



Administrative Directive of the State Court Administrator, 2025-01 Amended On the 2025 Apportionment of Judicial Magistrate Positions to the Counties

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

A. Overview

State law requires the state court administrator (SCA) to apportion the 206 judicial magistrate positions currently authorized among Iowa's 99 counties every four years. As required by Iowa Code section 602.6302(1)(b), each county must receive at least one resident magistrate or district associate judge (DAJ) created through an exchange of three magistrates for a DAJ pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.6302. Based on decisions by the district judges in seven of the eight judicial districts, 66 magistrate positions have been traded to obtain 22 DAJ positions (three part-time magistrate positions for one full-time DAJ position). Consequently, there are only 140 magistrate positions available for appointments in 2025. The challenge is to determine how to allocate equitably the 140 available magistrate positions among the counties. Iowa Code section 602.6401(2) directs the SCA to consider county-based factors including geographical area and seasonal population changes, among others. However, there is no statutorily specified formula for determining the allocation of magistrate positions. In the absence of a statutorily specified formula, the SCA employed the same weighted caseload formula and decision-making criteria to determine the 2025 allocation of magistrate positions that the SCA employed when allocating magistrate positions in 2021. (See Section B, below)

Based on the weighted caseload formula, two counties that previously had two magistrate positions will receive just one magistrate position in 2025. The counties are Benton and Hamilton. Two counties with the greatest need for magistrates according to the weighted caseload formula will receive at least one additional magistrate position: Scott (1) and Johnson (1). After reallocating the two magistrate positions, 10 counties still have a shortage of magistrate positions according to the weighted caseload formula: Dallas, Dubuque, Harrison, Johnson, Linn, Polk, Pottawattamie, Scott, Tama and Woodbury.

B. Weighted caseload formula

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

Calculating the need for judicial magistrate positions in each county: The weighted caseload formula begins with two-year average filings (2023 to 2024) in each county for the case types within a magistrate's jurisdiction: small claims, simple misdemeanors and adult mental health

commitment petitions – plus the number of initial appearances in indictable criminal cases and the number of search warrants filed. These filing figures are multiplied by the case weights (average minutes spent by a judicial officer per case per year) for each case type. The sum of these calculations provides an estimate of the number of case-related work minutes a magistrate will need to handle the workload in the county. That figure is divided by the number of work minutes available to an average full-time equivalent (FTE) judicial officer per year¹ to produce an estimate of the number of FTE judicial officers needed in each county to handle the judicial magistrate workload. (See Table 2, column A, which shows the results of these calculations for each county) Table 2 shows the demand for magistrates ranges from less than .10 (10%) of an FTE judicial magistrate in seven of the least populous counties to 10.2 FTE judicial magistrates in Polk County.

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

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

1. On-call time.

One of the concerns expressed by magistrates regarding the weighted caseload formula is that the study of judicial worktime, which is the basis for calculating the case weights used in the weighted caseload formula, did not count “on-call time” as worktime. During the judicial work time study in the fall of 2016, when magistrates were called upon to consider an application for a search warrant or a petition for a mental health commitment during on-call time (e.g., between 5:00 PM and 7:00 AM), the magistrate’s work time was included in the calculation of the case weights. However, the other on-call time, during which a magistrate must be available to handle such matters outside of regular work hours, was not included in the case weights.

To address this concern, the SCA has allocated two magistrate positions to a county that shows a weighted caseload demand for .31 (31%) of an FTE judicial officer. By comparison, in most workload assessments for determining the need for full-time judges, a jurisdiction must reach a workload demand of at least 1.5 FTE judicial officers before the jurisdiction qualifies for a second judgeship, and 2.5 FTEs before being granted a third judgeship. If this common standard would be applied to the allocation of magistrate positions, a county would receive a second magistrate position only when the workload demand reaches about .49 FTE – .33 plus half of .33 (.165 FTE), for a total of .495 FTE. In light of this common approach, allocating a second magistrate position when a county reaches a weighted caseload demand of .31 FTE is a reasonable adjustment to account for on-call time. The .31 FTE threshold for allocation of a second magistrate position remains unchanged from the 2021 magistrate apportionment, which also used a .31 FTE threshold for allocation of a second magistrate position.

