



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

[www.courts.ca.gov/cfac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/cfac.htm)  
[cfac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:cfac@jud.ca.gov)

COURT FACILITIES  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE: COURTHOUSE COST REDUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 7, 2017  
10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Judicial Council of California – San Francisco Office

**Subcommittee Members Present:** Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, CCRS Chair  
Hon. Brad R. Hill, CFAC Chair  
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd  
Hon. Keith D. Davis  
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley  
Hon. William F. Highberger  
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)  
Hon. Gary R. Orozco  
Mr. Kevin Stinson  
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

**Subcommittee Members Absent:** Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA

**Others Present:** The following Judicial Council staff/others were present:

Hon. Mark A. Mandio, Judge, Superior Court of Riverside County  
Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Riverside County  
Mr. Chris Talbot, Deputy Executive Officer of Facilities, Superior Court of Riverside County  
Mr. Nick Seierup, Design Principal, Perkins+Will

Hon. Kevin R. Culhane, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Sacramento County  
Hon. Lloyd G. Connelly (Ret.), Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Sacramento County  
Mr. Jim Lombard, Chief Deputy Executive Officer, Superior Court of Sacramento County  
Mr. Jason T. Miller, AIA, Senior Associate/Project Architect, NBBJ  
Mr. Matthew Somerton, Principal, NBBJ  
Mr. James L. Tully, Principal, NBBJ

Hon. Ricardo Cordova, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Stanislaus County  
Hon. Jack M. Jacobson, Judge, Superior Court of Stanislaus County  
Mr. Hugh K. Swift, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Stanislaus County  
Ms. Brandi Christensen, Facilities Support Services Manager, Superior Court of Stanislaus County  
Mr. James B. Perry, Facilities Consultant  
Mr. Michael Duncan, Design Principal, SOM  
Mr. Peter Lee, Senior Structural Engineer, SOM  
Mr. Steve Sobel, Managing Director, SOM  
Mr. Robert Bolin, MEP Engineer, Syska Hennessy Group  
Ms. Diane Elliott, Senior Project Manager, Construction Management Agency, Kitchell  
Mr. Rick Lloyd, Vice President, Cost Estimating, MGAC

Mr. Mike Courtney, Director, Facilities Services  
Mr. Ed Ellestad, Security Supervisor, Facilities Services  
Ms. S. Pearl Freeman, AIA, Manager, Facilities Services  
Mr. Clifford Ham, Senior Project Manager, Facilities Services  
Ms. Lisa Hinton, Project Manager, Facilities Services  
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Senior Facilities Analyst, Facilities Services  
Ms. Pella McCormick, Deputy Director, Facilities Services  
Ms. Kristine Metzker, Manager, Facilities Services  
Ms. Deepika Padam, Quality Assurance Supervisor, Facilities Services  
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Facilities Services  
Mr. Jagan Singh, Principal Manager, Facilities Services  
Mr. Loren C. Smith, Project Manager, Facilities Services

**OPEN MEETING**

---

**Call to Order and Opening Remarks**

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM and opening remarks were made.

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

---

**Item 1****Riverside County–New Mid-County Civil Courthouse: 50 Percent Design Development Review**

Mr. Clifford Ham, Judicial Council Senior Project Manager, introduced the project team for the New Mid-County Civil Courthouse: from the Superior Court of Riverside County, Judge Mark A. Mandio, Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Court Executive Officer, and Mr. Chris Talbot, Deputy Executive Officer of Facilities; and Mr. Nick Seierup, Design Principal, from Perkins+Will.

Respectively, Mr. Ham and Mr. Seierup presented the project's 50 percent design development plans and drawings consistent with the PowerPoint slides included in the project materials that were posted on line for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20171207-ccrs-materials.pdf>. Mr. Ham presented the project's summary, space program, cost estimate, and schedule. Mr. Seierup presented the project's site context, site plan, building elevations, floor plans, courtroom layouts, security elements, building systems (structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing), and sustainability. In addition, the following comments were made:

