



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on June 28, 2013

Title	Agenda Item Type
Court Facilities: <i>Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan</i> for Fiscal Year 2014–2015	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	June 28, 2013
Recommended by	Date of Report
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	June 11, 2013
	Contact
	Curtis L. Child, 916-643-7030 curtis.child@jud.ca.gov Kelly Quinn, 818-558-3078 kelly.quinn@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee recommends the submission of the annual update of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for fiscal year (FY) 2014–2015 to meet the state Department of Finance’s (DOF) July 2013 submission deadline. This five-year plan accompanies the council’s previously directed FY 2014–2015 funding requests to the DOF for the next phase in all SB 1407 projects.

Recommendation

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective June 28, 2013, take the following action:

1. Submit the annual update of the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2014–2015—including an updated Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan based on the closure of court facilities—to meet the DOF’s July 2013 submission deadline. The five-year plan

accompanies all FY 2014–2015 funding requests submitted to the DOF for the next phase in all SB 1407 projects.

Previous Council Action

On February 26, 2013, the council directed that the AOC submit to the DOF FY 2014–2015 funding requests for the next phase in all SB 1407 projects pending availability of SB 1407 funds, as well as the annual update to the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2014–2015 to meet the DOF’s July 2013 submission deadline. Additionally, the council delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts the authority to make technical changes to FY 2014–2015 funding requests submitted to the DOF necessary to move forward all judicial branch construction projects, subject to the review and approval of the chair and vice-chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee and the chair of the committee’s Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee.

Rationale for Recommendation

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).) The AOC 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 the AOC to submit the five-year plan to the DOF. The five-year plan provides the executive and legislative branches with a context for annual courthouse capital project funding requests.²

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-20120727-itemG.pdf.

² 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 to facilitate executive branch approval of judicial branch capital project funding requests.

This requested action is based on previous council direction and to allow the council the benefit of reviewing the entire five-year plan document. As described above, the council directed the AOC to move the SB 1407 courthouse construction program forward in FY 2014–2015 by specifically directing the AOC to submit FY 2014–2015 continuation-funding requests to meet the DOF’s deadline in July 2013. The council also directed the AOC to submit to the DOF the annual update to the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, in this case for FY 2014–2015. Attachment 2 is the five-year plan, which identifies each of the projects, relevant phases, and phase amounts associated with the continuation-funding requests for FY 2014–2015. The estimated cost of each phase is based on project schedules that assume the May Revision of the Governor’s Budget is enacted. It is likely those 16 projects—totaling an estimated cash requirement of \$168.9 million—will be requested for design-phase funding in FY 2014–2015. Detailed information on this funding request is provided in table 1 (p. 9) of Attachment 2. In order to prepare the final version for submission to the DOF, technical revisions to table 1 (p. 9) and other sections of Attachment 2 may be made.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

The Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan, which is comprised in Appendix A of the attached five-year plan, has been updated based on removing projects that are no longer needed or will not be as large due to the closure of courthouses occurring through June 1, 2013. These courthouse closures are owing to budget reductions that superior courts were forced to make as a result of the state’s ongoing fiscal crisis. Attachment 1 lists the adjustments made to projects, since the last capital-outlay plan presented in the five-year plan for FY 2013–2014. Overall, and as of this date, one project was removed from the plan. Consequently, the capital-outlay plan now presents a total of 100 projects, rather than the 101 projects listed in the previous five-year plan for FY 2013–2014. These 100 trial court capital-outlay projects are categorized as follows: 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. Also of the total 100 projects, 8 are in the Immediate Need Priority Group and 16 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 2014–2015 is dated June 28, 2013, is sorted by both total score and court, and is shown in unescalated January 2013 dollars. A summary of the capital-outlay plan—including its current, unescalated total budget of \$6.7 billion (in January 2013 dollars)—is provided in Table 5 (p. 24) of the attached five-year plan. The process of reviewing the remaining projects on this list to determine whether changed trial-court operating conditions may have an impact on their scope and location is ongoing, so further changes of this type may well be submitted to the DOF.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The AOC did not solicit comments on the recommended council action. The AOC did consult with the superior courts listed in Attachment 1, and their input has been documented. No alternatives to the recommended action were considered.