¹ Average number of minutes available to a full-time equivalent judicial officer to work on cases: 103,200 minutes (215 workdays X 8 hours per day X 60 minutes per hour).

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

As indicated above, in the 2025 apportionment of magistrate positions a county qualifies for a second magistrate position when the weighted caseload demand reaches .31 (31%) of an FTE judicial officer. Thereafter, counties receive an additional magistrate position for each additional increase of .35 of an FTE in the weighted caseload: .66 FTE to obtain a third magistrate, 1.01 FTE to obtain a fourth magistrate, etc. (See Table 3 for more information) Using .35 of an FTE, rather than .31 of an FTE, as the criterion for receiving additional magistrate positions is consistent with the common approach for determining the need for additional judicial full-time judges noted in section C.1 above.

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

Iowa Code section 602.6302 authorizes the district judges in a judicial district, by majority vote, to exchange three part-time magistrate positions for one full-time DAJ. This situation “locks in” magistrate positions previously allocated to a county. (Note: After such an exchange, every county must have at least one resident magistrate or resident DAJ) Statewide, the judicial districts have traded 66 magistrate positions to create 22 DAJ positions. (See Table 1, column C) In these instances, the three magistrate positions used to create the DAJ position cannot be moved until the DAJ leaves that position.

Currently, the DAJ positions in seven counties (Buena Vista, Delaware, Dickinson, Hamilton, Keokuk, Kossuth, and Mahaska) were created at a time when the counties that contributed magistrate positions to create the DAJ positions qualified for more magistrate positions than they currently qualify for based on the current allocation formula. Specifically, there are 10 counties that have “locked in” one magistrate position through previous trades to create one of the six DAJ positions, but those counties no longer qualify those magistrate positions according to the 2025 weighted caseload formula. The 10 counties include Appanoose, Boone, Clay, Delaware, Dickinson, Emmet, Hardin, Jefferson, Palo Alto and Poweshiek. If any of the seven DAJ positions created by trades of magistrate positions from the 10 counties becomes vacant, the SCA may deny a request to retain that DAJ position and reallocate one or more of the magistrate positions that created the DAJ position to counties that have fewer magistrate positions than the most recent magistrate formula indicates they need.² (See Table 2, column O)

4. Allocation of the shortage of magistrate positions.

There are a total of 206 magistrate positions that the SCA has to allocate among the 99 counties, including the 66 positions traded to obtain 22 DAJ positions. The weighted caseload formula indicates the need for 217 magistrate positions – 11 more positions than authorized by the legislature. (See Table 2, column B) As indicated earlier, 10 counties have “locked in” one more magistrate position than they currently qualify for because they previously traded magistrate positions to obtain a DAJ, but those counties no longer qualify for one of their magistrate positions according to the 2025 weighted caseload formula. This situation decreases the number of magistrate positions available to allocate to counties that currently have a shortage of magistrate positions. Consequently, several counties cannot receive the number of magistrate

² If the SCA moves a magistrate position to the county most in need of a magistrate, the district court judges in the judicial district will have the opportunity to recreate the DAJ position by exchanging three magistrate positions from a different combination of counties in the district.

positions they need. In the 2025 apportionment of magistrates, 10 counties receive a combined total of 21 fewer magistrate positions than the formula indicates they need: Dallas (1), Dubuque (1), Harrison (1), Johnson (1), Linn (2), Polk (10), Pottawattamie (1), Scott (2), Tama (1) and Woodbury (1). (See Table 2, column M)

D. Changes in the Allocation of Magistrate Positions


Based on the decision-making criteria set forth in section C above, two counties that previously had two magistrate positions lose one of those positions in the 2025 apportionment. They are Benton and Hamilton. These two positions are assigned to two counties that have the most substantial shortage of magistrate positions: Scott (1) and Johnson (1).

