

Judicial District Summary Worksheet – Reestablishment 2021-2022

Start by saving the fillable worksheet template locally on your system as a PDF form. Then, open and complete the worksheet in a PDF browser (not a web browser) to ensure all options and functionality are available. Answer the questions by typing or selecting responses. Press TAB or click on a field to advance. Hover the fields for tips and instructions. Save and upload the completed form to SharePoint. Complete one worksheet or one for each county if you are a joint judicial district.

Juc	licial District Number:	er: 22 County: Wayne Class or		of Coun	ty:	6		
 List the existing magisterial districts in your judicial district (##-#-##): 22-3-01; 22-3-02; 22-3-04 								
Cas	seload Analysis							
_	Avoraga total casaland				Avg for Judicial Dis	rict Avg	for C	lass of County
	. Average total caseload	S:			A. 2,043	В.		3,230
3	3. Compare the difference between the caseload average Difference (2A - 2B)			Ranking		Total		
	of your judicial district to the class of county1187				23rd	0	ut of 24	
	 Is your judicial district range when compared 	caseload to the o	d average at ther judicial	the lower end districts in you	of the caseload r class of county?	Yes		
Pro	posed Actions							
5. Are any magisterial districts proposed for reestablishment? If YES , list the magisterial districts proposed for reestablishment (no changes). 22-3-01; 22-3-02; 22-3-04							Yes	
6	. Are any magisterial dist	rict pro	oosed for re	alignment?				No
If YES , list the magisterial districts proposed for realignment (changes).								
7.	Are any magisterial dist	ricts pro	posed for el	imination?				No
	If YES , list the magisteri	al distric	ts proposed	for elimination	n.			



Additional Workload Factors	
8. Do you have a night court operating within the judicial district?	No
9. Do you have a central court within your judicial district?	Yes
10. Do you have any special programs that will entail effort by the MDJs such as truancy programs or drug, DUI, veteran, or mental health diversion programs? If YES, briefly explain the types of programs.	No
Final Checklist	
11. Was a request for public comment posted?	Yes
12. Method of posting - electronic, physical copy, or both?	Both
13. Were media outlets notified?	No 🔽
14. Were public comments received?	No
15. Did you include a copy of the posting and public comments in your submission?	Yes
16. Did you complete summary worksheets for all magisterial districts?	Yes
17. Did you include your petition and all supporting documentation, if applicable?	No -
18. Did you confer with the MDJs in your county?	Yes
19. Additional Remarks	
Verification of Submission	
20. Date submitted to AOPC: 2/28/2022	
21. President Judge Name: Janine Edwards	
Signature	



Magisterial District Summary Worksheet - Reestablishment 2021-2022

Start by saving the fillable worksheet template locally on your system as a PDF form. Then, open and complete the worksheets in a PDF browser (not a web browser) to ensure all options and functionality are available. Answer the questions by typing or selecting responses. Press TAB or click on a field to advance. Save and upload the completed form to SharePoint.

Magisterial District Court Number:	22-3-01	Co	ounty:	Wayne		
1. Proposed plan for this magisterial district: Reestablish 2. Ef					e:	
Caseload Analysis						
	Magisterial District		Judicial	District	Class	of County
3. Average total caseloads:	2,896		2,04	13	3,230	
4. Compare the difference between th	e caseload average	of th	is	# of Cases	Ranking	Total
magisterial district to your judicial district caseload average.				853	1st	out of 3
5. Compare the difference between the caseload average of this magisterial district to your class of county caseload average.				# of Cases	% Abo	ve/Below
				-334		-10 %

6. If this magisterial district is at the lower end of the caseload range <u>and</u> you are proposing to reestablish (no changes), please summarize your response from the petition that explains why you are departing from caseload equity.

Workload Analysis						
	Magisterial District	Judicial District				
7. Average total workloads:	23,368	19,136				
8. Compare the difference between the average total workloads	Total Difference	% Above/Below				
of this magisterial district to the judicial district.	4,232	22 %				

9. If this magisterial district's average workload is fifteen (15%) percent *higher or lower than* your judicial district average workload <u>and</u> you are proposing to <u>reestablish</u> this magisterial district, please explain (*summarize your response from the petition*) why this does not result in an unwarranted inequity among the judges.