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 the AOC.

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).

Attachments

1. Adjustments to the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
2. *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan FY 2014–2015*

Adjustments to the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

Each update of the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan lists only the projects for which funding has yet to be secured. For the fiscal year 2014–2015 update to the plan, staff contacted each of the courts below that experienced court closures through June 1, 2013 and, based on their input, recommends the removal of one project from the plan. These closures—as well as other courthouse closures around the state—are the result of budget reductions that superior courts were forced to make as a consequence of the state’s ongoing fiscal crisis. As courthouse closures continue due to the ongoing fiscal crisis, the necessary process of reviewing projects that remain in the FY 2014–2015 update to the plan—to determine whether changed trial court operating conditions may have an impact on their scope and location—is ongoing. Therefore, the 10 projects listed here may not reflect the full universe of changes to the plan that will eventually be made before actual project funding authorization is requested from the state Department of Finance.

The following changes have been incorporated in the plan dated June 28, 2013, which is attached to the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for FY 2014–2015. The plan now presents a total of 100 trial court capital projects, including 8 in the Immediate Need and 16 in the Critical Need priority groups. As noted above, further changes to this list of 100 trial court capital projects are likely before actual funding is sought; but the current plan reflects the best available information as of the date of this submission.

Based on court input, following is the rationale for the modifications to the plan:

1. *Contra Costa—New North Concord Courthouse*. This project is based on consolidating the existing Concord and Walnut Creek courthouses. No change to this project’s current-need budget is recommended at this time because the closure of the Concord Courthouse and the reduction of services in the Walnut Creek Courthouse are both temporary, pending restoration of funds. The need to provide court services in this part of the county has not diminished and remains in high demand from its large population. Owing to this temporary loss of space, and until the Concord Courthouse resumes operation, caseload from both courthouses (with the exception of traffic cases from both Concord and Walnut Creek assigned to Walnut Creek) is being processed in Martinez—a condition which is highly unsustainable for the court given the preexisting overcrowded conditions.
2. *Fresno—New Clovis Courthouse*. No change to this project’s current-need budget is recommended at this time; however, the basis for this project has changed: This project will no longer replace the Clovis Courthouse, which closed due to budget restrictions in 2012. Owing to this budget-driven closure, and because the court is also unable to return to this facility because of its security and physical and functional deficiencies, the caseload has since been shifted to the courthouses in downtown Fresno, as a means to temporarily provide for the loss of space until this new courthouse project is funded. The need to provide court services in the northeast region

of the county has not diminished and in fact continues to grow along with the population. This project will now consolidate caseload from the overcrowded courthouses in downtown Fresno.

3. *Fresno—New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse.* No change to this project’s current-need budget is recommended at this time; however, the basis for this project has changed: This project will no longer replace the Juvenile Dependency Courthouse, which closed due to budget restrictions 2010. Owing to this budget-driven closure, and because the court is also unable to return to this facility because of its security and physical and functional deficiencies, the caseload has since been shifted to the Main Criminal Courthouse in downtown Fresno, as a means to temporarily provide for the loss of space until this new courthouse project is funded. The need to provide these specialized court services countywide and in an appropriate setting separate from adult criminal calendars has not diminished and in fact continues to grow along with the county’s population. This project will now consolidate juvenile dependency caseload from the overcrowded Main Criminal Courthouse in downtown Fresno.
4. *Fresno—New Selma Regional Justice Center.* No change to this project’s current-need budget is recommended at this time; however, the basis for this project has changed: This project will no longer replace the six branch courts that have all closed due to budget restrictions: Kerman in 2009, Fowler in 2010, and Coalinga, Kingsburg, Reedley, and Selma in 2012. Owing to these courthouse closures, and because the court is also unable to return to these facilities because of their security and physical and functional deficiencies, the caseloads have since been shifted to the courthouses in downtown Fresno, as a means to temporarily provide for the loss of spaces until this new courthouse project is funded. The need to provide court services to this southern region of the county and in a modern, centralized justice center—rather than through small, satellite leased-facilities—has not diminished and in fact continues to grow along with the population. This project will now consolidate caseload from the overcrowded courthouses in downtown Fresno.
5. *San Bernardino—Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse.* This addition project is based on caseload from the existing Chino Courthouse. No change to this project’s current-need budget is recommended at this time because the closure of the existing Chino Courthouse is temporary, pending restoration of funds. The need to provide court services in the western region of the county has not diminished and in fact continues to grow along with the population. Owing to this temporary loss of space, the caseload from the Chino Courthouse has been split between existing Rancho Cucamonga and Fontana courthouses until the existing Chino Courthouse resumes operation.
6. *San Bernardino—New High Desert Courthouse.* The current-need size and budget for this project was reviewed due to the closure of three of four courtrooms in the existing Barstow Courthouse. No change to this project’s current-need budget is recommended at this time because the reduction in court services in Barstow is temporary, pending restoration of funds.
7. *San Joaquin—New South San Joaquin County Courthouse.* This project is based on consolidating the existing Manteca and Tracy courthouses. No change to this project’s current-

