GOVERNMENT
Storage
Y4
.J89/2
Ev 1

89th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

EVALUATION CHARTS ON DELAY IN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

A71600 671254

PREPARED FOR THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

BY ITS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

MAY 1966

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
63-700 O WASHINGTON : 1966

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Y 4.J 89/2:
En 1

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Maryland
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri, *Chairman*

PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
BIRCH BAYH, Indiana
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

BERNARD FENSTERWALD, JR., *Chief Counsel*
STUART S. NAGEL, *Project Director*

FOREWORD

This study is one of several that is being conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure in an attempt to discover some of the causes and cures for administrative delay. It is hoped that the subcommittee and the Administrative Conference, in time, will be able to reduce the time and cost of administrative proceedings. The subcommittee wishes to emphasize that it is not its desire to in any way embarrass or criticize the various administrative agencies. These studies are making use of new techniques and are not based upon sufficient evidence to warrant other than tentative conclusions. We believe, however, that the studies will be of particular interest and assistance to those in the various agencies who are attempting to cope with problems of delay.

The subcommittee wishes to thank both those within and those outside the agencies who have been of assistance. In particular, we wish to thank Prof. Stuart Nagel, of the University of Illinois, a temporary counsel on our staff, who has been in charge of the administrative delay project. It is Professor Nagel who has originated and carried through these studies.

EDWARD V. LONG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	III
Explanation of the administrative delay evaluation charts	1
Identification, complexity, and time consumed	1
Trend analysis	4
Dispersion analysis	8
Comparative anslysis	10
General utility of the evaluation charts	13
The charts for 61 types of proceedings	16
Index of the agencies	77

EXPLANATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHARTS

This collection of charts represents an experimental attempt to evaluate statistically the work of the administrative agencies with regard to the occurrence of possibly unwarranted time consumption in administrative proceedings. The explanatory material on the following pages is designed to clarify the contents of the charts and particularly to suggest future presentation improvements that might be made. It is hoped that if this project appears to be worth while, the Administrative Conference of the United States will continue it and improve upon it in future years.

A detailed discussion of the utility of these charts is given at the end of this explanatory material, but it might be pointed out here that the ultimate goals of these charts are (1) to encourage the agencies into reducing possibly unnecessary time consumption; (2) to show at what stages and in what types of proceedings unnecessary time consumption may be occurring; and (3) to provide some data relevant to determining the causes of and remedies for the delays which may be occurring. The charts attempt to achieve these goals by showing for each type of proceeding the average number of days that were actually consumed at nine stages and the average number of days that one might expect to see consumed in light of (1) past performance; (2) the possibility of reducing deviant cases; and (3) other types of proceedings. In calculating the expected days, one can make allowance for the complexity of the cases being evaluated.

I. Identification, Complexity, and Time Consumed

A. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES

Each chart shows some important time-consumption information for the 61 types of Federal administrative proceedings that involved 10 or more formal cases decided on the merits after hearing in fiscal year 1963. The charts are arranged in rank order from the type of proceeding that seemed to be the most subject to improvement with regard to its total time consumed down to the type of proceeding that seemed to be the least subject to improvement. In case of ties, the type of proceeding with the greater volume of cases is placed first. The index should be consulted in order to find all the types of proceedings that are included for a given agency.

The basic raw data was collected by the subcommittee and was published in a different form in the long report entitled "Statistical Data Related to Administrative Proceedings Conducted by Federal Agencies" (1964) (hereinafter referred to as the *Statistical Greenbook*). This data was used because it was the most recent data gathered from the cases of each agency in a standardized form to which the subcommittee had access. Sufficient data was, however, lacking wherever asterisks are shown in the charts. Although the data is not as current

as it could be, it does illustrate the basic methodological matters involved in attempting to statistically evaluate the efficiency of the agencies in reducing delay. The data is possibly also capable of generating rankings and other scores that are roughly similar to those which might be found with more recent data in most types of proceedings.

Types of proceedings containing less than 10 *Greenbook* cases were not given evaluation charts because it was felt they contained too few cases on which to base a meaningful evaluation. More than 61 types of proceedings could have met the 10-cases requirement if 2 or more years of data would have been combined, or if time consumption data had been available on informal cases or on formal cases not decided on the merits. Many types of proceedings having less than 10 qualifying cases are listed in the *Statistical Greenbook*.

Lines IA and IB of each chart show the name of the agency and the name of the type of proceeding whose cases are being evaluated. An agency may hear more than one type of proceeding, but a type of proceeding can only be heard by one agency. The "type of proceeding" was used as the basic unit of evaluation because it represents a fairly homogeneous (but not unduly small) grouping of cases. A more detailed description of the purpose and the statutory authority for each type of proceeding is given in part 1 of the *Statistical Greenbook*.

B. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

Lines IIA, B, and C provide three indices of the complexity of the cases, namely their average transcript length, average number of exhibits, and average number of private parties. The experts on administrative procedures who were consulted with regard to this evaluation project agreed that a set of cases with a large average transcript length, number of exhibits, and private parties is generally more complex than a set of cases with small averages on these three indices. They recognized, however, that an individual case may sometimes be simple in spite of a long transcript (if the transcript is filled with trivia), in spite of many exhibits (if they all relate to the same transaction), or many parties (if their interests are not divergent). Likewise an individual case may sometimes be complex in spite of being low on these indices. Nevertheless these indices were generally thought to be valid. It was also felt that of the three indices, transcript length was the most relevant for indicating complexity. Other complexity measures that have been suggested include the average number of pages of pleadings filed, the proportion of nonunanimous decisions, the average number of hearing days, and the proportion of decisions appealed to the courts. These measures were, however, considered inferior in validity or availability to the three chosen.

One or more of these three indices is taken into consideration, or is proposed to be taken into consideration, in each of the methods described below for evaluating the amount of time consumed by a type of proceeding. It was thought desirable to consider or to advocate considering some measure of case complexity in calculating expected time averages so that when an expected average turned out to be substantially lower than an actual average, those responsible for the type of proceeding involved could not say the subcommittee staff did not consider how complex their cases are. Truly complex cases

inherently take longer than simple cases regardless how efficient an agency might be in processing its caseload.

C. TIME CONSUMED BY THE CASES

The stages for each type of proceeding are defined on line IIIA in terms of the main activity which occurs during each stage. They can also be defined in terms of the event that occurs at the beginning and the end of each stage. Thus the same nine stages are labeled in the *Statistical Greenbook* as follows:

1. From the start of the proceeding to the final decision (i.e., "total"). According to the *Greenbook* appendix, "start" is considered to have occurred when a proceeding is committed to the hearing process and in normal course (barring withdrawal, settlement, or default) will proceed through a hearing and decision.
2. From the start to the completion of the pleading stage (i.e., "pleading").
3. From the completion of the pleading stage to the opening of the hearing (i.e., "awaiting hearing").
4. From the opening of the hearing to the date the record is closed (i.e., "hearing total").
5. The number of days of the hearing (i.e., "hearing days").
6. From the date the record is closed to the date ready for the preliminary decision (i.e., "proposed findings").
7. From the date ready for, to the issuance of the preliminary decision (i.e., "awaiting prelim").
8. From the preliminary decision to the date ready for a final decision (i.e., "briefs").
9. From the date ready for, to the issuance of the final decision (i.e., "awaiting final").

Line IIIB shows the average number of calendar days consumed by the type of proceeding at each stage in the adjudication or rule-making process. The average is the sum of the time consumed by each case divided by the number of cases, as contrasted to the median which is the time consumed by the middle case when the cases are arranged in order of time consumed. The average is used because (1) it is more commonly understood, (2) it takes into consideration the time consumed by every case not just the middle case, and because (3) the median tends to understate the time consumed.

The averages, shown on line IIIB, like the complexity indices, may sometimes be one number lower in the last digit than the averages which are shown in the *Statistical Greenbook* because of downward rounding errors. Larger discrepancies between these averages and those in the *Greenbook* are due to changes in how the data was recorded. Thus all cases having "M" dispositions (which means the preliminary decision was skipped) were re-recorded as having consumed no time at the proposed preliminary findings stage or at the awaiting preliminary decision stage, and whatever time had been recorded as having been consumed at the proposed findings stage was moved to the briefs stage (*e.g.*, the cases on page 144 of the *Greenbook*). All cases having "N" dispositions (which means the final decision was skipped) were re-recorded as having consumed no time at the briefs stage or at the awaiting final decision stage (*e.g.*, the cases on page 111 of the *Green-*

63–700 O—66——2

book). Likewise all cases in which the *Greenbook* indicated the pleading stage had not occurred subsequent to "start" were re-recorded as having consumed no time at the pleading stage, and whatever time had been recorded as having been consumed after start but before the hearing was allocated to the awaiting hearing stage (*e.g.*, the cases on page 259 of the *Greenbook*). In a future compilation, it might be more meaningful to define "start" as the beginning of the pleading stage so that the pleading always occurs subsequent to start.

The sum of the seven stages which together comprised the total time (excluding "hearing days" since they are already included in "hearing total") may not equal the total time figure mainly because for many cases the total time was known but not the amount of time consumed at certain stages. The average total time may thus be based on more cases than the average time for a component stage. Minor deviations between the sum of the seven stages and the total may also be due to rounding errors and to the fact that the same day may be included as both the last day of one stage and the first day of the following stage, but as only one day in the total time.

Likewise sometimes the average time consumed at a given stage for a type of proceeding may seem strangely low or high, but if one considers that some cases could not be used because of lack of information concerning a given stage and if one considers the re-recording described above, then all the averages should be consistent with the data in the *Statistical Greenbook*. For example if in a type of proceeding 10 cases skipped the final decision (i.e., the commission level decision) by making the preliminary decision final, one case consumed 60 days waiting for the final decision, and two cases were unknown on how much time was spent waiting for the final decision, then for this type of proceeding the "awaiting final" average would be 6 days (i.e., 60 days divided by 10 usable cases). Future evaluation charts could conceivably show the average time spent awaiting the final decision for cases where a final commission-level decision occurred (i.e., 60 days) as well as the time spent awaiting the final decision for all usable cases even those that did not await a final decision (i.e., 6 days).