E. Next Steps

Each clerk of district court should promptly inform the chairperson of the county’s Magistrate Appointing Commission regarding this notification and, upon completion of the appointment process, certify to this office the names and addresses of the magistrate appointees. Guidelines and procedures for selecting magistrates are governed by Iowa Code sections 602.6403 and 602.6404. A current magistrate who is not an attorney and held office on April 1, 2009, is eligible for appointment pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.6404(3).

This administrative directive is effective immediately.

Dated this 12th day of March 2025.



Robert Gast
State Court Administrator

- Copies to:
- Justices of the Supreme Court
 - Chief Judges of the Judicial Districts
 - District Court Administrators
 - Clerks of District Court
 - Deputy State Court Administrator
 - Director of Finance
 - Director of Human Resources
 - Research, Policy & Planning Analyst

- Attachments:
- Table 1 – Summary of 2025 Magistrate Allocations to Each County
 - Table 2 – Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County
 - Table 3 – Criteria for Apportioning Two or More Judicial Magistrate Positions

Table 1 - Summary of 2025 Magistrate Allocations to Each County (3.11.2025) - 2023-2024 only

Magis District	County	A	B	C	D*	E**	F	Subdistrict	County	A	B	C	D*	E**	F
		2025 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2025 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2025 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2025 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I)	2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (D-E)	2025 change from previous (2021) allocation [H-D]			2025 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2025 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2025 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2025 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I)	2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I)	2025 change from previous (2021) allocation [H-D]
1A	Allamakee	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	Audubon	1	0	0	1	1	0
1A	Clayton	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	Cass	1	0	0	1	1	0
1A	Delaware*	2	2	1	0	0	0	4	Fremont	1	0	0	1	1	0
1A	Dubuque	5	1	0	4	4	0	4	Harrison	1	0	0	1	1	0
1A	Winnsiek	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	Mills	1	0	0	1	1	0
1B	Black Hawk**	7	2	0	5	5	0	4	Montgomery	1	0	0	1	1	0
1B	Buchanan	2	0	0	2	2	0	4	Page	1	0	0	1	1	0
1B	Chickasaw	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	Pottawattamie	6	3	1	3	3	0
1B	Fayette	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	Shelby	1	0	0	1	1	0
1B	Grundy**	1	1	1	0	0	0	5A	Dallas	3	0	0	3	3	0
1B	Howard	1	0	0	1	1	0	5A	Guthrie	1	0	0	1	1	0
2A	Bremer	2	0	0	2	2	0	5A	Jasper	2	1	0	1	1	0
2A	Butler	1	0	0	1	1	0	5A	Madison	1	0	0	1	1	0
2A	Cerro Gordo	3	0	0	3	3	0	5A	Marion	2	2	1	0	0	0
2A	Floyd	1	0	0	1	1	0	5A	Warren	3	3	1	0	0	0
2A	Franklin	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Adair	1	0	0	1	1	0
2A	Hancock	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Adams	1	0	0	1	1	0
2A	Mitchell	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Clarke	1	0	0	1	1	0
2A	Winnnebago	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Decatur	1	0	0	1	1	0
2A	Worth	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Lucas	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Boone*	2	1	0	1	1	0	5B	Ringgold	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Calhoun	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Taylor	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Carroll	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Union	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Greene	1	0	0	1	1	0	5B	Wayne	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Hamilton [-1]	1	1	1	0	1	-1	5C	Polk	20	12	4	8	8	0
2B	Hardin*	2	1	0	1	1	0	6	Benton [-1]	1	0	0	1	2	-1
2B	Humboldt	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	Iowa	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Marshall	3	0	0	3	3	0	6	Johnson [1]	7	0	0	7	6	1
2B	Pocahontas	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	Jones	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Sac	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	Linn	9	6	2	3	3	0
2B	Story	4	3	1	1	1	0	6	Tama	1	0	0	1	1	0
2B	Webster	3	0	0	3	3	0	7	Cedar	2	0	0	2	2	0
2B	Wright	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	Clinton	3	0	0	3	3	0
3A	Buena Vista	2	2	1	0	0	0	7	Jackson	1	0	0	1	1	0
3A	Cherokee	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	Muscatine	3	0	0	3	3	0
3A	Clay*	2	1	0	1	1	0	7	Scott [1]	11	0	0	11	10	1
3A	Dickinson***	2	2	1	0	0	0	8A	Appanoose*	2	1	0	1	1	0
3A	Emmet*	2	1	0	1	1	0	8A	Davis	1	0	0	1	1	0
3A	Kossuth	1	1	1	0	0	0	8A	Jefferson*	2	1	0	1	1	0
3A	Lyon	1	0	0	1	1	0	8A	Keokuk	1	1	1	0	0	0
3A	O'Brien***	1	1	0	0	0	0	8A	Mahaska	2	1	1	1	1	0
3A	Osceola	1	0	0	1	1	0	8A	Monroe	1	0	0	1	1	0
3A	Palo Alto*	2	1	0	1	1	0	8A	Poweshiek*	2	1	0	1	1	0
3B	Crawford	1	0	0	1	1	0	8A	Van Buren	1	0	0	1	1	0
3B	Ida	1	0	0	1	1	0	8A	Wapello	3	0	0	3	3	0
3B	Monona	1	0	0	1	1	0	8A	Washington	2	1	0	1	1	0
3B	Plymouth	2	2	1	0	0	0	8B	Des Moines	3	3	1	0	0	0
3B	Sioux	2	1	0	1	1	0	8B	Henry	2	0	0	2	2	0
3B	Woodbury	6	3	1	3	3	0	8B	Lee	3	3	1	0	0	0
								8B	Louisa	1	0	0	1	1	0
								STATE		206	66	22	140	140	0

