



Courthouse Cost
Reduction Subcommittee
100 Percent Design
Development Review
Report

NEW SONORA COURTHOUSE
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE

November 30, 2015

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
CAPITAL PROGRAM

PROJECT MANAGER
LISA HINTON

1. Executive Summary of Project Status at 100 Percent Design Development

At the completion of Design Development, the project status is as follows:

- 1.1 Scope – the project is within the approved scope, as described below.
- 1.2 Budget – the project is within budget. Note that the Judicial Council required this project to achieve a mandatory 14 percent reduction to hard construction cost.
- 1.3 Schedule – the project is on schedule for construction starting in Summer of 2017, (pending timing of spring bond sale).

2. Background

2.1. Budget Year 2009–2010 – initial project authorization:

- Project first submitted for SB 1407 funding authorization.
- Original Approved FY 2009–2010 Building Gross Square Feet (BGSF): 66,724 SF
- Original Hard Construction Cost in FY 2009–2010: \$39,596,115
- Funding for Acquisition and Preliminary Plans were approved in FY 2009–2010, with Working Drawings being approved in FY 2011–2012. No authorized amounts were approved in FY 2012–2013 and FY 2013–2014.

2.2. Budget Year 2013–2014:

- Recognize Change: building was reprogrammed to reduce overall square footage and costs and presented to the Cost Reduction Sub Committee's (CCRS) meeting on January 9, 2014.
 - At the January 9, 2014 CCRS meeting, CCRS directed the project team to make changes to some program elements of the building. These changes are included in the updated building gross square footage.
 - BGSF reduction from original square footage of 66,724 SF to the current 61,537 SF. This is approximately 7.8 percent reduction in total square footage.
 - Hard Construction Cost Subtotal was reduced from \$39,596,115 to \$32,911,575. This is a 16.9 percent reduction in the hard construction budget.
-

- The budget reduction reflects the Judicial Council mandated reductions of 4 percent in December 2011 of FY 2011–2012 and a 10 percent reduction by the Judicial Council in April 2012 of FY 2011–2012.
- January 9, 2014 CCRS approved the resumption of the Preliminary Plans Phase.

2.3. Budget Year 2014–2015:

- Preliminary Plans Phase appropriation recognized
- New building size: 61,537 BGSF
- New Hard Construction Cost subtotal is \$32,911,575.
- May 28, 2015 CCRS approved 100% Schematic Design Phase

2.4. Budget Year 2015–2016:

- Working Drawings Phase appropriation recognized
- September 25, 2015 CCRS approved 50% Design Development phase

2.5. Summary of changes to Hard Construction Cost Subtotal:

- Original (Budget Year 2009–2010): \$ 39,596,115
- Current (Budget Year 2015–2016): \$ 32,911,575
- Reduction from Original budget: \$ 6,684,540 or 16.9 percent decrease.

2.6. Summary of changes to BGSF:

- Original (Budget Year 2009–2010): 66,724 BGSF
- Current (Budget Year 2015–2016): 61,537 BGSF
- Reduction from Original to Current: 5,187 BGSF, or approximately 7.8 percent decrease.

3. CCRS Review and Directives:

- 3.1. January 2014: Site and Program Review: The CCRS approved the site and the building program and approved the start of Preliminary Plans phase.
-

- 3.2. May 2015: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review: The CCRS approved the 100 Percent Schematic Design presentation and approved the start of Design Development.
- 3.3. September 2015: 50 Percent Design Development Review: The CCRS approved the 50 Percent Design Development and approved the start of 100 Percent Design Development.

4. Project Update

The project is submitted for approval of the 100% Design Development phase. During this period the approved plans have been further developed and now include appropriate detail for completion of the design development phase and outline the entire building scope. Examples of work completed since the 50% Design Development review include the following items:

- 4.1 Refinement of entrance lobby and security screening. The exit flow did not appear to be clear. Lionakis provided a layout that allows public to exit via the main entry doors at screening.
- 4.2 Site lines at central holding control station are not optimal to pedestrian sally port, elevators and to transfer corridor. Lionakis has improved the layout in central holding to provide optimal site lines from the control station.

All of these developments have been incorporated into the consultant construction cost estimate.

The Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) Turner Construction has been selected for this project and has been engaged since 50 Percent Design Development.

5. Schedule

The project schedule is outlined below.

a	b	c	d		e	f
Phase	Current Authorized Schedule FY 15/16 ¹		Current Schedule			Percent Complete
	Start Date	Finish Date	Start Date	Finish Date		
Site Selection.....	11/1/09	5/13/11	11/1/09	5/13/11		100%
Site Acquisition.....	5/16/11	4/11/12	5/16/11	4/11/12 ²		100%
Preliminary Plans.....	7/1/14	9/22/15	7/1/14	1/15/15		100%
Working Drawings & Approval to Bid.	9/23/15	9/30/16	1/15/16	10/1/16		—
Bid and Contract Award ³	10/1/16	7/31/17	10/2/16	6/30/17		—
Construction.....	8/1/17	11/1/19	7/1/17	11/1/19		—
Move-in.....	11/2/19	11/30/19	11/2/19	11/30/19		—

¹ Current authorized schedule based on approved FY 2015–2016.

² Site acquisition approved by SPWB on April 11, 2012. Escrow closed on June 29, 2012.

³ Assumes Spring 2017 Bond Sale.

6. Status of Hard Construction Cost Budget and 100 Percent Design Development Estimate

6.1. Below is a summary of the original hard construction cost, hard construction reductions based on the council direction of December 12, 2011, and April 24, 2012, and additional reductions accepted by the CCRS in January 2014, the current design-to-budget, and a comparison of the current hard construction cost budget to the 100 Percent Design Development estimate.

6.2. Calculation of Hard Construction Cost Budget with Judicial Council Directed and CCRS Accepted Reductions

Original FY 2009-2010 Hard Construction Cost Subtotal	\$ 39,596,115
FY 2012-2013: JC mandated 4% reduction	\$ (1,583,844)
FY 2013-2014: JC mandated 10% reduction.....	\$ (3,959,611)
FY 2014-2015: CCRS BGSF reduction.....	\$ (1,141,085)
<i>Revised Hard Construction Cost Subtotal</i>	\$ 32,911,575
Cost Reduction Achieved	\$ 6,684,540
Cost Reduction as percent of original Construction Cost Subtotal	% 16.9%

6.3. Design-to-Budget Calculation

FY 2009-2010 Hard Construction cost (including Cost Reductions)	\$ 32,911,575
Data, Communication and Security	\$ 1,046,129
CCCI Adjustment to July 2014 dollars.....	\$ 4,251,125
Current Design-to-Budget	\$ 38,208,829

6.4. Summary of Design-to-Budget in Comparison to 100 Percent Design Development Estimate

The CM@R, Turner Construction, developed a 100 Percent Design Development estimate which shows the project to be within budget.



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA





SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA