



Administrative Directive of the State Court Administrator, 2021–03 On the 2021 Apportionment of Judicial Magistrate Positions to the Counties

Pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.6401(4), the state court administrator hereby allocates the 140 available judicial magistrate positions among the 99 counties.

A. Overview

State law requires the state court administrator (SCA) to apportion the 206 judicial magistrate positions currently authorized among Iowa's 99 counties every four years. As required by Iowa Code section 602.6302(1)(b), each county must receive at least one resident magistrate or district associate judge (DAJ) created through an exchange of three magistrates for a DAJ pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.6302. Based on decisions by the district judges in seven of the eight judicial districts, 66 magistrate positions have been traded to obtain 22 DAJ positions (three part-time magistrate positions for one full-time DAJ position). Consequently, there are only 140 magistrate positions available for appointments in 2021. The challenge is to determine how to allocate equitably the 140 available magistrate positions among the counties. Iowa Code section 602.6401(2) directs the SCA to consider county-based factors including geographical area and seasonal population changes, among others. However, there is no statutorily specified formula for determining the allocation of magistrate positions. In the absence of a statutorily specified formula, the SCA employed the same weighted caseload formula and decision-making criteria to determine the 2021 allocation of magistrate positions that the SCA employed when allocating magistrate positions in 2017 (see section B, below).

Based on the weighted caseload formula, four counties that previously had two magistrate positions will receive just one magistrate position in 2021. The counties are Cass, Fayette, Iowa, and Tama. Three counties with the greatest need for magistrates according to the weighted caseload formula will receive at least one additional magistrate position: Scott (2), Linn (1), and Polk (1). After reallocating the four magistrate positions, nine counties still have a shortage of magistrate positions according to the weighted caseload formula: Black Hawk, Dubuque, Johnson, Linn, Muscatine, Polk, Pottawattamie, Scott, and Woodbury.

B. Weighted caseload formula

Since 2005, the SCA has relied primarily on a weighted caseload formula for determining the apportionment of available judicial magistrate positions among the counties. During the fall of 2016, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) conducted a new study of the work time of Iowa judges and magistrates to update the judicial branch's weighted caseload formula for judicial officers in Iowa. Ninety-two percent of all magistrates participated in that study, which was the basis for developing case "weights" -- the average time judicial officers spend on various case types from filing through disposition.

Calculating the need for judicial magistrate positions in each county: The weighted caseload formula begins with three-year average filings (2017 to 2019)¹ in each county for the

¹ Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, which affected significantly court filings and operations during most of 2020, we did not include 2020 filings in the three-year average number of filings used in the weighted caseload calculations.

case types within a magistrate’s jurisdiction: small claims, simple misdemeanors, and adult mental health commitment petitions – plus the number of initial appearances in indictable criminal cases and the number of search warrants filed. These filing figures are multiplied by the case weights (average minutes spent by a judicial officer per case per year) for each case type. The sum of these calculations provides an estimate of the number of case-related work minutes a magistrate will need to handle the workload in the county. That figure is divided by the number of work minutes available to an average full-time equivalent (FTE) judicial officer per year² to produce an estimate of the number of FTE judicial officers needed in each county to handle the judicial magistrate workload. (See Table 2, column A, which shows the results of these calculations for each county.) Table 2 shows the demand for magistrates ranges from less than .10 (10%) of an FTE judicial magistrate in seven of the least populous counties to 9.2 FTE judicial magistrates in Polk County.

Since judicial magistrates are part-time and are paid approximately 31% of the salary of a full-time district associate judge, it is reasonable to require a county have a weighted caseload demand of at least .31 (31%) of an FTE magistrate (in Table 2, column A) to qualify for a second magistrate position. That is the starting point for allocating magistrate positions. Thirty-five counties have a weighted caseload demand of .31 of an FTE magistrate position or more.

