Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2016–2017

SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA COURTS OF APPEAL
SUPERIOR COURTS OF CALIFORNIA

ADOPTED BY THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:
AUGUST 21, 2015

SUBMITTED TO THE
STATE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE:
SEPTEMBER 2, 2015

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Judicial Council of California
Operations and Programs Division
Capital Program
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Phone number: 415-865-4900
www.courts.ca.gov/5year1617.pdf

Judicial Branch
AB 1473
Five-Year Infrastructure Plan
Fiscal Year 2016–2017

Supreme Court of California
California Courts of Appeal
Superior Courts of California

Adopted by the Judicial Council on August 21, 2015
Including Subsequent Technical Revisions
Submitted to the State Department of Finance on September 2, 2015

Purpose and Acknowledgments

This report has been prepared by the Capital Program office of the Judicial Council of California. At the direction of the Judicial Council, it is updated annually for submission to the state Department of Finance along with funding requests for courthouse capital-outlay projects.

Judicial Council Staff
Executive Office and Capital Program office

Mr. Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director

Mr. William J. Guerin
Director

Ms. Kelly Quinn
Assistant Director for Business and Planning

Ms. Kristine Metzker
Planning Manager

Ms. Angela Guzman
Financial Manager

Mr. Chris H. Magnusson
Senior Facilities Planner

Contents

I. Introduction 1
- A. Legislative Framework: Structural Changes to the Responsibility for the Court System 3
- B. Judicial Council of California 3
- C. Trial and Appellate Courts 4
- D. Completed Transfers of Trial Court Facilities 5
- E. Court Facilities Advisory Committee—Advisory Committee to the Judicial Council 5
- F. California's Court Facilities 6
- G. Map of California Court Jurisdictions 8

II. Summary of Fiscal Year 2016–2017 Funding Requests and Capital-Outlay Needs for SB 1407 Trial Court Projects 9

III. Appellate Courts Five-Year Infrastructure Plan 12
- A. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Supreme Court 12
- B. Summary of Existing Supreme Court Facilities 12
  - 1. Supreme Court of California – San Francisco and Los Angeles 13
  - 2. Supreme Court of California – San Francisco and Los Angeles, *continued* 14
- C. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Courts of Appeal 14
- D. Planning for Future Appellate Court Facilities 14
- E. Summary of Appellate Court Projects 16
- F. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Appellate Court Facilities 17
  - 1. First Appellate District – San Francisco 17
  - 2. Second Appellate District – Los Angeles and Ventura 17
  - 3. Third Appellate District – Sacramento 18
  - 4. Fourth Appellate District – San Diego, Riverside, and Santa Ana 19
  - 5. Fifth Appellate District – Fresno 20
  - 6. Sixth Appellate District – San Jose 21

IV. Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan 22
- A. Summary of Trial Court Capital Planning Process 22
  - 1. Task Force on Court Facilities 22
  - 2. Facility Master Plans for 58 Trial Courts 23
  - 3. Prioritization of Trial Court Capital Projects Identified in Master Plans 24
  - 4. Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan: Updated Budgets and Project Priority Groups. 24
  - 5. Judicial Projections as a Basis for Planning. 25
  - 6. FY 2015–2016 Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects Authorized for Funding. 26
- B. Drivers of Need 27
  - 1. Lack of Security, Severe Overcrowding, and Poor Physical Conditions 27
  - 2. Current Need for Additional Judges 30
  - 3. Consolidation of Facilities 32
  - 4. Improved Access to the Courts / Access 3D 32
- C. Inventory of Trial Court Space 32
- D. Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs 33

E. Alternative Approaches to Meeting Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs 34
F. Facilities to Meet Trial Court Unmet Needs and Proposed Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan 34
G. Consequences of Not Addressing Identified Needs 35
1. In-Custody Movement Costs Remain High 36
2. Unsafe Conditions Will Persist 36
3. Facilities Will Continue to Deteriorate 36
4. Funding Needs for Facility Modifications Will Increase 36
5. Scattered and Unconsolidated Facilities Must Be Maintained 37
6. Space for New Judges Will Be Provided in Nonconsolidated Facilities, and Access to Court Services Will Continue to Be Limited. 37
H. Reconciliation to Previous Plan 37

V. Staff to the Judicial Council 39
A. Purpose of the Staff to the Judicial Council 39
1. Executive Office. 40
2. Governmental Affairs. 40
3. Leadership Services Division. 40
4. Operations and Programs Division. 41
5. Administrative Division. 42
B. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Judicial Council Facilities 42
1. San Francisco (Headquarters) 43
2. Sacramento 44
3. Burbank 45
4. Field Offices 46

Appendix A A-1

- August 2015 Judicial Council Report: Senate Bill 1407 Project Funding Requests and *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year 2016–2017
- *10 Indefinitely Delayed SB 1407 Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects: Sorted by Alphabetical Order,* August 21, 2015
- *Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan,* August 21, 2015: Sorted by Total Score and by Court (January 2015 dollars)

I. Introduction

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

California's court system is the largest in the world, with over 8.5 million filings annually, 10 million Californians called to jury service, and service to a population of more than 38 million people. As the primary point of contact between the public and the judicial branch, court facilities—housing more than 2,000 judicial officers and 19,000 branch employees statewide—play a central role in access to and delivery of justice. Today, however, California's court buildings are in a state of significant disrepair, and they require substantial improvements to ensure the safety and security of court users, greater court efficiency, and equal access for all.

Assembly Bill 1473 (Hertzberg; Stats. 1999, ch. 606), codified at Government Code sections 13100–13104, requires the Governor to submit annually to the Legislature (1) a proposed five-year plan addressing the infrastructure needs of state executive branch agencies, schools, and postsecondary institutions; and (2) a proposal for funding the needed infrastructure. Because the Judicial Council of California is not an executive branch agency, its projects are not technically required to be included in the Governor's five-year infrastructure plan under AB 1473. However, because Government Code section 13103 empowers the Governor to order *any entity* of state government to assist in preparation of the infrastructure plan, the Judicial Council on a voluntary basis has historically submitted an annual infrastructure plan to the state Department of Finance (DOF) to facilitate executive branch approval of judicial branch capital project funding requests. This annual infrastructure plan—the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*—conveys the judicial branch's funding needs for capital-outlay projects only, including new courthouse construction and major renovations to existing courthouses, because funding for improvements to existing facility infrastructure is not considered part of the judicial branch's planned capital outlay. [1] The Judicial Council is the authority responsible for adopting annual updates to this five-year plan and for directing its staff to submit this five-year plan to the DOF.[2] The state's court facilities require a renewed and continuing investment to ensure that they serve the public safely, efficiently, and effectively and that they provide equal access to the law and the

[1] At the direction of the Judicial Council, all modifications to existing facilities are addressed through the trial court facility modifications program and in accordance with the *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy* available at *www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212_tcfmp-update.pdf.*

[2] Staff to the Judicial Council assists the council in meeting its responsibilities by, among other things, annually submitting to the DOF an updated *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, which includes capital-outlay plans for the superior courts and the Courts of Appeal, including the Supreme Court of California. The *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* provides the executive and legislative branches with a context for annual courthouse capital project funding requests.

judicial system. The *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year (FY) 2006–2007 established a program for improvement of the court facilities of the State of California. Since the approval of that document by the Judicial Council on June 1, 2005, its staff has made significant progress toward accomplishing various aspects of this program. This *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2016–2017 represents an update to its predecessor, documenting a multibillion-dollar program for improvement of the state's court facilities.

The passage of Senate Bill 1407 (Perata; Stats. 2008, ch. 311) established special revenues to support up to $5 billion in lease-revenue bonds for trial court facility improvements and enabled the branch to make great strides toward improving the trial courts across the state. However, since 2009, $1.5 billion in Senate Bill 1732 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1082) and SB 1407 funds have been loaned, redirected to offset trial court funding cuts, or swept to offset the ongoing state General Fund deficit.[3] Consequently, the judicial branch no longer has sufficient funding to do everything the Judicial Council had directed since SB 1407 was enacted.

In FY 2011–2012 alone, over $540 million was loaned, redirected, or swept from SB 1407 funds—requiring the cancellation of two SB 1407 projects, the delay of others' moving into their next phases, and the reduced budgets of all active projects. In FY 2012–2013, the Judicial Council indefinitely delayed seven projects for the Superior Courts of Kern, Los Angeles, Monterey, Placer, and Plumas Counties resulting from the enactment of the 2012 Budget Act (FY 2012−2013)—which redirected over $240 million in SB 1407 funds, of which $50 million became an ongoing, annual redirection to offset trial court General Fund reductions.

In January 2013, the Judicial Council took additional steps due to enactment of the Governor's Budget for FY 2013–2014that included payment for the New Long Beach Courthouse (Governor George Deukmejian Courthouse) from SB 1407 funds rather than the General Fund, the deferred repayment of a $90 million loan (to the state General Fund) from SB 1407 construction funds, and the redirection of $200 million in SB 1407 funds to trial court operations. As a result, the Judicial Council determined that four more projects—in Fresno, Los Angeles, Nevada, and Sacramento—were indefinitely delayed.[4]

When the 2014 Budget Act (FY 2014–2015) was enacted in June 2014, a one-time General Fund augmentation of $40 million was included to reduce—from $50 million to $10 million—the required annual amount of SB 1407 funds redirected to support trial court operations. This

[3] This total capital-outlay deficit continues to increase each year by $50 million because of ongoing redirection of facilities funds to trial court operations.

[4] In January 2013, the Judicial Council determined that the Sacramento–New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse project move forward with its site acquisition, to seek necessary funding and acquisition approvals for its preferred site; however, work on its predesign and design was suspended and indefinitely delayed. Site acquisition was completed and approved by the State Public Works Board on July 18, 2014, and on July 29, 2014, the council determined it would sponsor legislation to appropriate funds for the project's preliminary plans and working drawings phases. In September 2014, one-time funds for those phases of the project were authorized through Assembly Bill 1476 (Committee on Budget; Stats. 2014, ch. 663), and its status is no longer indefinitely delayed because it is currently in design.

General Fund augmentation was not continued in the 2015 Budget Act (FY 2015–2016). However, funding established for courthouse construction by SB 1732 and SB 1407—even without redirection of funds—remains inadequate to meet all infrastructure needs. The unmet funding requirement for courthouse construction is expressed and summarized in table 5 of this five-year plan, which presents the total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan budget of $7.3 billion in January 2015 dollars.[5]

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

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

In 2002, the Trial Court Facilities Act (Sen. Bill 1732; and subsequent modifying language) was enacted. The act provides for the shift of responsibility for trial court facilities—including operations, maintenance, facility modifications, and capital-outlay projects—from county to state governance, under the direction of the Judicial Council. The act was the final step in restructuring the courts into an integrated judicial branch and built on three earlier pieces of legislation intended to unify the courts: the Trial Court Funding Act (1997), which provided for state funding of the court system; Proposition 220 (1998), which allowed for the voluntary unification of the state's superior and municipal courts into a single trial court in each county; and the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (2000), which at the time made the courts independent employers of the more than 20,000 trial court workers. It is within the context of these changes to the funding and organization of the California court system as well as the mandate of the Trial Court Facilities Act that this five-year infrastructure plan for the California court system has been developed.

B. Judicial Council of California

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

Structural changes in the judicial branch that began in the late 1990s, such as unification of the superior and municipal courts and state funding of the court system, have significantly increased the Judicial Council's roles and responsibilities. In August 2012, the Judicial Council voted unanimously to restructure its staff, and a new organizational structure was implemented on October 1, 2012. Today, the Judicial Council has a staff of approximately 775 led by an

[5] The capital-outlay plan's budget is presented in current dollars, defined for this plan as January 2015 dollars.

Executive Office that oversees Governmental Affairs in Sacramento and three divisions with staff in San Francisco, Sacramento, and Burbank.

Staff to the Judicial Council is housed in four main facilities, in addition to field offices in commercial leased space and space in existing court facilities. The field offices support facilities management of various local courts. The headquarters is located in San Francisco, in the state-owned Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex. In Sacramento, the staff office and the office of Governmental Affairs are located in commercial leased space, as is the office in Burbank. In section V.A. of this report, detailed descriptions have been provided of the Judicial Council staff's three divisions and the offices that they comprise, its four main facilities, and its field offices.

To fulfill the responsibilities of the Trial Court Facilities Act, the Judicial Council, in August 2003, established an office to manage trial court transfers (all of which were successfully completed by December 2009); to strategically plan for capital outlay, design, and construction of court facilities; and to facilitate real estate management of facilities for its staff and the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and superior courts statewide. The office responsible for planning and executing the capital-outlay program is called Capital Program.[6]

C. Trial and Appellate Courts

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

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

California's appellate court facilities are currently the responsibility of the state. The responsibility for trial or superior court facilities was transferred from the counties to the state

[6] As part of Judicial Council staff restructuring in fall 2012, the Judicial Council's Office of Court Construction and Management, which was established to implement the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002, was divided into two new offices: the Judicial Branch Capital Program Office and the Office of Real Estate and Facilities Management. Effective July 29, 2014, the council renamed these offices Capital Program and Real Estate and Facilities Management, respectively.

under the mandate of the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. This undertaking and its timeline are summarized in section D. below.

