

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Kim Davis, Director, Office of Court Construction and Management,
415-865-7971, kim.davis@jud.ca.gov
Kelly Popejoy, Manager of Planning, Office of Court Construction and
Management, 818-558-3078, kelly.popejoy@jud.ca.gov

DATE: February 24, 2006

SUBJECT: Court Facilities Planning: Five-Year Infrastructure Plan
Fiscal Year 2007–2008 (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has prepared an update to the *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year 2007–2008. This update has been performed in compliance with Assembly Bill 1473. The submittal of this plan to the Department of Finance is used as a mechanism to convey funding requests and long-term planning of capital outlay projects. The plan sets forth requests for the next phases of previously funded projects and documents requests submitted in the spring finance letter. This update to the plan has been endorsed by the Interim Court Facilities Panel¹ (Interim Panel) and makes current all relevant project costs, funding requests, and names, with no reprioritization of the list of trial court capital projects.

Recommendation

Staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts recommends that the Judicial Council take the following actions:

1. Adopt the *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2007–2008* and direct staff to submit it to the Department of Finance.
2. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to make technical corrections to the AOC's *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, as necessary.

¹ According to rule 6.15(d) of the California Rules of Court, the Interim Panel consists of at least two trial court judges, one appellate court justice, and two court administrators, each appointed by the Chief Justice from the members of the Judicial Council. The Interim Panel members must include at least one member from each of the Judicial Council's other internal committees. Furthermore and according to rule 6.15(b), the Interim Panel must review and consult with the AOC on matters concerning court facilities and must review proposals involving such matters before they are considered by the full council.

Rationale for Recommendation

Recommendation 1

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Gov. Code, §§ 70301–70404) specifies the authority and responsibility of the Judicial Council to exercise policymaking authority over appellate and trial court facilities including, but not limited to, planning, construction, and acquisition, and to “[r]ecommend to the Governor and the Legislature the projects [that] shall be funded from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund” (Gov. Code, § 70391(1)(3)). In support of this responsibility of the council, the Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM) of the AOC has updated the *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year 2007–2008. This plan, which includes the capital plans for the trial courts, the courts of appeal, and the AOC, is submitted annually to the Department of Finance as the AOC’s *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*.

Five-year capital outlay plans developed under Government Code sections 13100–13104 are intended to complement the existing state budget process for appropriating funds for infrastructure, by providing a comprehensive five-year overview of the types and costs of projects to be funded through the state budget process. The Department of Finance requests that this plan be updated annually, under the provisions of AB 1473. Although the judicial branch is not subject to Government Code sections 13100–13104, the AOC has historically submitted an infrastructure plan, which is a familiar vehicle for informing the executive and legislative branches of our plan and funding needs. Lack of participation in this statewide infrastructure planning effort will likely preclude the judicial branch from receiving general funds in the future.

The *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, Fiscal Year 2007–2008* is based on compliance with the provisions of AB 1473 and provides updated estimates of total project costs, in January 2006 dollars. This plan also aids the Governor when preparing the statewide five-year infrastructure plan.

The Interim Panel has directed staff to consider alternate ways to prioritize major capital outlay projects, owing to a variety of reasons, including limited funding. Later this year, AOC staff will propose to the council a new method of prioritizing major trial court capital projects, subject to normal circulation for comment from court stakeholders. A future update to the capital outlay plan will be based on a modified prioritization methodology.

The plan includes FY 2007–2008 funding requests for the ongoing phases of trial court projects requested for FY 2006–2007 funding: the new cross-jurisdictional court in Plumas and Sierra Counties and the new East Contra Costa Court in Contra Costa County. In addition, the plan also documents the spring finance letter, which included a request for FY 2006–2007 funding for additional design fees for the East Contra Costa Court, the renovation to the B. F. Sisk Fresno Federal Court for use by the Superior Court of Fresno County, and the new Mammoth Lakes Court in Mono County. Funding for additional design fees are requested for the East Contra Costa Court to add three courtrooms to the previously approved four-courtroom facility, based on the Governor’s proposal to provide

150 new superior court judges over a three-year period beginning in FY 2006–2007. The Department of Finance rejected the request for funding for the Sisk project, ranked #5, and AOC staff recommends appealing this rejection by resubmission of the funding request for the project. A funding request for land acquisition and for preliminary design for the new Mammoth Lakes Court is being submitted in the spring finance letter, for a variety of reasons. The latter project, ranked #7, will replace an inadequate leased space with security problems for which responsibility has transferred to the state. Land is available at a below-market rate through a U.S. Forest Service land exchange coordinated by the local hospital district, which is willing to allow the court to participate in a planned hospital-civic center complex.

For FY 2007–2008, submissions may be revised to include proposed FY 2006–2007 funding requests, based on final FY 2006–2007 budget approvals, as well as additional trial court projects (submitted in rank order) if bond funding is approved by voters in 2006.

Recommendation 2

As necessary, the Administrative Director of the Courts would make corrections to the AOC's *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, based on decisions given in the FY 2006–2007 project funding requests.

Alternative Actions Considered

Alternate actions would be to not submit requests for FY 2007–2008 funding for any projects, or to not submit an updated plan until either a bond measure is passed or support is secured for direct general fund appropriations. This approach would likely postpone improvements to court facilities statewide and preclude opportunities for use of monies from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund, because the Department of Finance prefers to evaluate funding requests in the context of an updated *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*. This approach would also deny stakeholders updated information on the need for court facilities improvements.

Comments From Interested Parties

In an informal meeting with staff on January 6, 2006, the chair and co-chair of the Interim Panel discussed and endorsed the update of the five-year plan for the coming fiscal year, including the specific funding requests for FY 2007–2008 and the FY 2006–2007 spring finance letter. As staff has only performed an update to the five-year plan—making current all relevant project costs, funding requests, and names, with no reprioritization of the list of trial court capital projects—no comments were solicited from the courts or the public on the recommendation.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional costs are required to implement the recommendation.

Attachment

Judicial Branch
Assembly Bill 1473
Five-Year Infrastructure Plan
Fiscal Year 2007–2008

Supreme Court of California
California Courts of Appeal
Superior Courts of California
Administrative Office of the Courts

February 24, 2006

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the following professionals in developing the judicial branch's Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2007–2008:

Members of the Judicial Council of California

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Law Offices of Anthony Capozzi

Hon. Candace D. Cooper*
Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal
Second Appellate District
Division Eight

Hon. J. Stephen Czuleger
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Joseph Dunn
Member of the Senate

Hon. Michael T. Garcia*
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Mr. Thomas V. Girardi
Girardi & Keese

Mr. Rex S. Heinke*
Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, LLP

Hon. Richard D. Huffman
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District
Division One

Hon. Dave Jones
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of El Dorado

Hon. Charles W. McCoy, Jr.
Supervising Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Barbara J. Miller
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Douglas P. Miller
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Hon. Eileen C. Moore
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District
Division Three

Hon. Dennis E. Murray
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Tehama

Hon. William J. Murray, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Joaquin

* Also a member of the Interim Court Facilities Panel

Hon. Michael Nash
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Barbara J. Parker
Chief Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney

Hon. Richard E. L. Strauss*
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Advisory Members

Hon. Ronald E. Albers
Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Ms. Tamara Lynn Beard*/**
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Fresno

Ms. Deena Fawcett
Clerk/Administrator
Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District

Hon. Terry B. Friedman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Mr. Alan Slater
Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Ms. Sharol Strickland*
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Butte

Hon. Sharon J. Waters
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Administrative Office of the Courts

Mr. William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of the Judicial Council

* Also a member of the Interim Court Facilities Panel

** Also the Judicial Council Liaison to the Court Facilities Transitional Task Force

Court Facilities Transitional Task Force

Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Fresno

Hon. James Michael Welch, Vice-Chair
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Hon. Mark Ashton Cope
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Mr. Dean Dennis
Hill, Farrer & Burrill

Mr. Dennis Dunne
Dunne & Associates

Hon. Alice C. Hill
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Roger T. Kosel
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Siskiyou

Hon. Kathleen E. O'Leary
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District
Division Three

Mr. Frederick K. Ohlrich
Clerk of the Court
Supreme Court

Mr. Gordon Park-Li*
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Mr. James B. Perry
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Yolo

Mr. Ken Torre
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Ms. Kiri S. Torre
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Mr. John C. Van Whervin
Director, Facilities & Capital Projects
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Mr. Thomas Joseph Warwick, Jr.
Grimes & Warwick

Hon. Diane Elan Wick
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Governing Committee of CJER Liaison

Ms. Tressa S. Kentner
Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

*Trial Court Presiding Judges
Advisory Committee Liaison*

Hon. Larry W. Allen
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

* Also the Court Executives Advisory Committee Liaison to the Court Facilities Transitional Task Force

Staff, Administrative Office of the Courts,
Office of Court Construction and Management

Ms. Kim Davis
Director

Mr. Chris Magnusson
Facilities Planner

Mr. Robert Emerson
Assistant Director for Business and Planning

Mr. Bruce Newman
Facilities Planner

Ms. Kelly Quinn Popejoy
Manager of Planning

Mr. Thomas Ng
Facilities Planner

Ms. Gisele Corrie
Financial Manager

Ms. Rhonda Williams
Administrative Coordinator II

Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
A. Legislative Framework: Structural Changes to the Responsibility for the Court System.....	1
B. The Judicial Council and the Administrative Office of the Courts	2
C. Trial and Appellate Courts.....	2
D. California’s Appellate Court Facilities	3
E. California’s Trial Court Facilities.....	3
F. Transfer of Trial Court Facilities	4
G. Map of California Court Jurisdictions	5
II. Summary of Fiscal Year 2007–2008 Funding Requests and Concept Papers for Future Funding	6
III. Appellate Courts Five-Year Infrastructure Plan	7
A. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Supreme Court	7
B. Summary of Existing Supreme Court Facilities	7
C. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Courts of Appeal	9
D. Planning for Future Appellate Court Facilities.....	9
E. Summary of Appellate Court Projects	10
F. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Appellate Court Facilities	11
1. First Appellate District – San Francisco	11
2. Second Appellate District.....	11
Los Angeles – Divisions 1-5, 7 & 8	11
Ventura – Division 6	12
3. Third Appellate District – Sacramento	12
4. Fourth Appellate District.....	13
San Diego – Division 1	13
Riverside – Division 2.....	13
Santa Ana – Division 3.....	14
5. Fifth Appellate District – Fresno	15
6. Sixth Appellate District – San Jose	15
IV. Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.....	16
A. Summary of Trial Court Capital Planning Process.....	16
1. Task Force on Court Facilities.....	16
2. Facility Master Plans for 58 Trial Courts	16
3. Prioritization of Trial Court Capital Projects Identified in Master Plans	17
4. Substitutions in Ranked Projects in Capital Outlay Plan.....	18
5. Trial Court Prioritized List of Capital Projects.....	18
6. Completed Studies.....	24
7. FY 2006–2007 Major Trial Court Capital Outlay Projects Submitted to Governor	25
B. Current Planning Activities and Future Updates to Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan.....	25