The average workload is higher than the judicial district average. This does not result in unwarranted inequity among the magisterial district judges because the judge with the lowest workload has been assigned to cover all Central Court work.



Magisterial District Infor	rmation			
10. Magisterial District Jud	ge (MDJ) Informa	ation:		
Bonnie L. Carney			1/3/28	12/31/32
Magisterial District Judge Nar	me Bi	irthdate	Term Expiration Date	Mandatory Retirement Date
11. Magisterial District Cou	ırt Information - I	Physical Location:		
98 Main Ave, Hawley	y, PA 18428			
12. Is this court within the	boundaries of th	e magisterial disti	ict?	Yes
13. Is the MDJ's residence	within the bound	daries of the magi	sterial district?	Yes
14. Are all portions of the i	magisterial distric	ct contiguous?		Yes
15. To the best of your kno	• ,		•	No/Not Sure
such as a mall, highwa		_	•	esponse below.
16. List any police departm	nents located wit	hin this magisteria	al district.	
Hawley Borough Police [Dept, Lehigh Town	ship Police Dept.		
17. List any major highway	s within this mag	gisterial district.		
US Route 6, I-84, I-380,	PA Route 590			
18. List the <u>current</u> munici for Realignment Orders			(alphabetically). I	For a list, click <u>HERE</u>
	Palmyra Township			
, ,	Paupack Township Salem Township			
	Sterling Township			
				_
19. Are the proposed mun	vicinalities the san	mo as abovo?		Yes
If NO , please list all pro	•		ly).	103
20. Additional Comment	ts:			



Magisterial District Summary Worksheet - Reestablishment 2021-2022

Start by saving the fillable worksheet template locally on your system as a PDF form. Then, open and complete the worksheets in a PDF browser (not a web browser) to ensure all options and functionality are available. Answer the questions by typing or selecting responses. Press TAB or click on a field to advance. Save and upload the completed form to SharePoint.

Mag	risterial District Court Number:	22-3-02	Со	unty:	Wayne		
1.	1. Proposed plan for this magisterial district: Reestablish 2. Effo				fective dat	e:	
Case	Caseload Analysis						
		Magisterial District		Judicial I	District	Class	of County
3.	3. Average total caseloads: 2,119 2,0				13	3,230	
4	Compare the difference between the	e caseload average	of thi	is	# of Cases	Ranking	Total
"	magisterial district to your judicial district caseload average.				76	2nd	out of 3
5	5. Compare the difference between the caseload average of this magisterial district to your class of county caseload average.				# of Cases	% Abo	ove/Below
J.					-1111		-34 %

6. If this magisterial district is at the lower end of the caseload range <u>and</u> you are proposing to reestablish (no changes), please summarize your response from the petition that explains why you are departing from caseload equity.

This district is in the middle of the caseload range and is very close to the average for the judicial district.

Workload Analysis						
	Magisterial District	Judicial District				
7. Average total workloads:	23,314	19,136				
8. Compare the difference between the average total workloads	Total Difference	% Above/Below				
of this magisterial district to the judicial district.	4,178	22 %				

9. If this magisterial district's average workload is fifteen (15%) percent *higher or lower than* your judicial district average workload <u>and</u> you are proposing to <u>reestablish</u> this magisterial district, please explain (*summarize your response from the petition*) why this does not result in an unwarranted inequity among the judges.

The average workload is higher than the judicial district average. This does not result in unwarranted inequity among the magisterial district judges because the judge with the lowest workload has been assigned to cover all Central Court work.



