitting judges remains at 28.

¹⁶ For a more detailed explanation of case processing in the Court of Appeals, see the Preliminary Report and Recommendations of the Delay Reduction Work Group, March 1, 2002, available on the web at: <http://coa.courts.mi.gov/resources/drwg.htm>.

Michigan Court of Appeals
Workload, Judges, and Research Attorneys

1989-1998

Year	Filings	Dispositions	Opinions	Average Day Evaluation	Research Days	Sitting Judges	Visiting Judges	Research Attorneys
1989	10,951	8,983	4,976	NA	NA	24	0	70
1990	12,369	10,504	4,729	NA	NA	24	0	56
1991	11,825	10,237	4,627	NA	NA	24	0	38
1992	13,352	11,662	5,300	3.0	16,006	24	3	51
1993	12,494	13,037	6,240	3.5	21,778	24	5	65
1994	11,287	12,824	6,332	3.3	21,086	24	12	79
1995	10,370	12,596	5,968	3.5	20,828	28	10	85
1996	9,108	10,842	4,774	3.7	17,759	28	12	75
1997	8,866	10,242	4,418	3.9	17,407	28	3	80
1998*	8,264	8,806	3,013	3.8	11,570	28	1	61
Averages	10,889	10,973	5,038	3.5	18,062	26	5	66

1999-2010

Year	Filings	Dispositions	Opinions	Average Day Evaluation	Research Days	Sitting Judges	Visiting Judges	Research Attorneys
1999	7,731	7,715	3,063	4.1	12,528	28	1	61
2000	7,460	7,799	2,967	4.4	13,144	28	1	63
2001	7,102	7,606	3,138	4.4	13,870	28	0	63
2002	7,156	7,647	3,645	4.6	16,658	28	0	60
2003	7,445	7,706	3,558	4.3	15,335	28	0	60
2004	7,055	7,293	3,424	4.2	14,347	28	0	56
2005	7,629	7,853	3,409	4.0	13,534	28	0	56
2006	7,951	8,278	3,494	4.0	13,941	28	0	54
2007	7,590	7,543	3,007	4.2	12,479	28	0	48
2008	6,936	7,232	2,903	4.1	11,786	28	0	47
2009	6,257	6,810	2,888	4.0	11,552	28	0	47
2010	6,177	6,131	2,732	4.0	10,928	28	0	47
Averages	7,207	7,468	3,186	4.2	13,327	28	0	55

*Before 1998, the Court of Appeals counted one case for each lower court case number referenced in a Court of Appeals file. Beginning in 1998, the Court of Appeals counted one case for each Court of Appeals file regardless of how many lower court docket numbers are referenced in the file. The Court of Appeals' filing trends represent both an actual decrease in filings and a change in case counting methods.

**The annual equivalent number of visiting judges.

Case-Call Panels

In response to having fewer research attorneys, the Court of Appeals has been forced to assign more cases without research reports directly to judges. This increased the amount of research performed by judges and their law clerks. It also forced a reduction in the number of cases that could be handled by each case-call panel.

With 28 judges, the Court of Appeals was able to schedule 9 case-call panels per month for 11 months of the year for a total of 99 case-call panels. In 2006, 3,494 opinion cases were disposed, for an average of 35 cases per panel. At that time, each judge on a panel received one case that did not include a research report from the research division; each judge had an average of 10.6 cases without research reports during 2006.

In 2010, due to reduced numbers of research attorneys, each judge was assigned two cases without research reports, in addition to cases with research reports. Due to this increased workload, the number of case-call panels per month was reduced to 8, for a total of 88 per year. That year, 2,732 opinion cases were disposed, for an average of 31 cases per panel. Each judge had an average of 20.3 cases without research reports during 2010.

Case-Call Panels

Year	Case-Call Panels		Cases	
	Per Month	Per Year	Opinion Cases Disposed	Average Per Panel
2006	9	99	3,494	35
2010	8	88	2,732	31

Conclusion

In its 2007 Judicial Resources Recommendations report, the SCAO recommended reducing the number of judges on the Court of Appeals from 28 to 24. The SCAO reaffirmed this recommendation in its 2009 report. Since 2007, the workload has continued to decline significantly.

The estimated savings of eliminating four judgeships is \$736,636 per year. The Legislature removed approximately half that amount from the Fiscal Year 2012 judiciary budget due to the two judgeships that are currently vacant.

