



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/cfac.htm
cfac@jud.ca.gov

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 19, 2022

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Ms. Linda Romero Soles
Hon. Robert J. Trentacosta
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Hon. Keith D. Davis (Ret.)
Hon. Robert D. Foiles
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)
Mr. Larry Spikes

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

Mr. Chris Ruhl, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Monterey County
Mr. Felipe Navarro, Chief Administrative Officer, Superior Court of Monterey County
Ms. Nancy CS Eberhardt, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Bernardino County
Mr. Nathan Lemley, Court Facilities Project Manager, Superior Court of San Bernardino County
Ms. Tamara Clarke, Principal, Dewberry
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons, Judge/E&P Committee Liaison, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Deputy Director, Facilities Services
Ms. Katherine Albertus, Facilities Analyst, Facilities Services
Ms. Kim Bobic, Senior Project Manager, Facilities Services
Mr. Jack Collins, Manager, Facilities Services
Ms. Rose Livingston, Senior Analyst, Executive Office
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Facilities Services
Mr. Charles Martel, Supervising Attorney, Legal Services
Ms. Pella McCormick, Director, Facilities Services
Mr. Bruce Newman, Senior Facilities Analyst, Facilities Services
Ms. Deepika Padam, Manager, Facilities Services
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Facilities Services
Mr. Michael Scott, Senior Project Manager, Facilities Services
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Facilities Services
Ms. Lynette Stephens, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services
Ms. Peggy Symons, Manager, Facilities Services
Mr. John Wordlaw, Chief Administrative Officer, Executive Office

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order, Roll Call, and Opening Remarks

The chair called the open meeting to order at 12:00 p.m., roll was taken, and opening remarks were made.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory committee voted—with abstention of members absent from the meeting and exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members—to approve the minutes of its meeting held on February 7, 2022.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–3)

Item 1

Director’s Report (No Action – Information Only)

Summary: The Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) received an update from Ms. Pella McCormick on the following topics:

2022–23 Budget:

- Eight capital projects were included—three that are in-progress (and for the Butte, Mendocino, and San Bernardino superior courts), and five that are new and for the Fresno, Los Angeles, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, and Solano superior courts.
- There were few questions on the capital program at Legislative subcommittee meetings in March 2022, and all items were held open.
- The April 1st Finance Letter includes the request of the following:
 - \$6 million in capital-outlay funding to build out a shelled courtroom in the Stanislaus—New Modesto Courthouse project to house a funded new judgeship; and
 - Funding for two large facility modification projects:
 - \$13.5 million (Judicial Council’s estimated cost) to correct egress deficiencies ordered by the Office of the State Fire Marshal at the San Diego East County Regional Center; and
 - \$27.1 million (Judicial Council’s estimated cost) to modernize the San Diego Hall of Justice including upgraded conveying (elevators and escalators) and mechanical systems.
- Timeframe for next series of budget hearings is last week of April or first week of May 2022;
- Release of the May Revision to the Governor’s Budget is expected on May 13, 2022.

Capital Project Highlights:

- The Judicial Council’s Judicial Branch Budget Committee will review proposals for the 2023–24 Budget in May 2022, including capital projects in the council’s five-year infrastructure plan for the Kern, Lake, Los Angeles, Placer, and San Joaquin superior courts.
- The New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse is nearing construction midpoint, with the structural steel topping out ceremony scheduled for April 22, 2022.
- Foundation work is commencing on the Menifee Justice Center in Riverside.

- The renovation and addition project at the Willows Courthouse in Glenn County has new windows and paint, its mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems are roughed in, and the addition is approximately 75 percent complete with curtain wall, exterior sheathing, and weather proofing being installed.
- For the New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse in Riverside, demolition of the existing facility is ongoing, with the separation of the utilities completed.
- For the New Lakeport Courthouse project in Lake County, the procurement is underway for both the Construction Management Agency and the Design-Build Entity contracts.
- *Update on Capital Project Delays.* The eight projects under construction are progressing; however, supply chain and commodity market instability are having direct impact on schedules and costs. The construction industry is struggling to supply component parts, such as electrical switch gear, transformers, and components with a microchip (e.g., audio-video equipment, building management systems, fire alarms, signage systems, and lighting controls), taking triple the time to receive. For example: Electrical switch gear has been on order for more than six months, glazing sourced nearly a year ago has yet to arrive, and structural steel from overseas is still waiting to be unloaded at the port. Several projects are potentially delayed from missing components affecting construction sequencing and building commissioning. Project managers and contractors are working diligently and collaboratively to minimize impacts; however, schedules and costs are likely to experience overruns.

