



# Judicial Council of California

## Court Facilities Advisory Committee

[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

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

June 27, 2023

10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Judicial Council of California – San Francisco Office/Public Videocast

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair  
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas (Ret.), Vice-chair  
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd (by video)  
Hon. Keith D. Davis (Ret.)  
Hon. Robert D. Foiles  
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley  
Hon. William F. Highberger  
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)  
Ms. Krista LeVier  
Hon. Gary R. Orozco (by video)  
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.) (by video)  
Mr. Lee Seale  
Hon. Robert J. Trentacosta (by video)  
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr. (by video)

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego  
Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA  
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi  
Mr. Larry Spikes

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

Mr. Ron Strand, City Manager, City of Ridgecrest  
Mr. Navi Dhillon, Attorney, Paul Hastings LLP (representing the City of Ridgecrest)  
Ms. Ellen Heiman, Attorney, Paul Hastings LLP (representing the City of Ridgecrest)  
Ms. Tamarah Harber-Pickens, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Kern County (by video)  
Hon. Andrew S. Blum, Judge, Superior Court of Lake County (by video)  
Mr. Ted Foor, Design Manager, Clark/Sullivan Broward Builders  
Mr. Mike Davey, Principal, Lionakis (Architect of Record)  
Ms. Carolyn Stegon, Design Manager, AECOM (Construction Management Agency)  
Mr. Mike Regan, Project Manager, AECOM  
Mr. Jeremy Cortez, Chief Deputy of Finance and Administration, Superior Court of Los Angeles County (by video)  
Mr. Allen Leslein, Director of Facilities Services and Capital Projects, Superior Court of Los Angeles County (by video)  
Mr. Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Placer County (by video)  
Hon. Craig B. Van Rooyen, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County (by video)  
Mr. Michael Powell, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County (by video)  
Mr. Bob Dolbinski, AIA, Associate Principal, Moore Ruble Yudell | Architects & Planners  
Ms. Jeanne Chen, FAIA, Principal, Moore Ruble Yudell | Architects & Planners  
Ms. Zara Fahim, Project Manager, ARUP (by video)  
Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Ms. Nina Besne, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Ms. Kim Bobic, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Ms. Mary Bustamante, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)  
Mr. Jack Collins, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)  
Mr. Zulqar Helal, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Ms. Kristin Kerr, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services (by video)  
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Ms. Pella McCormick, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Mr. Bruce Newman, Senior Facilities Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)  
Ms. Deepika Padam, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)  
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Mr. Michael Sablich, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services  
Ms. Maggie Stern, Attorney II, Judicial Council Legal Services  
Ms. Peggy Symons, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)  
Ms. Sadie Varela, Facilities Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)  
Mr. John Wordlaw, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council Executive Office (by video)

**OPEN MEETING**

---

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM, introductions were made, and roll was taken.

**Public Videocast**

A live videocast of the meeting was made available to the public through the advisory body web page on the California Courts website listed above and is archived at <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/clip/3967>.

**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 March 22, 2023, and the minutes of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee’s (CFAC) Subcommittee on Courthouse Names meeting held on June 12, 2023.

*(Motion: Lucas; Second: Davis)*

**Public Comments**

Representing the City of Ridgecrest in Kern County as the city’s legal counsel, the following persons spoke during the meeting regarding agenda Item 2:

1. Mr. Navi Dhillon, Attorney, Paul Hastings LLP
2. Ms. Ellen Heiman, Attorney, Paul Hastings LLP

Also present was Mr. Ron Strand, City Manager of the City of Ridgecrest.

A record of the comments made during this portion of the meeting are available through the archived videocast at <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/clip/3967>.

---

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 6)**

---

**Item 1**

**Director’s Report (No Action – Information Only)**

**Summary:** The CFAC received an update from Ms. Pella McCormick on the following topics:

2023 Budget Act (FY 2023–24):

- The Governor is expected to sign the 2023 Budget Act today, June 27, 2023.
- The Budget Act is expected to include funding for the following:
  - Continuing phases for trial court capital outlay projects in Monterey, Nevada, and San Bernardino counties and a new start capital outlay project for the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District;
  - Signage for the Superior Court of Merced County’s main courthouse that has been renamed as the Charles James Ogletree, Jr. Courthouse; and
  - Operations and maintenance for nine recently completed capital outlay projects (or projects that will complete) within the upcoming year.