C. Other Factors Considered in Allocating Two or More Magistrate Positions to a County

1. On-call time.

One of the concerns expressed by magistrates regarding the weighted caseload formula is that the study of judicial work-time, which is the basis for calculating the case weights used in the weighted caseload formula, did not count “on-call time” as work-time. During the judicial work time study in the fall of 2016, when magistrates were called upon to consider an application for a search warrant or a petition for a mental health commitment during on-call time (e.g., between 5:00 PM and 7:00 AM), the magistrate’s work time was included in the calculation of the case weights. However, the other on-call time, during which a magistrate must be available to handle such matters outside of regular work hours, was not included in the case weights. In the less populous counties that have only one magistrate, that one magistrate is typically expected to handle all on-call duties nearly every day each year – except during vacation or sick leave, when a magistrate from a neighboring county usually will handle the on-call duties. Expecting one magistrate to handle nearly all the on-call duties *and* to handle a workload of one-third of an FTE judicial officer seems like an undue burden to many magistrates given that their salary is approximately one-third of a DAJ’s salary.³

To address this concern, the SCA has allocated two magistrate positions to a county that shows a weighted caseload demand for .31 (31%) of an FTE judicial officer. By comparison, in most workload assessments for determining the need for full-time judges, a jurisdiction must reach a workload demand of at least 1.5 FTE judicial officers before the jurisdiction qualifies for

² Average number of minutes available to a full-time equivalent judicial officer to work on cases: 103,200 minutes (215 workdays X 8 hours per day X 60 minutes per hour).

³ A pilot project testing electronic submission of search warrant applications and a judicial officer’s approval of the applications will begin in 2021. If it is successful, it could be expanded statewide in 2022. This will enable regular sharing of on-call time among magistrates within a judicial district, so one magistrate will no longer need to be on-call as regularly as most of them have been up to this point.

a second judgeship, and 2.5 FTEs before being granted a third judgeship. If this common standard would be applied to the allocation of magistrate positions, a county would receive a second magistrate position only when the workload demand reaches about .49 FTE -- .33 plus half of .33 (.165 FTE), for a total of .495 FTE. In light of this common approach, allocating a second magistrate position when a county reaches a weighted caseload demand of .31 FTE is a reasonable adjustment to account for on-call time. The .31 FTE threshold for allocation of a second magistrate position remains unchanged from the 2017 magistrate apportionment, which also used a .31 FTE threshold for allocation of a second magistrate position.

2. Determining when to allocate three or more judicial magistrate positions.

As indicated above, in the 2021 apportionment of magistrate positions a county qualifies for a second magistrate position when the weighted caseload demand reaches .31 (31%) of an FTE judicial officer. Thereafter, counties receive an additional magistrate position for each additional increase of .35 of an FTE in the weighted caseload: .66 FTE to obtain a third magistrate, 1.01 FTE to obtain a fourth magistrate, etc. (See Table 3 for more information.) Using .35 of an FTE, rather than .31 of an FTE, as the criterion for receiving additional magistrate positions is consistent with the common approach for determining the need for additional judicial full-time judges noted in section C.1 (above).

3. Impact of magistrate positions traded to obtain a DAJ.

Iowa Code section 602.6302 authorizes the district judges in a judicial district, by majority vote, to exchange three part-time magistrate positions for one full-time DAJ. This situation “locks in” magistrate positions previously allocated to a county. (Note: After such an exchange, every county must have at least one resident magistrate or resident DAJ.) Statewide, the judicial districts have traded 63 magistrate positions to create 21 DAJ positions. (See Table 1, column C.) In these instances, the three magistrate positions used to create the DAJ position cannot be moved until the DAJ leaves that position.

Currently, the DAJ positions in six counties (Delaware, Dickinson, Grundy, Keokuk, Mahaska, and Warren) were created at a time when the counties that contributed magistrate positions to create the DAJ positions qualified for more magistrate positions than they currently qualify for based on the current allocation formula. Specifically, there are 10 counties that have “locked in” one magistrate position through previous trades to create one of the six DAJ positions, but those counties no longer qualify those magistrate positions according to the 2021 weighted caseload formula. The 10 counties include Appanoose, Delaware, Dickinson, Emmet, Grundy, Hardin, Jefferson, Palo Alto, Warren, and Washington. If any of the six DAJ positions created by trades of magistrate positions from the 10 counties becomes vacant, the SCA may deny a request to retain that DAJ position and reallocate one or more of the magistrate positions that created the DAJ position to counties that have fewer magistrate positions than the most recent magistrate formula indicates they need (see Table 2, column O).⁴

4. Allocation of the shortage of magistrate positions.

There are a total of 206 magistrate positions that the SCA has to allocate among the 99 counties, including the 66 positions traded to obtain 22 DAJ positions. The weighted caseload

⁴ If the state court administrator moves a magistrate position to the county most in need of a magistrate, the district court judges in the judicial district will have the opportunity to recreate the DAJ position by exchanging three magistrate positions from a different combination of counties in the district.

