

**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: AOC Office of Court Construction and Management
Kim Davis, Director, 415-865-4055, kim.davis@jud.ca.gov
Kelly Popejoy, Senior Manager of Planning,
818-558-3078, kelly.popejoy@jud.ca.gov

DATE: April 25, 2008

SUBJECT: Court Facilities Planning: Update to Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and
Fiscal Year 2009–2010 Capital-Outlay Funding Requests
(Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff recommends the adoption of the updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan (the plan) to include (1) the reevaluation of one project, (2) the removal of 20 projects for various reasons, (3) the combination of projects for two buildings, (4) the renaming of six projects for various reasons, (5) the adjustment to the statewide growth budget to remove facility funds for new judgeships now allocated to project budgets of proposed FY 2008–2009 and 2009–2010 capital-outlay projects, and (6) an annual update to current-need project budgets to January 2008 dollars. AOC staff also recommends that capital-outlay project funding requests be submitted to the executive branch to request FY 2009–2010 funding, pending the outcome of a proposed bond. These requests include initial funding for eight trial court projects and any trial court project funding request previously submitted to the executive branch that is not included in the FY 2008–2009 Budget Act. The updated plan and the project funding requests support the mission and policy direction of the Judicial Council in its long-range strategic plan—Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration and Goal VI, Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence—by providing safe and secure facilities and improving existing court facilities to allow adequate, suitable space for the conduct of court business. The recommended funding requests have been developed based on input from the Executive and Planning Committee¹ (the committee), and the committee's directives are reflected in the staff recommendation.

¹ Since the sunset of the Interim Court Facilities Panel on June 30, 2007, the Executive and Planning Committee has assumed the responsibility of reviewing and consulting with the AOC on matters concerning court facilities and of reviewing proposals involving such matters before they are considered by the full Judicial Council.

Recommendation

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

1. Adopt the updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, based on the reevaluation of one capital-outlay project due to changed underlying conditions, the removal of 20 projects for various reasons, the combination of projects for two buildings, the renaming of six projects for various reasons, the adjustment to the statewide growth budget to remove facility funds for new judgeships now allocated to project budgets of proposed FY 2008–2009 and 2009–2010 capital-outlay projects, and an annual update to current-need project budgets to January 2008 dollars.
2. Direct AOC staff to submit FY 2009–2010 funding requests to the Department of Finance (DOF) for initial funding for eight new trial court projects and to resubmit any trial court capital-outlay project that is not funded in the FY 2008–2009 Budget Act.
3. Direct AOC staff to present the updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and the FY 2009–2010 funding requests for the trial courts in the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2009–2010 and to submit it to the DOF.

Rationale for Recommendation

Recommendation 1

AOC staff recommends an update to the plan based on the six distinctive actions outlined in the recommendation above. The rationale for and affected projects of the first four actions are captured in the attachment. The fifth action is taken because pending capital-outlay projects (four in FY 2008–2009) and proposed projects (eight in FY 2009–2010) provide space for 15 of the next 100 new judgeships. Funds for facility space for these 15 new judgeships (i.e., two in the FY 2008–2009 projects and 13 in the FY 2009–2010 projects) have been allocated from the statewide growth budget to the budgets of these projects. Consequently, the statewide growth budget has been reduced from 100 to 85 to provide facility space increments for 85 new judgeships. The sixth action is routinely performed as part of the annual update to the plan, in which the current-need project budgets² for each of the plan's projects are updated from January 2007 to January 2008 dollars, based on research of cost escalation from January 2007 to December 2007 and on the assumptions described in footnote No. 3 of the attached

² The April 27, 2007, Judicial Council report titled, *Court Facilities Planning: Update to Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and Fiscal Year 2008–2009 Capital-Outlay Funding Requests*, provides a complete description of how Current-Need Project Budgets are determined for new construction, renovation, and addition projects. Current-Need Project Budgets are based on a project to replace or improve court space for existing judges and judicial position equivalents (JPEs). The Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships shown in the attached plan provides increments of facility space for 85 of the 100 new judgeships to be funded and authorized by the legislature, as described above. This approach meets the following goals: (1) Avoids having to repeatedly adjust each individual project cost within the plan (i.e., Project Budgets for Current Needs) whenever judgeship needs are updated. Senate Bill 56 (Dunn) requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature on the need for judicial officers every two years. Such frequent adjustments to the statewide judgeship needs analysis may lead those unfamiliar with the process to question the credibility of the plan and funding needs; (2) Aligns the determination of growth allocation to each project with the time a specific project funding request is prepared; and (3) Defines a Total Budget for Current Needs, as well as creates a statewide growth budget that presents a pool of funds to provide facility increments for new judgeships.

plan. The attached plan—dated April 25, 2008, and sorted by total score and sorted by court—reflects each of the actions described above and now includes 152 projects.

Recommendation 2

The DOF establishes a 15- to 18-month lead time for the submission of funding requests for an upcoming fiscal year. Funding requests for FY 2009–2010 are due to the DOF on June 1, 2008. Based on direction from the committee, staff recommends requesting initial funding in FY 2009–2010 for the following eight Immediate Need trial court projects: Imperial – New El Centro Family Courthouse, Lake – New Lakeport Courthouse, Monterey – New South Monterey County Courthouse, Riverside – New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Sacramento – New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, Shasta – New Redding Courthouse, Sonoma – New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, and Sutter – New Yuba City Courthouse. (Descriptions of each are attached.) Each of the new trial court projects will replace unsafe, overcrowded facilities in poor physical condition, with some consolidating more than one existing facility. The eight trial court projects are estimated to cost a total of \$1.2 billion, including land costs.³

In addition and based on the January 2008 Governor’s budget for FY 2008–2009, the projects that may need to be resubmitted for initial funding in FY 2009–2010, pending the FY 2008–2009 Budget Act and the outcome of the proposed court facilities bond bill, are: Butte – New North Butte County Courthouse, Los Angeles – New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse, Tehama – New Red Bluff Courthouse, and Yolo – New Woodland Courthouse. Descriptions of these projects can be found at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/jc/documents/reports/042707itemF.pdf in the archived Judicial Council report dated April 27, 2007, and titled, *Court Facilities Planning: Update to Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and Fiscal Year 2008–2009 Capital-Outlay Funding Requests*.

