



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: April 24, 2012

Title	Agenda Item Type
Court Facilities: Recommendations on Reducing Costs of SB 1407 Projects	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	April 24, 2012
Recommended by	Date of Report
Court Facilities Working Group	April 20, 2012
Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair	Contact
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair	Office of Court Construction and Management
Hon. Jeffrey. W. Johnson, Chair of the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee	Lee Willoughby, Director
	916-263-1493
	lee.willoughby@jud.ca.gov
	Robert Emerson, Assistant Director
	415-865-4061
	robert.emerson@jud.ca.gov
	Kelly Quinn, Senior Manager of Planning
	818-558-3078
	kelly.quinn@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Court Facilities Working Group recommends the next steps to reduce costs for each SB 1407 project, including reassessing 13 projects with the goal of significantly lowering their costs. Minimum reductions to hard construction costs are recommended for all projects along with a set of principles for use by the courts, the AOC, and the design teams to meet cost reduction minimum goals. In support of reducing SB 1407 project costs, the Working Group also recommends that the director of the AOC's Office of Court Construction and Management be delegated authority to make technical adjustments to facility design standards, subject to working group oversight.

Recommendation

The Court Facilities Working Group recommends that the Judicial Council, effective April 24, 2012, adopt the following:

1. A total of 13 projects—with an estimated \$1.1 billion in total project budgets—will be reassessed to find significant ways to reduce costs, including where feasible, reducing square footage, undertaking renovations of existing buildings instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods. Projects to be reassessed are:

Imperial–New El Centro Family Courthouse, Inyo–New Inyo County Courthouse, Kern–New Delano Courthouse, Kern–New Mojave Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Glendale Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Santa Clarita Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse, Mendocino–New Ukiah Courthouse, Monterey–New South Monterey County Courthouse, Nevada–New Nevada City Courthouse, Riverside–New Hemet Courthouse, and Santa Barbara–New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse.

2. A total of 24 projects—with an estimated \$3.2 billion in total project budgets—will move forward to reduce SB 1407 costs now in addition to the four percent reduction mandated by the Judicial Council in December 2011. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible. Projects to move forward to reduce SB 1407 costs now are:

Butte–New North Butte County Courthouse, El Dorado–New Placerville Courthouse, Fresno–Renovate Fresno County Courthouse, Glenn–Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse, Kings–New Hanford Courthouse, Lake–New Lakeport Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Mental Health Courthouse, Merced–New Los Banos Courthouse, Placer–New Tahoe Area Courthouse, Plumas–New Quincy Courthouse, Riverside–New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Sacramento–New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, San Diego–New Central San Diego Courthouse, San Joaquin–Renovation and Addition to Juvenile Justice Center, Santa Clara–New Santa Clara Family Justice Center, Shasta–New Redding Courthouse, Siskiyou–New Yreka Courthouse, Solano–Renovation to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse, Sonoma–New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, Stanislaus–New Modesto Courthouse, Sutter–New Yuba City Courthouse, Tehama–New Red Bluff Courthouse, Tuolumne–New Sonora Courthouse, and Yolo–New Woodland Courthouse.

3. All projects moving forward to reduce SB 1407 costs now will achieve the following reductions to unescalated hard construction costs based on project type and current phase. Further reductions beyond the minimums are expected if no compromise in safety, security, building performance or court operations will result. Minimum SB 1407 cost reductions by project types and phases are as follows:

- 3.1 Renovation projects must reduce hard construction costs by a minimum of two percent. These projects are:

Fresno—Renovate Fresno County Courthouse, Glenn—Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse, San Joaquin—Renovation and Addition to Juvenile Justice Center, and Solano—Renovation to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse.

3.2 For all new construction projects, a range of cost-reduction minimums are established as follows:

3.2.1 Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects are established to demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods with a target to limit overall costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models. These projects are:

Merced—New Los Banos Courthouse, Placer—New Tahoe Area Courthouse, Plumas—New Quincy Courthouse, Riverside—New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Tehama—New Red Bluff Courthouse, Tuolumne—New Sonora Courthouse, and Butte—New North Butte County Courthouse.

