

Lower Authority Appeals Ranked by Total Pending Cases

Dec 2010		Sorted by Total Pending Cases					<=30-day ALP Indicated						
National Ranking	State	Dec Timelapse		Average Age of Pending Cases	Total # of Pending Cases	% of Nat. Total	% of Cases 1 to 25 Days	% of Cases 26-40 Days	% of Cases 41-90 Days	% of Cases 91-120 Days	% of Cases 121-180 Days	% of Cases 181- 360 Days	% of Cases > 360 Days
		30-day	45-day										
1	CA	2.4	11.8	45	57,481	25.27%	30.3%	17.4%	44.6%	6.0%	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%
2	TX	15.0	54.7	44	19,380	8.52%	40.4%	15.3%	34.7%	6.0%	2.9%	0.5%	0.2%
3	PA	15.0	44.2	38	14,851	6.53%	29.6%	22.7%	37.7%	1.6%	0.4%	7.9%	0.0%
4	OH	1.6	2.1	85	12,237	5.38%	19.4%	11.0%	39.6%	21.6%	7.8%	0.6%	0.0%
5	NY	13.8	42.6	116	11,388	5.01%	30.7%	10.4%	25.8%	7.2%	7.3%	9.4%	9.2%
6	FL	81.8	94.9	18	10,531	4.63%	83.6%	9.4%	6.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
7	MA	3.7	34.8	60	5,592	2.46%	26.9%	16.3%	38.1%	9.7%	5.5%	3.1%	0.4%
8	VA	26.9	37.8	34	5,208	2.29%	42.5%	22.7%	33.6%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
9	CT	3.7	7.7	58	4,751	2.09%	23.1%	12.8%	51.0%	9.3%	1.3%	2.3%	0.1%
10	MD	28.9	82.0	28	4,683	2.06%	56.2%	25.8%	16.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%
11	AR	0.2	1.1	47	4,596	2.02%	26.0%	15.5%	58.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
12	WI	9.9	22.7	38	4,407	1.94%	39.4%	20.2%	38.2%	1.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
13	GA	77.4	95.7	16	4,270	1.88%	88.1%	8.0%	3.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
14	NM	5.9	9.1	58	4,231	1.86%	25.0%	11.3%	44.2%	14.8%	4.0%	0.6%	0.0%
15	NC	48.5	80.3	44	4,179	1.84%	50.2%	22.3%	22.1%	1.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.7%
16	NJ	40.9	85.5	43	3,949	1.74%	35.8%	35.8%	21.4%	1.8%	2.7%	2.0%	0.5%
17	MI	22.4	53.0	55	3,941	1.73%	36.1%	20.9%	28.9%	4.3%	5.5%	3.5%	0.9%
18	IL	73.7	88.1	24	3,777	1.66%	81.7%	6.5%	7.7%	1.9%	1.6%	0.6%	0.1%
19	LA	1.3	4.2	49	3,401	1.49%	36.5%	20.1%	30.0%	5.2%	5.5%	2.7%	0.0%
20	AZ	65.1	87.7	34	3,255	1.43%	59.6%	14.8%	22.5%	1.5%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%
21	KY	7.1	47.1	43	3,210	1.41%	36.4%	24.9%	30.9%	4.9%	2.1%	0.5%	0.2%
22	WA	68.7	91.5	28	3,154	1.39%	78.2%	11.9%	6.8%	0.5%	0.3%	1.4%	0.9%
23	IN	70.2	90.8	26	3,121	1.37%	70.3%	19.1%	6.5%	0.8%	2.6%	0.4%	0.1%
24	IA	8.9	37.2	41	2,659	1.17%	47.1%	18.1%	28.8%	1.6%	1.2%	2.0%	1.2%
25	TN	1.1	87.0	32	2,467	1.08%	33.7%	49.5%	15.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%
26	NV	8.2	38.3	42	2,048	0.90%	35.5%	26.0%	33.7%	2.2%	0.8%	1.2%	0.5%
27	MO	69.9	89.8	28	1,940	0.85%	73.2%	11.4%	12.9%	1.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
28	CO	76.1	92.6	25	1,937	0.85%	70.3%	19.6%	8.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%
29	RI	0.3	0.3	70	1,932	0.85%	27.9%	8.8%	36.6%	20.7%	3.5%	1.4%	1.1%
30	OK	7.6	89.0	29	1,909	0.84%	49.3%	24.9%	25.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
31	KS	11.4	42.5	47	1,880	0.83%	20.6%	25.7%	50.3%	2.1%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%
32	PR	5.2	25.6	51	1,564	0.69%	31.3%	15.9%	37.5%	11.4%	3.1%	0.9%	0.0%
33	OR	28.8	92.0	22	1,515	0.67%	70.8%	24.5%	4.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
34	MN	86.1	95.2	16	1,493	0.66%	87.3%	6.6%	4.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%
35	MS	49.6	82.0	19	1,420	0.62%	76.1%	15.8%	7.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
36	AL	81.0	92.9	33	1,397	0.61%	68.8%	7.4%	14.4%	5.8%	2.2%	1.0%	0.4%
37	SC	98.7	100.0	11	1,201	0.53%	79.4%	20.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
38	UT	98.9	99.9	14	1,138	0.50%	97.8%	2.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
39	WV	21.0	60.4	30	872	0.38%	50.5%	19.8%	28.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
40	NH	24.3	71.2	164	727	0.32%	44.6%	8.5%	5.5%	1.2%	1.9%	13.8%	24.5%
41	ME	54.7	90.6	24	693	0.30%	75.2%	11.1%	8.2%	4.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
42	DC	19.2	78.9	81	609	0.27%	41.5%	16.1%	14.4%	5.7%	7.7%	11.3%	3.1%
43	DE	61.3	86.7	22	560	0.25%	72.1%	15.9%	11.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
44	NE	87.8	99.1	13	508	0.22%	97.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
45	ID	98.3	99.8	12	436	0.19%	99.1%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
46	HI	87.2	94.6	24	315	0.14%	85.1%	5.7%	7.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%
47	SD	55.9	90.9	18	187	0.08%	77.0%	18.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
48	ND	69.2	88.9	14	171	0.08%	93.6%	5.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
49	AK	94.7	99.1	33	144	0.06%	89.6%	2.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	4.2%	2.1%
50	VT	70.3	94.9	30	139	0.06%	75.5%	20.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.7%
51	MT	72.1	91.9	12	47	0.02%	93.6%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	US	41.6	65.9	39.0	227,501	100%	57.06%	15.80%	19.85%	3.18%	1.55%	1.57%	0.97%
Note: Data calculated from available State data as of report date											Rpt date: 1/21/11		
Red indicates failed timelapse; Green indicates passed measure; Tan indicates fail average case age													
States who have not reported, as of the report date, are not on this report													

