

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report Summary

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, Manager of Planning,
818-558-3078, kelly.popejoy@jud.ca.gov

DATE: April 27, 2007

SUBJECT: Court Facilities Planning: Update to Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and
Fiscal Year 2008–2009 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), based on (1) collaboration with counties on the evaluation of projects due to the passage of Senate Bill 10 (Dunn), (2) progress on new construction projects to be completed in 2007, (3) removing six projects for various reasons, and (4) an update to project budgets to distinguish current needs from future growth. AOC staff also recommends that capital-outlay project funding requests be submitted to the executive branch to request FY 2008–2009 funding. This includes land acquisition for future expansion to the existing appellate courthouse for the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in Riverside, four new trial court facilities, as well as any trial court project funding requests submitted to the executive branch for initial FY 2007–2008 funding that are not included in the final FY 2007–2008 budget. The recommended funding requests have been developed based on input from the Interim Court Facilities Panel¹ (the panel), and the panel's directives are reflected in the staff recommendation.

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 collaboration with the counties on the evaluation of projects due to the enactment of SB 10, the reevaluation of two capital-outlay projects due to the construction of new courthouses to be completed in 2007, the

¹ According to rule 10.15(d), the 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 panel members must include at least one member from each of the Judicial Council's other internal committees. Furthermore, according to rule 10.15(b), the 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.

removal of six projects for various reasons, and an update to project budgets to distinguish current needs from future growth.

2. Direct AOC staff to submit FY 2008–2009 funding requests to the Department of Finance (DOF) for land acquisition for future expansion to the appellate courthouse for the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in Riverside; initial funding for four new trial court projects; and the resubmission of any new appellate and trial court capital-outlay project that is not funded in the final FY 2007–2008 budget.
3. Direct AOC staff to present the updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and the FY 2008–2009 funding requests for the appellate and trial courts in the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2008–2009 and to submit it to the Department of Finance.

Rationale for Recommendation

Recommendation 1

AOC staff recommends an update to the plan based on four distinct actions. The attached plan—dated April 27, 2007 and sorted by total score and by court—reflects each of these actions. A complete description of each action is presented in the report.

Enactment of SB 10

In September 2006, SB 10, Seismic Condition of Trial Court Facilities was passed. The enactment of this bill allows the seismic-factoring feature of the *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* (the methodology) to be implemented: Seismic condition of buildings can now become part of the evaluation to determine the project score and placement of trial court capital projects within the five priority groups.

Two New Construction Projects to Be Completed in 2007

The New South Placer Justice Center in Roseville, Placer County (nine courtrooms), is scheduled to be completed in fall 2007. The August 2006 plan lists a project—Placer – Addition to (New) Roseville Courthouse—to expand this new courthouse for one SB 56 judgeship and future new judgeships. The new courthouse in Merced (seven courtrooms) is scheduled to be completed in April 2007. The August 2006 plan presents a project—Merced – Addition to New Merced Courthouse—to expand this new courthouse to replace the existing arraignment courtroom and provide for future new judgeships. Both of these projects should now be reevaluated—using the methodology—based on the underlying condition of the new facility, not the existing facility or facilities that soon will be replaced. The revised score and associated new project priority group (i.e., Medium Need) for these two projects are presented in the attached plan.

Removing Six Projects From Plan

Staff recommends that six projects—two for Kern and one each for Orange, Riverside, San Joaquin, and Yolo—be removed from the August 2006 plan for a variety of reasons. The attached plan presents the remaining 175 projects, after these six projects are removed.

Update to Project Budgets to Distinguish Current Needs From Future Growth

Staff has considered the issue of growth of judicial position equivalents (JPEs) or number of courtrooms in the plan, in order to determine an approach for updating each project's budget (i.e., Project Budget for Current Needs). Staff has identified approximately 700 courtrooms representing growth that are included in the master plan project budgets for the 175 projects. Staff has developed a recommended approach for updating the plan's project budgets to address the issue of growth. This approach was endorsed by the panel at its March 12, 2007 meeting, and meets the following goals:

1. Avoids having to repeatedly adjust all 175 individual project costs (i.e., Project Budgets for Current Needs) whenever judgeship needs are updated. The statewide judgeship need analysis is currently required by SB 56 to be updated every two years. Frequent adjustments 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 new facility increments for new judgeships.

The plan attached defines a Project Budget for Current Needs for each individual project and provides a statewide growth budget that presents a pool of funds to provide new facility increments for the next 100 new judgeships. This approach is consistent with the approach taken by the Task Force on Court Facilities, when it estimated total capital need. From year to year, as projects are presented to the council and to the DOF for funding, individual Project Budgets for Current Needs would be adjusted as necessary, with funds being assigned to them from the statewide growth budget. The statewide growth budget is included as a single line item at the bottom of the list of capital projects. The statewide growth budget can easily be modified annually as needed, in order to reflect how timely new judgeships are approved, updated statewide judgeship projections, and changes in council policy.

Recommendation 2

Funding requests for FY 2008–2009 are due to the DOF on June 1, 2007. Based on direction from the panel, staff recommends requesting FY 2008–2009 funding for the following: land acquisition for future expansion of the existing courthouse serving the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in Riverside and initial funding for four new trial court projects: 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 each are attached.) The four trial court projects are estimated to cost a total of \$425.5 million, including land costs.² In addition, and based on the January 2007 Governor's budget for FY 2007–2008, the projects that may need to be resubmitted, pending the final FY 2007–2008 budget, for initial funding in FY 2008–2009 are new courthouses for the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in San Diego and Sixth Appellate District, in San Jose; Calaveras –

² AOC staff will continue to refine the cost of each of these four projects up to the time of submission to DOF.

New San Andreas Courthouse; Lassen – New Susanville Courthouse; Los Angeles – New Long Beach Courthouse; San Benito – New Hollister Courthouse; and Tulare – New Porterville Courthouse.

Recommendation 3

For FY 2008–2009, 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, 2007, deadline, along with the budget change proposals for the appellate and trial court capital projects described above under Rationale 2.

Alternative Actions Considered

AOC staff considered the alternative of updating each Project Budget for Current Needs in the plan, based on its size and location. Staff rejected this option in favor of an option that aligns more detailed cost estimating with the executive branch’s project funding review process. Staff considered an option that did not address the large numbers of future JPEs included in many of the master plan projects, but rejected this in favor of a method that creates Project Budgets for Current Needs and a statewide growth budget. An alternative to submitting the FY 2008–2009 funding requests is to wait for further development on the support of the court facilities bond bill, discussed on an ongoing basis with the Governor’s Office. Given the June 1, 2007, deadline for the judicial branch to submit its FY 2008–2009 budget change proposals to the DOF, this alternative would preclude the AOC from meeting that deadline.

Comments From Interested Parties

The panel directed AOC staff to post two items for court comment: two options for adjusting the project priority group points ranges, based on the reevaluation of the projects owing to the enactment of SB 10, and a preliminary list of 17 trial court projects under consideration for initial funding in FY 2008–2009, from which the four new trial court projects were ultimately selected. The court comment period resulted in three comments in support of an equal distribution of projects to priority groups. Staff also presented the approach to updating the project budgets in the plan to both the Court Executives Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee the week of March 12, 2007.