need budget is recommended at this time because the closure of the Tracy Courthouse is temporary, pending restoration of funds. The need to provide court services in this part of the county has not diminished and in fact continues to grow along with the population. Owing to this temporary loss of space, the caseload from the Tracy Courthouse has been split between existing Manteca and Stockton courthouses until the Tracy Courthouse resumes operation.

8. *San Luis Obispo—New South County Courthouse.* No change to this project's current-need budget is recommended at this time because the closure of the one-courtroom Grover Beach Courthouse is temporary, pending restoration of funds. Owing to this temporary loss of space, the court is operating a make-shift courtroom out of the self-help center in the San Luis Obispo Courthouse to accommodate the Grover Beach caseload.
9. *Siskiyou—New Siskiyou Service Centers.* This project—which was to replace the existing, one-courtroom Tulelake, Dorris, and Happy Camp courthouses—has been removed. This project is no longer needed for several reasons. The existing Tulelake Courthouse was closed in 2011, with the calendars moving to Dorris. The Dorris Courthouse was recently remodeled to improve its physical condition and functionality for long-term operation. The Dorris-Tulelake courthouse is operated under a joint resolution with the Superior Court of Modoc County. The remodel in Dorris was accomplished after that courthouse transferred to the state. The AOC provided funding because the remodel was primarily for security purposes and to make the courthouse ADA accessible. Finally, a replacement courthouse in Happy Camp would be infeasible for the court to staff full-time for budgetary reasons.
10. *Tulare—Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse.* No change to this project's budget is recommended at this time; however, the basis for this project has changed: This project will no longer replace the three-courtroom Tulare Division Courthouse, which closed in 2012, and the one-courtroom Dinuba Division Courthouse, which closed in 2009. Owing to these courthouse closures, the caseload had to be shifted to Visalia, where the court currently has access to two facilities—the convention center and city council chambers—as a means to temporarily provide for the loss of space until this renovation and addition project is funded. This project will now replace these temporary spaces in Visalia.

Judicial Branch
AB 1473 Five-Year
Infrastructure Plan
Fiscal Year 2014–2015

SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA COURTS OF APPEAL
SUPERIOR COURTS OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ADOPTED BY THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:
JUNE 28, 2013

SUBMITTED TO THE
STATE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE:
JULY 1, 2013



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Judicial and Court Operations Services Division
Judicial Branch Capital Program Office
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Phone number: 415-865-4900
www.courts.ca.gov/5year1415.pdf

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
June 28, 2013
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	\$53,500,000	
Fresno	New Selma Regional Justice Center	Immediate	16	5	3	3	5	\$62,400,000	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$68,450,000	\$5,500,000
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	3	5	4	\$62,400,000	
Riverside	New Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$32,100,000	
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	2	5	\$10,700,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	15	4	1	5	5	\$93,600,000	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	14	5	3	1	5	\$10,700,000	
San Bernardino	New High Desert Courthouse	Critical	14	1	3	5	5	\$128,700,000	
Solano	Renovation and Addition to Solano Court Complex	Critical	13.5	3	3	5	2.5	\$54,440,000	
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	13.5	2	4	5	2.5	\$10,700,000	
Imperial	Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$25,080,000	
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	13	5	4	1	3	\$21,400,000	
Sacramento	New Sacramento Civil Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$118,800,000	\$16,500,000
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$99,000,000	\$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	\$72,800,000	\$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	\$21,400,000	
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	\$21,400,000	\$2,750,000
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	12.5	4	3	5	0.5	\$138,600,000	\$19,250,000
Kern	Renovation and Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$277,200,000	\$38,500,000