D. Completed Transfers of Trial Court Facilities

Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, negotiations for transfer of responsibility of all trial court facilities from the counties to the state began July 1, 2004, and continued through June 30, 2007. During that time period, approximately 120 trial court facilities were addressed under transfer agreements. On April 23, 2008, Assembly Bill 1491 (Jones; Stats. 2008, ch. 9) was enacted to extend the facility transfers deadline to December 31, 2009. On December 29, 2009, the last trial court facility transfer was completed, resulting in over 500 facilities transferred and under the responsibility of the state. The facility transfer process—involving the participation of all 58 counties—was the foundation for creating a single, comprehensive infrastructure program for courthouses statewide.

E. Court Facilities Advisory Committee—Advisory Committee to the Judicial Council

In July 2011, Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye established the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (formerly, the Court Facilities Working Group) as a standing advisory committee to the Judicial Council to provide ongoing oversight of the judicial branch capital construction program for trial and appellate courts throughout the state. The committee oversees the work of Judicial Council staff in its effort to implement the judicial branch's statewide capital improvement program and makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for action.

Committee members are drawn from the trial and appellate courts throughout the state—including justices, judges, and court executives—in addition to private attorneys, design and facilities professionals, and a local government administrator. In evaluating courthouse projects as well as facility policies, this committee solicits input from the affected courts and from the public. To date, the full committee has met 16 times.

Since April 2012, the committee met five times specifically to review how one-time and ongoing enacted or proposed redirection of SB 1407 funds would affect the ability of the judicial branch to move all SB 1407 projects forward as planned and to develop recommendations to the Judicial Council. These meetings—in April, July, September, and December of 2012, and in February of 2013—resulted in action by the Judicial Council at its meetings in April and October of 2012 and in January and February of 2013. During this period, the SB 1407 courthouse construction program and its overall schedule were modified each time the Judicial Council took action.[7] In October 2011, the committee formed its Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee with the purpose of proposing further cost reductions to the SB 1407 courthouse construction program. In October 2012, the Judicial Council directed that the subcommittee oversee and have direct implementation authority to mandate project cost reductions for all capital-outlay projects in design (preliminary plans and working drawings) managed by the judicial branch. The subcommittee's primary goal is to reduce expenditure of public funds on the judicial branch's

[7] Complete details of the Judicial Council's actions are in the Judicial Council reports in Appendix A of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan: Fiscal Year 2013–2014.*

capital-outlay projects without compromising safety, security, and functionality for the public and the courts. To date, this subcommittee has managed to reduce the budgets of the 28 SB 1407 projects it has reviewed by approximately $380 million.[8]

F. California's Court Facilities

The Judicial Council's real property portfolio includes all property leased or owned for the benefit of its staff, the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal, the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, the Commission on Judicial Performance, and all superior courts. The real estate portfolio currently comprises approximately 360 active expense and revenue leases and 400 owned properties,[9] totaling approximately 14 million usable square feet (USF) [10] exclusively occupied by Judicial Council staff, the courts, and other judicial branch entities. On the whole, the building area under Judicial Council responsibility and management has gradually increased to what is now approximately 20 million square feet of facility space.[11]

The Supreme Court occupies just over 100,000 USF of space between two facilities: the Earl Warren Building of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex in San Francisco and the Ronald Reagan State Building in Los Angeles. The other appellate courts, occupying a total of just over 500,000 square feet of space in 10 facilities, serve six regional districts: the first appellate district, in San Francisco; the second appellate district, in Los Angeles and Ventura; the third appellate district, in Sacramento; the fourth appellate district, in San Diego, Riverside, and Santa Ana; the fifth appellate district, in Fresno; and the six appellate district, in San Jose.

California's trial court facilities—totaling the approximately 500 that transferred to the state by December 29, 2009—vary considerably in size, age, and condition. The largest trial court facility is the Stanley Mosk Courthouse in downtown Los Angeles, with 100 courtrooms. Some rural and mountainous areas are served by one- or two-courtroom facilities. Although a few court facilities are new or quite old and historic, the inventory is generally aging, with approximately 70 percent of all court facilities in California built before 1980. In most cases, these older facilities serve neither the public nor the court well, owing to physical conditions and designs rendered obsolete by modern court operations and caseload demands. During the past decade, some counties

---

[8] Judicial Council mandates on reducing costs of SB 1407 projects are listed in the April and October 2012 reports contained in Appendix A of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan: Fiscal Year 2013–2014.*

[9] These properties are owned either by the judicial branch or by counties but their management has transferred to the Judicial Council under the provisions of SB 1732. The owned property portfolio includes buildings, parking lots and structures, and new courthouse sites.

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

[11] The square footage under responsibility includes all court-exclusive areas in the transferred facilities, including their percentages of common space, and the gross square footage of any building for which the Judicial Council is the managing party (i.e., responsible for the entirety of the building's operations and maintenance). Also included under responsibility is rentable square footage for any leased facility.

invested in their court facilities but many could not, because of insufficient funding and competing priorities.

Although the facility transfer process has successfully concluded, California's trial court facilities remain in a state of significant disrepair. Based on Task Force on Court Facilities data, approximately 90 percent of California's trial court facilities require significant renovation, repair, or maintenance. Over 80 percent were constructed before the 1988 seismic codes took effect, 23 court facilities are in temporary buildings or trailers, and 25 percent lack space to assemble jurors.[12] These facilities are in extremely poor condition, lack any type of security, are functionally insufficient to support court operations, and are sometimes inaccessible.

Court facilities serving California's trial courts were initially built and maintained by each of California's 58 county governments. Historically, court facility needs were assessed at the county level, and both funding and approval for construction, maintenance, and renovation projects had been the responsibility of each county's board of supervisors, until such time as facility transfers were executed. As a result, the trial courts were often "subject to the vagaries of local fiscal health and relationships,"[13] and significant inequities grew between courts in terms of facilities operations and maintenance.

In addition to local priorities, other reasons for historic inequality in county funding were related to limited funding, including Proposition 13's limits on property taxes; severe recessions in the late 1980s and early 1990s; and the shift from the counties to the state of funding that supports school districts.[14] As a result, many California trial court facilities became deficient for court operations, suffering from deferred maintenance and lacking adequate security, compliance with life and health safety or seismic codes, and accessibility for people with disabilities.[15] Several courts with high caseload growth still occupy leased offices or modular buildings to meet the need for additional courtrooms and public service areas, which results in unconsolidated court operations that are inefficient to operate and inadequate in meeting the full, functional needs of the public and the superior court.

---

[12] State of California, Task Force on Court Facilities, *Final Report of the Task Force on Court Facilities* (Oct. 1, 2001).

[13] Ronald M. George, Chief Justice of California, State of the Judiciary, address to a joint session of the California Legislature (Sacramento, Mar. 2003).

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

[15] State of California, Task Force on Court Facilities, *supra*.

G. Map of California Court Jurisdictions

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

Figure 1: State of California Superior and Appellate Court Jurisdictions

II. Summary of Fiscal Year 2016–2017 Funding Requests and Capital-Outlay Needs for SB 1407 Trial Court Projects

To further Judicial Council goals of modernization of management and branchwide infrastructure for service excellence, the Judicial Council is requesting funding authorization in FY 2016–2017 (2016 Budget Act) for initial and subsequent phases of all eight trial court capital-outlay projects shown below in table 1. Their funding is from SB 1407.

Table 1: Funding Requests for Court Capital Projects for FY 2016−2017

Project	$ (in millions)	Phases[1]	Funding Source[2]
El Dorado, New Placerville Courthouse	$ 4.918	W	ICNA
Imperial, New El Centro Courthouse	39.714	C	PBCF (ICNA)
Mendocino, New Ukiah Courthouse[3]	6.068	W	ICNA
Riverside, New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse	44.463	C	PBCF (ICNA)/ ICNA
Riverside, New Mid-County Civil Courthouse	5.666	W	ICNA
Shasta, New Redding Courthouse	136.705	C	PBCF (ICNA)
Stanislaus, New Modesto Courthouse[3]	15.252	W	ICNA
Tuolumne, New Sonora Courthouse	55.955	C	PBCF (ICNA)
Trial Court Capital Projects Total	**$ 308.741**		

Table Footnotes:

1. W = Working Drawings; C = Construction.
2. ICNA = Immediate and Critical Needs Account (SB 1407 [Perata]); PBCF (ICNA) = Public Building Construction Fund (to be repaid from the ICNA).
3. Funding for this project has been requested as a reappropriation of previously authorized funds as shown.

Judicial Council staff submitted an initial *Capital-Outlay Concept Paper* to the state Department of Finance in August 2009 for all trial court capital-outlay projects to be funded by SB 1407 during the five-year plan period. Presented below in table 2 is the updated need for the remaining fiscal years of the SB 1407 trial court capital projects program, including all funded projects as well as the 10 unfunded SB 1407 projects indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council because of funding redirections and General Fund loans. Note that funding for any additional projects is likely to be secured after FY 2021–2022, so their funding requirements have not been estimated in table 2. The estimated annual funding requirements to implement the entire SB 1407 program are presented in table 8, section IV.F., of this five-year plan.

Table 2: Updated Capital-Outlay Needs for All Funded and Unfunded SB 1407 Trial Court Projects— Fiscal Years 2017–2018 through 2021–2022

Project	Initial FY Request	Estimated FY Total $ (in millions)
SB 1407 Capital Projects	FY 2017–2018	624.0
SB 1407 Capital Projects	FY 2018–2019	80.0
SB 1407 Capital Projects	FY 2019–2020	20.0
SB 1407 Capital Projects	FY 2020–2021	53.0
SB 1407 Capital Projects	FY 2021–2022	1,068.0

The map in figure 2 highlights the California counties that have one or more trial court projects fully funded through either SB 1732 or SB 1407 revenues. This map—highlighting 36 of the 58 counties—represents the judicial branch's most urgently needed trial court capital projects for which funding is available after substantial one-time and ongoing redirection of construction funds from 2009 to 2012.

With the exception of the Sacramento–New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse project, which completed site acquisition in July 2014 and has proceeded with design (preliminary plans and working drawings) in FY 2014–2015 using one-time funds, figure 2 does not account for the seven SB 1407 projects that were indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council in October 2012 and the four that were indefinitely delayed in January 2013.

Figure 2: 36 Superior Courts Benefiting from State-Funded Trial Court Projects

III. Appellate Courts Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

The five-year plan for the appellate courts of California does not include any projects submitted for funding consideration in FY 2016–2017.

Five appellate court projects have recently been completed. Each project is summarized below in section III.E., and in table 4, with a more complete description provided under its respective appellate court district in section III.F., Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Appellate Court Facilities.

A. Purpose of and Services Provided by the Supreme Court

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

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

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

B. Summary of Existing Supreme Court Facilities

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

1. Supreme Court of California – San Francisco and Los Angeles

Existing Facility:	*Supreme Court of California – San Francisco* *350 McAllister Street, San Francisco – 1st, 4th, 5th & 6th Floors* *455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco – 6th Floor* • 98,155 USF • State-owned historic Earl Warren Building (1923) – part of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex • Justices – 7
Current Status:	The Earl Warren Building of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex is the headquarters of the California Supreme Court, which occupies the 1st, 4th, 5th, and 6th floors of this building. The court shares the building with the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, which occupies part of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors. A total restoration including a seismic retrofit of this building was completed in 1998.
Needs:	Required Space..... 98,155 USF Current Space ..... 98,155 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

2. Supreme Court of California – San Francisco and Los Angeles, *continued*

Existing Facility:	*Supreme Court of California – Los Angeles* *300 South Spring Street, Los Angeles – 2nd, 3rd & 4th Floors* • 7,598 USF • State-owned Ronald Reagan State Building (1990)
Current Status:	The Supreme Court shares a courtroom with the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, to hold oral argument four times a year. On December 31, 2009, and due to budgetary restrictions, the Supreme Court Clerk's Office in this building was closed, and the available space—approximately 1,981 USF formerly occupied by three staff persons—was subsequently occupied by the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District. On the third and fourth floors of the building, the Supreme Court occupies judicial chambers and associated staff spaces.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 7,598 USF Current Space..... 7,598 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

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

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

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

D. Planning for Future Appellate Court Facilities

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

state budget climate, money from the state General Fund has not been authorized for replacing the leased facilities with state-owned facilities in Ventura, San Diego, and San Jose.

Table 3 below presents the current number of authorized justices for the appellate courts.