formula (see Table 2, column B) indicates the need for 214 magistrate positions – eight more positions than authorized by the legislature. As indicated earlier, 10 counties have “locked in” one more magistrate position than they currently qualify for because they previously traded magistrate positions to obtain a DAJ, but those counties no longer qualify for one of their magistrate positions according to the 2021 weighted caseload formula. This situation decreases the number of magistrate positions available to allocate to counties that currently have a shortage of magistrate positions. Consequently, several counties cannot receive the number of magistrate positions they need. In the 2021 apportionment of magistrates, nine counties receive a combined total of 24 fewer magistrate positions than the formula indicates they need: Muscatine (-1), Dubuque (-2), Pottawattamie (-1), Johnson (-2), Black Hawk (-2), Woodbury (-2), Linn (-3), Scott (-3), and Polk (-8). (See Table 2, column M.)

D. Changes in the Allocation of Magistrate Positions

Based on the decision-making criteria set forth in section C (above), four counties that previously had two magistrate positions lose one of those positions in the 2021 apportionment. They are Cass, Fayette, Iowa, and Tama. These four positions are assigned to three counties that have the most substantial shortage of magistrate positions: Scott (2), Linn (1) and Polk (1).

E. Next Steps

Each district court clerk should promptly inform the chairperson of the county’s Magistrate Appointing Commission regarding this notification and, upon completion of the appointment process, certify to this office the names and addresses of the magistrate appointees. Guidelines and procedures for selecting magistrates are governed by Iowa Code sections 602.6403 and 602.6404. Please note that all candidates for appointment as a magistrate must be attorneys licensed to practice law in Iowa. A current magistrate who is not an attorney is no longer eligible for appointment pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.6404(3).

This administrative directive is effective immediately.

Dated this 10th day of March 2021.



Todd Nuccio
State Court Administrator

Copies to: Justices of the Supreme Court
Chief Judges of the Judicial Districts
District Court Administrators
Clerks of District Court
Deputy State Court Administrator
Director of Finance
Director of Human Resources

Attachments:

- Table 1 – Summary of the 2021 Apportionment of Judicial Magistrate Positions
- Table 2 – 2021 Weighted Caseload Formula for Apportionment of Judicial Magistrates
- Table 3 – Criteria for Apportioning Two or More Judicial Magistrate Positions (3-10-21)

Table 1 - Summary of 2021 Magistrate Allocations to Each County (Final - March 11, 2021)

| Subdistrict | County | A | B | C | D* | E** | F | Subdistrict | County | A | B | C | D* | E** | F |
|-------------|--------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-------------|---------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | 2021 Preliminary allocation of 206 total magis positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total) | # of resident DAJs from magis trades (22 total) | 2021 Actual allocation of 140 magis positions to each county (A-B) | 2017 Actual allocation of magis positions to each county | 2021 change from previous (2017) actual allocation [D-E] | | | 2021 Preliminary allocation of 206 total magis positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total) | # of resident DAJs from magis trades (22 total) | 2021 Actual allocation of 140 magis positions to each county (A-B) | 2017 Actual allocation of magis positions to each county | 2021 change from previous (2017) actual allocation [D-E] |
| 1A | Allamakee | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4A | Audubon | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1A | Clayton | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4A | Cass [-1] | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | -1 |
| 1A | Delaware*** | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4A | Fremont | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1A | Dubuque | 5 | 1 | | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4A | Harrison | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1A | Winneshiek | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4A | Mills | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1B | Black Hawk | 6 | 1 | | 5 | 5 | 0 | 4A | Montgomery | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1B | Buchanan | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4A | Page | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1B | Chickasaw | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4A | Pottawatt. | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 1B | Fayette [-1] | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | -1 | 4A | Shelby | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1B | Grundy*** | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5A | Dallas | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 1B | Howard | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5A | Guthrie | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Bremer | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5A | Jasper | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Butler | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5A | Madison | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Cerro Gordo | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5A | Marion | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2A | Floyd | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5A | Warren*** | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2A | Franklin | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Adair | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Hancock | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Adams | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Mitchell | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Clarke | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Winnebago | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Decatur | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2A | Worth | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Lucas | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2B | Boone | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Ringgold | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2B | Calhoun | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Taylor | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2B | Carroll | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Union | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2B | Greene | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5B | Wayne | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2B | Hamilton | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5C | Polk [+1] | 19 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 9 | -2 |
| 2B | Hardin*** | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6A | Benton | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 2B | Humboldt | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6A | Iowa [-1] | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | -1 |
| 2B | Marshall | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6A | Johnson | 6 | | | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 2B | Pocahontas | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6A | Jones | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2B | Sac | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6A | Linn [+1] | 9 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 5 | -2 |
| 2B | Story | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6A | Tama [-1] | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | -1 |
| 2B | Webster | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 7A | Cedar | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 2B | Wright | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7A | Clinton | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 3A | Buena Vista | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7A | Jackson | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3A | Cherokee** | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7A | Muscatine | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 3A | Clay | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7A | Scott [+2] | 10 | | | 10 | 8 | 2 |
| 3A | Dickinson*** | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8A | Appanoose*** | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3A | Emmet*** | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Davis | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3A | Kossuth | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8A | Jefferson*** | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3A | Lyon | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Keokuk | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3A | O'Brien | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Mahaska | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3A | Osceola | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Monroe | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3A | Palo Alto*** | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Poweshiek | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3B | Crawford | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Van Buren | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3B | Ida | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Wapello | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 3B | Monona | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8A | Washington*** | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3B | Plymouth | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8B | Des Moines | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3B | Sioux | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8B | Henry | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 3B | Woodbury** | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8B | Lee | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | 8B | Louisa | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | Totals | 206 | 66 | 22 | 140 | 146 | | | | | | | | |