PLEASE NOTE: The review of projects in this plan is ongoing to determine whether changed trial-court operating conditions have an impact on scope, location, and budget. These aspects of the projects are confirmed prior to the submission of funding requests to the state Department of Finance.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

June 28, 2013

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	\$940,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to San Diego Meadowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$6,350,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$868,600,000	\$138,880,000
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$53,500,000	\$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$9,180,000	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	12	4	5	3	0	\$21,400,000	
Orange	New South County Courthouse	High	12	4	1	2	5	\$42,800,000	
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$21,400,000	
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	11.5	2	4	2	3.5	\$21,400,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	11.5	1	2	5	3.5	\$72,800,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	11	4	2	5	0	\$3,950,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$128,700,000	\$17,880,000
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$10,700,000	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$62,400,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$206,400,000	
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	\$204,850,000	\$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	\$62,400,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$21,400,000	
Alameda	Addition to Wiley W. Manuel Courthouse	High	10	4	1	5	0	\$138,600,000	\$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	\$99,000,000	\$13,750,000
San Luis Obispo	New South County Courthouse	High	10	3	5	2	0	\$10,700,000	\$1,380,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$51,100,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$33,000,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$32,140,000	

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

June 28, 2013

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	\$14,490,000	Included in budget
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to Central San Mateo Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$2,050,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$108,900,000	\$15,130,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$109,110,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$34,500,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$38,060,000	\$2,750,000
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$53,950,000	\$2,750,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$42,800,000	\$5,500,000
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	9	1	2	1	5	\$10,700,000	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	9	1	1	2	5	\$10,700,000	\$1,380,000
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	8.5	2	2	1	3.5	\$215,000,000	\$34,380,000
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	8	4	2	2	0	\$27,040,000	
Trinity	New Weaverville Courthouse	Medium	8	4	3	1	0	\$21,400,000	
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$42,800,000	
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$10,700,000	
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$10,700,000	
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$158,400,000	
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$10,700,000	
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	8	1	4	3	0	\$10,700,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$53,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$53,500,000	\$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$35,440,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$37,580,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$12,170,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$14,950,000	
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	\$63,510,000	Included in budget

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
 June 28, 2013
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	\$99,000,000	\$13,750,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$1,950,000	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$56,290,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	7	2	2	3	0	\$63,920,000	
Riverside	New Blythe Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Low	7	2	4	1	0	\$21,400,000	
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	\$168,300,000	\$23,380,000
Monterey	New Monterey Bay Civil and Family Courthouse	Low	6	2	2	2	0	\$72,800,000	
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	6	1	2	3	0	\$15,220,000	
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	6	1	2	1	2	\$2,850,000	
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	\$21,400,000	
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	\$7,110,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$13,040,000	
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$2,430,000	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
<i>Total Project Budget for Current Needs⁵</i>								\$5,658,940,000	\$478,550,000
<i>Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁶</i>								\$478,550,000	
Total Budget for Current Needs⁷								\$6,137,490,000	
<i>Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships⁸</i>								\$457,600,000	
<i>Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships⁹</i>								\$60,500,000	
Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships¹⁰								\$518,100,000	
Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget¹¹								\$6,655,590,000	

PLEASE NOTE: The Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget is presented in January 2013 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

June 28, 2013

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 2013 dollars from the corresponding range in the table shown below. The project-budget-per-courtroom ranges in the table below are derived from unescalated 2012 total project budgets of SB 1407 new construction projects submitted to the state Department of Finance for funding in FY 2013–2014. These unescalated 2012 total project budgets—reflecting Judicial Council-mandated cost reductions—were then grouped according to number of courtrooms and averaged 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. 2013 dollars)	\$10,700,000
6–9 Courtrooms (Jan. 2013 dollars)	\$10,400,000
10–20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2013 dollars)	\$9,900,000
More than 20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2013 dollars)	\$8,600,000

(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 2013 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 2013 dollars). The January 2013 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 44 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. It is calculated by multiplying \$11.2 million per courtroom—based on the budget per courtroom in January 2013 dollars for *New Construction* and *Addition* projects ranging from 6–9 courtrooms (shown in the table above)—by 44 unfunded new judgeships. To date, facility space for 56 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships has been budgeted in funded trial court capital projects: 21 new judgeships to 6 funded SB 1732 projects (two have completed: Contra Costa and Fresno - Sisk) and to 1 funded General Fund project (LA - Long Beach), and 35 new judgeships to 15 funded SB 1407 projects.