Table 3: Summary of Current Number of Authorized Justices for the Appellate Courts

District – Court Location	Current Authorized Justices[1]
First – San Francisco	20
Second – Los Angeles, Ventura	32
Third – Sacramento	11
Fourth – San Diego, Riverside, Santa Ana	25
Fifth – Fresno	10
Sixth – San Jose	7
Total	**105**

Table Footnote:

1. Current authorized justices are derived from the latest version of the court statistics report, *2014 Court Statistics Report, Statewide Caseload Trends: 2003–2004 Through 2012–2013*.

E. Summary of Appellate Court Projects

As presented in table 4, five appellate court projects have been completed. The new Fifth Appellate District Courthouse in Fresno was completed in August 2007. For both the Fourth Appellate District, Division One, in San Diego and the Sixth Appellate District in San Jose, projects to expand the courts into adjacent space in their current leased facilities were completed— San Jose's in November 2008 and San Diego's in July 2009. The new Fourth Appellate District, Division Three, courthouse in Orange County was completed in August 2009. And a renovation of the Third Appellate District Courthouse in Sacramento was completed in April 2013.

Space requirements for appellate court facilities are based on the *Appellate Court Facilities Guidelines*. These guidelines were developed by the Task Force and were adopted by the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2002.

Table 4: Summary of Appellate Court Facilities and Capital-Outlay Projects

Appellate District	Division	City	State-Owned	Existing Commercial Lease	Capital-Outlay Project Approved or Planned
First	1–5	San Francisco	×		—
Second	1–5, 7 & 8	Los Angeles	×		—
Second	6	Ventura		×	—
Third	—	Sacramento	×		Completed in April 2013
Fourth	1	San Diego		×	Completed in July 2009[1]
Fourth	2	Riverside	× (lease to own)		—
Fourth	3	Santa Ana	×		Completed in August 2009
Fifth	—	Fresno	×		Completed in August 2007
Sixth	—	San Jose		×	Completed in November 2008[1]

Table Footnote:

1. This project was funded to expand court leased space in lieu of constructing a new courthouse.

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

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

1. First Appellate District – San Francisco

Existing Facility:	*San Francisco – Divisions 1–5* *350 McAllister Street, San Francisco – 1st, 2nd & 3rd Floors* *455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco – 4th Floor* • 82,716 USF • Ronald M. George State Office Complex: State-owned historic Earl Warren Building (1923) and adjoining new state-owned high rise, Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building (1998)
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 82,716 USF Current Space ..... 82,716 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

2. Second Appellate District – Los Angeles and Ventura

Existing Facility:	*Los Angeles – Divisions 1–5, 7 & 8* *300 South Spring Street, Los Angeles – 2nd, 3rd & 4th Floors* • 119,137 USF • State-owned Ronald Reagan State Building (1990)
Current Status:	The appellate district gained the available space in the building (approximately 1,981 USF) that was formerly occupied by the Supreme Court Clerk's Office, which was closed on December 31, 2009. The existing facility adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 119,137 USF Current Space ..... 119,137 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

2. Second Appellate District – Los Angeles and Ventura, *continued*

Existing Facility:	*Ventura – Division 6* *200 East Santa Clara Street, Ventura* • 23,329 USF (excludes 800 USF for storage) • Commercial leased standalone building
Current Status:	The existing facility now adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 23,329 USF Current Space ..... 23,329 USF Net Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

3. Third Appellate District – Sacramento

Existing Facility:	*Sacramento* *914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento – 1st, 2nd, 4th & 5th Floors* • 55,821 USF • State-owned historic Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building (1929)
Current Status:	A renovation to the courthouse was completed in April 2013. This renovation resolved security, accessibility, and numerous preexisting deficiencies as well as providing additional space (approximately 15,827 USF) to consolidate all operations previously housed in the state-owned Library and Courts Annex Building (900 N Street). This facility adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 55,821 USF Current Space ..... 55,821 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This renovated courthouse adequately meets the court's facility needs.

4. Fourth Appellate District – San Diego, Riverside, and Santa Ana

Existing Facility:	*San Diego – Division 1* *750 B Street, Suite 300, San Diego – 2nd, 3rd, 4th & 5th Floors* • 50,349 USF • Commercial leased Symphony Towers high rise
Current Status:	The court is located on four floors in a commercial building in downtown San Diego. A new state-owned court facility—to replace this leased facility—was proposed for funding in FY 2008–2009, but this project was not included in the January Governor's Budget. However, in July 2009 Judicial Council staff completed a project to accommodate the court's expansion into adjacent space in this facility on the second, third, fourth, and fifth floors.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 50,349 USF Current Space ..... 50,349 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

Existing Facility:	*Riverside – Division 2* *3389 Twelfth Street, Riverside* • 35,034 USF • Lease-to-own standalone building (1998) leased from the County of Riverside
Current Status:	The existing facility adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time. However, future expansion of this facility will be necessary, due to projected caseload growth and the need for space to accommodate projected new justices.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 51,034 USF Current Space ..... 35,034 USF Net Need ..... 16,000 USF
Proposal:	To secure a site large enough for future expansion, a funding request for acquisition of the county-owned parcel adjacent to the existing facility was proposed in FY 2008–2009. However, this project was not included in the Governor's January Budget.

4. Fourth Appellate District – San Diego, Riverside, and Santa Ana, *continued*

Existing Facility:	*Santa Ana – Division 3* *601 West Santa Ana Boulevard, Santa Ana* • 52,000 USF • State-owned Fourth Appellate District courthouse (2009)
Current Status:	A new courthouse was constructed in August 2009, replacing two former leased facilities. This facility adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 52,000 USF Current Space ..... 52,000 USF Net Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This new courthouse adequately meets the court's facility needs.

5. Fifth Appellate District – Fresno

Existing Facility:	*Fresno* *2424 Ventura Street, Fresno* • 51,000 USF • State-owned Fifth Appellate District courthouse (2007)
Current Status:	A new courthouse was constructed in August 2007, replacing two former leased facilities. This facility adequately meets the needs of the court, requiring no additional area or modifications at this time.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 51,000 USF Current Space ..... 51,000 USF Net Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

6. Sixth Appellate District – San Jose

Existing Facility:	*San Jose* *333 West Santa Clara Street, San Jose – 10th & 11th Floors* • 39,000 USF • Commercial leased space in high-rise building
Current Status:	The court has been located in this high-rise commercial building since 1988. A new state-owned court facility—to replace this leased facility—was proposed for funding in FY 2008–2009, but this project was not included in the Governor's January Budget. However in November 2008, Judicial Council staff completed a project to accommodate the court's expansion into adjacent space in this facility.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 39,000 USF Current Space ..... 39,000 USF Net Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	This facility adequately meets the needs of this court.

IV. Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

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

A. Summary of Trial Court Capital Planning Process

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

In 2012, the judicial branch continued to face difficult planning decisions—for example, how to move forward with the SB 1407 program given the diversion of $240 million from SB 1407 funds. In 2013, this situation continued in the 2013 Governor's Budget (FY 2013–2014), which included deferred repayment of a $90 million loan (to the state General Fund) from SB 1407 construction funds and the redirection of $200 million in SB 1407 funds to trial court operations. The Court Facilities Advisory Committee, appointed by Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye and described above in section I.E., examined this problem throughout 2012, as well as in early 2013, to develop a series of recommendations to the Judicial Council. The committee's recommendations were formally adopted by the Judicial Council on April 24 and October 26, 2012, and on January 17 and February 26, 2013.[16]

Below is a summary of the planning process undertaken to develop the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan—the prioritized list of trial court capital projects from which the Judicial Council selects projects to be funded by either SB 1732 or SB 1407 funding sources.

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

[16] Complete details of the Judicial Council's actions are contained within the Judicial Council reports in Appendix A of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan: Fiscal Year 2013–2014.*

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

2. Facility Master Plans for 58 Trial Courts. The Judicial Council undertook the next step in the capital planning process in June 2001 with the initiation of a two-and-a-half-year effort to develop a facility master plan for each of the 58 trial courts in California. By December 2003, the Judicial Council completed a facility master plan for each of the 58 courts. Each master plan was guided by a steering committee or project team composed of members of the local court, county administration, county justice partners, and staff to the Judicial Council. The planning horizon for the master plans is 20 years. The master plans confirmed the Task Force's findings related to the physical and functional condition of each court facility, refined the caseload projections for each court, considered how best to provide court services to the public, developed a judgeship and staffing projection for each court location, and examined development options for how best to meet goals related to court service, operational efficiency, local public policy, and cost-effectiveness.

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

- A methodology adopted by the Judicial Council to project and standardize statewide judicial needs based on a set of judicial workload standards was applied to census-based population demographics and historical caseload data to estimate future caseload by type, at five-year planning intervals. In turn, the data was used to project the needs of each court for future judgeships. Associated staffing requirements were extrapolated from the judgeship projections.

- *Trial Court Facilities Guidelines,* developed by the Task Force and later adopted by the Judicial Council in July 2002, were used as a basis for developing space requirements based on judgeship and staff projections.[17] Application of these guidelines resulted in 8,500 to 10,000 USF per courtroom. The requisite increase to building gross square feet (BGSF) included circulation and building structure as well, which resulted in 11,900 to 14,000 BGSF when basement-level sallyports and secure holding were included. Analysis of the 58 facility master plans confirmed the high side of the Task Force's analysis, with the statewide average USF per courtroom calculated at 10,160 USF or 14,225 BGSF.

[17] These guidelines were superseded by the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards,* which were adopted by the Judicial Council in April 2006.

- Local superior court public service objectives, including how best to serve the public, were examined in each master plan. The distribution of court facilities and the types of cases that are heard at each location vary from county to county. The master plan process determined which court services could be expanded to more locations or, conversely, which court facilities and services could be consolidated and how access to court services could be best provided in the county.

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

3. Prioritization of Trial Court Capital Projects Identified in Master Plans. The third step in the capital planning process was to prioritize individual projects identified in the 58 master plans and then consolidate these projects into a statewide plan. A procedure to accomplish this prioritization was adopted by the Judicial Council in August 2003.[18] This prioritization methodology sought to prioritize these projects consistently and without bias. The methodology evaluated 201 capital projects identified in the master plans to be initiated in the second quarter of 2010 or earlier. The resulting Trial Court Five-Year Capital-Outlay Plan, a first in the state of California, was approved by the Judicial Council for submission to the state Department of Finance in February 2004.

Beginning in 2005, Judicial Council staff, guided by the advising bodies of the Court Facilities Transitional Task Force and the Interim Court Facilities Panel, reevaluated the prioritization methodology. As a result, the methodology was simplified and then adopted on August 25, 2006, by the Judicial Council. Through its application, a new list of trial court capital projects—the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan—was developed, presenting five project priority groups: Immediate, Critical, High, Medium, and Low. As a result of the passage of SB 1407 (Perata), which was enacted on September 26, 2008, and authorizes $5 billion in lease-revenue bonds for trial court facility construction, the methodology was further revised and then adopted by the Judicial Council on October 24, 2008. The methodology and the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan are the framework for all trial court capital project funding requests.[19]

4. Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan: Updated Budgets and Project Priority Groups. The most recently updated capital-outlay plan was adopted by the Judicial Council on August 21, 2015. The capital-outlay plan for FY 2016–2017 presents project budgets in

[18] The *Five-Year Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan: Prioritization Procedure and Forms* can be referenced as Appendix A of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2006–2007*.

[19] The latest Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan is contained in Appendix A of this five-year plan. The latest *Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* is contained in Appendix A of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan: Fiscal Year 2010–2011*.

January 2015 dollars, has a current total budget of $7.3 billion (in January 2015 dollars), and contains a total of 100 capital projects, all of which are without an identified funding source. [20] Table 5 below presents a summary of the complete capital-outlay plan, which is provided in Appendix A. Because of the (a) passage of more than a decade since the first iteration of the plan was submitted to the state Department of Finance, (b) ongoing population shifts in various regions of the state, and (c) consolidation and relocation of many trial court operations owing to budget reductions that superior courts were forced to make as a result of the state's ongoing fiscal crisis, review of the remaining projects will be necessary to determine whether a change to the scope or location of various listed projects is needed. This process will be undertaken before actual funding is sought for specific projects. The current plan reflects the best available information as of the date of this submission.

Table 5: Summary of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, Project Priority Groups and Budget (January 2015 Dollars)

Project Priority Group	Number of Projects[1]	Total Current Need Budget (in billions of 2015 dollars)[2]
Immediate Need	8	$0.51
Critical Need	16	$1.18
High Need	27	$2.58
Medium Need	31	$1.56
Low Need	18	$0.72
Total Number of Projects and Total Budget for Current Needs	**100**	$6.55
Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships		$0.72
Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget		**$7.27**

Table Footnotes:

1. Of the capital-outlay plan's 100 total trial court projects, 46 are new construction projects to replace obsolete existing court facilities, 34 are renovations to existing court facilities, and 20 are expansions of existing or future court facilities. All 100 projects are without an identified funding source.
2. The total cost of implementing the entire Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan will be higher than the capital-outlay plan's total budget in January 2015 dollars, due to escalation to the midpoint of construction, as well as to regional variations in actual land acquisition costs and other project development costs.

