

**UI TRENDS - FO**

Program Codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42

**NEW OPENED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
2008	24,049	20,982	25,443	28,984	24,768	24,092	24,904	24,902	29,898	31,704	29,345	29,331	318,402	<b>26,534</b>		
2009	32,164	29,014	31,429	31,869	32,267	34,435	32,319	31,827	33,713	35,619	27,150	37,388	389,194	<b>32,433</b>	122%	5,899
2010	37,307	34,125	38,172	42,249	37,447	36,321	39,238	40,219	31,780	35,604	30,181	35,509	438,152	<b>36,513</b>	113%	4,080
2011	38,676	34,399	39,494										112,569	<b>37,523</b>	103%	1,010

UI registrations Mar to date are up 3% from 2010, up 22% from 2009, and up 60% from 2008  
 UI registration monthly average is up 3% from 2010, up 16% from 2009, and up 41% from 2008

**CLOSED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
2008	21,005	22,903	29,555	25,899	26,437	24,463	24,439	19,930	24,266	27,396	21,606	26,483	294,382	<b>24,532</b>		
2009	25,728	24,752	28,392	30,565	30,101	32,703	34,500	30,455	32,165	39,878	34,525	36,623	380,387	<b>31,699</b>	129%	7,167
2010	32,738	37,951	44,067	39,481	35,731	36,680	35,798	39,000	38,748	37,386	34,848	36,237	448,665	<b>37,389</b>	118%	5,690
2011	34,029	37,998	50,124										122,151	<b>40,717</b>	109%	3,328

UI dispositions Mar to date are up 6% from 2010, up 55% from 2009, and up 66% from 2008  
 UI disposition monthly average is up 9% from 2010, up 28% from 2009, and up 66% from 2008

**BALANCE OPEN CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
2008	42,602	40,635	36,437	39,418	37,700	37,280	37,664	42,554	48,111	52,305	59,975	62,706		<b>44,782</b>		
2009	69,049	73,237	76,311	77,968	80,188	81,750	79,774	81,302	82,785	78,473	71,095	71,813		<b>76,979</b>	172%	32,197
2010	76,301	72,323	66,136	68,715	70,234	69,664	72,557	73,410	66,243	64,624	59,811	59,075		<b>68,258</b>	89%	-8,721
2011	63,632	59,909	49,088											<b>57,543</b>	84%	-10,715

UI balance of open cases Mar to date is down 20% from 2010, down 21% from 2009, and up 44% from 2008  
 UI balance monthly average down 16% from 2010, down 25% from 2009, and up 28% from 2008

2010	84%	80%
2009	75%	79%
2008	128%	144%
	chg to '11 avg	chg to '11 YTD

**DI TRENDS - FO**  
Program Codes 7, 10, 11, 12, 16 & 20

**NEW OPENED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
<b>2008</b>	1,481	1,470	1,661	1,887	1,534	1,540	1,615	1,333	1,697	1,640	1,317	1,522	18,697	<b>1,558</b>		
<b>2009</b>	1,610	1,107	1,794	1,519	1,628	1,748	1,537	1,321	1,571	1,414	1,245	1,330	17,824	<b>1,485</b>	95%	-73
<b>2010</b>	1,446	1,437	1,775	1,957	1,371	1,232	1,763	1,609	1,366	1,372	1,159	1,414	17,901	<b>1,492</b>	100%	6
<b>2011</b>	1,537	1,651	1,411										4,599	<b>1,533</b>	103%	41
DI registrations Mar to date are down 1% from 2010, up 2% from 2009, and even with 2008													2010	103%	99%	
DI registration monthly average is up 3% from 2010, up 3% from 2009, and down 2% from 2008													2009	103%	102%	
													2008	98%	100%	
													chg to '11 avg		chg to '11 YTD	

**CLOSED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
<b>2008</b>	1,579	1,477	1,506	1,368	1,884	1,720	1,601	1,385	1,579	1,920	1,049	1,277	18,345	<b>1,529</b>		
<b>2009</b>	1,217	1,269	1,451	1,465	1,129	1,463	1,823	1,644	1,648	1,753	1,527	1,701	18,090	<b>1,508</b>	99%	-21
<b>2010</b>	1,283	1,557	1,967	1,852	1,276	1,581	1,494	1,511	1,581	1,552	1,372	1,565	18,591	<b>1,549</b>	103%	42
<b>2011</b>	1,295	1,576	1,925										4,796	<b>1,599</b>	103%	49
DI dispositions Mar to date are even with 2010, up 22% from 2009, and up 5% from 2008													2010	103%	100%	
DI disposition monthly average is up 3% from 2010, up 6% from 2009, and up 5% from 2008													2009	106%	122%	
													2008	105%	105%	
													chg to '11 avg		chg to '11 YTD	

**BALANCE OPEN CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
<b>2008</b>	2,590	2,586	2,738	3,257	2,907	2,728	2,742	2,692	2,810	2,525	2,790	3,034		<b>2,783</b>		
<b>2009</b>	3,426	3,264	3,613	3,684	4,197	4,478	4,204	3,895	3,819	3,476	3,203	2,836		<b>3,675</b>	132%	891
<b>2010</b>	2,997	2,876	2,682	2,789	2,891	2,541	2,808	2,908	2,691	2,513	2,299	2,148		<b>2,679</b>	73%	-996
<b>2011</b>	2,390	2,465	1,951											<b>2,269</b>	85%	-410
Open Balance DI Mar to date is down 20% from 2010, down 34% from 2009, and down 14% from 2008													2010	85%	80%	
Open Balance monthly average down 15% from 2010, down 38% from 2009, and down 18% from 2008													2009	62%	66%	
													2008	82%	86%	
													chg to '11 avg		chg to '11 YTD	

**TAX TRENDS - FO**  
Program Codes 15, 17, 18, 32

**NEW OPENED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
2008	187	277	202	191	183	281	199	171	201	303	170	254	2,619	<b>218</b>		
2009	166	93	219	174	258	164	252	256	169	292	224	229	2,496	<b>208</b>	95%	-10
2010	142	139	164	233	140	163	94	137	146	181	188	232	1,959	<b>163</b>	78%	-45
2011	134	168	144										446	<b>149</b>	91%	-15
													2010	91%	100%	
													2009	71%	93%	
													2008	68%	67%	
														chg to '11 avg	chg to '11 YTD	

Tax registrations Mar to date are even with 2010, down 7% from 2009, and down 33% from 2008

Tax registration monthly average down 9% from 2010, down 29% from 2009, and down 32% from 2008

**CLOSED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg
2008	82	147	117	78	414	145	174	139	118	167	68	87	1,736	<b>145</b>		
2009	92	97	172	149	72	97	126	111	162	70	149	288	1,585	<b>132</b>	91%	-13
2010	48	109	107	91	117	124	135	101	174	130	99	235	1,470	<b>123</b>	93%	-10
2011	139	173	193										505	<b>168</b>	137%	46
													2010	137%	191%	
													2009	127%	140%	
													2008	116%	146%	
														chg to '11 avg	chg to '11 YTD	

Tax dispositions Mar to date are up 91% from 2010, up 40% from 2009, and up 46% from 2008

Tax disposition monthly average is up 37% from 2010, up 27% from 2009, and up 16% from 2008

**BALANCE OPEN CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Yr-Yr AvgChg	
2008	2,739	2,869	2,953	3,066	2,833	2,969	2,994	3,026	3,109	3,243	3,344	3,511		<b>3,055</b>			
2009	3,585	3,580	3,627	3,649	3,836	3,903	4,029	4,174	4,180	4,402	4,477	4,416		<b>3,988</b>	131%	934	
2010	4,509	4,539	4,596	4,738	4,759	4,796	4,754	4,790	4,758	4,801	4,890	4,885		<b>4,735</b>	119%	746	
2011	4,880	4,874	4,824											<b>4,859</b>	103%	125	
														2010	103%	107%	
														2009	122%	135%	
														2008	159%	170%	
															chg to '11 avg	chg to '11 YTD	

Tax balance of open cases Mar to date is up 7% from 2010, up 35% from 2009, and up 70% from 2008

Tax balance monthly average up 3% from 2010, up 22% from 2009, and up 59% from 2008