Lower Authority Appeals Ranked by Average Case Aging

Dec 2010		Sorted by Average Age						<=30-day ALP Indicated				
		Average Case Age ALP <=30-days										
National Ranking	Dec Timelapse		Average Age of Pending Cases	Total # of Pending Cases	% of Cases 1 to 25 Days	% of Cases 26-40 Days	% of Cases 41-90 Days	% of Cases 91-120 Days	% of Cases 121-180 Days	% of Cases 181- 360 Days	% of Cases > 360 Days	
	#	State										30-day 60%
1	SC	98.7	100.0	11	1,201	79.4%	20.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	ID	98.3	99.8	12	436	99.1%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	MT	72.1	91.9	12	47	93.6%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	NE	87.8	99.1	13	508	97.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	UT	98.9	99.9	14	1,138	97.8%	2.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	ND	69.2	88.9	14	171	93.6%	5.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	MN	86.1	95.2	16	1,493	87.3%	6.6%	4.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%
5	GA	77.4	95.7	16	4,270	88.1%	8.0%	3.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	FL	81.8	94.9	18	10,531	83.6%	9.4%	6.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
6	SD	55.9	90.9	18	187	77.0%	18.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	MS	49.6	82.0	19	1,420	76.1%	15.8%	7.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
8	DE	51.3	86.7	22	560	72.1%	15.9%	11.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
8	OR	28.8	92.0	22	1,515	70.8%	24.5%	4.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
9	HI	87.2	94.6	24	315	85.1%	5.7%	7.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%
9	IL	73.7	88.1	24	3,777	81.7%	6.5%	7.7%	1.9%	1.6%	0.6%	0.1%
9	ME	54.7	90.6	24	693	75.2%	11.1%	8.2%	4.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
10	CO	76.1	92.6	25	1,937	70.3%	19.6%	8.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%
11	IN	70.2	90.8	26	3,121	70.3%	19.1%	6.5%	0.8%	2.6%	0.4%	0.1%
12	MO	69.9	89.8	28	1,940	73.2%	11.4%	12.9%	1.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
12	WA	68.7	91.5	28	3,154	78.2%	11.9%	6.8%	0.5%	0.3%	1.4%	0.9%
12	MD	28.9	82.0	28	4,683	56.2%	25.8%	16.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%
13	OK	7.6	69.0	29	1,909	49.3%	24.9%	25.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
14	VT	70.3	94.9	30	139	75.5%	20.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.7%
14	WV	21.0	60.4	30	872	50.5%	19.8%	28.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
15	TN	1.1	87.0	32	2,467	33.7%	49.5%	15.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%
16	AK	94.7	99.1	33	144	89.6%	2.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	4.2%	2.1%
16	AL	81.0	92.9	33	1,397	68.8%	7.4%	14.4%	5.8%	2.2%	1.0%	0.4%
17	AZ	65.1	87.7	34	3,255	59.6%	14.8%	22.5%	1.5%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%
17	VA	26.9	37.8	34	5,208	42.5%	22.7%	33.6%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
18	PA	15.0	44.2	38	14,851	29.6%	22.7%	37.7%	1.6%	0.4%	7.9%	0.0%
18	WI	9.9	22.7	38	4,407	39.4%	20.2%	38.2%	1.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
19	IA	8.9	37.2	41	2,659	47.1%	18.1%	28.8%	1.6%	1.2%	2.0%	1.2%
20	NV	8.2	38.3	42	2,048	35.5%	26.0%	33.7%	2.2%	0.8%	1.2%	0.5%
21	NJ	40.9	85.5	43	3,949	35.8%	35.8%	21.4%	1.8%	2.7%	2.0%	0.5%
21	KY	7.1	47.1	43	3,210	36.4%	24.9%	30.9%	4.9%	2.1%	0.5%	0.2%
22	NC	48.5	80.3	44	4,179	50.2%	22.3%	22.1%	1.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.7%
22	TX	15.0	54.7	44	19,380	40.4%	15.3%	34.7%	6.0%	2.9%	0.5%	0.2%
23	CA	2.4	11.8	45	57,481	30.3%	17.4%	44.6%	6.0%	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%
24	KS	11.4	42.5	47	1,880	20.6%	25.7%	50.3%	2.1%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%
24	AR	0.2	1.1	47	4,596	26.0%	15.5%	58.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
25	LA	1.3	4.2	49	3,401	36.5%	20.1%	30.0%	5.2%	5.5%	2.7%	0.0%
26	PR	5.2	25.6	51	1,564	31.3%	15.9%	37.5%	11.4%	3.1%	0.9%	0.0%
27	MI	22.4	53.0	55	3,941	36.1%	20.9%	28.9%	4.3%	5.5%	3.5%	0.9%
28	NM	5.9	9.1	58	4,231	25.0%	11.3%	44.2%	14.8%	4.0%	0.6%	0.0%
28	CT	3.7	7.7	58	4,751	23.1%	12.8%	51.0%	9.3%	1.3%	2.3%	0.1%
29	MA	3.7	34.8	60	5,592	26.9%	16.3%	38.1%	9.7%	5.5%	3.1%	0.4%
30	RI	0.3	0.3	70	1,932	27.9%	8.8%	36.6%	20.7%	3.5%	1.4%	1.1%
31	DC	19.2	78.9	81	609	41.5%	16.1%	14.4%	5.7%	7.7%	11.3%	3.1%
32	OH	1.6	2.1	86	12,237	19.4%	11.0%	39.6%	21.6%	7.8%	0.6%	0.0%
33	NY	13.8	42.6	116	11,388	30.7%	10.4%	25.8%	7.2%	7.3%	9.4%	9.2%
34	NH	24.3	71.2	164	727	44.6%	8.5%	5.5%	1.2%	1.9%	13.8%	24.5%
	US	41.6	65.9	39.0	227,501	57.06%	15.80%	19.85%	3.18%	1.55%	1.57%	0.97%
Red indicates failed timelapse; Green indicates passed measure; Tan indicates fail average case age												
% Meeting Average Case Age only 47.06%												
Rpt date: 1/21/11												
States who have not reported, as of the report date, are not on this report												