5. Judicial Projections as a Basis for Planning. A key input to the development of the size and scope of each capital-outlay project is the number of courtrooms. Project feasibility reports

[20] As has been standard, the plan does not include escalation to the projects' construction midpoints. At the time a specific capital project funding request is prepared, its cost estimate will include escalation to the construction midpoint.

and studies—prepared to define project scopes and budgets, explore project development options, and confirm site requirements for new construction—typically include a description of the number of existing courtrooms and the number of judicial officers for the building or buildings being replaced by the proposed capital-outlay project.

The number of current and projected judicial position equivalents (JPEs) is used to determine the number of judicial officers and, consequently, the number of courtrooms for each project. [21] Each trial court capital project's size and budget are generally derived from these factors. Although the facility master plans developed JPE projections, these projected-JPE figures are not used as a basis for planning the number of courtrooms in a facility. The California Judicial Needs Assessment Project—which is based on a combination of population and workload drivers—is used as a basis for the judicial branch to request funding for new judgeships. Proposed capital-outlay projects typically include courtrooms for existing JPEs and for JPEs planned to be assigned to the project from the next 100 new judgeships requested by the Judicial Council for funding authorization: 50 per AB 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722) and another 50 identified but still to be attached to legislation. To date, facility space for 56 new judgeships of the next 100 new judgeships has been budgeted in the trial court capital projects funded by the state General Fund, SB 1732, and SB 1407.

6. FY 2015–2016 Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects Authorized for Funding. As shown below in table 6, initial and continuation funding was authorized in the 2015 Budget Act (FY 2015–2016) for a total of 13 trial court capital-outlay projects. The funding for these projects is from SB 1407.

[21] JPEs reflect authorized judicial positions adjusted for vacancies, assistance rendered by a court to other courts, and assistance received by a court from assigned judges, temporary judges, commissioners, and referees.

Table 6: Funding Authorized for Courthouse Capital-Outlay Projects for FY 2015−2016

Project	$ (in millions)	Phases[1]	Funding Source[2]
El Dorado, New Placerville Courthouse[3]	$ 4.780	A, P	ICNA
Glenn, Renovate and Addition to Willows Courthouse[3]	34.793	C	PBCF (ICNA)/ ICNA
Inyo, New Inyo County Courthouse[3]	1.930	A, P	ICNA
Lake, New Lakeport Courthouse	40.803	C	PBCF (ICNA)
Los Angeles, New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse[3]	13.772	A	ICNA
Mendocino, New Ukiah Courthouse[4]	14.084	A, P, W	ICNA
Riverside, New Mid-County Civil Courthouse[3]	4.673	A, P	ICNA
Santa Barbara, New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	6.294	W, C	ICNA
Shasta, New Redding Courthouse	8.849	W, C	ICNA
Siskiyou, New Yreka Courthouse	56.936	C	PBCF (ICNA)
Sonoma, New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	11.252	W	ICNA
Stanislaus, New Modesto Courthouse	15.252	W	ICNA
Tuolumne, New Sonora Courthouse	4.066	W	ICNA
Trial Court Capital Projects Total	**$ 217.484**		

Table Footnotes:

1. A = Land Acquisition; P = Preliminary Plans; W = Working Drawings; C = Construction.
2. ICNA = Immediate and Critical Needs Account (SB 1407 [Perata]); PBCF (ICNA) = Public Building Construction Fund (to be repaid from the ICNA).
3. Funding for this project has been authorized as a reappropriation of previously authorized funds as shown.
4. This project's authorization includes $8.016 million reappropriated for land acquisition and preliminary plans and $6.068 million new funds for working drawings.

B. Drivers of Need

Several drivers of need underlie the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan. They are described below.

1. Lack of Security, Severe Overcrowding, and Poor Physical Conditions. The conditions of California's court facilities are both the primary driver of need for capital improvement and the basis for this five-year plan. These conditions include poor security; a significant shortfall in space; poor functional conditions, including those that result in unsafe facilities; and inadequate physical conditions.

The lack of investment to improve and to operate and maintain existing courthouses exacerbates all facility conditions and stresses limited available funding resources. When trial court capital-outlay projects are indefinitely delayed—because of funds loaned, redirected, or swept to offset the ongoing state General Fund deficit—an even greater strain is placed on existing resources for funding facility modifications as well as operations and maintenance of existing facilities. Each

capital-outlay project that is not completed requires ongoing funding resources for the operations of the existing, deficient court facility or facilities (most projects consolidate more than one facility) it would have replaced. Due to the current General Fund shortfall, to date the judicial branch has been unsuccessful in receiving approval of new General Fund resources to fund these costs, which increase over time.

The *Final Report of the Task Force on Court Facilities* provides compelling information about the need for improving existing court space and providing additional space for California's trial courts, as listed below.

a. *Lack of Security.* A significant number of court facilities and courtrooms are not secure. Movement of in-custody defendants through public areas of court facilities presents a real risk to public safety, given that more than 2 million in-custody defendants are walked through California's courthouses each year.

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

   1. *No entrance screening for weapons*. Many courts, particularly those located in historic or small buildings, lack the physical capacity to accommodate the magnetometer, x-ray machine, and staff required to operate a weapons screening station. Other court facilities have multiple entrances, making weapons screening stations difficult to implement at a reasonable cost.

   2. *Lack of holding cells*. Many court facilities lack on-site holding cells for in-custody defendants transferred from the jail for court appearances. As a result, some courts must hold in-custody defendants in rooms not designed for in-custody holding, monitored by several security staff. In other courts, in-custody defendants are brought to the court facility in small groups and held in the courtroom or hallway while being monitored by deputy sheriffs.

   3. *Lack of hallway space and waiting areas*. Many courts lack sufficient hallway and waiting areas to allow for reasonable separation between defendants, victims, jurors, and the public. As a result, court security staff is needed to keep order in public areas outside the courtroom.

   4. *Unsafe circulation areas*. Many court facilities lack adequate separate and secure circulation areas for moving inmates, judges, and staff. As a result, the security staff uses unsafe paths to transport in-custody inmates. The internal circulation patterns for a court facility in which in-custody cases are heard should include three separate and distinct zones for public, private, and secured circulation. The public circulation zone provides access to each public area of the building. The private circulation zone provides to court

staff, judicial officers, escorted jurors, and security personnel limited-access corridors between specific functions. The secured circulation zone for in-custody defendants should be completely separate from the public and staff circulation zones, providing access between the secured in-custody entrance (sally port), central holding and intake areas, attorney interview rooms, courtroom holding areas, and courtrooms. In a secure courthouse, the courtroom is the only place where in-custody defendants, the public, judges, and court staff would interact.

b. *Severe Overcrowding.* Many courthouses are severely overcrowded—either fully or partially—which negatively affects how well the courts operate and how well the public is served. Currently, and in addition to operating out of permanent buildings, the superior courts operate out of 31 trailers or modular buildings, providing space for staff office functions as well as for public assembly through 19 courtrooms. These types of facilities—provided to address staff and public service space needs temporarily—have been operating for years beyond their intended use. Hence, most of these temporary facilities are in extremely poor condition and lack any type of security or planned functionality, including accessibility, to support court operations and service to the public in the long term.

c. *Poor Physical Conditions.* The need for facility modifications in most existing courthouses in California is documented and substantial. As courthouse capital-outlay projects are indefinitely delayed due to the redirection of SB 1407 funds, the need increases for facility modifications to existing, deficient facilities—the very same facilities that would otherwise be replaced through the construction of capital-outlay projects. With limited funding, only the most urgently needed facility modifications can proceed, leaving unaddressed significant system replacements—to roofs and mechanical and electrical systems, for example—that often result in more costly repairs in future years.

1. California's court facilities are not fully accessible, and many buildings do not fully meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. More than half of all court facilities require moderate renovation or replacement of ADA features, and one-third require major renovation or replacement of such features. These conditions lead to reduced access to the courts for many Californians.

2. Many court facilities need substantial seismic improvements. Even though the Task Force made preliminary findings on the need for seismic improvements, the findings were generic and based only on structure type and age. In 2003, Judicial Council staff prepared more thorough seismic safety assessments of court buildings under the Trial Court Facilities Act, section 70327. About half of the court facilities statewide were exempted from evaluation.[22] Of the 225 court buildings assessed, 162 have been assigned

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

unacceptable seismic safety ratings, as defined by the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. These unacceptable buildings contain about 65 percent of all court space in the state.

3. The infrastructure systems of many buildings are not up to modern health and life safety requirements. Major improvements are needed in fire protection, life safety, plumbing, electrical, communications, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems. The systems deficiencies adversely affect the safety of staff and the public and the efficiency of court operations.

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

5. Space shortfalls in court facilities for most counties range from 40 to 65 percent of required space if all space were reused, based on application of the *Trial Court Facilities Guidelines.* Staff areas are crowded, and many administrative and support spaces are inadequately sized. Many courtrooms are undersized. Three-fifths of all of California's courtrooms (i.e., more than 2,100 courtrooms in total) are smaller than the minimum Task Force guideline area of 1,500 USF.[23] One-third of all courtrooms are less than 1,200 USF in area. Undersized courtrooms result in unsafe conditions due to crowding in the well areas; inadequate waiting room for litigants, victims, and witnesses; inadequate jury boxes; and lack of accessibility for disabled persons.

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

2. Current Need for Additional Judges. A secondary, but still important, underlying driver of need for major capital investment in the California trial court system is the need for space to accommodate additional judgeships currently required to adequately serve the public. Each new judgeship requires approximately 8,000 USF or 11,500 BGSF to provide adequate space for a courtroom and associated support space for both staff and courtroom functions, such as jury facilities, public meeting space, clerk and filing counters, and in-custody holding. If California does not prepare to provide space for new judges in consolidated, state-owned facilities, but rather leases commercial office space for conversion into court facilities, the state's

[23] More than three-fifths of all of California's courtrooms are smaller than the minimum courtroom size of 1,600 USF as defined by the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards.* These standards were adopted by the Judicial Council in April 2006.

court facilities will be even more scattered and disparate. In addition, leasing space for court facilities is relatively expensive because of the requirements for secure circulation and holding cells.

A 2004 report to the Judicial Council, *Update of Judicial Needs Study*—following up on the California Judicial Needs Assessment Project of 2001—identified a statewide need for 355 new judgeships in California's trial courts. The 2001 study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts, the nation's leader in state court research, consulting, and education. The study involved a two-month analysis of 337 judicial officers to determine the amounts of time required for case processing. Although the project identified a need for approximately 355 judgeships, the Judicial Council approved a request for only the most critically needed 150 judgeships over the next three years, in consideration of the state's ongoing fiscal crisis. The first 50 of these 150 new judgeships were approved for one month of funding in FY 2006–2007.

In February 2007, the Judicial Council approved an update to the California Judicial Needs Assessment, including an allocation of the next 100 proposed new judgeships. The total statewide need for new judgeships became adjusted from 355 to 361. The Judicial Council adopted another update in October 2008.[24] This update further adjusted the total statewide need from 361 to 327, taking into account a slight increase in assessed judicial need less 50 authorized and funded judicial positions through the passage of Senate Bill 56 (Dunn; Stats. 2006, ch. 390) and 50 newly authorized judicial positions through the passage of AB 159. At that time, the Judicial Council also memorialized a list of the last 50 of the 150 most critically needed new judgeships still requiring legislative authorization for planning purposes for future facilities and adopted a priority ranking for requesting future funding authorization for 100 new judgeships beyond them. In October 2010, and to adhere to the legislative reporting requirement, the Judicial Council reported in the *Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: Report to the Legislature Under Government Code Section 69614(C)* that the total statewide need for new judgeships was adjusted from 327 to 330. In October 2012, and to adhere to the legislative reporting requirement, the Judicial Council reported in the *Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2012 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment* that the total statewide need for new judgeships was adjusted from 330 to 264. In December 2014, and to adhere to the legislative reporting requirement, the Judicial Council reported in the *Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2014 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment* that the total statewide need for new judgeships was adjusted from 264 to 270.

Although 270 now represents the current statewide need for new judgeships, the Judicial Council recognizes statewide budget constraints and has requested only the next 100 new judgeships for funding authorization: 50 per AB 159 and another 50 identified but still to be attached to legislation. Over the next 10 years, additional judgeships will be required to adequately serve the public.

[24] Government Code section 69614(c) requires the Judicial Council to report to the Legislature and the Governor on or before November 1 of every even-numbered year on the need for new judgeships in each superior court. This need is determined using the uniform criteria for allocation of judgeships described in Government Code section 69614(b).