II. Trend Analysis

A. What is shown and how to interpret it

Line IVA1 shows the expected average time consumed in light of past performance. The year 1962 was used as a base year because it was the earliest year for which figures were available comparable to the 1963 figures shown on line IIIB. For some types of proceedings as indicated by the asterisks, the minimum of 10 usable cases was not met in 1962, and these types could not be evaluated on the past performance criterion. A simple approach to arriving at an expected average for each stage in light of past performance merely involves showing on line IVA1 the 1962 figures on the theory that one would generally expect 1963 to be at least as good as 1962. Thus if the 1962 total for a type of proceeding was 50 days and the 1963 total was 150 days, one could say that in 1963 this type of proceeding consumed an extra 100 days.

The above hypothetical type of proceeding is thus considered to have 100 savable days or to be 100 days improvable (as is shown on line IVA2) unless some meaningful justification can be offered for why it

was necessary to consume an extra 100 days. In other words "days savable" equals the actual average minus the expected average. It represents a rough attempt to estimate unnecessary days. It can never be greater than actual days since every type of proceeding obviously needs some days in order to be processed. A negative "days saveable" does not mean that a type of proceeding went too fast, but merely that it went faster than expected in light of past performance (IVA), in light of the possibility of reducing deviant cases (IVB), or in light of other types of proceedings (IVC). Thus, a −10 days savable means that the type of proceeding consumed 10 days less than expected.

If a 150-day proceeding has 100 savable days, then one could say that 67 percent of the proceeding was unnecessary in light of past performance. Percents are, however, not shown in the chart mainly because they tend to detract from the more important days-savable figures. Thus it is generally better to save 30 days out of 90 than only 2 days out of 4, even though 30 divided by 90 is 33 percent and 2 divided by 4 is 50 percent. Negative percents also promote confusion although they can be recorded as zero percents since having an expected average that is greater than its corresponding actual average in effect means there are no savable days in light of the criterion used.

If the number of savable days is small for a given type of proceeding at a given stage, then the difference might be considered too trivial to be worthy of justification. Thus 2 savable days out of 100 days or even out of 5 days might be considered attributable to methodological error or simply unimportant even if valid. Methodological error in this context could include an unusual sample of cases being evaluated, a deceiving measurement of complexity, or clerical mistakes made in recording or processing the data. With regard to small differences, the 1963 figures tend to include 1 extra day (for stages extending more than 1 day) because the 1963 calculations for the length of a stage include the first and last days in subtracting the beginning date from the ending date whereas the 1962 figures do not. Thus if a stage began January 5 and ended January 10, the 1963 figures would indicate that 6 days were consumed whereas the 1962 figures would show 5 days.

There are two significant exceptions to the idea that small quantities of savable days are unimportant. One exception relates to the volume of cases involved. Thus a few days savable in motor carrier application cases at the Interstate Commerce Commission would be quite important since there are thousands of such cases. The quantity of cases covered by each type of proceeding is available in the *Statistical Greenbook*. There is much greater diversity among the types of proceedings with regard to their volume covered than there is with regard to their days savable. Thus if they were ranked on volume times days savable, the rankings would depend too heavily on volume, over which the agencies have much less control than they have over days savable.

The other situation in which a small amount of days saved can make a big difference is where the days are saved at a stage that has a chain reaction on another stage. For example if the average number of hearing days is cut in half, the time spent waiting for a hearing may also be substantially reduced since time spent waiting for a hearing tends to equal the hearing backlog multiplied by the average

hearing days divided by the number of examiners available. For example if there is a backlog of 90 cases awaiting a hearing, and hearings take an average of 2 days, and there is an average of 3 hearing examiners available to conduct hearings, then after the pleading stage an incoming case will have to wait approximately 60 working days before receiving a hearing (i.e., 90 cases times 2 days divided by 3 examiners). Reducing the hearing days by 1 day will, therefore, reduce the waiting time by about 30 days (i.e., 90 times 1 divided by 3). For this reason it would be helpful if future data gathering would indicate fractions of days for the hearing days stage for each case instead of rounding off to whole days. It would also be helpful if data were available on the portion of the awaiting prelim stage that is actually spent in writing the preliminary decision and the portion of the awaiting final stage that is actually spent in writing the final decision.

With regard to the chain reaction of one stage on other stages, it should be mentioned that reducing the pleading time will merely tend to lengthen the awaiting hearing time if there is no shortening of hearing days or no decrease in the backlog or no increase in hearing examiners. Likewise reducing the proposed findings stage or the briefs stage will increase the awaiting preliminary or awaiting final decision stages unless the time required to write these decisions or the backlog awaiting such decision is reduced or unless there is an increase in decision writers. Nevertheless a reduction in the pleading, proposed findings, and briefs stages will be useful in putting pressure on the agencies to shorten the hearing and decision writing processes so that the time spent waiting for a hearing, preliminary decision, or final decision will at least be held constant.

B. WHAT COULD BE SHOWN

Although the hypothetical proceeding mentioned above was 67 percent improvable, such a simplified trend analysis does not take into consideration the possibility that the 1963 cases may have been 67 percent or more complex than the 1962 cases. The complexity indices for a given type of proceeding, however, do not tend to change substantially from one year to the next. Nevertheless a more realistic expected average would add or subtract some days from the 50 days of the expected average (which was based on the 1962 average) depending on the degree of positive or negative change in complexity between the 2 years. Suppose in our hypothetical illustration we use average transcript length as an index of complexity and transcript length increased from an average of 200 pages to 230 pages from 1962 to 1963 thereby providing a 15-percent increase in our index of complexity (i.e., 30 extra pages divided by the original 200). If so, one might expect 50 plus 8 days to be consumed in 1963 (i.e., 50 days plus 15 percent of 50 days).

Even this approach has some important defects that might be remedied in future compilations of these evaluation charts. One defect of the above approach is that it only uses one of the three indexes of complexity. A second defect is that it assumes there is a perfect relation between a change in complexity and a change in time consumed. In reality a 15-percent increase in complexity may tend to produce a less than or greater than 15-percent increase in time consumed. The most meaningful way to predict how much time should

be consumed by a type of proceeding in 1963 if one knows (1) how much time was consumed in 1962 and (2) how much each of the three indexes of complexity changed from 1962 to 1963 is to proceed as follows:

Step 1. For each of the 61 types of proceedings, record on an IBM card four things; namely the percentage change in time consumption (symbolized ΔT which is pronounced "delta T"), the percentage change in transcript length (symbolized ΔL), the percentage change in the average number of exhibits (symbolized ΔE), and the percentage change in the average number of private parties (symbolized ΔP).

Step 2. These IBM cards can then be processed by what is known as a regression program available at nearly any computer installation where statistical calculations are made.

Step 3. The output of the computer run will mainly consist of four numbers which represent parts of an equation of the form $\Delta T = 2 + 0.8(\Delta L) + 0.2(\Delta E) + 0.3(\Delta P)$. These numerical parts are called regression coefficients.

Step 4. With a regression equation like this, we can make about as accurate a prediction of ΔT from ΔL, ΔE, and ΔP as is statistically possible. For example, if a type of proceeding (1) increased its average transcript length by 15 percent, (2) decreased its average number of exhibits by 5 percent, and (3) increased its average number of parties by 20 percent, then one would predict from the above equation that the type of proceeding would probably increase its time consumed by approximately 19 percent since $19 = 2 + .8(15) + 0.2(-5) + 0.3(20)$.

Step 5. To calculate the expected time for 1963, we then determine 19 percent of the 1962 figure and add this number to the 1962 figure. If 1962 consumed 50 days, we would thus expect 1963 to consume 60 days since 19 percent of 50 is 10.

Step 6. The process of creating an equation like that produced in steps 1 through 3 should be repeated for each of the nine procedural stages. The 9 equations should then be applied to each of the 61 types of proceedings as was done in steps 4 and 5. All six steps can be quickly handled by the standard regression programs mentioned in step 2.

In future compilations of evaluation charts, the year 1962 can continue to be used as a base year against which comparisons can be made. As an alternative one could use a different base year for each type of proceeding. A good base year would be the recent year in which the type of proceeding consumed the least amount of total time. This trend analysis approach might be referred to as the golden base-year approach. A more sophisticated approach (but one that is less of a stimulant to efficiency) might use all the recent good and bad years for which data was available. Standard computer programs exist that can fit a straight or a slightly curved line to the data points for multiple years so as to minimize the deviations from the points to the line, and they can also project the location of the last point. Thus if a type of proceeding consumed an average of 50 days in 1962, 66 days in 1963, and 74 in 1964, the computer output would logically indicate that the expected average for 1965 is about 78 or else it would provide an equation from which one could derive the 78. The 78 days could then be adjusted upward or downward to take into consideration the percentage change from the previous year with

regard to average transcript length, number of exhibits, and number of parties as was previously described.

Table 1 summarizes the basic trend analysis approaches that have been described on the previous pages. Examining the table and the formulas beneath it, should help to clarify the calculations involved.

TABLE 1.—*Calculating an expected average via trend analysis*

What changed	Base year	Present year	Difference (col. 3 minus col. 2)	Percentage change (col. 4 divided by col. 2)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Days	50	150	100	200
Transcript length	200	230	30	15
Number of exhibits	20	19	−1	−5
Number of private parties	5	6	1	20

NOTES

1. Simple expected average=days in base year=50.
2. More sophisticated average=(days in base year)+[(percentage change in transcript length)×(days in base year)]=50+(15 percent of 50)=58.
3. Most sophisticated average=(days in base year)+[(percentage change in predicted days)×(days in base year)]=50+(19 percent of 50)=60 where percentage change in predicted days=sum of [(computer-generated regression coefficients)×(percentage changes in complexity)]=2+.8(15)+0.2(−5)+0.3(20)=19.

III. DISPERSION ANALYSIS

A. WHAT IS SHOWN

A second method of determining an average expected time to compare with an average actual time is to use the average actual time as a target time or a norm. Line IVB1 shows the average expected time if the cases that are dispersed or spread upward from the average actual time were reduced down to the average A deviant case is thus defined as one that is above average on time consumption. For example if a type of proceeding had three cases consuming 21, 9, and 6 days respectively, then the actual average would be 12 days (*i.e.*, 36 days divided by 3). If the cases that were above this average were reduced to the average, one would expect the average to be 9 days (*i.e.*, 12+9+6 days divided by 3). This represents a saving of 3 days or 25 percent (*i.e.*, 3 days divided by 12). The more deviant the above-average cases are, the greater the improvability is. The sum of the days savable from each of the stages may be greater than the days savable in the total time because the cases tend to be more deviant at the individual stages than they are on the total time.