Magisterial District Information	
10. Magisterial District Judge (MDJ) Information: Kay Bates Magisterial District Judge Name Birthdate Term Expiration Date	12/31/36 Te Mandatory Retirement Date
11. Magisterial District Court Information - Physical Location:	
925 Court Street, Honesdale, PA 18431	
12. Is this court within the boundaries of the magisterial district?	Yes
13. Is the MDJ's residence within the boundaries of the magisterial district?	Yes
14. Are all portions of the magisterial district contiguous?	Yes
15. To the best of your knowledge, are there any planned developments such as a mall, highway expansion or gas drilling that will likely cause an increase in the case filings for this office? If YES, please summarize your	No/Not Sure response below.
16. List any police departments located within this magisterial district.	
Honesdale Borough Police Dept, Waymart Borough Police Dept, PA State Polic	e
17. List any major highways within this magisterial district.	
US Route 6, PA Route 191, PA Route 296	
 List the <u>current</u> municipalities for this magisterial district (alphabetically). for Realignment Orders submitted in the past. 	For a list, click <u>HERE</u>
Canaan Township Waymart Borough Cherry Ridge Township Honesdale Borough Prompton Borough South Canaan Township Texas Township	
19. Are the <u>proposed</u> municipalities the same as above? If NO , please list all proposed municipalities (alphabetically).	Yes
20. Additional Comments:	



Magisterial District Summary Worksheet - Reestablishment 2021-2022

Start by saving the fillable worksheet template locally on your system as a PDF form. Then, open and complete the worksheets in a PDF browser (not a web browser) to ensure all options and functionality are available. Answer the questions by typing or selecting responses. Press TAB or click on a field to advance. Save and upload the completed form to SharePoint.

Mag	risterial District Court Number:	22-3-04	Cou	nty:	Wayne		
1.	1. Proposed plan for this magisterial district: Reestablish 2. Effective date:						
Caseload Analysis							
Magisterial District				Judicial District		ct Class of County	
3.	Average total caseloads:	1,110		2,043		3,230	
4.	Compare the difference between th	e caseload average	of this		# of Cases	Ranking	Total
	magisterial district to your judicial district caseload average.					3rd	out of 3
5	 Compare the difference between the caseload average of this magisterial district to your class of county caseload average. 				# of Cases	% Abo	ove/Below
J.					-2120		-66 %

6. If this magisterial district is at the lower end of the caseload range <u>and</u> you are proposing to **reestablish** (no changes), please summarize your response from the petition that explains why you are departing from caseload equity.

The caseload in this magisterial district is approximately 50 percent less than the average caseload in the other two magisterial districts. However, this district is also the largest in the judicial district per square mileage. Realigning this district would create a travel burden for the public residing in this district.

Workload Analysis						
	Magisterial District	Judicial District				
7. Average total workloads:	10,676	19,136				
8. Compare the difference between the average total workloads	Total Difference	% Above/Below				
of this magisterial district to the judicial district.	-8,460	-44 %				

9. If this magisterial district's average workload is fifteen (15%) percent *higher or lower than* your judicial district average workload <u>and</u> you are proposing to <u>reestablish</u> this magisterial district, please explain (*summarize your response from the petition*) why this does not result in an unwarranted inequity among the judges.

This magisterial district is the largest in the district per square mile and is second in population within the county. The magisterial district judge at this office will be tasked with handling our Central Court. This will result in an increased caseload for this office; however, it won't be possible to quantify this increase.



Magisterial District Informa	ation				
10. Magisterial District Judge ((MDJ) Information:				
Jonathan Dunsinger Magisterial District Judge Name	Birthdate	1/3/28 Term Expiration Date	12/31/47 Mandatory Retirement Date		
11. Magisterial District Court I	nformation - Physica	l Location:			
1065 Creamton Drive, F	Honesdale, PA 184	31			
12. Is this court within the bou	undaries of the magis	sterial district?	Yes		
13. Is the MDJ's residence wit	hin the boundaries o	f the magisterial district?	Yes		
14. Are all portions of the mag	gisterial district conti	guous?	Yes		
15. To the best of your knowle			No/Not Sure		
such as a mall, highway ex increase in the case filings		ng that will likely cause an E S , please summarize your re	esponse below.		
16. List any police departmen	ts located within this	magisterial district.			
17. List any major highways w Pa Route 191, 670, 247, 37	_	district.			
18. List the <u>current</u> municipali for Realignment Orders su	-	ial district (alphabetically). I	For a list, click <u>HERE</u>		
Berlin Township M Buckingham Township M Clinton Township O Damascus Township Pr	ebanon Township anchester Township It. Pleasant Township regon Township reston Township cott Township	Starrucca Borough	E		
19. Are the <u>proposed</u> municip If NO , please list all propos			Yes		
20. Additional Comments:					