Overall, the planning of facility growth for future court expansion has been limited in the trial court construction program. About half of the 25 active trial court capital projects—funded by the state General Fund, SB 1732, and SB 1407—address only current space needs of the superior courts, with the balance providing only a modest amount of space for new judgeships (i.e., approximately 27 of the next 100 new judgeships described above). Although no funding for new judgeships has been authorized by the Legislature since FY 2006–2007, planning for new judgeships in California's judicial branch facilities is a prudent approach given the results of the judicial needs assessment.

3. Consolidation of Facilities. In addition to facility condition and the need for new judgeships, the Task Force and facility master plans identified opportunities to consolidate facilities to improve service to the public, avoid duplication of services, and improve efficient delivery of court services in the state. Opportunities for consolidation result from several conditions. Before the completion of the trial court facility transfer process in December 2009, some counties had historically lacked funds or the political will to provide consolidated facilities to meet additional court space requirements. Moreover and rather than expand or replace existing court facilities, some counties had leased commercial office space or acquired temporary modular buildings that were not always physically connected to existing court facilities. Opportunities for consolidation of court facilities resulted from trial court unification, and some courts that still operate several former municipal court facilities have recognized that consolidating a number of small facilities into one larger facility offers various service-delivery and operational benefits.

When the 25 active trial court capital projects funded by the state General Fund, SB 1732, and SB 1407 are completed, approximately 121 facilities will be consolidated into 25 new, renovated, or expanded courthouses. [25] Of the 18 already completed trial court capital projects, 45 facilities have been consolidated into 18 new or renovated courthouses.

4. Improved Access to the Courts / Access 3D. Expanding access to justice is a goal of the Judicial Council and is one of four criteria used to establish relative priority among trial court capital-outlay projects. The facility master plans completed in 2002–2003 identified a number of areas in the state where access to justice could be increased by construction of a new court facility or expansion of an existing court facility. And, more recently, the Chief Justice announced her Access 3D initiative to expand the public's physical, remote, and equal access to the courts. Physical access includes providing safe, secure, accessible, and cost-effective courthouses.

C. Inventory of Trial Court Space

The key findings from the Task Force's inventory and evaluation process characterize the existing state of trial court facilities. Most of California's trial court facilities are housed in

[25] Since January 2013, the Judicial Council has determined that a total of 10 SB 1407 projects are indefinitely delayed and no longer considered active. These trial court capital projects will be considered active again once their funding is fully restored.

mixed-use buildings, and the courts and court-related agencies (such as the public defender, the district attorney, and probation) are the dominant uses in such buildings. The Task Force reported a 2001 inventory in California of 451 facilities, including over 2,100 courtrooms and 10 million USF. As of December 2009 and resulting from the completion of the trial court facility transfer process, the inventory now totals approximately 500 trial court facilities. Moreover, the building area under Judicial Council responsibility and management has increased to approximately 20 million USF, including the responsibility for more than 2,100 courtrooms.

The Task Force found the following functional and physical problems with California's trial court facilities:

- Only 45 percent of all usable court area is located in buildings rated functionally and physically adequate; 22 percent is located in buildings that have serious functional problems.
- Approximately 21 percent of all courtrooms were rated deficient for their current use, principally due to deficient holding, security, or in-custody access.
- Security-related deficiencies strongly affect the ability of courts to ensure the safety of court participants and the public. In many court facilities, the lack of adequate in-custody defendant holding and secure circulation requires sheriff personnel to move shackled defendants through public hallways, which is a labor-intensive and therefore costly practice.

D. Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs

Additional space is required to meet current needs and space requirements for new judgeships. The unmet need for space in California's trial courts is presented below in table 7. Space requirements assume that approximately 8,000 USF or 11,500 BGSF is required for each new judgeship, although some new judgeships have been accommodated in existing court space, within new modular buildings, or within new leased space. Given the limited fiscal resources of the state, space required for new judgeships is presented as a range.

Table 7: Unmet Trial Court Facility Needs

	USF (in millions)	Assumptions
Total Current Space Needs	15.00	Task Force Final Report
Plus Space Required for Current Need for Additional Judges	0.80 to 2.16	100 to 270 Judges at 8,000 USF per Courtroom[1]
Less Total Current Space Occupied	14.00	Judicial Council Leases and Owned-Property Portfolio
Total Unmet Facility Needs	**1.80 to 3.16 USF (2.52 to 4.42 BGSF)**	

Table Footnote:

1. This range is from the 100 new judgeships currently sought for funding (50 in Assem. Bill 159 and 50 confirmed by the Judicial Council but still requiring legislative authorization) to the total overall need of 270, which resulted from the latest adjustment to the total net need for new judgeships reported to the Legislature and the Governor by the council in December 2014.

E. Alternative Approaches to Meeting Unmet Trial Court Facilities Needs

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

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

The proposed five-year plan for the trial courts is based on the SB 1407 courthouse construction program, whose funding plan is represented below in table 8. Funding for the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan—a proposed list of 100 new construction, renovation, and expansion capital-outlay projects—has not yet been identified. Funding for this capital-outlay plan is most likely to be secured after FY 2021–2022, and therefore, table 8 does not present a funding plan for these projects. The Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan is presented in summary in table 5 and in full in Appendix A.

The five-year plan for the trial courts is also based on the unmet funding need for 10 SB 1407 projects that were *indefinitely delayed* through Judicial Council action in October 2012 and January 2013. These courthouse capital projects were indefinitely delayed because of the one-time and ongoing redirections of SB 1407 trial court construction funds described in the Introduction to this report. They are identified in a list—presented in Appendix A—separate

from the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan because their funding source originally identified as SB 1407 remains identifiable and tied to SB 1407, unlike the projects listed in the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, which have no identifiable funding source. Because table 8 represents a complete funding plan for the SB 1407 courthouse construction program, estimated funding for these 10 indefinitely delayed SB 1407 capital projects is accounted for in outlying fiscal years.

Table 8 presents the FY 2009–2010 through FY 2015–2016 funding requirements based on actual, authorized expenditures for initial and continuation project phases.[26] The total funding requirements for fiscal years 2016–2017 through 2021–2022 represent the amount of funding estimated for authorization, based on project schedules and funding requirements and including the budgets of the 10 unfunded SB 1407 projects indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council.

Table 8: Estimated Annual Funding Requirements to Implement the SB 1407 Program—Funded and Unfunded Trial Court Projects

Fiscal Year	Annual Funding (in billions)
2009–2010	$ 0.119
2010–2011	0.121
2011–2012	0.062
2012–2013	0.556
2013–2014	0.507
2014–2015	0.152
2015–2016	0.262
2016–2017	0.309
2017–2018	0.624
2018–2019	0.080
2019–2020	0.020
2020–2021	0.053
2021–2022	1.068
Total Funding Need	**$ 3.933**

G. Consequences of Not Addressing Identified Needs

California's court buildings will only continue to deteriorate if facilities problems are not addressed. If improvements are delayed, the problems' scope and cost to correct will increase dramatically, and as the state population continues to grow, both the public and the justice system will suffer from increasingly overtaxed, unsafe, and inefficient court buildings. Major funding is needed to permit the judicial branch to move quickly to correct these significant

[26] Initial funding for the first 15 SB 1407 projects was authorized in the FY 2009–2010 Budget Act, enacted in July 2009, and the remaining 26 projects were authorized between November 2009 and July 2010, through a continuous appropriation process specified by Senate Bill X2 12, Special Session (Steinberg; Stats. 2009, ch. 10).

problems, thus supporting the branch's role as a national leader in innovative court programming and its commitment to equal access for all Californians.

Several specific consequences could result if the unmet facility needs of California's trial courts are not addressed.

1. In-Custody Movement Costs Remain High. Given that over half of all court buildings were rated by the Task Force as either marginal or deficient for judicial/staff circulation, secure circulation, and building security, the court system will continue to bear the cost for sheriff personnel to directly escort in-custody defendants in and throughout court facilities unless these conditions are corrected. Every court facility that does not have secure circulation from the holding cell area (if one exists) to a courtroom requires sworn deputies to escort in-custody defendants through public and staff/judicial corridors.

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

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

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

4. Funding Needs for Facility Modifications Will Increase. For each capital-outlay project that is not completed, ongoing funding resources are needed for the operation and maintenance of the existing, deficient court facility or facilities (since most projects consolidate more than one facility) it would have replaced. The need for facility modifications—which largely reflect deferred maintenance needs—has increased since 10 projects were indefinitely delayed because of the redirection of SB 1407 funds designated for these projects to replace or renovate a total of 13 existing buildings. Facility modification requirements for these facilities are now even more urgent due to the deliberate deferral of preventive maintenance and all but emergency repairs. There are also challenges in trying to improve court facilities that remain under local county ownership. For example, and because of their historical significance, approximately 17 courthouses did not transfer to the state and remain in county ownership.

These facilities, however, require a range of improvements to be made safe and secure. Currently, no funding mechanism is in place for the state to improve county-owned facilities such as these.

In February 2013, the Judicial Council authorized the submission of a FY 2013–2014 funding request to the state Department of Finance for $10 million ongoing to be allocated to facility modifications from SB 1732 resources—specifically the State Court Facilities Construction Fund—to bring the average annual budget for facility modifications of both SB 1407 and SB 1732 funding sources to $60 million. This funding request was denied by DOF. The 2014 Budget Act (FY 2014–2015) budget provided an annual $15 million appropriation increase from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund for a 10-year period. However, gaining this funding still does not close the gap between the need for facility modifications and proposed resources; in fact, a budget of $65 million annually for a 10-year period for facility modifications still falls tens of millions of dollars short of what is needed to maintain existing courthouses in California.

5. Scattered and Unconsolidated Facilities Must Be Maintained. Implementing this five-year plan will consolidate former municipal courts into full-service superior courts. Although some remote court locations offer access to court services for residents of less populous areas of the state, maintaining small leased court facilities and temporary modular buildings hinders courts' ability to provide accessible and efficient service to the public. Consolidation of criminal functions also results in operational savings for the broader criminal justice system of district attorneys, sheriffs, correctional institutions, and public defenders. The consolidation of criminal court functions would be the result of some 45 court projects.

6. Space for New Judges Will Be Provided in Nonconsolidated Facilities, and Access to Court Services Will Continue to Be Limited. Implementing this five-year plan will provide space for some new judges in consolidated facilities. California is a growing state, and additional judges are required to provide proper service to its residents. If California does not prepare to provide space for new judges in consolidated, state-owned facilities but, rather, leases and converts commercial office space into court facilities, the state's court facilities will become even more scattered and disparate. In addition, leasing space for criminal court facilities is relatively expensive because of the requirements for secure circulation and holding cells. In reference to the Access 3D initiative, physical access to justice can be achieved only by providing safe, secure, accessible, and cost-effective courthouses to improve access to court services for Californians.

H. Reconciliation to Previous Plan

This plan proposes a continuation of projects that were initially authorized from November 2009 to July 2011 and have been moving forward—with some delays due to redirection of construction funds.

The primary difference between this five-year plan and the five-year plan for FY 2015–2016 results from the following:

1. The list of funding requests for FY 2016–2017, which is presented in table 1 of this five-year plan and is consistent with the Court Facilities Advisory Committee's recommendations adopted by the Judicial Council in August 2015;
2. The estimated funding requirements presented in table 8 of this five-year plan include the budgets of the 10 unfunded SB 1407 projects indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council;
3. An update to the 10 unfunded SB 1407 projects indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council, based on updating project budgets to 2015 dollars; and
4. An update to the unescalated cost of the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, based on updating project budgets to 2015 dollars. Therefore, and at the direction of the Judicial Council in August 2015, the capital-outlay plan continues to present a total of 100 projects. This capital-outlay plan is dated August 21, 2015, is sorted by both total score and court, is shown in January 2015 dollars, and presents only those projects for which funding is still required and has yet to be secured. A summary of the capital-outlay plan is shown in table 5 above, including its current total budget of $7.3 billion (in January 2015 dollars) and is presented in full in Appendix A.

Additional technical revisions have been made to the previous fiscal year's five-year plan, to update it to reflect FY 2016–2017 needs and to prepare it for submission to the DOF in September 2015 along with all project-funding requests for consideration in the Governor's January Budget for FY 2016–2017.

V. Staff to the Judicial Council

A. Purpose of the Staff to the Judicial Council

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

Today, the Judicial Council has approximately 775 staff members, who provide services to more than 2,000 judicial officers and 19,000 branch employees of the trial and appellate courts in 65 courts at approximately 450 locations. The Judicial Council works in collaboration with 5 internal committees, 25 advisory committees and 3 task forces—comprising representatives from the courts, the State Bar, and the general public—that address important issues facing the judicial system.