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

**The 2021 actual allocation shown here reflects the reallocation of 1 magistrate position from Grundy to Black Hawk during July 2021 when a DAJ position created through a trade of 3 magistrates became vacant and Grundy no longer qualified for the second magistrate position. D1 then approved exchanging 2 mags from BH and 1 from Grundy to create a DAJ in BH who will serve as magistrate in Grundy.

***DAJ position became vacant in November 2021. The position was comprised of 3 magistrates from Dickinson. Dickinson no longer qualified for 3 magistrates. D3 approved exchanging the remaining 2 magistrates from Dickinson and 1 from O'Brien to preserve their DAJ position. The other magistrate position was reallocated to Polk County.

Table 2 - 2025 Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County (03.11.25) - 2023-2024 only

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O			
Subdistrict	County	2021 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs	↓	2025 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]	2021 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]	2021 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2021 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2021 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (D-E)	2025 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2025 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2025 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2025 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I)	2025 change from previous (2021) allocation [H-D]	preliminary allocation above or below 2025 # needed [H-B]	% allocated above or below # needed [M/B]	2025 Wgt'd caseload per 2025 allocated mag pos. [A/H]	County	2023 Population
			2025 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs	2025 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]															
1A	Allamakee	0.174	0.145	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.15	Allamakee	14,074
1A	Clayton	0.253	0.251	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.25	Clayton	16,969
1A	Delaware*	0.261	0.273	1	1	2	2	1	0	2		1	0	0	1	100.0%	0.14	Delaware*	17,600
1A	Dubuque	2.293	2.055	6	7	5	1		4	5	1		4	0	-1	-16.7%	0.41	Dubuque	98,887
1A	Winnshiek	0.242	0.203	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.20	Winnshiek	19,815
1B	Black Hawk**	2.612	2.280	7	8	7	2		5	7	2		5	0	0	0.0%	0.33	Black Hawk**	130,471
1B	Buchanan	0.412	0.362	2	2	2			2	2			2	0	0	0.0%	0.18	Buchanan	20,691
1B	Chickasaw	0.191	0.101	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.10	Chickasaw	11,658
1B	Fayette	0.300	0.298	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.30	Fayette	19,210
1B	Grundy**	0.160	0.148	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.15	Grundy**	12,384
1B	Howard	0.105	0.136	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.14	Howard	9,376
2A	Bremer	0.356	0.328	2	2	2			2	2			2	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Bremer	25,307
2A	Butler	0.129	0.105	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.10	Butler	14,172
2A	Cerro Gordo	0.917	0.903	3	3	3			3	3			3	0	0	0.0%	0.30	Cerro Gordo	42,406
2A	Floyd	0.252	0.198	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.20	Floyd	15,326