*In 2017 there were 146 magistrate positions available for allocation because the districts had traded 60 magis positions to obtain 20 DAJs. In February 2021, Polk and Linn Counties traded 3 magistrate positions for 1 more DAJ, leaving just 140 magistrate positions to allocate statewide.

**The 2017 actual allocation (col. E) shown here reflects the reallocation of 1 magistrate position from Cherokee to Woodbury during 2018 when a DAJ position created through a trade of 3 magistrates became vacant and Cherokee no longer qualified for the second magistrate position.

***These counties have traded a magistrate to obtain a DAJ position in their district, but no longer qualify for the traded magistrate position (see Tables 1 and 3). That magistrate position is "locked in" to the DAJ position until the DAJ position becomes vacant. When that occurs, the state court administrator may reallocate one magistrate position from this county to the county that has the greatest shortage of magistrates based on the allocation formula.

Table 2 - 2021 Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County (Final - March 10, 2021)

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G* | H | I | J | K* | L | M | N | O | |
|---------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Subdist | County | 2021 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs | 2017 Wgtd case formula: # of mag positions needed (see Table 3) | 2021 Wgtd case formula: # of mag positions needed (see Table 3) | 2017* preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (60 total) | # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (20 total) | 2017 actual allocation of the 146 available magis positions (D-E) | 2021 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total) | # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total) | 2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I) | 2021 change from previous (2017) allocation [H-D] | 2021 preliminary allocation above or below 2021 # needed [H-C] | % allocated above or below # needed [M/C] | 2021 Wgtd caseload per 2021 allocated mag pos. [A/H] |
| 5B | Ringgold | 0.043 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.04 |
| 5B | Taylor | 0.059 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.06 |
| 5B | Wayne | 0.065 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.06 |
| 5B | Adams | 0.078 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.08 |
| 8A | Van Buren | 0.088 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.09 |
| 4A | Audubon | 0.091 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.09 |
| 8A | Davis | 0.098 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.10 |
| 1B | Howard | 0.105 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.11 |
| 2A | Mitchell | 0.106 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.11 |
| 2B | Pocahontas | 0.108 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.11 |
| 3B | Ida | 0.110 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.11 |
| 5B | Decatur | 0.114 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.11 |
| 2B | Calhoun | 0.115 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.11 |
| 8A | Monroe | 0.116 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.12 |
| 3A | Osceola | 0.119 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.12 |
| 2B | Humboldt | 0.120 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.12 |
| 8A | Keokuk | 0.123 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.12 |
| 2A | Butler | 0.129 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.13 |
| 5B | Lucas | 0.134 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.13 |
| 2A | Winnebago | 0.136 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.14 |
| 5B | Adair | 0.139 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.14 |
| 3A | Palo Alto*** | 0.145 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.07 |
| 4A | Fremont | 0.148 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.15 |
| 2B | Sac | 0.149 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.15 |
| 5A | Guthrie | 0.149 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.15 |
| 2A | Worth | 0.151 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.15 |
| 1B | Grundy*** | 0.160 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.08 |
| 3A | Kossuth | 0.166 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 2A | Hancock | 0.168 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 3A | Lyon | 0.170 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 3A | Cherokee** | 0.171 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 8B | Louisa | 0.173 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 1A | Allamakee | 0.174 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 2B | Greene | 0.175 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 3A | Emmet*** | 0.176 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.09 |
| 2A | Franklin | 0.182 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.18 |
| 5A | Madison | 0.185 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.19 |
| 1B | Chickasaw | 0.191 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.19 |
| 2B | Wright | 0.193 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.19 |
| 4A | Montgomery | 0.193 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.19 |
| 4A | Shelby | 0.195 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.19 |
| 5B | Union | 0.202 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.20 |
| 3B | Monona | 0.212 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.21 |
| 3A | O'Brien | 0.222 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.22 |
| 8A | Appanoose*** | 0.226 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.11 |
| 4A | Page | 0.227 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.23 |
| 1A | Winneshiek | 0.242 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.24 |