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 44 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This budget is calculated by multiplying 44 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 2013 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 44 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 2013 dollars.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
June 28, 2013
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	\$138,600,000	\$19,250,000
Alameda	Renovate Hayward Hall of Justice	Low	6	1	2	3	0	\$15,220,000	
Colusa	New Colusa Courthouse - North	Low	5	1	3	1	0	\$21,400,000	
Contra Costa	New North Concord Courthouse	Immediate	16	4	3	5	4	\$62,400,000	
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	\$62,400,000	
Fresno	New Clovis Courthouse	Immediate	15	5	3	2	5	\$10,700,000	
Fresno	New Fresno Criminal Courthouse	Medium	8.5	2	2	1	3.5	\$215,000,000	\$34,380,000
Fresno	New Fresno Juvenile Dependency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$42,800,000	
Humboldt	New Eureka Courthouse	High	10	3	3	3	1	\$99,000,000	\$13,750,000
Humboldt	New Eureka Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$10,700,000	
Humboldt	New Garberville Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$10,700,000	
Humboldt	New Hoopa Courthouse	Medium	8	1	4	3	0	\$10,700,000	
Imperial	Renovation and Addition to El Centro Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$25,080,000	
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Critical	13	5	4	1	3	\$21,400,000	
Kern	Renovation and Addition to Bakersfield Courthouse	Critical	12.5	3	3	5	1.5	\$277,200,000	\$38,500,000
Kern	New Taft Courthouse	High	11.5	2	4	2	3.5	\$21,400,000	
Lake	New Clearlake Courthouse	Critical	13.5	2	4	5	2.5	\$10,700,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Civil and Family Courthouse (C)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$868,600,000	\$138,880,000
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Central Juvenile Courthouse (JDel)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$53,500,000	\$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Burbank Courthouse (NC)	High	12	4	3	5	0	\$9,180,000	
Los Angeles	Addition to New East Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (E)	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$128,700,000	\$17,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Metropolitan Courthouse (C)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$51,100,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Santa Monica Courthouse (W)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$33,000,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Torrance Courthouse (SW)	High	10	2	3	5	0	\$32,140,000	
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (C)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New East District Criminal Courthouse (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$108,900,000	\$15,130,000

PLEASE NOTE: The review of projects in this plan is ongoing to determine whether changed trial-court operating conditions have an impact on scope, location, and budget. These aspects of the projects are confirmed prior to the submission of funding requests to the state Department of Finance.

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan

June 28, 2013

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	\$109,110,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Pomona Courthouse South (E)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$34,500,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Alhambra Courthouse (NE)	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$38,060,000	\$2,750,000
Los Angeles	Addition to Pasadena Main Courthouse (NE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$53,500,000	
Los Angeles	New Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
Los Angeles	New West Los Angeles Criminal Courthouse (W)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$53,500,000	\$6,880,000
Los Angeles	Renovate Compton Courthouse (SC)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$35,440,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate El Monte Courthouse (E)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$37,580,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Los Angeles Airport Courthouse (SW)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$12,170,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Whittier Courthouse (SE)	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$14,950,000	
Los Angeles	Renovation and Addition to Van Nuys Courthouse East (NW)	Low	7	2	2	3	0	\$63,920,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate Bellflower Courthouse (SE)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$7,110,000	
Los Angeles	Renovate San Fernando Courthouse (NV)	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$13,040,000	
Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Juvenile Dependency Courthouse (JD)	Low	3	1	1	1	0	\$83,200,000	\$11,000,000
Marin	New Marin Civic Center Courthouse - North	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$158,400,000	
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	High	12	4	5	3	0	\$21,400,000	
Merced	Addition to New Merced Courthouse	Medium	9	1	2	1	5	\$10,700,000	
Modoc	Addition to Alturas Barclay Justice Center	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$10,700,000	
Mono	Renovate Bridgeport Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$940,000	
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	\$72,800,000	
Nevada	New Truckee Courthouse	High	10	5	3	2	0	\$21,400,000	
Orange	New South County Courthouse	High	12	4	1	2	5	\$42,800,000	
Orange	Renovate Newport Beach Courthouse	Medium	9	4	3	2	0	\$14,490,000	Included in budget
Orange	Addition to Santa Ana Courthouse	Low	6.5	2	2	2	0.5	\$168,300,000	\$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
June 28, 2013
Sorted by Court