To meet the anticipated deadline for submission of FY 2009–2010 funding requests to the DOF, AOC staff collaborated with the committee on potential funding requests by reviewing all projects in the Immediate Need group as presented in the April 2007 plan. On January 17, 2008, the committee recommended that nine projects be submitted for Judicial Council approval (at the April 2008 business meeting) for initial funding in FY 2009–2010, based on the application of the subcriteria for funding contained within the methodology: specific rating for the security criterion, potential economic opportunity, and replacement or consolidation of leased or owned space that corrects operational deficiencies. The committee directed AOC staff to collaborate with each of the nine courts in order to confirm project size and cost. Subsequent to that meeting and as a result of AOC staff’s analysis of the proposed Renovation and Addition to Santa Barbara Figueroa Courthouse, AOC staff recommended that its funding request be delayed until FY 2010–2011. This additional time will allow for a thorough analysis of the complexities involved with the onsite expansion and renovation of the existing facility.

³ AOC staff will continue to refine the cost of each of the eight projects up to the time of submission to the DOF.

The committee also recommended that the Judicial Council not submit funding requests for either of the two Courts of Appeal projects that had been requested in both the FY 2007–2008 and FY 2008–2009 funding years, and were not included in either the January 2007 or January 2008 Governor’s budgets, given the current General Fund budget deficit and the lack of support for these projects by the Governor in the two previous fiscal years.

Recommendation 3

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 Legislature the projects [that] shall be funded from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund” (Gov. Code, § 70391(1)(3)). In support of this responsibility and on an annual basis, the AOC submits to the DOF the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, which includes the capital plans for the trial courts, the Courts of Appeal, and the AOC.

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 DOF 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 the judicial branch’s 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.

For FY 2009–2010, the AOC will include the updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan within the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, which will be submitted to the DOF to meet the June 1, 2008, deadline, along with the budget change proposals for the trial court capital projects described above under Recommendation 2.

Alternative Actions Considered

AOC staff considered maintaining all 175 projects from the April 2007 plan but rejected this option in favor of removing projects for which initial funding has been received and removing 11 future-growth-only projects (each with a current need budget of \$0), to which no new AB 159 judgeships or any from the last group of the 100 unfunded new judgeships have been assigned. Also, staff considered deleting from the plan all projects with a current-need budget of \$0 but instead determined there are certain such projects that should remain, as they will ultimately provide permanent facility space for judges out of the next 100 new judgeships.

An alternative to submitting the FY 2009–2010 funding requests is to wait for further development on the support of the court facilities bond bill, discussed on an ongoing basis with legislators and the Governor’s Office. Given the June 1, 2008, deadline for the judicial branch to submit its FY 2009–2010 capital-outlay budget change proposals to the DOF, this

alternative would preclude the AOC from meeting the deadline. Furthermore, funding requests are accompanied by project feasibility reports on which AOC and local court staff collaborate. As these reports take a number of months to prepare, the next funding year for which AOC staff could prepare funding requests would be FY 2010–2011.

Comments From Interested Parties

AOC staff did not solicit comments on the recommended Judicial Council actions. AOC staff did consult with each court regarding the deletion of the 11 future-growth-only projects from the plan.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

The update to the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan was performed by AOC staff. No costs are involved to implement the recommendations.

Attachments:

Expanded Rationale for Recommendation 1: Reevaluation of One Project, Removal of 20 Projects, Combination of Projects for Two Buildings, and Renaming of Six Projects

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, April 25, 2008: Sorted by Total Score and Sorted by Court

Descriptions of the Proposed New Capital-Outlay Funding Requests for Fiscal Year 2009–2010

**Expanded Rationale for Recommendation 1:
Reevaluation of One Project, Removal of 20 Projects,
Combination of Projects for Two Buildings, and Renaming of Six Projects**

The following actions are taken as part of the update to the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan (the plan) for FY 2009–2010, which is attached to the Judicial Council report. These actions support staff’s Recommendation 1, under the Rationale section of the report. In completing these actions, the plan presents a remaining total of 152 projects, with a total of 34 of those projects within the Immediate Need Group. This plan contains 23 projects less than the previous FY 2008–2009 plan total of 175, due to the removal of 20 projects and the combining of three projects for two buildings, as described below.

Reevaluation of One Project

Capital projects are evaluated and assigned to one of five priority groups in the plan based on the *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* (the methodology) adopted by the council in August 2006. The plan adopted by the council in April 2007 (April 2007 plan) contains one project—described below—with underlying conditions that have changed since it was originally evaluated. AOC staff prepared an updated evaluation of this project in collaboration with the local court. The revised score and associated new project priority group for this project is presented in the plan attached to the Judicial Council report.

1. *Alameda – New East County Hall of Justice*. The score of this project was originally based on the physical condition, security, and overcrowding ratings of two buildings, including the Allen E. Broussard Justice Center, which was permanently vacated by the court in July 2007 due flooding caused by a plumbing leak on the sixth floor. This facility’s seven court calendars were immediately relocated to other existing courthouses, and the Allen E. Broussard Justice Center has been permanently closed. Consequently, the project has been reevaluated by AOC staff through the application of the methodology and is now considered a Critical Need project.