In the Interstate Commerce Commission, a target time system related to the above analysis is used to flag cases that may be consuming an excessive amount of time at a given stage. Initiating the system involved establishing how long a given type of proceeding (*e.g.*, applications for transportation operating rights) usually takes to complete a given stage (*e.g.*, 60 days for completion of the pleading stage). In other words the average time consumed was used as a norm on the theory that this was a reasonable expectation for the cases to meet. The ICC has a computer which every month prints out the docket numbers of the cases in each type of proceeding that have exceeded the target time of the stage at which they are located. These docket numbers are called to the attention of those who are

responsible for the types and stages involved. The target times are periodically adjusted to take policy changes and changes in the averages into consideration.

Trying to hold unusually long cases down to the average of their type of proceeding not only tends to lower the average, but it also results in more uniformity of treatment. Disuniformity is undesirable even if the average time consumed is low if the disuniformity reflects the fact that some cases are receiving more favorable treatment than others. For a simple way to measure the degree of disuniformity in a set of cases, one can determine the deviation of each case from the average, and then average these deviations ignoring the plus-or-minus sign. Thus in the hypothetical type of proceeding mentioned above the deviations are 9, 3, and 6 respectively (i.e., 21–12, 9–12, and 6–12) giving an average deviation of 6 days. The average deviation can also be expressed as a percent of the average (i.e., 6 days divided by 12 equals 50 percent for comparison with other average deviations. From the data given in the evaluation charts, one can easily calculate the average deviation at a given stage by simply doubling the days savable on line IVB2. Thus in the above hypothetical the average deviation of 6 equals twice the 3 days savable. In other words where above average cases are considered deviant, days savable equals exactly half the average time deviation.

B. WHAT COULD BE SHOWN

The thing that is lacking in the calculation of the expected averages on line IVB1 is the failure to take into consideration the fact that the cases which are above average on time consumed may be equally or even more above average on complexity and thus not so readily reducible. In other words if the spread on complexity were considered, then the actual average of 12 days in the hypothetical example mentioned above might be more realistically reducible to an expected average of about 10 or 11 days rather than 9 days.

One meaningful way to consider complexity in determining the expected average for line IVB1 is to feed into a computer the time consumed and the transcript length for each case in each type of proceeding. The computer can then be given instructions to make the simple calculations shown in the hypothetical data given in table 2 below. For each case the computer should calculate—(1) the percent by which the case deviates from the time average of its type of proceeding as is done in column 4 of the table, (2) the percent by which the case deviates from the complexity average of its type of proceeding as in column 7, (3) the difference between these two percents as in column 8, and (4) the product of this difference where it is a positive difference multiplied by the time consumed. The computer should then average these products in order to determine the average days savable which in the hypothetical data is 2 days. By subtracting this figure from the average actual time, one arrives at the expected average time. In the hypothetical data, this would yield an expected average of 10 days (i.e., 12 days minus 2) rather than the 9 days arrived at when the complexity spread was ignored.

This method not only attempts to indicate the extent to which above-average cases can be reduced (as with case no. 1 of the hypothetical data), but also the extent to which below average cases

can be even further reduced. Thus if a below average case is only 25 percent below the time average but is 45 percent below the complexity average, then it is still 20 percent improvable (as with case 2 of the hypothetical data). On the other hand if a case is above (or below) the time average but is even more above (or less below) the complexity average, then column 8 of the table will show a negative difference indicating the time consumed by that case is not readily improvable (as with case 3). In such a broadened method, deviant cases are in effect defined not as those that are above the average in time consumption, but as those that are more upward deviant on time consumption than they are on complexity.

For each case in all 61 types of proceedings, one could conceivably calculate 3 improvability percentages. One percentage could be based on transcript length as in column 8 of table 2, one based on the number of exhibits in a manner analogous to table 2, and one based on the number of parties. These three scores, however, could not be used as input into a regression program like that described in the trend analysis above or the comparative analysis below because there is no measure of time improvability against which they can be meaningfully correlated analogous to T in the $T=L+E+P$ formula. Nevertheless the dispersion analysis approach is a useful method for evaluating the level and the uniformity of the time consumption data for each of the types of proceedings.

TABLE 2.—*Calculating an expected average via dispersion analysis*

Case No.	Time			Complexity			Percent savable (col. 4 minus col. 7)	Days savable (col. 8 times col. 2)
	Time consumed	Deviation from average (col. 2 minus time average) [1]	Percent deviation (col. 3 divided by time average [1] times 100)	Transcript length	Deviation from average (col. 5 minus complexity average) [2]	Percent deviation (col. 6 divided by complexity average [2] times 100)		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1	21	+9	+75	36	+14	+64	+11	2.3
2	9	−3	−25	12	−10	−45	+20	1.8
3	6	−6	−50	18	−4	−18	−22	0
Average	(1)			(2)				1.7

[1] Time average equals 12.
[2] Complexity average equals 22.

NOTES

Simple expected average = (time average) − [½(average absolute deviation)] = $12-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{9+3+6}{3}\right)=12-3=9$.

Sophisticated expected average = (time average) − (days savable considering complexity deviation) = 12 − 1.7 = 10.

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A. WHAT COULD BE SHOWN

The third set of expected averages are based on how well other types of proceedings do. The simplest form of this method would merely involve summing the average time consumed for each of the 61 types of proceedings and then dividing by 61. If this calculation produces an average total time of 290 days, then on line IVC1 under "total,"

290 days would appear as the expected time for each of the 61 types of proceedings. It is, however, obviously unrealistic to expect all types of proceedings to have the same expected average at a given stage in view of the fact that some type of proceedings are much more complex than others.

As a more sophisticated variation on the crude comparative analysis just described, one could divide the 61 types of proceedings into separate complexity groups depending on their average transcript length. First the types should be arranged from the one with the lowest average transcript length to the one with the highest. One can then examine this distribution for clusters and breaks in order to construct the groups, bearing in mind that there are more short-transcript cases than long-transcript cases. Doing this tends to reveal three discernible groups. The low complexity group contains types of proceedings with an average transcript length of less than 100 pages. The high complexity group contains types with averages of over 300 pages. The medium complexity group covers types that average 100 to 300 page transcripts.

If the average total time consumed of the low complexity group were 230 days, then all the types of proceedings that fell into the low complexity group would receive an expected time average of 230 days. Thus there would be three sets of expected time averages, one for each complexity group. This comparative method in effect only compares types of proceedings with other types of proceedings in their own complexity group. Nevertheless it is defective by virtue of the fact that it only considers one index of complexity. More important, it lumps about 25 proceedings together into the low complexity group regardless of differences in their transcript length averages, and it lumps about 20 together under medium complexity, and 15 together under high complexity.

B. WHAT IS SHOWN

The comparative method that is actually used to calculate the expected averages for line IVC–1 takes into consideration the exact scores each type of proceeding received on all three measures of complexity. Where one of the three measures of complexity is missing, asterisks are shown in section IVC. The comparative method used involves going through the following five steps which are related to those described under the trend analysis discussion:

Step 1. For each of the 61 types of proceedings, record on an IBM card four things; namely, the average time consumed (symbolized T), the average transcript length (symbolized L), the average number of exhibits (symbolized E), and the average number of private parties (symbolized P). The method cannot be applied to a type of proceeding which lacks any one of these four items of information unless a reasonable estimate is used for the missing information.

Step 2. These IBM cards can then be processed by what is known as a regression program available at nearly any computer installation.

Step 3. The output of the computer run will mainly consist of four numbers which represent the numerical parts called regression coefficients of an equation of the form $T=250+0.3(L)+1.2(E)$ and $0.7(P)$.

63–700 O—66——3

Step 4. With a regression equation like this, we can make about as accurate a prediction of T from L, E, and P as is statistically possible. For example if a type of proceeding had 130 pages as an average transcript length, 15 as an average number of exhibits, and 3 as an average number of private parties, then we would predict from the above equation that the type of proceeding (in light of its scores on the three complexity indices) should consume 309 days, since $309=250+0.3(130)+1.2(15)+0.7(3)$.

Step 5. The process of creating an equation like that produced in steps 1 through 3 should be repeated for each of the nine procedural stages. The nine equations should then be applied to each of the 61 types of proceedings as was done in step 4. All five steps can be executed by the regression program mentioned in step 2.

Notice on line IVC–1 that no two types of proceedings have exactly the same expected average time unless by a strange coincidence they had exactly the same average transcript length, number of exhibits, and number of parties. In other words the expected average of this approach takes into consideration all three indices of complexity about as much as it is statistically possible to do so. Thus if one type of proceeding has a bigger difference between its expected and actual time average than another type of proceeding does, then those responsible for the first type cannot readily complain that its complexity was not considered.

As an even more valid comparative approach, one could divide the types of proceedings into a low, medium, and high complexity group as previously suggested, and then obtain a separate regression equation for each group of types at each of the nine stages. One would then have 27 rather than 9 regression equations thereby providing more refined expected averages, but the additional regression work can be easily handled by standard computer programs. This variation and the other three variations on the comparative approach are conveniently summarized in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Calculating an expected average via comparative analysis*

Type of proceeding	Days consumed	Transcript length and group	Number of exhibits	Number of parties	Average days per group
A	300	[1] 500	30	5	[1] 250
B	200	[1] 400	25	4	[1] 250
C	100	[2] 150	20	3	[2] 100
D	80	[3] 60	15	2	[3] 50
E	20	[3] 55	10	2	[3] 50
Overall average days	140				

[1] High.
[2] Medium.
[3] Low.

NOTES

1. Simple expected average for type A=overall average days=140.
2. Semisophisticated average=average days per group=250.
3. More sophisticated average=sum of [(computer-generated regression coefficients)×(complexity scores)] $=90+0.1(500)+1.1(30)+3.2(5)=189$ (using imaginary coefficients).
4. Most sophisticated average=sum of [(computer-generated regression coefficients per group)×(complexity scores)]$=120+0.2(500)+1.5(30)+2.8(5)=279$ (using imaginary coefficients).

V. General Utility of the Evaluation Charts

In section V of each evaluation chart an overall evaluation is given based on all three evaluation approaches. Line VA provides the average days savable by adding the days savable figures of lines IVA–2, B–2, and C–2 and then dividing by three or by two if one of the days savable figures was incalculable. In calculating this average, all three evaluation approaches are given equal weight because they seem to be about equally meaningful especially if case complexity is considered in the trend and dispersion analysis as well as the comparative analysis.