**ALL PROGRAM TRENDS - FO**

**NEW OPENED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTAL	Avg.	% Change	Number Change
2008	25,938	23,093	27,702	31,537	27,015	26,199	27,234	27,027	32,412	33,831	30,926	31,245	344,159	28,680		
2009	34,115	30,306	33,645	34,018	34,720	36,687	34,412	33,610	35,623	38,035	29,542	39,222	413,935	34,495	120%	5,815
2010	39,381	36,310	40,820	45,037	39,399	38,140	41,563	43,324	33,493	37,396	31,757	37,369	463,989	38,666	112%	4,171
2011	40,411	36,315	41,141										117,867	39,289	102%	623

Registrations Mar to date are up 1% from 2010, up 20% from 2009, and up 54% from 2008  
 Registration monthly average is up 2% from 2010, up 14% from 2009, and up 37% from 2008

**CLOSED CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTAL	Avg.	% Change	Number Change
2008	22,962	24,939	31,377	27,534	29,082	26,725	26,640	21,783	26,305	29,943	23,055	27,989	318,334	26,528		
2009	27,273	26,451	30,253	32,388	31,481	34,471	36,722	32,474	34,290	41,893	36,461	38,969	403,126	33,594	127%	7,066
2010	34,404	40,009	46,641	42,106	37,589	39,101	37,848	41,243	40,987	39,872	36,622	38,452	474,874	39,573	118%	5,979
2011	35,905	40,146	52,970										129,021	43,007	109%	3,434

Dispositions Mar to date are up 7% from 2010, up 54% from 2009, and up 63% from 2008  
 Disposition monthly average is up 9% from 2010, up 28% from 2009, and up 62% from 2008

**BALANCE OPEN CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Avg.	% Change	Number Change
2008	50,735	48,851	45,085	48,985	46,870	46,297	46,811	51,973	58,005	61,773	69,574	72,712	53,973		
2009	79,459	83,239	86,674	88,675	91,984	94,025	91,932	93,231	94,499	90,583	83,671	83,874	88,487	164%	34,515
2010	88,772	84,920	78,808	81,554	83,171	81,997	85,167	86,889	79,186	76,869	71,857	70,783	80,831	91%	-7,656
2011	75,199	71,225	59,203										68,542	85%	-12,289

Open Balance Mar to date is down 19% from 2010, down 18% from 2009, and up 42% from 2008

Open Balance monthly average is down 15% from 2010, down 23% from 2009, and up 27% from 2008

2010	85%	81%
2009	77%	82%
2008	127%	142%
	chg to '11 avg	chg to '11 YTD

## Lower Authority Appeals Ranked by Timelapse and Average Age

Feb 2011		<=30-day Avg Age ALP		States Ranked by Timelapse								
National Ranking	Feb 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	UT	99.8	100.0	13	1,310	95.6%	4.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	SC	97.7	100.0	19	1,157	50.6%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	AK	96.3	99.2	16	359	95.0%	4.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
4	ID	95.5	99.2	13	429	92.3%	6.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	NE	94.7	98.9	11	448	98.9%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	OR	90.2	98.2	15	1,208	92.1%	5.3%	2.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
7	MN	89.4	96.4	16	1,410	87.2%	6.4%	5.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%
8	IL	87.1	94.9	18	3,563	85.9%	5.7%	5.6%	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.2%
9	FL	85.6	95.2	15	10,267	86.8%	9.5%	3.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
10	HI	84.8	92.7	23	329	73.3%	17.3%	6.7%	1.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%
11	MT	83.9	98.2	19	45	77.8%	15.6%	4.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	IN	82.9	92.7	18	2,388	84.3%	6.4%	7.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%
13	AL	82.4	89.0	17	1,105	84.9%	8.3%	5.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.2%
14	WY	78.3	84.3	75	334	50.0%	6.0%	17.1%	7.8%	5.4%	10.8%	3.0%
15	CO	78.1	93.1	23	1,680	75.1%	18.7%	4.2%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.1%
16	ND	77.0	97.8	17	203	82.8%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	AZ	75.2	89.7	26	3,075	76.9%	16.8%	3.5%	0.9%	1.3%	0.4%	0.1%
18	GA	73.5	92.3	15	3,970	87.2%	8.8%	3.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
19	DE	67.6	81.4	19	520	77.7%	14.2%	7.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
20	MO	64.9	87.2	32	1,719	63.1%	20.4%	13.3%	1.3%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%
21	NC	63.4	77.7	41	3,597	68.8%	16.8%	8.4%	1.4%	1.1%	1.4%	2.0%
22	MS	63.1	81.1	13	679	91.9%	4.9%	1.6%	1.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
23	WV	63.0	87.6	21	526	70.0%	22.6%	5.9%	1.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
24	WA	61.0	90.2	24	3,743	71.9%	19.0%	7.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
25	NH	47.4	77.3	35	372	83.6%	5.4%	4.6%	0.5%	1.3%	1.3%	3.2%
26	DC	38.4	87.3	110	471	39.3%	8.1%	17.2%	2.3%	8.7%	15.9%	8.5%
27	MD	38.1	82.8	26	4,305	62.0%	25.9%	10.5%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%
28	ME	26.5	88.7	32	987	56.4%	25.3%	10.4%	2.1%	5.3%	0.2%	0.2%
29	MI	22.3	47.8	74	3,483	27.3%	13.1%	34.5%	10.6%	6.5%	5.7%	2.3%
30	WI	21.3	45.7	38	3,340	43.7%	25.1%	27.8%	1.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%
31	PA	18.2	35.2	41	12,818	38.2%	16.5%	29.5%	4.8%	1.7%	9.2%	0.1%
32	NJ	15.1	68.3	43	5,010	41.3%	29.8%	20.0%	2.8%	2.8%	3.0%	0.4%
33	NV	14.4	36.8	44	1,527	42.5%	20.0%	27.7%	6.0%	2.1%	1.4%	0.3%
34	KS	13.9	50.1	53	1,809	20.0%	27.1%	45.2%	4.7%	1.8%	0.6%	0.6%
35	OK	13.1	65.2	23	1,347	64.1%	24.4%	10.7%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
36	PR	13.1	31.3	39	1,875	52.3%	15.6%	19.5%	6.9%	5.1%	0.6%	0.0%
37	NY	12.5	33.0	113	11,356	32.5%	16.9%	20.3%	6.3%	7.0%	7.4%	9.6%
38	IA	9.0	66.7	47	1,857	52.5%	20.7%	17.6%	2.6%	1.7%	2.9%	2.2%
39	TX	8.4	33.2	44	17,430	38.8%	21.5%	29.3%	5.7%	3.5%	0.9%	0.2%
40	MA	7.8	30.4	69	3,936	27.9%	14.4%	28.0%	15.2%	11.0%	2.6%	0.8%
41	NM	7.4	9.1	49	4,036	28.6%	17.2%	46.1%	4.6%	3.1%	0.4%	0.1%
42	KY	7.3	40.3	45	3,467	34.6%	27.2%	28.8%	5.9%	2.3%	0.8%	0.5%
43	CT	4.4	7.2	66	4,760	19.5%	13.6%	43.3%	17.8%	4.0%	1.7%	0.1%
44	CA	3.1	16.1	44	50,580	28.9%	23.8%	39.2%	6.3%	1.5%	0.2%	0.0%
45	VA	3.0	12.2	33	4,773	44.3%	23.5%	29.9%	1.7%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%
46	SD	1.6	88.9	21	204	60.3%	37.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
47	LA	1.5	15.9	50	2,692	18.8%	35.1%	38.3%	3.0%	2.4%	2.2%	0.1%
48	AR	0.1	0.3	49	4,181	24.8%	17.7%	54.7%	2.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
49	TN	0.0	3.8	29	3,878	44.6%	30.5%	24.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
50	RI	0.0	0.0	80	1,810	20.1%	10.2%	39.4%	18.8%	8.7%	1.5%	1.3%
	US	46	65	36	196,368	59.3%	17.0%	16.3%	3.1%	1.9%	1.5%	0.8%
Red indicates failed timelapse; Green indicates passed measure; Tan indicates failed average case age												
% of States that met all 3 measures					42.00%						Rpt date:	3/22/11
% of States that met both timelapse measures					48.00%							
States who have not reported, as of the report date, are not on this report												