3.2.2 Projects in Working Drawings or those that have their Preliminary Plans completed and submitted to the State Public Works Board by May 30, 2012, must reduce hard construction costs by a minimum of three percent. Qualifying projects are:

Kings—New Hanford Courthouse, Lake—New Lakeport Courthouse, San Diego—New Central San Diego Courthouse, Santa Clara—New Santa Clara Family Justice Center, Sutter—New Yuba City Courthouse, and Yolo—New Woodland Courthouse.

3.2.3 For projects in Acquisition, reductions are established as follows:

3.2.3.1 Projects that can be constructed using low-cost construction methodologies will achieve minimum cost savings of 10 percent or more. Qualifying projects are:

El Dorado—New Placerville Courthouse, Los Angeles—New Mental Health Courthouse, and Siskiyou—New Yreka Courthouse.

3.2.3.2 All other projects must reduce hard construction costs by a minimum of 10 percent. Qualifying projects are:

Sacramento—New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, Shasta—New Redding Courthouse, Sonoma—New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, and Stanislaus—New Modesto Courthouse.

4. AOC staff will collaborate with the courts and project design teams to implement the above-directed reductions using the Principles of Cost Reduction (Principles) attached to this report.

Application of the Principles should not compromise the security, safety, building performance, or operations of the courthouses.

5. In support of cost reduction efforts, the director of the AOC's Office of Court Construction and Management is authorized to make technical adjustments to the *California Trial Court Facilities* Standards for specific projects subject to majority approval of the following committee comprised of: Chair and Vice-Chair of the Court Facilities Working Group and the Chair of the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee. The technical adjustments should not compromise the security, safety, building performance, or operations of the courthouses.
6. The Alameda–New East County Courthouse project will move forward with no changes to project costs.
7. The Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee of the Court Facilities Working Group shall oversee and have direct implementation authority with regard to the above recommendations.
8. The AOC shall submit to the state Department of Finance technical corrections to FY 2012–2013 funding requests required to implement the above recommendations.

Previous Council Action

On December 12, 2011, the council adopted the Court Facilities Working Group's¹ recommended actions for moving forward with the Senate Bill (SB) 1407 courthouse construction program, including canceling projects for the Superior Courts of Alpine and Sierra Counties and committing additional funds to move other projects forward in FY 2011–2012. The council also directed the following pertaining to the SB 1407 courthouse construction program: continuation-funding requests be submitted to the state Department of Finance, along with the FY 2012–2013 annual update to the Judicial Branch Assembly Bill 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, and that reductions be made to SB 1407 project construction budgets and the program-wide contingency budget.

Recommendations 1–3: Reduced Costs of SB 1407 Courthouse Projects

1. A total of 13 projects—with an estimated \$1.1 billion in total project budgets—will be reassessed to find significant ways to reduce costs, including where feasible, reducing square footage, undertaking renovations of existing buildings instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods. Projects to be reassessed are:

¹ In July 2011, Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye appointed the 25-member Court Facilities Working Group as a standing advisory committee to the council to oversee the judicial branch program that manages new construction, renovations, facilities operations, maintenance, and real estate for trial and appellate courts throughout the state. The working group oversees the AOC's management of court facilities statewide and efforts to implement the judicial branch's capital improvement program and makes recommendations to the council for action.

Imperial–New El Centro Family Courthouse, Inyo–New Inyo County Courthouse, Kern–New Delano Courthouse, Kern–New Mojave Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Glendale Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Santa Clarita Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse, Mendocino–New Ukiah Courthouse, Monterey–New South Monterey County Courthouse, Nevada–New Nevada City Courthouse, Riverside–New Hemet Courthouse, and Santa Barbara–New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse.