2A	Franklin	0.182	0.148	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.15	Franklin	9,875
2A	Hancock	0.168	0.143	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.14	Hancock	10,615
2A	Mitchell	0.106	0.104	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.10	Mitchell	10,518
2A	Winnebago	0.136	0.099	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.10	Winnebago	10,571
2A	Worth	0.151	0.156	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Worth	7,297
2B	Boone*	0.391	0.294	1	2	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.15	Boone*	26,590
2B	Calhoun	0.115	0.135	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.14	Calhoun	9,763
2B	Carroll	0.303	0.209	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.21	Carroll	20,522
2B	Greene	0.175	0.181	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.18	Greene	8,584
2B	Hamilton [-1]	0.310	0.286	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	-1	0	0.0%	0.29	Hamilton	14,729
2B	Hardin*	0.280	0.219	1	1	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.11	Hardin*	16,463
2B	Humboldt	0.120	0.120	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.12	Humboldt	9,500
2B	Marshall	0.846	0.666	3	3	3			3	3			3	0	0	0.0%	0.22	Marshall	40,014
2B	Pocahontas	0.108	0.091	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.09	Pocahontas	6,976
2B	Sac	0.149	0.139	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.14	Sac	9,686
2B	Story	1.197	1.019	4	4	4	3	1	1	4	3	1	1	0	0	0.0%	0.25	Story	98,566
2B	Webster	0.856	0.801	3	3	3			3	3			3	0	0	0.0%	0.27	Webster	36,485
2B	Wright	0.193	0.177	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.18	Wright	12,656
3A	Buena Vista	0.349	0.317	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Buena Vista	20,567
3A	Cherokee	0.171	0.142	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.14	Cherokee	11,605
3A	Clay*	0.342	0.289	1	2	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.14	Clay*	16,511
3A	Dickinson***	0.358	0.295	1	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	100.0%	0.15	Dickinson***	18,056
3A	Emmet*	0.176	0.144	1	1	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.07	Emmet*	9,229
3A	Kossuth	0.166	0.164	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Kossuth	14,396
3A	Lyon	0.170	0.153	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.15	Lyon	12,324
3A	O'Brien***	0.222	0.200	1	1	1	1		0	1	1		0	0	0	0.0%	0.20	O'Brien***	14,012
3A	Osceola	0.119	0.103	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.10	Osceola	5,978
3A	Palo Alto*	0.145	0.107	1	1	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.05	Palo Alto*	8,810
3B	Crawford	0.258	0.195	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.19	Crawford	16,013
3B	Ida	0.110	0.097	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.10	Ida	6,833
3B	Monona	0.212	0.166	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.17	Monona	8,493
3B	Plymouth	0.450	0.374	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.19	Plymouth	25,722
3B	Sioux	0.334	0.399	2	2	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	0	0.0%	0.20	Sioux	36,246
3B	Woodbury	2.708	2.307	7	8	6	3	1	3	6	3	1	3	0	-1	-14.3%	0.38	Woodbury	105,951

Table 2 - 2025 Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County (03.11.25) - 2023-2024 only