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:

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, April 27, 2007: Sorted by Total Score and by Court Descriptions of the Proposed Capital-Outlay Funding Requests for FY 2008–2009

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, Manager of Planning,
818-558-3078, kelly.popejoy@jud.ca.gov

DATE: April 27, 2007

SUBJECT: Court Facilities Planning: Update to Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and
Fiscal Year 2008–2009 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), based on (1) collaboration with counties on the evaluation of projects due to the passage of Senate Bill 10 (Dunn), (2) progress on new construction projects to be completed in 2007, (3) removing six projects for various reasons, and (4) an update to project budgets to distinguish current need from future growth. AOC staff also recommends that capital-outlay project funding requests be submitted to the executive branch to request FY 2008–2009 funding. This includes land acquisition for future expansion to the existing appellate courthouse for the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in Riverside, four new trial court facilities, as well as any trial court project funding requests submitted to the executive branch for initial FY 2007–2008 funding that are not included in the final FY 2007–2008 budget. The updated plan and the project funding requests support the main goals of the court facility improvement program and the mission and policy direction of the Judicial Council in its long-range strategic plan—Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration—which is to provide safe and secure facilities and to improve 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 Interim Court Facilities Panel¹ (the panel), and the panel’s directives are reflected in the staff recommendation.

¹ According to rule 10.15(d), the 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 panel members must include at least one member from each of the Judicial Council’s other internal committees. Furthermore, according to rule 10.15(b), the 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.

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 collaboration with the counties on the evaluation of projects due to the enactment of SB 10, the reevaluation of two capital-outlay projects due to the construction of new courthouses to be completed in 2007, the removal of six projects for various reasons, and an update to project budgets to distinguish current need from future growth.
2. Direct AOC staff to submit FY 2008–2009 funding requests to the Department of Finance (DOF) for land acquisition for future expansion to the appellate courthouse for the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in Riverside; initial funding for four new trial court projects; and the resubmission of any new appellate and trial court capital-outlay project that is not funded in the final FY 2007–2008 budget.
3. Direct AOC staff to present the updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and the FY 2008–2009 funding requests for the appellate and trial courts in the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2008–2009 and to submit it to the Department of Finance.

Rationale for Recommendation

Recommendation 1

AOC staff recommends an update to the plan based on four distinct actions, described below. The attached plan—dated April 27, 2007, and sorted by total score and by court—reflects each of these actions.

Enactment of SB 10

On August 25, 2006, the council adopted the *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* (the methodology) and a Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan of 181 projects, separated into five priority groups of need: Immediate, Critical, High, Medium, and Low. A provision within the methodology indicates that if legislation passes to allow the state to assume responsibility for or title to buildings that could not, under SB 1732, transfer because of seismic condition without correction provisions, seismic condition will be included in the evaluation of each capital-outlay project. In September 2006, such legislation was passed in the form of SB 10, Seismic Condition of Trial Court Facilities. The enactment of this bill allows the seismic-factoring feature of the methodology to be implemented: The seismic condition of buildings can now become part of the evaluation to determine the project score and placement of trial court capital projects within the five priority groups. Specifically, the methodology states that the maximum possible points for the Physical Condition criteria will be assigned to a project affecting one or more buildings that have a Seismic Risk Level of V, if legislation passes that allows for these buildings to transfer to the state with an uncorrected seismic condition.

Under the AOC's agreement with the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and by statute, the counties still reserve the right to appeal the preliminary findings of the AOC Seismic Assessment Program (AOC assessment). Therefore, the AOC cannot release any information on individual building ratings of seismic condition and cannot activate the seismic-factoring feature without the consent of local county governments. In fall 2006, 41 of the 48 counties polled by AOC staff (i.e., those with projects in the plan that affect facilities evaluated by the AOC as having a seismic risk level of V) agreed to allow the use of the AOC assessment in updating the project scores based on the passage of SB 10.

Updated scores resulted in nearly doubling the size of the projects that could be included within the Immediate Need group, based on the point range—12.5 to 20—established by the council in August 2006. Given there is limited funding for trial court capital-outlay projects, AOC staff solicited the assistance of the panel to revise the points to reduce the number of eligible projects. The panel considered two options for reallocation of points to project priority groups and determined that the number of projects in the Immediate Need group should be similar to what the council adopted in August 2006: 48 projects. The panel directed the AOC to post two point-range alternatives for court comment, which resulted in a total of three comments on this topic. All comments favored a more equal distribution of projects to priority groups, and the attached plan—dated April 27, 2007, and sorted by total score and by court—reflects this distribution.

Two New Construction Projects to Be Completed in 2007

Capital projects are evaluated and assigned to one of five priority groups in the plan based on the methodology adopted by the council in August 2006 (August 2006 plan). The August 2006 plan lists two projects that would expand courthouses currently under construction. These projects now need to be reevaluated based on the status of the new construction projects. The New South Placer Justice Center in Roseville, Placer County (nine courtrooms), is scheduled to be completed in fall 2007. The August 2006 plan lists a project—Placer – Addition to (New) Roseville Courthouse—to expand this new courthouse for one SB 56 judgeship and future new judgeships. The August 2006 plan indicated this is an Immediate Need project because it was evaluated based on the current conditions of the existing facility that will be replaced by the facility under construction.

The new courthouse in Merced (seven courtrooms) is scheduled to be completed in April 2007. The August 2006 plan presents a project—Merced – Addition to New Merced Courthouse—to expand this new courthouse to replace the existing arraignment courtroom and provide for future new judgeships. Similar to the case of the Placer project described above, the August 2006 plan lists this one as an Immediate Need project because it was evaluated based on the current condition of one of the several existing facilities that will soon be replaced by the new facility that is nearly completed.

Both the expansion projects should now be reevaluated—using the methodology—based on the underlying condition of the new facility, not the existing facility or facilities that soon will be replaced. AOC staff reviewed the updated evaluation of each expansion project with the local court. The revised score and associated new project priority group for these two projects

are presented in the attached plan. Both projects are now assigned to the Medium Need priority group.

Removing Six Projects From Plan

Staff recommends the following six projects be removed from the August 2006 plan for a variety of reasons. In each case, the court has been notified of the recommended action. Below is a description of the project listed in the August 2006 plan and the rationale for removing the project from the plan. The attached plan presents the remaining 175 projects after the six projects listed below are removed.

1. *Kern – Renovation of Bakersfield Courthouse.* The county is funding this project, which is the renovation of office space for two SB 56 judgeships.
2. *Kern – Complete Bakersfield Juvenile Justice.* The county is funding this project, which is the renovation of office space for future new judgeships from the next 100 new judgeships.
3. *Orange – Addition to Laguna Niguel Courthouse.* This project is county and court funded with state approval (council approved use of civil assessments in October 2006.)
4. *Riverside – Renovate Historic Riverside Courthouse.* This facility will transfer under a Historic MOU, and the state will not be responsible for future improvements.
5. *San Joaquin – New Lodi Courthouse.* Court Construction Funds have been committed to providing one courtroom in the new Lodi Police facility that replaces Lodi Department 1.
6. *Yolo – New Juvenile Courthouse.* This project is included in New Woodland Courthouse project, presented to the council in this report for FY 2008–2009 appropriation request (see below).

Based on the updates to the plan described above—due to the enactment of SB 10, reevaluation of two projects due to construction projects to be completed in 2007, and removing six projects—43 of the plan’s 175 projects will be Immediate Need projects.

Update to Project Budgets to Distinguish Current Need From Future Growth

The budgets for each of the 175 projects listed in the plan have been revised to distinguish between current need and future growth. This approach defines a Project Budget for Current Needs for each individual project and provides a statewide growth budget that presents a pool of funds to provide new facility increments for the next 100 new judgeships. This approach is consistent with the approach taken by the Task Force on Court Facilities, when it estimated total capital need.