## Lower Authority Appeals Ranked by Average Case Aging

Feb 2011		Sorted by Average Age						<=30-day ALP Indicated					
		Average Case Age ALP <=30-days											
National Ranking	State	Feb 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	NE	94.7	98.9	11	448	98.9%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2	UT	99.8	100.0	13	1,310	95.6%	4.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2	ID	95.5	99.2	13	429	92.3%	6.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
2	MS	63.1	81.1	13	679	91.9%	4.9%	1.6%	1.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	
3	OR	90.2	98.2	15	1,208	92.1%	5.3%	2.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	
3	FL	85.6	95.2	15	10,267	86.8%	9.5%	3.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	
3	GA	73.5	92.3	15	3,970	87.2%	8.8%	3.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
4	AK	96.3	99.2	16	359	95.0%	4.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	
4	MN	89.4	96.4	16	1,410	87.2%	6.4%	5.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	
5	AL	82.4	89.0	17	1,105	84.9%	8.3%	5.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.2%	
5	ND	77.0	97.8	17	203	82.8%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
6	IL	87.1	94.9	18	3,563	85.9%	5.7%	5.6%	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.2%	
6	IN	82.9	92.7	18	2,388	84.3%	6.4%	7.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	
7	SC	97.7	100.0	19	1,157	50.6%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
7	MT	83.9	98.2	19	45	77.8%	15.6%	4.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
7	DE	67.6	81.4	19	520	77.7%	14.2%	7.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	
8	WV	63.0	87.6	21	526	70.0%	22.6%	5.9%	1.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	
8	SD	1.8	88.9	21	204	60.3%	37.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
9	HI	84.8	92.7	23	329	73.3%	17.3%	6.7%	1.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	
9	CO	78.1	93.1	23	1,680	75.1%	18.7%	4.2%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.1%	
9	OK	13.1	65.2	23	1,347	64.1%	24.4%	10.7%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
10	WA	61.0	90.2	24	3,743	71.9%	19.0%	7.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	
11	AZ	75.2	89.7	26	3,075	76.9%	16.8%	3.5%	0.9%	1.3%	0.4%	0.1%	
11	MD	38.1	82.8	26	4,305	62.0%	25.9%	10.5%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	
12	TN	0.0	3.8	29	3,878	44.6%	30.5%	24.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	
13	MO	64.9	87.2	32	1,719	63.1%	20.4%	13.3%	1.3%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	
13	ME	28.5	88.7	32	987	56.4%	25.3%	10.4%	2.1%	5.3%	0.2%	0.2%	
14	VA	3.0	12.2	33	4,773	44.3%	23.5%	29.9%	1.7%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	
15	NH	47.4	77.3	35	372	83.6%	5.4%	4.6%	0.5%	1.3%	1.3%	3.2%	
16	WI	21.3	45.7	38	3,340	43.7%	25.1%	27.8%	1.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%	
17	PR	13.1	31.3	39	1,875	52.3%	15.6%	19.5%	6.9%	5.1%	0.6%	0.0%	
18	NC	63.4	77.7	41	3,597	68.8%	16.8%	8.4%	1.4%	1.1%	1.4%	2.0%	
18	PA	18.2	35.2	41	12,818	38.2%	16.5%	29.5%	4.8%	1.7%	9.2%	0.1%	
19	NJ	15.1	68.3	43	5,010	41.3%	29.8%	20.0%	2.8%	2.8%	3.0%	0.4%	
20	NV	14.4	36.8	44	1,527	42.5%	20.0%	27.7%	6.0%	2.1%	1.4%	0.3%	
20	TX	8.4	33.2	44	17,430	38.8%	21.5%	29.3%	5.7%	3.5%	0.9%	0.2%	
20	CA	3.1	16.1	44	50,580	28.9%	23.8%	39.2%	6.3%	1.5%	0.2%	0.0%	
21	KY	7.3	40.3	45	3,467	34.6%	27.2%	28.8%	5.9%	2.3%	0.8%	0.5%	
22	IA	9.0	66.7	47	1,857	52.5%	20.7%	17.6%	2.6%	1.7%	2.9%	2.2%	
23	NM	7.4	9.1	49	4,036	28.6%	17.2%	46.1%	4.6%	3.1%	0.4%	0.1%	
23	AR	0.1	0.3	49	4,181	24.8%	17.7%	54.7%	2.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	
24	LA	1.5	15.9	50	2,692	18.8%	35.1%	38.3%	3.0%	2.4%	2.2%	0.1%	
25	KS	13.9	50.1	53	1,809	20.0%	27.1%	45.2%	4.7%	1.8%	0.6%	0.6%	
26	CT	4.4	7.2	66	4,760	19.5%	13.6%	43.3%	17.8%	4.0%	1.7%	0.1%	
27	MA	7.8	30.4	69	3,936	27.9%	14.4%	28.0%	15.2%	11.0%	2.6%	0.8%	
28	MI	22.3	47.8	74	3,483	27.3%	13.1%	34.5%	10.6%	6.5%	5.7%	2.3%	
29	WY	78.3	84.3	75	334	50.0%	6.0%	17.1%	7.8%	5.4%	10.8%	3.0%	
30	RI	0.0	0.0	80	1,810	20.1%	10.2%	39.4%	18.8%	8.7%	1.5%	1.3%	
31	DC	38.4	67.3	110	471	39.3%	8.1%	17.2%	2.3%	8.7%	15.9%	8.5%	
32	NY	12.5	33.0	113	11,356	32.5%	16.9%	20.3%	6.3%	7.0%	7.4%	9.6%	
	US	45.7	65.4	36.3	196,368	59.34%	17.02%	16.26%	3.15%	1.92%	1.54%	0.78%	
		Red indicates failed timelapse; Green indicates passed measure; Tan indicates fail average case age											
		% Meeting Average Case Age only		50.00%								Rpt date: 3/22/11	
States who have not reported, as of the report date, are not on this report													