Table 2 - 2021 Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County (Final - March 10, 2021)

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G* | H | I | J | K* | L | M | N | O | |
|---------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Subdist | County | 2021 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs | 2017 Wgtd case formula: # of mag positions needed (see Table 3) | 2021 Wgtd case formula: # of mag positions needed (see Table 3) | 2017* preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (60 total) | # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (20 total) | 2017 actual allocation of the 146 available magis positions (D-E) | 2021 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total) | # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total) | 2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I) | 2021 change from previous (2017) allocation [H-D] | 2021 preliminary allocation above or below 2021 # needed [H-C] | % allocated above or below # needed [M/C] | 2021 Wgtd caseload per 2021 allocated mag pos. [A/H] |
| 4A | Mills | 0.244 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.24 |
| 7A | Jackson | 0.251 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.25 |
| 6A | Iowa [-1] | 0.251 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0% | 0.25 |
| 2A | Floyd | 0.252 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.25 |
| 1A | Clayton | 0.253 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.25 |
| 3B | Crawford | 0.258 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.26 |
| 5B | Clarke | 0.259 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.26 |
| 1A | Delaware*** | 0.261 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.13 |
| 8A | Jefferson*** | 0.267 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.13 |
| 2B | Hardin*** | 0.280 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.14 |
| 1B | Fayette [-1] | 0.300 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 6A | Tama [-1] | 0.302 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 2B | Carroll | 0.303 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 4A | Cass [-1] | 0.304 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 6A | Jones | 0.308 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.31 |
| 4A | Harrison | 0.308 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.31 |
| 8A | Washington*** | 0.308 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100% | 0.15 |
| 2B | Hamilton | 0.310 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.16 |
| 8A | Poweshiek | 0.311 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.16 |
| 3B | Sioux | 0.334 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 3A | Clay | 0.342 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 3A | Buena Vista | 0.349 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.17 |
| 2A | Bremer | 0.356 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.18 |
| 3A | Dickinson*** | 0.358 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50% | 0.12 |
| 6A | Benton | 0.365 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.18 |
| 2B | Boone | 0.391 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.20 |
| 8B | Henry | 0.402 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.20 |
| 7A | Cedar | 0.403 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.20 |
| 8A | Mahaska | 0.404 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.20 |
| 1B | Buchanan | 0.412 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.21 |
| 5A | Marion | 0.438 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.22 |
| 3B | Plymouth | 0.450 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.22 |
| 5A | Warren*** | 0.592 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50% | 0.20 |
| 5A | Jasper | 0.617 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.31 |
| 5A | Dallas | 0.765 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.26 |
| 8B | Lee | 0.803 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.27 |
| 2B | Marshall | 0.846 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.28 |
| 2B | Webster | 0.856 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.29 |
| 8A | Wapello | 0.906 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 8B | Des Moines | 0.906 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 2A | Cerro Gordo | 0.917 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.31 |
| 7A | Clinton | 0.921 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.31 |

Table 2 - 2021 Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County (Final - March 10, 2021)