In August 2012, the Judicial Council voted unanimously to approve recommendations to restructure its staff and endorse a plan for monitoring the implementation of the recommendations. The recommendations were developed by the Judicial Council's Executive and Planning Committee and are based on the Chief Justice's Strategic Evaluation Committee (SEC) report, presented to the Judicial Council at its meeting in June 2012.[27] By Judicial Council direction, the new organizational structure was implemented on October 1, 2012, and its Executive Office was modified to include four positions: Administrative Director, Chief of Staff, Chief Operating Officer, and Chief Administrative Officer. Moreover, the previous nine divisions became offices, with their directors reporting to one of the new Executive Office positions. On July 29, 2014, the Judicial Council voted to simplify the names of these offices.

Judicial Council staff—led by an Executive Office that oversees Governmental Affairs and three divisions—is described below:

[27] Soon after taking office in 2011, the Chief Justice appointed the SEC to conduct an in-depth review of its staff agency (formerly known as the Administrative Office of the Courts), with a view toward promoting transparency, accountability, and efficiency. The request from the Chief Justice required the SEC to undertake a thorough and objective examination of the role, functions, organizational structure, methods of operation, and staffing of the agency and to make recommendations to improve the manner in which it performs core functions and provides services to the courts and the public.

1. Executive Office. Serving the Judicial Council and the California courts, the Administrative Director provides the highest level of policy and programmatic leadership. The Executive Office has oversight responsibility for the development and implementation of programs in furtherance of Judicial Council policies and priorities. The office works with Judicial Council staff, the courts, the Legislature, the Governor's Office, and all other external stakeholders to coordinate and facilitate timely handling of judicial administration issues. Additionally, the office sets direction for development and implementation of goals, objectives, policies, procedures, and work standards and, together with management, works to develop and implement appropriate strategies to meet the agency's needs. The Chief of Staff, Chief Operating Officer, and Chief Administrative Officer all report to the Administrative Director and together make up the Executive Office.

2. Governmental Affairs. Governmental Affairs, in Sacramento, represents and advocates for the Judicial Council on legislative, policy, and budget matters.

3. Leadership Services Division. The Chief of Staff leads the Leadership Services Division. This division provides support directly to the Judicial Council and the Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees. This division is composed of the following six offices:

a. *Audit Services.* Audit Services conducts risk assessments, develops audit programs, performs audits of judicial branch entities, assists state and external auditors, and recommends improvements based on audit results, thereby playing a key role in meeting the branch's fiscal oversight responsibilities.

b. *Communications.* Communications is responsible for communications planning and implementation to further the goals of the Judicial Council and its priority programs. The office also supports branchwide communications through the California Courts Connected initiative.

c. *Judicial Council Support.* Judicial Council Support ensures that Judicial Council business meetings focus on well-planned and well-prepared policy issues; supports the nomination process of Judicial Council and advisory committee members; maintains records of circulating orders and Judicial Council member and advisory committee member appointments; organizes orientations for Judicial Council members and advisory committee chairs; prepares minutes of Judicial Council business meetings; and maintains the Judicial Council calendar.

d. *Legal Services.* Legal Services provides quality, timely, and ethical legal advice and services to the Chief Justice, the Judicial Council and its staff, the Judicial Council's advisory committees and task forces, and the appellate and trial courts. The office has two major functions: house counsel, and rules and projects.

e. *Special Projects.* Special Projects administers significant special projects for the organization through the provision of analytical and project management services under the leadership and direction of the Chief of Staff.

f. *Trial Court Liaison.* The Trial Court Liaison office establishes and maintains effective working relationships with the trial courts to accomplish the strategic and operational goals of the Judicial Council.

4. Operations and Programs Division. The Chief Operating Officer leads the Operations and Programs Division. This division houses activities and programs that support court operations, programs, and services. This division is composed of the following six offices, each of which is temporarily reporting to either the Administrative Director or the Chief of Staff while the Chief Operating Officer position is vacant:

a. *Appellate Court Services.* Appellate Court Services is responsible for facilitating and coordinating quality and timely service to the California Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal, and for providing lead staff support to the administrative presiding justices and clerk/administrators of the appellate courts.

b. *Capital Program.* Capital Program enhances the administration of justice by providing responsible and efficient management of California's facilities construction program of capital-outlay projects and promotes equal access to justice by providing leadership in the design, construction, and renovation of California courthouses.

c. *Center for Families, Children & the Courts.* The Center for Families, Children & the Courts is dedicated to improving the quality of justice and services to meet the diverse needs of children, youth, parents, families, and other users of the California courts.

d. *Center for Judiciary Education and Research.* The Center for Judiciary Education and Research staff and volunteers lead and support continuing professional development for each individual in the California judicial branch, to enhance the administration of justice.

e. *Court Operations Services.* Court Operations Services provides direct services, resources, and program support to the California courts to facilitate access to justice for the people of the state. The division is organized into six functional areas: Administration and Planning, Assigned Judges Program, Court Language Access Support Program, Divisional Budgeting/Appellate Court Services, Office of Court Research, and Special Services Program Support.

f. *Criminal Justice Services.* Criminal Justice Services oversees and coordinates multidivisional efforts related to community corrections, the 2011 Criminal Justice Realignment, and other criminal justice activities to improve efficiencies and assistance to the courts, justice partners, and the public.

5. Administrative Division. The Chief Administrative Officer leads the Administrative Division. This division houses traditional administrative services for Judicial Council staff and the judicial branch. This division is composed of the following six offices:

a. *Administrative Support.* Administrative Support is an internal service organization that provides all Judicial Council staff divisions and offices with logistical support services, including oversight of conference center operations, facilitation of local ground transportation, friendly and helpful reception, professional off-site conference and meeting planning, mail and shipping, records management, document digitization, and commercial-quality copy and print production.

b. *Finance.* Finance facilitates and enhances the administration of justice by providing timely and effective fiscal, contract, and procurement services to the judicial branch in a proactive, flexible, and service-oriented environment, consistent with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

c. *Human Resources.* To California judicial branch employees and judicial officers, Human Resources provides timely, responsive, and professional human resource management services reflecting best practices, with the overarching goal of developing the California judicial branch as an employer of choice.

d. *Information Technology.* Information Technology is responsible for assisting the courts in achieving the Judicial Council's technology objectives. This office is directly responsible for the development, acquisition, implementation, and support of automated systems in the appellate courts and staff offices of the Judicial Council and for the planning and coordination of technological developments in the trial courts.

e. *Real Estate and Facilities Management.* Real Estate and Facilities Management is responsible for managing the state judiciary's property portfolio for the courts and people of California. This office manages ongoing operational needs for more than 500 court and other judicial branch facilities, as well as site selection and acquisition for capital projects managed by the Capital Program office. This office also contains the Office of Security.

f. *Trial Court Administrative Services.* Trial Court Administrative Services manages and implements the Phoenix System (financial and human resources automated systems) in trial courts throughout the state.

B. Summary, Inventory, and Evaluation of Existing Judicial Council Facilities

Judicial Council staff is adequately housed in its present facilities. Details of each of the facilities are provided below.

1. San Francisco (Headquarters)

The headquarters is located in San Francisco, in the state-owned Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex.

Existing Facility:	*Headquarters – San Francisco* *455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco – 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th & 8th Floors* • 179,924 USF • State-owned Hiram W. Johnson State Office Building (1999) – part of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex • Staff – 540
Current Status:	In January 2013, and owing to restructuring, staff relocated within floors 3–6 and 8 to conserve space and lease costs. During this process, Judicial Council staff vacated the 7th floor, reducing its usable area by 38,576 USF. Space is adequate.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 179,924 USF Current Space ..... 179,924 USF Net Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

2. Sacramento

In Sacramento, the staff office and Governmental Affairs are both located in commercial leased space.

Existing Facility:	*Governmental Affairs* *770 L Street, Suite 1240, Sacramento – 12th Floor* • 6,578 USF • Commercial leased space in high-rise building • Staff – 10
Current Status:	Governmental Affairs is the Judicial Council's liaison to the executive and legislative branches and is necessarily located near the state capitol. In February 2012, Governmental Affairs moved suites within the same building to reduce space and lease costs. Space is adequate.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 6,578 USF Current Space ..... 6,578 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

Existing Facility:	*Sacramento* *2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300, Sacramento – 3rd Floor* *2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento – 4th Floor* • 57,963 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 168
Current Status:	Since February 2012, Judicial Council staff vacated the 4th floor of 2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, reducing its usable area by 6,668 USF. Space is adequate.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 57,963 USF Current Space ..... 57,963 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

3. Burbank

The staff office in Burbank is located in commercial leased space.

Existing Facility:	*Burbank* *2255 North Ontario Street, Suite 200, Burbank – 2nd Floor* • 10,666 USF • Commercial lease spaced • Staff – 45
Current Status:	Judicial Council staff moved into new leased space in June 2013, reducing its usable area by 26,681 USF. Space is adequate.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 10,666 USF Current Space ..... 10,666 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

4. Field Offices

Six field offices, all in commercial leased space (shown below) and space in existing court facilities, provide close-proximity facilities management support to various local courts.

Existing Facility:	*Real Estate and Facilities Management Field Office – District 31 (Sonoma County)* *2880 Cleveland Avenue, Suite 7, Santa Rosa* • 658 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 1
Current Status:	Real Estate and Facilities Management began to lease space on June 1, 2009, for its regional facilities staff servicing the Superior Court of Sonoma County.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 658 USF Current Space ..... 658 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

Existing Facility:	*Real Estate and Facilities Management Field Office – District 10 (Shasta County)* *2400 Washington Avenue, Suite 300, Redding* • 670 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 1
Current Status:	Real Estate and Facilities Management began to lease space on July 1, 2008, for its regional facilities staff servicing the Superior Court of Shasta County.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 670 USF Current Space ..... 670 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

4. Field Offices, *continued*

Existing Facility:	*Real Estate and Facilities Management Field Office – District 20 (San Bernardino County)* *1776 West Park Avenue, Suite 136, Redlands* • 896 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 3
Current Status:	Real Estate and Facilities Management began to lease space on December 17, 2008, for its regional facilities staff servicing the Superior Court of San Bernardino County.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 896 USF Current Space ..... 896 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

Existing Facility:	*Real Estate and Facilities Management Field Office – District 21 (Santa Barbara County)* *2601 Skyway Drive, Suite A2, Santa Maria* • 1,882 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 2
Current Status:	Real Estate and Facilities Management began to lease space on August 1, 2009, for its regional facilities staff servicing the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 1,882 USF Current Space ..... 1,882 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

4. Field Offices, *continued*

Existing Facility:	*Real Estate and Facilities Management Field Office – District 22 (Los Angeles County)* *333 East Foothill Boulevard, Suite 101, San Dimas* • 1,000 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 3
Current Status:	Real Estate and Facilities Management began to lease space on February 1, 2009, for its regional facilities staff servicing the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 1,000 USF Current Space ..... 1,000 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

Existing Facility:	*Real Estate and Facilities Management Field Office – District 23 (San Diego County)* *12396 World Trade Drive, Suite 218, San Diego* • 990 USF • Commercial leased space • Staff – 2
Current Status:	Real Estate and Facilities Management began to lease space on May 1, 2009, for its regional facilities staff servicing the Superior Court of San Diego County.
Needs:	Required Space ..... 990 USF Current Space ..... 990 USF Net Current Need ..... 0 USF
Proposal:	No additional space is required at this time.

Appendix A

August 2015 Judicial Council Report: Senate Bill 1407 Project Funding Requests and *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year 2016–2017

10 Indefinitely Delayed SB 1407 Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects: Sorted by Alphabetical Order, August 21, 2015

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, August 21, 2015: Sorted by Total Score and by Court (January 2015 dollars)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: August 21, 2015

Title
Court Facilities: Senate Bill 1407 Project Funding Requests and *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for Fiscal Year 2016–2017

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Recommended by
Court Facilities Advisory Committee
Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-chair
Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair of the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee

Agenda Item Type
Action Required

Effective Date
August 21, 2015

Date of Report
August 11, 2015

Contact
William J. Guerin, 415-865-7510
william.guerin@jud.ca.gov
Kelly Quinn, 818-558-3078
kelly.quinn@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee, to meet the state Department of Finance's September 2015 deadline, recommends the submission of funding requests for the next phase of Senate Bill 1407 projects eligible for available SB 1407 funds and of the annual update of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year 2016–2017.

Recommendation

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective August 21, 2015, take the following action:

1. Submit to meet the state Department of Finance's (DOF's) September 2015 deadline funding requests for the next phase of SB 1407 projects eligible for available SB 1407 funds (see table 1, page 9, of the attached plan) and the attached annual update of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year (FY) 2016–2017.

2. Delegate to the Administrative Director the authority to make technical changes to the FY 2016–2017, SB 1407 project funding requests and the five-year plan document for submission to the DOF, subject to the review and approval of the chair and vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee and the chair of the advisory committee's Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee.