## Lower Authority Appeals Ranked by Total Pending Cases

Feb 2011		Sorted by Total Pending Cases					<=30-day ALP Indicated						
National Ranking	# State	Feb 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 60%	45-day 80%										
1	CA	3.1	16.1	44	50,580	25.76%	28.9%	23.8%	39.2%	6.3%	1.5%	0.2%	0.0%
2	TX	8.4	33.2	44	17,430	8.88%	38.8%	21.5%	29.3%	5.7%	3.5%	0.9%	0.2%
3	PA	18.2	35.2	41	12,818	6.53%	38.2%	16.5%	29.5%	4.8%	1.7%	9.2%	0.1%
4	NY	12.5	33.0	113	11,356	5.78%	32.5%	16.9%	20.3%	6.3%	7.0%	7.4%	9.6%
5	FL	85.6	95.2	15	10,267	5.23%	86.8%	9.5%	3.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
6	NJ	15.1	68.3	43	5,010	2.55%	41.3%	29.8%	20.0%	2.8%	2.8%	3.0%	0.4%
7	VA	3.0	12.2	33	4,773	2.43%	44.3%	23.5%	29.9%	1.7%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%
8	CT	4.4	7.2	66	4,760	2.42%	19.5%	13.6%	43.3%	17.8%	4.0%	1.7%	0.1%
9	MD	38.1	82.8	26	4,305	2.19%	62.0%	25.9%	10.5%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%
10	AR	0.1	0.3	49	4,181	2.13%	24.8%	17.7%	54.7%	2.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
11	NM	7.4	9.1	49	4,036	2.06%	28.6%	17.2%	46.1%	4.6%	3.1%	0.4%	0.1%
12	GA	73.5	92.3	15	3,970	2.02%	87.2%	8.8%	3.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
13	MA	7.8	30.4	69	3,936	2.00%	27.9%	14.4%	28.0%	15.2%	11.0%	2.6%	0.8%
14	TN	0.0	3.8	29	3,878	1.97%	44.6%	30.5%	24.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
15	WA	61.0	90.2	24	3,743	1.91%	71.9%	19.0%	7.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
16	NC	63.4	77.7	41	3,597	1.83%	68.8%	16.8%	8.4%	1.4%	1.1%	1.4%	2.0%
17	IL	87.1	94.9	18	3,563	1.81%	85.9%	5.7%	5.6%	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.2%
18	MI	22.3	47.8	74	3,483	1.77%	27.3%	13.1%	34.5%	10.6%	6.5%	5.7%	2.3%
19	KY	7.3	40.3	45	3,467	1.77%	34.6%	27.2%	28.8%	5.9%	2.3%	0.8%	0.5%
20	WI	21.3	45.7	38	3,340	1.70%	43.7%	25.1%	27.8%	1.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%
21	AZ	75.2	89.7	26	3,075	1.57%	76.9%	16.8%	3.5%	0.9%	1.3%	0.4%	0.1%
22	LA	1.5	15.9	50	2,692	1.37%	18.8%	35.1%	38.3%	3.0%	2.4%	2.2%	0.1%
23	IN	82.9	92.7	18	2,388	1.22%	84.3%	6.4%	7.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%
24	PR	13.1	31.3	39	1,875	0.95%	52.3%	15.6%	19.5%	6.9%	5.1%	0.6%	0.0%
25	IA	9.0	66.7	47	1,857	0.95%	52.5%	20.7%	17.6%	2.6%	1.7%	2.9%	2.2%
26	RI	0.0	0.0	80	1,810	0.92%	20.1%	10.2%	39.4%	18.8%	8.7%	1.5%	1.3%
27	KS	13.9	50.1	53	1,809	0.92%	20.0%	27.1%	45.2%	4.7%	1.8%	0.6%	0.6%
28	MO	64.9	87.2	32	1,719	0.88%	63.1%	20.4%	13.3%	1.3%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%
29	CO	78.1	93.1	23	1,680	0.86%	75.1%	18.7%	4.2%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	0.1%
30	NV	14.4	36.8	44	1,527	0.78%	42.5%	20.0%	27.7%	6.0%	2.1%	1.4%	0.3%
31	MN	89.4	96.4	16	1,410	0.72%	87.2%	6.4%	5.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%
32	OK	13.1	65.2	23	1,347	0.69%	64.1%	24.4%	10.7%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
33	UT	99.8	100.0	13	1,310	0.67%	95.6%	4.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
34	OR	90.2	98.2	15	1,208	0.62%	92.1%	5.3%	2.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
35	SC	97.7	100.0	19	1,157	0.59%	50.6%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
36	AL	82.4	89.0	17	1,105	0.56%	84.9%	8.3%	5.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.2%
37	ME	28.5	88.7	32	987	0.50%	56.4%	25.3%	10.4%	2.1%	5.3%	0.2%	0.2%
38	MS	63.1	81.1	13	679	0.35%	91.9%	4.9%	1.6%	1.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
39	WV	63.0	87.6	21	526	0.27%	70.0%	22.6%	5.9%	1.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
40	DE	67.6	81.4	19	520	0.26%	77.7%	14.2%	7.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
41	DC	38.4	67.3	110	471	0.24%	39.3%	8.1%	17.2%	2.3%	8.7%	15.9%	8.5%
42	NE	94.7	98.9	11	448	0.23%	98.9%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
43	ID	95.5	99.2	13	429	0.22%	92.3%	6.5%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
44	NH	47.4	77.3	35	372	0.19%	83.6%	5.4%	4.6%	0.5%	1.3%	1.3%	3.2%
45	AK	96.3	99.2	16	359	0.18%	95.0%	4.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
46	WY	78.3	84.3	75	334	0.17%	50.0%	6.0%	17.1%	7.8%	5.4%	10.8%	3.0%
47	HI	84.8	92.7	23	329	0.17%	73.3%	17.3%	6.7%	1.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%
48	SD	1.6	88.9	21	204	0.10%	60.3%	37.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
49	ND	77.0	97.8	17	203	0.10%	82.8%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
50	MT	83.9	98.2	19	45	0.02%	77.8%	15.6%	4.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	US	45.7	65.4	36.3	196,368	100%	59.34%	17.02%	16.26%	3.15%	1.92%	1.54%	0.78%
Note: Data calculated from available State data as of report date												Rpt date:	3/22/11
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													

AO REPORT TO BOARD—April 12, 2011  
March 2011 Cases

	# Cases	# Appellants	Fiscal Yr Ave
REGISTRATIONS	3779	2410	2850
DISPOSITIONS	2583	1618	2583
OPEN BALANCE	4984	2496 estimate	3697

**CASE AGING**                      34 Days                      MET DOL STANDARD (40 days or less)

**TIME LAPSE**

DOL Standard	Actual %	Goal %
45 Days	13%	50%
75 Days	90%	80%
150 Days	100%	95%

**FO TO AO APPEAL RATE**              9.4%                      7.3% Fiscal Year Average

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

AO met the critical Case Aging standard for the month of March so no corrective action plan will be necessary for the US Department of Labor for appeals to the board. Our cases registered in March may be a record and is significantly over our average this fiscal year.

The record number of decisions by FO during March will impact AO as the appeal rate is also rose significantly higher this month than the fiscal year average. AO is using mass calendar assignments for administrative law judges to increase the number of dispositions. The return of an ALJ on April 11th from an extended leave will help increase AO dispositions; but another ALJ recently left on leave until April 27<sup>th</sup>. We have also scheduled overtime for support staff in decisions typing to increase production.



APPELLATE		July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	Average	AO Current Mo. % of Avg.
<b>TIME LAPSE</b>															
	45 Day- 50 %	81	83	87	86	77	48	29	11	13				57	22%
	75 Day- 80 %	98	97	97	98	98	96	89	88	90				95	95%
	150 Day- 95 %	100	99	100	100	100	100	100	100	100				100	100%
<b>CASE AGE</b>															
	Avg Days-UI (mean)	27	25	28	28	33	38	38	36	34				32	107%
	Avg Days-UI (median)	24	22	23	26	32	37	34	34	31				29	106%
<b>Over 120 days old</b>															
	UI Cases	17	7	13	6	9	10	12	10	2				10	21%
	UI %	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%				0%	0%
	UI % w/out Nulls	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%				0%	0%
<b>NET PGS USED</b>															
	ALJ	14.75	15.69	16.80	16.81	16.39	16.32							16.1	101%
	AO Non ALJ	33.09	32.30	33.08	33.62	28.52	31.16							32.0	97%
	CTU Non ALJ	4.14	4.02	5.14	4.85	4.60	4.00							4.5	90%
	Net Pys	51.98	52.01	55.02	55.28	49.51	51.48							52.5	98%
<b>RATIOS</b>															
	AO w/c transcribers	2.24	2.06	1.97	2.00	1.74	1.91							1.98	96%
	AO with transcribers	2.52	2.31	2.28	2.29	2.02	2.15							2.26	95%
<b>TRANSCRIPTS</b>															
	PAGES	117	112	124	144	80	150	134	92	143				122	117%
	AVG PGS Per T/S	8,193	8,024	9,475	9,805	6,278	10,538	9,784	6,637	10,433				8,796	119%
	AVG PGS Per T/S	70	72	76	68	78	70	73	72	73				73	101%
<b>PRODUCTIVITY</b>															
	ALJ Dispkk	38.0	38.5	37.5	38.6	41.2	32.9							37.8	87%
	Trans Pgs/day	94.24	90.73	87.78	91.89	71.83	119.75							92.7	129%

**UI TRENDS-AO**  
**Program Codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42**

**REGISTRATIONS**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Number Change
2008	1,345	1,008	1,524	1,485	1,514	1,413	1,500	1,173	1,305	1,773	1,286	1,595	16,921	<b>1,410</b>		
2009	1,502	1,272	1,889	1,758	1,646	1,868	2,259	1,928	2,047	2,044	1,982	2,118	22,313	<b>1,859</b>	132%	449
2010	2,374	2,049	2,870	2,656	2,262	2,575	2,404	2,862	2,945	2,547	2,654	2,600	30,798	<b>2,567</b>	138%	707
2011	2,389	2,509	3,616										8,514	<b>2,838</b>	111%	272

UI registrations Jan to date are up 17% from 2010, up 83% from 2009, and up 120% from 2008  
 UI registration monthly average up 11% from 2010, up 53% from 2009, and up 101% from 2008

