
Judicial Needs Assessment

Table A.10
Method III Actual and Projected Court Filings and Judicial Officer Levels

Filing Category	Actual FY 2005	Projected Filings			
		2010	2015	2020	2025
Criminal Traffic					
DUI	6,963	8,445	9,072	9,699	9,896
Other Criminal Traffic	8,436	11,296	12,135	12,974	13,236
Subtotal Criminal Traffic	15,399	19,741	21,207	22,673	23,132
Civil Traffic	85,647	122,587	131,692	140,797	143,645
Misdemeanor	18,615	22,161	23,807	25,453	25,968
Non-criminal Ordinance	3,054	9,575	10,286	10,997	11,219
Protective Orders					
Domestic Violence Injunctions Against Harassment	1,420	1,506	1,618	1,730	1,765
	856	914	982	1,050	1,072
Subtotal Protective Orders	2,276	2,420	2,600	2,780	2,837
Total Filings	124,991	176,484	189,593	202,699	206,801
Ratio of Filings per Judicial Officer	15,624	16,811	16,811	16,811	16,811
Judicial Officers	8.0	10.5	11.3	12.1	12.3

Summary of Findings

The projected levels of judicial officers resulting from each projection methodology applied in this analysis are summarized in Table A.13.

Table A.13
Comparison of Alternative Methodologies

	Actual FY 2005	Projected Judicial Officers			
		2010	2015	2020	2025
Method I	8.0	10.5	11.7	13.0	13.5
Method IA	8.0	10.6	11.9	13.3	13.7
Method II	8.0	(9.5)	(10.2)	(10.9)	(11.2)
Method III	8.0	10.5	11.3	12.1	12.3
Method IIIA	8.0	9.8	10.6	11.3	11.5
Method IV	8.0	10.7	11.7	12.7	13.1
Average of Methods I, IA, III, IIIA and IV	8.0	10.4	11.4	12.5	12.8

Overall, the results from the six alternative judicial projection methodologies reflect a relatively consistent set of findings. The difference between the high and low results in each projection increment ranges by no more than one to two and one half judicial positions.

Methods I and IA reflect results that can be expected should the historical relationship between city population growth and judicial position levels continue in future years. Method I reflects the results of the previous twenty-year trend and Method IA the past ten-year trend. While useful to establish the relationship between population growth and judicial positions, these methodologies do not provide an understanding of the individual filing trends that are the direct basis for judicial position needs, nor a means for adjusting historical trends to reflect planned changes that could impact future court workload.

By applying FY 2005 filing rates per 1,000 population, Method II is useful for providing a context within which to view the results of other methodologies. However, historically, filing rates have not remained constant and cannot be expected to do so in the future. Thus, this method should be discounted as a reliable result.

Method III represents a strong statistical basis for forecasting purposes, as it applies all available case filing and JPE data and takes into account planned changes that are expected to affect workload in the Civil Traffic and Non-criminal Ordinance filing categories. Method IIIA further refines Method III by moderating the projected impact of increased Non-criminal Ordinance filings on judicial position levels.

Method IV utilizes a strong statistical relationship between city population levels and total filings, However, it also reflects similar limitations as those exhibited by Methods I and IA, as it does not assess the individual filing trends that are the direct basis for judicial position needs, nor does it provide a means for adjusting individual historical filing trends to reflect planned changes that could impact future court workload.

Recommendations

Table A.14 shows the levels of judicial officers recommended to serve as the basis for facility planning over the period 2010 through 2025, in five year increments.

From the above assessment it is apparent that all of the methodologies employed, with the exception of Method II, have merits that should be considered in the forecast of judicial officer positions. For purposes of facility planning, a moderate approach to needs forecasting, as applied to near-term capital construction commitments, should be employed to minimize the potential for overbuilding. Subject to available capital funding, a first increment of construction should provide for operational requirements at move-in and expansion to provide for three to five years of growth, before additional construction is required. This normally translates into an initial construction increment providing for space to meet projected needs up to ten years from initiation of design (e.g. provides three to five years for design and construction to move-in, plus three to five years of further operational increases). Thus, judicial officer levels recommended for the years most likely to represent an initial construction increment - 2010/ 2015 - reflect the average of Methods I, IA, III, IIIA, and IV.

For long-term strategic planning purposes, the results from a range of forecasts should establish a degree of contingency, appropriate for expansion beyond the initial construction increment, based on the dynamics of the potential growth indicated. As the difference, at the year 2025, between the average of the applied methodologies (12.8) and the highest level projected (13.7 in Method IIA) is only one judicial position, the higher forecast is recommended for the years 2020 and 2025. It is these years that are most likely to represent strategic future planning increments.

**Table A.14
Recommended Judicial Officer Planning Levels**

	Current Actual	Projected			
		2010	2015	2020	2025
Judicial Officers	8.0	10.4	11.4	13.3	13.7

MESA MUNICIPAL COURT FACILITY REQUIRED PROJECT SIZE & BUDGET

<i>Number of Courtrooms</i>	<i>Gross SF</i>	<i>Total Project Cost</i>	<i>Budget Add</i>	<i>Years to Meet Needs</i>
10 Courtrooms (Budget)	84,473 SF	\$33,616,000		2009 - 2012 +
10 Courtrooms (Standard)	91,747 SF	\$36,522,000	+ \$2.91M	2009 - 2012 +
10 Courtrooms (Support Space for 12 Courtrooms)	94,059 SF	\$37,456,000	+ \$3.85M	2009 - 2012 +
12 Courtrooms	104,885 SF	\$42,070,000	+ \$8.45M	2012 - 2020 +
14 Courtrooms	124,162 SF	\$48,793,000	+ \$15.17M	Build-Out

Footnotes:

- All project costs are estimated in 2007 dollars. Construction of 12 Courtroom Option in the future will therefore result in higher costs than shown, and must be escalated appropriately.
- A small addition to the building in the future will have proportionately higher costs for materials and labor than that for the original building. This includes more foundations, more roof area and more exterior wall per floor area due to the relatively small floor plan and low height (one or two stories).
- A small addition constructed in the future will experience a higher cost on a percentage basis for the contractor's project management and general conditions for the project.