Removal of 20 Projects

Staff recommends the following 20 projects be removed from the April 2007 plan. Below is a description of the projects listed in the April 2007 plan and the rationale for removing them.

The following list of nine projects received initial funding in FY 2007–2008 and no longer need to be presented in the plan, which is intended to only present projects for which funding has yet to be secured:

1. *Calaveras – New San Andreas Courthouse*
2. *Lassen – New Susanville Courthouse*
3. *Los Angeles – New Long Beach Courthouse*
4. *Madera – New Madera Courthouse*
5. *Riverside – New Riverside Mid-County Region Courthouse*
6. *San Benito – New Hollister Courthouse*
7. *San Bernardino – New San Bernardino Courthouse*
8. *San Joaquin – New Stockton Courthouse*
9. *Tulare – New Porterville Courthouse*

The following list of 11 projects would accommodate future growth only (each with a current need budget of \$0) and to which no new AB 159 judgeships or any from the last group of the 100 unfunded new judgeships have been assigned. Each affected court has reviewed this proposal and agrees with the staff recommendation:

1. *Imperial – Addition to Calexico Courthouse*
2. *Los Angeles – New Long Beach Courthouse – Phase 2 (S)¹*
3. *Los Angeles – Addition to New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)*
4. *Los Angeles – Complete Michael D. Antonovich Antelope Valley Courthouse (N)*
5. *Orange – Addition to Fullerton Courthouse*
6. *Sacramento – Complete Sacramento Juvenile Justice Center*
7. *San Bernardino – Addition to Juvenile Dependency Courthouse*
8. *San Joaquin – Renovate Stockton Courthouse²*
9. *San Mateo – Addition to San Mateo Juvenile Courthouse*
10. *Santa Clara – Addition to San Jose Civil Courthouse*
11. *Tehama – Addition to New Red Bluff Courthouse*

¹ The existing Long Beach Courthouse will be replaced by a new courthouse that has received initial funding in FY 2007–2008. As a result of the proposed performance based infrastructure (PBI) project delivery method, space within the new facility is being planned to accommodate future court growth.

² Because the state will not take title to or responsibility for the existing Stockton Courthouse—which will be replaced by a new courthouse that received initial funding in FY 2007–2008—this building cannot be renovated for future court expansion, as was envisioned by the court’s 2002 Facilities Master Plan.

The plan attached to the Judicial Council report still includes projects with a \$0 Current Need Project Budget for the superior courts of Del Norte, Monterey, Riverside, Sacramento, and Stanislaus, because these projects will ultimately provide permanent facility space for judges out of the next 100 new judgeships.

Combination of Projects for Two Buildings

The plan attached to the Judicial Council report includes the combination of projects that would renovate and expand a single courthouse. Combining these projects will expedite the funding approval process for the planned renovations and additions to these courthouses, at such time as they are proposed to the DOF. Upon receiving project funding, the AOC will phase each building's expansion and renovation as is necessary. The combined projects are as follows:

1. *Imperial – Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse.* This project combines three Critical Need projects into one: Addition to El Centro Courthouse, Renovate El Centro Courthouse, and Renovate El Centro Courthouse – Phase 2.
2. *Los Angeles – Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE).* This project combines two Medium Need projects into one: Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE) and Renovate Alhambra Courthouse (NE).

Renaming of Six Projects

As part of the plan's update, the following six projects have renamed:

1. *Imperial – Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse.* This project name has been created as a result of combining projects as described above.
2. *Los Angeles – New Santa Clarita Courthouse.* This project name reflects the Superior Court of Los Angeles County's request for it to be changed from a renovation of the existing facility to a new construction project.
3. *Los Angeles – Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE).* This project name has been created as a result of combining projects as described above.
4. *Monterey – New South Monterey County Courthouse.* This project name more accurately captures the county region to which full court services will be provided.
5. *Riverside – New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse.* This project name reflects the family law services that will also be provided, in addition to juvenile services, to the desert region of this county.
6. *Solano – Renovation of Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse.* While the master plan recommended a renovation and an expansion of the Old Solano Courthouse, the superior court's current plan to accommodate new judgeships in the Fairfield Hall of Justice/Law and Justice Center removes the need to expand the existing facility.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Riverside	New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Immediate	20	5	5	5	5	\$61,771,791	
Butte	New North Butte County Courthouse	Immediate	19	5	4	5	5	\$79,681,000	
Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$71,263,284	
Monterey	New South Monterey County Courthouse	Immediate	17	5	4	3	5	\$37,063,074	
Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	5	3	5	\$8,500,000	
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$42,500,000	
Stanislaus	New Modesto Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Lancaster Courthouse (N)	Immediate	17	3	4	5	5	\$5,596,278	
Kern	New Mojave Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$17,000,000	
Sacramento	New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	3	5	3.5	\$460,317,129	Included in budget
Sutter	New Yuba City Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$86,480,507	
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	16	5	3	3	5	\$51,000,000	
Shasta	New Redding Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$195,949,503	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$58,412,336	\$4,510,000
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	3	5	4	\$51,000,000	
Riverside	Addition to Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$0	
San Bernardino	Addition to Joshua Tree Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$25,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse (NV)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$34,000,000	
Merced	New Los Banos Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$8,500,000	
Riverside	Addition to Hemet Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$25,500,000	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$18,036,340	
San Joaquin	Renovate Juvenile Justice Center	Immediate	15.5	5	4	5	1.5	\$4,150,022	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	3	5	2.5	\$209,945,897	
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	2	5	\$8,500,000	
Lake	New Lakeport Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	4	5	1	\$49,417,433	
Tehama	New Red Bluff Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	5	2	\$72,882,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	15	4	1	5	5	\$76,500,000	
Kern	New Delano Courthouse	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$17,000,000	
Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$112,510,000	
Imperial	New El Centro Family Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$49,417,433	
Santa Barbara	Renovation and Addition to Santa Barbara Figueroa Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$75,026,744	\$9,020,000
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Yolo	New Woodland Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$158,430,000	
Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse (NC)	Immediate	14.5	4	3	5	2.5	\$76,500,000	\$10,147,500