- From an energy-usage perspective and because of efficiency, 100 percent of the building's lighting, including back-of-house spaces, should be LED lighting;
- Given that the exterior cladding of the building is planned for cement plaster, the design team will investigate more durable material, such as tile or a concrete product, for the first five feet in height of the exterior columns as well as at the service dock;
- Cement plaster systems on buildings within this region of the state have an expected lifecycle of 40 years. These systems require regular maintenance as well as painting every 10 years;
- The rooftop mechanical equipment is screened but not covered, and the design team plans to study its lifecycle costs. The climate in Indio is much hotter than in Menifee, and this courthouse location is a much better candidate for uncovered rooftop mechanical equipment; and
- No potable water is planned to irrigate the landscaping. Given the high drought tolerance, the onsite native and adapted vegetation would only be irrigated for the first year. Recycled water for landscape irrigation is not currently available but may become available in the future.

**Action:** The subcommittee—with the exceptions of Hon. Donald Cole Byrd and Hon. William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and the member absent as shown above—voted unanimously to approve the following motion:

1. The 50 percent design development report is accepted, and the project team move forward to complete 100 percent design development and close out the preliminary plans phase.

**Item 2****Sacramento County–New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse: 50 Percent Design Development Review**

Mr. Loren (Mike) Smith, Judicial Council Project Manager, introduced the project team for the New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse: from the Superior Court of Sacramento County, Presiding Judge Kevin R. Culhane, Retired Judge Lloyd G. Connelly, Court Executive Officer, and Mr. Jim Lombard, Chief Deputy Executive Officer; and from NBBJ, Mr. James L. Tully, Principal, Mr. Matthew Somerton, Principal, and Mr. Jason T. Miller, Senior Associate/Project Architect.

Presiding Judge Culhane made introductory statements concerning the project, indicating it was on scope and budget and apprised the advisory committee that Retired Judge Connelly had been affirmed as the court's Court Executive Officer and Mr. Lombard as the court's Chief Deputy Executive Officer.

Respectively, Mr. Smith, Mr. Tully, and Mr. Somerton presented the project's 50 percent design development plans and drawings consistent with the PowerPoint slides included in the project materials that were posted on line for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20171207-ccrs-materials.pdf>. Mr. Smith presented the project's background, compliance with the space program, site design, cost estimate, and schedule. Mr. Tully presented the building's stacking and floor plans, building systems (exterior, structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing), and sustainability. Mr. Somerton presented the building's design in terms of façade and exterior materials and interior materials applied to the building's entry, public waiting areas and corridors, jury assembly room, and courtrooms. In addition, the following comments were made:

- The layouts of the courtrooms and courtroom holding cores are based on the layouts in the Judicial Council's *Catalog of Courtroom Layouts for California Trial Courts* (June 2015);
- The overage of approximately 3,290 building gross square feet is primarily related to designing space for building operations and for Sheriff's staff and functions for in-custody holding and criminal courtrooms;
- The sallyport is designed to accept Sheriff's buses coming from the nearby jail and any other detention facilities within the county;
- To mitigate glare, transparent glass with a high-performance coating is being applied to the north-facing side of the building;
- The application of wood is very limited in the building and applied to only four principal areas: wood paneling in the jury assembly room and at the building entry's security screening stations (at approximately \$80 per square foot because it also contains a ballistic element); and wooden courtroom doors with side panels and courtroom millwork (at approximately \$55–60 per square foot);
- The seal (of approximately \$5,000) to be applied in the public lobby area is not engraved or etched but similar to a sign mounted to the concrete wall;
- No access is available from the courtyard into the jury assembly room, and a landscape buffer and grade difference are present to separate the courtyard from the jury assembly room windows;
- Gypsum board with an applied hard surface (such as tile) is considered for the public corridors;

- The building's primary lateral system for earthquakes and wind is a concrete shear wall system and secondary system at the perimeter, for resisting progressive collapse and as required by code, is a steel moment frame system;
- The project is currently tracking for LEED Gold certification, which is over the minimum standard of LEED Silver;
- The building will not be entirely wireless by the time it is constructed and will contain a hardwired backbone in the intermediate distribution facility (IDF) as well as copper wiring for certain systems such as vertical transportation (elevators) and security; and
- A new rail line track is planned for H Street, which borders the site to the south.