Lower Authority Appeals Ranked by Timelapse and Average Age

Dec 2010		<=30-day Avg Age ALP		States Ranked by Timelapse								
National Ranking	#	Dec Timelapse		Average Age of Pending Cases	Total # of Pending Cases	% of Cases 1 to 25 Days	% of Cases 26-40 Days	% of Cases 41-90 Days	% of Cases 91-120 Days	% of Cases 121-180 Days	% of Cases 181-360 Days	% of Cases > 360 Days
		30-day 60%	45-day 80%									
1	UT	98.9	99.9	14	1,138	97.8%	2.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	SC	98.7	100.0	11	1,201	79.4%	20.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	ID	98.3	99.8	12	436	99.1%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	AK	94.7	99.1	33	144	89.6%	2.8%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	4.2%	2.1%
5	NE	87.8	99.1	13	508	97.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	HI	87.2	94.6	24	315	85.1%	5.7%	7.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%
7	MN	86.1	95.2	16	1,493	87.3%	6.6%	4.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%
8	FL	81.8	94.9	18	10,531	83.6%	9.4%	6.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
9	AL	81.0	92.9	33	1,397	68.8%	7.4%	14.4%	5.8%	2.2%	1.0%	0.4%
10	GA	77.4	95.7	16	4,270	88.1%	8.0%	3.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	CO	76.1	92.6	25	1,937	70.3%	19.6%	8.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%
12	IL	73.7	88.1	24	3,777	81.7%	6.5%	7.7%	1.9%	1.6%	0.6%	0.1%
13	MT	72.1	91.9	12	47	93.6%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
14	VT	70.3	94.9	30	139	75.5%	20.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.7%
15	IN	70.2	90.8	26	3,121	70.3%	19.1%	6.5%	0.8%	2.6%	0.4%	0.1%
16	MO	69.9	89.8	28	1,940	73.2%	11.4%	12.9%	1.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
17	ND	69.2	88.9	14	171	93.6%	5.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	WA	68.7	91.5	28	3,154	78.2%	11.9%	6.8%	0.5%	0.3%	1.4%	0.9%
19	AZ	65.1	87.7	34	3,255	59.6%	14.8%	22.5%	1.5%	0.6%	1.0%	0.0%
20	SD	55.9	90.9	18	187	77.0%	18.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	ME	54.7	90.6	24	693	75.2%	11.1%	8.2%	4.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
22	DE	51.3	86.7	22	560	72.1%	15.9%	11.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
23	MS	49.6	82.0	19	1,420	76.1%	15.8%	7.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
24	NC	48.5	80.3	44	4,179	50.2%	22.3%	22.1%	1.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.7%
25	NJ	40.9	85.5	43	3,949	35.8%	35.8%	21.4%	1.8%	2.7%	2.0%	0.5%
26	MD	28.9	82.0	28	4,683	56.2%	25.8%	16.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%
27	OR	28.8	92.0	22	1,515	70.8%	24.5%	4.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
28	VA	26.9	37.8	34	5,208	42.5%	22.7%	33.6%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
29	NH	24.3	71.2	164	727	44.6%	8.5%	5.5%	1.2%	1.9%	13.8%	24.5%
30	MI	22.4	53.0	55	3,941	36.1%	20.9%	28.9%	4.3%	5.5%	3.5%	0.9%
31	WV	21.0	60.4	30	872	50.5%	19.8%	28.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
32	DC	19.2	78.9	81	609	41.5%	16.1%	14.4%	5.7%	7.7%	11.3%	3.1%
33	TX	15.0	54.7	44	19,380	40.4%	15.3%	34.7%	6.0%	2.9%	0.5%	0.2%
34	PA	15.0	44.2	38	14,851	29.6%	22.7%	37.7%	1.6%	0.4%	7.9%	0.0%
35	NY	13.8	42.6	118	11,388	30.7%	10.4%	25.8%	7.2%	7.3%	9.4%	9.2%
36	KS	11.4	42.5	47	1,880	20.6%	25.7%	50.3%	2.1%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%
37	WI	9.9	22.7	38	4,407	39.4%	20.2%	38.2%	1.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
38	IA	8.9	37.2	41	2,659	47.1%	18.1%	28.8%	1.6%	1.2%	2.0%	1.2%
39	NV	8.2	38.3	42	2,048	35.5%	26.0%	33.7%	2.2%	0.8%	1.2%	0.5%
40	OK	7.6	59.0	29	1,909	49.3%	24.9%	25.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
41	KY	7.1	47.1	43	3,210	36.4%	24.9%	30.9%	4.9%	2.1%	0.5%	0.2%
42	NM	5.9	9.1	58	4,231	25.0%	11.3%	44.2%	14.8%	4.0%	0.6%	0.0%
43	PR	5.2	25.6	51	1,564	31.3%	15.9%	37.5%	11.4%	3.1%	0.9%	0.0%
44	MA	3.7	34.8	60	5,592	26.9%	16.3%	38.1%	9.7%	5.5%	3.1%	0.4%
45	CT	3.7	7.7	58	4,751	23.1%	12.8%	51.0%	9.3%	1.3%	2.3%	0.1%
46	CA	2.4	11.8	45	57,481	30.3%	17.4%	44.6%	6.0%	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%
47	OH	1.6	2.1	86	12,237	19.4%	11.0%	39.6%	21.6%	7.8%	0.6%	0.0%
48	LA	1.3	4.2	49	3,401	36.5%	20.1%	30.0%	5.2%	5.5%	2.7%	0.0%
49	TN	1.1	87.0	32	2,467	33.7%	49.5%	15.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%
50	RI	0.3	0.3	70	1,932	27.9%	8.8%	36.6%	20.7%	3.5%	1.4%	1.1%
51	AR	0.2	1.1	47	4,596	26.0%	15.5%	58.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	US	42	66	39	227,501	57.1%	15.8%	19.8%	3.2%	1.5%	1.6%	1.0%