Previous Council Action

Capital-outlay project funding requests and the accompanying five-year plan are submitted annually to meet DOF deadlines, which tend to be set approximately one year in advance from the passage of the next fiscal year's state budget. On August 22, 2014, and to meet the DOF's September 2014 submission deadline, the council directed its staff to submit funding requests for the next phase of SB 1407 projects eligible for available SB 1407 funds and the annual update of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2015–2016.

Rationale for Recommendation

SB 1407 Project Funding Requests for FY 2016–2017

To advance the progress of the SB 1407 courthouse construction program next fiscal year, the advisory committee recommends that SB 1407 projects move forward as presented in table 1, page 9, of the attached plan. With available funding requested in FY 2016–2017 for 8 courthouse capital projects, 2 projects would be reauthorized for Working Drawings, 2 projects would start Working Drawings, and 4 projects would start Construction. In July 2015, the advisory committee reviewed this proposal in the context of capital-outlay project funding received in FY 2015–2016 through the enactment of the 2015 Budget Act (FY 2015–2016).

Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Gov. Code, §§ 70301–70403) specifies the Judicial Council's authority and responsibility to exercise policymaking authority over appellate and trial court facilities including, but not limited to, planning, construction, and acquisition, and to "[r]ecommend to the Governor and the Legislature the projects to be funded by the State Court Facilities Construction Fund." (Gov. Code, § 70391(*1*)(3).) Council staff assists the council in meeting its responsibilities by, among other things, annually submitting an updated five-year plan to the state Department of Finance, which includes capital-outlay plans for the superior courts and the Courts of Appeal, including the Supreme Court of California.[1] The Judicial Council is the authority responsible for adopting annual updates to the five-year plan and for directing its staff to submit the five-year plan to the DOF. The five-year plan provides the

[1] This five-year plan conveys the judicial branch's funding needs for new courthouse construction only; funding for improvements to existing facility infrastructure is not considered part of the judicial branch's planned capital outlay. At the direction of the Judicial Council, all modifications to existing facilities are addressed through the trial court facility modifications program and in accordance with the *Trial Court Facility Modifications Policy*, available at *www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141212_tcfmp-update.pdf.*

executive and legislative branches with a context for annual capital-outlay project funding requests.[2]

Table 1, page 9, of the attached plan identifies each of the projects, relevant phases, and phase amounts associated with the continuation-funding requests for FY 2016–2017. The estimated cost of each phase is determined from project schedules that factor in funding made available in FY 2015–2016 through the enactment of the 2015 Budget Act. To prepare the final version for submission to the DOF, technical revisions to table 1 and other sections of the attached plan may be necessary in the process described in recommendation 2.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

The Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, which is included in Appendix A of the attached plan, has been modified based on updating project budgets to 2015 dollars. The capital-outlay plan continues to present a total of 100 projects that have never received funding, as well as 10 projects that were funded by SB 1407 but were indefinitely delayed by the council in October 2012 and January 2013, due to ongoing redirection of over $100 million in SB 1407 construction funds. These 110 trial court capital-outlay projects are categorized as follows: 55 are new construction projects to replace obsolete existing court facilities, 35 are renovations to existing court facilities, and 20 are expansions of existing or future court facilities. Of these 110 projects, 16 are in the Immediate Need Priority Group and 18 are in the Critical Need Priority Group. Each update of the capital-outlay plan presents only projects without an identified funding source. This capital-outlay plan for FY 2016–2017 is dated August 21, 2015, is sorted by both total score and court, and is shown in unescalated January 2015 dollars. A summary of the capital-outlay plan—including its current, unescalated total budget of $7.3 billion (in January 2015 dollars)—is provided in table 5, page 25, of the attached plan.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

In advance of the advisory committee meeting on July 16, 2015, council staff presented the proposed FY 2016–2017 funding requests (i.e., table 1, page 9, of the attached plan) as an information item to the Joint Court Facilities Subcommittee of the Trial Court Presiding Judges and Court Executives Advisory Committees on July 1, 2015. Also in advance of the advisory committee meeting on July 16, 2015, the FY 2016–2017 funding requests and attached plan were posted for public comment on July 13, 2015, and no public comments were received. No alternatives to the recommended action were considered.

---

[2] Assembly Bill 1473 (Hertzberg; Stats. 1999, ch. 606), codified at Gov. Code, §§ 13100–13104, requires the Governor to submit annually to the Legislature (1) a proposed five-year plan addressing the infrastructure needs of state executive branch agencies, schools, and postsecondary institutions; and (2) a proposal for funding the needed infrastructure. Because the Judicial Council of California is not an executive branch agency, its projects are not technically required to be included in the Governor's five-year infrastructure plan under AB 1473. However, because Gov. Code, § 13103 empowers the Governor to order *any entity* of state government to assist in preparation of the infrastructure plan, the Judicial Council on a voluntary basis has historically submitted an annual infrastructure plan to the state Department of Finance to facilitate executive branch approval of judicial branch capital-outlay project funding requests.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

No costs are involved in implementing the recommended council action, because it is performed on behalf of the council by its staff.

The *Status of Judicial Branch Courthouse Construction Program* is available at *www.courts.ca.gov/documents/SB1407-courthouse-projects.pdf.*

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The recommended council action supports Goal III (Modernization of Management and Administration) and Goal VI (Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence).

Attachment

1. *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, FY 2016–2017*, August 2015

10 Indefinitely Delayed SB 1407 Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects: Sorted by Alphabetical Order

August 21, 2015

County	Project Name[1]	Project Priority Group	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Date of Indefinite Delay by Judicial Council	Project Phase When Indefinitely Delayed	Estimated Total Project Budget[5]
Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse[2]	Immediate	**18**	5	3	5	5	January 2013	Preliminary Plans	$69,080,000
Kern	New Delano Courthouse[3]	Immediate	**15**	2	3	5	5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	$43,613,000
Kern	New Mojave Courthouse[3]	Immediate	**16.5**	5	4	5	2.5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	$46,066,000
Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse[3]	Immediate	**14.5**	4	3	5	2.5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	$132,595,000
Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse[3]	Immediate	**16**	3	3	5	5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	$66,442,000
Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse[2]	Immediate	**15**	2	3	5	5	January 2013	Site Acquisition	$131,579,000
Monterey	New South Monterey County Courthouse[3]	Immediate	**17**	5	4	3	5	October 2012	Preliminary Plans	$50,393,000
Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse[4]	Critical	**13**	4	4	5	0	January 2013	Site Acquisition	$107,633,000
Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse[3]	Immediate	**17**	4	5	3	5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	$23,545,000
Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse[3]	Critical	**14**	5	4	5	0	October 2012	Site Acquisition	$36,289,000
	Total Estimated Projects Budgets									**$707,235,000**

Footnotes:

1. These projects are sorted by alphabetical order of county names and then by project names.
2. This project was indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council in January 2013.
3. This project was indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council in October 2012.
4. This project was indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council in January 2013. Its scope will be confirmed—as it may become a renovation project—if its funding is restored.
5. These estimated total project budgets, which reflect Judicial Council-mandated cost reductions, are current as of January 2015.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name[1]	Project Priority Group[2]	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs[3]	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs[4]
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	**17**	4	3	5	5	$57,500,000	
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	**16**	5	3	3	5	$65,400,000	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	**16**	5	3	5	3	$73,300,000	$5,500,000
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	**16**	4	3	5	4	$65,400,000	
Riverside	New Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	**16**	4	2	5	5	$34,500,000	
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	**15**	5	3	2	5	$11,500,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	**15**	4	1	5	5	$98,100,000	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	**14.5**	5	3	5	1.5	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	**14**	5	3	1	5	$11,500,000	
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	**14**	1	3	5	5	$137,800,000	
Solano	Renovation and Addition to Solano Court Complex	Critical	**13.5**	3	3	5	2.5	$58,200,000	
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	**13.5**	2	4	5	2.5	$11,500,000	
Imperial	Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$26,700,000	
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	4	1	3	$23,000,000	
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$127,200,000	$16,500,000
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$106,000,000	$13,750,000
Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$0	$0
San Diego	Addition to Vista (North County) Courthouse	Critical	**13**	4	3	5	1	$76,300,000	$9,630,000
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	$23,000,000	
San Diego	Renovate San Diego South County Regional Center	Critical	**13**	3	3	5	2	$10,000,000	
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	**12.5**	5	2	5	0.5	$23,000,000	$2,750,000
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	**12.5**	4	3	5	0.5	$148,400,000	$19,250,000
Kern	Renovation and Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	**12.5**	3	3	5	1.5	$296,800,000	$38,500,000

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name[1]	Project Priority Group[2]	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs[3]	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs[4]
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	**12**	5	4	3	0	$1,000,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadlowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	**12**	5	4	3	0	$6,800,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	**12**	4	3	5	0	$949,400,000	$138,880,000
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	**12**	4	3	5	0	$57,500,000	$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	**12**	4	3	5	0	$9,800,000	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	**12**	4	5	3	0	$23,000,000	
Orange	New South County Courthouse	High	**12**	4	1	2	5	$46,000,000	
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	**12**	3	3	5	1	$23,000,000	
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	**11.5**	2	4	2	3.5	$23,000,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	**11.5**	1	2	5	3.5	$76,300,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	**11**	4	2	5	0	$4,200,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$137,800,000	$17,880,000
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$11,500,000	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$65,400,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$225,600,000	
Monterey	Addition to Salinas Courthouse	High	**10.5**	3	2	3	2.5	$0	
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	**10.5**	2	3	5	0.5	$219,200,000	$24,750,000
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Juvenile Courthouse	High	**10.5**	2	4	2	2.5	$0	
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	**10.5**	2	2	5	1.5	$65,400,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	**10**	5	3	2	0	$23,000,000	
Alameda	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	High	**10**	4	1	5	0	$148,400,000	$19,250,000
Del Norte	Addition to Crescent City Courthouse	High	**10**	4	3	2	1	$0	
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	**10**	3	3	3	1	$106,000,000	$13,750,000
San Luis Obispo	New South County Courthouse	High	**10**	3	5	2	0	$11,500,000	$1,380,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	**10**	2	3	5	0	$54,500,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	**10**	2	3	5	0	$35,200,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	**10**	2	3	5	0	$34,300,000	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

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]
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	**9**	4	3	2	0	$15,400,000	Included in budget
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	**9**	4	3	2	0	$2,200,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$116,600,000	$15,130,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$116,300,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$36,800,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$40,800,000	$2,750,000
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$57,700,000	$2,750,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$46,000,000	$5,500,000
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	**9**	1	2	1	5	$11,500,000	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	**9**	1	1	2	5	$11,500,000	$1,380,000
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	**8.5**	2	2	1	3.5	$235,000,000	$34,380,000
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	**8**	4	2	2	0	$29,000,000	
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	**8**	4	3	1	0	$23,000,000	
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$46,000,000	
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$11,500,000	
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$11,500,000	
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$169,600,000	
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$11,500,000	
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	**8**	1	4	3	0	$11,500,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$57,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$57,500,000	$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$37,800,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$40,100,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$13,000,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$15,900,000	
Placer	Addition to New Roseville Courthouse	Medium	**8**	1	1	1	5	$0	
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	
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$67,700,000	Included in budget

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

Sorted by Score

County	Project Name[1]	Project Priority Group[2]	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs[3]	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs[4]
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	**7**	3	3	1	0	$106,000,000	$13,750,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	**7**	3	3	1	0	$2,100,000	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	**7**	3	3	1	0	$60,000,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	**7**	2	2	3	0	$68,500,000	
Riverside	New Blythe Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Low	**7**	2	4	1	0	$23,000,000	
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	Low	**7**	2	3	1	1	$0	$0
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	**6.5**	2	2	2	0.5	$180,200,000	$23,380,000
Monterey	New Monterey Bay Civil and Family Courthouse	Low	**6**	2	2	2	0	$76,300,000	
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	**6**	1	2	3	0	$16,200,000	
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	**6**	1	2	1	2	$3,000,000	
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento William Ridgeway Family Courthouse	Low	**5.5**	1	1	1	2.5	$0	
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	**5**	1	3	1	0	$23,000,000	
Placer	New Auburn Courthouse	Low	**5**	1	3	1	0	$0	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Hall of Justice (W Reg)	Low	**5**	1	2	1	1	$0	
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	**4**	1	2	1	0	$7,600,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	**4**	1	2	1	0	$13,900,000	
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	**4**	1	2	1	0	$2,600,000	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	**3**	1	1	1	0	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
	Total Project Budget for Current Needs[5]							*$6,067,000,000*	*$478,550,000*
	Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs[6]							*$478,550,000*	
Total Budget for Current Needs[7]								**$6,545,550,000**	
	Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships[8]							*$643,100,000*	
	Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships[9]							*$81,125,000*	
Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships[10]								**$724,225,000**	
Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget[11]								**$7,269,775,000**	

PLEASE NOTE: The scope of each capital project is confirmed prior to submission of a funding request to the state Department of Finance. The Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget is presented in January 2015 dollars and does not include escalation to construction midpoint. At the time a specific capital project funding request is prepared, its project budget will include escalation to the construction midpoint.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
August 21, 2015
Notes to Sorted by Score

(Notes 2–13 are identical to Notes to Sorted by Court)

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

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

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

Each project's Budget for Current Needs is calculated as follows:

(1) For all *New Construction* and *Addition* projects, the project budget is calculated by multiplying current need courtrooms by the average unescalated project budget per courtroom in January 2015 dollars from the corresponding range in the table shown below. The project-budget-per-courtroom ranges in the table below are derived from unescalated 2014/2015 total project budgets of SB 1407 new construction projects submitted to the state Department of Finance for funding in FY 2014–2015/FY 2015–2016. These unescalated 2014/2015 total project budgets—reflecting Judicial Council-mandated cost reductions—were then grouped according to number of courtrooms, averaged, and multiplied by an escalation factor to provide the average unescalated budgets per courtroom in current year dollars shown in the table below.