**Action:** The subcommittee—with the exceptions of Hon. Donald Cole Byrd and Hon. William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and the member absent as shown above—voted unanimously to approve the following motion:

1. The 50 percent design development report is accepted, and the project team move forward (to complete 100 percent design development and close out the preliminary plans phase) furthering the design process (to begin the working drawings phase).

### **Item 3**

#### **Stanislaus County–New Modesto Courthouse: 50 Percent Design Development Review**

Mr. Deepika Padam, Judicial Council Quality Assurance Manager, introduced the project team for the New Modesto Courthouse: from the Superior Court of Stanislaus County, Presiding Judge Ricardo Cordova, Judge Jack M. Jacobson, Mr. Hugh K. Swift, Court Executive Officer, and Ms. Brandi Christensen, Facilities Support Services Manager; and from SOM, Michael Duncan, Design Principal, Mr. Steve Sobel, Managing Director, and Mr. Peter Lee, Senior Structural Engineer; from Syska Hennessy Group, Mr. Rob Bolin, MEP Engineer; from Construction Management Agency, Kitchell, Ms. Diane Elliott, Senior Project Manager; from MGAC cost estimating, Mr. Rick Lloyd, Vice President; and facilities consultant to the project, Mr. James B. Perry.

Respectively, Ms. Padam, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Lee, and Mr. Bolin presented the project's 50 percent design development plans and drawings consistent with the PowerPoint slides included in the project materials that were posted on line for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20171207-ccrs-materials.pdf>. Ms. Padam presented the project's summary including prior cost-study directives, cost estimate, and schedule. Mr. Duncan presented the project's site plan, landscape design, and the building's stacking and floor plans and design in terms of façade and exterior materials and interior materials applied to the building's entry, public waiting areas and corridors, jury assembly room, courtrooms, chambers, and jury deliberation rooms. Mr. Lee presented the savings to the building's structural design in both the superstructure and substructure. Mr. Bolin presented the mechanical system and sustainability. In addition, the following comments were made:

- The sunshade applied to the exterior of the building is similar in design to the shading device applied to the new courthouses in San Bernardino and San Diego. The design team is proficient in understanding

the angle at which the sunshade should be applied as well as employing bird control devices to minimize birds roosting or nesting;

- The layouts of the trial courtrooms are based on the layouts for the new San Diego Central Courthouse in the Judicial Council’s *Catalog of Courtroom Layouts for California Trial Courts* (June 2015);
- For new courthouse buildings, Judicial Council Facilities Services’ threshold for steel is 20.0 pounds per square foot, and at 18.5 pounds per square foot, this building is designed under the threshold;
- The building’s structural system has been optimized to accommodate different exterior skins: cement plaster (stucco), glass-fiber reinforced concrete, composite architectural precast panels (CAPP), or architectural precast concrete panels (APC). Any of these exterior skins may be applied to the building without incurring additional cost to the structural system;
- The project has the lowest construction cost per square foot of any of the SB 1407 courthouse capital projects. Owing to this condition, the exterior façade of the tower portion of the building had to be planned for cement plaster at floor levels 2–8 and APC applied only at the first floor. Judicial Council Facilities Services staff does not recommend constructing this building with cement plaster on the upper floors for the following reasons: it is rarely used in high-rise buildings and compared to the three other systems referenced above is the least durable, requires regular maintenance, has the least surface articulation for architectural variation, and is the costliest over a 30-year life cycle. Staff recommends an increase to the project budget of \$2.1 million for either CAPP or APC instead of cement plaster; and
- The judicial branch’s budget to maintain existing facilities has never afforded costs for painting the exterior of court facilities as part of regularly-scheduled maintenance. For this project, and because the costs will also not be afforded in the future, applying a cement plaster system requiring painting every five to ten years should be avoided.

**Action:** The subcommittee—with the exceptions of Hon. Donald Cole Byrd and Hon. William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and the member absent as shown above—voted unanimously to approve the following motion:

1. The project budget is increased by \$2.1 million for the expressed purpose of allowing the design team to consider the application of CAPP or APC to provide a more durable exterior façade; and
2. The 50 percent design development report is accepted, and the project team move forward to complete 100 percent design development and close out the preliminary plans phase.

---

#### **A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Approved by the subcommittee on September 27, 2018.