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Alameda	New East County Hall of Justice	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$50,000,000	
Alpine	New Markleeville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$17,000,000	
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	14	5	3	1	5	\$8,500,000	
Sierra	New Downieville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Stanislaus	New Turlock Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Courthouse (MH)	Critical	14	4	3	5	2	\$25,500,000	\$3,382,500
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	14	1	3	5	5	\$110,500,000	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Hall of Justice/Law & Justice Center	Critical	13.5	3	3	5	2.5	\$4,594,839	
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	13.5	2	4	5	2.5	\$8,500,000	
El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$51,000,000	
Imperial	Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$23,866,233	
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	13	5	4	1	3	\$17,000,000	
Mendocino	New Ukiah Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$76,500,000	
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$93,500,000	\$12,402,500
San Diego	New Central San Diego Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$586,500,000	\$77,797,500
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Jury Assembly	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$622,744	
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$85,000,000	\$11,275,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Family Resources Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$33,000,000	
Siskiyou	New Yreka Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$42,500,000	\$5,637,500
Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$0	\$0
Kings	New Hanford Courthouse	Critical	13	4	2	5	2	\$68,000,000	
Los Angeles	New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$42,500,000	
Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$51,000,000	
San Diego	New Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	4	3	5	1	\$59,500,000	\$7,892,500
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Juvenile Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	13	3	4	1	5	\$0	
Riverside	New Western Regional Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	13	3	3	2	5	\$17,000,000	
San Diego	New Chula Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	3	3	5	2	\$17,000,000	\$2,255,000
Glenn	Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$20,468,529	
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$17,000,000	\$2,255,000
Tuolumne	New Sonora Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	4	3	0.5	\$34,000,000	
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	12.5	4	3	5	0.5	\$51,000,000	\$6,765,000
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$119,000,000	\$15,785,000
Solano	New South Wing and Renovation of Fairfield Old School – Phase One	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$17,000,000	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$887,230	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$6,041,938	
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Historic Anacapa Courthouse	High	12	5	2	5	0	\$5,865,573	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$858,500,000	\$113,877,500
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$42,500,000	\$5,637,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$8,736,446	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	12	4	5	3	0	\$17,000,000	
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Courthouse	High	12	4	3	2	3	\$68,000,000	
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse - Phase 2	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$119,000,000	
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$17,000,000	
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	11.5	2	4	2	3.5	\$17,000,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	11.5	1	2	5	3.5	\$59,500,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	11	4	2	5	0	\$3,753,293	
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$110,500,000	\$14,657,500
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$8,500,000	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$51,000,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$204,000,000	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old School – Phase Two	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$26,847,709	
Monterey	Addition to Salinas Courthouse	High	10.5	3	2	3	2.5	\$0	
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	3	5	0.5	\$76,363,908	\$6,765,000
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	4	2	2.5	\$0	
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	10.5	2	2	5	1.5	\$51,000,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$17,000,000	
Alameda	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	High	10	4	1	5	0	\$119,000,000	\$15,785,000
Del Norte	Addition to Crescent City Courthouse	High	10	4	3	2	1	\$0	
San Bernardino	Renovation and Addition to Needles Courthouse	High	10	4	3	3	0	\$1,399,070	
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	10	3	3	3	1	\$85,000,000	\$11,275,000
San Luis Obispo	New Grover Courthouse	High	10	3	5	2	0	\$8,500,000	\$1,127,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$48,632,920	
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$31,405,280	
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$30,582,969	
Riverside	Renovate Palm Springs Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$8,321,684	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Inyo	New Bishop Courthouse	Medium	9	4	4	1	0	\$8,500,000	
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$13,785,719	Included in budget
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$1,950,582	
Siskiyou	New Siskiyou Service Centers	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$25,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$93,500,000	\$12,402,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$103,846,727	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$32,832,300	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$32,849,910	\$2,255,000
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$47,977,909	\$2,255,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$34,000,000	\$4,510,000
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	9	1	2	1	5	\$8,500,000	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	9	1	1	2	5	\$8,500,000	\$1,127,500
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	8.5	2	2	1	3.5	\$127,500,000	\$16,912,500
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	8	4	2	2	0	\$22,364,716	
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	8	4	3	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$34,000,000	
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$8,500,000	
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$8,500,000	
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$136,000,000	
Napa	Renovate Napa Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$4,307,511	
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$8,500,000	
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	8	1	4	3	0	\$8,500,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$42,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$42,500,000	\$5,637,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$33,732,754	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$35,766,890	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$11,583,274	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$14,225,727	
Placer	Addition to New Roseville Courthouse	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$8,500,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Family Law Courthouse (W Reg)	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	\$0
Riverside	Addition to Southwest Justice Center (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	\$0
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$60,449,423	Included in budget

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$85,000,000	\$11,275,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$1,846,591	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$53,576,400	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	7	2	2	3	0	\$54,095,882	
Riverside	New Blythe Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Low	7	2	4	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	Low	7	2	3	1	1	\$0	\$0
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	6.5	2	2	2	0.5	\$144,500,000	\$19,167,500
Monterey	New Monterey Bay Civil and Family Courthouse	Low	6	2	2	2	0	\$59,500,000	
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	6	1	2	3	0	\$14,480,595	
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	6	1	2	1	2	\$2,703,766	
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento William Ridgeway Family Courthouse	Low	5.5	1	1	1	2.5	\$0	
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Placer	New Auburn Courthouse	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Hall of Justice (W Reg)	Low	5	1	2	1	1	\$0	
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$6,760,016	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$12,406,787	
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$2,305,835	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000

Total Project Budget for Current Needs⁵

\$7,987,590,450 \$458,892,500

Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁶

\$458,892,500

Total Budget for Current Needs⁷

\$8,446,482,950

Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships⁸

\$722,500,000

Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships⁹

\$95,837,500

Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships¹⁰

\$818,337,500

Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget¹¹

\$9,264,820,450

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Notes to Sorted by Score

(Notes 2 - 11 are identical to Notes to Sorted by Court)

1. **Projects** are sorted by total score, then by security score, and then in alphabetical order by county.