Court of Common Pleas 22nd Judicial District Wayne County, Pennsylvania

Honorable Janine Edwards President Judge Nicole A. Hendrix, Esq. District Court Administrator

NOTICE OF DRAFT PROPOSAL REESTABLISHMENT OF THE MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS WITHIN THE 22ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA-WAYNE COUNTY

January 19, 2022

NOTICE is hereby given that a proposal to reestablish the Magisterial Districts within the 22nd Judicial District (Wayne County) has been drafted and is available for in-office examination and review through February 19, 2022, at the following locations:

- 1. The office of the District Court Administrator, and
- 2. All Magisterial District Judicial offices in Wayne County.

The draft is also available on the Court's website at: www.waynecountypa.gov

Written comments or suggestions regarding the proposal may be directed to Nicole Hendrix, Esq., District Court Administrator, 925 Court Street, Honesdale, PA 18431 or by email to nhendrix@waynecountypa.gov. All written comments or suggestions must be received no later than February 19, 2022.

Hon. Janine Edwards President Judge The following page contains the draft proposal for the Reestablishment of the Magisterial Districts within the 22^{nd} Judicial District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania-Wayne County.

The Wayne County Court of Common Pleas proposes to reestablish the current magisterial districts as they are currently configured. Attached are Magisterial District Summary Worksheets for each magisterial district in Wayne County.

2022 MDJ Reestablishment-Preliminary Report

REESTABLISHMENT GUIDLEINES AND EXPECTATIONS.

- How many magisterial districts do you need to handle the case filings, not just now, but for the next ten years?
- Where should the boundaries of those districts be draw so that the workload is equitably distributed among the MDJs in the County
- There is NO presumption that there are too many or too few districts
- Comparisons should be made of <u>average caseloads</u> of the offices within the county <u>and</u> for our class of county and judicial districts within the class of county.
 - o If district falls at the lower end of the range, must evaluate this factor in formulating realignment proposal and explain the departure from caseload equity.
- Comparison should be made of <u>workload</u>. No MDJ should have a total <u>workload</u> which is 15% higher or lower
 that the workload of any other district in the judicial district. If so, explanation must be provided, why this DOES
 NOT result in unwarranted inequity among the judges
- OTHER REQUIREMENTS
 - MDJ court must be located within the district boundaries
 - All portions of district must be contiguous
 - No district can be eliminated during term of incumbent MDJ
 - Boundaries cannot be redrawn in such a way that would move an incumbent MDJ residence into another district.
 - Voting districts cannot be split
 - Any planned development in county such as mall, highway expansion that will likely cause an increase in case filings of the district should be discussed.
 - Note any special programs in your county that will entail effort by MDJ's, such as truancy programs or drug, veteran or MH diversion programs
 - o Public access and safety should be considered

2020 Demographics

Wayne County is a 6th class county with an area of 751 square miles and a 2020 population of approximately 51,155 persons. This is a decrease in population of approximately 1670 persons from the 2010 census. Wayne County is largely rural with population centers located in the boroughs of Honesdale, Hawley, Waymart and townships of southern Wayne. There are approximately nine (9) miles of Interstate Rt. 84 (Sterling Twp.) and approximately a quarter mile of Interstate Rt. 380 (Lehigh Twp.) in southern Wayne. There is no county wide mass transportation system aside from limited Area Agency on Aging buses. The remainder of county is service by two lane secondary roads.