***New Construction* and *Additions* Project Budgets for Current Needs: Average Unescalated Project-Budget-Per-Courtroom Ranges**	
1–5 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$11,500,000
6–9 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$10,900,000
10–20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$10,600,000
More than 20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$9,400,000

(2) For all *Renovation* projects and for all projects that *Complete* construction of unfinished space, the project budget is the master plan budget escalated to January 2015 dollars. Renovation budgets may change substantially, depending on specific conditions in each building and on further study at the time a project feasibility study is completed, which is prior to the submission of the capital project's funding request.

(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.

4. Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs was calculated only for projects in which 2002/2003 facility master plans identified a need for structured parking. The budget is calculated by multiplying the number of current need courtrooms by 25 parking spaces per courtroom and then by $55,000 total project budget per parking space (January 2015 dollars). The January 2015 budget of $55,000 per parking space was based on the average budget per parking space of three funded trial court capital project parking structures. A budget of $0 indicates there was a parking structure identified in the master plan but that it serves only future growth and not current needs.

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

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

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

8. Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships is for increments of facility space to accommodate 59 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. It is calculated by multiplying $10.9 million per courtroom—based on the budget per courtroom in January 2015 dollars for *New Construction* and *Addition* projects ranging from 6–9 courtrooms (shown in the table above)—by 59 unfunded new judgeships. To date, facility space for 41 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships has been budgeted in funded and indefinitely-delayed trial court capital projects. The allocation (to trial courts) of these unfunded 100 new judgeships was last updated based on the 2014 Judicial Needs Assessment approved by the Judicial Council in December 2014.

9. Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships is for facility increments of space within a parking structure to accommodate a total of 25 parking spaces for each of the 59 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This budget is calculated by multiplying 59 new judgeships (at one judgeship per courtroom) by a total of 25 parking spaces and then by $55,000 total budget per parking space (January 2015 dollars). (Note: See footnote No. 4 for explanation of the total budget per parking space.)

10. Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships is the sum of the Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships and the Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships. Funds in this budget will be allocated to a specific project as needed to accommodate facility and parking capital-outlay costs for 59 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships, as appropriate at the time a funding request is prepared for that project.

11. Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget is the sum of the Total Budget for Current Needs and the Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships in January 2015 dollars.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

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	$148,400,000	$19,250,000
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	**6**	1	2	3	0	$16,200,000	
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	**5**	1	3	1	0	$23,000,000	
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	**16**	4	3	5	4	$65,400,000	
Del Norte	Addition to Crescent City Courthouse	High	**10**	4	3	2	1	$0	
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	**16**	5	3	3	5	$65,400,000	
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	**15**	5	3	2	5	$11,500,000	
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	**8.5**	2	2	1	3.5	$235,000,000	$34,380,000
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$46,000,000	
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	**10**	3	3	3	1	$106,000,000	$13,750,000
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$11,500,000	
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$11,500,000	
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	**8**	1	4	3	0	$11,500,000	
Imperial	Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$26,700,000	
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	4	1	3	$23,000,000	
Kern	Renovation and Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	**12.5**	3	3	5	1.5	$296,800,000	$38,500,000
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	**11.5**	2	4	2	3.5	$23,000,000	
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	**13.5**	2	4	5	2.5	$11,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	**12**	4	3	5	0	$949,400,000	$138,880,000
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	**12**	4	3	5	0	$57,500,000	$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	**12**	4	3	5	0	$9,800,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$137,800,000	$17,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	**10**	2	3	5	0	$54,500,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	**10**	2	3	5	0	$35,200,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	**10**	2	3	5	0	$34,300,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$116,600,000	$15,130,000

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

Sorted by Court

County	Project Name[1]	Project Priority Group[2]	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs[3]	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs[4]
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$116,300,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$36,800,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$40,800,000	$2,750,000
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$57,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$57,500,000	$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$37,800,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$40,100,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$13,000,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$15,900,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	**7**	2	2	3	0	$68,500,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	**4**	1	2	1	0	$7,600,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	**4**	1	2	1	0	$13,900,000	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	**3**	1	1	1	0	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$169,600,000	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	**12**	4	5	3	0	$23,000,000	
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	**9**	1	2	1	5	$11,500,000	
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$11,500,000	
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	**12**	5	4	3	0	$1,000,000	
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	$76,300,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	**10**	5	3	2	0	$23,000,000	
Orange	New South County Courthouse	High	**12**	4	1	2	5	$46,000,000	
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	**9**	4	3	2	0	$15,400,000	Included in budget
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	**6.5**	2	2	2	0.5	$180,200,000	$23,380,000
Placer	Addition to New Roseville Courthouse	Medium	**8**	1	1	1	5	$0	
Placer	New Auburn Courthouse	Low	**5**	1	3	1	0	$0	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

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]
Riverside	New Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	**16**	4	2	5	5	$34,500,000	
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	**14**	5	3	1	5	$11,500,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Juvenile Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	**13**	3	4	1	5	$0	
Riverside	New Western Regional Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse (W Reg)	Critical	**13**	3	3	2	5	$23,000,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	**11.5**	1	2	5	3.5	$76,300,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Family Law Courthouse (W Reg)	Medium	**8**	1	1	1	5	$0	$0
Riverside	Addition to Southwest Justice Center (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Medium	**8**	1	1	1	5	$0	
Riverside	New Blythe Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Low	**7**	2	4	1	0	$23,000,000	
Riverside	Addition to Riverside Hall of Justice (W Reg)	Low	**5**	1	2	1	1	$0	
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$127,200,000	$16,500,000
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento Carol Miller Justice Center	Low	**7**	2	3	1	1	$0	$0
Sacramento	Complete Sacramento William Ridgeway Family Courthouse	Low	**5.5**	1	1	1	2.5	$0	
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	**14**	1	3	5	5	$137,800,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	**11**	4	2	5	0	$4,200,000	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	**9**	1	1	2	5	$11,500,000	$1,380,000
San Diego	Addition to Vista (North County) Courthouse	Critical	**13**	4	3	5	1	$76,300,000	$9,630,000
San Diego	Renovate San Diego South County Regional Center	Critical	**13**	3	3	5	2	$10,000,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadlowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	**12**	5	4	3	0	$6,800,000	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$65,400,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$57,700,000	$2,750,000
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	**4**	1	2	1	0	$2,600,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	**11**	3	3	5	0	$225,600,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	**7**	3	3	1	0	$106,000,000	$13,750,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	**7**	3	3	1	0	$2,100,000	
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	**17**	4	3	5	5	$57,500,000	
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	**12.5**	4	3	5	0.5	$148,400,000	$19,250,000
San Luis Obispo	New South County Courthouse	High	**10**	3	5	2	0	$11,500,000	$1,380,000

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

August 21, 2015

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 Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	**9**	4	3	2	0	$2,200,000	
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	**8**	4	2	2	0	$29,000,000	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	**7**	3	3	1	0	$60,000,000	
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	**12.5**	5	2	5	0.5	$23,000,000	$2,750,000
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	**8**	3	3	2	0	$11,500,000	
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$106,000,000	$13,750,000
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	**10.5**	2	3	5	0.5	$219,200,000	$24,750,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	**9**	2	2	5	0	$46,000,000	$5,500,000
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	**12**	3	3	5	1	$23,000,000	
Solano	Renovation and Addition to Solano Court Complex	Critical	**13.5**	3	3	5	2.5	$58,200,000	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	**14.5**	5	3	5	1.5	$87,200,000	$11,000,000
Sonoma	Renovate Santa Rosa Hall of Justice	Critical	**13**	5	3	5	0	$0	$0
Stanislaus	Addition to Modesto Juvenile Courthouse	High	**10.5**	2	4	2	2.5	$0	
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	**8**	4	3	1	0	$23,000,000	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	**16**	5	3	5	3	$73,300,000	$5,500,000
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	**6**	1	2	1	2	$3,000,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	**15**	4	1	5	5	$98,100,000	
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	**8**	1	2	5	0	$67,700,000	Included in budget
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	**10.5**	2	2	5	1.5	$65,400,000	
	Total Project Budget for Current Needs[5]							*$6,067,000,000*	*$478,550,000*
	Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs[6]							*$478,550,000*	
Total Budget for Current Needs[7]								**$6,545,550,000**	
	Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships[8]							*$643,100,000*	
	Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships[9]							*$81,125,000*	
Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships[10]								**$724,225,000**	
Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget[11]								**$7,269,775,000**	

PLEASE NOTE: The scope of each capital project is confirmed prior to submission of a funding request to the state Department of Finance. The Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget is presented in January 2015 dollars and does not include escalation to construction midpoint. At the time a specific capital project funding request is prepared, its project budget will include escalation to the construction midpoint.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
August 21, 2015
Notes to Sorted by Court

(Notes 2–13 are identical to Notes to Sorted by Score)

1. Projects are sorted by alphabetical order of county names, then by total score, and then by security score.

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

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

Each project's Budget for Current Needs is calculated as follows:

(1) For all New Construction and Addition projects, the project budget is calculated by multiplying current need courtrooms by the average unescalated project budget per courtroom in January 2015 dollars from the corresponding range in the table shown below. The project-budget-per-courtroom ranges in the table below are derived from unescalated 2014/2015 total project budgets of SB 1407 new construction projects submitted to the state Department of Finance for funding in FY 2014–2015/FY 2015–2016. These unescalated 2014/2015 total project budgets—reflecting Judicial Council-mandated cost reductions—were then grouped according to number of courtrooms, averaged, and multiplied by an escalation factor to provide the average unescalated budgets per courtroom in current year dollars shown in the table below.

***New Construction* and *Additions* Project Budgets for Current Needs: Average Unescalated Project-Budget-Per-Courtroom Ranges**	
1–5 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$11,500,000
6–9 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$10,900,000
10–20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$10,600,000
More than 20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2015 dollars)	$9,400,000

(2) For all *Renovation* projects and for all projects that *Complete* construction of unfinished space, the project budget is the master plan budget escalated to January 2015 dollars. Renovation budgets may change substantially, depending on specific conditions in each building and on further study at the time a project feasibility study is completed, which is prior to the submission of the capital project's funding request.

(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.

4. Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs was calculated only for projects in which 2002/2003 facility master plans identified a need for structured parking. The budget is calculated by multiplying the number of current need courtrooms by 25 parking spaces per courtroom and then by $55,000 total project budget per parking space (January 2015 dollars). The January 2015 budget of $55,000 per parking space was based on the average budget per parking space of three funded trial court capital project parking structures. A budget of $0 indicates there was a parking structure identified in the master plan but that it serves only future growth and not current needs.

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

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

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

8. Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships is for increments of facility space to accommodate 59 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. It is calculated by multiplying $10.9 million per courtroom—based on the budget per courtroom in January 2015 dollars for *New Construction* and *Addition* projects ranging from 6–9 courtrooms (shown in the table above)—by 59 unfunded new judgeships. To date, facility space for 41 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships has been budgeted in funded and indefinitely-delayed trial court capital projects. The allocation (to trial courts) of these unfunded 100 new judgeships was last updated based on the 2014 Judicial Needs Assessment approved by the Judicial Council in December 2014.

9. Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships is for facility increments of space within a parking structure to accommodate a total of 25 parking spaces for each of the 59 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This budget is calculated by multiplying 59 new judgeships (at one judgeship per courtroom) by a total of 25 parking spaces and then by $55,000 total budget per parking space (January 2015 dollars). (Note: See footnote No. 4 for explanation of the total budget per parking space.)

10. Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships is the sum of the Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships and the Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships. Funds in this budget will be allocated to a specific project as needed to accommodate facility and parking capital-outlay costs for 59 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships, as appropriate at the time a funding request is prepared for that project.

11. Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget is the sum of the Total Budget for Current Needs and the Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships in January 2015 dollars.