The SCAO again recommends eliminating four Court of Appeals judgeships by attrition.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Counties With First- or Second-Class District Courts

County	Current Judgeships	Judge Need (+) or Excess (-)		
		2007	2009	2011
Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, Oscoda	7	-3.3	-3.5	-2.7
Alger, Luce, Mackinac, Schoolcraft	5	-2.8	-3.0	-2.7
Allegan	5	0.0	-0.1	-0.1
Alpena, Montmorency	4	-1.6	-1.8	-1.4
Antrim, Grand Traverse, Leelanau	8	-1.6	-1.6	-1.5
Baraga, Houghton, Keweenaw	4.5	-2.4	-2.5	-2.5
Barry	3	-0.2	-0.4	-0.5
Bay	7	-1.2	-1.2	-1.7
Benzie, Manistee	4	-1.7	-1.8	-1.4
Berrien	11	-1.0	-1.2	-0.2
Branch	3	-0.3	-0.3	-0.4
Calhoun	10	-0.9	-0.8	-0.9
Cass	3	-0.1	-0.3	-0.5
Charlevoix, Emmet	4	-0.7	-0.8	0.0
Cheboygan, Presque Isle	4	-1.5	-1.6	-1.1
Chippewa	3	-1.1	-1.2	-0.8
Clare, Gladwin	4	-0.1	0.0	0.4
Clinton, Gratiot	6	-1.5	-1.7	-1.4
Crawford, Kalkaska, Otsego	6	-2.0	-2.0	-1.4
Delta	3	-1.2	-1.2	-1.3
Dickinson, Iron, Menominee	7	-3.6	-3.8	-3.3
Eaton	5	-0.4	-0.6	-0.6
Genesee	17	0.2	0.7	3.0
Gogebic, Ontonagon	4	-2.7	-2.7	-2.6
Hillsdale	3	-0.7	-0.9	-0.9
Huron	3	-1.6	-1.6	-1.3
Ingham	11	0.2	0.0	-0.1
Ionia, Montcalm	6	0.2	0.2	0.0
Isabella	4	-0.4	-0.4	-0.5
Jackson	9	0.3	0.2	0.5
Kalamazoo	15	-1.4	-2.2	-0.9
Kent	16	3.0	3.8	4.1
Lake, Mason	4	-1.8	-1.7	-1.2

County	Current Judgeships	Judge Need (+) or Excess (-)		
		2007	2009	2011
Lapeer	5	-1.1	-1.0	-1.3
Lenawee	5	1.0	0.7	0.4
Livingston	6	-0.1	0.1	0.9
Macomb	17	3.0	4.0	6.8
Marquette	5	-2.4	-2.3	-2.2
Mecosta, Osceola	4	-0.6	-0.7	-0.4
Midland	5	-1.4	-1.5	-1.8
Missaukee, Wexford	4	-1.1	-1.2	-1.1
Monroe	8	-0.7	-0.5	-0.5
Muskegon	10	-0.1	0.3	0.7
Newaygo, Oceana	5	-1.1	-1.3	-1.0
Oakland	34	0.3	2.0	6.5
Ogemaw, Roscommon	5	-1.4	-1.4	-1.7
Ottawa	9	0.3	0.5	0.8
Saginaw	13	-2.1	-1.7	-0.9
Sanilac	3	-1.1	-1.1	-0.8
Shiawassee	4	-0.5	-0.6	-0.7
St. Clair	8	-0.4	-0.5	-0.2
St. Joseph	4	0.0	0.0	-0.1
Tuscola	3	-0.3	-0.4	-0.5
Van Buren	5	-0.3	-0.6	-0.7
Washtenaw	10	0.7	0.9	1.0
Wayne	69	-3.6	-4.0	-0.1