The last line of each evaluation chart gives an improvability rank for each type of proceeding at each stage relative to the other 61 types of proceedings. These ranks were determined by arranging the average days-savable figures for each stage for each type of proceeding from the highest figure which received an improvability rank of 1 to the lowest figure which received a rank of 61. At the briefs stage and the awaiting final stage, only 58 types of proceedings were ranked because 3 types lacked sufficient information with regard to their time consumed at these stages. As an example of the ranking with regard to the total time consumed, the cases of the Veterans' Administration Contract Appeals Board ranked first on need for improvement since they had an average days savable in light of the three criteria of 471 days out of 1,067 days. At the other extreme the Atomic Energy Commission licensing cases in spite of their complexity only consumed 122 days which was 96 days less than expected in light of the three criteria. Types of proceedings are not often tied since the computer carries average days savable to over six decimal places although the decimal portion is not printed. When a tie does occur, the types are given the first rank for which they are tied. Thus a three-way tie for ranks 7, 8, and 9 will result in all three types receiving a rank of 7, and the next type of proceeding will receive a rank of 10. In future runs the tied types might be given the average of the ranks for which they are tied; i.e., 8 in the example. Better yet, ties might be broken by ranking the types of proceeding with the largest volume closer to rank No. 1 since it is more undesirable to have a large-volume proceeding consume needless time than a small-volume proceeding.

Although there is presently some degree of correlation between the improvability rank on line VB and the time consumption figures on line IIIB, it should be emphasized that when complexity is considered on all three criteria, then a medium-length but highly simple type of proceeding will be even more likely to have an improvability rank closer to first place than a long-length but highly complex type of proceeding. This can be achieved by using (1) the golden-year trend analysis along with the regression program to take into consideration the relation between a change in the complexity indexes and a change in time consumed; (2) the comparison between the time deviation of each case and its complexity deviation in refining the dispersion analysis; and by using (3) the system of three groups of regression equations mentioned above with regard to the comparative analysis. The mechanics of carrying out these recommendations can be readily handled by a competent computer programer who is familiar with statistical techniques after he reads these explanatory materials and

analyzes the format of the evaluation charts, assuming the basic raw data is gathered similar to how it has been in the past.

What useful purposes can be served by these evaluation charts in general and these rankings in particular? One useful purpose is to encourage the administrative agencies which handle quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative proceedings to constantly reexamine their procedures and personnel in order to reduce the time that is needlessly consumed in light of past performance, in light of the possibility of reducing deviant cases, and in comparison with other types of proceedings. The rankings can serve as a particularly vigorous prod in view of the understandable desire of the agencies not to look bad when ranked against the other agencies. An example of this desire was displayed when a preliminary version of some of these evaluation charts was recently shown to the Chairman of one of the regulatory commissions. His reaction to the fact that his agency had an improvability ranking close to No. 1 was that if things had not improved drastically since 1963 (the year on which the rankings were based) he would resign. Statistics compiled by his agency alone, without any attempt to compare agencies, would not have such a vigorous effect. The Administrative Conference of the United States or the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is in a particularly good birds-eye position to provide such comparative statistics.

Another useful purpose that the evaluation charts can serve is to inform the agencies at which specific stages and in which types of proceedings a reduction in time may be most feasible. This purpose can be aided by the fact that the charts provide days-savable figures for eight stages plus the total process rather than for just the total process. The points of occurrence and the causes of unnecessary time consumption can thereby be better located. Likewise for each agency the evaluation charts are generally given for a few types of proceedings rather than have just one evaluation chart per agency. This further enables the agencies to isolate the occurrence and possibly the causes of unnecessary time consumption.

With regard to the causes and remedies of administrative delay the charts also provide scores, particularly on lines IV A2 and C2, against which various suspected causes and partial remedies can be correlated. For example, it might be interesting to know what is the relation between (1) the use, or increased use, of prehearing conferences; and (2) being subject to improvement with regard to time spent from the opening to the closing of the hearing stage. Such a relation can be shown by dividing the 61 days-savable scores into about 5 intervals (corresponding to very low, low, medium, high, and very high) and doing likewise with 61 scores giving the percentage of cases or the change in percentage of cases subjected to prehearing conferences within each type of proceeding. One can then tally the location of each type of proceeding in a 5-by-5 or 25-cell table to see if having a high or low percent of prehearing conferences corresponds to having a high or low days-savable score. As an alternative, one can determine the average hearing time consumed for the types of proceedings that fall into interval 1 on the prehearing percentages and likewise for intervals 2, 3, 4, and 5. Standard computer programs

are also available which can calculate a correlation coefficient that expresses the relationship as a number varying from −1.00 (completely opposite relationship) to 0 (no relationship) on up to +1.00 (completely concurrent relationship). The two scores of each type of proceeding can also be plotted as a series of dots on a graph, and the linear or curvilinear relation which manifests itself can be expressed by an equation that enables one to predict the days-savable score of a type of proceeding from its percentage of prehearing conferences or vice versa.

Other relations that might be similarly determined could include (1) the relation between the frequency of oral argument and improvability in the time spent waiting for a final decision, (2) the relation between the continuity of hearings (as measured by the ratio between hearing days and hearing total) and improvability in hearing time, (3) the relation between backlog or quantity of relevant personnel and various waiting times, and (4) the relation between use of modified procedure or various forms of delegation and days-savable in total time consumed. Making such correlations with days-savable scores rather than with raw time-consumption averages enables one to come closer to determining the causes of and remedies for needless time consumption rather than for mere time consumption. It also tends to statistically control for complexity since complexity is or can be considered in the days-savable scores. Therefore a finding that coverage by the Administrative Procedure Act correlates with substantially higher days-savable scores could not be so readily attributed to the fact that the APA applies to the more complex types of proceedings. Some of this quantitative correlation work will possibly be undertaken by the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, but most of the subcommittee's work on finding the causes of and remedies for administrative delay is based on a questionnaire and interviewing survey which is currently underway.

In spite of the possible uses of evaluation charts like these particularly as a prod to increased efficiency, there will be those who will object to the idea of attempting a statistical evaluation of the work of the agencies with regard to administrative delay. On the other hand, one of the most frequent criticisms of the *Statistical Greenbook* was that it failed to indicate how well the agencies were doing in light of their past performance, in light of the wide time variations of their cases, and in comparison with other agencies. These evaluation charts and future improved versions are designed to fulfill that general purpose. To the extent that they do encourage some reduction in unnecessary time consumption, they will be striking at what the *Congressional Quarterly* in 1961 referred to as being the most serious problem in the work of the administrative agencies, a feeling which was reiterated to the subcommittee in 1966 by the head of the Office of Administrative Procedure and the executive secretary of the Administrative Conference. The work of the agencies has an important impact on the economy as well as on the immediate parties. The stakes are, therefore, high and whatever this evaluation chart approach can contribute to the problem will be welcomed by those sincerely interested in reducing needless delay. It is hoped that it will become an annual activity of the Administrative Conference.

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,CONTRACT APPEALS BOARD.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = APPEALS FROM DECISIONS-CONTRACTING OFFICERS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 76

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 8

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	1067.	537.	83.	414.	1.	0.	0.	9.	25.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	782.	139.	105.	89.	1.	0.	0.	296.	180.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	285.	398.	-22.	325.	0.	0.	0.	-287.	-155.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	746.	207.	32.	167.	1.	0.	0.	1.	14.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	321.	330.	51.	247.	0.	0.	0.	8.	11.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	261.	44.	72.	32.	1.	6.	20.	29.	59.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	806.	493.	11.	382.	0.	-6.	-20.	-20.	-34.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	471.	407.	13.	318.	0.	-2.	-7.	-100.	-59.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	1	1	17	1	14	38	44	58	57

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = SECTION 5 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT DECEPTIVE PRACTICES

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 721

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 130

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL ▼	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	1080.	163.	66.	275.	8.	64.	55.	156.	304.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	680.	90.	97.	179.	5.	106.	63.	100.	37.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	400.	73.	-31.	96.	3.	-42.	-8.	56.	267.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	762.	106.	42.	141.	5.	44.	27.	125.	107.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	318.	57.	24.	134.	3.	20.	28.	31.	197.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	585.	20.	72.	107.	4.	33.	50.	76.	233.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	495.	143.	-6.	168.	4.	31.	5.	80.	71.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	404.	91.	-4.	133.	3.	3.	8.	56.	178.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	2	4	30	2	2	14	16	4	2

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = APPEALS FROM RANGE MANAGERS DECISIONS - GRAZING CASES

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 162

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 14

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 3

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	752.	32.	403.	76.	1.	2.	56.	100.	132.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	552.	2.	427.	1.	1.	42.	40.	4.	3.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	200.	30.	-24.	75.	0.	-40.	16.	96.	129.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	583.	9.	276.	33.	1.	1.	36.	33.	43.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	169.	23.	127.	43.	0.	1.	20.	67.	89.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	293.	34.	76.	35.	2.	9.	28.	32.	62.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	459.	-22.	327.	41.	-1.	-7.	28.	68.	70.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	276.	10.	143.	53.	-0.	-15.	21.	77.	96.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	3	17	1	6	48	60	7	2	5

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PROCEEDINGS UNDER SURFACE RESOURCES ACT-PL 167

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 53

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 5

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	545.	45.	209.	44.	1.	11.	51.	71.	93.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	347.	88.	142.	8.	1.	29.	67.	3.	3.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	198.	-43.	67.	36.	0.	-18.	-16.	68.	90.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	329.	11.	143.	15.	1.	5.	35.	14.	18.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	216.	34.	66.	29.	0.	6.	16.	57.	75.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	252.	51.	75.	27.	1.	6.	22.	28.	45.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	293.	-6.	134.	17.	0.	5.	29.	43.	48.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	236.	-5.	89.	27.	0.	-2.	10.	56.	71.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	4	27	3	13	14	41	13	3	6

63-700 O—66——4

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = RATE COMPLAINTS AND INVESTIGATIONS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 554