Today's Meeting Agenda:

- Agenda items are largely focused on preparation for budget requests for FY 2024–25.
- As informed and directed by today's actions, the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* and *Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals* (COBCPs) for FY 2024–25 will be submitted for consideration at the Judicial Council's July 2023 business meeting:
  - The *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* and COBCPs are due to the California Department of Finance (DOF) on July 31, 2023.
  - The Superior Courts of Kern and Los Angeles Counties have requested project scope adjustments.
  - Based on analysis from the ongoing long-range plan, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County has affirmed its desire to continue with the centralized service model with facilities concentrated in downtown Los Angeles, rather than distributing dockets from the 100-courtroom Stanley Mosk Courthouse to courthouses within outlying districts.
  - Four Los Angeles trial court capital outlay projects were rescoped and rescored utilizing the 2019 prioritization methodology and then integrated into the statewide capital project list—which resulted in the West Los Angeles, Van Nuys, and Inglewood projects moving down in score and the Stanley Mosk Courthouse replacement project moving up.
  - At the Superior Court of Kern County's request, the New East County Courthouse project has changed from four to three courtrooms and will replace Mojave court facilities only.
    - The project will no longer replace the county-owned facility in the City of Ridgecrest, and that existing one-courtroom facility will continue its operations.
    - The superior court's letter, included in the meeting materials, describes the request and recent stakeholder and justice partner input as well as the court's outreach meetings to the Ridgecrest and Mojave communities.
- The CFAC's Subcommittee on Courthouse Names met at a public meeting on June 12, 2023, to consider the following:
  - Revision to the *Courthouse Naming Policy*, which was posted for a two-week court/public comment period commencing June 13, 2023; and
  - A request from the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three, to name the existing Fourth Appellate District Courthouse in Santa Ana after former Associate Justice Cruz Reynoso.
    - This item will be presented to the CFAC for future action either through a special meeting or action by email depending on the timing to present the naming request to the Judicial Council.
    - Judicial Council approval of the naming request will be subject to its conformance to the revised *Courthouse Naming Policy* and the CFAC's concurrence.

Capital Program Status Update:

- There are currently 18 active projects: 8 in construction, 2 in performance criteria, 1 in working drawings, and 7 in acquisition.
- Capital outlay projects in Imperial, Glenn, and Shasta counties will complete construction this year.
- The Los Angeles long-range planning study is progressing and expected to complete this year. This study will address the superior court's 17 capital outlay projects on the statewide list. It will have a specific focus on the projects for the Mosk and Foltz courthouses, to validate prior assumptions and provide a 20- to 30-year plan in alignment with court operational priorities.

Update to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards*:

- The 2023 update to the facilities standards has started in conjunction with the triennial release of the 2022 California Building Standards Code in January of 2023.
- CFAC’s workgroup on the Standards update has reformed and will be meeting with facilities staff over the summer and fall.
- Facilities staff estimate a December 2023 presentation to the CFAC for approval to post the updated Standards for court/public comment, and ultimately, targeted Judicial Council adoption of the updated Standards in May 2024.

September CFAC Meeting:

- The next project milestone reviews will be for the Monterey—New Fort Ord Courthouse site acquisition, New Fresno Courthouse site selection, New Solano Courthouse (Fairfield) site selection, and possibly, the New Quincy Courthouse site selection.

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

**Item 2****Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan and Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals for Fiscal Year 2024–25**

**Summary:** The CFAC reviewed the capital projects proposed in the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* and COBCPs for fiscal year 2024–25. This plan informs capital project funding requests for upcoming and outlying fiscal years. For consideration of funding in the 2024 Budget Act (FY 2024–25), submission of the plan and COBCPs are required in advance of DOF’s deadline.