From year to year, as projects are presented to the council and to the DOF for funding, individual project budgets will be adjusted as necessary, and funds assigned from the statewide growth budget to specific project budgets. The statewide growth budget is included as a single line item at the bottom of the list of capital projects. The statewide growth budget may be modified annually as needed, in order to reflect how timely new judgeships are approved, updated statewide judgeship projections, and changes in council policy.

The plan adopted by the council in August 2006 includes a list of projects and an estimated total project cost, in current dollars, for each project. The estimated total project cost of the August 2006 plan was based on the 2002 facility master plan (master plan) cost estimates, generically adjusted to account for escalation in construction and land acquisition costs. The master plan project costs included space for current need and substantial growth in JPEs. The 58 master plans identified approximately 330 capital-outlay projects. These projects, as they were originally defined in the master plans, included space for almost 1,200 additional courtrooms for accommodating growth in JPEs beyond the approximately 2,060 JPEs reported by the 58 trial courts in FY 2004–2005.

AOC Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM) staff initiated collaboration with the AOC Office of Court Research (OCR) to develop more realistic long-term JPE projections for use in facility planning. This collaboration culminated in a presentation by the AOC OCCM and OCR at the February 2006 Judicial Council Issues Meeting. This presentation summarized an analysis that compared the master plans' 20-year projections of JPEs to two adjusted projections: one based on the proposed 150 new judgeships and one based on the total statewide current need of more than 361 new judgeships.² The former projection is referred to as the Partial-JPEs Need projection, because it accounts for only a portion of the total current need of 361 new judgeships statewide. Over the 20-year planning horizon, the Partial-JPEs projection has approximately 520 fewer JPEs than the master plan JPEs projection.

Using the Partial-JPEs projection as a basis for planning is more realistic, and it would dramatically modify the projected capital-outlay needs for the trial courts statewide. Based on council discussion at its February 2006 Issues Meeting, staff was directed to include a summary of how the JPEs projection will be used for facilities planning in the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2007–2008*. The plan states that:

“Although the Full-JPEs-Need projections represent closing the gap between current JPEs and current needs, the Partial-JPEs Need projections will be used as a basis for updating the size and budget of capital projects, due to the historical delays in securing needed judgeships. Periodically, the AOC will update the near-term and long-term JPEs projections based on an evaluation of several factors including actual case filings and dispositions and the current approved number of judgeships.”

Staff has considered the issue of growth of JPEs or number of courtrooms in the plan, in order to determine an approach for updating each project's budget (i.e., Project Budget for Current Needs). Staff has identified approximately 700 courtrooms representing growth included in the master plan project budgets for the 175 projects listed in the plan. Staff has developed a recommended approach for updating the project budgets in the plan to address the issue of

² The total statewide current net need of 361 was updated by the AOC OCR and presented to the Judicial Council on February 23, 2007. The 361 figure is in addition to the 50 new judgeships authorized and funded for June 2007 in the Fiscal Year 2006–2007 Budget Act. The previous statewide net need for additional judgeships, which was used as a basis for the February 2006 Issues Meeting discussion, was 355, which included the 50 new judgeships authorized and funded in the Fiscal Year 2006–2007 Budget Act.

growth, and distinguish current need from future growth. This approach, which was endorsed by the panel at its March 12, 2007, meeting, meets the following goals:

1. Avoids having to repeatedly adjust all 175 individual project costs (i.e., Project Budgets for Current Needs) whenever judgeship needs are updated. The statewide judgeship need analysis is currently required by SB 56 to be updated every two years. Frequent adjustments 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 new facility increments for new judgeships.

A *Project Budget for Current Needs* is based on the current need courtrooms, defined as existing number of courtrooms or JPEs in the facility or facilities to be fully or partially replaced or renovated, plus the allocation of any new SB 56 judgeships funded in FY 2006–2007, if applicable. A Project Budget for Current Needs—for either a *New* (construction) or an *Addition* project—is calculated by multiplying the current need courtrooms by a total project budget per courtroom of \$7.9 million³ and adding to that a budget for parking structures, where specified in the master plan. An example of this calculation is presented below.

Sample Project Budget for Current Needs: *New* (Construction) or *Addition* Project

Project Name	Current Courtrooms or JPEs	x	Budget per Courtroom/JPEs	=	<i>Project Budget for Current Needs</i>
New North Courthouse	4	x	\$7.9 million	=	\$31.6 million

A Project Budget for Current Needs—for either a *Renovation* project or for those that *Complete* unfinished space in an existing courthouse—is the master plan cost estimate escalated to January 2007 (unless the project is planned to only accommodate future growth), because a normalized multiplier for renovation projects cannot be reliably established. For all *Renovation and Addition* projects, blended Project Budgets for Current Needs were calculated based on the addition component and the renovation component, adjusting for growth as necessary.

For individual projects that the council has approved to request appropriations for, the total estimated project costs, including the cost of escalation to construction midpoint, is presented in the plan in order to ensure consistency among all documents presented to DOF, legislators, and the public. To date, this would include the total estimated project costs for the nine new

³ \$7.9 million is the average of the cost per courtroom in January 2007 dollars of all nine new trial court projects submitted to DOF for fiscal year 2007–2008 funding.

trial courts approved by the council for submission to DOF for FY 2007–2008 funding. The plan also presents the estimated project costs, including the cost of escalation to construction midpoint, for the four new trial courts submitted to the council for consideration for approval to request FY 2008–2009 appropriations as part of this council report.

The *Total Budget for Current Needs*—for all 175 projects within the plan—is the sum total of each Project Budget for Current Needs and where applicable, the estimated total project costs for council-approved projects.

The *Total Statewide Budget for 100 New Judgeships* represents a pool of funds to pay for facility increments needed to accommodate future new judgeships. This budget is based on funding needed for court facilities to house the next 100 future new judgeships approved by the council in February 2007. This budget can easily be modified annually as needed, in order to reflect how timely new judgeships are approved, updated statewide judgeship projections, and changes in council policy. Specifically, this budget would be reduced as the future 100 new judgeships that require space are assigned to specific projects at the time funding requests are developed, or increased when funding for new judgeships beyond the next 100 are added to the plan. Funds will be shifted from the *Total Statewide Growth Budget for 100 New Judgeships* to individual project budgets over time. The *Total Statewide Growth Budget for 100 New Judgeships* is added to the *Total Budget for Current Needs* to derive the *Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget* in any given year.

Recommendation 2

DOF establishes a 15- to 18-month lead time for the submission of funding requests for an upcoming fiscal year. Funding requests for FY 2008–2009 are due to the DOF on June 1, 2007. Based on direction from the panel, staff recommends requesting FY 2008–2009 funding for the following: land acquisition for future expansion of the existing courthouse serving the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in Riverside and initial funding for four new trial court projects: 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 each are attached.) Each of the new trial court projects will replace unsafe, overcrowded facilities in poor physical condition and will consolidate more than one existing facility. Potentially, three of the four projects will provide an economic opportunity in the form of a land donation or discounted land acquisition cost. The four trial court projects are estimated to cost a total of \$425.5 million, including land costs.⁴

In addition, and based on the January 2007 Governor’s budget for FY 2007–2008, the projects that may need to be resubmitted, pending the final FY 2007–2008 budget, for initial funding in FY 2008–2009 are new courthouses for the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, in San Diego and Sixth Appellate District, in San Jose; Calaveras – New San Andreas Courthouse; Lassen – New Susanville Courthouse; Los Angeles – New Long Beach Courthouse; San Benito – New Hollister Courthouse; and Tulare – New Porterville Courthouse. Descriptions of the Courts of Appeal projects can be found at

⁴ AOC staff will continue to refine the cost of each of these four projects up to the time of submission to DOF.