2. A total of 24 projects—with an estimated \$3.2 billion in total project budgets—will move forward to reduce SB 1407 costs now in addition to the four percent reduction mandated by the Judicial Council in December 2011. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible. Projects to move forward to reduce SB 1407 costs now are:

Butte–New North Butte County Courthouse, El Dorado–New Placerville Courthouse, Fresno–Renovate Fresno County Courthouse, Glenn–Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse, Kings–New Hanford Courthouse, Lake–New Lakeport Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Mental Health Courthouse, Merced–New Los Banos Courthouse, Placer–New Tahoe Area Courthouse, Plumas–New Quincy Courthouse, Riverside–New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Sacramento–New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, San Diego–New Central San Diego Courthouse, San Joaquin–Renovation and Addition to Juvenile Justice Center, Santa Clara–New Santa Clara Family Justice Center, Shasta–New Redding Courthouse, Siskiyou–New Yreka Courthouse, Solano–Renovation to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse, Sonoma–New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, Stanislaus–New Modesto Courthouse, Sutter–New Yuba City Courthouse, Tehama–New Red Bluff Courthouse, Tuolumne–New Sonora Courthouse, and Yolo–New Woodland Courthouse.

3. All projects moving forward to reduce SB 1407 costs now will achieve the following reductions to unescalated hard construction costs based on project type and current phase. Further reductions beyond the minimums are expected if no compromise in safety, security, building performance or court operations will result. Minimum SB 1407 cost reductions by project types and phases are as follows:

- 3.1 Renovation projects must reduce hard construction costs by a minimum of two percent. These projects are:

Fresno–Renovate Fresno County Courthouse, Glenn–Renovation and Addition to Willows Historic Courthouse, San Joaquin–Renovation and Addition to Juvenile Justice Center, and Solano–Renovation to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse.

- 3.2 For all new construction projects, a range of cost-reduction minimums are established as follows:

- 3.2.1 Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects are established to demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods with a target to limit overall costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates

for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models. These projects are:

Merced–New Los Banos Courthouse, Placer–New Tahoe Area Courthouse, Plumas–New Quincy Courthouse, Riverside–New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse, Tehama–New Red Bluff Courthouse, Tuolumne–New Sonora Courthouse, and Butte–New North Butte County Courthouse.

- 3.2.2 Projects in Working Drawings or those that have their Preliminary Plans completed and submitted to the State Public Works Board by May 30, 2012, must reduce hard construction costs by a minimum of three percent. Qualifying projects are:

Kings–New Hanford Courthouse, Lake–New Lakeport Courthouse, San Diego–New Central San Diego Courthouse, Santa Clara–New Santa Clara Family Justice Center, Sutter–New Yuba City Courthouse, and Yolo–New Woodland Courthouse.

- 3.2.3 For projects in Acquisition, reductions are established as follows:

- 3.2.3.1 Projects that can be constructed using low-cost construction methodologies will achieve minimum cost savings of 10 percent or more. Qualifying projects are:

El Dorado–New Placerville Courthouse, Los Angeles–New Mental Health Courthouse, and Siskiyou–New Yreka Courthouse.

- 3.2.3.2 All other projects must reduce hard construction costs by a minimum of 10 percent. Qualifying projects are:

Sacramento–New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse, Shasta–New Redding Courthouse, Sonoma–New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse, and Stanislaus–New Modesto Courthouse.

Rationale for recommendations 1–3

In the current fiscal year, the Legislature used \$750 million in court construction funds to address the state’s overall budget shortfall. This included loans from court construction funds totaling \$440 million and a one-time redirection of court construction funds to the General Fund—not the courts—of another \$310 million, equivalent to an entire year’s worth of SB 1407 program revenues. In response, the council canceled two courthouse projects, reduced budgets on all others, and delayed several projects. In addition, \$213 million of court facilities funds—originally budgeted for both construction and facility modifications—were redirected to trial court operations in the current fiscal year.

In response to the current fiscal crisis, the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee, a subcommittee of the working group, was created with the purpose of identifying significant ways to further reduce costs of the SB 1407 projects. Since the beginning of the year, this

subcommittee has been meeting to develop and present cost-reduction recommendations to the full working group. And, at the working group meeting on April 13, 2012, these recommendations were presented to and ratified by the full working group, so that recommendations could be made to the council on how to further reduce costs of SB 1407 courthouse projects.

The working group recommends that a total of 13 SB 1407 projects be reassessed to identify significant ways to reduce their costs, and a total of 24 projects move forward now to reduce costs.