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O			
Subdistrict	County	2021 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs	↓ 2025 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs	2025 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]	2021 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]	2021 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2021 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2021 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (D-E)	2025 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2025 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2025 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2025 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I)	2025 change from previous (2021) allocation [H-D]	preliminary allocation above or below 2025 # needed [H-B]	% allocated above or below # needed [M/B]	2025 Wgt'd caseload per 2025 allocated mag pos. [A/H]	County	2023 Population
		4	Audubon	0.091	0.077	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.08
4	Cass	0.304	0.268	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.27	Cass	13,130
4	Fremont	0.148	0.188	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.19	Fremont	6,458
4	Harrison	0.308	0.339	2	1	1			1	1			1	0	-1	-50.0%	0.34	Harrison	14,670
4	Mills	0.244	0.216	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.22	Mills	14,633
4	Montgomery	0.193	0.164	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Montgomery	10,139
4	Page	0.227	0.183	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.18	Page	15,014
4	Pottawattamie	2.409	2.157	7	7	6	3	1	3	6	3	1	3	0	-1	-14.3%	0.36	Pottawattamie	93,179
4	Shelby	0.195	0.160	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Shelby	11,806
5A	Dallas	0.765	1.044	4	3	3			3	3			3	0	-1	-25.0%	0.35	Dallas	111,092
5A	Guthrie	0.149	0.131	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.13	Guthrie	10,722
5A	Jasper	0.617	0.581	2	2	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	0	0.0%	0.29	Jasper	37,919
5A	Madison	0.185	0.143	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.14	Madison	16,971
5A	Marion	0.438	0.477	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.24	Marion	33,770
5A	Warren	0.592	0.702	3	2	3	3	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.23	Warren	55,205
5B	Adair	0.139	0.110	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.11	Adair	7,389
5B	Adams	0.078	0.044	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.04	Adams	3,544
5B	Clarke	0.259	0.194	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.19	Clarke	9,588
5B	Decatur	0.114	0.084	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.08	Decatur	7,665
5B	Lucas	0.134	0.151	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.15	Lucas	8,747
5B	Ringgold	0.043	0.049	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.05	Ringgold	4,642
5B	Taylor	0.059	0.046	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.05	Taylor	5,924
5B	Union	0.202	0.169	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.17	Union	11,906
5B	Wayne	0.065	0.054	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.05	Wayne	6,557
5C	Polk	9.160	10.215	30	27	20	12	4	8	20	12	4	8	0	-10	-33.3%	0.51	Polk	505,255
6	Benton [-1]	0.365	0.275	1	2	2			2	1			1	-1	0	0.0%	0.28	Benton	25,796
6	Iowa	0.251	0.221	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.22	Iowa	16,381
6	Johnson [1]	2.474	2.493	8	8	6			6	7			7	1	-1	-12.5%	0.36	Johnson	157,528
6	Jones	0.308	0.258	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.26	Jones	20,900
6	Linn	4.056	3.530	11	12	9	6	2	3	9	6	2	3	0	-2	-18.2%	0.39	Linn	228,972
6	Tama	0.302	0.344	2	1	1			1	1			1	0	-1	-50.0%	0.34	Tama	16,833
7	Cedar	0.403	0.360	2	2	2			2	2			2	0	0	0.0%	0.18	Cedar	18,302
7	Clinton	0.921	0.824	3	3	3			3	3			3	0	0	0.0%	0.27	Clinton	46,158
7	Jackson	0.251	0.215	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.22	Jackson	19,342
7	Muscatine	1.045	0.886	3	4	3			3	3			3	0	0	0.0%	0.30	Muscatine	42,218
7	Scott [1]	4.343	4.473	13	13	10			10	11			11	1	-2	-15.4%	0.41	Scott	174,270
8A	Appanoose*	0.226	0.229	1	1	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.11	Appanoose*	12,119
8A	Davis	0.098	0.078	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.08	Davis	9,169
8A	Jefferson*	0.267	0.224	1	1	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.11	Jefferson*	15,440
8A	Keokuk	0.123	0.111	1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.11	Keokuk	9,914
8A	Mahaska	0.404	0.325	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0.0%	0.16	Mahaska	21,874
8A	Monroe	0.116	0.111	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.11	Monroe	7,504
8A	Poweshiek*	0.311	0.246	1	2	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	1	100.0%	0.12	Poweshiek*	18,453
8A	Van Buren	0.088	0.073	1	1	1			1	1			1	0	0	0.0%	0.07	Van Buren	7,266
8A	Wapello	0.906	0.820	3	3	3			3	3			3	0	0	0.0%	0.27	Wapello	35,166
8A	Washington	0.308	0.389	2	1	2	1		1	2	1		1	0	0	0.0%	0.19	Washington	22,560