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/occm/publications.htm#atcp. Descriptions of the trial court projects that may need to be resubmitted for FY 2008–2009 initial funding can be found at www.courtinfo.gov/jc in the archived Judicial Council report dated August 25, 2006, and titled, *Court Facilities Planning: Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects and Fiscal Year 2007–2008 Trial Court Funding Requests*.

To meet the anticipated deadline for submission of FY 2008–2009 funding requests to DOF, AOC staff collaborated with the panel on potential funding requests by reviewing all projects in the Immediate Need group as presented in the attached plan. The panel, at its October 20, 2006, meeting, selected 17 projects for further analysis, based on the application of the subcriteria for funding contained within the methodology: specific rating for security criterion, potential economic opportunity, and replacement or consolidation of leased or owned space that corrects operational deficiencies. The panel directed AOC staff to collaborate with each of the courts that had one of the 17 preliminarily recommended trial court projects, in order to confirm size, cost, and consolidation and economic opportunities.

On December 18, 2006, the panel recommended the submission of only four new trial court projects for initial FY 2008–2009 funding, based on the following:

1. The status of the request for FY 2007–2008 initial funding for nine projects is unknown. By directing the AOC—in August 2006—to submit the nine trial court projects to the DOF for FY 2007–2008 funding, the council has deemed these nine the highest priority projects for the branch.
2. Alternative funding sources for court capital-outlay projects have not been secured. While the Governor has proposed a \$2 billion General Obligation Bond for court facilities, the earliest this could be placed on a ballot would be 2008. The State Court Facilities Construction Fund cannot support all the costs of the proposed nine projects for initial funding in FY 2007-2008.
3. Given the lack of available funds for court projects, the panel very narrowly considered the subcriteria for selecting projects, identifying only those projects with a maximum security rating of 80 and either an economic opportunity, a consolidation opportunity, or both. As a result, only 3 of the 17 projects evaluated by the panel met these criteria: Butte – New North Butte County Courthouse, Tehama – New Red Bluff Courthouse, and Yolo – New Woodland Courthouse.
4. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County has substantial capital improvement needs (i.e., 34 capital Project Budgets for Current Needs, totaling \$2.5 billion in January 2007 dollars), and these needs cannot be met in a reasonable time frame unless at least one project is approved in each fiscal year. The priority project for the court—among the six Los Angeles projects in the Immediate Need priority group—is the New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse.

For the two Courts of Appeal projects that were not included in the January 2007 Governor's budget for FY 2007–2008, the AOC typically resubmits these requests for consideration by the Executive Branch in the following fiscal year and recommends that the council direct staff to do so for FY 2008–2009. Appropriations from state General Funds will be requested for the land acquisition in Riverside and for the proposed new courthouses for the Fourth Appellate District in San Diego and the Sixth Appellate District in San Jose. Appropriations from state General Funds will also be requested for all costs associated with land acquisition, design and construction of the four proposed new trial court projects.

Recommendation 3

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Gov. Code, §§ 70301–70404) specifies the authority and responsibility of the 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 the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* to the DOF, 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 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.

For FY 2008–2009, 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, 2007, deadline, along with the budget change proposals for the appellate and trial court capital projects described above under Rationale 2.

Alternative Actions Considered

AOC staff considered the alternative of updating each Project Budget for Current Needs in the plan, based on its size and location. The AOC's experience in submitting funding requests for specific capital-outlay projects indicates that the size and estimated total cost of each project is determined at the time it is submitted for funding and there are many variables—some which change periodically—that affect the size and cost of a project over time. The biannual update to currently needed new judgeships is one variable that determines project size, and land donations and other economic opportunities also directly affect project costs. Staff rejected this option in favor of an option that aligns more detailed cost estimating with the executive branch's project funding review process. Staff considered an option that did not address the

large numbers of future JPEs included in many of the master plan projects, but rejected this in favor of a method that creates Project Budgets for Current Needs and a statewide growth budget.

An alternative to submitting the FY 2008–2009 funding requests is to wait for further development on the support of the court facilities bond bill, discussed on an ongoing basis with the Governor’s Office. Given the June 1, 2007, deadline for the judicial branch to submit its FY 2008–2009 budget change proposals to the DOF, this alternative would preclude the AOC from meeting that deadline. 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 2009–2010.

Comments From Interested Parties

On September 18, 2006, AOC staff polled, via e-mail, the 48 counties with facilities affected by seismic-correction provisions to request their permission to use the preliminary seismic findings in updating the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan. This initial request provided a two-week response period, in which the following occurred: 38 counties granted permission to use the findings, 5 did not, 1 was undecided, and 4 did not respond. On October 25, 2006, the panel directed AOC staff to post two items for court comment: two options for adjusting the project priority group points ranges, which established the Immediate Need group’s range from 14.5–20, and a preliminary list of 17 trial court projects under consideration for initial funding in FY 2008–2009, from which the four new trial court projects were ultimately selected. These items were posted on Serranus for a three-week comment period. The court comment period resulted in three comments in support of an equal distribution of projects to priority groups. At the same time, additional counties responded on the use of the preliminary seismic findings, and a total of 41 counties agreed to the use of the AOC preliminary seismic ratings to evaluate projects for the purpose of updating the plan.

Staff presented the approach to updating the project budgets in the plan to both the Court Executives Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee the week of March 12, 2007.

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:

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, April 27, 2007: Sorted by Total Score and by Court Descriptions of the Proposed Capital-Outlay Funding Requests for FY 2008–2009

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	Cumulative Budget
Riverside	New Indio Juvenile Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Immediate	20	5	5	5	5	\$7,900,000		\$7,900,000
Butte	New North Butte County Courthouse	Immediate	19	5	4	5	5	\$72,800,000		\$80,700,000
Madera	New Madera Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	4	5	4	\$94,714,000		\$175,414,000
Riverside	New Riverside Mid-County Region Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$56,154,000		\$231,568,000
San Bernardino	New San Bernardino Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$303,437,000		\$535,005,000
Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$66,390,240	Included in budget	\$601,395,240
Tulare	New Porterville Courthouse	Immediate	17.5	5	4	5	3.5	\$81,215,000		\$682,610,240
Monterey	New King City Courthouse	Immediate	17	5	4	3	5	\$23,700,000		\$706,310,240
Los Angeles	New Long Beach Courthouse – Phase 1 (S)	Immediate	17	5	3	5	4	\$296,635,000	Included in budget	\$1,002,945,240
Los Angeles	New Long Beach Courthouse – Phase 2 (S)	Immediate	17	5	3	5	4	\$31,600,000	\$4,200,000	\$1,038,745,240
Stanislaus	New Modesto Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000	\$1,110,345,240
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$39,500,000		\$1,149,845,240
Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	5	3	5	\$7,900,000		\$1,157,745,240
Los Angeles	Renovate Lancaster Courthouse (N)	Immediate	17	3	4	5	5	\$5,213,600		\$1,162,958,840
Kern	New Mojave Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$15,800,000		\$1,178,758,840
Sacramento	New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	3	5	3.5	\$229,100,000	\$30,450,000	\$1,438,308,840
Sutter	New Yuba City Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$47,400,000		\$1,485,708,840
San Benito	New Hollister Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	4	5	2	\$33,121,000		\$1,518,829,840
Shasta	New Redding Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$94,800,000	\$12,600,000	\$1,626,229,840
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	16	5	3	3	5	\$47,400,000		\$1,673,629,840
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$54,343,000	\$4,200,000	\$1,732,172,840
Riverside	Addition to Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$0		\$1,732,172,840
San Bernardino	Addition to Joshua Tree Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$23,700,000		\$1,755,872,840
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	3	5	4	\$47,400,000		\$1,803,272,840
Riverside	Addition to Hemet Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$23,700,000		\$1,826,972,840
Merced	New Los Banos Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$7,900,000		\$1,834,872,840
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Clarita Courthouse (NV)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$5,772,480		\$1,840,645,320
Solano	Renovation and Addition to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$10,171,516		\$1,850,816,836
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	3	5	2.5	\$118,500,000	\$15,750,000	\$1,985,066,836
San Joaquin	New Stockton Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	3	5	2.5	\$231,719,000		\$2,216,785,836
Lassen	New Susanville Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	4	5	1.5	\$36,139,000		\$2,252,924,836
San Joaquin	Renovate Juvenile Justice Center	Immediate	15.5	5	4	5	1.5	\$3,866,240		\$2,256,791,076
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	2	5	\$7,900,000		\$2,264,691,076
Lake	New Lakeport Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	4	5	1	\$31,600,000		\$2,296,291,076
Tehama	New Red Bluff Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	5	2	\$76,300,000		\$2,372,591,076
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	15	4	1	5	5	\$71,100,000		\$2,443,691,076