C. Drivers of Need.....	26
1. Lack of Security and Poor Physical Conditions	26
2. Current Need for Additional Judges	28
3. Consolidation of Facilities	29
4. Improve Access to the Courts.....	29
D. Inventory of Trial Court Space	29
E. Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs	30
F. Alternative Approaches to Meeting Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs.....	30
G. Facilities to Meet Trial Court Unmet Needs and Proposed Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan	30
H. Consequences of Not Addressing Identified Needs.....	31
1. In-Custody Movement Costs Remain High.....	31
2. Unsafe Conditions Persist.....	32
3. Facilities Continue to Deteriorate.....	32
4. Scattered and Unconsolidated Facilities Must Be Maintained.....	32
5. Space for New Judges Will Not Be Provided in Consolidated Facilities.....	32
I. Reconciliation to Previous Plan	32
 V. Administrative Office of the Courts	 33
A. Purpose of the AOC	33
B. Drivers of Need for AOC Space Expansion	34
C. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Facilities.....	36
1. Administrative Office of the Courts	36
AOC Headquarters – San Francisco.....	36
Office of Governmental Affairs	37
Northern/Central Regional Office – Sacramento	37
Southern Regional Office – Burbank	38

I. Introduction

The state's court facilities require a renewed and continuing investment to ensure that they serve the public safely, efficiently, and effectively, and that they provide equal access to the law and the judicial system. The Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for fiscal year 2006–2007 established a program for improvement of the court facilities of the State of California. Since the approval of that document by the Judicial Council of California on June 1, 2005, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has progressed toward accomplishing various aspects of this program. This Five-Year Infrastructure Plan—for FY 2007–2008—represents an update to its predecessor, documenting a multibillion dollar program for improvement of the state's court facilities.

For the first 100 years of statehood, county court facilities stood—figuratively but often quite literally as well—at the center of civic life, monuments to the democratic ideals of early Californians. The court facility remains, now as then, a tangible symbol of the rule of law. It is a central point of contact between Californians and their government and is a key component in the administration of justice. The primary constitutional duty of the courts is to provide an accessible, fair, and impartial forum for the resolution of disputes. Court facilities are public resources that need to be managed in the most effective way to serve the public.

With more than eight million filings annually, California's court system is the largest in the United States. As the primary point of contact between the public and the judicial branch, court facilities play a central role in access to and delivery of justice. Today, however, California's court buildings are in a state of significant disrepair, and they require substantial improvements to ensure the safety and security of court users, greater court efficiency, and equal access for all.

A. Legislative Framework: Structural Changes to the Responsibility for the Court System

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 shifted responsibility for funding trial court operations from the counties to the state and established the Task Force on Court Facilities (Task Force) to identify facility needs and possible funding alternatives. It was the overarching recommendation of the Task Force that responsibility for trial court facilities funding and operation be shifted from the counties to the state. The Task Force recommended that the judicial branch, which is wholly responsible for all court functions, should also be responsible for the facilities in which it operates.

In 2002, the Trial Court Facilities Act (Sen. Bill 1732, Stats. 2002, ch. 1082, and subsequent modifying language) was enacted. The act provides for the shift of responsibility for trial court facilities—including operations, maintenance, facility modifications, and major capital projects—from county to state governance, under the direction of the Judicial Council. The act was the final step in restructuring the courts into an integrated judicial branch and built on three earlier pieces of legislation intended to unify the courts: the Trial Court Funding Act (1997), which provided for state funding of the court system; Proposition 220 (1998), which allowed for the voluntary unification of the state's superior and municipal courts into a single trial court in each county; and the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (2000), which made the courts independent employers of the more than 20,000 trial court workers.

It is within the context of these changes to the California court system funding and organization as well as of the mandate of the Trial Court Facilities Act that this Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for the California court system has been developed.

B. The Judicial Council and the Administrative Office of the Courts

The judicial branch is one of the three branches of California state government, along with the executive and legislative branches. The Judicial Council, chaired by the Chief Justice, is the governing body that provides policy guidelines to this branch of government and all the California courts.

The Administrative Office of the Courts is the staff agency to the Judicial Council of California. Recent structural changes in the state judicial branch, such as unification of the superior and municipal courts, and state funding of the court system, have significantly increased the AOC's roles and responsibilities. Today, the agency has more than 850 staff and is organized into nine divisions in San Francisco, one division in Sacramento, and three regional offices.

The AOC is housed in four facilities, with its main headquarters and the Bay Area/Northern Coastal Regional Office in the Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building in San Francisco. The Office of Governmental Affairs and the Northern/Central Regional Office are located in separate leased offices in Sacramento. The Southern Regional Office is located in leased office space in Burbank.

To fulfill the responsibilities of the Trial Court Facilities Act, the AOC, in August 2003, established the Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM) to manage trial court transfers, strategic planning for capital outlay, design and construction of court facilities, and facility real estate management for the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, AOC, and superior courts statewide.

C. Trial and Appellate Courts

Trial courts are the primary point of contact between California's residents and the judicial system. These courts, funded by the state and operated by local court officers and employees, determine the facts of a particular case and initially decide the applicable law. California's trial courts are used by millions of visitors: victims, witnesses, attorneys, police and sheriff personnel, jurors, and defendants both in-custody and out of custody.

The Courts of Appeal review trial court interpretation and application of the law and devote themselves exclusively to the law—its application and development. The appellate courts function more simply than the trial courts, without the participation of the litigating parties, witnesses, and juries. Lawyers generally are the only individuals present in court sessions, and hearings typically take no more than a few days per month, focusing on oral argument supplementing the written briefs and records. The Supreme Court, the highest California court, has jurisdiction in proceedings for extraordinary relief. It may elect to review cases previously decided by the Courts of Appeal and, by law, must review all those cases in which a judgment of death has been pronounced by a trial court.

California's appellate court facilities are currently the responsibility of the state, while the responsibility for superior court facilities is moving from counties to the state under the mandate of the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002.

D. California's Appellate Court Facilities

The appellate courts function in nine facilities in as many locations serving six districts. Capital projects for new state-owned court facilities for the Fourth Appellate District in Santa Ana and for the Fifth Appellate District in Fresno are in progress. New appellate facilities are also planned in San Diego and San Jose, to provide adequate and cost-effective space for these courts now located in leased office space. A funding request to secure a site for the expansion of the Fourth Appellate District in Riverside has also been incorporated into this plan.

E. California's Trial Court Facilities

California's 451 trial court facilities vary considerably in size, age, and condition. The largest trial court facility is the Stanley Mosk Courthouse in downtown Los Angeles with 101 courtrooms. Some rural and mountain areas are served by 1 or 2 courtroom facilities. While a few court facilities are new or quite old and historic, the inventory is generally aging, with 70 percent of all court facilities in California built before 1980. In most cases, these older facilities do not serve the public or the court well, owing to physical conditions and designs rendered obsolete by modern court operations and caseload demands. While some counties have invested in their court facilities during the last decade, many counties have not, due to insufficient funding and competing priorities.

California's court facilities are in a state of significant disrepair. Of the state's 451 court facilities, 90 percent require significant renovation, repair, or maintenance. Over 80 percent were constructed before the 1988 seismic codes took effect, 23 court facilities are in temporary buildings or trailers, and 25 percent lack space to assemble jurors.¹ These facilities are in extremely poor condition, lack any type of security, are functionally insufficient to support court operations, and are sometimes inaccessible.

Court facilities serving California's trial courts were built and are maintained by each of California's 58 county governments. Needs were assessed at the county level, and both funding and approval for construction, maintenance, and renovation projects have been and remain the responsibility of each county's board of supervisors, until such time as transfers are executed. As a result, the trial courts are often "subject to the vagaries of local fiscal health and relationships,"² and significant inequities have grown between courts in terms of facilities operations and maintenance.

In addition to local priorities, other reasons for inequality in county funding were related to limited funding, including Proposition 13's limits on property taxes, severe recessions in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and the shift of funding that supports school districts from the counties to the state.³ As a result, many California courts have suffered from deferred maintenance, lack

¹ *Final Report of the Task Force on Court Facilities*, Oct. 1, 2001.

² *State of the Judiciary*, March 2003.

³ *Proposition 13 at Twenty-Five*, Capital Center for Government Law and Policy, University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law, May 2004.

adequate security, do not meet life and health safety or seismic codes, and are not accessible to people with disabilities.⁴ Several courts with high caseload growth occupy leased offices or modular buildings to meet the need for additional courtrooms and public service areas, resulting in unconsolidated court operations that are inefficient to operate and inadequate in meeting the full, functional needs of the public and the court.

F. Transfer of Trial Court Facilities

Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, negotiations for transfer of responsibility of all trial court facilities from the counties to the state began July 1, 2004, and will continue through June 30, 2007. This transfer process will gradually increase the area under Judicial Council responsibility and AOC management by over 10 million usable square feet (USF).⁵

⁴ *Final Report of the Task Force on Court Facilities*, Oct. 1, 2001.

⁵ Usable square feet (USF) is defined by the Task Force as component gross area (CGSF), which represents all net areas assigned to a given component, as well as related internal circulation, interior partitions and interior columns, chases serving the space, and other areas incidental to the component's spatial organization or construction, plus the corridors connecting the components. It expresses the amount of "usable" area for a specific use. Component gross area excludes the area required for public circulation and lobbies, mechanical and electrical spaces and distribution shafts, stairs, elevators, and other common building elements.

G. Map of California Court Jurisdictions

Figure 1 presents a map showing the geographical jurisdiction of each of the six appellate court districts and each of the 58 superior courts.

Figure 1: State of California Superior and Appellate Court Jurisdictions



II. Summary of Fiscal Year 2007–2008 Funding Requests and Concept Papers for Future Funding

The AOC is requesting funding authorization in fiscal year (FY) 2007–2008 for the projects shown in Table 1. For FY 2007–2008, submissions may be revised to include proposed FY 2006–2007 funding requests, as presented later in Table 7, based on final FY 2006–2007 budget approvals, as well as additional trial court projects (submitted in rank order) if bond funding is approved by voters in 2006.

