

area and if you compare it to district 12 which is the Panhandle area you'll see that district 11 has 18 counties compared to district 12's 11, so there are more stopping places for judges. District 11 is larger in geographic area, almost 16,000 square miles compared to 14,000. District 11 is larger in population, 102, 103,000 compared to 91,000 and that district is being served currently by three judges and those three judges do not have any complaints with LB 1059 as far as I know nor do they have any complaints with their workload. When you divide the total case load in those districts with, by the number of judges, by three judges, and by the way, the number of judges in those districts is not changed by 1059, you see you have a case loads per judge of 587 cases. Now compare that to district 12. There you have five judges instead of three for a district that is smaller in geographic area and smaller in population and smaller in number of counties. And even when you take away one judge, which is what 1059 purports to do, then you have four judges to divide up the workload which comes to 552 cases per judge or in other words, a workload that is still easier to handle, still easier to handle than the workload in district 11. So the point I'm trying to make, and I think is made by this comparison, is that taking into account distances and travel time you can see that even as between areas out west, there are tremendous inconsistencies and inequities in terms of what we're asking judges to do. With regard to the matter of savings, I'd like to ask you to look at the cumulative effect of what we do when we add a judge and we don't really need to add one. I have handed out to you another handout which says \$2,880,000 wasted and I tried to describe to you and I think I have described to you how that, in fact, happened and it goes back to the time in the early 1980s when district 16, instead of combining districts with its neighboring districts to even out workloads, obtained an added judge. They didn't need to do that. The problem could have been resolved in another manner.

SENATOR CONWAY: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: If redistricting had occurred, the state would not have spent \$120,000 a year for the past twelve years or one almost a million a half dollars. You know sometimes we think well, what's one judge here, one judge there but I think that this nicely illustrates what the cumulative effect spendingwise these things have, these small decisions that we make add up and all of a sudden over the 1980s we've wasted a million and a half dollars that could have been economic incentives for businesses