Red Indicates failed timelapse; Green Indicates passed measure; Tan indicates failed average case age

% of States that met all 3 measures	31.37%	Rpt date:	1/21/11
% of States that met both timelapse measures	37.26%		
States who have not reported, as of the report date, are not on this report			

FIELD OPERATIONS - REPORT SUMMARY

STATEWIDE	2010-2011												STATEWIDE				
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Average	Current Mo. % of Avg.	Total	Appellants	
WORKLOAD																	
New Opened Cases																	
UI TL	39,238	40,219	31,780	35,604	30,181	35,509	38,676						35,887	108%	251,207	24,946	23,147
DI	1,763	1,609	1,366	1,372	1,159	1,414	1,537						1,460	105%	10,220		
Ruling & T-R	427	1,328	161	222	202	193	46						368	12%	2,579		
Tax	94	137	146	181	188	232	134						159	84%	1,112		
Other	41	31	40	17	27	21	18						28	65%	195		
Total	41,563	43,324	33,493	37,396	31,757	37,369	40,411						37,902	107%	265,313		
Multi Case/Clmt	386	153	77	6	5	5											
Closed Cases																	
UI TL	35,798	39,000	38,748	37,386	34,848	36,237	34,029						35,578	93%	256,046	21,949	23,593
DI	1,494	1,511	1,581	1,552	1,372	1,565	1,286						1,480	87%	10,361		
Ruling & T-R	395	600	446	751	280	389	413						468	88%	3,274		
Tax	135	101	174	130	99	235	139						145	96%	1,013		
Other	26	31	38	53	23	26	38						34	113%	235		
Total	37,848	41,243	40,987	39,872	36,622	38,452	35,905						38,704	93%	270,929		
Multi Case/Clmt	31/152		939	246/15	683												
Balance - Open Cases																	
UI TL	72,557	73,410	66,243	64,624	59,811	59,092	63,648						65,626	97%		41,053	42,329
DI	2,808	2,908	2,691	2,513	2,299	2,148	2,368						2,534	93%			
Ruling & T-R	4,970	5,701	5,412	4,885	4,806	4,610	4,243						4,947	86%			
Tax	4,754	4,790	4,758	4,801	4,890	4,885	4,867						4,821	101%			
Other	78	80	82	46	51	48	73						65	112%			
Total	85,167	86,889	79,186	76,869	71,857	70,783	75,199						77,993	96%			
Multi Case/Clmt	421	575	502	77	18	17											
Time Lapse																	
30 TL %	2	4	3	3	3	2	3						3	0%			
45 TL %	12	13	15	15	15	12	12						13	0%			
90 TL %	72	69	70	74	76	73	77						73	0%			
CASE AGE																	
Average Days	47	45	44	45	45	45	47						45	0%			
Average Days UI (median)	43	40	40	41	40	40	42						41	0%			
>90 Days Old	8%	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%	10%						8%	0%			
>90 Days Old w/out Multi	8%	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%	10%						8%	0%			
>90 Days Old DI	14%	12%	8%	9%	12%	12%	16%						12%	0%			
PY USAGE																	
ALJ	178.13	198.27	200.09	209.16	175.01								192.1	0%			
Non ALJ	219.66	231.08	213.17	218.83	184.80								213.5	0%			
Field Offices	397.79	429.35	413.26	427.99	359.81								405.6	0%			
Net PYs	1.23	1.17	1.07	1.05	1.06								1.11	0%			
Ratio 1 /	182.54	203.37	205.47	215.33	180.93								197.5	0%			
w/FOHQ&RSU	262.69	277.18	266.06	262.04	219.42								255.5	0%			
SS w/EDD	445.23	480.55	461.53	477.37	400.35								453.0	0%			
Net PYs	1.44	1.36	1.25	1.22	1.21								1.29	0%			
Ratio 1 /																	
PRODUCTIVITY																	
Weekly Dispos per ALJ (UI&DI)	48.6	45.3	46.7	43.1	52.7								47.3	0%			
Weekly Dispos per ALJ	49.4	46.1	47.5	44.1	53.3								48.1	0%			
Weekly Dispos (Non-ALJ)	34.3	33.8	38.1	36.2	43.9								37.3	0%			

AO REPORT TO BOARD—MONTH OF JANUARY 2011

	# Cases	# Appellants	Fiscal Yr Ave
REGISTRATIONS	2,506	1,497 est.	9% below
DISPOSITIONS	2,601	1,686	1% above
OPEN BALANCE	3,871	2,022 (est.)	11% above
CASE AGING	38 Days	MET DOL STANDARD (40 days or less)	

TIME LAPSE

DOL Standard	Actual % for January 2011	Expected
45 Days	29%	50%
75 Days	89%	80%
150 Days	100%	95%

APPEAL RATE The average rate of ALJ decisions appealed to the board was 6.5% which is below the November and December rates of 7.0% and 7.4% .

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FO TO AO Monthly Report The average days in transfer for cases in January 2011 was lower than each of the three months for the last quarter of 2010..

The Report on ALJ production in January 2011 is included with the board materials.

A luncheon to recognize the retirement of Jorge Carrillo, former Chief ALJ, Appellate Operations is scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 2011 at noon.

A proposed precedent benefit decision has been prepared and forwarded to the Chief Counsel for review.