**DISPOSITIONS**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Number Change
2008	1,046	1,098	1,427	1,502	1,269	1,475	1,465	1,130	1,404	1,402	1,286	1,624	16,128	<b>1,344</b>		
2009	1,476	1,510	1,708	1,469	1,493	1,693	1,760	1,804	1,852	2,216	1,894	2,845	21,720	<b>1,810</b>	135%	466
2010	2,115	2,508	2,646	2,519	2,435	2,785	2,267	2,539	2,550	2,748	2,442	2,276	29,830	<b>2,486</b>	137%	676
2011	2,476	2,459	2,464										7,399	<b>2,466</b>	99%	-20

UI dispositions Jan to date are up 2% from 2010, up 58% from 2009, and up 107% from 2008  
 UI disposition monthly average down 1% from 2010, up 36% from 2009, and up 84% from 2008

**BALANCE OPEN CASES**

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Avg.	% Chg of Avg	Number Change
2008	1710	1613	1710	1693	1939	1878	1914	1954	1855	2223	2222	2195	22,906	<b>1,909</b>		
2009	2218	1967	2158	2436	2584	2755	3253	3371	3547	3372	3463	2720	33,844	<b>2,820</b>	148%	912
2010	2977	2507	2742	2868	2695	2492	2662	2983	3392	3181	3401	3712	35,612	<b>2,968</b>	105%	147
2011	3619	3668	4738										12,025	<b>4,008</b>	135%	1,041

UI balance of open cases Jan to date is up 46% from 2010, up 90% from 2009, and up 139% from 2008  
 UI balance monthly average up 35% from 2010, up 42% from 2009, and up 110% from 2008

2010	135%	146%
2009	142%	190%
2008	210%	239%
chg to 11 avg		chg to 11 YTD

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

	March, 2011	February, 2011	January, 2011	December, 2010
	Average Days in Transfer			
	Case Count	Case Count	Case Count	Case Count
Fresno	4.08 265	4.16 188	4.92 186	8.04 176
Inglewood	6.42 260	7.35 265	8.66 204	9.62 224
Inland	5.18 428	6.00 372	5.21 266	8.62 365
Los Angeles	4.20 245	5.28 233	5.60 213	8.96 279
Oakland	6.33 250	6.93 151	7.91 164	12.64 199
Orange County	4.74 370	4.09 308	7.61 204	14.58 383
Oxnard	4.84 227	5.11 184	5.27 176	9.10 151
Pasadena	8.36 196	12.62 181	18.41 129	15.46 145
Sacramento	5.17 321	4.30 380	5.99 405	10.71 308
San Diego	7.89 255	11.19 195	12.28 276	14.46 244
San Francisco	4.08 165	4.22 185	6.08 132	8.10 167
San Jose	6.03 98	6.82 116	7.38 122	10.27 113
Tax Office	3.69 51	4.35 34	5.89 45	7.57 42
<b>Total</b>	5.49 3131	6.18 2792	7.61 2522	10.94 2796

CUIAB 10/11 Fiscal Year Overtime - SCO Report  
July 2010 through February 2011

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	128.75	\$3,519.21	328.00	\$10,197.86
Admin	10.00	\$440.80	0.00	\$0.00	256.50	\$9,136.66	322.00	\$13,733.94
IT	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	805.75	\$34,429.85
Exec	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	23.50	\$1,199.21	142.50	\$4,221.53
Field	2,253.50	\$85,000.05	0.00	\$0.00	2,051.50	\$61,335.22	3,860.50	\$103,499.19
Total	2,271.25	\$85,669.09	0.00	\$0.00	2,460.25	\$75,190.30	5,458.75	\$166,082.37

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 Position Equivalent	Year-to-Date Pay	Allocation Balance	Estimated Expenditures Over-/Under			
Appellate	\$158,242.99	464.50	0.34	\$13,945.31	\$144,297.68	\$137,325.03			
Admin	\$121,418.90	588.50	0.42	\$23,311.40	\$98,107.50	\$86,451.80			
IT	\$113,289.60	805.75	0.58	\$34,429.85	\$78,859.75	\$61,644.83			
Exec	\$17,565.82	166.00	0.12	\$5,420.74	\$12,145.08	\$9,434.71			
Field Operations	\$1,221,881.22	8,165.50	5.89	\$249,834.46	\$972,046.76	\$847,129.53			
Total	1,632,398.53	10,190.25	7.35	\$326,941.76	\$1,305,456.77	\$1,141,985.89			
Actual Monthly Average Personnel Year (July/August/Feb)							19.60		

10/11 Fiscal Year-to-Date Lump Sum Payout July 2010 through February 2011				
Branch	Year-to-Date Hours	Year-to-Date Position Equivalent	Year-to-Date Pay	
Appellate	1,534.00	1.11	\$78,940.00	
Admin	582.30	0.42	\$13,393.00	
IT	360.00	0.26	\$9,545.00	
Exec	4,136.00	2.98	\$209,856.00	
Field Operations	8,188.80	5.91	\$357,125.00	
Total	14,801.10	10.68	\$668,859.00	

**CUIABI'S LEAVE LIABILITY**  
Data as of March 2011

# Employees	Age Group	Total Hours	Cashout
9	70 +	6,931	\$366,727
134	60 - 69	82,879	\$4,080,502
231	50 - 59	104,285	\$4,426,643
162	40 - 40	59,081	\$2,152,934
83	30 - 39	21,538	\$607,085
86	19 - 29	12,999	\$227,964
705		287,712	\$11,861,855

# Employees	Leave Group	Total Hours	Cashout
63	1000 +	78,870	\$3,996,561
20	900 - 999	18,921	\$782,713
27	800 - 899	22,729	\$995,338
31	700 - 799	23,506	\$1,017,035
27	600 - 699	17,499	\$706,288
34	500 - 599	18,727	\$728,773
57	400 - 499	25,547	\$1,006,261
71	300 - 399	24,617	\$838,558
122	200 - 299	30,380	\$1,012,026
132	100 - 199	19,953	\$607,431
121	Below 100	6,964	\$170,869
705		287,712	\$11,861,855

## CUIAB LEAVE BY AGE GROUP

Age Group	LEAVE RANGE										
	1000 +	900 - 999	800 - 899	700 - 799	600 - 699	500 - 599	400 - 499	300 - 399	200 - 299	100 - 199	Below 100
80 +	1					1					
70 - 79	1	1	1	1						2	
60 - 69	28	6	13	9	6	3	9	13	20	18	1
50 - 59	24	9	7	9	12	17	31	24	33	33	8
40 - 49	8	2	6	9	7	11	13	18	29	29	32
30 - 39	1	2		2	2	2	2	13	18	25	30
19 - 29							2	3	22	25	17
TOTAL	63	20	27	30	27	34	57	71	122	132	122

**CUIAB ATTRITION TRENDS**  
**SFY 2006-07 to 2010-11 / 5 YEARS**  
*through March 2011*

4/11/11 vg

**RETIREMENTS**

	AO ALJ*	FO ALJ*	AO Support**	FO Support**	ADMIN	Executive	IT	2010/11 Projection	SFY TOTAL	% Change
06/07 FY	0	10	2	8	0	0	0		20	
07/08 FY	1	12	1	7	4	1	0		26	30%
08/09 FY	1	13	2	5	1	1	1		24	-8%
09/10 FY	2	13	2	5	1	1	3		27	13%
10/11 FY	1	6	1	6	4	1	0	25	19	-30%

**SEPARATIONS**

	AO ALJ*	FO ALJ*	AO Support**	FO Support**	ADMIN	Executive	IT	2010/11 Projection	SFY TOTAL	% Change
06/07 FY	0	3	3	19	5	2	2		34	
07/08 FY	0	0	1	37	8	4	5		55	62%
08/09 FY	2	12	6	43	8	6	2		79	44%
09/10 FY	1	7	4	20	7	0	2		41	-48%
10/11 FY	2	15	5	18	4	4	3	68	51	24%