Table 1: Funding Requests for Court Projects for FY 2007–2008

<u>Project</u>	<u>\$ (in millions)</u>	<u>Phases*</u>
Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District (San Diego)	\$ 21.504	A
Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District (San Jose)	15.434	A
Contra Costa, New East Contra Costa Court	51.410	W and C
Mono, New Mammoth Lakes Court	0.725	W
Plumas/Sierra, New Portola/Loyalton Court	5.318	W and C
AOC 2nd Floor Expansion, Hiram W. Johnson Building.....	0.851	P and W
Trial Court Projects (Bond Funded)	TBD	TBD
Total	<u>\$ 95.242</u>	(Additional funding to be determined, if bonds are approved)

* A = Land acquisition; P = Preliminary design; W = Working drawings; C = Construction

The AOC will submit concept papers to the Department of Finance for projects to be funded during the Five-Year Plan period, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Concept Papers for Court Projects for FYs 2008–2009 to 2011–2012

<u>Project</u>	<u>Initial FY Request</u>	<u>Total All FYs \$ (in millions)</u>
Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District (Riverside).....	FY 2008–2009, ongoing	20.2
Trial Court Major Capital Outlay Projects.....	FY 2008–2009, ongoing	<u>5,000.0</u>
Total		<u>\$ 5,020.2</u>

III. Appellate Courts Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

The Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for the appellate courts of California includes initial phases of projects to construct two new appellate court facilities to replace leased facilities in San Diego and San Jose. These proposals are consistent with the prior year's Infrastructure Plan. The plan also includes future funding for expansion of the appellate court in Riverside.

A. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court of California has discretion to review decisions of the Courts of Appeal, the Public Utilities Commission, the State Bar of California, and the Commission on Judicial Performance. It is required to review all death penalty judgments from the superior courts. In addition, the court has original jurisdiction in proceedings for "extraordinary relief," such as petitions seeking writs of certiorari, mandate, prohibition, and habeas corpus.

The Supreme Court consists of a Chief Justice and six associate justices, each serving 12-year terms as mandated by the California State Constitution. The justices are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Commission on Judicial Appointments. The court is located in the Earl Warren Building in San Francisco, with additional chambers in Sacramento and Los Angeles. The court hears oral argument four times a year in San Francisco, four times a year in Los Angeles, and twice a year in Sacramento. Occasionally, special oral argument sessions are held elsewhere.

The number of cases filed in the Supreme Court is projected to increase from FY 2003–2004 actual filings of 8,564 to 11,430 in 2010, based on Task Force projections.

Except for death penalty cases, which are guaranteed an automatic appeal, the Supreme Court has discretion to decide whether it will review any case. Consequently, the court's space requirements do not change dramatically over time, despite the increased number of filings. When a majority of the justices agree to hear a case, the Chief Justice will order the matter set for oral argument. After oral argument, the justices confer and issue a written decision within the statutory time of 90 days.

B. Summary of Existing Supreme Court Facilities

The Supreme Court is headquartered in the Earl Warren Building on San Francisco's Civic Center Plaza. The court also maintains small office suites in the Ronald Reagan State Office Building in Los Angeles and in the Stanley Mosk Library and Courts building in Sacramento, which is included in this report as part of the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District inventory.

1. Supreme Court of California

Existing Facility:	<i>Supreme Court of California – San Francisco</i> 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco – 1st, 4th, 5th & 6th Floors 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco – 6th Floor		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 98,155 USF• State-owned historic Earl Warren Building (1923)• Justices – 7		
Current Status:	The Earl Warren Building is the headquarters of the California Supreme Court, which occupies the 1st, 4th, 5th, and 6th floors of this building. (The court shares the building with the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, which occupies part of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors.) A total restoration including a seismic retrofit of this building was completed in 1998. The Warren Building is fully occupied and the Supreme Court has maximized the space it occupies.		
Needs:	Required Space.....	98,155	USF
	Current Space.....	98,155	USF
	Net Current Need	0	USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.		

Existing Facility:	<i>Supreme Court of California – Los Angeles</i> 300 South Spring Street, Los Angeles – 2nd Floor		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 9,579 USF• State-owned Ronald Reagan State Building (1990)		
Current Status:	The court hears oral argument at this location four times a year. Three staff members are permanently located in this building, which adequately houses a suite of offices for the court’s use. The Supreme Court shares a courtroom with the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District.		
Needs:	Required Space	9,579	USF
	Current Space.....	9,579	USF
	Net Current Need	0	USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.		

C. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Courts of Appeal

The Courts of Appeal must respond to all appeals to decisions made by the trial courts and will need additional justices over time to meet an increased caseload.

The Courts of Appeal decide questions of law, such as whether the superior court judge applied the law correctly in a case. The court makes its decision based on review of the record of the original trial, not by hearing testimony or retrying cases. Consequently, appellate courts are not high-traffic facilities. Each of the nine appellate court facilities requires only one courtroom to accommodate a panel of justices. Appellate court facilities do not require holding cells or space for jurors. Courts of Appeal handle large volumes of paper, including multiple copies of briefs and trial court records that vary in size because of case complexity.

D. Planning for Future Appellate Court Facilities

A comprehensive evaluation of all appellate court facilities in California was completed by the Task Force. As part of the study, the Task Force developed facility guidelines for appellate courts, identified current space needs, projected future needs, inspected and evaluated all appellate court facilities, and developed capital planning options for each. This Five-Year Infrastructure Plan summarizes the Task Force findings, which recommended replacing leased facilities with state-owned facilities designed specifically for the Courts of Appeal.

The Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for the Courts of Appeal is based on current authorized judicial positions in 2005 as well as a 2010 forecast of judicial positions and projected filings developed by the Task Force in 1999, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Courts of Appeal FY 2003–2004 and 2010 Projected Justices and Filings

District – Court Location	2005 Justices	2010 Projected Justices	2003– 2004 Filings	2010 Projected Filings
First – San Francisco	20	20.3	3,819	5,327
Second – Los Angeles, Ventura	32	36.2	7,987	15,288
Third – Sacramento	11	11.5	2,734	4,390
Fourth – San Diego, Riverside, Santa Ana.....	25	26.7	5,917	11,079
Fifth – Fresno	10	12.7	2,368	3,500
Sixth – San Jose.....	7	7.4	1,471	1,991
Totals	105	114.8	24,296	41,575

E. Summary of Appellate Court Projects

As presented in Table 4, there are several appellate court projects that are planned or already underway. This Five-Year Plan includes major capital outlay projects for new court facilities for the Fourth Appellate District, Division One in San Diego; the Fourth Appellate District, Division Two in Riverside; and the Sixth Appellate District in San Jose.

At the present time, two appellate courts are underway. In 2005, the Judicial Council approved site selection in the City of Santa Ana to build a new appellate court facility for the Fourth Appellate District, Division Three in Orange County. Design of the new court in Santa Ana is underway. The new Fifth Appellate District court project in Fresno is under construction and is estimated to be completed by winter 2007. The space requirements of each of these court facilities are based on the “Appellate Court Facilities Guidelines.” These guidelines were developed by the Task Force and were adopted by the Judicial Council effective July 1, 2002.

Table 4: Summary of Appellate Court Facilities and Major Capital Projects

<u>Appellate District</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>State-Owned</u>	<u>Existing Commercial Lease</u>	<u>Major Capital Outlay Project Approved or Planned</u>
First	1–5	San Francisco	×		
Second	1–5, 7, & 8	Los Angeles	×		
Second	6	Ventura		×	
Third	—	Sacramento	×		
Fourth	1	San Diego		×	Planned FY 2007–2008
Fourth	2	Riverside	× (lease to own)		Planned FY 2008–2009
Fourth	3	Santa Ana		×	Design underway
Fifth	—	Fresno		×	Construction underway
Sixth	—	San Jose		×	Planned FY 2007–2008

F. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Appellate Court Facilities

Each of the Courts of Appeal in California is described below. Five courts are currently located in leased space. The Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District in Riverside is located in a leased-to-own facility and, as such, is treated as a state-owned building.

1. First Appellate District – San Francisco

Existing Facility:	<i>San Francisco</i> <i>350 McAllister Street, San Francisco – 1st, 2nd & 3rd Floors</i> <i>455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco – 4th Floor</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 82,716 USF • State-owned historic Earl Warren Building (1923) and adjoining new state-owned high-rise Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building (1998) 	
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.	
Needs:	Required Space	82,716 USF
	Current Space	82,716 USF
	Net Current Need	0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.	

2. Second Appellate District

Existing Facility:	<i>Los Angeles – Divisions 1–5, 7 & 8</i> <i>300 South Spring Street, Los Angeles – 2nd, 3rd & 4th Floors</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 117,156 USF • State-owned Ronald Reagan State Building (1990) 	
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.	
Needs:	Required Space	117,156 USF
	Current Space	117,156 USF
	Net Current Need	0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.	

Existing Facility:	<i>Ventura – Division 6</i> <i>200 East Santa Clara Street, Ventura</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23,329 USF (excludes 800 USF for storage) • Commercial leased standalone building 	
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.	
Needs:	Required Space	23,329 USF
	Current Space	23,329 USF
	Net Need	0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.	

3. Third Appellate District – Sacramento

Existing Facility:	<i>Sacramento</i> <i>914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento – 1st, 2nd & 5th Floors</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36,945 USF • State-owned historic Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building (1929) 	
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.	
Needs:	Required Space	36,945 USF
	Current Space	36,945 USF
	Net Current Need	0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.	

Existing Facility:	<i>Sacramento</i> <i>900 N Street, Sacramento – 4th Floor</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15,827 USF • State-owned Library and Courts Annex Building (1994) 	
Current Status:	This space houses the Clerk’s office, public filing office, court receptionist, and administrative and computer staff.	
Needs:	Required Space	15,827 USF
	Current Space	15,827 USF
	Net Need	0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.	

4. Fourth Appellate District

Existing Facility:	<i>San Diego – Division 1</i> <i>750 B Street, Suite 300, San Diego – 3rd, 4th & 5th Floors</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43,042 USF • Commercial leased Symphony Towers high-rise 	
Current Status:	The court is located on three floors in a commercial building in downtown San Diego. Because of the floor plan configuration and the required building egress, it is not possible to secure the 5th floor and provide a safe workplace for the justices who occupy this floor. The building is too small for current needs.	
Needs:	Required Space	66,232 USF
	Current Space	43,042 USF
	Net Current Need	23,190 USF
Proposal:	A new state-owned court facility is being proposed for funding beginning in FY 2007–2008. The new facility is estimated to be 66,232 USF or 79,478 Building Gross Square Feet (BGSF) and cost \$77.4 million to build. This estimate includes a preliminary estimate of the cost to acquire land and the project’s soft costs.	