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	Cumulative Budget
Kern	New Delano Courthouse	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$15,800,000		\$2,459,491,076
Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$114,500,000	\$9,450,000	\$2,583,441,076
Imperial	New El Centro Family Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$31,600,000		\$2,615,041,076
Calaveras	New San Andreas Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	4	1.5	\$51,953,000		\$2,666,994,076
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000	\$2,738,594,076
Yolo	New Woodland Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$161,900,000		\$2,900,494,076
Santa Barbara	Renovation and Addition to Santa Barbara Figueroa Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$53,983,775	\$5,250,000	\$2,959,727,851
Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse (NC)	Immediate	14.5	4	3	5	2.5	\$71,100,000	\$9,450,000	\$3,040,277,851
Sierra	New Downieville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$7,900,000		\$3,048,177,851
Alpine	New Markleeville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$7,900,000		\$3,056,077,851
Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$15,800,000		\$3,071,877,851
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	14	5	3	1	5	\$7,900,000		\$3,079,777,851
Stanislaus	New Turlock Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$7,900,000		\$3,087,677,851
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Courthouse (MH)	Critical	14	4	3	5	2	\$23,700,000	\$3,150,000	\$3,114,527,851
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	14	1	3	5	5	\$102,700,000		\$3,217,227,851
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Hall of Justice/Law & Justice Center	Critical	13.5	3	3	5	2.5	\$4,280,640		\$3,221,508,491
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	13.5	2	4	5	2.5	\$7,900,000		\$3,229,408,491
Imperial	Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$0		\$3,229,408,491
San Diego	New Central San Diego Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$545,100,000	\$72,450,000	\$3,846,958,491
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$79,000,000	\$10,500,000	\$3,936,458,491
El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$47,400,000		\$3,983,858,491
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	13	5	4	1	3	\$15,800,000		\$3,999,658,491
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$86,900,000	\$11,550,000	\$4,098,108,491
Santa Clara	New San Jose Family Resources Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$173,800,000	\$23,100,000	\$4,295,008,491
Mendocino	New Ukiah Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$71,100,000		\$4,366,108,491
Siskiyou	New Yreka Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$39,500,000	\$5,250,000	\$4,410,858,491
Imperial	Renovate El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$19,993,120		\$4,430,851,611
Imperial	Renovate El Centro Courthouse - Phase 2	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$2,241,120		\$4,433,092,731
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Jury Assembly	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$580,160		\$4,433,672,891
Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	included above	included above	\$4,433,672,891
San Joaquin	Renovate Stockton Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$0		\$4,433,672,891
Los Angeles	New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse (JDeI)	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$39,500,000		\$4,473,172,891
Kings	New Hanford Courthouse	Critical	13	4	2	5	2	\$63,200,000		\$4,536,372,891
Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$47,400,000		\$4,583,772,891
San Diego	New Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	4	3	5	1	\$55,300,000	\$7,350,000	\$4,646,422,891
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Juvenile Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	13	3	4	1	5	\$0		\$4,646,422,891
San Diego	New Chula Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	3	3	5	2	\$15,800,000	\$2,100,000	\$4,664,322,891
Riverside	New Western Regional Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	13	3	3	2	5	\$15,800,000		\$4,680,122,891
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$15,800,000	\$2,100,000	\$4,698,022,891

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	Cumulative Budget
Tuolumne	New Sonora Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	4	3	0.5	\$31,600,000		\$4,729,622,891
Glenn	Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$19,031,348		\$4,748,654,239
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	12.5	4	3	5	0.5	\$47,400,000	\$6,300,000	\$4,802,354,239
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$110,600,000	\$14,700,000	\$4,927,654,239
Solano	New South Wing and Renovation of Fairfield Old School – Phase One	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$15,800,000		\$4,943,454,239
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$826,560		\$4,944,280,799
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Historic Anacapa Courthouse	High	12	5	2	5	0	\$5,464,480		\$4,949,745,279
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$5,628,785		\$4,955,374,064
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Courthouse	High	12	4	3	2	3	\$63,200,000		\$5,018,574,064
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$797,900,000	\$106,050,000	\$5,922,524,064
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$39,500,000	\$5,250,000	\$5,967,274,064
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	12	4	5	3	0	\$15,800,000		\$5,983,074,064
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$8,139,040		\$5,991,213,104
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse - Phase 2	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$110,600,000		\$6,101,813,104
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$15,800,000		\$6,117,613,104
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	11.5	2	4	2	3.5	\$15,800,000		\$6,133,413,104
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	11.5	1	2	5	3.5	\$55,300,000		\$6,188,713,104
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	11	4	2	5	0	\$3,496,640		\$6,192,209,744
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$7,900,000		\$6,200,109,744
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$102,700,000	\$13,650,000	\$6,316,459,744
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$47,400,000		\$6,363,859,744
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$189,600,000		\$6,553,459,744
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old School – Phase Two	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$25,011,840		\$6,578,471,584
Orange	Addition to Fullerton Courthouse	High	10.5	4	2	2	2.5	\$0	\$0	\$6,578,471,584
Monterey	Addition to Salinas Courthouse	High	10.5	3	2	3	2.5	\$0		\$6,578,471,584
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	4	2	2.5	\$0		\$6,578,471,584
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	10.5	2	2	5	1.5	\$47,400,000		\$6,625,871,584
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	3	5	0.5	\$47,329,503	\$6,300,000	\$6,679,501,087
Imperial	Addition to Calexico Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$0		\$6,679,501,087
Santa Clara	Addition to San Jose Civil Courthouse	High	10	5	2	3	0	\$0	\$0	\$6,679,501,087
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$15,800,000		\$6,695,301,087
Del Norte	Addition to Crescent City Courthouse	High	10	4	3	2	1	\$0		\$6,695,301,087
Alameda	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	High	10	4	1	5	0	\$229,100,000	\$14,700,000	\$6,939,101,087
San Bernardino	Renovation and Addition to Needles Courthouse	High	10	4	3	3	0	\$1,303,400		\$6,940,404,487
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	10	3	3	3	1	\$79,000,000	\$10,500,000	\$7,029,904,487
San Luis Obispo	New Grover Courthouse	High	10	3	5	2	0	\$7,900,000	\$1,050,000	\$7,038,854,487
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$45,307,360		\$7,084,161,847
Riverside	Renovate Palm Springs Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$7,752,640		\$7,091,914,487
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$29,257,760		\$7,121,172,247