**TOTAL ATTRITIONS (Retirements and Separations)**

	AO ALJ*	FO ALJ*	AO Support**	FO Support**	ADMIN	Executive	IT	2010/11 Projection	SFY TOTAL	% Change
06/07 FY	0	13	5	27	5	2	2		54	
07/08 FY	1	12	2	44	12	5	5		81	50%
08/09 FY	3	25	8	48	9	7	3		103	27%
09/10 FY	3	20	6	25	8	1	5		68	-34%
10/11 FY	3	21	6	24	8	5	3	93	70	3%

The projected 10-11 attrition rate has increased by 39 positions compared to 06-07 which is an increase of 73%

**TOTAL ATTRITIONS (by Temporary Help (PI) and Permanent (PFT))**

	PI	PFT	Total	PI %	PFT %
06/07 FY	14	40	54	26%	74%
07/08 FY	42	39	81	52%	48%
08/09 FY	61	42	103	59%	41%
09/10 FY	28	40	68	41%	59%
10/11 FY	32	37	69	46%	54%

Actuals through March 2011

**Personnel Hires**

	AO ALJ*	FO ALJ*	AO Support**	FO Support**	ADMIN	Executive	IT	2010/11 Projection	SFY TOTAL	% Change
06/07 FY	1	3	1	24	2	1	2		34	
07/08 FY	1	26	3	38	1	1	3		73	115%
08/09 FY	10	96	12	74	5	6	4		207	184%
09/10 FY	2	49	9	56	14	2	13		145	-30%
10/11 FY	0	14	3	9	7	5	5	57	43	-70%

August 2008 - Temp Layoff/not rehired

September 2010 - hiring freeze

\*ALJ includes PALJ, ALJ II and ALJ I

\*\*Support includes all non-PALJ/ALJ staff

## Compilation of Comments on Proposed Regulations

### A. From Hugh Harrison

As always, Julie makes excellent points and I agree with all of them.

My concerns, however, are far more fundamental.

1. The regulations as originally drafted required that the reopening or vacation of a decision if the application failed to provide a reason for the application. Most PALJs strongly felt that this was a bad idea for a variety of reasons, but primarily because many parties, especially claimants, are not articulate in writing and don't really understand our procedures. However, some PALJs felt that there were circumstances where the application should be denied for that reason. All PALJs, however, wanted to maintain maximum flexibility to handle these matters. The compromise was to suggest that denial of the application might be allowed if no reason was expressed [which is not an option under the current regulations as written], but to continue the long standing practice of allowing the PALJ to just set it for hearing or to send a letter requesting additional information to determine if there was a reason to set another hearing. The rendition currently under review eliminates any specific mention of the 10-day letter in subsection (c), but retains it in subsection (a)(ii). It is unclear why this dichotomy exists. The proposed language in (c) is permissive. While I would read this to allow the PALJ to set the case for hearing despite the expression of the reason for non-appearance, or to send the 10-day letter if he or she so chooses, that certainly is not clear, especially given the mention of 10-day letter in (a)(ii) and in the proposed section 5071.
2. If the intent of the latest change is to eliminate these options for the field, I would oppose the new regulation. The current system is superior to one that automatically denies reopening to an individual who can barely write and fails to understand the requirement of a written explanation.
3. If the intent is not to cut off another hearing in those situations, I would return to the proposed language in both (a) and (c) for clarity sake.
4. To the extent "time lapse" is driving these changes, the 10-day letter does not seriously impact time lapse as the entire process of requesting and processing the additional information can be handled in relatively short period of time. Moreover, if that is that major concern, we could just set all cases for a hearing except where the reason provided is clearly not good cause.
5. As to the repeated requests for reopening, I do not believe this is a major problem, but apparently remain in the minority on this point. I think the proposed language goes a good way to bridging that divide. I will note, however, that the more we cut this off at the field level, the more the Board will have to deal with it.

6. I continue to have concerns in reference to section 5072. I see little gain in this process and anticipate that it will actual create more problems and is subject to abuse, and will provide little assistance in those rare times it may have some value.

What is the process regarding our comments. Do they go directly to the Board or are they filtered through you? If the latter, what is the appropriate modality for PALJs to directly communicate their thoughts to the Board?

Thanks as always for including us in the process.

### **B. From Julie Krebs, Sacramento Office**

In general these look o.k. but I have some suggestions.

1. Subsection 5068(g) is confusing because it covers multiple points. I think it should be broken out into two sections similar to 5067(h) and (i). Also the language in 5067 and 5068 should mirror one another to the extent possible. For example, 5067(h) makes an exception if the application "provides grounds to find good cause" while 5068(g) refers to "reasons that establish grounds for finding good cause." The changes are already somewhat confusing so the more similar you can make the language, the more likely it will be understood. Also, people won't look for some arcane distinction in the words.
2. I would change the title to 5071 to "Untimely Applications." There are other sections which refer to untimely documents (e.g. 5005 and 5051). The current title seems overly broad, particularly since it only refers to applications.
3. I would rearrange the clauses in 5071(a) so the references to 5050, 5067 and 5068 are in ascending numerical order.
4. In subsection 5071(d), I would change the language in the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the last sentence to read, "If the party that filed the untimely application shows good cause for the delay, the time to file the application shall be extended and the administrative law judge shall consider the merits of the application." The term "extended" is consistent with the language of section 5005 and the language we use for late appeals. We also generally make distinctions between orders and decisions. We might issue an order denying the application, so it is better to avoid the term decision.
5. I may be missing something but I don't understand why the language "the untimely appeal" is in the first line of subsection 5071(f). Shouldn't it be "To obtain review of an order denying an untimely application and to the adverse order or decision that was the subject of the application...."?
6. Similar to item 1, I think the language in subsection 5071(f) should mirror to the extent possible the language in 5067(h), 5067(i) and 5068(g).

7. Section 5072 may be useful in very limited circumstances, but it also could be misused. I'm not convinced we really need it, but am not opposed if someone can identify some strong reasons to add it.

I know these may be picky points, but since I had to read all these proposals, I might as well give my 2 cents.

#### **C. From Zaida Hackett, Los Angeles Office**

Ralph, I agree with Hugh, and after detailed discussions at the last PJ meeting, I thought the proposed regulation would reflect PJ/local office flexibility regarding repeated requests for reopening. In Los Angeles we routinely set all cases for a hearing except in those where the written request clearly does not establish good cause. This has never posed a big problem for us even through the worst of caseload spikes.

I agree with Julie's suggestions as well – the language should be as clear as possible.

#### **D. From Kirk Garvin, Inland Office**

I generally agree with both what Julie and Hugh have indicated. Repeated requests for reopening are, however, a problem. We frequently get 3 or more requests to reopen, and these I generally handle and deny. Still, if the party has set forth some plausible explanation, even after a second request, I will set it for hearing.

My basic concern is that many, many parties act with all diligence and as we all know, some of them are in very desperate circumstances. It is therefore problematical when a party just can't seem to make it to a hearing. Such a party has likely cost another acting diligently a significant amount of lost time, if not benefits.

#### **E. From Elena Gonzales, Oakland Office**

To the extent that the most recent changes to the proposed regulations seem to deprive the PJs from maintaining flexibility to address reopenings, I am opposed to them. I believe these changes will adversely impact those less sophisticated, less educated, and most in need of our help in navigating our procedures.

The proposed regulations you sent just prior to the latest ones, seemed to address the concerns about the continuous loop of reopening hearings, yet retain flexibility so that certain segments of the population

could be fairly treated. This was a fair compromise, and a result of the very conscientious input from the PJs at the last PJ meeting. I support the prior version.

**F. From Jasmine Mukai, Oxnard Office**

Hi Ralph, since I'm out of the office and have problems emailing from a phone my response will be very short. Essentially I feel responses by all the PJs who have already responded very well state what my opinion is about the proposed regulations. The field needs the flexibility to consider more than one request to reopen, etc. when appropriate.

**G. From Cindy Rosse, San Jose Office**

Hi Ralph. San Jose has rarely had a problem with repeated reopening requests. We routinely grant them, and allow the ALJ hearing the case to determine whether good cause exists for the failure to appear. On the rare occasion that it is clear from the documents in the file that no good cause exists to reopen the case, then I will simply issue an order denying reopening.

As we do serve a very diverse population which includes many people who are uneducated, illiterate, and/or non-English speaking, I agree with the thoughts expressed by Hugh and the other PJs that we can best serve our diverse communities if the local offices and PJs retain the authority to grant reopening when deemed appropriate.