2. **Project Priority Group** based on application of *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*.

3. **Project Budget for Current Needs** calculated based on current need courtrooms (defined as current courtrooms or Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs) plus SB 56 judgeships allocated to project). Projects with a current need budget of \$0 are for future growth only at this time; the budgets for these projects will be augmented, as appropriate, to accommodate new judgeships at the time funding requests are prepared. The project budget for each project is calculated as follows:

(1) For all *New* projects, the project budget is calculated by multiplying current need courtrooms by \$8.5 million per courtroom, which is the January 2007 cost per courtroom (of \$7.9 million) multiplied by a blended escalation rate of 7.34%. This blended escalation rate is derived as follows for the purpose of escalating the Project Budget for Current Needs: Each project is assumed to have Acquisition, Preliminary Plans, and Working Drawings phase budgets of 6% each and a Construction phase budget of 82% of the Project Budget for Current Needs. Each project phase budget then assumes escalation at the rates of 3% for Acquisition, 5% for Preliminary Plans and Working Drawings, and 8% for Construction.

(2) For all *Renovation* projects and for all projects that *Complete* construction of unfinished space, the project budget is the master plan cost estimate escalated to January 2008 dollars.

(3) For all *Renovation and Addition* projects, a blended budget is determined using a combination of the methods described under nos. 1 and 2 above.

Total project budgets for the four FY 2008–2009 trial court projects and for the eight proposed FY 2009–2010 trial court projects include escalation to construction mid-point. FY 2008–2009 projects include: Butte – New North Butte County Courthouse; Los Angeles – New Southeast Los Angeles (SE) Courthouse; Tehama – New Red Bluff Courthouse; and Yolo – New Woodland Courthouse. FY 2009–2010 projects include: Imperial – New El Centro Family Courthouse, Lake – New Lakeport Courthouse, Monterey – New South Monterey County Courthouse, Riverside – New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Sacramento – New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, Shasta – New Redding Courthouse, Sonoma – New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, and Sutter – New Yuba City Courthouse. Project budgets for the four FY 2008–2009 trial court projects reflect the June 2007 DOF submission. Project budgets for the eight proposed FY 2009–2010 trial court projects will be updated by a professional cost estimator prior to submission to DOF in June 2008. Project budgets for the Alameda – New East County Hall of Justice and the Santa Clara – New San Jose Family Resources Courthouse reflect state contributions to the project to augment various court and county funding sources.

4. **Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs** was calculated for only those projects for which the 2002 facility master plan identified a need for structured parking. It is calculated by multiplying the number of current need courtrooms by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$45,100 total project budget (January 2008 \$) per parking space. (Note: The January 2008 cost of \$45,100 per parking space is determined by multiplying the January 2007 budget of \$42,000 per space by a 7.34% blended escalation rate.) A budget of \$0 indicates there was a parking structure identified in the master plan but that it serves only future growth and not current needs.

5. **Total Project Budget for Current Needs** is the sum of each individual project budget for current needs.

6. **Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs** is the sum total of each individual parking structure budget for current needs.

7. **Total Budget for Current Needs** is the sum of the Total Project Budget for Current Needs and the Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs.

8. **Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships** is for increments of facility space to accommodate 85 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. It is calculated by multiplying \$8.5 million per courtroom by 85 unfunded new judgeships.

9. **Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships** assumes facility increments of space to accommodate 25 parking spaces within a parking structure for each courtroom for each of the 85 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This budget is calculated by multiplying 85 by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$45,100 (January 2008 \$) total budget per parking space. (Note: See footnote No. 4 for explanation on the total budget per parking space.)

10. **Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships** is the sum of the Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships and the Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships. Funds in this budget will be allocated to a specific project as needed to accommodate facility and parking capital-outlay costs for 85 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships, as appropriate at the time a funding request is prepared for that project.

11. **Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget** is the sum of the Total Budget for Current Needs and the Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Court

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Alameda	New East County Hall of Justice	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$50,000,000	
Alameda	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	High	10	4	1	5	0	\$119,000,000	\$15,785,000
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	6	1	2	3	0	\$14,480,595	
Alpine	New Markleeville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Butte	New North Butte County Courthouse	Immediate	19	5	4	5	5	\$79,681,000	
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	3	5	4	\$51,000,000	
Del Norte	Addition to Crescent City Courthouse	High	10	4	3	2	1	\$0	
El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$51,000,000	
Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$71,263,284	
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	16	5	3	3	5	\$51,000,000	
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	2	5	\$8,500,000	
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	8.5	2	2	1	3.5	\$127,500,000	\$16,912,500
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$34,000,000	
Glenn	Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$20,468,529	
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	10	3	3	3	1	\$85,000,000	\$11,275,000
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$8,500,000	
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$8,500,000	
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	8	1	4	3	0	\$8,500,000	
Imperial	New El Centro Family Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$49,417,433	
Imperial	Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$23,866,233	
Inyo	New Bishop Courthouse	Medium	9	4	4	1	0	\$8,500,000	
Kern	New Mojave Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$17,000,000	
Kern	New Delano Courthouse	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$17,000,000	
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	13	5	4	1	3	\$17,000,000	
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$119,000,000	\$15,785,000
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse - Phase 2	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$119,000,000	
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	11.5	2	4	2	3.5	\$17,000,000	
Kings	New Hanford Courthouse	Critical	13	4	2	5	2	\$68,000,000	
Lake	New Lakeport Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	4	5	1	\$49,417,433	
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	13.5	2	4	5	2.5	\$8,500,000	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Court