County	Project Name¹	Project Priority Group²	Total Score	Security	Over-crowding	Physical Condition	Access to Court Services	Project Budget for Current Needs³	Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁴
Riverside	New Corona Courthouse (W Reg)	Immediate	16	4	2	5	5	\$32,100,000	
Riverside	New Temecula Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Critical	14	5	3	1	5	\$10,700,000	
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	\$21,400,000	
Riverside	New Indio Courthouse (Desert Reg)	High	11.5	1	2	5	3.5	\$72,800,000	
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	\$21,400,000	
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	\$118,800,000	\$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	\$128,700,000	
San Bernardino	Renovate Joshua Tree Courthouse	High	11	4	2	5	0	\$3,950,000	
San Bernardino	Addition to Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse	Medium	9	1	1	2	5	\$10,700,000	\$1,380,000
San Diego	Addition to Vista (North County) Courthouse	Critical	13	4	3	5	1	\$72,800,000	\$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 Meadowlark Juvenile Courthouse	High	12	5	4	3	0	\$6,350,000	
San Diego	New San Diego Traffic/Small Claims Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$62,400,000	
San Diego	Renovation and Addition to El Cajon Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$53,950,000	\$2,750,000
San Diego	Renovate San Diego Hall of Justice	Low	4	1	2	1	0	\$2,430,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Criminal Courthouse	High	11	3	3	5	0	\$206,400,000	
San Francisco	New San Francisco Family Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$99,000,000	\$13,750,000
San Francisco	Renovate San Francisco Civic Center Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$1,950,000	
San Joaquin	New South San Joaquin County Courthouse	Immediate	17	4	3	5	5	\$53,500,000	
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Critical	12.5	4	3	5	0.5	\$138,600,000	\$19,250,000
San Luis Obispo	New South County Courthouse	High	10	3	5	2	0	\$10,700,000	\$1,380,000

Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan
 June 28, 2013
 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	\$2,050,000	
San Mateo	Renovation and Addition to South San Francisco Courthouse	Medium	8	4	2	2	0	\$27,040,000	
San Mateo	Renovate Redwood City Courthouse	Low	7	3	3	1	0	\$56,290,000	
Santa Barbara	Addition to Santa Maria Lewellen Justice Center	Critical	12.5	5	2	5	0.5	\$21,400,000	\$2,750,000
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Juvenile Courthouse	Medium	8	3	3	2	0	\$10,700,000	
Santa Clara	New Mountain View Courthouse	Critical	13	5	3	5	0	\$99,000,000	\$13,750,000
Santa Clara	Renovation and Addition to San Jose Criminal and Juvenile Courthouse	High	10.5	2	3	5	0.5	\$204,850,000	\$24,750,000
Santa Clara	New San Jose Traffic and Small Claims Courthouse	Medium	9	2	2	5	0	\$42,800,000	\$5,500,000
Santa Cruz	Addition to Santa Cruz Courthouse	High	12	3	3	5	1	\$21,400,000	
Solano	Renovation and Addition to Solano Court Complex	Critical	13.5	3	3	5	2.5	\$54,440,000	
Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Family and Civil Courthouse	Immediate	14.5	5	3	5	1.5	\$83,200,000	\$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	\$21,400,000	
Tulare	Renovation and Addition to Visalia Courthouse	Immediate	16	5	3	5	3	\$68,450,000	\$5,500,000
Tulare	Renovate Visalia Juvenile Courthouse	Low	6	1	2	1	2	\$2,850,000	
Ventura	New Ventura East County Courthouse	Immediate	15	4	1	5	5	\$93,600,000	
Ventura	Renovate Ventura Hall of Justice	Medium	8	1	2	5	0	\$63,510,000	Included in budget
Yuba	New Marysville Courthouse	High	10.5	2	2	5	1.5	\$62,400,000	
<i>Total Project Budget for Current Needs⁵</i>								\$5,658,940,000	\$478,550,000
<i>Total Parking Structure Budget for Current Needs⁶</i>								<u>\$478,550,000</u>	
Total Budget for Current Needs⁷								\$6,137,490,000	
<i>Statewide Budget for Court Facility Space for New Judgeships⁸</i>								\$457,600,000	
<i>Statewide Budget for Parking Structures for New Judgeships⁹</i>								<u>\$60,500,000</u>	
Total Statewide Budget for New Judgeships¹⁰								\$518,100,000	
Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget¹¹								<u>\$6,655,590,000</u>	