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 52

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 10

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	702.	69.	149.	133.	4.	1.	118.	76.	151.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	510.	48.	133.	68.	2.	0.	94.	41.	100.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	192.	21.	16.	65.	2.	1.	24.	35.	51.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	504.	35.	90.	66.	3.	1.	80.	54.	102.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	198.	34.	59.	67.	1.	0.	38.	22.	49.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	449.	81.	88.	59.	5.	24.	56.	48.	96.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	253.	-12.	61.	74.	-1.	-23.	62.	28.	55.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	214.	14.	45.	69.	1.	-7.	41.	28.	52.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	5	15	6	3	9	57	1	10	10

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CONTESTS IN LAND CASES

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 98

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 4

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	612.	39.	189.	17.	1.	27.	73.	97.	98.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	504.	40.	278.	3.	1.	33.	143.	4.	2.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	108.	-1.	-89.	14.	0.	-6.	-70.	93.	96.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	427.	24.	141.	6.	1.	14.	40.	23.	22.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	185.	15.	48.	11.	0.	13.	33.	74.	76.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	262.	45.	72.	33.	1.	6.	20.	27.	61.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	350.	-6.	117.	-16.	0.	21.	53.	70.	37.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	214.	3.	25.	3.	0.	9.	5.	79.	70.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	5	21	11	25	14	6	22	1	7

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,DEPARTMENT OF NAVY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS REVIEW

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 29

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 1

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	550.	469.	37.	5.	0.	0.	0.	24.	16.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	357.	272.	34.	13.	1.	0.	0.	10.	28.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	193.	197.	3.	-8.	-1.	0.	0.	14.	-12.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	415.	340.	31.	1.	0.	0.	0.	15.	10.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	135.	129.	6.	4.	0.	0.	0.	9.	6.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	239.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	26.	47.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	311.	423.	-36.	-21.	-1.	-5.	-19.	-2.	-31.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	213.	250.	-9.	-8.	-1.	-2.	-6.	7.	-12.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	7	2	34	38	55	28	37	20	37

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = MINING CONTEST CASES

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 86

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 11

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 3

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	624.	118.	276.	37.	1.	16.	70.	31.	50.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	527.	43.	317.	21.	1.	25.	117.	0.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	97.	75.	-41.	16.	0.	-9.	-47.	31.	49.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	443.	49.	184.	14.	1.	8.	41.	6.	9.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	181.	69.	92.	23.	0.	8.	29.	25.	41.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	269.	55.	76.	28.	2.	8.	26.	31.	46.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	355.	63.	200.	9.	-1.	8.	44.	0.	4.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	211.	69.	84.	16.	-0.	2.	9.	19.	31.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	8	5	4	16	48	17	15	15	15

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = BROKER-DEALER DENIAL PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 416

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 33

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	637.	1.	91.	99.	3.	13.	33.	69.	333.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	495.	1.	21.	63.	2.	6.	14.	44.	259.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	142.	0.	70.	36.	1.	7.	19.	25.	74.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	383.	42.	73.	63.	2.	16.	31.	36.	125.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	254.	-41.	18.	36.	1.	-3.	2.	33.	208.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	198.	-21.	44.	36.	1.	2.	11.	29.	141.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	9	53	8	11	5	18	12	9	3

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CP - CHARGES OF UNION UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES SECTION 8 B

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 158

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 24

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	507.	18.	25.	1.	1.	24.	34.	33.	409.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	417.	10.	23.	4.	1.	22.	30.	54.	271.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	90.	8.	2.	-3.	0.	2.	4.	-21.	138.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	353.	12.	17.	1.	1.	21.	24.	27.	257.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	154.	6.	8.	0.	0.	3.	10.	6.	152.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	303.	46.	74.	39.	2.	10.	27.	36.	74.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	204.	-28.	-49.	-38.	-1.	14.	7.	-3.	335.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	149.	-5.	-13.	-14.	-0.	6.	7.	-6.	208.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	10	26	41	54	48	9	18	41	1

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CERTIFICATE CASE

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 1186

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 33

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 23

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	743.	288.	62.	122.	9.	87.	73.	38.	75.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	633.	210.	78.	68.	10.	56.	89.	38.	87.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	110.	78.	-16.	54.	-1.	31.	-16.	0.	-12.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	547.	163.	46.	67.	5.	45.	45.	22.	44.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	196.	125.	16.	55.	4.	42.	28.	16.	31.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	604.	152.	109.	79.	9.	38.	93.	40.	94.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	139.	136.	-47.	43.	0.	49.	-20.	-2.	-19.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	148.	113.	-16.	51.	1.	41.	-3.	5.	0.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	11	3	45	9	5	1	34	22	28

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PROCEEDINGS BEFORE GSA BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 119

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 6

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	510.	86.	39.	131.	1.	0.	0.	0.	256.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	445.	93.	13.	134.	0.	0.	0.	2.	237.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	65.	-7.	26.	-3.	1.	0.	0.	-2.	19.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	382.	56.	33.	70.	1.	0.	0.	0.	172.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	128.	30.	6.	61.	0.	0.	0.	0.	84.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	270.	44.	72.	35.	1.	7.	21.	27.	66.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	240.	42.	-33.	96.	0.	-7.	-21.	-27.	190.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	144.	22.	-0.	51.	0.	-2.	-7.	-10.	98.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	12	11	25	8	12	41	48	48	4

63-700 O—66——5

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = BROKER-DEALER REVOCATION OR N.A.S.D. EXPULSION

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 906

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 67

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 3

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	651.	1.	195.	123.	6.	23.	31.	44.	235.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	520.	2.	168.	40.	1.	13.	11.	180.	196.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	131.	-1.	27.	83.	5.	10.	20.	-136.	39.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	482.	1.	107.	64.	4.	9.	16.	32.	160.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	169.	0.	88.	59.	2.	14.	15.	12.	75.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	557.	36.	72.	108.	4.	29.	45.	46.	224.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	94.	-35.	123.	15.	2.	-6.	-14.	-2.	11.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	131.	-12.	79.	52.	3.	6.	7.	-42.	42.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	13	38	5	7	3	10	18	57	13

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT REPARATICN PROCEEDING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 88

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 11

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	516.	73.	209.	2.	1.	0.	0.	101.	132.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	476.	182.	103.	7.	1.	0.	0.	32.	152.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	40.	-109.	106.	-5.	0.	0.	0.	69.	-20.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	450.	59.	170.	1.	1.	0.	0.	75.	107.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	66.	14.	39.	1.	0.	0.	0.	26.	25.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	268.	49.	74.	31.	1.	7.	24.	31.	55.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	248.	24.	135.	-29.	0.	-7.	-24.	70.	77.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	118.	-24.	93.	-11.	0.	-2.	-8.	55.	27.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	14	57	2	47	14	41	53	5	16

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,OFFICE INDUSTRIAL PERSONNEL ACCESS AUTHORIZATION R

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = INDUSTRIAL PERSONNEL ACCESS AUTHORIZATION REVIEW

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = ****

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = ****

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	295.	45.	65.	21.	1.	68.	32.	30.	18.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	211.	0.	47.	6.	1.	65.	28.	1.	0.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	84.	45.	18.	15.	0.	3.	4.	29.	18.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	240.	35.	45.	4.	1.	55.	25.	15.	8.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	55.	10.	20.	17.	0.	13.	7.	15.	10.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	70.	28.	19.	16.	0.	8.	6.	22.	14.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	15	9	15	16	14	7	21	13	22

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = INVESTIGATION AND SUSPENSION - MOTOR

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 136

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 13

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 3

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	348.	71.	71.	34.	1.	0.	16.	16.	141.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	304.	39.	102.	39.	1.	5.	24.	3.	106.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	44.	32.	-31.	-5.	0.	-5.	-8.	13.	35.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	268.	36.	54.	23.	1.	0.	3.	3.	104.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	80.	35.	17.	11.	0.	0.	13.	13.	37.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	284.	54.	76.	33.	2.	9.	27.	31.	56.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	64.	17.	-5.	1.	-1.	-9.	-11.	-15.	85.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	63.	28.	-6.	2.	-0.	-5.	-2.	4.	52.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	16	8	32	27	48	52	32	24	9

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = MOTOR CARRIER FINANCE PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 305

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 30

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 6

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	472.	46.	121.	48.	2.	2.	124.	46.	88.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	493.	103.	63.	38.	1.	0.	137.	41.	94.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-21.	-57.	58.	10.	1.	2.	-13.	5.	-6.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	389.	40.	100.	24.	2.	2.	92.	28.	51.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	83.	6.	21.	24.	0.	0.	32.	18.	37.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	353.	66.	81.	43.	3.	15.	39.	39.	71.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	119.	-20.	40.	5.	-1.	-13.	85.	7.	17.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	60.	-24.	40.	13.	0.	-4.	35.	10.	16.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	17	57	9	18	14	48	3	18	21

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT REPARATION PROCEEDING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 115

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 7

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	399.	106.	129.	4.	1.	0.	0.	75.	85.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	405.	124.	96.	1.	1.	0.	0.	65.	118.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-6.	-18.	33.	3.	0.	0.	0.	10.	-33.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	340.	74.	106.	1.	1.	0.	0.	52.	65.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	59.	32.	23.	3.	0.	0.	0.	23.	20.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	271.	50.	74.	32.	1.	7.	23.	28.	57.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	128.	56.	55.	-28.	0.	-7.	-23.	47.	28.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	60.	23.	37.	-7.	0.	-2.	-8.	27.	5.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	17	10	10	37	14	41	50	12	26

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = FEDERAL COMMUNICATION COMMISSION,BROADCAST BUREAU.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = MISCELLANEOUS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 399

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 15

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 4

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	406.	1.	129.	113.	3.	52.	34.	70.	11.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	408.	8.	147.	56.	2.	37.	35.	49.	28.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-2.	-7.	-18.	57.	1.	15.	-1.	21.	-17.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	278.	1.	100.	42.	2.	34.	19.	22.	2.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	128.	0.	29.	71.	1.	18.	15.	48.	9.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	358.	57.	77.	53.	3.	14.	33.	30.	97.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	48.	-56.	52.	60.	0.	38.	1.	40.	-86.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	58.	-21.	21.	63.	1.	24.	5.	36.	-31.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	19	55	13	5	9	2	23	8	51

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = COMPLAINTS, RULE MAKING, INTERPRETIVE RULES AND REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 225