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Los Angeles	Renovate Lancaster Courthouse (N)	Immediate	17	3	4	5	5	\$5,596,278	
Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse (NV)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$34,000,000	
Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$112,510,000	
Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse (NC)	Immediate	14.5	4	3	5	2.5	\$76,500,000	\$10,147,500
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Courthouse (MH)	Critical	14	4	3	5	2	\$25,500,000	\$3,382,500
Los Angeles	New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$42,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$858,500,000	\$113,877,500
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$42,500,000	\$5,637,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$8,736,446	
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$110,500,000	\$14,657,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$48,632,920	
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$31,405,280	
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$30,582,969	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$32,849,910	\$2,255,000
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$93,500,000	\$12,402,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$103,846,727	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$32,832,300	
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$42,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$42,500,000	\$5,637,500
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$33,732,754	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$35,766,890	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$11,583,274	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$14,225,727	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	7	2	2	3	0	\$54,095,882	
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$6,760,016	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$12,406,787	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$136,000,000	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	12	4	5	3	0	\$17,000,000	
Mendocino	New Ukiah Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$76,500,000	
Merced	New Los Banos Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$8,500,000	
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	9	1	2	1	5	\$8,500,000	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Court

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$887,230	
Monterey	New South Monterey County Courthouse	Immediate	17	5	4	3	5	\$37,063,074	
Monterey	Addition to Salinas Courthouse	High	10.5	3	2	3	2.5	\$0	
Monterey	New Monterey Bay Civil and Family Courthouse	Low	6	2	2	2	0	\$59,500,000	
Napa	Renovate Napa Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$4,307,511	
Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$51,000,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$17,000,000	
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$13,785,719	Included in budget
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	6.5	2	2	2	0.5	\$144,500,000	\$19,167,500
Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	5	3	5	\$8,500,000	
Placer	Addition to New Roseville Courthouse	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$8,500,000	
Placer	New Auburn Courthouse	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$17,000,000	
Riverside	New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Immediate	20	5	5	5	5	\$61,771,791	
Riverside	Addition to Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$0	
Riverside	Addition to Hemet Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$25,500,000	
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	14	5	3	1	5	\$8,500,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Juvenile Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	13	3	4	1	5	\$0	
Riverside	New Western Regional Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	13	3	3	2	5	\$17,000,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	11.5	1	2	5	3.5	\$59,500,000	
Riverside	Renovate Palm Springs Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$8,321,684	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Family Law Courthouse (W Reg)	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	\$0
Riverside	Addition to Southwest Justice Center (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	
Riverside	New Blythe Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Low	7	2	4	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Hall of Justice (W Reg)	Low	5	1	2	1	1	\$0	
Sacramento	New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	3	5	3.5	\$460,317,129	Included in budget
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$93,500,000	\$12,402,500
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	Low	7	2	3	1	1	\$0	\$0
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento William Ridgeway Family Courthouse	Low	5.5	1	1	1	2.5	\$0	
San Bernardino	Addition to Joshua Tree Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$25,500,000	
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	14	1	3	5	5	\$110,500,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	11	4	2	5	0	\$3,753,293	
San Bernardino	Renovation and Addition to Needles Courthouse	High	10	4	3	3	0	\$1,399,070	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	9	1	1	2	5	\$8,500,000	\$1,127,500

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Court

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
San Diego	New Central San Diego Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$586,500,000	\$77,797,500
San Diego	New Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	4	3	5	1	\$59,500,000	\$7,892,500
San Diego	New Chula Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	3	3	5	2	\$17,000,000	\$2,255,000
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$6,041,938	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$51,000,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$47,977,909	\$2,255,000
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$2,305,835	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$204,000,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$85,000,000	\$11,275,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$1,846,591	
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$42,500,000	
San Joaquin	Renovate Juvenile Justice Center	Immediate	15.5	5	4	5	1.5	\$4,150,022	
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	12.5	4	3	5	0.5	\$51,000,000	\$6,765,000
San Luis Obispo	New Grover Courthouse	High	10	3	5	2	0	\$8,500,000	\$1,127,500
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$1,950,582	
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	8	4	2	2	0	\$22,364,716	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$53,576,400	
Santa Barbara	Renovation and Addition to Santa Barbara Figueroa Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$75,026,744	\$9,020,000
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Jury Assembly	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$622,744	
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$17,000,000	\$2,255,000
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Historic Anacapa Courthouse	High	12	5	2	5	0	\$5,865,573	
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$8,500,000	
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$85,000,000	\$11,275,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Family Resources Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$33,000,000	
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	3	5	0.5	\$76,363,908	\$6,765,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$34,000,000	\$4,510,000
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$17,000,000	
Shasta	New Redding Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$195,949,503	
Sierra	New Downieville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Siskiyou	New Yreka Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$42,500,000	\$5,637,500
Siskiyou	New Siskiyou Service Centers	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$25,500,000	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$18,036,340	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Hall of Justice/Law & Justice Center	Critical	13.5	3	3	5	2.5	\$4,594,839	
Solano	New South Wing and Renovation of Fairfield Old School – Phase One	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$17,000,000	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old School – Phase Two	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$26,847,709	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Sorted by Court