Projects to be *reassessed* will be examined for significant ways to reduce costs, including significantly reducing square footage, undertaking renovations instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods where feasible. The AOC will collaborate with the affected courts with projects to be reassessed. Once a thorough reassessment is completed for a project, the AOC will present the findings to the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee, to seek their direction on next steps for the project. All projects to be reassessed will be required to significantly reduce their costs in order to move forward. The primary drivers of reassessment are specified for those projects in the attached table (Attachment 1). It should be noted that owing to the unique complexity of each reassessment, the amount of time needed to evaluate and complete a reassessment will vary.

Projects *reducing costs now* will be reduced by the minimum cost reductions ranging from 2 to 10 percent or more as specified in the attached table (Attachment 1). The unescalated hard construction budget (of each project's currently-authorized total budget) will be reduced by (a) these minimum cost reductions, in addition to (b) the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the council in December 2011. In summary, the total of all cost reductions to each SB 1407 project's unescalated hard construction budget since December 2011 would now range from 6 to 14 percent or more. All projects moving forward that reduce costs now will be expected to meet or exceed the minimum cost reductions listed in the attached table (Attachment 1). Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

A total of seven projects are established as Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects (demonstration projects). Demonstration projects will demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods, with a target to achieve an equivalence with costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models. While no minimum percentage has been set for these projects, the working group expects most to significantly exceed the 10 percent "or more" percentage established for smaller courthouse projects currently in the Acquisition phase. All demonstration projects will be required to significantly reduce their costs in order to move forward.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

Given the current budget issues facing the judicial branch, the working group recognizes that the costs of all SB 1407 projects must be reduced. The working group considered moving all

projects forward with recommended minimum reductions to their unescalated hard construction budgets but rejected this idea after reviewing information on each project's courtroom use and possibilities for alternates—such as renovating existing courthouses or procuring lease space—to maximize cost savings to the greatest extent possible.

Recommendations 4 and 5: Tools for Reducing SB 1407 Costs

4. AOC staff will collaborate with the courts and project design teams to implement the above-directed reductions using the Principles of Cost Reduction (Principles) attached to this report. Application of the Principles should not compromise the security, safety, building performance, or operations of the courthouses.
5. In support of cost reduction efforts, the director of the AOC's Office of Court Construction and Management is authorized to make technical adjustments to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* for specific projects subject to majority approval of the following committee comprised of: Chair and Vice-Chair of the Court Facilities Working Group and the Chair of the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee. The technical adjustments should not compromise the security, safety, building performance, or operations of the courthouses.

Rationale for recommendations 4 and 5

The working group recommends that the courts, the AOC, and the project design teams be given the necessary tools to meet and exceed the minimum cost reductions established for each project. The Principles of Cost Reduction—that have been ratified by the working group—are attached (Attachment 2). These Principles were developed by the working group's Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee, as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the project design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. In terms of implementation to achieve cost savings, the Principles can be applied to a project in its particular phase or at any point in its life. It is the expectation in applying these Principles that the security, safety, building performance, or operations of the courthouses would not be compromised.

Technical adjustments to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* (the Standards) may be necessary in order to implement cost reductions to SB 1407 courthouse projects. All adjustments would be approved by the director of the AOC's Office of Court Construction and Management subject to majority approval of the committee described above. This approval process is designed to minimize project implementation delays in a cost-reduction environment.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

The Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee recognized that the courts, the AOC, and the project design teams would need principles to guide their efforts to meet or to exceed the minimum cost-reductions. The working group also recommends that an approval process be established for technical adjustments to the Standards, to ensure timely project execution as projects move forward to reduce costs.

Recommendation 6: Alameda–New East County Courthouse Moves Forward

6. The Alameda–New East County Courthouse project will move forward with no changes to project costs.

Rationale for recommendation 6

Because this project already exhibits major cost savings to the SB 1407 courthouse construction program, it was recommended that it move forward with no cost reductions. The state contribution of \$50 million in SB 1407 funds offsets the estimated \$110 million cost of the court portion of this court-county project. The total cost of the court and county project is \$140 million. In addition, there are substantial economic opportunities associated with this project, including a donation of land from the county, the use local Courthouse Construction Funds, and the financing of the project through the sale of bonds by the county. Upon retirement of the bond debt, the state and the county will have shared title, with the state as the managing party of the shared facility.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

Reductions to the state contribution to this project of \$50 million in SB 1407 funds were considered but decided against, considering that any reduction to that amount would place the project at the risk of cancellation, owing to the stringency of the development and disposition agreement between the AOC, the court, and the county.