Consistent with materials (Tab 3) 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-20230627-materials.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf), Mr. Chris Magnusson introduced this item and presented slides 1–4 and 14–20, and Ms. Pella McCormick presented slides 5–13. Following the presentation and committee discussion and as described below, the CFAC took separate actions on the capital project for Superior Court of Placer County and the five-year plan and COBCPs.

**Placer–Tahoe Area Courthouse Project**

The advisory committee made the following comments concerning the motion:

- The capital project for the Superior Court of Placer County should be scoped as a renovation of the existing courthouse building and proceed with an acquisition/study phase in FY 2024–25.
- Staff should work with the Placer County Board of Supervisors to determine whether the county is willing to provide the site, including easement for parking, at minimal (i.e., less than fair market) if not zero cost (i.e., donation) to support the Judicial Council in its investment in the renovation of the existing courthouse building.
  - The hope is that very early on there would be buy in from the County of Placer to be a participant in allowing the Judicial Council to use their old building, which they are not going to use, without any additional cost to the state.

- Throughout the many years of the capital program’s existence, many counties have gone to great extents financially, and otherwise, to ensure local courthouses are constructed at economical cost and of value to the members of their communities.
- Hopefully, the County of Placer will look at it as a positive and come forward with an understanding to be willing to give up their building, which is not going to be used; so that they could benefit from a renovated courthouse to better serve the members of their community.
- Staff should study all aspects of the renovation, including asbestos abatement, necessary systems upgrades, walls relocation to assist the functional space plan, etc., to determine a quantified expense.
- Staff should study whether the second floor needs to be used at all, or whether the space program can be accomplished solely on the first floor with the second floor designated as attic space to save the cost of an elevator.
  - A cost-benefit analysis should be performed to determine whether the cost of the space on second floor is worth the investment of an elevator.
- Staff should aspire to deliver the renovation project for a construction cost of \$6 million rather than between \$9.5–12.5 million.
- Staff should study the feasibility of including a covered walkway connection between the existing courthouse building and the county’s proposed new Tahoe Justice Center (TJC) Building.
  - The county’s proposed TJC building is planned to house the Sheriff Substation, and its holding cells can be used for in-custodies moved between the two buildings and reduce the need for holding cells in the renovated courthouse.

**Action 1:** The advisory committee—with exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

1. The capital project for the Superior Court of Placer County is changed from new construction to a renovation of the existing courthouse building in Tahoe City and moves forward for request of initial funding for an acquisition/study phase in FY 2024–25.

*(Motion: Highberger; Second: Lucas)*

#### **Five-year Plan and Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals for Fiscal Year 2024–25**

**Actions 2 and 3:** The advisory committee—with exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motions:

2. The five-year plan and COBCPs be submitted to the Judicial Council for review and approval  
*(Motion: Jahr; Second: Davis); and*
3. The review/approval of the committee’s report to the Judicial Council is delegated to the CFAC Chair and Vice-chair. *(Motion: Davis; Second: Orozco)*

**Item 3****San Luis Obispo – New San Luis Obispo 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 materials (Tab 4) 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-20230627-materials.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf), Ms. Kim Bobic introduced this item and presented slides 1–13 and 33–34, and Mr. Bob Dolbinski presented slides 14–32. They were joined by Ms. Jeanne Chen. Ms Bobic also indicated that from the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County, Presiding Judge Craig B. Van Rooyen and Mr. Michael Powell, Court Executive Officer, were both present via videoconference.

In addition, the following comments were made:

- The Kimball property and the existing courthouse property are both owned by the County of San Luis Obispo. Acquiring the Kimball property may result in cost savings, as this site would be credited for the exchange of the state’s space equity interest (approximately 50 percent) in the existing courthouse property through the county’s buyout of that equity. Any remaining balance of the cost for the site is still to be determined.
- No public, juror, or staff parking exists on the existing courthouse property. The city’s nearby public parking garages provides such parking accommodation. These parking facilities would continue to be available to meet this parking need with development of the new courthouse on the Kimball property.