Existing Facility:	<i>Riverside – Division 2</i> <i>3389 Twelfth Street, Riverside</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35,034 USF • Lease-to-own standalone building (1998). Leased from the County of Riverside. 	
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time. However, future expansion of this facility will be necessary, due to projected caseload growth.	
Needs:	Required Space	51,034 USF
	Current Space	35,034 USF
	Net Need	16,000 USF
Proposal:	An expansion of 16,000 USF, or 20,000 BGSF to this facility is proposed for funding beginning in FY 2008-2009 at a cost of \$20.224 million. This estimate includes acquisition and project soft costs.	

Existing Facility:	<i>Santa Ana – Division 3</i> <i>925 North Spurgeon Street and 500 West Santa Ana Boulevard</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 34,016 USF • Leased space in two commercial buildings 	
Current Status:	The main location for the court is on North Spurgeon Street, where the court occupies 26,686 USF of space in a standalone commercial building. In March 2002, the court moved into 7,330 USF of additional commercial space in a neighboring multitenant building to accommodate two new justices and staff created by Senate Bill 1857. Lack of consolidated space hinders court operational efficiency.	
Needs:	Required Space	45,166 USF
	Current Space	34,016 USF
	Net Need	11,150 USF
Proposal:	Plans to replace leased space in two neighboring buildings are underway. In 2005, the Judicial Council approved selection of a site owned by the City of Santa Ana for the new 55,000 BGSF court facility. An agreement for the acquisition of this property has been executed by the parties, and the escrow period has begun. Design of the building is underway and scheduled to be completed in December 2006. When the new court facility is completed in 2008, the court will vacate the leased spaces it presently occupies.	

5. Fifth Appellate District – Fresno

Existing Facility:	<i>Fresno</i> 2525 Capitol Street and 2445 Capitol Street, Fresno	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37,579 USF • Leased space in two commercial buildings 	
Current Status:	The main location for the court is at 2525 Capitol Street, where the court occupies 37,579 USF of space in a commercial standalone building. In late January 2002, the court expanded into 2,918 USF of leased space in 2445 Capitol Street located across the street from the court facility. This additional space accommodated the new justice and staff created by Senate Bill 1857.	
Needs:	Required Space	51,000 USF
	Current Space	37,579 USF
	Net Need	13,421 USF
Proposal:	Drawings for a new 51,000 USF or 61, 000 BGSF court facility were bid in summer 2005. Construction is underway, with completion scheduled for winter 2007. When the court moves into the new facility, both the leased offices it now occupies will be vacated.	

6. Sixth Appellate District – San Jose

Existing Facility:	<i>San Jose</i> 333 West Santa Clara Avenue, San Jose – 10th & 11th Floors	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31,420 USF • Commercial leased space in high-rise building. 	
Current Status:	The court has been located in this high-rise commercial building since 1988. The building is too small for current needs.	
Needs:	Required Space	53,623 USF
	Current Space	31,420 USF
	Net Need	22,203 USF
Proposal:	A new state-owned court facility is proposed for funding beginning in FY 2007–2008. The new facility is estimated to be 53,623 USF, or 64,348 BGSF, and cost \$61.6 million to build. This estimate includes a preliminary estimate of the cost to purchase a site and project soft costs.	

IV. Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

The Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for the trial courts is presented here in the context of a multiyear planning process with interim steps that have been directed by policy adopted by the Judicial Council. While some funding for court capital projects has been proposed by the Governor, this plan presents the funding requirements (in current dollars) for all proposed court capital improvement projects.

A. Summary of Trial Court Capital Planning Process

Since 1998, the AOC has been engaged in a process of planning for capital improvements to California's court facilities. This planning work has been undertaken in the context of the transition toward state responsibility for court facilities. The planning initiatives, beginning with the Task Force, have gradually moved from a statewide overview to county-level master planning and to project-specific planning efforts.

1. Task Force on Court Facilities. The capital planning process began with the passage of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997, which transferred responsibility for funding trial court operations from the counties to the state and established the Task Force to identify facility needs and possible funding alternatives. Over two and a half years, the Task Force developed a set of findings and recommendations contained in its Final Report, dated October 1, 2001. The Task Force surveyed the superior court facilities to identify the functional and physical problems of each facility. Many of the Task Force's key findings are referred to in this document.

The Task Force projected space requirements based on correcting current deficiencies and meeting future growth needs. A broad estimate of the cost to meet these needs was then developed, including the extent to which the existing facilities could be reused. The options developed were painted with a very broad brush, did not consider changes to how the court might deliver services at various locations, and were based on limited involvement of the local courts or justice community.

2. Facility Master Plans for 58 Trial Courts. The AOC undertook the next step in the capital planning process in June 2001 with the initiation of a 2½-year effort to develop a facility master plan for each of the 58 trial courts in California. By December 2003, the AOC completed a facility master plan for each of the 58 courts. Each master plan was guided by a steering committee or project team composed of members of the local court, county administration, county justice partners, and the AOC. The planning horizon for the master plans is 20 years.

The master plans confirmed the Task Force findings related to physical and functional condition of each court facility, refined the caseload projection for each court, considered how best to provide court services to the public, developed a judgeship and staffing projection for each court location, and examined development options for how best to meet goals related to court service, operational efficiency, local public policy, and cost-effectiveness.

The facility requirements for the superior courts were based on several guidelines or guiding principles:

- A methodology developed by the AOC and adopted by the Judicial Council to project and standardize statewide judicial needs based on a set of judicial workload standards was applied to census-based population demographics and historical caseload data to estimate future caseload by type, at five-year planning intervals. In turn, the data was used to project the needs of the court as to future judgeships. Associated staffing requirements were extrapolated from the judgeship projections.
- Trial Court Facility Guidelines, developed by the Task Force and later adopted by the Judicial Council, were used as a basis for developing space requirements based on judgeship and staff projections. Application of these guidelines results in 8,500 to 10,000 USF per courtroom (the requisite increase to BGSF includes circulation and building structure as well). Analysis of the 58 facility master plans confirmed the high side of the Task Force analysis, with the statewide average USF per courtroom calculated at 10,160 USF.
- Local superior court public service objectives, including how best to serve the public, were examined in each master plan. The distribution of court facilities and the types of cases that are heard at each location vary from county to county. The master plan process determined which court services could be expanded to more locations, or, conversely, which court facilities and services could be consolidated and how access could be best provided to court services in the county.

After space requirements were developed and existing building condition and capacity were confirmed by the master plan team, the team examined how best to meet the service delivery goals of the court. A master plan solution to the capital needs of each court is presented in each facility master plan, including the types and amounts of space required, the time frame in which construction or renovation projects should be initiated and completed, and the estimated cost of each project in 2002 dollars. Capital projects include building new court facilities, renovating existing court facilities, and expanding existing facilities.

3. Prioritization of Trial Court Capital Projects Identified in Master Plans. The third step in the capital planning process was to prioritize individual projects identified in the 58 master plans and then consolidate these projects into a statewide plan. The AOC developed a procedure that was adopted by the Judicial Council in August 2003, which is referenced as Appendix A of the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2006–2007. This procedure, while complex, sought to prioritize these projects on an unbiased and consistent basis. The procedure evaluated 201 capital projects identified in the master plans to be initiated in the second quarter of 2010 or earlier. The resulting Trial Court Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan, a first in the state of California, was approved by the Judicial Council for submission to the Department of Finance in February 2004. The prioritized list of projects that was approved at that time can be referenced under Appendix B of the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2006–2007.

4. Substitutions in Ranked Projects in Capital Outlay Plan. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1473, the AOC submitted to the Department of Finance a Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, entitled AB 1473 Five-Year Capitalized Asset Plan FY 2005–2006. Based on subsequent discussions with staff of the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office, AOC staff recommended modifications of the capital outlay plan for Judicial Council approval. The main recommendation was the combination of two lists (demonstration projects and ranked projects) to provide the single prioritized list the state is familiar with. Staff also recommended that project phasing anomalies in the ranked list be corrected. As in last year’s plan, this Five-Year Plan includes the limited reranking within some of the 58 courts, based on the policies adopted by the Judicial Council in December 2004. These policies include:

- Eliminate the separate list of demonstration projects previously proposed as part of the capital outlay plan and report back to the council regarding the demonstration project concept.
- Return the eight previously proposed demonstration projects, which were not funded, to the ranked list at their previous ranking, and report to the council the results of the study phase for these projects. Based on this policy, the two cross-jurisdictional projects (one for Plumas/Sierra and one for Placer/Nevada) would be ranked one and two respectively.
- Allow ranked projects to be reordered (within each superior court) to reflect the superior court’s master plan priorities, logical project phasing, or exceptional circumstances. This substitution process would not affect the rankings of projects from other superior courts.

In January 2005 and based on this policy, the AOC requested each of the 58 courts to submit recommended substitutions to that court’s ranking in the capital outlay plan, including the rationale for each modification. In spring 2005, the AOC reviewed the requests. Overall, 41 courts had no changes, while 16 courts had recommended alterations that were incorporated in whole or in part.

5. Trial Court Prioritized List of Capital Projects. Table 6 presents a list of 201 prioritized trial court capital projects. Project names have been updated to provide uniformity and clarity. The list of projects presents the estimated total project costs in January 2006 dollars.

The updated cost figures were derived from the July 2002 master plan costs escalated to January 2006, based on the assumptions presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Project Cost Escalation Rates, July 2002 through December 2005

<u>Escalation Period</u>	<u>Escalation Rate</u>
July 2002 – December 2002	2%
January 2003 – December 2003	4%
January 2004 – December 2004	18%
January 2005 – December 2005	<u>18%</u>
Total	42%
Total Escalation Compounded Over Escalation Period	<u>47.7%</u>

These escalation rates are based on inflation and market forces that the California construction industry has continued to experience over the past few years. The escalation rate of 18 percent each calendar year from January 2004 to December 2005 includes a 20 percent factor for dramatic market swings over and above 15 percent escalation, due to (1) increased construction in school, hospital, and public sector buildings; (2) general scarcity of materials and labor; and (3) national and international market factors. Additionally, national market demands on the construction industry and resulting elevated costs could be attributed to the hurricane disasters of 2005. The total cost of the trial court capital outlay plan will be higher than the total costs in January 2006 dollars, due to actual land acquisition costs and other project development costs as well as the escalation to the midpoint of construction, although anticipated increases in costs will be somewhat offset by confirming project scopes.