The county is serviced by three (3) magisterial district judges. At the onset of this evaluation, the judicial district was served by Hon. Bonnie Carney (Dist. 22-3-01); Hon. Linus Myers (Dist. 22-3-02); and Vacant (Dist. 22-3-04). As of January 3, 2022, the judicial district was served by Hon. Bonnie Carney (22-3-01); Hon. Kay Bates (22-3-02); and Hon. Jonathan Dunsinger (22-3-04). For purposes of this report and for brevity districts shall be referred to as 1, 2, and 4.

Jurisdiction and elected status of magisterial district judges.

District #	Judge	Municipalities	Elected	Commission Expires
22-3-01	Bonnie L. Carney	Dreher, Hawley, Lake, Lehigh, Palmyra, Paupack, Salem, Sterling Twps.	2003	1/02/22
22-3-02	Linus Myers	Canaan, Cherry Ridge, Honesdale, Prompton, South Canaan, Texas, Waymart	2015	1/02/22
22-3-04	Vacant	Berlin, Bethany, Buckingham, Clinton, Damascus, Dyberry, Lebanon, Manchester, Mt. Pleasant, Oregon, Preston, Scott, Starrucca.	N/A	N/A

District #	Judge	Municipalities	Elected	Commission Expires
22-3-01	Bonnie L. Carney	Dreher, Hawley, Lake, Lehigh, Palmyra, Paupack, Salem, Sterling Twps.	2003	2028
22-3-02	Kay Bates	Canaan, Cherry Ridge, Honesdale, Prompton, South Canaan, Texas, Waymart	2021	2028
22-3-04	Jonathan J. Dunsinger	Berlin, Bethany, Buckingham, Clinton, Damascus, Dyberry, Lebanon, Manchester, Mt. Pleasant, Oregon, Preston, Scott, Starrucca.	2021	2028

Analysis

The Supreme Court directive provides for this Court to view comparisons in average total caseloads by a district against the judicial district's average caseload for all MDJs and against 6th class county averages. **The average MDJ caseload for Wayne County is 2,043** a year; this is a decrease from the 2010 average caseload which was 2,165 a year. The average total caseload for 6th class counties is 3,230 a year. Wayne County districts have below average caseload compared to other 6th Class Counties. In fact out of the 24 counties that are 6th class counties, Wayne County ranks 23 out of 24 in average caseload making this judicial district at the lowest end of the caseload range for 6th class counties.

The following chart indicates the population in each district for 2010 and 2020, the case load average of the MDJ office, the 6th class county average (and percentage above/below that average), and the judicial district's average (and percentage above or below that average).

District	Population 2010	Population 2020	Caseload Average	6 th Class County Caseload	Judicial District's Average Caseload
				Average	
1	20,661	19,829	2846	3230 (12% below)	2043 (39% above)
2	16,266	15,595	1963	3230 (39% below)	2043 (4% below)
4	15,895	15,731	1080	3230 (67% below)	2043 (47% below)
County wide	52,822	51,155			

	Average CV Filings	Average LT Filings	Average CR Filings	Average NT Filings	Average PC Filings	Average PS Filings	Average TR Filings	Total Average
Wayne	683	154	554	938	19	124	3421	5893
22-3-01	325	47	230	426	4	22	1791	2846
22-3-02	246	84	212	289	11	81	1040	1963
22-3-04	112	22	112	222	4	21	587	1080

Caseload trends

	Criminal	Non- Traffic	Private Criminal	Private Summary	Traffic	Civil	Landlord/Tenant	Misc. Docket	Annual Average Filings per Court
Class 6	263	379	5	57	2257	165	53	51	3230
Wayne	185	313	6	41	1140	228	51	79	2043

The judicial district has, on average, more civil filings than other 6th class counties. The district falls below the average of 6th class counties in most of the other case types. District 2 has more LL/T matters than the other magisterial districts in Wayne County.

<u>WORKLOAD ANALYSIS-Differs</u> from actual number of filings. The measure relates to the relative amount of work involved in the disposition of the case.