**California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board
Board Appeal Summary Report**

	January, 2011	December, 2010	November, 2010	October, 2010
	Average Days In Transfer	Average Days In Transfer	Average Days In Transfer	Average Days In Transfer
	Case Count	Case Count	Case Count	Case Count
Fresno	4.81	8.04	6.98	5.78
Inglewood	6.22	9.60	10.79	9.66
Inland	4.80	8.47	9.89	7.30
Los Angeles	5.18	8.96	7.44	5.18
Oakland	6.28	12.22	12.16	7.93
Orange County	4.88	7.59	8.71	5.82
Oxnard	5.08	9.10	7.44	4.87
Pasadena	13.64	15.30	15.82	12.15
Sacramento	5.71	10.71	8.47	4.59
San Diego	7.85	14.56	16.59	19.80
San Francisco	5.01	8.14	7.88	5.57
San Jose	6.28	9.21	10.88	11.94
Tax Office	5.32	7.57	6.75	4.59
Total	6.02	9.97	9.83	8.05
	2103	2752	3036	3146

- (a) If a party fails to appear in any day of a hearing and an administrative law judge issues a decision on the merits adverse to that party's interest, the party may file an application to vacate the decision within 20 days after service of the decision. The application shall specify the reason for vacating the decision. If the application is untimely, it shall specify the reason for the delay.
- (b) If the application fails to specify the reason for vacating the decision, or, if applicable, for its ~~untimeliness~~ filing, an administrative law judge ~~may order the application to vacate the decision denied. may serve notice requiring the applicant to specify the reason by filing it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the applicant fails to comply, an administrative law judge may order the application to vacate the decision denied.~~ Alternatively, an administrative law judge may serve notice requiring the applicant to specify the reason by filing it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the applicant fails to comply, an administrative law judge may order the application to vacate the decision denied.
- (c) If the reason specified by the applicant shows that there is no good cause for vacating the decision, or, if applicable, for the untimely application, an administrative law judge may order the application to vacate the decision denied.
- (d) An application to vacate a decision that is not otherwise denied in accordance with this rule shall be scheduled for hearing. If the applicant shows good cause for vacating the decision, and, if applicable, for the untimely application, the decision shall be ordered vacated; otherwise the application to vacate the decision shall be ordered denied.
- (e) If an applicant fails to appear in the hearing on an application to vacate a decision, an administrative law judge may order the application denied.
- (f) If a party that has grounds to file an application to vacate a decision files what purports to be a board appeal, it shall be treated as an application to vacate the decision, unless the application or the party clearly states to the contrary.
- (g) ~~Except as provided in subsection (h) of this rule, u~~Upon service of an order denying an application to vacate a decision, the applicant shall be deemed to have filed a board appeal of the denial of the application to vacate, and also of the original adverse decision which was the subject of the application to vacate.
- (h) ~~A party may file an application to reopen an order denying an application to vacate issued under subsections (b) or (e) of this rule within 20 days after service of the order. The application to reopen shall specify the reason for reopening and, if applicable, for its untimely filing. If the application provides grounds for finding good cause to reopen or, if applicable, for the untimely filing, the application shall be scheduled for a hearing. If the applicant shows good cause for reopening the decision, and, if applicable, for the untimely filing, the application shall be reopened; otherwise, an administrative law judge shall order the application denied. If the application does not provide grounds~~

for finding good cause to reopen or, if applicable, for the untimely filing, the application shall instead be processed as a board appeal and be deemed part of the board appeal specified in subsection (g) of this rule.

- (i) An order vacating a decision is appealable to the board only upon service of an adverse decision or order on the appeal or petition.

(2-01-11)

5067, title 22, CCR amended:

- (a) The appellant, petitioner, or applicant may file an application to reopen the appeal, petition or application within 20 days after service of an order:
 - (i) Dismissing an appeal or petition on any of the grounds specified in rule 5066;
 - (ii) Denying an application for reinstatement, ~~or reopening, or vacating a decision for failure to specify the reason for the application or, if applicable, the reason the application is untimely,~~ or for failure comply with a 10 day notice to specify the reason for the application or, if applicable, the reason the application is untimely;
 - (iii) Denying an application for reinstatement, ~~or reopening, or vacating a decision~~ for failure to appear in the hearing on such an application;
 - (iv) Dismissing an untimely petition for failure to comply with a 20 day notice to specify the reason the petition is untimely; or,
 - (v) Denying a hearing on a petition for failure to apply for a hearing within 20 days after service of a notice of intention to render a decision or order on the petition without a hearing.
 - (vi) ~~Denying a hearing on an appeal for failure to apply for a hearing within 10 days after service of a notice of intention to render a decision or order on the appeal without a hearing.~~
 - (vii) ~~Dismissing an untimely appeal for failure to specify the reason for the delay or for failure to comply with a 10 day notice to specify the reason for the delay.~~
- (b) The application shall specify the reason for reopening. If the application is untimely, it shall also specify the reason for the delay.
- (c) If the application fails to specify the reason for reopening, or, if applicable, for ~~it's the untimeliness-filing,~~ an administrative law judge may ~~serve notice requiring the applicant to specify the reason by filing it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the applicant fails to comply, an administrative law judge may order reopening denied.~~ Alternatively, if the untimely application fails to specify a reason, an administrative law judge may serve notice requiring the applicant to specify the reason by filing it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the applicant fails to comply, an administrative law judge may order reopening denied.
- (d) If the reason specified by the applicant shows that there is no good cause for reopening, or, if applicable, for the untimely application, an administrative law judge may order reopening denied.
- (e) An application for reopening that is not otherwise denied, or processed as a board appeal, in accordance with this rule shall be scheduled for hearing. If the applicant shows good cause for reopening, and, if applicable, for the untimely application, the matter shall be ordered reopened; otherwise reopening shall be denied.
- (f) If an applicant for reopening fails to appear in the hearing on reopening, an administrative law judge may order reopening denied.

- (g) If a party that has grounds to file an application to reopen pursuant to subsections (a)(i), (a)(iv), (a)(v) and (a)(vi) of this rule files what purports to be a board appeal, it shall be treated as an application to reopen, unless the application or the party clearly states to the contrary.
- (h) If a party that has grounds to file an application to reopen pursuant to subsections (a)(ii) and (a)(iii) of this rule files such an application or files what purports to be a board appeal, it shall be processed as an application to reopen pursuant to subsection (e) of this rule if the application or purported board appeal provides grounds to find good cause for reopening or, if applicable, for the untimely filing. If the application or purported board appeal does not provide grounds to find good cause for reopening or, if applicable, for the untimely filing, the application or purported board appeal shall instead be processed as a board appeal.
- (i) An order granting reopening is appealable to the board only upon service of an adverse decision or order on the appeal or petition.