The estimated total project costs for project #'s 1, 4, 5, and 7 listed in Table 6—for which funding has been requested—include escalation to the midpoint of construction, using inflation factors from the Department of Finance. The cost for the project ranked #3—Merced County, New Merced Court—represents the state contribution to a county-funded project to consolidate the inadequate court facilities in downtown Merced. For project #6, authorization for the AOC to enter into a lease-purchase agreement with the County of Fresno was approved for the New Fresno Area Juvenile Court. The project will be funded by the county, with the AOC leasing a portion of the building from the county for court use. The estimated cost in Table 6 presented for project #6 represents an estimate of the state's portion of the total project cost.

Of the 201 trial court projects, 101 are new construction projects to replace obsolete existing court facilities, 55 are renovations to existing court facilities, and 45 are expansions of existing or future court facilities.

Table 6: February 2006 Prioritized List of Trial Court Capital Projects

Note: These project costs are in millions in January 2006 dollars and do not include escalation to the midpoint of construction or unanticipated increases to the cost of acquiring land and other development costs. Project costs for #'s 1, 4, 5, and 7 include escalation to the midpoint of construction.

State Rank	RCP Score	County	Project	Total Project Cost (January 2006 dollars in millions)
1	920	Plumas/Sierra	New Portola/Loyalton Court	\$ 6,024,000
2	739	Placer/Nevada	New Tahoe/Truckee Regional Court	11,500,000
3	890	Merced	New Merced Court	3,040,000
4	633	Contra Costa	New East Contra Costa Court	63,979,000
5	284	Fresno	Renovate B. F. Sisk Fresno Federal Court	31,627,000
6	498	Fresno	New Fresno Area Juvenile Delinquency Court	22,195,000
7	820	Mono	New Mammoth Lakes Court	15,075,000
8	490	Humboldt	New Eureka Court	94,757,000
9	800	Merced	New Los Banos Court	16,117,000
10	800	Riverside	New Moreno Valley Court (W Reg)	25,069,000
11	772	San Benito	New Hollister Court	27,931,000
12	770	Napa	Renovate Napa Juvenile Court	3,583,000
13	660	Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	34,273,000
14	714	Siskiyou	New Yreka Court	28,151,000
15	410	San Joaquin	New Stockton Court	72,738,000
16	629	Imperial	New El Centro Family Court	21,905,000
17	727	Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Court (SE)	98,535,000
18	725	Calaveras	New San Andreas Court	27,392,000
19	724	Madera	New Madera Court	121,482,000
20	718	Placer	Addition to Roseville Court	15,818,000
21	718	Yolo	New Woodland Court	113,232,000
22	750	Siskiyou	New Siskiyou Service Centers	5,989,000
23	708	Lassen	New Susanville Court	38,591,000
24	705	Orange	Addition to Laguna Niguel Court	47,657,000
25	700	Imperial	Addition to Calexico Court	4,965,000
26	667	Santa Clara	New San Jose Family Resources Court	158,089,000
27	666	Amador	New Jackson Court	26,860,000
28	548	Santa Barbara	Renovation and Addition to Santa Barbara Figueroa Court	36,391,000
29	653	El Dorado	New Placerville Court	37,564,000
30	417	Los Angeles	New Long Beach Criminal Court (S)	186,365,000
31	634	San Bernardino	New San Bernardino Court	123,940,000
32	840	Contra Costa	New Martinez Juvenile Court	15,039,000
33	746	San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Court	49,710,000
34	730	Imperial	Renovate Winterhaven Court	548,000
35	623	Tulare	New Porterville Court	62,452,000
36	617	San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Court	55,230,000
37	604	San Diego	New Central San Diego Court	330,737,000
38	597	Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Court	738,000
39	596	Mendocino	New Ukiah Court	31,918,000
40	592	Tehama	New Red Bluff Court	17,358,000
41	590	Alpine	New Markleeville Court	7,179,000
42	588	Sutter	New Yuba City Court	55,323,000
43	800	Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Court	3,553,000
44	579	Lake	New Lakeport Court	30,138,000
45	569	Sierra	New Downieville Court	7,636,000

Table 6: February 2006 Prioritized List of Trial Court Capital Projects

Note: These project costs are in millions in January 2006 dollars and do not include escalation to the midpoint of construction or unanticipated increases to the cost of acquiring land and other development costs. Project costs for #'s 1, 4, 5, and 7 include escalation to the midpoint of construction.

State Rank	RCP Score	County	Project	Total Project Cost (January 2006 dollars in millions)
46	181	San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Court	38,646,000
47	566	Plumas	New Quincy Court	23,331,000
48	564	Kern	New Taft Court	10,592,000
49	558	Yolo	New Yolo County Juvenile Court	6,396,000
50	550	Tuolumne	New Sonora Court	40,642,000
51	549	Monterey	Addition to Salinas Court	33,846,000
52	770	Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Court	4,716,000
53	544	Contra Costa	New North Concord Court	83,816,000
54	309	Kern	Renovate Bakersfield Court	646,000
55	541	Butte	New Chico Court	22,886,000
56	347	Stanislaus	New Modesto Court	31,418,000
57	537	Mariposa	New Mariposa Court	18,893,000
58	445	Sacramento	New Sacramento Criminal Court	229,584,000
59	527	Solano	Renovation and Addition to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse	17,812,000
60	526	Madera	Renovate Madera Court	7,476,000
61	525	Glenn	Renovate Willows Historic Court	13,493,000
62	364	Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	9,324,000
63	518	Santa Clara	New Mountain View Court	76,394,000
64	514	Inyo	New Bishop Court	11,322,000
65	510	Solano	Renovate Fairfield Hall of Justice/Law & Justice Center	3,822,000
66	506	Nevada	New Nevada City Court	54,946,000
67	544	Kern	New Mojave Court	16,625,000
68	829	Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Ctr and 7 New Service Centers	63,226,000
69	496	Shasta	New Redding Court	116,528,000
70	585	Humboldt	New Garberville Court	5,902,000
71	440	San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Court	41,667,000
72	488	Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Court	18,508,000
73	477	Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Historic Anacapa Court	4,879,000
74	519	Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Criminal Court	130,564,000
75	469	San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Court	10,823,000
76	457	Mariposa	Renovate Mariposa Court	76,000
77	456	Solano	New South Wing and Renovation of Fairfield Old School – Phase One	63,569,000
78	450	Alameda	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Court	107,902,000
79	450	Marin	New Marin Civic Center Court - North	63,035,000
80	448	Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Court	136,711,000
81	0	Sacramento	Renovate Sacramento Wm Ridgeway Family Relations Court	7,579,000
82	652	Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Court (JDel)	74,243,000
83	489	San Diego	Renovate San Diego Meadowlark Juvenile Court	18,025,000
84	431	Riverside	Renovate Riverside Historic Court (W Reg)	5,273,000
85	430	Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Court	51,386,000
86	427	San Diego	New Vista Court	79,595,000
87	424	Monterey	New Monterey Bay Civil and Family Court	57,712,000
88	75	Sacramento	Renovate Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	18,668,000

Table 6: February 2006 Prioritized List of Trial Court Capital Projects

Note: These project costs are in millions in January 2006 dollars and do not include escalation to the midpoint of construction or unanticipated increases to the cost of acquiring land and other development costs. Project costs for #'s 1, 4, 5, and 7 include escalation to the midpoint of construction.

State Rank	RCP Score	County	Project	Total Project Cost (January 2006 dollars in millions)
89	499	Kern	New Ridgecrest Court	10,198,000
90	440	Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Court (MH)	30,886,000
91	421	Los Angeles	New Eastlake Juvenile Court (JDel)	36,688,000
92	419	San Mateo	Addition to Central San Mateo Court	5,074,000
93	417	Imperial	Renovate El Centro Court	17,851,000
94	420	Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Court (C)	756,737,000
95	411	Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	5,723,000
96	380	San Joaquin	Renovate Stockton Court	31,893,000
97	410	Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old School – Phase Two	22,332,000
98	421	Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Court	87,956,000
99	404	Yuba	New Marysville Court	46,949,000
100	389	Lake	New Clearlake Court	12,275,000
101	387	Imperial	Renovate El Centro Court - Phase 2	2,001,000
102	387	Imperial	Addition to El Centro Court	70,228,000
103	384	Los Angeles	New Long Beach Civil Court (S)	65,634,000
104	383	Riverside	New Indio Juvenile Court (Desert Reg)	15,231,000
105	382	Nevada	New Truckee Court	19,177,000
106	633	San Joaquin	New Lodi Court	22,582,000
107	373	Kings	New Hanford Court	80,063,000
108	372	Tehama	Addition to Red Bluff Court	10,119,000
109	369	Los Angeles	Renovate Lancaster Court (N)	4,655,000
110	367	Trinity	New Weaverville Court	10,593,000
111	477	Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Court	120,072,000
112	362	Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Court (E)	68,891,000
113	357	Los Angeles	New Glendale Court (NC)	83,441,000
114	309	Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Court	31,418,000
115	344	San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Court	44,565,000
116	343	Humboldt	New Hoopa Court	5,479,000
117	338	San Mateo	Addition to San Mateo Juvenile Court	1,659,000
118	316	Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Court	59,277,000
119	409	Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Court - Phase 2	22,017,000
120	309	Orange	Addition to Fullerton Court	44,766,000
121	541	Stanislaus	New Turlock Court	34,892,000
122	307	Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Jury Assembly	518,000
123	306	Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Court (SW)	9,635,000
124	820	Fresno	New Clovis Court	31,136,000
125	305	Placer	New Auburn Court	34,452,000
126	302	Los Angeles	Renovate Van Nuys Court East (NW)	49,790,000
127	296	Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Court	162,244,000
128	295	Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Court (W)	26,123,000
129	293	Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	12,045,000
130	288	San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Court	79,468,000
131	305	Fresno	Renovate Fresno Juvenile Dependency	5,224,000
132	284	San Diego	Renovate Ramona Court	163,000
133	282	Nevada	Renovate Truckee Court	332,000

Table 6: February 2006 Prioritized List of Trial Court Capital Projects

Note: These project costs are in millions in January 2006 dollars and do not include escalation to the midpoint of construction or unanticipated increases to the cost of acquiring land and other development costs. Project costs for #'s 1, 4, 5, and 7 include escalation to the midpoint of construction.