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 23

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 5

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	485.	106.	75.	45.	1.	1.	115.	52.	93.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	638.	154.	119.	71.	2.	2.	137.	52.	84.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-153.	-48.	-44.	-26.	-1.	-1.	-22.	0.	9.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	358.	66.	56.	21.	1.	1.	76.	26.	55.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	127.	40.	19.	24.	0.	0.	39.	26.	38.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	322.	62.	80.	38.	3.	12.	35.	36.	61.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	163.	44.	-5.	7.	-2.	-11.	80.	16.	32.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	46.	12.	-10.	2.	-1.	-4.	32.	14.	26.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	20	16	36	28	58	50	4	16	17

63-700 O—66—6

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = MARKETING ORDER PROMULGATION PROCEEDING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 258

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 13

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 0

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	239.	1.	21.	18.	1.	27.	76.	17.	83.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	112.	0.	20.	1.	1.	16.	42.	17.	13.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	127.	1.	1.	17.	0.	11.	34.	0.	70.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	158.	1.	18.	3.	1.	23.	54.	15.	30.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	81.	0.	3.	15.	0.	4.	22.	2.	53.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	315.	36.	69.	50.	1.	10.	21.	28.	102.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-76.	-35.	-48.	-32.	0.	17.	55.	-11.	-19.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	44.	-11.	-15.	0.	0.	11.	37.	-3.	35.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	21	36	42	30	14	5	2	34	14

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRAT

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = APPEALS FROM ADVERSE DETERMINATIONS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 45

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 25

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	266.	25.	140.	13.	0.	6.	40.	39.	3.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	188.	24.	106.	12.	3.	0.	37.	0.	3.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	78.	1.	34.	1.	-3.	6.	3.	39.	0.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	211.	17.	106.	2.	0.	2.	28.	15.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	55.	8.	34.	11.	0.	4.	12.	24.	2.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	273.	41.	73.	32.	1.	8.	23.	37.	62.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-7.	-16.	67.	-19.	-1.	-2.	17.	2.	-59.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	42.	-2.	45.	-2.	-1.	3.	11.	22.	-19.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	22	23	7	33	59	15	11	14	48

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,ARMED SERVICES BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = APPEALS FROM PROCUREMENT CONTRACT DECISIONS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 218

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = ****

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	469.	130.	133.	90.	1.	0.	0.	0.	117.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	482.	126.	133.	104.	2.	0.	0.	9.	110.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-13.	4.	0.	-14.	-1.	0.	0.	-9.	7.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	386.	100.	96.	64.	1.	0.	0.	0.	75.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	83.	30.	37.	26.	0.	0.	0.	0.	42.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	35.	17.	19.	6.	-1.	0.	0.	-5.	25.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	23	13	16	21	53	24	28	35	18

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = OPERATING RIGHTS PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 160

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 15

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 6

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	297.	65.	60.	16.	1.	1.	79.	27.	50.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	318.	63.	53.	22.	1.	0.	70.	34.	61.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-21.	2.	7.	-6.	0.	1.	9.	-7.	-11.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	211.	46.	50.	4.	1.	1.	47.	12.	19.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	86.	19.	10.	12.	0.	0.	32.	15.	31.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	295.	70.	82.	28.	3.	11.	35.	34.	37.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	2.	-5.	-22.	-12.	-2.	-10.	44.	-7.	13.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	22.	5.	-2.	-2.	-1.	-3.	28.	0.	11.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	24	18	27	32	55	47	6	27	23

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,OIL IMPORT APPEALS BOARDS

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = OIL HEARINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 38

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 3

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	181.	112.	18.	14.	1.	0.	0.	0.	38.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	92.	39.	14.	1.	1.	0.	0.	7.	30.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	89.	73.	4.	13.	0.	0.	0.	-7.	8.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	146.	69.	14.	14.	1.	0.	0.	0.	26.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	35.	43.	4.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	12.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	245.	51.	75.	25.	1.	5.	22.	28.	41.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-64.	61.	-57.	-11.	0.	-5.	-22.	-28.	-3.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	20.	59.	-16.	1.	0.	-2.	-7.	-12.	6.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	25	6	47	29	14	28	49	53	25

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CC - CHARGES OF UNION UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES SECTION 8 B

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 261

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 20

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	343.	15.	53.	5.	2.	28.	42.	32.	179.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	372.	14.	29.	4.	2.	45.	49.	43.	183.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-29.	1.	24.	1.	0.	-17.	-7.	-11.	-4.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	272.	12.	27.	2.	2.	25.	32.	28.	121.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	71.	3.	26.	3.	0.	3.	10.	4.	58.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	326.	46.	73.	47.	2.	11.	27.	32.	91.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	17.	-31.	-20.	-42.	0.	17.	15.	0.	88.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	20.	-9.	10.	-13.	0.	1.	6.	-2.	47.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	26	31	21	52	14	20	20	31	12

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 38

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 4

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	124.	0.	19.	94.	1.	0.	0.	1.	11.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	38.	0.	11.	23.	1.	0.	0.	0.	3.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	86.	0.	8.	71.	0.	0.	0.	1.	8.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	49.	0.	10.	27.	1.	0.	0.	0.	4.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	75.	0.	9.	67.	0.	0.	0.	1.	7.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	246.	46.	73.	28.	1.	5.	19.	27.	50.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-122.	-46.	-54.	66.	0.	-5.	-19.	-26.	-39.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	13.	-15.	-12.	68.	0.	-2.	-6.	-8.	-8.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	27	44	39	4	14	28	37	44	33

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR STANDARDS-WALSH-HEALEY PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 94

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 6

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	236.	29.	43.	65.	1.	55.	23.	6.	16.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	265.	44.	74.	22.	1.	72.	28.	5.	18.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-29.	-15.	-31.	43.	0.	-17.	-5.	1.	-2.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	151.	24.	29.	15.	1.	31.	14.	1.	2.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	85.	5.	14.	50.	0.	24.	9.	5.	14.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	264.	50.	74.	30.	1.	7.	23.	28.	53.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-28.	-21.	-31.	35.	0.	48.	0.	-22.	-37.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	9.	-10.	-16.	43.	0.	18.	1.	-5.	-8.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	28	34	46	10	14	3	26	39	34

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS REVIEW

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 46

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 5

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	187.	0.	81.	1.	1.	0.	0.	0.	106.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	143.	0.	49.	1.	1.	0.	0.	93.	-1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	44.	0.	32.	0.	0.	0.	0.	-93.	107.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	152.	0.	63.	1.	1.	0.	0.	0.	79.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	35.	0.	18.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	27.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	249.	45.	73.	28.	1.	5.	20.	28.	52.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-62.	-45.	8.	-27.	0.	-5.	-20.	-28.	54.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	6.	-15.	19.	-9.	0.	-2.	-7.	-40.	63.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	29	43	14	42	14	28	44	56	8

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = SAFETY ENFORCEMENT

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 138

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 9

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	190.	27.	46.	6.	1.	10.	64.	14.	26.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	142.	25.	39.	4.	1.	3.	39.	10.	12.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	48.	2.	7.	2.	0.	7.	25.	4.	14.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	139.	19.	32.	2.	1.	3.	45.	3.	5.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	51.	8.	14.	4.	0.	7.	19.	11.	21.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	278.	44.	72.	37.	1.	8.	21.	28.	71.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-88.	-17.	-26.	-31.	0.	2.	43.	-14.	-45.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	4.	-2.	-2.	-8.	0.	5.	29.	0.	-3.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	30	23	27	38	14	11	5	27	29

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,BCARD OF VETERANS APPEALS.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = HEARING ON APPEAL

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 13

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = ****

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	84.	0.	27.	1.	1.	0.	0.	******	******
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	107.	0.	37.	1.	1.	0.	0.	69.	0.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-23.	0.	-10.	0.	0.	0.	0.	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	64.	0.	20.	1.	1.	0.	0.	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	20.	0.	7.	0.	0.	0.	0.	******	******
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-2.	0.	-2.	0.	0.	0.	0.	******	******
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	31	22	26	30	14	24	28	**	**

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = 10 K HEARING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 601

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 47

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 4

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	329.	0.	39.	35.	4.	0.	0.	25.	242.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	298.	0.	34.	5.	3.	0.	0.	14.	243.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	31.	0.	5.	30.	1.	0.	0.	11.	-1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	254.	0.	27.	13.	3.	0.	0.	11.	183.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	75.	0.	12.	22.	1.	0.	0.	14.	59.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	451.	49.	76.	76.	3.	22.	41.	41.	150.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-122.	-49.	-37.	-41.	1.	-22.	-41.	-16.	92.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-5.	-16.	-7.	4.	1.	-7.	-14.	3.	50.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	32	51	33	23	5	57	59	25	11

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES COMPENSATIONS.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CLAIMS UNDER THE LONGSHOREMENS AND HARBOR WORKERS COMPENSATIONS ACT

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 118

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 5

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	156.	0.	45.	70.	1.	0.	0.	0.	41.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	127.	0.	30.	44.	1.	0.	0.	0.	52.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	29.	0.	15.	26.	0.	0.	0.	0.	-11.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	105.	0.	27.	29.	1.	0.	0.	0.	30.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	51.	0.	18.	41.	0.	0.	0.	0.	11.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	269.	50.	74.	32.	1.	7.	23.	27.	57.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-113.	-50.	-29.	38.	0.	-7.	-23.	-27.	-16.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-11.	-17.	1.	35.	0.	-2.	-8.	-9.	-5.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	33	52	24	12	14	41	50	45	30

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CORRECTION OF ARMY RECORDS REVIEW

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 17

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 4

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	123.	0.	28.	1.	1.	0.	0.	71.	24.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	88.	0.	27.	1.	1.	0.	0.	0.	60.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	35.	0.	1.	0.	0.	0.	0.	71.	-36.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	103.	0.	21.	1.	1.	0.	0.	56.	18.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	20.	0.	7.	0.	0.	0.	0.	15.	6.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	240.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	28.	46.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-117.	-46.	-45.	-25.	0.	-5.	-19.	43.	-22.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-21.	-15.	-12.	-8.	0.	-2.	-6.	43.	-17.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	34	44	39	38	14	28	37	6	44

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = HATCH ACT-SECTION 9

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 121

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 12

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	206.	21.	94.	2.	1.	33.	40.	5.	15.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	223.	44.	94.	1.	1.	29.	36.	0.	18.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-17.	-23.	0.	1.	0.	4.	4.	5.	-3.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	184.	17.	79.	2.	1.	22.	28.	3.	11.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	22.	4.	15.	0.	0.	11.	12.	2.	4.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	278.	43.	72.	36.	1.	8.	22.	30.	69.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-72.	-22.	22.	-34.	0.	25.	18.	-25.	-54.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-22.	-14.	12.	-11.	0.	13.	11.	-6.	-18.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	35	41	20	47	14	4	9	41	45