Judicial District Average	19,136 Total Difference		% Above/Below	
District 1	23,368	4,232	22%	
District 2	23,314	4,178	22%	
District 4	10,676	-8,460	-44%	

The analysis requires:

No MDJ should have a total <u>workload</u> which is <u>15% higher or lower</u> that the workload of any other district in the judicial district. If so, <u>explanation must be provided</u>.

ANALYSIS:

The size of the county and positioning of population centers create the obvious disparity in caseload/workloads among the three magisterial districts in the 22nd Judicial District. From the workloads in the chart above, it is clear that the MDJ at District 4 has a workload that is almost 50 percent less than the other two districts. Despite the fact that District 1 has more case fillings than District 2, Districts 1 and 2 have almost identical workload averages. District 4 makes up at least half of the entire area of the judicial district. Interestingly, the population of District 4 now surpasses the population of District 2; yet, the case fillings of District 2 are almost double the case fillings of District 4.

In past evaluations, the geography and population centers of Wayne County and the lack of mass transit or interstates <u>and</u> the concern for convenience and safety of the public has played the most important part in determining placement of districts. To travel from the southernmost part of Wayne County to its most northern can take up to two hours, in good weather.

While the numbers may suggest the elimination of an MDJ position and simply splitting the county in half to create an equitable division of workload in the judicial district, the elimination would create significant travel, safety, and convenience issues for users of the judicial system.

Inequities in present configuration:

- 1. District 1 has almost triple the case filings of Districts 2 and 4.
- 2. District 2 has almost double the case filings of District 4.
- 3. Districts 1 and 2 have almost equal workload, despite District 1 having more case filings.
- 4. District 4 has a workload 44 percent below the county average.
- 5. Districts 1 and 2 have a workload 22 percent above the county average.

Proposal One: Reestablish all districts

The geography of the county suggests that the current configuration of the districts supports the safety and convenience of the judicial system users. The major issue with this current configuration is the disparity between the workloads of the magistrates. The magistrate in District 4 has considerably less of a workload than the other two magistrates. If the Court intends to reestablish all district, it is my recommendation that the magistrate from District 4 be responsible for handling all central court proceedings as a way to reduce the disparity among the magistrate workloads. In Wayne County, central court occurs weekly on Wednesdays and operates as a waiver court. Currently the magistrates rotate central court duty with the on-call magistrate covering central court. Under this reestablishment, the magistrate of District 4 would cover central court weekly. This would create an increase in the workload of the magistrate at District 4 and would decrease the workload of the magistrates at District 1 and 2.

Proposal Two: Realign all districts

Under this proposal, the Court would attempt to reconfigure the districts in a way to reduce workload disparity. Keeping in mind the requirements for realignment, it is recommended that:

- 1. Waymart Borough and Canaan Township would move from District 2 to District 4.
- 2. Lake Township would move from District 1 to District 2.

Under this realignment, the workload for the magistrates would become more equalized. While it would not erase the disparity entirely and District 4 would continue to have a lower workload than the other two districts, it would decrease the workload of Districts 1 and 2. However, this proposal would increase the area serviced by District 4. District 4 already services a greater population than District 2; this would simply increase that population difference. District 4 would become even larger in square mileage and serve a greater population within the county. The population of District 2 would remain static, and the population within District 1 would be the lowest in the county. This proposal increases the travel and safety concerns for users of District 4.

District	Population 2020	Realignment Proposal Population
		2020
1	19,829	14,979
2	15,595	15,538
4	15,731	20,638
County wide	51,155	51,155

Proposal Three: Eliminate District 4 and realign Districts 1 and 2

Under this proposal, District 4 would be eliminated and Districts 1 and 2 would be realigned to encompass the entire county. This is the least desirable plan for the county and the current magisterial district justices. Due to the timing of reelection, this plan could not take effect until 2028. At that point in time, we would almost be ready for another reestablishment review and the data would not be helpful for the next one. Further, current trends of influx to the area from out-of-state individuals due to Covid are not reflected in the 2020 census.

Further, as the county seat, I believe Honesdale would need to remain an office site for at least one of the MDJ districts. This would create a safety and transportation issue for those in the northernmost part of the county.