State Rank	RCP Score	County	Project	Total Project Cost (January 2006 dollars in millions)
134	278	Riverside	New Temecula Court (Mid-Cnty Reg)	16,737,000
135	534	Sacramento	Renovate Sacramento Juvenile Justice Center	4,975,000
136	275	Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Court	134,426,000
137	271	Riverside	Addition to Corona Court (W Reg)	14,473,000
138	271	San Diego	New Chula Vista Court	111,957,000
139	265	Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Court (NC)	7,267,000
140	263	Kern	New Delano Court	17,113,000
141	255	Santa Clara	Addition to San Jose Civil Court	98,979,000
142	252	Riverside	New Banning Court (Mid-Cnty Reg)	27,677,000
143	248	Del Norte	Addition to Crescent City Court	20,538,000
144	245	Ventura	New Ventura East County Court	88,935,000
145	243	San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Court	61,077,000
146	239	Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Court	11,467,000
147	236	Los Angeles	Addition to New Southeast Los Angeles Court (SE)	42,891,000
148	234	Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Court (NE)	36,852,000
149	227	Riverside	Addition to Riverside Juvenile Court (W Reg)	15,299,000
150	223	Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Court (W)	124,283,000
151	0	San Bernardino	Addition to Joshua Tree Court	11,338,000
152	215	Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Court (E)	29,751,000
153	213	Kings	Renovations to Avenal and Corcoran Courts	321,000
154	204	Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Court (E)	131,885,000
155	195	Riverside	New Indio Court (Desert Reg)	148,444,000
156	187	Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Court (SW)	25,439,000
157	184	Colusa	New Colusa Court - North	13,216,000
158	184	Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Court South (E)	27,310,000
159	0	San Bernardino	Addition to Juvenile Dependency Court	33,767,000
160	174	Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Court (C)	146,164,000
161	166	Kern	Renovate Lake Isabella Court	96,000
162	163	Los Angeles	New Compton Court (SC)	61,906,000
163	156	Riverside	Addition to Hemet Court (Mid-Cnty Reg)	15,357,000
164	149	Riverside	Renovate Palm Springs Court (Desert Reg)	6,922,000
165	131	Riverside	New Blythe Court (Desert Reg)	21,990,000
166	0	Ventura	New Ventura West County Court	63,064,000
167	120	Los Angeles	Addition to Alhambra Court (NE)	44,782,000
168	120	Los Angeles	Renovate Alhambra Court (NE)	13,184,000
169	117	Fresno	Renovate Fresno North Jail Annex Court	3,042,000
170	112	Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Court (C)	40,453,000
171	111	Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Court (SE)	11,833,000
172	111	San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Court	1,536,000
173	106	Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Court (SC)	28,059,000
174	100	San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	1,918,000
175	94	Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	86,380,000
176	80	Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Court (JD)	106,323,000
177	276	Sacramento	Renovate Sacramento Gordon D. Schaber Court	19,353,000
178	68	Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Court (SE)	5,623,000
179	63	Riverside	Addition to Riverside Hall of Justice (W Reg)	26,738,000

Table 6: February 2006 Prioritized List of Trial Court Capital Projects

Note: These project costs are in millions in January 2006 dollars and do not include escalation to the midpoint of construction or unanticipated increases to the cost of acquiring land and other development costs. Project costs for #'s 1, 4, 5, and 7 include escalation to the midpoint of construction.

State Rank	RCP Score	County	Project	Total Project Cost (January 2006 dollars in millions)
180	58	Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Court	2,249,000
181	46	Riverside	Addition to Larson Justice Center (Mid-Cnty Reg)	127,349,000
182	40	Riverside	Addition to Riverside Family Law Court (W Reg)	25,691,000
183	16	Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Court (NV)	10,320,000
184	0	Fresno	New Fresno Civil and Traffic Court	113,800,000
185	0	Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Court	139,983,000
186	0	Glenn	Addition to Willows Historic Court	10,712,000
187	0	Kern	Addition to New Taft Court	10,511,000
188	0	Los Angeles	Complete Michael Antonovich Antelope Valley Court (N)	5,685,000
189	0	Los Angeles	Complete Chatsworth Court (NV)	7,246,000
190	0	Merced	Addition to New Merced Court	31,060,000
191	0	Orange	New East County Court	64,831,000
192	0	Placer	Addition to Roseville Court - Phase 2	31,722,000
193	0	Riverside	New Civil Court (Mid-Cnty Reg)	38,151,000
194	0	Riverside	New Riverside Civil Court (W Reg)	58,237,000
195	424	Sacramento	New Sacramento Court Administration Building	56,195,000
196	0	San Benito	Addition to New Hollister Court	11,517,000
197	568	San Bernardino	Addition and Renovation of Needles Court	3,574,000
198	222	San Bernardino	Renovation of Joshua Tree Courthouse	3,122,000
199	0	San Diego	New East Mesa Juvenile Court	11,450,000
200	0	Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Juvenile Court	3,452,000
201	123	Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	50,282,000
Total in millions				\$ 9,091,621,000
Total in billions				\$ 9.092

6. Completed Studies. The AOC has been refining project scope and costs for several of the demonstration projects proposed in Five-Year Infrastructure Plan FY 2005–2006 and, in some cases, has explored new service delivery models and development partnerships. The project findings have been completed, and final reports have either been issued or are being prepared. These reports confirm each project’s space program and cost, explore options for project delivery, confirm parking requirements, and validate site requirements for new construction.

The following studies have been completed:

<u>County</u>	<u>Project</u>
Plumas/Sierra	New Portola/Loyalton Court
Placer/Nevada	New Tahoe/Truckee Regional Court
Fresno	Renovate B. F. Sisk Fresno Federal Court
Imperial	New El Centro Family Court
Orange	Addition to Laguna Niguel Court
El Dorado	New Placerville Court
San Diego	New Central San Diego Court
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Court

Funding requests have been submitted to the Department of Finance for the Plumas/Sierra and Fresno projects indicated above. Other project funding requests, based on the completed studies, may be submitted to the Department of Finance when adequate funding is available and when the possible future updates to the trial court capital outlay plan have been completed, as discussed below.

7. FY 2006–2007 Major Trial Court Capital Outlay Projects Submitted to Governor.

As shown in Table 7, FY 2006–2007 requests for funding authorization for the following projects have been submitted to the Department of Finance. The Contra Costa and Plumas/Sierra projects were included in the Governor’s January 2005 budget. Additional funding for those two projects—in addition to funding for the Mono and Fresno projects—was requested in a February 2006 Spring Finance letter for inclusion in the final budget.

Table 7: FY 2006–2007 Major Trial Court Capital Outlay Projects Submitted to Governor

<u>Project</u>	<u>\$ (in millions)</u>	<u>Phases*</u>
Contra Costa, New East Contra Costa Court....	\$ 5.332	A and P
Mono, New Mammoth Lakes Court.....	2.055	A and P
Plumas/Sierra, New Portola/Loyalton Court	0.706	A and P
Fresno, Renovation of B. F. Sisk Fresno Federal Court.....	31.627	P, W, and C
Total	\$ 39.720	

* A = Land acquisition; P = Preliminary design; W = Working drawings; C = Construction

B. Current Planning Activities and Future Updates to Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan

AOC staff is currently developing a proposed method for reprioritizing the list of trial court capital projects, based on direction from the Interim Court Facilities Panel (Interim Panel). The initial concepts include developing a simplified method that links the main objectives of the trial

court capital program to fewer, more focused criteria for prioritization. Staff anticipates that the new method will result in a revised set of priorities to guide the future funding requests.

In addition, the Interim Panel directed the AOC to continue to examine the costs associated with all current and future capital projects and alternative ways to prioritize them, to seek cooperation from counties to assist in funding those projects whenever possible, and to develop a cost-analysis approach that is consistently applicable to courts throughout the state. If the state assumes responsibility for seismic upgrades to court facilities, seismic condition will need to be factored into the overall prioritization of projects, and the costs associated with these upgrades will need to be quantified.

C. Drivers of Need

Several drivers of need underlie the trial court capital outlay plan. These are described below.

1. Lack of Security and Poor Physical Conditions. The conditions of California's court facilities are both the primary driver of need for capital improvement and the basis for this Five-Year Infrastructure Plan. These conditions include poor security; a significant shortfall in space; poor functional conditions, including those that result in unsafe facilities; and inadequate physical conditions. The Task Force Final Report provides compelling information about the need for improving existing court space and providing additional space for California's trial courts, as listed below.

- a. A significant number of court facilities and courtrooms are not secure. Movement of in-custody defendants through public areas of court facilities presents a real risk to public safety, given that more than two million in-custody defendants are walked through California's courthouses each year.

Over half of all buildings were rated by the Task Force as either marginal or deficient for judicial/staff circulation, secure circulation, and building security. As many as 15 percent of all courtrooms have deficient in-custody defendant holding or access areas. The types of security problems identified by the Task Force include the following:

- *No entrance screening for weapons.* Many courts, particularly those located in historic or small buildings, do not have the physical capacity to accommodate the magnetometer, x-ray machine, and staff required to operate a weapons screening station. Other court facilities have multiple entrances, making it difficult to implement weapons screening stations at a reasonable cost.
- *Lack of holding cells.* Many court facilities do not have on-site holding cells for in-custody defendants transferred from the jail for court appearances. As a result, some courts must hold in-custody defendants in rooms not designed for in-custody holding, monitored by several security staff. In other courts, in-custody defendants are brought to the court facility in small groups and held in the courtroom or hallway while being monitored by deputy sheriffs.

- *Lack of hallway space and waiting areas.* Many courts do not have sufficient hallway and waiting areas to allow for reasonable separation between defendants, victims, jurors, and the public. As a result, court security staff is needed to keep order in public areas outside the courtroom.
- *Unsafe circulation areas.* Many court facilities do not have adequate separate circulation areas for moving inmates, judges, and staff. Lack of separate, secure circulation results in security staff using unsafe paths to transport in-custody inmates. The internal circulation patterns for a court facility in which in-custody cases are heard should include three separate and distinct zones for public, private, and secured circulation. The public circulation zone provides access to each public area of the building. The private circulation zone provides limited-access corridors between specific functions to court staff, judicial officers, escorted jurors, and security personnel. The secured circulation zone for in-custody defendants should be completely separate from the public and staff circulation zones, providing access between the secured in-custody entrance (sally port), central holding and intake areas, attorney interview rooms, courtroom holding areas, and courtrooms.