Recommendation 7: Authority Delegation of Cost Reduction Oversight

7. The Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee of the Court Facilities Working Group shall oversee and have direct implementation authority with regard to the above recommendations.

Rationale for recommendation 7

The Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee was created with the purpose of proposing further cost reductions to the SB 1407 program. This subcommittee has met since the beginning of the year to develop and present cost-reduction recommendations to the full working group. Given the rationale for its creation, this subcommittee is best qualified to oversee the progress made toward achieving all recommended SB 1407 cost reductions on courthouse projects.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

Assigning the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee oversight and implementation authority to reduce costs on SB 1407 projects is practical, because the subcommittee was created to focus on this aspect of the judicial branch's courthouse construction program. No other alternatives were discussed by the working group.

Recommendation 8: Corrections to FY 2012–2013 Funding Requests

8. The AOC shall submit to the state Department of Finance technical corrections to FY 2012–2013 funding requests required to implement the above recommendations.

Rationale for recommendation 8

At the direction of the council in February 2012, the AOC requested funding authorization in FY 2012–2013 for initial and subsequent phases of 34 SB 1407 trial court capital projects. To implement the working group’s recommended SB 1407 cost reductions, the AOC will need to make the necessary technical corrections to SB 1407 project budgets, as well as any schedule adjustments, as the courthouse projects move forward. In doing so, the AOC needs to work directly with the state Department of Finance (DOF) to adjust the FY 2012–2013 funding requests, so that updated funding requests—consistent with council policy—can be considered for the Governor’s May Revise Budget.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

The alternative to the recommendation is to make no adjustments to the FY 2012–2013 funding requests submitted to the DOF in February 2012. This approach does not fully implement the council’s recommendations and could lead to miscommunication with both the DOF and the Legislature. The FY 2012–2013 funding requests should reflect direction adopted by the council, and this recommendation provides direction to the AOC to ensure consistency between policy and funding requests for the next fiscal year.

Comments From Interested Parties

The AOC did not solicit comments on the recommended council actions.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

No costs are involved in implementing the recommended council actions, as they are performed on behalf of the council by the AOC.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The recommended council actions supports Goal III (Modernization of Management and Administration) and Goal VI (Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence).

Attachments

1. *Summarized Requirements for SB 1407 Project Cost Reductions*, at pages 11–14
2. *Principles of Cost Reduction*, at pages 15–20

**Summarized Requirements for SB 1407 Project Cost Reductions:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012**

Reassess – Projects in this category will be examined for significant ways to reduce costs, including significantly reducing square footage, undertaking renovations instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods where feasible.

Reduce Costs Now – Projects in this category will move forward now and reduce costs in addition to the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the Judicial Council in December 2011. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Minimum Cost Reduction – Projects reducing costs now will be reduced by the minimum cost reduction ranging from 2 to 10 percent or more as specified in the table below. The unescalated hard construction budget (of each project’s currently-authorized total budget) will be reduced by (a) these minimum cost reductions, in addition to (b) the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the council in December 2011. In summary, the total of all cost reductions to each SB 1407 project’s unescalated hard construction budgets since December 2011 would now range from 6 to 14 percent or more. All projects moving forward that reduce costs now will be expected to meet or exceed the minimum cost reductions listed in the table below. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects – Projects qualifying for demonstration are established to demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods, with a target to limit overall costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models.