(2-01-11)

5050 Withdrawal and Reinstatement

- (a) An appellant or petitioner may apply to withdraw an appeal or petition before the decision of the administrative law judge is served.
- (b) Upon such an application, an administrative law judge shall order the appeal or petition dismissed.
- (c) An applicant may apply to withdraw an application for reinstatement, reopening or vacating a decision before the order of the administrative law judge on the application is served.
- (d) Upon such an application to withdraw, an administrative law judge shall order the application for reinstatement, reopening, or vacating dismissed.
- (e) The appellant, petitioner, or applicant may file an application for reinstatement within 20 days after service of an order dismissing an appeal, petition or application due to withdrawal. The application shall specify the reason for reinstatement. If the application is untimely, it shall also specify the reason for the delay.
- (f) If the application fails to specify the reason for reinstatement or, if applicable, for its **untimely iness filing**, an administrative law judge may **order reinstatement denied**. **Alternatively, an administrative law judge may** serve notice requiring the application to specify the reason by filing it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the applicant fails to comply, an administrative law judge may order reinstatement denied.
- (g) If the reason specified by the applicant show that there is no good cause for reinstatement, or, if applicable, for the untimely application, an administrative law judge may order reinstatement denied.
- (h) An application for reinstatement that is not otherwise denied in accordance with this rule shall be scheduled for hearing. If the applicant shows good cause for reinstatement, and, if applicable, for the untimely application, the appeal or petition shall be ordered reinstated; otherwise reinstatement shall be ordered denied.
- (i) If an applicant for reinstatement fails to appear in the hearing on reinstatement, an administrative law judge may order reinstatement denied.
- (j) **An order granting reinstatement is appealable to the board only upon service of an adverse order or decision on the appeal or petition.**

(2-01-11)

5051 Dismissal of Untimely Appeal

~~An administrative law judge shall order an untimely appeal dismissed unless the appellant shows good cause for the untimeliness. If good cause is shown, the appeal shall be decided on the merits.~~

- (a) If an appeal is untimely filed, the appellant shall specify the reason for the delay.
- (b) If the appellant fails to specify a reason for the delay, an administrative law judge may dismiss the appeal. Alternatively, the administrative law judge may serve notice requiring the appellant to specify the reason by filing it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the appellant fails to comply, an administrative law judge may dismiss the appeal.
- (c) If the reason specified by the appellant shows that there is no good cause for the untimely filing, an administrative law judge may dismiss the appeal.
- (d) An untimely appeal that is not otherwise dismissed in accordance with this rule shall be scheduled for hearing. If the appellant shows good cause for the untimely filing, the appeal shall be decided on the merits. Otherwise, the appeal shall be dismissed.
- (e) An order finding good cause for the untimely appeal is appealable to the board only upon service of an adverse decision or order on the appeal.

(2-01-11)

5071. Decision or Order on Appeal Without Hearing

On his or her own motion, or on the application of a party, an administrative law judge may serve notice of intention to render a decision or order on an appeal without a hearing. Within 10 days after service of such a notice, any party may file and serve an application for a hearing. A hearing shall be granted upon such an application. If no such application is filed and served within that time, an administrative law judge may proceed to render a decision or order on the appeal without a hearing. The evidence of record in the proceeding and matters officially noticed in the proceeding shall be identified in the audiovisual record or the case register.

5104 Untimely Documents

- (a) Any untimely document filed in a proceeding before the board, including an untimely board appeal, shall specify the reason for the delay.
- (b) If an untimely document fails to specify the reason for the delay, the board may **dismiss the board appeal or deny acceptance of a document. Alternatively, the board may** serve notice requiring the party that filed it to specify the reason for the delay by filing and serving the reason within 10 days after service of such order. If the party that filed the untimely document fails to comply with such a notice, the board may order an untimely board appeal dismissed, or may deny late filing or service of any other untimely document.
- (c) Within 10 days after service of such a specification of a reason, any other party may file and serve a response to it.
- (d) If the party that filed an untimely document shows good cause for the delay, the untimely document shall be allowed **or the board appeal accepted**; otherwise an untimely board appeal shall be ~~shall be~~ ordered dismissed, or late filing or service of any other untimely document shall be denied.

(2-01-11)

Board Member	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	UI	DI	Ruling	Tax	1 Party	2 Party	Total
Alberto Torrico														
Sum	223	160	5	0	0	0	0	380	8	0	0	115	273	388
Percent	13%	9%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%	4%	0%	0%	9%	12%	
Bonnie Garcia														
Sum	391	576	8	0	0	0	0	870	92	7	6	395	580	975
Percent	23%	33%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%	27%	45%	39%	43%	31%	26%	
Denise Ducheny														
Sum	190	174	7	0	0	0	0	362	7	1	1	113	258	371
Percent	11%	10%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	3%	6%	7%	9%	11%	
Dennis Hollingsworth														
Sum	201	188	3	0	0	0	0	387	3	2	0	122	270	392
Percent	12%	11%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%	1%	11%	0%	10%	12%	
George Plescia														
Sum	537	476	7	0	0	0	0	921	86	7	6	407	613	1020
Percent	31%	27%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	28%	42%	39%	43%	32%	27%	
Roy Ashburn														
Sum	190	162	9	0	0	0	0	349	10	1	1	106	255	361
Percent	11%	9%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	5%	6%	7%	8%	11%	
Total Cases Reviewed:	1732	1736	39	0	0	0	0	3269	206	18	14	1258	2249	

*Off Calendar

Tuesday, February 01, 2011



CALIFORNIA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BOARD
SPECIAL PROJECTS MATRIX
February 2011

California's economy is globally ranked with approximately 1.0 million business owners and 15.9 million workers. Currently, California, along with the nation, is experiencing an immense economic downturn with 2.3 million California workers out of work. These are unprecedented numbers for California and the nation. Given this current economic situation, we strive to better serve California's workers and business owners during a time when more than ever, they are in need of our services. Since January 2009, the Board has been focused on the appeal backlog and identifying work solutions that will help address the workload.