Appendix B – Third-Class District Courts

Court	Current Judgeships	Judge Need (+) or Excess (-)		
		2007	2009	2011
14B District – Ypsilanti Township	1	0.3	0.3	0.5
15th District – Ann Arbor	3	-1.3	-1.4	-1.0
16th District – Livonia	2	-0.3	-0.2	0.1
17th District – Redford Township	2	-0.8	-0.7	-0.7
18th District – Westland	2	0.6	0.9	1.3
19th District – Dearborn	3	0.0	-0.3	0.1
20th District – Dearborn Heights	2	-0.5	-0.2	-0.4
21st District – Garden City	1	-0.5	-0.4	-0.1
22nd District – Inkster	1	0.4	0.2	0.0
23rd District – Taylor	2	0.4	0.7	0.3
24th District – Allen Park, Melvindale	2	-0.7	-0.6	-0.5
25th District – Lincoln Park	2	-0.8	-0.8	-0.7
26th District – Ecorse, River Rouge	2	-0.9	-1.1	-0.8
27th District – Riverview, Wyandotte	1	0.1	0.1	-0.1
28th District – Southgate	1	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1
29th District – Wayne	1	-0.3	-0.3	-0.2
30th District – Highland Park	1	-0.2	-0.2	0.1
31st District – Hamtramck	1	-0.3	-0.4	0.1
32A District – Harper Woods	1	-0.5	-0.4	-0.2
33rd District – Woodhaven	3	-1.2	-1.2	-1.2
34th District – Romulus	3	-0.5	0.0	0.3
35th District – Plymouth	3	-0.8	-0.6	-0.3
36th District – Detroit	31	-3.1	2.3	5.1
37th District – Center Line, Warren	4	-0.2	0.1	0.7
38th District – Eastpointe	1	0.0	0.1	0.5
39th District – Fraser, Roseville	3	-1.0	-1.0	-0.6
40th District – St. Clair Shores	2	-0.8	-0.6	-0.5
41A District – Shelby Township, Sterling Heights	4	-0.3	0.1	0.5
41B District – Clinton Township, Mt. Clemens	3	0.2	0.2	0.4
43rd District – Ferndale, Hazel Park, Madison Heights	3	-0.9	-0.7	-0.5
44th District – Royal Oak	2	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6
45A District – Berkley	1	-0.7	-0.7	-0.6
45B District – Oak Park	2	-0.6	-0.5	-0.5

Court	Current Judgeships	Judge Need (+) or Excess (-)		
		2007	2009	2011
46th District – Southfield	3	-0.2	0.0	-0.2
47th District – Farmington, Farmington Hills	2	-0.4	-0.1	0.0
48th District – Bloomfield Hills	3	-0.9	-0.7	-0.7
50th District – Pontiac	4	-1.7	-1.9	-1.8
51st District – Waterford	2	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6
54A District – Lansing	5	-1.1	-1.1	-1.0
54B District – East Lansing	2	0.1	0.0	0.2
59th District – Grandville, Walker	1	-0.2	-0.3	-0.1
61st District – Grand Rapids	6	-1.0	-0.6	0.2
62A District – Wyoming	2	-0.4	-0.4	-0.5
62B District – Kentwood	1	-0.1	-0.1	0.0
68th District – Flint	5	-1.4	-1.2	-1.6

Appendix C – Stratum, Day Values, and Judicial Proportions

Counties are divided into three strata based on the volume of cases filed in the court. The case-related day values reflect the hours per day for judicial case-related activities. The judicial year is 215 days for all courts. Combined, the judicial day and judicial year reflect the amount of time the average judge is expected to perform on case-related activity each year. The judicial proportion values reflect the proportion of the case weight, on average, performed by judges. The remaining workload, on average, is performed by referees, magistrates, law clerks, and other quasi-judicial officers who have limited authority to perform judicial functions.

The weighted caseload model incorporates all case-related and non-case-related work performed by judges. The non-case-related work includes travel, administrative work, judicial education, and other essential non-case-related tasks. Different case-related day values allows for variation in the amount of time devoted to non-case-related work. For instance, the district court day value for stratum 1 is smaller than the district court day value for stratum 3. This reflects the fact that, on average, district court judges in stratum 1 need more time to travel between counties and court locations than district court judges in stratum 3 where there is typically only one court location. During the secondary analysis, the SCAO reviewed the specific travel requirements of specific courts. In some courts, the amount of time needed for non-case-related work deviates significantly from the stratum average.