I am against the proposal allowing only one reopening application in the field, as there can often be multiple good reasons for multiple failures to appear. It therefore does not make sense to me to issue regulations which provide that after only one application the party's only available remedy is to the Board.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Sorry for the delay in getting back to you. It has been a hectic week.

**H. From Irene Server, Pasadena Office**

I fully agree with Elena's position. We are, after all, here to serve the public who in most cases before us are unrepresented legally and often unable to grasp the procedures involved in reopenings.

**I. From John Martin, Inglewood Office**

Just back from vacation. I agree with Hugh and Julie. I oppose anything that would take away my flexibility. I have never viewed this as a problem of any noteworthiness in Inglewood over the last 5 years.

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 untimeliness, 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 shows 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.

(3-30-11)

5067. Reopening

- (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 to 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.
- (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, for its untimeliness,~~ 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 subsection (a)(i), (a)(iv), (a)(v), or (a)(vi), 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 files an application to reopen pursuant to subsections (a) (ii)-(iii), or files what purports to be a board appeal, it shall be treated as a board appeal, unless the application provides grounds to find good cause for reopening.

- (i) An applicant may file a board appeal in accordance with rule 5008 to the order denying an application to reopen within 20 days after service of the order. An order granting reopening is appealable to the board only upon service of an adverse decision or order on the appeal or petition.

3/30/11

## 5068. Vacating Decision

- (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, 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, or processed as a Board appeal, 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) ~~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.~~ To obtain review of the order denying the application to vacate and the adverse order or decision on the appeal that was the subject of the application, an applicant must file a board appeal in accordance with rule 5008 within 20 days after service of the order denying the application to vacate. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, if an applicant files an appeal to an order denying an application issued under subsections (b) or (e) of this rule and the applicant provides reasons that establish grounds for finding good cause for vacating the decision, the matter shall be set for hearing pursuant to subsection (d) of this rule; otherwise, the applicant's appeal shall be processed as a board appeal to the order denying the application to vacate and the administrative law judge's decision on the merits.
- (h) An order vacating a decision is appealable to the board only upon service of an adverse decision or order on the appeal or petition.

5071. Untimely Documents Filed Before an Administrative Law Judge (new)

- (a) Any untimely application filed before an administrative law judge, including but not limited to an application to reopen pursuant to rule 5067, an application for reinstatement pursuant to rule 5050, or an application to vacate a decision pursuant to rule 5068, shall specify the reason for the delay.
- (b) If an untimely application fails to specify the reason for the delay, the administrative law judge may deny the application. Alternatively, the administrative law judge may serve notice requiring the filing party 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 notice, the administrative law judge may deny the application.
- (c) If the reason specified by the applicant shows that there is no good cause for the untimely application, an administrative law judge may order the application denied.
- (d) An untimely application that is not otherwise denied, or processed as a board appeal, in accordance with this rule shall be scheduled for hearing. If the party that filed the untimely application shows good cause for the delay, the application shall be accepted and the administrative law judge shall proceed to a decision on the merits of the application. If good cause is not shown, the application shall be denied.
- (e) If an applicant fails to appear in the hearing on the untimely application, an administrative law judge may deny the application.
- (f) To obtain review of an order denying an untimely application and the untimely appeal to the adverse order or decision that was the subject of the application, the applicant may file a board appeal in accordance with rule 5008 within 20 days after service of the order. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, if an applicant files an appeal to an order denying an untimely application issued under subsections (b) or (e) of this rule and the applicant provides reasons that establish grounds for finding good cause to reopen the application, the matter shall be set for hearing pursuant to subsection (d) of this rule; otherwise, the applicant's appeal shall be processed as a board appeal to the order denying the untimely application.
- (g) An order granting an untimely application may only be appealed upon service of an adverse order or decision on the appeal.

3/30/11

5072. Decision or Order Without Hearing (new)

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.

3/30/11

### 5103. WITHDRAWAL AND REINSTATEMENT OF BOARD APPEAL

- (a) A Board appellant may file an application to withdraw a board appeal before the board decision is served.
- (b) Upon receipt of such an application, the board shall order the board appeal dismissed.
- (c) The board appellant may file and serve an application for reinstatement of the board appeal within 20 days after service of such a dismissal order. The application shall specify the reason for reinstatement. If the application is untimely, it shall also specify the reason for the delay.
- (d) Within 10 days after service of an application for reinstatement of a board appeal, any other party may file and serve a response to it.
- (e) If the application fails to specify the reason for reinstatement, or, if applicable, for its untimeliness, the board may order the application denied. Alternatively, the board may serve notice requiring the applicant to specify the reason by filing and serving it within 10 days after service of such notice. If the applicant fails to comply, the board may order reinstatement denied.
- (f) Within 10 days after service of such a specification of a reason, any other party may file and serve a response to it.
- (g) If the applicant shows good cause for reinstatement, and, if applicable, for the untimely application, the board appeal shall be ordered reinstated; otherwise reinstatement shall be ordered denied.

3/30/11

#### 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 ordered dismissed, or late filing or service of any other untimely document shall be denied.

(3-30-11)

# Litigation Report - March 2011

AGENDA ITEM 9

<u>LITIGATION CASES PENDING</u>	TOTAL = 286	
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b>	Claimant Petitions.....	235
	Employer Petitions.....	31
	EDD Petitions.....	3
	Other Petitions.....	5
<b>APPELLATE COURT:</b>	Claimant Appeals.....	8
	Employer Appeals.....	3
	EDD Appeals.....	0
	Other Appeals.....	1
	Non-Benefit Cases.....	10
	UI.....	244
	DI.....	16
	Taxes.....	16

### 2011 CALENDAR YEAR ACTIVITY - Benefit & Tax Cases

<u>LITIGATION CASES FILED</u>	<u>YTD</u>	<u>March</u>	
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b>	Claimant Petitions.....	48	12
	Employer Petitions.....	3	1
	EDD Petitions.....	0	0
<b>APPELLATE COURT:</b>	Claimant Appeals.....	1	0
	Employer Appeals.....	0	0
	EDD Appeals.....	0	0
<u>LITIGATION CASES CLOSED</u>	<u>YTD</u>	<u>March</u>	
<b>SUPERIOR COURT:</b>	Claimant Petitions.....	15	6
	Employer Petitions.....	3	0
	EDD Petitions.....	0	0
<b>APPELLATE COURT:</b>	Claimant Appeals.....	0	0
	Employer Appeals.....	0	0
	EDD Appeals.....	0	0

### 2011 Decision Summary

<u>Claimant Appeals</u>		<u>Employer Appeals</u>		<u>CUIAB Decisions</u>		
Win: 3	Loss: 11	Win: 0	Loss: 2	Affirmed: 13	Reversed: 3	Remanded: 0

Board Member	1st	2nd	3rd	UI	DI	Ruling	Tax	1 Party	2 Party	Total
<b>Alberto Torrico</b>										
Sum	299	311	16	591	31	1	3	223	403	626
Percent	18%	18%	24%	18%	17%	25%	10%	18%	18%	
<b>Bonnie Garcia</b>										
Sum	258	174	10	407	27	1	7	171	271	442*
Percent	15%	10%	15%	13%	15%	25%	23%	14%	12%	
<b>Denise Ducheny</b>										
Sum	258	315	11	551	27	1	5	201	383	584
Percent	15%	19%	17%	17%	15%	25%	17%	16%	17%	
<b>Dennis Hollingsworth</b>										
Sum	290	330	11	598	30	0	3	230	401	631
Percent	17%	19%	17%	18%	17%	0%	10%	19%	18%	
<b>George Plescia</b>										
Sum	224	262	10	463	27	0	6	173	323	496
Percent	13%	15%	15%	14%	15%	0%	20%	14%	14%	
<b>Robert Dresser</b>										
Sum	43	1	0	44	0	0	0	6	38	44
Percent	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	
<b>Roy Ashburn</b>										
Sum	321	304	8	587	39	1	6	224	409	633
Percent	19%	18%	12%	18%	22%	25%	20%	18%	18%	
<b>Total Cases Reviewed:</b>	1693	1697	66	3241	181	4	30	1228	2228	