- b. 23 court facilities are in temporary buildings or trailers, and 25 percent lack space to assemble jurors.⁶ These facilities are in extremely poor condition, lack any type of security, are functionally insufficient to support court operations, and are sometimes inaccessible.
- c. California's court facilities are not fully accessible, and many buildings do not fully meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

More than half of all court facilities require moderate renovation or replacement of ADA features, and one-third require major renovation or replacement of such features. These conditions lead to reduced access to the courts for many Californians.

- d. Many court facilities need substantial seismic improvements.

While the Task Force made preliminary findings on the need for seismic improvements, those findings were generic, based only on structure type and age. In 2003, the AOC prepared more thorough seismic safety assessments of court buildings under the Trial Court Facilities Act, section 70327. About half of the court facilities statewide were exempted from evaluation.⁷ Of the 225 court buildings assessed, 162 have been assigned unacceptable seismic safety ratings, as defined by the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. These unacceptable buildings contain about 65 percent of all court space in the state. Some assessment findings remain in draft form, pending review of additional information being provided by the counties through the transfer process.

⁶ *Final Report of the Task Force on Court Facilities*, Oct. 1, 2001.

⁷ The Trial Court Facilities Act requires seismic assessment as part of the transfer process but exempts certain buildings and allows other discretionary exemptions. The AOC did not evaluate relatively new or recently upgraded buildings; leased, abandoned, modular, or storage facilities; some facilities used only part-time as courts; or facilities whose area was both less than 10,000 square feet and a minimal portion of the total building area.

- e. The infrastructure systems of many buildings are not up to modern health and life safety requirements.

Major improvements are needed in fire protection, HVAC, life safety, plumbing, electrical, and communications systems. The systems deficiencies adversely affect both the safety of staff and public and the efficiency of court operations.

- f. California's courts are aging.

Over 70 percent of the court area statewide is housed in buildings that are more than 20 years old. Approximately 24 percent of the court area statewide is in buildings more than 40 years old. The age of buildings and of their major systems is a fundamental reason for the need for substantial renovation of the state's court facilities.

- g. Space shortfalls in court facilities for most counties range from 40 to 65 percent of required space if all space were reused, based on application of the Trial Court Facilities Guidelines. Staff areas are crowded, and many administrative and support spaces are inadequately sized. Many courtrooms are undersized.

The Task Force found significant area shortfalls in court administration, trial court support, in-custody holding/access, court security, family court services, and jury assembly areas. Crowding and unmet demand for space affect the courts' ability to serve the public. Crowding is a logical consequence of additional assigned judges, commissioners, and hearing officers needed to meet an increased workload.

Three-fifths of all of California's more than 2,100 courtrooms are smaller than the minimum guideline area of 1,500 usable square feet. One-third of all courtrooms are less than 1,200 usable square feet in area. Undersized courtrooms result in unsafe conditions, due to crowding in the well areas; inadequate waiting room for litigants, victims, and witnesses; inadequate jury boxes; and lack of accessibility for disabled persons.

- 2. Current Need for Additional Judges.** A secondary, but still important, underlying driver of need for major capital investment in the California trial court system is the need for space to accommodate additional judgeships currently required to adequately serve the public.

A 2004 report to the California Judicial Council, *Update of Judicial Needs Study*—following up on the California Judicial Needs Assessment Project of 2001—identified a statewide need for 355 new judgeships in California's trial courts. The 2001 study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), the nation's leader in state court research, consulting, and education. The study involved a two-month analysis of 337 judicial officers to determine the amounts of time required for case processing. Although the project identified a need for approximately 355 judgeships, the Judicial Council has approved a request for only the most critically needed 150 judgeships over the next three years, in consideration of the state's ongoing fiscal crisis. Over the next 10 years, additional judgeships may be required to adequately serve the public.

Each new judgeship requires approximately 10,000 USF to provide adequate space for a courtroom and associated support space for both staff and courtroom functions, such as jury facilities, public meeting space, clerk and filing counters, and in-custody holding.

3. Consolidation of Facilities. In addition to facility condition and the need for new judgeships, the Task Force and facility master plans identified opportunities to consolidate facilities to improve service to the public, avoid duplication of services, and improve efficient delivery of court services in the state. Opportunities for consolidation result from several conditions. Some counties have historically lacked funds or the political will to provide consolidated facilities to meet additional court space requirements. Rather than expand or replace existing court facilities, some counties have leased commercial office space or acquired temporary modular buildings that may not be physically connected to existing court facilities. Some opportunities for consolidation of court facilities result from trial court unification. Some courts that still operate several former municipal court facilities have recognized there are various service delivery and operational benefits to consolidating a number of small facilities into one larger facility.

When the proposed 201 capital projects are completed, approximately 120 obsolete facilities will be vacated by the court.

4. Improved Access to the Courts. Expanding access to justice is one of several primary goals of the Judicial Council. The facility master plans completed in 2003 identified a number of areas in the state where access to justice could be increased by construction of a new court facility or expansion of an existing court facility. When the proposed capital projects are completed, access to court services will be improved for many Californians.

D. Inventory of Trial Court Space

The key findings from the Task Force's inventory and evaluation process characterize the existing state of trial court facilities. The Task Force reported an inventory in California of 451 facilities, including over 2,100 courtrooms and 10 million USF.

Most of California's trial court facilities are housed in mixed-use buildings, and the courts and court-related agencies (such as public defender, district attorney, and probation) are the dominant use in such buildings. Approximately 9 million USF (89 percent) are in county-owned buildings and 1.1 million USF (11 percent) are in commercially leased buildings.

The functional evaluation of buildings indicates significant need for functional improvement of court buildings statewide. Only 45 percent of all usable area of courts is located in buildings rated functionally and physically adequate, while 22 percent is located in buildings that have serious functional problems. Approximately 21 percent of all courtrooms were rated deficient for their current use, principally due to deficient holding, security, or in-custody access. These security-related deficiencies strongly affect the ability of courts to ensure the safety of court participants and the public. In some court facilities, the lack of adequate in-custody defendant holding and secure circulation requires sheriff personnel to move shackled defendants through public hallways.

E. Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs

Additional space is required to meet current needs and space requirements for new judgeships. The unmet need for space in California’s trial courts is presented in Table 8. Space requirements assume that 10,000 USF are required for each new judgeship. Given the limited fiscal resources of the state, new judgeships are presented as a range. The Governor’s budget proposes funding 150 new judges over the next three years, while the National Center for State Courts identified a current need for approximately 355 judgeships.

Table 8: Unmet Trial Court Facility Needs

	USF (in millions)	Assumptions
Total Current Space Needs	19.0	Task Force Final Report
<i>Plus</i> Space Required for Current Need for Additional Judges	1.5 to 3.5	150 to 355 judges at 10,000 USF per courtroom
<i>Less</i> Current Space Available	10.1	Task Force Final Report
Total Unmet Facility Needs	10.4 to 12.4	

F. Alternative Approaches to Meeting Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs

Starting with the planning analysis completed by the Task Force for each of the 58 courts, the facility master plans examined several factors in developing a capital outlay plan for each county. Each facility master plan considered how best to provide court services to the county, in the context of the recent consolidation of the superior and municipal courts, local demographic trends, court operational goals, the constraints and opportunities of the existing court facilities, and the Facility Guidelines adopted by the Judicial Council. Service goals resulted in consolidating courts to increase operational efficiency or expanding court services in underserved parts of counties. Each master plan solution consequently determines how best to meet the unmet trial court facility needs for each of the 58 trial courts in California.

G. Facilities to Meet Trial Court Unmet Needs and Proposed Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

The proposed Five-Year Trial Court Infrastructure Plan for the trial courts is based on the prioritized list of projects presented as Table 6. While the Governor proposes funding \$800 million for FY 2006–2007 to FY 2010–2011 and funding \$1 billion for FY 2011–2012 to FY 2015–2016, this plan presents the annual estimated funding requirement to fund all proposed projects over a 10-year implementation period, with all projects being completed at the end of the 10 years. This plan proposes that 180–185 projects will start preliminary design or land acquisition from FY 2007–2008 to FY 2011–2012. Funding is presumed available in January 2007.

As presented in Table 9, the annual estimated funding request increases from \$57 million in FY 2007–2008 to \$400 million in FY 2008–2009. Future fiscal year funding requests range from \$1.2 to \$3.9 billion dollars. If a bond is approved by voters in 2006, then FY 2007–2008 and

future funding requests may be amended. The annual funding request estimates presented in that table reflect the projected value of phases of projects that take several years to complete. All costs are presented in 2006 dollars. As indicated in this plan, the AOC continues to review all project costs to account for escalation increases to the midpoint of construction as well as unanticipated increases in land acquisition and other project development costs. The total cost of the trial court capital outlay plan may therefore be different from the amount of funds proposed in the court bond bill, due to a variety of factors.

Table 9 presents the estimated funding requirements for the Unfunded Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan from FY 2007–2008 to FY 2012–2013, based on these assumptions.

Table 9: Estimated Funding Request to Implement Unfunded Trial Court Infrastructure Plan FY 2007–2008 to FY 2012–2013 (2006 dollars)

<u>FY</u>	<u>\$ (Billions in 2006 dollars)</u>
2007–2008	\$ 0.057
2008–2009	0.400
2009–2010	1.200
2010–2011	1.400
2011–2012	2.000
2012–2013	<u>3.986</u>
Total Unfunded	<u>\$ 9.043</u>

H. Consequences of Not Addressing Identified Needs

California’s court buildings will only continue to deteriorate if facilities problems are not addressed. If improvements are delayed, their scope and cost to correct will increase dramatically, and, as the state population continues to grow, both the public and the justice system will suffer from increasingly overtaxed, unsafe, and inefficient court buildings. Major funding is needed to permit the judicial branch to move quickly to correct these significant problems, thus supporting both the branch’s role as a national leader in innovative court programming and its commitment to equal access for all Californians.

Several specific consequences could result if the unmet facility needs of California’s Trial Courts are not addressed.

1. In-Custody Movement Costs Remain High. Given that over half of all court buildings were rated by the Task Force as either marginal or deficient for judicial/staff circulation, secure circulation, and building security, the court system will continue to bear the cost of sheriff personnel directly escorting in-custody defendants in and throughout court facilities, unless these

conditions are corrected. Every court facility that does not have secure circulation from the holding cell area (if one exists) to a courtroom requires sworn deputies to escort in-custody defendants through public and staff/judicial corridors.

In a modern court facility, in-custody defendants are transported throughout a building using elevators and hallways devoted to secure movement, which reduces the number of sheriff personnel required for supervised in-custody movement. Given the fact that more than 2 million in-custody defendants are walked through California's court facilities each year, the lack of secure circulation in criminal court facilities is a major budgetary issue and a functional problem throughout the state. With updated facilities that address these issues, many courts would be able to redeploy existing security staff more efficiently and potentially operate at a lower cost.