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = APPEALS FROM INITIAL DECISIONS ON CLAIMS UNDER RR RETIREMENT ACT

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 31

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 0

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	200.	0.	103.	38.	1.	2.	15.	27.	16.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	280.	0.	142.	1.	1.	68.	35.	18.	15.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-80.	0.	-39.	37.	0.	-66.	-20.	9.	1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	154.	0.	83.	17.	1.	1.	10.	6.	4.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	46.	0.	20.	21.	0.	1.	5.	21.	12.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	239.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	26.	46.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-39.	-46.	30.	12.	0.	-3.	-4.	1.	-30.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-24.	-15.	4.	23.	0.	-23.	-6.	10.	-6.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	36	44	23	14	14	61	37	17	32

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = INVESTIGATION AND SUSPENSION - RAIL - WATER - FREIGHT FORWARDER

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 1437

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 74

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 11

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	468.	59.	48.	83.	6.	0.	57.	25.	197.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	410.	43.	83.	85.	2.	0.	47.	15.	133.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	58.	16.	-35.	-2.	4.	0.	10.	10.	64.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	364.	44.	34.	42.	3.	0.	17.	8.	132.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	104.	15.	14.	41.	3.	0.	40.	17.	65.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	713.	75.	85.	135.	7.	43.	73.	47.	259.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-245.	-16.	-37.	-52.	-1.	-43.	-16.	-22.	-62.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-28.	5.	-19.	-4.	2.	-14.	11.	2.	22.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	37	19	52	35	4	59	9	26	19

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE APPEALS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 36

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 7

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	103.	15.	10.	1.	1.	15.	7.	45.	9.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	74.	0.	21.	1.	1.	30.	11.	7.	8.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	29.	15.	-11.	0.	0.	-15.	-4.	38.	1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	70.	9.	8.	1.	1.	7.	4.	18.	5.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	33.	6.	2.	0.	0.	8.	3.	27.	4.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	249.	45.	73.	28.	1.	6.	20.	29.	51.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-146.	-30.	-63.	-27.	0.	9.	-13.	16.	-42.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-28.	-3.	-24.	-9.	0.	1.	-5.	27.	-12.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	38	25	59	42	14	21	35	11	37

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = FOREIGN AIR CARRIER PERMITS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 36

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 12

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	127.	5.	30.	1.	1.	7.	31.	12.	44.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	132.	0.	51.	2.	1.	10.	22.	12.	34.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-5.	5.	-21.	-1.	0.	-3.	9.	0.	10.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	79.	2.	17.	1.	1.	3.	22.	9.	16.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	48.	3.	13.	0.	0.	4.	9.	3.	28.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	255.	44.	73.	29.	1.	6.	21.	31.	54.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-128.	-39.	-43.	-28.	0.	1.	10.	-19.	-10.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-28.	-10.	-17.	-10.	0.	1.	9.	-5.	9.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	39	34	48	46	14	21	14	39	24

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = RAIL AND WATER CARRIER FINANCE PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 472

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 21

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 15

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	316.	41.	89.	45.	2.	2.	60.	31.	51.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	405.	73.	59.	54.	3.	0.	69.	49.	92.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-89.	-32.	30.	-9.	-1.	2.	-9.	-18.	-41.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	247.	32.	71.	30.	2.	2.	38.	14.	30.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	69.	9.	18.	15.	0.	0.	22.	17.	21.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	393.	116.	98.	35.	5.	20.	63.	38.	24.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-77.	-75.	-9.	10.	-3.	-18.	-3.	-7.	27.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-32.	-33.	13.	5.	-1.	-5.	3.	-3.	2.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	40	61	18	22	59	56	24	33	27

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = REVIEW OF DISCHARGE

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 17

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 3

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	130.	0.	98.	1.	1.	0.	0.	28.	5.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	147.	0.	112.	4.	1.	0.	0.	25.	5.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-17.	0.	-14.	-3.	0.	0.	0.	3.	0.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	110.	0.	82.	1.	1.	0.	0.	20.	4.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	20.	0.	16.	0.	0.	0.	0.	8.	1.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	239.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	27.	46.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-109.	-46.	25.	-25.	0.	-5.	-19.	1.	-41.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-35.	-15.	9.	-9.	0.	-2.	-6.	4.	-13.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	41	44	22	45	14	28	37	23	39

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX DIVISION.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PERMIT PROCEECINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 39

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 9

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	103.	17.	27.	1.	1.	21.	38.	1.	1.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	95.	18.	20.	10.	1.	21.	22.	0.	2.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	8.	-1.	7.	-9.	0.	0.	16.	1.	-1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	77.	11.	17.	1.	1.	14.	24.	1.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	26.	6.	10.	0.	0.	7.	14.	0.	0.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	252.	44.	73.	29.	1.	6.	20.	30.	53.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-149.	-27.	-46.	-28.	0.	15.	18.	-29.	-52.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-38.	-7.	-10.	-12.	0.	7.	16.	-9.	-18.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	42	30	35	51	14	8	8	47	45

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CA - CHARGES OF EMPLOYER UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES SECTION 8 A

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 480

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 31

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 3

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	271.	17.	38.	6.	3.	31.	55.	29.	95.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	320.	13.	43.	6.	3.	34.	68.	31.	118.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-49.	4.	-5.	0.	0.	-3.	-13.	-2.	-23.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	227.	12.	29.	3.	3.	28.	40.	24.	66.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	44.	5.	9.	3.	0.	3.	15.	5.	29.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	399.	47.	74.	65.	3.	17.	34.	35.	128.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-128.	-30.	-36.	-59.	0.	14.	21.	-6.	-33.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-44.	-7.	-11.	-19.	0.	5.	8.	-1.	-9.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	43	29	37	59	14	12	17	29	35

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = HEARINGS FOR PERMISSION TO ORGANIZE A NEW FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 229

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 26

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 9

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	203.	0.	66.	28.	21.	0.	0.	77.	35.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	248.	0.	72.	2.	2.	0.	0.	174.	-1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-45.	0.	-6.	26.	19.	0.	0.	-97.	36.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	168.	0.	56.	14.	3.	0.	0.	54.	24.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	35.	0.	10.	14.	18.	0.	0.	23.	11.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	330.	84.	87.	29.	4.	14.	45.	40.	31.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-127.	-84.	-21.	-1.	17.	-14.	-45.	37.	4.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-46.	-28.	-6.	13.	18.	-5.	-15.	-12.	17.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	44	60	31	18	1	52	61	54	20

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = INDIVIDUAL REGISTRATION PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 240

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 3

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	178.	24.	97.	4.	2.	10.	17.	12.	15.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	151.	23.	77.	2.	2.	6.	11.	10.	13.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	27.	1.	20.	2.	0.	4.	6.	2.	2.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	298.	44.	71.	44.	1.	9.	22.	24.	86.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-120.	-20.	26.	-40.	1.	1.	-5.	-12.	-71.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-47.	-10.	23.	-19.	1.	3.	1.	-5.	-35.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	45	32	12	60	11	16	27	38	53

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = HEARINGS FOR PERMISSION TO ESTABLISH A BRANCH OFFICE

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 222

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 28

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 7

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	190.	0.	65.	17.	3.	0.	0.	66.	43.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	228.	0.	130.	1.	1.	0.	0.	0.	240.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-38.	0.	-65.	16.	2.	0.	0.	66.	-197.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	156.	0.	52.	6.	2.	0.	0.	48.	27.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	34.	0.	13.	11.	1.	0.	0.	18.	16.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	329.	73.	84.	34.	3.	14.	41.	40.	47.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-139.	-73.	-19.	-17.	0.	-14.	-41.	26.	-4.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-48.	-24.	-24.	3.	1.	-5.	-14.	37.	-62.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	46	59	58	24	5	52	59	7	58

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = REVIEW OF DISCHARGE

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 17

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 3

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	64.	0.	55.	1.	1.	0.	0.	******	******
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	60.	0.	53.	2.	1.	0.	0.	5.	0.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	4.	0.	2.	-1.	0.	0.	0.	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	53.	0.	46.	1.	1.	0.	0.	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	11.	0.	9.	0.	0.	0.	0.	******	******
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	239.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	27.	46.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-175.	-46.	-18.	-25.	0.	-5.	-19.	******	******
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-53.	-15.	-2.	-9.	0.	-2.	-6.	******	******
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	47	44	29	41	14	28	37	**	**

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = REVIEWS OF DISCHARGE

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 23

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 6

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	72.	67.	1.	1.	1.	0.	0.	0.	4.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	84.	3.	70.	2.	1.	0.	0.	0.	9.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-12.	64.	-69.	-1.	0.	0.	0.	0.	-5.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	62.	58.	1.	1.	1.	0.	0.	0.	3.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	10.	9.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	1.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	244.	45.	73.	27.	1.	5.	20.	29.	48.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-172.	22.	-72.	-26.	0.	-5.	-20.	-29.	-44.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-58.	32.	-47.	-9.	0.	-2.	-7.	-10.	-16.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	48	7	61	42	14	28	44	48	41

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,SIZE APPEALS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = SIZE APPEALS PROCEEDING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 43

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 6

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	41.	14.	8.	10.	1.	0.	0.	7.	3.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	23.	5.	6.	4.	1.	0.	0.	3.	2.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	18.	9.	2.	6.	0.	0.	0.	4.	1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	27.	8.	6.	5.	1.	0.	0.	4.	3.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	14.	6.	2.	5.	0.	0.	0.	3.	0.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	249.	45.	73.	28.	1.	6.	20.	28.	52.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-208.	-31.	-65.	-18.	0.	-6.	-20.	-21.	-49.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-59.	-5.	-20.	-2.	0.	-2.	-7.	-5.	-16.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	49	28	53	33	14	38	44	36	41

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF STATE,BOARD OF REVIEW ON LOSS OF NATIONALITY.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = REVIEW ON LOSS OF NATIONALITY

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 41

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 26

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED.