Stratum 1 (smaller courts)

Alcona	Cheboygan	Houghton	Luce	Ontonagon
Alger	Chippewa	Huron	Mackinac	Osceola
Alpena	Clare	Iosco	Manistee	Oscoda
Antrim	Crawford	Iron	Mason	Otsego
Arenac	Dickinson	Kalkaska	Menominee	Presque Isle
Baraga	Emmet	Keweenaw	Missaukee	Sanilac
Benzie	Gladwin	Lake	Montmorency	Schoolcraft
Charlevoix	Gogebic	Leelanau	Oceana	

Case-Related Day Value		Judicial Proportion	
Circuit	5.50	Judge	Quasi-Judicial Officer
District	5.50	Circuit/Probate	.78
Probate	5.75	District	.63
			.37

Stratum 2 (medium courts)

Allegan	Clinton	Isabella	Midland	St. Clair
Barry	Delta	Jackson	Monroe	St. Joseph
Bay	Eaton	Lapeer	Montcalm	Tuscola
Berrien	Grand Traverse	Lenawee	Newaygo	Van Buren
Branch	Gratiot	Livingston	Ogemaw	Wexford
Calhoun	Hillsdale	Marquette	Roscommon	
Cass	Ionia	Mecosta	Shiawassee	

Case-Related Day Value		Judicial Proportion	
Circuit	5.75	Judge	Quasi-Judicial Officer
District	6.00	Circuit/Probate	.56
Probate	5.75	District	.75
			.44
			.25

Stratum 3 (largest courts)

Genesee	Kent	Oakland	Washtenaw
Ingham	Macomb	Ottawa	Wayne
Kalamazoo	Muskegon	Saginaw	

Case-Related Day Value		Judicial Proportion	
Circuit	6.00	Judge	Quasi-Judicial Officer
District	6.00	Circuit/Probate	.50
Probate	6.00	District	.86
			.14

Appendix D – Weighted Caseload Results for Counties with First- and Second-Class District Courts

Courts with First- or Second- Class District Courts	Current Judgeships				Combined Judge, Quasi-Judicial Officer, and Law Clerk Need			Judge Only Need or Excess (-)		
	Circuit	Probate	District	Total	Circuit/ Probate	District	Total	Circuit/ Probate	District	Total
1st Circuit Hillsdale County Probate 2B District	1	1	1	3	2.4	1.1	3.5	- 0.7	- 0.2	- 0.9
2nd Circuit Berrien County Probate 5th District	4	2	5	11	11.3	6.0	17.3	0.3	- 0.5	- 0.2
3rd Circuit Wayne County Probate	61	8		69	137.7		137.7	- 0.1		- 0.1
4th Circuit Jackson County Probate 12th District	4	1	4	9	9.9	5.3	15.2	0.5	0.0	0.5
5th Circuit Barry County Probate 56B District	1	1	1	3	2.9	1.1	4.0	- 0.3	- 0.2	- 0.5
6th Circuit Oakland County Probate 52nd District	19	4	11	34	62.1	10.9	73.0	8.1	- 1.6	6.5
7th Circuit Genesee County Probate 67th District	9	2	6	17	26.0	8.1	34.1	2.0	1.0	3.0
8th Circuit Ionia County Probate Montcalm County Probate 64A District 64B District	2	2	2	6	7.0	2.7	9.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
9th Circuit Kalamazoo County Probate 8th District	5	3	7	15	14.9	7.7	22.6	- 0.5	- 0.4	- 0.9
10th Circuit Saginaw County Probate 70th District	5	2	6	13	12.6	6.7	19.3	- 0.7	- 0.2	- 0.9
11th Circuit Probate District 5 Probate District 6 92nd District 93rd District	1	2	2	5	2.1	1.0	3.1	- 1.3	- 1.4	- 2.7
12th Circuit Baraga County Probate Houghton County Probate Keweenaw County Probate 97th District	1	2.5	1	4.5	1.8	0.8	2.6	- 2.0	- 0.5	- 2.5