PLEASE NOTE: The Total Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan Budget is presented in January 2013 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

June 28, 2013

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 2013 dollars from the corresponding range in the table shown below. The project-budget-per-courtroom ranges in the table below are derived from unescalated 2012 total project budgets of SB 1407 new construction projects submitted to the state Department of Finance for funding in FY 2013–2014. These unescalated 2012 total project budgets—reflecting Judicial Council-mandated cost reductions—were then grouped according to number of courtrooms and averaged 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. 2013 dollars)	\$10,700,000
6–9 Courtrooms (Jan. 2013 dollars)	\$10,400,000
10–20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2013 dollars)	\$9,900,000
More than 20 Courtrooms (Jan. 2013 dollars)	\$8,600,000

(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 2013 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 2013 dollars). The January 2013 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 44 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. It is calculated by multiplying \$11.2 million per courtroom—based on the budget per courtroom in January 2013 dollars for *New Construction* and *Addition* projects ranging from 6–9 courtrooms (shown in the table above)—by 44 unfunded new judgeships. To date, facility space for 56 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships has been budgeted in funded trial court capital projects: 21 new judgeships to 6 funded SB 1732 projects (two have completed: Contra Costa and Fresno - Sisk) and to 1 funded General Fund project (LA - Long Beach), and 35 new judgeships to 15 funded SB 1407 projects.

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 44 of the unfunded 100 new judgeships. This budget is calculated by multiplying 44 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 2013 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 44 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 2013 dollars.

Indefinitely Delayed SB 1407 Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects

June 28, 2013

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 ⁶
1. Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse ²	Immediate	18	5	3	5	5	January 2013	Preliminary Plans	\$65,996,000
2. Kern	New Mojave Courthouse ³	Immediate	16.5	5	4	5	2.5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	\$44,010,000
3. Kern	New Delano Courthouse ³	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	\$41,666,000
4. Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse ³	Immediate	16	3	3	5	5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	\$63,476,000
5. Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse ²	Immediate	15	2	3	5	5	January 2013	Site Acquisition	\$125,703,000
6. Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse ³	Immediate	14.5	4	3	5	2.5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	\$126,675,000
7. Monterey	New South Monterey County Courthouse ³	Immediate	17	5	4	3	5	October 2012	Preliminary Plans	\$48,143,000
8. Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse ⁴	Critical	13	4	4	5	0	January 2013	Site Acquisition	\$102,827,000
9. Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse ³	Immediate	17	4	5	3	5	October 2012	Site Acquisition	\$22,493,000
10. Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse ³	Critical	14	5	4	5	0	October 2012	Site Acquisition	\$34,669,000
11. Sacramento	New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse ⁵	Immediate	16.5	5	3	5	3.5	January 2013	Site Acquisition	\$391,680,000
Total Estimated Projects Budgets										\$1,067,338,000

Footnotes:

1. These projects are sorted by alphabetical order of county names and then by total score.
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. This project was indefinitely delayed by the Judicial Council in January 2013. The Judicial Council directed it to move forward with site acquisition, to seek necessary funding and acquisition approvals for its preferred site; however, work on its pre-design and design is to be suspended and indefinitely delayed.
6. These estimated total project budgets, which reflect Judicial Council-mandated cost reductions, are current as of June 2013.