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	Cumulative Budget
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$28,491,680		\$7,149,663,927
Inyo	New Bishop Courthouse	Medium	9	4	4	1	0	\$7,900,000		\$7,157,563,927
Siskiyou	New Siskiyou Service Centers	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$23,700,000		\$7,181,263,927
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$12,843,040	Included in budget	\$7,194,106,967
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$1,817,200		\$7,195,924,167
Los Angeles	Addition to New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)	Medium	9	3	1	5	0	\$0	\$0	\$7,195,924,167
Los Angeles	Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$15,800,000	\$2,100,000	\$7,213,824,167
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000	\$7,285,424,167
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$86,900,000	\$11,550,000	\$7,383,874,167
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$31,600,000	\$4,200,000	\$7,419,674,167
Los Angeles	Renovate Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$14,766,080		\$7,434,440,247
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$96,745,600		\$7,531,185,847
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$30,587,200		\$7,561,773,047
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$44,659,613	\$2,100,000	\$7,608,532,660
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	9	1	2	1	5	\$7,900,000		\$7,616,432,660
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	9	1	1	2	5	\$7,900,000	\$1,050,000	\$7,625,382,660
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	8.5	2	2	1	3.5	\$118,500,000	\$15,750,000	\$7,759,632,660
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	8	4	3	1	0	\$15,800,000		\$7,775,432,660
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	8	4	2	2	0	\$20,797,872		\$7,796,230,532
Alameda	New East County Hall of Justice	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$47,400,000		\$7,843,630,532
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$7,900,000		\$7,851,530,532
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$31,600,000		\$7,883,130,532
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$7,900,000		\$7,891,030,532
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$126,400,000		\$8,017,430,532
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$7,900,000		\$8,025,330,532
Napa	Renovate Napa Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$4,012,960		\$8,029,343,492
San Bernardino	Addition to Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	\$0	\$8,029,343,492
Placer	Addition to New Roseville Courthouse	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$7,900,000		\$8,037,243,492
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$39,500,000		\$8,076,743,492
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Family Law Courthouse (W Reg)	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	\$0	\$8,076,743,492
Riverside	Addition to Southwest Justice Center (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0		\$8,076,743,492
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000	\$8,148,343,492
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	8	1	4	3	0	\$7,900,000		\$8,156,243,492
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$39,500,000	\$5,250,000	\$8,200,993,492
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$31,426,080		\$8,232,419,572
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$33,321,120		\$8,265,740,692
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$10,791,200		\$8,276,531,892
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$56,315,840	Included in budget	\$8,332,847,732
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$13,252,960		\$8,346,100,692

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	Cumulative Budget
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$79,000,000	\$10,500,000	\$8,435,600,692
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$49,912,800		\$8,485,513,492
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$1,720,320		\$8,487,233,812
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	Low	7	2	3	1	1	\$0	Included in budget	\$8,487,233,812
Riverside	New Blythe Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Low	7	2	4	1	0	\$15,800,000		\$8,503,033,812
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	7	2	2	3	0	\$50,321,709		\$8,553,355,520
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	6.5	2	2	2	0.5	\$134,300,000	\$17,850,000	\$8,705,505,520
Tehama	Addition to Red Bluff Courthouse	Low	6	2	3	1	0	\$0		\$8,705,505,520
Monterey	New Monterey Bay Civil and Family Courthouse	Low	6	2	2	2	0	\$55,300,000		\$8,760,805,520
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	6	1	2	3	0	\$13,490,400		\$8,774,295,920
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	6	1	2	1	2	\$2,518,880		\$8,776,814,800
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento William Ridgeway Family Courthouse	Low	5.5	1	1	1	2.5	\$0		\$8,776,814,800
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Hall of Justice (W Reg)	Low	5	1	2	1	1	\$0		\$8,776,814,800
Los Angeles	Complete Michael D. Antonovich Antelope Valley Courthouse (N)	Low	5	1	1	1	2	\$0		\$8,776,814,800
Placer	New Auburn Courthouse	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$15,800,000		\$8,792,614,800
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$15,800,000		\$8,808,414,800
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$6,297,760		\$8,814,712,560
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$2,148,160		\$8,816,860,720
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$11,558,400		\$8,828,419,120
San Mateo	Addition to San Mateo Juvenile Courthouse	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$0		\$8,828,419,120
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Juvenile Justice Center	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$0		\$8,828,419,120
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000	\$8,900,019,120

Total Project Budget for Current Needs⁵

\$8,380,269,120 \$519,750,000

Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁶

\$519,750,000

Total Budget for Current Needs⁷

\$8,900,019,120

Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for 100 New Judgeships⁸

\$790,000,000

Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for 100 New Judgeships⁹

\$105,000,000

Total Statewide Budget for 100 New Judgeships¹⁰

\$895,000,000

Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget¹¹

\$9,795,019,120

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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 of project names.
- 2. Project Priority Group** based on collaboration with each county on application of *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* due to enactment of SB 10, and reevaluation of Merced - Addition to New Merced Courthouse and Placer - Addition to New Roseville Courthouse.
- 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 zero 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 \$7.9 million per courtroom, which is the average of the cost per courtroom in January 2007 dollars of all nine new trial courthouse projects submitted to DOF for FY 2007-2008 funding. (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 2007 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 nine FY 2007-2008, and for the four proposed FY 2008-2009 new trial courts include escalation to construction mid-point and surface or structured parking. FY 2007-2008 projects include: Calaveras - New San Andreas Courthouse; Lassen - New Susanville Courthouse; Los Angeles - New Long Beach Courthouse; Madera - New Madera Courthouse; Riverside - New Riverside Mid-County Region Courthouse; San Benito - New Hollister Courthouse; San Bernardino - New San Bernardino Courthouse; San Joaquin - New Stockton Courthouse; and Tulare - New Porterville Courthouse. 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. Costs for the Calaveras, Lassen, and San Benito projects are from the September 2006 DOF submission. Costs for the other FY 2007-2008 project are from March and April 2006 DOF submissions.