Courts with First- or Second-Class District Courts	Current Judgeships				Combined Judge, Quasi-Judicial Officer, and Law Clerk Need			Judge Only Need or Excess (-)		
	Circuit	Probate	District	Total	Circuit/Probate	District	Total	Circuit/Probate	District	Total
13th Circuit Antrim County Probate Grand Traverse County Probate Leelanau County Probate 86th District	2	3	3	8	7.0	2.9	9.9	- 0.6	- 0.9	- 1.5
14th Circuit Muskegon County Probate 60th District	4	2	4	10	12.5	5.1	17.6	0.3	0.4	0.7
15th Circuit Branch County Probate 3A District	1	1	1	3	2.7	1.4	4.1	- 0.5	0.1	- 0.4
16th Circuit Macomb County Probate 42nd District	13	2	2	17	43.5	2.3	45.8	6.8	0.0	6.8
17th Circuit Kent County Probate 63rd District	10	4	2	16	33.3	3.9	37.2	2.7	1.4	4.1
18th Circuit Bay County Probate 74th District	3	1	3	7	5.9	2.7	8.6	- 0.7	- 1.0	- 1.7
19th Circuit Benzie County Probate Manistee County Probate 85th District	1	2	1	4	2.1	1.3	3.4	- 1.3	- 0.1	- 1.4
20th Circuit Ottawa County Probate 58th District	4	1	4	9	10.1	5.5	15.6	0.1	0.7	0.8
21st Circuit Isabella County Probate 76th District	2	1	1	4	3.6	2.0	5.6	- 1.0	0.5	- 0.5
22nd Circuit Washtenaw County Probate 14A District	5	2	3	10	15.1	3.9	19.0	0.6	0.4	1.0
23rd Circuit Alcona County Probate Arenac County Probate Iosco County Probate Oscoda County Probate 81st District	2	4	1	7	3.9	1.8	5.7	- 2.8	0.1	- 2.7
24th Circuit Sanilac County Probate 73A District	1	1	1	3	2.0	1.0	3.0	- 0.4	- 0.4	- 0.8
25th Circuit Marquette County Probate 96th District	2	1	2	5	2.9	1.4	4.3	- 1.3	- 0.9	- 2.2

Courts with First- or Second-Class District Courts	Current Judgeships				Combined Judge, Quasi-Judicial Officer, and Law Clerk Need			Judge Only Need or Excess (-)		
	Circuit	Probate	District	Total	Circuit/Probate	District	Total	Circuit/Probate	District	Total
26th Circuit Alpena County Probate Montmorency County Probate 88th District	1	2	1	4	2.4	1.1	3.5	- 1.1	- 0.3	- 1.4
27th Circuit Newaygo County Probate Oceana County Probate 78th District	2	2	1	5	4.3	1.9	6.2	- 1.3	0.3	- 1.0
28th Circuit Missaukee County Probate Wexford County Probate 84th District	1	2	1	4	3.0	1.3	4.3	- 1.1	0.0	- 1.1
29th Circuit Clinton County Probate Grafton County Probate 65A District 65B District	2	2	2	6	4.5	2.6	7.1	- 1.4	0.0	- 1.4
30th Circuit Ingham County Probate 55th District	7	2	2	11	17.3	2.5	19.8	- 0.3	0.2	- 0.1
31st Circuit St. Clair County Probate 72nd District	3	2	3	8	9.3	3.5	12.8	0.2	- 0.4	- 0.2
32nd Circuit Gogebic County Probate Ontonagon County Probate 98th District	1	2	1	4	1.2	0.7	1.9	- 2.0	- 0.6	- 2.6
33rd Circuit and 57th Circuit Probate District 7 90th District	2	1	1	4	3.5	1.9	5.4	- 0.2	0.2	0.0
34th Circuit Ogemaw County Probate Roscommon County Probate 82nd District 83rd District	1	2	2	5	3.4	1.8	5.2	- 1.1	- 0.6	- 1.7
35th Circuit Shiawassee County Probate 66th District	1	1	2	4	3.9	1.5	5.4	0.2	- 0.9	- 0.7
36th Circuit Van Buren County Probate 7th District	2	1	2	5	4.6	2.3	6.9	- 0.4	- 0.3	- 0.7
37th Circuit Calhoun County Probate 10th District	4	2	4	10	9.4	5.2	14.6	- 0.8	- 0.1	- 0.9