\*Off Calendar



**CALIFORNIA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BOARD**  
**SPECIAL PROJECTS MATRIX**  
 April 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
<b>EDD/CUIAB Appeal Co-Location Pilot</b> Exploring the co-location of four CUIAB staff at EDD's LA PAC to streamline appeals registration processing.		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"> <li>- Reduce claimants' &amp; employers' wait time for hearing decisions.</li> <li>- Resolve appeal registration issues in a timely manner.</li> </ul>	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 freeze.
<b>US Department of Labor Taskforce</b> For nine years, CUIAB has failed to meet US DOL timeliness standards for UI appeals. California is ranked 51 <sup>st</sup> 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.		High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meet DOL time lapse measures.</li> <li>- Meet DOL case age measures.</li> </ul>	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><b>Accelerate Decision Notification to EDD</b> 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 Unisys 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"> <li>Reduce claimants' &amp; employers' wait times for benefits and adjustments.</li> <li>Reduce postage and paper costs.</li> <li>Increase information security for claimants &amp; employers.</li> </ul>	<p>FO design &amp; development began 05/03/2010 Phase II implementation rollout began 09/22 with three FOs. Rollout of five FOs follow on 10/04 &amp; 10/07. Phase III project development for Tax &amp; DI decisions on hold through 05/2011 due to EDD's ACES implementation and DI staffing constraints.</p>
<p><b>ALJ Mobility Pilot</b> Provides mobile equipment to conduct hearings in remote locations.</p>	Rafael Placencia	Medium	<p>Inland complete Training 03/2010 LA complete 12/2010</p>		<p>Inglewood and San Diego will be completed by late 3/2011.</p>
<p><b>CUIAB Network Upgrade</b> 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"> <li>Reduce processing time for appeals data flow and document saving.</li> </ul>	<p>Meeting with EDD IT to explore options &amp; alignment with Agency network consolidation efforts.</p>
<p><b>Digital Imaging</b> 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>	Lori Kurosaka	High	<p>Kick off 11/2010 FSR completion 02/2011 Potential BCP 02/2011 Procurement 04/2011 FSR in review 03/14/2011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce paper files prepared &amp; sent by EDD UI Branch.</li> <li>Increase information security.</li> <li>Reduce paper file storage space needs &amp; costs at CUIAB.</li> <li>Reduce postage costs.</li> <li>Increase federal performance.</li> </ul>	<p>DOL approved funding at \$354,000 for this planning phase only. Project and procurement strategy approved by LWDA &amp; EDD. Six week start delay due to OCIO approval. EDD &amp; CUIAB staff are compiling estimated project costs. FSR to be completed by 4/2011.</p>
<p><b>Digital Personnel System</b> 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"> <li>Replace existing manual process to full paperless process</li> <li>Eliminate the mailing of applicant documentation</li> <li>Reduce staff time for preparing to hire by fully automating the application process</li> </ul>	<p>Phase I is in use. Phase II is in development. On hold.</p>
<p><b>Electronic Case Management</b> CUIAB's case tracking database is 8 years old and becoming cumbersome to manage the current workload volume. CUIAB is collaborating with LWDA &amp; EDD to develop an integrated case management system.</p>	Lori Kurosaka	On Hold until 04/2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Receive appeals case documents electronically from EDD.</li> <li>Eliminate internal mailing of case documents</li> </ul>	<p>DOL approved funding at \$404,000 for the planning phase only. Project &amp; procurement strategy approved for FSR development by LWDA, EDD &amp; 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><b>Electronic Transmission of Board Appeals to FO</b>            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 Faye Saunders	High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Eliminate the mailing of hard copy decisions to CUIAB Field Offices.</li> <li>- Increase information security.</li> <li>- Save paper and postage costs.</li> </ul>	Draft reports pending review with AO. Reports completed and in production. IT received new modifications to the original request.
<p><b>Enhance Wireless Connections</b>            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. SF & Fresno complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seamlessly connect to CUIAB network via mobile devices.</li> </ul>	Equipment received. Design completed and working on configuration and testing. SF install on 11/09 & Fresno on 11/18. Last 3 large facilities will be completed by 3/2011 and that will conclude the project.
<p><b>Expand Auto Dialer Hearing Reminder</b>            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"> <li>- Increase hearing attendance rate &amp; productivity.</li> </ul>	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><b>Field Office Technology Enhancements</b>            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	On Hold Medium	Complete procurement 02/2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improve readability of documents on screen.</li> </ul>	Preparing procurement documents for additional monitors.
<p><b>Field Office Telephone Tree</b>            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"> <li>- Reduce claimants &amp; employers time on phones.</li> <li>- Standardize hearing information provided by phone.</li> </ul>	Standard phone tree design completed. Pilot began in the Inland FO. IT & Admin are developing evaluation tool to measure pilot effectiveness.
<p><b>Hearing Scheduling System</b>            Currently, FO &amp; AO support staff schedule or assign appeal hearings or cases using a hybrid manual process considering many different criteria.</p>	Lori Kurosaka Faye Saunders	High	Charter & scope completed. Kick off 10/14/2010. Requirements 2/2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce claimants &amp; employers wait time for hearing decisions.</li> <li>- Provide easier electronic process for staff to calendar hearings or schedule cases.</li> </ul>	AO, FO & IT observed an EDD demo on their UI Scheduling System. AO system in development & providing demos to AO staff.

**TECHNOLOGY cont.**

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p><b>LWDA Network Consolidation</b> To comply with OCIO Policy Letter 10-14, the LWDA Departments &amp; 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"> <li>- Improve IT efficiency &amp; effectiveness.</li> <li>- Improve security.</li> <li>- Reduce IT costs by using shared service models.</li> <li>- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</li> </ul>	The migration plan is completed and a cost model has been developed.
<p><b>Personal Productivity &amp; Mobility Pilot for Board Members, Appellate &amp; Senior Staff</b> CUIAB 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"> <li>- Reduce the use of paper for board appeal processing and board meetings.</li> </ul>	Researching feasibility of technology alternatives.
<p><b>Printer Standardization</b> 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	On Hold Medium		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce maintenance &amp; support costs.</li> <li>- Reduce toner costs.</li> </ul>	Researching feasible equipment. Standards are in place for light, heavy, color, and multi-function printers.
<p><b>VOIP Telephony</b> CUIAB 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 Janet Maglinte	High	Van Nuys & Santa Ana complete.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elimination of long distance toll calls</li> <li>- Consolidation of telecommunications support areas.</li> </ul>	OTECH delegation submitted 04/06/10 Working with vendor to establish system requirements. Revising rollout schedule with Verizon. Will perform a high level cost analysis of the project by late March 2011.
<p><b>Workstation Refresh</b> Replace the 150 remaining PCs that have expired warranties throughout the state.</p>	Rafael Placencia	High		-	Preparing procurement documents. Standard images are being tested on the hardware received.

**STAFFING, FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT & OTHER**

Project & Description	Lead	Priority	Milestones	Goals	Status
<p><b>Administration Branch Move</b> To leverage headquarters space, a part of Administration Branch staff will be housed on the first floor @ Venture Oaks.</p>	<p>Janet Maglinte Pam Boston</p>	High	Tenant improvements done. Modular furniture installed.	-	This move will accommodate space needs for Personnel. IT move completed. Personnel move scheduled for June 2011.
<p><b>Archive File Document Conversion</b> 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>	High	<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 &amp; 08/19.</p>	<p>- Recapture real estate space for ALJ offices and hearing rooms. - Priority conversion for OC, Inland, LA, San Jose &amp; Oxnard.</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><b>Performance Management Tools for Board &amp; Leadership</b> In addition to program performance reporting to US DOL, CUIAB is developing reporting tools that the Board &amp; 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 Maglinte</p>	High	<p>Business case metrics for imaging Business case metrics for case management</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><b>Transforming CUIAB</b> 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>	High	<p>CMAA scope of work completed. Release RFO 03/18/2011</p>	<p>- Plan, design and implement organizational design for the large scale technology projects. - Plan and coordinate communications with all stakeholder groups.</p>	Vendor question responses due 04/08/2011. Vendor bids due 04/15/2011.