Table 2 - 2025 Magistrate Formula and Allocation of Magistrates to Each County (03.11.25) - 2023-2024 only

Subdistrict	County	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	County	2023 Population	
		2021 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs	↓ 2025 magis weighted caseload demand in FTEs	2025 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]	2021 Wgt'd case formula: # of mag positions needed [see Table 3]	2021 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2021 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2021 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2021 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (D-E)	2025 preliminary allocation of 206 total mag positions	2025 # of mags traded for a DAJ (66 total)	2025 # of resid. DAJs from mags traded (22 total)	2025 actual allocation of the 140 available magis positions (H-I)	2025 change from previous (2021) allocation [H-D]	preliminary allocation above or below 2025 # needed [H-B]	% allocated above or below # needed [M/B]			2025 Wgt'd caseload per 2025 allocated mag pos. [A/H]
8B	Des Moines	0.906	0.782	3	3	3	3	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.26	Des Moines	38,253
8B	Henry	0.402	0.413	2	2	2	2		2	2		2	0	0	0.0%	0.21	Henry	19,547	
8B	Lee	0.803	0.691	3	3	3	3	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0.0%	0.23	Lee	32,565	
8B	Louisa	0.173	0.152	1	1	1			1	1		1	0	0	0.0%	0.15	Louisa	10,513	
TOTALS		57.700	54.695	217	220	206	66	22	140	206	66	22	140	0	-11	-5%	0.27		3,207,004

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

**The 2021 actual allocation shown here reflects the reallocation of 1 magistrate position from Grundy to Black Hawk during July 2021 when a DAJ position created through a trade of 3 magistrates became vacant and Grundy no longer qualified for the second magistrate position. D1 then approved exchanging 2 mags from BH and 1 from Grundy to create a DAJ in BH who will serve as magistrate in Grundy.

***DAJ position became vacant in November 2021. The position was comprised of 3 magistrates from Dickinson. Dickinson no longer qualified for 3 magistrates. D3 approved exchanging the remaining 2 magistrates from Dickinson and 1 from O'Brien to preserve their DAJ position. The other magistrate position was reallocated to Polk County.

- Change from 2021 to 2025
- Counties with >0.35 weighted caseload per allocated magistrate position (max is 0.35/magistrate)

Table 3 -- Criteria for Apportioning Two or More Judicial Magistrate Positions in 2025							
When FTE demand (Table 2, col A) reaches: *	County receives this # of Mags.	Min FTE workload per Mag. position	Max FTE workload per Mag. position	When FTE demand (Table 2, col A) reaches: *	County receives this # of Mags.	Min FTE workload per Mag. position	Max FTE workload per Mag. position
up to .30	1	0.04	0.31	5.56	17	0.33	0.35
0.31	2	0.16	0.33	5.91	18	0.33	0.35
0.66	3	0.22	0.34	6.26	19	0.33	0.35
1.01	4	0.25	0.34	6.61	20	0.33	0.35
1.36	5	0.27	0.34	6.96	21	0.33	0.35
1.71	6	0.29	0.34	7.31	22	0.33	0.35
2.06	7	0.29	0.34	7.66	23	0.33	0.35
2.41	8	0.30	0.35	8.01	24	0.33	0.35
2.76	9	0.31	0.35	8.36	25	0.33	0.35
3.11	10	0.31	0.35	8.71	26	0.34	0.35
3.46	11	0.31	0.35	9.06	27	0.34	0.35
3.81	12	0.32	0.35	9.41	28	0.34	0.35
4.16	13	0.32	0.35	9.76	29	0.34	0.35
4.51	14	0.32	0.35	10.11	30	0.34	0.35
4.86	15	0.32	0.35	10.46	31	0.34	0.35
5.21	16	0.33	0.35	10.81	32	0.34	0.35

add .35
add .35
add .35
etc.

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

(March 11, 2025)