Courts with First- or Second-Class District Courts	Current Judgeships				Combined Judge, Quasi-Judicial Officer, and Law Clerk Need			Judge Only Need or Excess (-)		
	Circuit	Probate	District	Total	Circuit/Probate	District	Total	Circuit/Probate	District	Total
38th Circuit Monroe County Probate 1st District	3	2	3	8	8.0	4.0	12.0	- 0.5	0.0	- 0.5
39th Circuit Lenawee County Probate 2A District	2	1	2	5	5.7	2.9	8.6	0.2	0.2	0.4
40th Circuit Lapeer County Probate 71A District	2	1	2	5	4.1	1.9	6.0	- 0.7	- 0.6	- 1.3
41st Circuit Dickinson County Probate Iron County Probate Menominee County Probate 95A District 95B District	2	3	2	7	3.5	1.6	5.1	- 2.3	- 1.0	- 3.3
42nd Circuit Midland County Probate 75th District	2	1	2	5	3.7	1.4	5.1	- 0.9	- 0.9	- 1.8
43rd Circuit Cass County Probate 4th District	1	1	1	3	2.9	1.0	3.9	- 0.3	- 0.2	- 0.5
44th Circuit Livingston County Probate 53rd District	2	1	3	6	8.3	3.1	11.4	1.6	- 0.7	0.9
45th Circuit St. Joseph County Probate 3B District	1	1	2	4	4.2	2.0	6.2	0.4	- 0.5	- 0.1
46th Circuit Crawford County Probate Kalkaska County Probate Otsego County Probate 87A District 87B District 87C District	2	3	1	6	4.4	1.8	6.2	- 1.5	0.1	- 1.4
47th Circuit Delta County Probate 94th District	1	1	1	3	1.8	0.9	2.7	- 1.0	- 0.3	- 1.3
48th Circuit Allegan County Probate 57th District	2	1	2	5	5.4	2.5	7.9	0.0	- 0.1	- 0.1
49th Circuit Probate District 18 77th District	2	1	1	4	3.7	1.7	5.4	- 0.6	0.2	- 0.4
50th Circuit Chippewa County Probate 91st District	1	1	1	3	2.1	1.0	3.1	- 0.4	- 0.4	- 0.8

Courts with First- or Second- Class District Courts	Current Judgeships				Combined Judge, Quasi-Judicial Officer, and Law Clerk Need			Judge Only Need or Excess (-)		
	Circuit	Probate	District	Total	Circuit/ Probate	District	Total	Circuit/ Probate	District	Total
51st Circuit Lake County Probate Mason County Probate 79th District	1	2	1	4	2.5	1.2	3.7	- 1.0	- 0.2	- 1.2
52nd Circuit Huron County Probate 73B District	1	1	1	3	1.5	0.8	2.3	- 0.8	- 0.5	- 1.3
53rd Circuit Cheboygan County Probate Presque Isle County Probate 89th District	1	2	1	4	2.8	1.0	3.8	- 0.7	- 0.4	- 1.1
54th Circuit Tuscola County Probate 71B District	1	1	1	3	3.0	1.1	4.1	- 0.3	- 0.2	- 0.5
55th Circuit Probate District 17 80th District	2	1	1	4	3.9	2.0	5.9	0.1	0.3	0.4
56th Circuit Eaton County Probate 56A District	2	1	2	5	5.1	2.0	7.1	- 0.1	- 0.5	- 0.6

Appendix E – Weighted Caseload Results for Third-Class District Courts

3rd Class District Courts	Current Judgeships	Combined Judge, Quasi-Judicial Officer, and Law Clerk Need	Judge Only Need or Excess (-)
14B District - Ypsilanti Township	1	1.8	0.5
15th District - Ann Arbor	3	2.3	-1.0
16th District - Livonia	2	2.4	0.1
17th District - Redford Township	2	1.5	-0.7
18th District - Westland	2	3.8	1.3
19th District - Dearborn	3	3.6	0.1
20th District - Dearborn Heights	2	1.9	-0.4
21st District - Garden City	1	1.0	-0.1
22nd District - Inkster	1	1.2	0.0
23rd District - Taylor	2	2.7	0.3
24th District - Allen Park, Melvindale	2	1.8	-0.5
25th District - Lincoln Park	2	1.5	-0.7
26th District - Ecorse, River Rouge	2	1.4	-0.8
27th District - Riverview, Wyandotte	1	1.1	-0.1
28th District - Southgate	1	1.0	-0.1
29th District - Wayne	1	0.9	-0.2
30th District - Highland Park	1	1.3	0.1
31st District - Hamtramck	1	1.3	0.1
32A District - Harper Woods	1	0.9	-0.2
33rd District - Woodhaven	3	2.1	-1.2
34th District - Romulus	3	3.8	0.3
35th District - Plymouth	3	3.1	-0.3
36th District - Detroit	31	42.0	5.1
37th District - Center Line, Warren	4	5.5	0.7
38th District - Eastpointe	1	1.8	0.5
39th District - Fraser, Roseville	3	2.8	-0.6
40th District - St. Clair Shores	2	1.8	-0.5
41A District - Shelby Township, Sterling Heights	4	5.2	0.5
41B District - Clinton Township, Mt. Clemens	3	3.9	0.4
43rd District - Ferndale, Hazel Park, Madison Heights	3	2.9	-0.5
44th District - Royal Oak	2	1.6	-0.6
45A District - Berkley	1	0.5	-0.6
45B District - Oak Park	2	1.7	-0.5
46th District - Southfield	3	3.3	-0.2
47th District - Farmington, Farmington Hills	2	2.3	0.0
48th District - Bloomfield Hills	3	2.7	-0.7
50th District - Pontiac	4	2.6	-1.8
51st District - Waterford	2	1.6	-0.6
54A District - Lansing	5	4.7	-1.0
54B District - East Lansing	2	2.5	0.2
59th District - Grandville, Walker	1	1.1	-0.1
61st District - Grand Rapids	6	7.2	0.2
62A District - Wyoming	2	1.7	-0.5
62B District - Kentwood	1	1.2	0.0
68th District - Flint	5	3.9	-1.6