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	124.	31.	17.	39.	1.	0.	0.	38.	1.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	171.	66.	19.	60.	1.	0.	0.	25.	0.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-47.	-35.	-2.	-21.	0.	0.	0.	13.	1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	103.	24.	12.	17.	1.	0.	0.	28.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	21.	7.	5.	22.	0.	0.	0.	10.	0.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	274.	41.	73.	32.	1.	8.	23.	37.	62.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-150.	-10.	-56.	7.	0.	-8.	-23.	1.	-61.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-59.	-13.	-18.	3.	0.	-3.	-8.	8.	-20.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	49	39	51	26	14	46	50	19	49

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = EXCLUSION PROCEEDINGS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 24

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 3

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	36.	0.	7.	24.	1.	0.	0.	0.	5.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	32.	0.	18.	7.	1.	0.	0.	0.	6.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	4.	0.	-11.	17.	0.	0.	0.	0.	-1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	12.	0.	3.	5.	1.	0.	0.	0.	2.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	24.	0.	4.	19.	0.	0.	0.	0.	3.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	241.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	27.	47.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-205.	-46.	-66.	-2.	0.	-5.	-19.	-27.	-42.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-59.	-15.	-24.	11.	0.	-2.	-6.	-9.	-13.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	51	44	60	20	14	28	37	45	39

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = APPEALS FROM INITIAL DECISIONS ON CLAIMS UNDER RR UNEMPLOY. INSUR. ACT

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 27

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 0

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	64.	0.	30.	4.	1.	1.	19.	6.	6.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	84.	0.	35.	5.	1.	0.	26.	11.	7.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-20.	0.	-5.	-1.	0.	1.	-7.	-5.	-1.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	50.	0.	26.	2.	1.	1.	14.	1.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	14.	0.	4.	2.	0.	0.	5.	5.	5.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	238.	46.	73.	26.	1.	5.	19.	26.	46.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-174.	-46.	-43.	-22.	0.	-4.	0.	-20.	-40.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-60.	-15.	-15.	-7.	0.	-1.	-1.	-7.	-12.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	52	44	42	36	14	26	31	43	36

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = FAA SAFETY ENFORCEMENT HEARING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 170

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 7

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	129.	2.	81.	9.	1.	0.	0.	******	******
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	99.	1.	65.	2.	1.	0.	0.	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	30.	1.	16.	7.	0.	0.	0.	******	******
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	285.	44.	72.	39.	1.	8.	21.	27.	75.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-156.	-42.	9.	-30.	0.	-8.	-21.	******	******
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-63.	-21.	13.	-12.	0.	-4.	-11.	******	******
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	53	53	19	50	14	50	58	**	**

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = ROUTE LICENSING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 890

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 213

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 17

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	475.	54.	83.	21.	6.	53.	89.	68.	109.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	550.	0.	144.	19.	9.	60.	131.	56.	131.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-75.	54.	-61.	2.	-3.	-7.	-42.	12.	-22.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	349.	33.	65.	9.	4.	45.	60.	41.	62.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	126.	21.	18.	12.	2.	8.	29.	27.	47.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	744.	85.	101.	102.	9.	52.	103.	121.	187.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-269.	-31.	-18.	-81.	-3.	1.	-14.	-53.	-78.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-73.	15.	-20.	-22.	-1.	1.	-9.	-5.	-18.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	54	14	53	61	59	21	54	36	45

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = CB - CHARGES OF UNION UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES SECTION 8 B

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 317

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 24

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 2

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	259.	44.	32.	5.	2.	29.	42.	29.	82.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	442.	14.	50.	11.	2.	42.	66.	41.	214.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-183.	30.	-18.	-6.	0.	-13.	-24.	-12.	-132.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	208.	18.	24.	3.	2.	26.	32.	20.	55.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	51.	26.	8.	2.	0.	3.	10.	9.	27.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	346.	45.	73.	53.	2.	13.	28.	33.	103.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-87.	-1.	-41.	-48.	0.	16.	14.	-4.	-21.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-73.	18.	-17.	-17.	0.	2.	-0.	-2.	-42.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	55	12	48	56	14	18	28	31	55

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PHYSICAL DISABILITY SEPARATION REVIEW

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 12

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 2

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	73.	0.	44.	2.	1.	0.	0.	6.	22.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	57.	0.	37.	1.	1.	0.	0.	5.	11.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	16.	0.	7.	1.	0.	0.	0.	1.	11.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	236.	46.	73.	25.	1.	4.	19.	27.	44.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-163.	-46.	-29.	-23.	0.	-4.	-19.	-21.	-22.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-74.	-23.	-11.	-11.	0.	-2.	-10.	-10.	-6.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	56	56	38	47	14	38	55	50	31

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL.

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 139

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 30

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 3

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	184.	53.	46.	1.	1.	0.	0.	61.	20.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	334.	55.	105.	8.	1.	0.	0.	88.	83.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-150.	-2.	-59.	-7.	0.	0.	0.	-27.	-63.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	139.	39.	27.	1.	1.	0.	0.	40.	14.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	45.	14.	19.	0.	0.	0.	0.	21.	6.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	306.	51.	76.	36.	2.	11.	30.	39.	66.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-122.	2.	-30.	-35.	-1.	-11.	-30.	22.	-46.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-76.	5.	-23.	-14.	-0.	-4.	-10.	5.	-34.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	57	20	56	55	48	48	56	21	52

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = HEARING ON OBJECTIONS AND/OR CHALLENGES IN ELECTION CASES

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 428

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 21

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	143.	0.	27.	7.	2.	9.	33.	17.	52.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	178.	0.	35.	6.	2.	14.	43.	14.	60.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-35.	0.	-8.	1.	0.	-5.	-10.	3.	-8.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	110.	0.	20.	3.	2.	4.	22.	11.	31.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	33.	0.	7.	4.	0.	5.	11.	6.	21.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	371.	39.	70.	64.	2.	14.	27.	30.	129.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-228.	-39.	-43.	-57.	0.	-5.	6.	-13.	-77.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-77.	-13.	-15.	-17.	0.	-2.	2.	-1.	-21.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	58	40	42	56	14	28	25	30	50

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF MERCHANT SEAMENS LICENSES AND DOCUMENTS

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 33

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 2

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	27.	1.	4.	10.	1.	1.	8.	3.	3.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	88.	0.	6.	39.	3.	0.	17.	13.	11.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-61.	1.	-2.	-29.	-2.	1.	-9.	-10.	-8.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	14.	1.	3.	3.	1.	1.	5.	0.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	13.	0.	1.	7.	0.	0.	3.	3.	2.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	242.	46.	73.	27.	1.	5.	19.	27.	48.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-215.	-45.	-69.	-17.	0.	-4.	-11.	-24.	-45.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-88.	-15.	-23.	-13.	-1.	-1.	-6.	-10.	-17.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	59	42	56	53	55	26	36	51	43

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = R CASE HEARING

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 318

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 20

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 0

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	58.	0.	15.	4.	1.	1.	1.	1.	11.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	76.	0.	15.	6.	0.	5.	11.	7.	33.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-18.	0.	0.	-2.	1.	-4.	-10.	-6.	-22.
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	38.	0.	12.	2.	1.	0.	0.	0.	1.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	20.	0.	3.	2.	0.	1.	1.	1.	10.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	339.	34.	69.	56.	1.	12.	23.	30.	117.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-281.	-34.	-54.	-52.	0.	-11.	-22.	-29.	-106.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-93.	-11.	-17.	-17.	0.	-5.	-10.	-11.	-39.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	60	36	48	56	12	52	57	52	54

ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY EVALUATION CHART

I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CASES BEING EVALUATED

A. AGENCY = ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

B. TYPE OF PROCEEDING = LICENSING OF PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION FACILITIES

II. COMPLEXITY OF THE CASES

A. AVG. TRANSCRIPT LENGTH = 271

B. AVG. NUMBER OF EXHIBITS = 38

C. AVG. NUMBER OF PRIVATE PARTIES = 1

III. TIME THAT WAS CONSUMED

A. STAGE	TOTAL	PLEADING	AWAITING HEARING	HEARING TOTAL	HEARING DAYS	PROPOSED FINDINGS	AWAITING PRELIM	BRIEFS	AWAITING FINAL
B. ACTUAL AVG. DAYS	122.	16.	25.	51.	1.	14.	19.	0.	0.
IV. TIME EXPECTED TO BE CONSUMED									
A. IN LIGHT OF PAST PERFORMANCE									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
2. DAYS SAVABLE	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******	******
B. IN LIGHT OF THE POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING DEVIANT CASES									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	85.	14.	21.	14.	1.	8.	14.	0.	0.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	37.	2.	4.	37.	0.	6.	5.	0.	0.
C. IN LIGHT OF OTHER TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS									
1. EXPECTED AVG.	350.	37.	72.	54.	2.	13.	28.	40.	110.
2. DAYS SAVABLE	-228.	-21.	-47.	-3.	-1.	1.	-9.	-40.	-110.
V. OVERALL EVALUATION									
A. AVG. DAYS SAVABLE	-96.	-10.	-22.	17.	-1.	4.	-2.	-20.	-55.
B. IMPROVABILITY RANK OUT OF 61 TYPES OF PROCEEDINGS	61	32	55	15	53	13	32	55	56

INDEX OF THE AGENCIES

(Numbers in this index refer to chart numbers not to page numbers. Chart numbers are the numbers in the lower left hand corner of each chart. They show the rank of the type of proceeding out of the 61 types of proceedings with regard to improvability in the total time consumed.)

Department of Agriculture 14, 17, 21
Atomic Energy Commission 61
Civil Aeronautics Board 30, 39, 54
U.S. Civil Service Commission 35
Department of Commerce 57
Department of Defense 15, 23, 29, 34, 41, 47, 48, 56
Federal Aviation Agency 53
Federal Communication Commission 19
Federal Home Loan Bank Board 44, 46
Federal Power Commission 11
Federal Trade Commission 2
General Services Administration 12
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 22
Department of the Interior 3, 4, 5, 8, 25
Interstate Commerce Commission 5, 16, 17, 20, 24, 37, 40
Department of Justice 27, 51
Department of Labor 28, 33
National Labor Relations Board 10, 26, 32, 43, 55, 58, 60
Railroad Retirement Board 36, 52
Securities and Exchange Commission 9, 13
Small Business Administration 49
Department of State 49
Subversive Activities Control Board 45
Tennessee Valley Authority 38
Department of the Treasury 42, 59
Veterans' Administration 1, 31