- 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 current need courtrooms by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$42,000 total project budget (Jan 2007) per parking space. A budget of zero indicates there was a parking structure identified in the master plan, but it serves 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 100 New Judgeships** is for increments of facility space to accommodate the next 100 new judgeships and is calculated by multiplying \$7.9 million per courtroom by 100.
- 9. Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for 100 New Judgeships** assumes each facility increment of space to accommodate one of the 100 new judgeships will require a parking structure for 25 cars. Budget is calculated by multiplying 100 new judgeships by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$42,000 (Jan 2007) total budget per parking space.
- 10. Total Statewide Budget for 100 New Judgeships** is the sum of the Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for 100 New Judgeships and the Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for 100 New Judgeships. Funds in this budget will be allocated to a specific project as needed to accommodate facility and parking capital-outlay costs for judgeships from the proposed next 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 100 New Judgeships.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	High	10	4	1	5	0	\$229,100,000	\$14,700,000
Alameda	New East County Hall of Justice	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$47,400,000	-
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	6	1	2	3	0	\$13,490,400	-
Alpine	New Markleeville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$7,900,000	-
Butte	New North Butte County Courthouse	Immediate	19	5	4	5	5	\$72,800,000	-
Calaveras	New San Andreas Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	4	1.5	\$51,953,000	-
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$15,800,000	-
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	3	5	4	\$47,400,000	-
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	\$47,400,000	-
Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$66,390,240	Included in budget
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	16	5	3	3	5	\$47,400,000	-
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	2	5	\$7,900,000	-
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	8.5	2	2	1	3.5	\$118,500,000	\$15,750,000
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$31,600,000	-
Glenn	Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$19,031,348	-
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	10	3	3	3	1	\$79,000,000	\$10,500,000
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$7,900,000	-
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$7,900,000	-
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	8	1	4	3	0	\$7,900,000	-
Imperial	New El Centro Family Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$31,600,000	-
Imperial	Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$0	-
Imperial	Renovate El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$19,993,120	-
Imperial	Renovate El Centro Courthouse - Phase 2	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$2,241,120	-
Imperial	Addition to Calexico Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$0	-
Inyo	New Bishop Courthouse	Medium	9	4	4	1	0	\$7,900,000	-
Kern	New Mojave Courthouse	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	\$15,800,000	-
Kern	New Delano Courthouse	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$15,800,000	-
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	13	5	4	1	3	\$15,800,000	-
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$110,600,000	\$14,700,000
Kern	Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse - Phase 2	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$110,600,000	-
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	11.5	2	4	2	3.5	\$15,800,000	-
Kings	New Hanford Courthouse	Critical	13	4	2	5	2	\$63,200,000	-
Lake	New Lakeport Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	4	5	1	\$31,600,000	-
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	13.5	2	4	5	2.5	\$7,900,000	-
Lassen	New Susanville Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	4	5	1.5	\$36,139,000	-

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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	New Long Beach Courthouse – Phase 1 (S)	Immediate	17	5	3	5	4	\$296,635,000	Included in budget
Los Angeles	New Long Beach Courthouse – Phase 2 (S)	Immediate	17	5	3	5	4	\$31,600,000	\$4,200,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Lancaster Courthouse (N)	Immediate	17	3	4	5	5	\$5,213,600	-
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Clarita Courthouse (NV)	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$5,772,480	-
Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	\$114,500,000	\$9,450,000
Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse (NC)	Immediate	14.5	4	3	5	2.5	\$71,100,000	\$9,450,000
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Courthouse (MH)	Critical	14	4	3	5	2	\$23,700,000	\$3,150,000
Los Angeles	New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$39,500,000	-
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$797,900,000	\$106,050,000
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$39,500,000	\$5,250,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$8,139,040	-
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$102,700,000	\$13,650,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$45,307,360	-
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$29,257,760	-
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$28,491,680	-
Los Angeles	Addition to New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse (SE)	Medium	9	3	1	5	0	\$0	\$0
Los Angeles	Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$15,800,000	\$2,100,000
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$86,900,000	\$11,550,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$14,766,080	
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$96,745,600	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$30,587,200	
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$39,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$39,500,000	\$5,250,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$31,426,080	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$33,321,120	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$10,791,200	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$13,252,960	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	7	2	2	3	0	\$50,321,709	
Los Angeles	Complete Michael D. Antonovich Antelope Valley Courthouse (N)	Low	5	1	1	1	2	\$0	
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$6,297,760	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$11,558,400	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000
Madera	New Madera Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	4	5	4	\$94,714,000	
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$126,400,000	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	12	4	5	3	0	\$15,800,000	
Mendocino	New Ukiah Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$71,100,000	
Merced	New Los Banos Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$7,900,000	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	9	1	2	1	5	\$7,900,000	
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$7,900,000	
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$826,560	
Monterey	New King City Courthouse	Immediate	17	5	4	3	5	\$23,700,000	
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	\$55,300,000	
Napa	Renovate Napa Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$4,012,960	
Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	\$47,400,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$15,800,000	
Orange	Addition to Fullerton Courthouse	High	10.5	4	2	2	2.5	\$0	
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$12,843,040	Included in budget
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	6.5	2	2	2	0.5	\$134,300,000	\$17,850,000
Placer	Addition to New Roseville Courthouse	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$7,900,000	
Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	5	3	5	\$7,900,000	
Placer	New Auburn Courthouse	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$15,800,000	
Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$15,800,000	
Riverside	New Indio Juvenile Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Immediate	20	5	5	5	5	\$7,900,000	
Riverside	New Riverside Mid-County Region Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$56,154,000	
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	\$23,700,000	
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	14	5	3	1	5	\$7,900,000	
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	\$15,800,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	11.5	1	2	5	3.5	\$55,300,000	
Riverside	Renovate Palm Springs Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$7,752,640	
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	\$15,800,000	
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	\$229,100,000	\$30,450,000
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$86,900,000	\$11,550,000
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	Low	7	2	3	1	1	\$0	Included in budget
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento William Ridgeway Family Courthouse	Low	5.5	1	1	1	2.5	\$0	
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Juvenile Justice Center	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$0	
San Benito	New Hollister Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	4	5	2	\$33,121,000	
San Bernardino	New San Bernardino Courthouse	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	\$303,437,000	
San Bernardino	Addition to Joshua Tree Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$23,700,000	
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	14	1	3	5	5	\$102,700,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	11	4	2	5	0	\$3,496,640	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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 Bernardino	Renovation and Addition to Needles Courthouse	High	10	4	3	3	0	\$1,303,400	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	9	1	1	2	5	\$7,900,000	\$1,050,000
San Bernardino	Addition to Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	1	1	1	5	\$0	\$0
San Diego	New Central San Diego Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$545,100,000	\$72,450,000
San Diego	New Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	4	3	5	1	\$55,300,000	\$7,350,000
San Diego	New Chula Vista Courthouse	Critical	13	3	3	5	2	\$15,800,000	\$2,100,000
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$5,628,785	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$47,400,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$44,659,613	\$2,100,000
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$2,148,160	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$189,600,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$79,000,000	\$10,500,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$1,720,320	
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$39,500,000	
San Joaquin	New Stockton Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	3	5	2.5	\$231,719,000	
San Joaquin	Renovate Juvenile Justice Center	Immediate	15.5	5	4	5	1.5	\$3,866,240	
San Joaquin	Renovate Stockton Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$0	
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	12.5	4	3	5	0.5	\$47,400,000	\$6,300,000
San Luis Obispo	New Grover Courthouse	High	10	3	5	2	0	\$7,900,000	\$1,050,000
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$1,817,200	
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	8	4	2	2	0	\$20,797,872	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$49,912,800	
San Mateo	Addition to San Mateo Juvenile Courthouse	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$0	
Santa Barbara	Renovation and Addition to Santa Barbara Figueroa Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	4	5	0.5	\$53,983,775	\$5,250,000
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Jury Assembly	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$580,160	
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$15,800,000	\$2,100,000
Santa Barbara	Renovate Santa Barbara Historic Anacapa Courthouse	High	12	5	2	5	0	\$5,464,480	
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$7,900,000	
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$79,000,000	\$10,500,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Family Resources Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$173,800,000	\$23,100,000
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	3	5	0.5	\$47,329,503	\$6,300,000
Santa Clara	Addition to San Jose Civil Courthouse	High	10	5	2	3	0	\$0	\$0
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$31,600,000	\$4,200,000
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$15,800,000	
Shasta	New Redding Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$94,800,000	\$12,600,000
Sierra	New Downieville Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$7,900,000	
Siskiyou	New Yreka Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$39,500,000	\$5,250,000
Siskiyou	New Siskiyou Service Centers	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$23,700,000	
Solano	Renovation and Addition to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	\$10,171,516	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Hall of Justice/Law & Justice Center	Critical	13.5	3	3	5	2.5	\$4,280,640	
Solano	New South Wing and Renovation of Fairfield Old School – Phase One	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$15,800,000	
Solano	Renovate Fairfield Old School – Phase Two	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$25,011,840	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	Immediate	15.5	5	3	5	2.5	\$118,500,000	\$15,750,000
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000
Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	included above	included above
Stanislaus	New Modesto Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$63,200,000	\$8,400,000
Stanislaus	New Turlock Courthouse	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	\$7,900,000	
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Courthouse	High	12	4	3	2	3	\$63,200,000	
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	\$47,400,000	
Tehama	New Red Bluff Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	5	2	\$76,300,000	
Tehama	Addition to Red Bluff Courthouse	Low	6	2	3	1	0	\$0	
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	8	4	3	1	0	\$15,800,000	
Tulare	New Porterville Courthouse	Immediate	17.5	5	4	5	3.5	\$81,215,000	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$54,343,000	\$4,200,000
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	6	1	2	1	2	\$2,518,880	
Tuolumne	New Sonora Courthouse	Critical	12.5	5	4	3	0.5	\$31,600,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	15	4	1	5	5	\$71,100,000	
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$56,315,840	Included in budget
Yolo	New Woodland Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$161,900,000	
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	10.5	2	2	5	1.5	\$47,400,000	