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G* | H | I | J | K* | L | M | N | O | |
|---------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Subdist | County | 2021 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs | 2017 Wgtd case formula: # of mag positions needed (see Table 3) | 2021 Wgtd case formula: # of mag positions needed (see Table 3) | 2017* preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (60 total) | # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (20 total) | 2017 actual allocation of the 146 available magis positions (D-E) | 2021 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions | # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total) | # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total) | 2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I) | 2021 change from previous (2017) allocation [H-D] | 2021 preliminary allocation above or below 2021 # needed [H-C] | % allocated above or below # needed [M/C] | 2021 Wgtd caseload per 2021 allocated mag pos. [A/H] |
| 7A | Muscatine | 1.045 | 3 | 4 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 0 | -1 | -25% | 0.35 |
| 2B | Story | 1.197 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0.30 |
| 1A | Dubuque | 2.293 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 1 | | 4 | 5 | 1 | | 4 | 0 | -2 | -28.6% | 0.46 |
| 4A | Pottawatt. | 2.409 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | -1 | -14% | 0.40 |
| 6A | Johnson | 2.474 | 7 | 8 | 6 | | | 6 | 6 | | | 6 | 0 | -2 | -25.0% | 0.41 |
| 1B | Black Hawk | 2.612 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 1 | | 5 | 6 | 1 | | 5 | 0 | -2 | -25.0% | 0.44 |
| 3B | Woodbury** | 2.708 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | -2 | -25% | 0.45 |
| 6A | Linn [+1]* | 4.056 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | -3 | -25.0% | 0.45 |
| 7A | Scott [+2] | 4.343 | 11 | 13 | 8 | | | 8 | 10 | | | 10 | 2 | -3 | -23.1% | 0.43 |
| 5C | Polk [+1]* | 9.160 | 25 | 27 | 18 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 19 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 1 | -8 | -29.6% | 0.48 |
| | Totals | 58 | 214 | 220 | 206 | 60 | 20 | 146 | 206 | 66 | 22 | 140 | 0 | -14 | -6% | 0.28 |

*In 2017 there were 146 magistrate positions available for allocation because the districts had traded 60 magistrate positions to obtain 20 DAJs. In February 2021, both Polk and Linn Counties traded 3 magistrate positions for 1 DAJ -- giving Polk 4 and Linn 2 resident DAJs from magistrate trades in 2021, and leaving just 140 magistrate positions to allocate statewide.

**The 2017 actual allocation shown here reflects the reallocation of 1 magistrate position from Cherokee to Woodbury during 2018 when a DAJ position created through a trade of 3 magistrates became vacant and Cherokee no longer qualified for the second magistrate position.

***These counties have traded a magistrate to obtain a DAJ position in their district, but no longer qualify for the traded magistrate position. That magistrate position is "locked in" to the DAJ position until the DAJ position becomes vacant. When that occurs, the state court administrator may reallocate one magistrate position from this county to the county that has the greatest shortage of magistrates based on the allocation formula.

| | |
|--|---|
| | 2017 data |
| | 2021 data |
| | 2021 actual allocation of available magistrate positions (col. K) |

Table 3 -- Criteria for Apportioning Two or More Judicial Magistrate Positions in 2021

| When FTE demand (Table 2, col A) reaches: * | County receives this # of Mags. | Min FTE workload per Mag. position | Max FTE workload per Mag. position | When FTE demand (Table 2, col A) reaches: * | County receives this # of Mags. | Min FTE workload per Mag. position | Max FTE workload per Mag. position |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| up to .30 | 1 | 0.04 | 0.31 | 4.86 | 15 | 0.32 | 0.35 |
| 0.31 | 2 | 0.16 | 0.33 | 5.21 | 16 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 0.66 | 3 | 0.22 | 0.34 | 5.56 | 17 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 1.01 | 4 | 0.25 | 0.34 | 5.91 | 18 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 1.36 | 5 | 0.27 | 0.34 | 6.26 | 19 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 1.71 | 6 | 0.29 | 0.34 | 6.61 | 20 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 2.06 | 7 | 0.29 | 0.34 | 6.96 | 21 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 2.41 | 8 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 7.31 | 22 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 2.76 | 9 | 0.31 | 0.35 | 7.66 | 23 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 3.11 | 10 | 0.31 | 0.35 | 8.01 | 24 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 3.46 | 11 | 0.31 | 0.35 | 8.36 | 25 | 0.33 | 0.35 |
| 3.81 | 12 | 0.32 | 0.35 | 8.71 | 26 | 0.34 | 0.35 |
| 4.16 | 13 | 0.32 | 0.35 | | | | |
| 4.51 | 14 | 0.32 | 0.35 | | | | |

add .35
add .35
add .35
etc.

(March 10, 2021)

*We do not round up; a county must reach an FTE demand of .31, .66., 1.01, etc., to obtain an additional magistrate