Appendix F – Extended Analysis Questions

The following instructions and questions were provided to all courts in the extended analyses. Responses provided to the SCAO were reviewed prior to any recommendations.

A. Case-Related Factors

- A.1 Provide any information that would clarify your reported new case filing data.
- A.2 Provide any information that would clarify your reported dispositions, such as number of jury trials, number of bench trials.
- A.3 Explain any differences in trends, including 2011, that impact your need for judicial resources.
- A.4 Provide any information that would clarify any backlog of cases in your courts or failure to meet time guidelines.
- A.5 Do any of your courts operate a drug court or other specialty court? If so, how many judges participate in this program?
- A.6 Is there any reason why a concurrent jurisdiction plan for the courts in this jurisdiction would not help reduce the need for judgeships? If so, explain.
- A.7 Provide any information that would clarify how your alternative dispute resolution plans, if any, impact your need for judicial resources.
- A.8 Provide any other information regarding case-related factors that impact your need for judicial resources.

B. Resource Factors

- B.1 How many FTE support staff directly related to judicial activity are available (referees, magistrates, registers, law clerks, research attorneys, etc.)?
- B.2 Provide information that clarifies how the level of automation available in your courts impacts your need for judicial resources.
- B.3 Provide information that would clarify how the available court facilities impact your need for judicial resources.
- B.4 Provide any other information regarding resource factors that could impact your need for judicial resources.

C. Environmental Factors

- C.1 Do you anticipate growth or decline in infrastructure, industry, business activity, or social institutions that may affect judicial workload for courts? If so, what are these changes?
- C.2 Do the practices of retained attorneys, appointed attorneys, pro se litigants, and prosecutors increase the judicial need in your courts (e.g., charging and plea practices, unwillingness to stipulate, etc.)? If so, explain.

C.3 Are there any population trends in the courts' jurisdiction that may affect caseload? If so, what are these trends?

C.4 Provide any other information regarding environmental factors that could impact your need for judicial resources.

D. Other Factors

D.1 Provide any other information regarding other factors that could impact your need for judicial resources.

Appendix G – Judicial Needs Assessment Committee

JNAC Co-chairpersons:

Honorable Thomas L. Solka
Chief Judge, 25th Circuit Court

Mr. Carl L. Gromek
Former State Court Administrator

JNAC Members:

Honorable George S. Buth
Judge, 7th Circuit Court

Honorable James H. Fisher
Former Chief Judge, Barry County Unified Trial Court

Honorable Timothy J. Kelly
Chief Judge, 74th District Court

Honorable Milton L. Mack, Jr.
Chief Judge, Wayne County Probate Court

Honorable Cylenthia LaToye Miller
Judge, 36th District Court

Honorable Frederick R. Mulhauser
Chief Judge, Emmet and Charlevoix Probate Court

Ms. Suzanne M. Darling
Court Administrator, Referee, 9th Circuit Court

Mr. Jerome M.P. Kole
Regional Administrator, Region 4
Former Court Administrator, Referee, Magistrate, 42nd Circuit Court

Mr. Kevin M. Oeffner
Court Administrator, 6th Circuit Court