WORK PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p>EDD/CUIAB Appeal Co-Location Pilot Exploring the co-location of four CUIAB staff at EDD's LA PAC to streamline appeals registration processing.</p>		On Hold	Developed scope with EDD 07/2010 Connectivity established 08/2010 Equip installed 08/2010 Train staff 09/20/2010 Launch Pilot 09/27/2010 Analyze impact to appeals workload 12/2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce claimants' & employers' wait time for hearing decisions. - Resolve appeal registration issues in a timely manner. 	Project launch on 09/27. EDD & CUIAB staff will evaluate the initial project data after the first 30 days and follow with evaluations at 60 and 90 days. Suspended on 10/04 to address CUIAB registration backlog due to hiring/overtime freeze.
<p>US Department of Labor Taskforce For nine years, CUIAB has failed to meet US DOL timeliness standards for UI appeals. California is ranked 51st among 53 states and US territories on time lapse and case aging standards. In late 2008, US DOL placed CUIAB under a corrective action plan with oversight by a taskforce of US DOL, EDD & CUIAB representatives.</p>		High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet DOL time lapse measures. - Meet DOL case age measures. 	US DOL representatives conducted an appellate review and evaluation during the week of 07/27-31/2009. Formal DOL report sent on 02/05/2010. A response by LWDA was sent on 03/10/2010. The two-year "At-Risk" corrective action plan was submitted to DOL on 07/15/2010.

TECHNOLOGY

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p>Accelerate Decision Notification to EDD Currently, CUIAB Field staff prepare appeal decisions for mailing to the appellants and EDD UI Branch. CUIAB and EDD are jointly developing electronic solutions for the transfer of appeal decisions to all EDD programs.</p>	Lori Kurosaka	On Hold	<p>EDD/CUIAB workgroup launched 08/18/2009 Unlisy's contract award 01/2010 Phase I implementation 04/14/2010 (second level) Phase II design 05/03/2010 (first level) Phase II implementation 09-10/2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce claimants' & employers' wait times for benefits and adjustments. - Reduce postage and paper costs. - Increase information security for claimants & employers. 	<p>FO design & development began 05/03/2010 Phase II implementation rollout began 09/22 with three FOs. Rollout of five FOs follow on 10/04 & 10/07. Phase III project development for Tax & DI decisions on hold through mid 02/2011 due to EDD's ACES implementation and DI staffing constraints.</p>
<p>ALJ Mobility Pilot Provides mobile equipment to conduct hearings in remote locations.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium			<p>Inland FO will be pilot site. Training completed in 03/2010. Implementation is continuing. LA FO deployment scheduled for 12/2010.</p>
<p>CUIAB Network Upgrade This upgrade will double the bandwidth for faster processing of appeal data and information for ALJs and staff.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce processing time for appeals data flow and document saving. 	<p>Meeting with EDD IT to explore options & alignment with Agency network consolidation efforts.</p>
<p>Digital Imaging Currently, EDD mails hard copy documents to CUIAB when an appeal is filed. CUIAB will collaborate with EDD to image documents and records relating to all appeals and design an electronic exchange.</p>	Rafael Placencia Lori Kurosaka	High	<p>Kick off 11/2010 FSR completion 02/2011 Potential BCP 02/2011 Procurement 04/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce paper files prepared & sent by EDD UI Branch. - Increase information security. - Reduce paper file storage space needs & costs at CUIAB. - Reduce postage costs. - Increase federal performance. 	<p>DOL approved funding at \$354,000 for this planning phase only. Project and procurement strategy approved by LWDA & EDD. Six week start delay due to OCIO approval. EDD & CUIAB staff are drafting their portions and developing economic analysis worksheets.</p>
<p>Digital Personnel System This project creates a paperless process for recruitment and hiring process between HR and hiring managers (Phase I). Phase II will use CUIAB's external web site to accept electronic application filing for CUIAB job vacancies.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium	<p>Phase I design 05/2009 Phase I implementation 06/2009 Phase II design 08/2009 Phase II implementation 09/2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace existing manual process to full paperless process - Eliminate the mailing of applicant documentation - Reduce staff time for preparing to hire by fully automating the application process 	<p>Phase I is in use. Phase II is in development</p>
<p>Electronic Case Management CUIAB's case tracking database is 8 years old and becoming cumbersome to manage the current workload volume. CUIAB is collaborating with LWDA & EDD to develop an integrated case management system.</p>	Rafael Placencia Lori Kurosaka	On Hold until 04/2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Receive appeals case documents electronically from EDD. - Eliminate internal mailing of case documents 	<p>DOL approved funding at \$404,000 for the planning phase only. Project & procurement strategy approved for FSR development by LWDA, EDD & CUIAB. Vendor contract approved by LWDA. Kick off will occur after Digital Imaging contract.</p>

TECHNOLOGY cont.

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p>Electronic Transmission of Board Appeals to FO Currently, Presiding Judges receive hard copies of all board decisions for review to help identify ALJ training needs. This solution will transmit the decisions electronically to the PJs.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eliminate the mailing of hard copy decisions to CUIAB Field Offices. - Increase information security. - Save paper and postage costs. 	Draft reports pending review with AO.
<p>Enhance Wireless Connections CUIAB will upgrade 12 Field Offices and 3 large out-station offices for wireless connection. This will provide faster laptop and PC response times for ALJs in hearing rooms and offices.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High	Procure "hot spot" connectivity boosters. Install boosters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seamlessly connect to CUIAB network via mobile devices. 	Equipment received. Working on design and project plan. Design completed and working on configuration and testing. SF install on 11/09 & Fresno on 11/18.
<p>Expand Auto Dialer Hearing Reminder Adding email and cell phone text features for supplemental hearing notifications.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High	Updated software. Final testing 08/2010. Implemented 09/2010.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase hearing attendance rate & productivity. 	Email notifications implemented in 09/2010. Fourth request for DE 1000 update to UI Branch for cell phone text messaging made on 10/06/2010. Analyzing data to determine need for phone hearing reminders. Specs pending review.
<p>Field Office Technology Enhancements CUIAB is investing in technology improvements for Field Offices. CUIAB will test the use of larger sized monitors for hearing rooms. Also, CUIAB will provide second monitors for support staff to toggle into SCDB without interrupting their CATS displays.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium	Complete procurement 02/2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve readability of documents on screen. 	Preparing procurement documents for additional monitors
<p>Field Office Telephone Tree Field Operations will test the use of phone menu options to answer routine constituent calls. This will allow support staff to spend more time on the non-routine calls.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium	Develop standard automated phone tree to be used for all FO's Pilot new phone tree in the Inland FO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce claimants & employers time on phones. - Standardize hearing information provided by phone. 	Standard phone tree design completed. Pilot began in the Inland FO. IT & Admin are developing evaluation tool to measure pilot effectiveness.
<p>Hearing Scheduling System Currently, FO & AO support staff schedule or assign appeal hearings or cases using a hybrid manual process considering many different criteria.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High	Charter & scope completed. Kick off 10/14/2010. Requirements in review 01/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce claimants & employers wait time for hearing decisions. - Provide easier electronic process for staff to calendar hearings or schedule cases. 	AO, FO & IT observed an EDD demo on their UI Scheduling System. Finalizing project scope. Business requirements in review 01/2011.