County	Project Name ¹	Project Priority Group ²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs ³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs ⁴
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	3	5	2.5	\$209,945,897	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$0	\$0
Stanislaus	New Modesto Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$68,000,000	\$9,020,000
Stanislaus	New Turlock Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$8,500,000	
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Courthouse	High	12	4	3	2	3	\$68,000,000	
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	4	2	2.5	\$0	
Sutter	New Yuba City Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$86,480,507	
Tehama	New Red Bluff Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	5	2	\$72,882,000	
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	8	4	3	1	0	\$17,000,000	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$58,412,336	\$4,510,000
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	6	1	2	1	2	\$2,703,766	
Tuolumne	New Sonora Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	4	3	0.5	\$34,000,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	15	4	1	5	5	\$76,500,000	
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$60,449,423	Included in budget
Yolo	New Woodland Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$158,430,000	
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	10.5	2	2	5	1.5	\$51,000,000	

Total Project Budget for Current Needs⁵

\$7,987,590,450 **\$458,892,500**

Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁶

\$458,892,500

Total Budget for Current Needs⁷

\$8,446,482,950

Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships⁸

\$722,500,000

Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships⁹

\$95,837,500

Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships¹⁰

\$818,337,500

Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget¹¹

\$9,264,820,450

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 25, 2008

Notes to Sorted by Court

(Notes 2 - 11 are identical to Notes to Sorted by Score)

1. **Projects** are sorted by alphabetical order of county names, then by total score, and then by security score.
2. **Project Priority Group** based on application of *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*.
3. **Project Budget for Current Needs** calculated based on current need courtrooms (defined as current courtrooms or Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs) plus SB 56 judgeships allocated to project). Projects with a current need budget of \$0 are for future growth only at this time; the budgets for these projects will be augmented, as appropriate, to accommodate new judgeships at the time funding requests are prepared. The project budget for each project is calculated as follows:

(1) For all *New* projects, the project budget is calculated by multiplying current need courtrooms by \$8.5 million per courtroom, which is the January 2007 cost per courtroom (of \$7.9 million) multiplied by a blended escalation rate of 7.34%. This blended escalation rate is derived as follows for the purpose of escalating the Project Budget for Current Needs: Each project is assumed to have Acquisition, Preliminary Plans, and Working Drawings phase budgets of 6% each and a Construction phase budget of 82% of the Project Budget for Current Needs. Each project phase budget then assumes escalation at the rates of 3% for Acquisition, 5% for Preliminary Plans and Working Drawings, and 8% for Construction.

(2) For all *Renovation* projects and for all projects that *Complete* construction of unfinished space, the project budget is the master plan cost estimate escalated to January 2008 dollars.

(3) For all *Renovation and Addition* projects, a blended budget is determined using a combination of the methods described under nos. 1 and 2 above.

Total project budgets for the four FY 2008–2009 trial court projects and for the eight proposed FY 2009–2010 trial court projects include escalation to construction mid-point. FY 2008–2009 projects include: Butte – New North Butte County Courthouse; Los Angeles – New Southeast Los Angeles (SE) Courthouse; Tehama – New Red Bluff Courthouse; and Yolo – New Woodland Courthouse. FY 2009–2010 projects include: Imperial – New El Centro Family Courthouse, Lake – New Lakeport Courthouse, Monterey – New South Monterey County Courthouse, Riverside – New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Sacramento – New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, Shasta – New Redding Courthouse, Sonoma – New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, and Sutter – New Yuba City Courthouse. Project budgets for the four FY 2008–2009 trial court projects reflect the June 2007 DOF submission. Project budgets for the eight proposed FY 2009–2010 trial court projects will be updated by a professional cost estimator prior to submission to DOF in June 2008. Project budgets for the Alameda – New East County Hall of Justice and the Santa Clara – New San Jose Family Resources Courthouse reflect state contributions to the project to augment various court and county funding sources.

4. **Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs** was calculated for only those projects for which the 2002 facility master plan identified a need for structured parking. It is calculated by multiplying the number of current need courtrooms by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$45,100 total project budget (January 2008 \$) per parking space. (Note: The January 2008 cost of \$45,100 per parking space is determined by multiplying the January 2007 budget of \$42,000 per space by a 7.34% blended escalation rate.) A budget of \$0 indicates there was a parking structure identified in the master plan but that it serves only future growth and not current needs.

5. **Total Project Budget for Current Needs** is the sum of each individual project budget for current needs.

6. **Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs** is the sum total of each individual parking structure budget for current needs.

7. **Total Budget for Current Needs** is the sum of the Total Project Budget for Current Needs and the Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs.

8. **Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships** is for increments of facility space to accommodate 85 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. It is calculated by multiplying \$8.5 million per courtroom by 85 unfunded new judgeships.

9. **Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships** assumes facility increments of space to accommodate 25 parking spaces within a parking structure for each courtroom for each of the 85 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This budget is calculated by multiplying 85 by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$45,100 (January 2008 \$) total budget per parking space. (Note: See footnote No. 4 for explanation on the total budget per parking space.)

10. **Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships** is the sum of the Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships and the Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships. Funds in this budget will be allocated to a specific project as needed to accommodate facility and parking capital-outlay costs for 85 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships, as appropriate at the time a funding request is prepared for that project.

11. **Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget** is the sum of the Total Budget for Current Needs and the Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships.

Descriptions of the Proposed New Capital-Outlay Funding Requests for Fiscal Year 2009–2010

The following descriptions are of the eight new capital-outlay funding requests—referenced under the Rationale, Recommendation 2 section of the council report—to be submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) for consideration of funding in fiscal year 2009–2010. The eight trial court projects are estimated to cost a total of \$1.2 billion, including the costs for land and for escalation to the midpoint of construction.

AOC staff will continue to refine the cost of each of the eight trial court projects until the time of submission to the DOF on June 1, 2008. Funds will be requested for land acquisition, design, and construction from a proposed bond.