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

1. Site selection for this project—of two downtown San Luis Obispo sites, which are the preferred Kimball Property and alternate Existing Courthouse Property—be submitted to SPWB for approval and for the project to return for future review/approval of site acquisition.

*(Motion: Lucas; Second: Foiles)*

**Item 4****Lake – New Lakeport Courthouse: 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 materials (Tab 5) for Item 4 of the agenda, which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf), Ms. Nina Besne introduced this item and presented slides 1–3 and 35–36, Mr. Ted Foor presented slides 4–11 and 33–34, and Mr. Mike Davey presented slides 12–32. They were joined by Ms. Carolyn Stegon. Ms. Besne also indicated that from the Superior Court of Lake County, Judge Andrew S. Blum was present via videoconference, and Ms. Krista LeVier, Court Executive Officer, was present in the board room.

In addition, the following comments were made:

- Based on the projected number of daily court users and per the project’s elevator consultant, a single elevator has been determined to be sufficient.
- Not from the result of prior industrial or retail activity but the site’s natural character of its soil was found to have nickel and chromium. However, its soil does not require remediation, as it is not being exported to another site and subject to reclassification as a Class 1 hazardous material. Three inches of capping is required, which can be in the form of asphalt or concrete or hydroseed in landscape areas. There is no impact on any identified CEQA mitigation measures, and as this is a recent issue, the project team will be looking at impact to the project’s budget.
- The reuse of onsite soil resulting from excavation is planned to be applied throughout the site and will increase the elevation of site features including the access road, parking lot, and building pad. The local fire department has been made aware of this plan, and the site design, including steepness of the access road, is within that department’s parameters.
- There a public sidewalk planned on the west side of the access road in addition to a series of switchback walkways south of the secure parking area to provide an ADA accessible path from the street to the courthouse building.

**Action:** The advisory committee—with the abstention of Ms. LeVier and exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

1. Recommend approval of the project’s completed 100 Percent Schematic Design and to proceed with Design Development.

*(Motion: Highberger; Second: Fowler-Bradley)*

## Item 5

### Revised Courthouse Naming Policy

**Summary:** The CFAC reviewed a revision to the Judicial Council’s current *Courthouse Naming Policy*. The council, with recommendation from its CFAC’s Subcommittee on Courthouse Names, names courthouses based on standards to provide consistency in identifying courthouses in California. Changes over time necessitate an update to the policy since it was adopted by the council in 2014.

Mr. Chris Magnusson introduced this item and presented it consistent with materials (Tab 6) for Item 5 of the agenda, which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf). Moreover, Judge Keith D. Davis, chair of the CFAC’s Subcommittee on Courthouse Names, reiterated the subcommittee’s complete support for the revision to the policy as determined at its public meeting held on June 12, 2023. He also indicated he had no concern with the language suggested from the Superior Court of Riverside County that was provided during the public comment period and captured on presentation slide 7.

**Action:** The advisory committee—with exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motions:

1. With inclusion of language from the court comment (on presentation slide 7), the CFAC Subcommittee on Courthouse Names' recommendation—that the Judicial Council approve the draft revised policy—is affirmed; and
2. The review/approval of the committee's report to the Judicial Council is delegated to the CFAC Chair and Vice-chair.

*(Motion: Davis; Second: Highberger)*

#### **Item 6**

##### **Post Occupancy Evaluation (No Action – Information Only)**

**Summary:** The CFAC received a report on the post occupancy evaluation of the Stockton Courthouse, which was constructed in 2017 for the Superior Court of San Joaquin County.

Ms. Zara Fahim introduced this item and presented it consistent with materials (Tab 7) for Item 6 of the agenda, which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20230627-materials.pdf). Moreover, Ms. Deepika Padam indicated that as the Stockton Courthouse was designed under the 2011 edition of the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards*, many of the lessons learned from this project were captured in the 2020 update to the Standards and that others will be captured in the next iteration. She also noted that procedures and trainings have been improved within Judicial Council Facilities Services to better transition completed capital projects from the Project Management Unit to the Facilities Operations Unit, who will use the functionality of these modern buildings.

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

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on September 25, 2023.