2. Unsafe Conditions Persist. Given the lack of secure circulation and other life safety conditions at many California court facilities, unsafe conditions will persist unless the trial court capital outlay plan is implemented. These conditions include the lack of fire alarm systems, the lack of safe emergency egress paths, the lack of secure circulation (described above), and the lack of seismically sound building structures.

3. Facilities Continue to Deteriorate. California's courts are aging, and continued lack of investment in its court facilities will lead to continued deterioration of buildings, including roofs, mechanical and electrical systems, and other basic building components.

4. Scattered and Unconsolidated Facilities Must Be Maintained. Implementing this plan will result in consolidation of former municipal courts into full-service superior courts. Approximately 120 obsolete facilities will be vacated when the Five-Year Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan is implemented. Maintaining small leased court facilities and temporary modular buildings hinders courts' abilities to provide accessible and efficient service to the public. Consolidation of criminal functions also results in operational savings for the broader criminal justice system of district attorneys, sheriffs, correctional institutions, and public defenders. The consolidation of criminal court functions is the result of some 45 proposed court projects.

5. Space for New Judges Will Not Be Provided in Consolidated Facilities. Implementing this Five-Year Infrastructure Plan will provide space for new judges in consolidated facilities. California is a growing state, and additional judges are required to provide proper service to its residents. If California does not prepare to provide space for new judges in consolidated, state-owned facilities, but rather leases and converts commercial office space into court facilities, the state's court facilities will become even more scattered and disparate. In addition, leasing space for court facilities is relatively expensive because of the requirements for secure circulation and holding cells.

I. Reconciliation to Previous Plan

The Five-Year Infrastructure Plan submitted last year for FY 2006–2007 included all 201 projects, and the costs of these projects were presented in 2005 dollars. Last year's plan included funding for all ongoing and proposed appellate court projects, with the exception of the expansion to the appellate court in Riverside, which is proposed in this plan.

V. Administrative Office of the Courts

The Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for the AOC includes limited funding for an expansion of conference space and a testing model courtroom on the second floor of the Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building in San Francisco. This proposal is consistent with the vision and mission of the AOC.

A. Purpose of the AOC

The AOC was established in 1960 as the staff agency for the Judicial Council of California, which oversees the administration of the state judicial system. Historically, the AOC was a specialized administrative agency operating in a highly centralized management environment. It was primarily responsible for the Judicial Council rule-making process and the direct management of administrative support for appellate courts in such areas as personnel, budget, and technology systems support. That role has evolved significantly over the course of the last decade as California's judicial system has undergone changes in response to increasing public expectations as well as evolving statutory requirements. These major changes have considerably altered the AOC's responsibilities to the Judicial Council, the courts, and the public, resulting in a transformation in organization, in function, and in the means of providing services.

Today, an AOC staff of more than 850 is required to provide services to over 20,000 judicial officers and branch employees of the trial and appellate courts in 65 courts at more than 450 locations. AOC staff work in collaboration with 16 Judicial Council advisory committees and 7 task forces, with more than 600 representatives from the courts, the State Bar, and the public, addressing important issues facing the judicial system.

The AOC is organized into the divisions described below.

- **Office of the General Counsel** provides both legal and policy advice and services to the Judicial Council, the AOC, and the courts.
- **Center for Families, Children & the Courts** seeks to ensure that the well-being of children, youth, and families is treated as a high priority within the California judicial system, and it encourages positive changes at both the trial and appellate court level.
- **Executive Office Programs Division** provides agency and Executive Office support, including research, innovation, and planning; Court Programs Services (presiding judges and court executives advisory committees); Court Interpreters Program; Office of Court Research; Planning and Effective Programs; Office of Communications; and Secretariat.
- **Education Division/Center for Judicial Education and Research** serves as the Judicial Council's education resource for the entire branch, offering statewide educational programs to judges and judicial branch staff at the trial and appellate court levels. This division includes the Administrative Services Unit, which provides clerical, copying, and distribution services to the AOC, Supreme Court, and Courts of Appeal. This unit also manages the Judicial Council Conference Center and AOC reception services.

- **Office of Governmental Affairs** promotes and maintains positive relations with the legislative and executive branches and advocates on behalf of the Judicial Council on legislative and budget matters.
- **Finance Division** provides budget planning, asset management, accounting, procurement, and contract management to the judicial branch and trial courts.
- **Human Resources Division** provides a complete range of personnel services to state judicial branch agencies.
- **Information Services Division** coordinates court technology statewide, manages centralized statewide technology efforts, and optimizes the scope and accessibility of accurate information statewide.
- **Appellate and Trial Court Judicial Services Division** provides staff coordination for various committees and task forces and serves as the liaison to the trial and appellate courts. This unit is responsible for managing the court-appointed counsel program that provides appellate defense representation for indigents.
- **Office of Court Construction and Management** provides for the capital planning, construction, and facility management of statewide court facilities. This division has staff located in San Francisco, Sacramento, and Burbank.
- **Regional Offices** opened in 2002 in Sacramento and Burbank to more effectively serve the courts. A third regional office, serving the San Francisco Bay Area and Northern Coastal region, is located in the AOC's headquarters in San Francisco.

B. Drivers of Need for AOC Space Expansion

The expansion of space for the AOC proposed in this Five-Year Infrastructure Plan is based on the need to provide additional staff, to provide associated conference and training space, to support several ongoing initiatives that improve service to the courts and court users, and to increase operational efficiency by providing consolidated information technology systems to each of the courts.

1. Statewide Treasury Function and Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS).

The AOC is creating a centralized treasury function and continuing the statewide rollout of CARS, the statewide financial system serving the courts.

2. Courts Human Resources Information System (CHRIS). The AOC is continuing the analysis, design, development, and implementation of a statewide human resources information system.

3. California Court Case Management System (CCMS). Continued development, implementation, and deployment of a statewide CCMS is under way by the AOC. The statewide case management solution will provide standardized information integration, facilitate consistent

business practices, and ensure a timely exchange of data for the trial courts and their state and local justice partners.

4. California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). The Technology Center is the hosting center for trial court applications, including CCMS, CARS, and CHRIS. In addition, it will be used for future applications, such as facilities management and data integration. The AOC is continuing to manage the migration of local courts from county-provided information technology services and to support the oversight and coordination of network, operational, and application transition to a statewide court Technology Center.

5. Regional Office Assistance Group (ROAG) Legal Services to the Trial Courts. The AOC has established a program to provide legal advice and assistance directly to the trial courts.

6. Collaborative Court-County Working Group on Enhanced Collections. The AOC is continuing to implement the statewide enhanced collection guidelines under Senate Bill 940 (Stats. 2003, ch. 275). The AOC staff assigned to this program provide technical assistance to the courts and counties in support of their collection program, facilitate the exchange of effective practices, and prepare and analyze data for annual reports to the Judicial Council and the Legislature.

7. Trial Court Facilities Act. Another significant new role and responsibility of the AOC was introduced with the enactment of the Trial Court Facilities Act. The AOC is currently in negotiations for the transfer of responsibility of the trial court facilities from the counties to the Judicial Council. The AOC is continuing to develop its organization in order to implement the major capital improvement program presented herein.

Owing to the expansion of services and attendant staff, the AOC is at full capacity in its present facility and will have inadequate space to meet anticipated needs. The AOC has completely used all its assigned space in the Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building (HJSB) during FY 2005–2006. Funding has been approved for expansion to 35,000 USF on the 8th floor of the HJSB. This project is currently in design.

The AOC is requesting approval in FY 2007–2008 for the expansion of the statewide court conferencing and training facilities into the 2nd floor of the HJSB by constructing conference/training rooms, hearing rooms, and, in addition, a prototypical “testing” courtroom used for training as well as technological and design investigation.

C. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Facilities

Administrative Office of the Courts

Existing Facility:	<i>AOC Headquarters – San Francisco</i> <i>455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco – 3rd, 5th, 6th & 7th Floors</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 219,070 USF• State-owned Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building (1999)• Staff in San Francisco – 720 authorized full-time equivalents, including temporary and consulting positions. This office includes the Bay Area/Northern Coastal Regional Office.
Current Status:	Space is being used at maximum capacity. In FY 2005–2006, the AOC is expanding from 175,111 USF to 219,070 USF to address staff growth. This includes an additional 35,000 USF on the 8th floor in the HJSB (now in design), as well as the relocation of the mail and copy center on the 6th floor to 6,976 USF on the first floor.
Needs:	Required Space 237,370 USF Current Space..... 219,070 USF Net Need 18,300 USF
Proposal:	To address the need for expanded conference and training space and to provide space for a test model and training courtroom, leasing of and improvements to 18,300 USF are requested for funding in FY 2007–2008.

Existing Facility:	<i>Office of Governmental Affairs</i> <i>770 L Street, Suite 700, Sacramento – 7th Floor</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8,313 USF • Commercial lease space in high-rise building • Staff – 15 	
Current Status:	The Office of Governmental Affairs is the Judicial Council’s liaison to the executive and legislative branches and is necessarily located near the state capitol. It has occupied this space since November 1999.	
Needs:	Required Space	8,313 USF
	Current Space	8,313 USF
	Net Current Need	0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.	

Existing Facility:	<i>Northern/Central Regional Office – Sacramento</i> <i>2880 and 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44,884 USF • Commercial lease space • Staff – 131 	
Current Status:	Growth in staff and resulting space needs to meet mandated programs and services to the trial courts require additional office space. In late 2005, the office expanded to 44,844 USF. The lease for this space includes an option to expand into an additional 29,647 USF in FY 2007–2008. The AOC plans to exercise this option owing to projected staff and the need for expanded conference facilities.	
Needs:	Required Space	74,531 USF
	Current Space	44,884 USF
	Net Current Need	29,647 USF
Proposal:	The expanded facility will adequately meet the needs of the agency.	

Existing Facility:	<i>Southern Regional Office – Burbank</i> <i>2233 North Ontario Street, Burbank – 1st Floor</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25,355 USF • Commercial lease space • Staff – 41 	
Current Status:	Growth in staff and resulting space needs to meet mandated programs and services to the trial courts required additional office space in FY 2005–2006. The office relocated to expanded space in summer 2005.	
Needs:	Required Space	25,355 USF
	Current Space	25,355 USF
	Net Current Need	0 USF
Proposal:	The expanded facility adequately meets the needs of the agency.	