Superior Court of California, County of Imperial—New El Centro Family Courthouse

This project will provide four courtrooms to accommodate four current judicial position equivalents (JPEs) and is estimated to cost \$49.4 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. This project has the potential for discounted acquisition of land for the future courthouse site near the existing county jail and juvenile hall. This project consolidates all family resources functions from two locations into one site, including juvenile delinquency, juvenile dependency, family law, child support, domestic relations, and probate. Once family law is moved into the new project from the existing, main El Centro Courthouse, space will then be available for move in of the traffic court from its current leased facility. Consolidation of the family caseload will improve access to family court services, create operational efficiencies, and provide on-going operational savings, part of which will be realized through elimination of a leased facility. This project will allow the superior court to vacate the severely unsafe and overcrowded Juvenile Court facility.

Superior Court of California, County of Lake—New Lakeport Courthouse

This project will provide four courtrooms to accommodate four current JPEs and is estimated to cost \$49.4 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. A site large enough to accommodate a building addition for one future JPE will be sought. The superior court has initiated discussions with the county regarding the provision of land for the new courthouse, and the county has identified several options for providing this land. This project replaces both the existing unsafe and overcrowded Lakeport Courthouse and a leased space housing staff and records. This project provides a modern, secure courthouse for the residents of northern Lake County, replacing the existing deficient courthouse and creating operational efficiencies and on-going savings through consolidation.

Superior Court of California, County of Monterey—New South Monterey County Courthouse

This project will provide three courtrooms to accommodate two current JPEs and one new judgeship out of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This project is estimated to cost \$37.1 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. A site large enough to accommodate a building addition for one future JPE will be sought. The City of Greenfield has proposed to donate land for this project, and the cities of King City and Soledad have both passed resolutions pledging their assistance during the site selection and acquisition process. This project will replace the existing, deficient King City Courthouse and will return civil and small claims case processing to the south Monterey county area, by creating a full-service courthouse for the residents of southern Monterey County.

Superior Court of California, County of Riverside—New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse

This project will provide five courtrooms to accommodate five current JPEs and is estimated to cost \$61.8 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. This project will consolidate the juvenile court services now operating at the existing Indio Juvenile Courthouse and three family-court calendars now operating at the Larsen Justice Center. This project will also provide for the eventual consolidation of all criminal matters in the desert area at the Larsen Justice Center, considering it is the main courthouse in the desert region and equipped for criminal calendars and trials. This project provides a modern, secure courthouse for the residents of Indio, improves access to justice by consolidating family and juvenile calendars at one location, and through consolidation, creates operational efficiencies and on-going savings.

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento—New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse

This project will provide 35 courtrooms to accommodate 26 current JPEs and 9 new judgeships out of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This project is estimated to cost \$460.3 million, including the cost of land, a parking structure for the net increase in new judgeships since the passage of Senate Bill 56 (Dunn), and the escalation to construction midpoint. In addition to almost consolidating all criminal operations in the entire county, this project will provide consolidation of downtown functions (except for the Hall of Justice courtrooms)—including various court administrative functions, court reporters, legal research staff, and the settlement conference and law and motion functions from leased facilities—into either this project or the existing Gordon D. Schaber Courthouse. Moving most of the criminal calendars out of the Schaber facility and into the new courthouse will allow the court to maintain criminal calendars in the Schaber Courthouse in space designed to safely support criminal proceedings, as well as free space in the Schaber facility for consolidation of non-criminal calendars. The superior court will then be reduced from seven to three court facilities within downtown Sacramento, allowing termination of four existing leases and the relocation of technology support from a county office building. This project will greatly improve access to justice through the consolidation of court calendars and administrative

functions, creating operational efficiencies and on-going savings through the elimination of annual lease costs.

Superior Court of California, County of Shasta—New Redding Courthouse

This project will provide 14 courtrooms to accommodate 12 current JPEs and two new judgeships out of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This project is estimated to cost \$196.0 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. A site large enough to accommodate a building addition for three future JPEs will be sought. Both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta have indicated their willingness to donate land for this project. This project will provide consolidation of three court facilities: the Main Courthouse and Annex, the Justice Center/Main Jail Facility, and the Juvenile Delinquency Court. This project will also consolidate two courtrooms for Senate Bill 56 (Dunn) and Assembly Bill 159 (Jones) new judgeships, which are to be located in modular facilities at the Main Courthouse site. This consolidation provides savings for security services and improves operational efficiency by eliminating file transfers between the facilities. This project provides a modern, secure courthouse for the residents of Shasta County to improve access to justice and replaces the existing, deficient courthouse.

Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma—New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse

This project will provide 15 courtrooms to accommodate 15 current JPEs and is estimated to cost \$210.0 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. A site large enough to accommodate a building addition for two future JPEs will be sought. The superior court has had discussions with the county regarding prospective sites for the new courthouse. This project provides a modern, secure courthouse for the residents of Sonoma County, replacing the existing deficient courthouse and creating operational efficiencies and on-going savings through consolidation of current court services with mediation services currently located in leased space. This new courthouse will provide centralized criminal, traffic, and juvenile dependency proceedings for the entire county.

Superior Court of California, County of Sutter—New Yuba City Courthouse

This project will provide seven courtrooms to accommodate six current JPEs and one new judgeship out of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This project is estimated to cost \$86.5 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint. The superior court has had discussions with the county concerning the land donation of a site that was identified and set aside for a new courthouse more than 25 years ago. When the county jail was constructed and in anticipation of the eventual movement of prisoners, a security tunnel was constructed to this property. This project will consolidate all of the court functions—including criminal, civil, juvenile, and family law—from three facilities: Courthouse West, Courthouse East, and the leased Family Court Facility. Court operations and access to justice will be enhanced through consolidation, annual lease costs will be eliminated, security will be improved, on-going operational savings will be provided, and an existing, deficient courthouse will be replaced.