TECHNOLOGY cont.

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p>LWDA Network Consolidation To comply with OCIO Policy Letter 10-14, the LWDA Departments & Boards are developing a network consolidation plan that must be completed by June 2013.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium	LWDA Workgroup develops migration plan. Consensus on migration plan. Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve IT efficiency & effectiveness. - Improve security. - Reduce IT costs by using shared service models. - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions. 	The migration plan is completed and a cost model has been developed.
<p>Personal Productivity & Mobility Pilot for Board Members, Appellate & Senior Staff CUJAB will test the use of new mobile, paperless technology with Board Members, six Appellate ALJs, and Senior Staff.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce the use of paper for board appeal processing and board meetings. 	Researching feasibility of technology alternatives.
<p>Printer Standardization Standardizes the use of printers throughout the organization as they are replaced. This will reduce maintenance and toner costs through the printers lives.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce maintenance & support costs. - Reduce toner costs. 	Researching feasible equipment
<p>VOIP Telephony CUJAB is exploring use of Voice Over Internet technology to provide lower cost telecommunications. This will also include expansion of auto dialer hearing reminder system.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High	Identify equipment costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elimination of long distance toll calls - Consolidation of telecommunications support areas. 	OTECH delegation submitted 04/06/10. Working with vendor to establish system requirements. First installations in Santa Ana, Oxnard & Van Nuys in 01/2011. Revising rollout schedule with Venzon.
<p>Workstation Refresh Replace the 150 remaining PCs that have expired warranties throughout the state.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High		-	Preparing procurement documents.

STAFFING, FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT & OTHER

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p>Administration Branch Move To leverage headquarters space, a part of Administration Branch staff will be housed on the first floor @ Venture Oaks.</p>	<p>Janet Maglente Pam Boston</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>This move will accommodate space needs for IT. Will require tenant improvement to move security door.</p>
<p>Archive File Document Conversion Each FO is retaining three years of completed paper appeal case files that are sitting in considerable real estate space. The file room space may be easily converted to ALJ offices or hearing rooms.</p>	<p>Lori Kurosaka Pat Houston</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>MSA vendor contract executed 01/2010. OC, Inland, LA, Oxnard, San Jose, San Diego, LA, Sacto, SF. Appellate complete Vendor quality check 04/05, 05/06 & 08/19.</p>	<p>- Recapture real estate space for ALJ offices and hearing rooms. - Priority conversion for OC, Inland, LA, San Jose & Oxnard.</p>	<p>FO staff are inventorying, prepping and boxing 2008 & 2009 archive appeal files in Fresno, Pasadena and Tax. FOs with adequate staffing are beginning to send 2010 files to vendor.</p>
<p>Performance Management Tools for Board & Leadership In addition to program performance reporting to US DOL, CUIAB & Leadership will use to monitor overall appellate performance and process cycle times. These tools will also help to measure success with the large scale technology projects.</p>	<p>Janet Maglente</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Business case metrics for imaging Business case metrics for case management</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Completed report templates with IT and tested with live data. Developing performance metric tool for Board & Leadership to summarize data and analysis of the metrics.</p>
<p>Transforming CUIAB To procure a consultant to help plan and guide the leadership team through organizational change management. A consultant will assist with defining organizational structure, proactive communications with stakeholders, identify staff skill sets needed for new technology, etc.</p>	<p>Rafael Placencia Pam Boston Lori Kurosaka</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>CMAA scope of work completed. Release RFO</p>	<p>- Plan, design and implement organizational design for the large scale technology projects. - Plan and coordinate communications with all stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>A draft scope of work is pending review with the leadership team and project teams. Anticipate initiating procurement process by 02/2011.</p>

CUIAB 10/11 Fiscal Year Overtime - SCO Report
July 2010 through December 2010

Branch	FY Y-T-D Decision Typing		FY Y-T-D CTU Typing		FY Y-T-D Registration		FY Y-T-D Other	
	Hours	Pay	Hours	Pay	Hours	Pay	Hours	Pay
Appellate	7.75	\$228.24	0.00	\$0.00	57.75	\$1,585.91	317.00	\$9,874.48
Admin	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	219.50	\$7,709.62	284.25	\$12,197.51
IT	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	630.75	\$26,915.67
Exec	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	23.50	\$1,199.21	124.00	\$3,684.38
Field	1,642.50	\$54,397.13	0.00	\$0.00	1,819.25	\$49,937.10	2,678.75	\$86,089.08
Total	1,650.25	\$54,625.37	0.00	\$0.00	2,120.00	\$60,431.84	4,034.75	\$138,761.12

10/11 Fiscal Year-to-Date Total Overtime Expenditures					FY 10/11 FY Projections	
Branch	10/11 FY Allocation	Year-to Date Hours	Year-to Date Pay	Allocation Balance	Estimated Expenditures Over-/Under	
Appellate	\$158,242.99	382.50	\$11,688.63	\$146,554.36	\$134,865.73	
Admin	\$121,418.90	503.75	\$19,907.13	\$101,511.77	\$81,604.64	
IT	\$113,289.60	630.75	\$26,915.67	\$86,373.93	\$59,458.26	
Exec	\$17,565.82	147.50	\$4,883.59	\$12,682.23	\$7,798.64	
Field Operations	\$1,221,881.22	6,140.50	\$190,423.31	\$1,031,457.91	\$841,034.59	
Total	1,632,398.53	7,805.00	\$253,818.33	\$1,378,580.20	\$1,124,761.86	