Upcoming Milestones:

- The next CFAC meeting is scheduled to be in person in San Francisco on May 26, 2022. A full agenda is expected with both informational and action items including an update to the capital program management manual, study findings for the Nevada City Courthouse project, a feasibility study for a new Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District courthouse on Judicial Council-owned property in the city of Sunnyvale, and the Performance Criteria for the Mendocino—New Ukiah Courthouse project.
- For action by email, the CFAC will soon receive the 100 Percent Design Development report for the Butte County Juvenile Hall Addition and Renovation project.

Action: The advisory committee took no action, as this item had only been presented for informational purposes.

Item 2

Monterey – New Fort Ord Courthouse: Site Selection Review

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation of the capital project’s Site Selection, which was a scheduled milestone review.

Consistent with the materials (Tabs 3A and 3B) for Item 2 of the agenda, which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20220419-materials.pdf, Ms. Kim Bobic presented the following for the New Fort Ord Courthouse project: the standard two-step approval process—for site selection and then site acquisition—required by the State Public Works Board (SPWB); the

Project Advisory Group's (PAG) involvement in the site selection process; the four sites considered (two in the city of Marina and two in the city of Seaside); the evaluation of each site through the application of selection criteria with weighting and scoring (consistent with the Judicial Council's *Site Selection and Acquisition Policy for Judicial Branch Facilities*); and based on the Main Gate site in the city of Seaside receiving the highest criteria score, the PAG's recommendation of the acquisition of a five-acre parcel on that site.

Action: The advisory committee—with exception of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and members absent as shown above—voted to approve the following motion:

1. Recommend site selection for this project—of a five-acre parcel on the Main Gate site in the city of Seaside—be submitted to SPWB for approval and for the project to return for future review/approval of site acquisition.

Item 3

San Bernardino – San Bernardino Juvenile Dependency Courthouse Addition and Renovation: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation of the capital project's completed 100 Percent Schematic Design, which was a scheduled milestone review.

Consistent with the materials (Tabs 4A and 4B) for Item 3 of the agenda, which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20220419-materials.pdf, Mr. Michael Scott presented slides 1–5 and 26–27, and Ms. Tamara Clarke presented slides 6–25.

The CFAC expressed concerns with the existing path of travel for in-custody movement as well as building security issues for access from the exterior to its chambers and roof. No such issues had been reported, as the Superior Court of San Bernardino County has been operating in this county-designed/owned building since 2004. Ms. Nancy Eberhardt indicated that owing to the courthouse's high juvenile dependency caseload, matters involving in-custodies could not be limited to only courtrooms at either end of the corridor. She stated the current path of travel for in-custodies is what has been used, which is not ideal practice but acceptable with the project design given what was allowable with the project's budget and that security will continue to be provided by the sheriff's department.

Given that additional security design would require additional funding, could extend the project schedule, and could affect the timing for funding the remaining project phases, Ms. Pella McCormick reiterated the following: the project is currently \$626,000 over budget; an appropriation has been requested for funding the Working Drawings phase in 2022–23 with the Construction phase funding-request to follow; and the aim was to work with allowable square footage because it is a county-owned facility.

Acknowledging the concerns expressed by Ms. McCormick, the CFAC discussed that the project should move forward while also studying improvement to in-custody movement (e.g., creating a courtyard to provide (a) an additional corridor to the building for in-custody movement and (b) a barrier to chambers from the parking lot, or reducing the size of new chambers in the building addition to provide holding cells to serve the new courtrooms).

Action: The advisory committee—with exception of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and members absent as shown above—voted to approve the following motion:

1. Recommend approval of the project’s completed 100 Percent Schematic Design and to proceed with Design Development in addition to further study to improve in-custody movement.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on May 26, 2022.