Total Project Budget for Current Needs⁵

\$8,380,269,120

\$519,750,000

Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁶

\$519,750,000

Total Budget for Current Needs⁷

\$8,900,019,120

Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for 100 New Judgeships⁸

\$790,000,000

Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for 100 New Judgeships⁹

\$105,000,000

Total Statewide Budget for 100 New Judgeships¹⁰

\$895,000,000

Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget¹¹

\$9,795,019,120

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

April 27, 2007

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 collaboration with each county on application of *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* due to enactment of SB 10, and reevaluation of Merced - Addition to New Merced Courthouse and Placer - Addition to New Roseville Courthouse.
- 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 zero 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 \$7.9 million per courtroom, which is the average of the cost per courtroom in January 2007 dollars of all nine new trial courthouse projects submitted to DOF for FY 2007-2008 funding. (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 2007 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 nine FY 2007-2008, and for the four proposed FY 2008-2009 new trial courts include escalation to construction mid-point and surface or structured parking. FY 2007-2008 projects include: Calaveras - New San Andreas Courthouse; Lassen - New Susanville Courthouse; Los Angeles - New Long Beach Courthouse; Madera - New Madera Courthouse; Riverside - New Riverside Mid-County Region Courthouse; San Benito - New Hollister Courthouse; San Bernardino - New San Bernardino Courthouse; San Joaquin - New Stockton Courthouse; and Tulare - New Porterville Courthouse. 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. Costs for the Calaveras, Lassen, and San Benito projects are from the September 2006 DOF submission. Costs for the other FY 2007-2008 project are from March and April 2006 DOF submissions.

- 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 current need courtrooms by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$42,000 total project budget (Jan 2007) per parking space. A budget of zero indicates there was a parking structure identified in the master plan, but it serves 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 100 New Judgeships** is for increments of facility space to accommodate the next 100 new judgeships and is calculated by multiplying \$7.9 million per courtroom by 100.
- 9. Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for 100 New Judgeships** assumes each facility increment of space to accommodate one of the 100 new judgeships will require a parking structure for 25 cars. Budget is calculated by multiplying 100 new judgeships by 25 parking spaces per courtroom by \$42,000 (Jan 2007) total budget per parking space.
- 10. Total Statewide Budget for 100 New Judgeships** is the sum of the Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for 100 New Judgeships and the Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for 100 New Judgeships. Funds in this budget will be allocated to a specific project as needed to accommodate facility and parking capital-outlay costs for judgeships from the proposed next 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 100 New Judgeships.

Descriptions of the Proposed New Capital-Outlay Funding Requests for Fiscal Year 2008–2009

The following descriptions are of the five 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 2008–2009. The four trial court projects are estimated to cost a total of \$425.5 million, 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 four trial court projects until the time of submission to the DOF on June 1, 2007. State General Funds will be requested for land acquisition, design, and construction.

Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District in Riverside—Land Acquisition

The AOC submitted a concept paper for FY 2008–2009 funding for the acquisition of property (i.e., an existing surface parking lot of approximately one acre, owned by the County of Riverside) adjacent to the existing appellate courthouse for future expansion of the courthouse. The existing courthouse was constructed by the Department of General Services as a lease-to-own facility, and the current site has very little capacity for future expansion. The case filings and need for additional justices within this high-population growth district warrant action to acquire the property for the purposes of securing the long-term future of this facility within the civic center area. General Funds will be requested for this land acquisition, which is estimated at \$1.7 million. No future phases, such as design or construction, will be requested until warranted.

Superior Court of California, County of Butte—New North Butte County Courthouse

The proposed New North Butte County Courthouse is aligned with the county's facilities master plan for consolidating its Chico-area offices into a northern government complex. As the county is committed to locating its complex in a location suitable to the court, a number of properties are currently under assessment by their hired consultants. This project consolidates the existing Chico and Paradise court facilities. An economic opportunity is likely in the form of a land donation, a below-market land acquisition cost, or a property swap negotiated with the county for the existing Chico courthouse site. On a site large enough to accommodate the expansion of one additional courtroom for future growth, this project will provide five courtrooms: three for the current judicial position equivalents (JPEs), one for the funded Senate Bill 56 (Dunn) judgeship, and one for the future, unfunded new judgeship from the next 100 requested new judgeships. The facility will be a full-service courthouse. With the closure of two other court facilities, this project would serve all northern county residents, and the existing Oroville facility would serve those in the southern county area. The Chico and Paradise facilities—which have poor security, are overcrowded, and have many physical problems—are scheduled to transfer to the state by June 2007. The project is estimated to cost \$72.8 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint.

Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles—New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse

The proposed New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse will replace the existing Huntington Park Branch facility and the former South Gate Courthouse, which the court was forced to close and to redistribute associated caseload as a result of security budget reductions, and will absorb the criminal case filings now handled at the Downey court facility. The new facility will replace nine existing courtrooms. The project will return needed criminal court services to the community. The Huntington Park Branch facility is scheduled to transfer to the state by June 2007. The project is estimated to cost \$114.5 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint.

Superior Court of California, County of Tehama—New Red Bluff Courthouse

The proposed New Red Bluff Courthouse will provide six courtrooms, one of which would remain unfinished to accommodate future growth. It will consolidate five existing courtrooms, located in four existing Red Bluff facilities, and the functions of the Corning facility. Essentially, all court functions will be operated from this new courthouse, except for those matters currently heard at the Juvenile Justice Center. In terms of economic opportunity, the court has initiated discussions with the county over the provision of land at a particular site, and the county is interested in working collaboratively with the state on this matter. Five affected facilities—the Historic Courthouse, Annex. No. 2, Family Law, Corning Superior Court, and the Court Storage—are all scheduled to transfer to the state by June 2007. The project is estimated to cost \$76.3 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint.

Superior Court of California, County of Yolo—New Woodland Courthouse

The proposed New Woodland Courthouse will provide 16 courtrooms. It will consolidate court operations and 13 existing courtrooms now located in six existing facilities. The new facility will be full service, the single-point access to all judicial services within the county. The court has successfully secured a resolution for a donation of land from the County of Yolo for at least one potential site for the new courthouse. Three affected facilities—the Old Jail, Family Support, and the Historic Courthouse—are all scheduled to transfer to the state in May 2007. The leased traffic court transferred on November 1, 2006. The project is estimated to cost \$161.9 million, including the cost of land and escalation to construction midpoint.