	County	Project Name	Recommendation	Minimum Cost Reduction (see definition above)
1	Alameda	New East County Courthouse	Continue, No Changes	na
2	Alpine	New Markleeville Courthouse	Canceled in December 2011	na
3	Butte	New North Butte County Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project
4	El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	10% or more
5	Fresno	Renovate Fresno County Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	2%
6	Glenn	Renovate and Addition to Willows Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	2%
7	Imperial	New El Centro Family Courthouse	Reassess. One additional courtroom may be required for one new judgeship, pending fall 2012 Judicial Council action to adopt update to new judgeship requirements.	
8	Inyo	New Inyo County Courthouse	Reassess. Explore lease option.	
9	Kern	New Delano Courthouse	Reassess. Explore both renovate and expand option and lease option.	
10	Kern	New Mojave Courthouse	Reassess. Confirm existing judicial officer assignment because project may have the equivalent of only 1 courtroom used full time. In addition, explore both renovation and lease options.	
11	Kings	New Hanford Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Leave 2 courtrooms unfinished, in addition to 3% reduction

**Summarized Requirements for SB 1407 Project Cost Reductions:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012**

Reassess – Projects in this category will be examined for significant ways to reduce costs, including significantly reducing square footage, undertaking renovations instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods where feasible.

Reduce Costs Now – Projects in this category will move forward now and reduce costs in addition to the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the Judicial Council in December 2011. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Minimum Cost Reduction – Projects reducing costs now will be reduced by the minimum cost reduction ranging from 2 to 10 percent or more as specified in the table below. The unescalated hard construction budget (of each project’s currently-authorized total budget) will be reduced by (a) these minimum cost reductions, in addition to (b) the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the council in December 2011. In summary, the total of all cost reductions to each SB 1407 project’s unescalated hard construction budgets since December 2011 would now range from 6 to 14 percent or more. All projects moving forward that reduce costs now will be expected to meet or exceed the minimum cost reductions listed in the table below. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects – Projects qualifying for demonstration are established to demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods, with a target to limit overall costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models.

	County	Project Name	Recommendation	Minimum Cost Reduction (see definition above)
12	Lake	New Lakeport Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	3%
13	Los Angeles	New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse	Reassess. Explore renovation option.	
14	Los Angeles	New Glendale Courthouse	Reassess. Confirm existing judicial officer assignments because project appears to have only 6 rather than 8 Judicial Position Equivalents. In addition, explore renovation option.	
15	Los Angeles	New Los Angeles Mental Health Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	10% or more
16	Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse	Reassess. Confirm existing judicial officer assignments because project appears to have only 3 rather than 4 Judicial Position Equivalents and court wishes to add two additional courtrooms to replace Redondo Beach Courthouse closed in 2011. In addition, verify vacant courtrooms in nearby courthouses.	
17	Los Angeles	New Southeast Los Angeles Courthouse	Reassess. Confirm existing judicial officer assignments because project appears to have only 3 rather than 9 Judicial Position Equivalents. In addition, verify vacant courtrooms in nearby courthouses.	
18	Los Angeles	Renovate Lancaster Courthouse	Funding request TBD	
19	Mendocino	New Ukiah Courthouse	Reassess. Confirm existing judicial officer assignment because project appears to have one additional courtroom than current Judicial Position Equivalent.	
20	Merced	New Los Banos Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project

**Summarized Requirements for SB 1407 Project Cost Reductions:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012**

Reassess – Projects in this category will be examined for significant ways to reduce costs, including significantly reducing square footage, undertaking renovations instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods where feasible.

Reduce Costs Now – Projects in this category will move forward now and reduce costs in addition to the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the Judicial Council in December 2011. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Minimum Cost Reduction – Projects reducing costs now will be reduced by the minimum cost reduction ranging from 2 to 10 percent or more as specified in the table below. The unescalated hard construction budget (of each project’s currently-authorized total budget) will be reduced by (a) these minimum cost reductions, in addition to (b) the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the council in December 2011. In summary, the total of all cost reductions to each SB 1407 project’s unescalated hard construction budgets since December 2011 would now range from 6 to 14 percent or more. All projects moving forward that reduce costs now will be expected to meet or exceed the minimum cost reductions listed in the table below. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects – Projects qualifying for demonstration are established to demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods, with a target to limit overall costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models.

	County	Project Name	Recommendation	Minimum Cost Reduction (see definition above)
21	Monterey	New South Monterey County Courthouse	Reassess. Confirm existing judicial officer assignment because project appears to have one additional courtroom than current Judicial Position Equivalent, and new judgeship to be assigned to project will be eliminated pending fall 2012 Judicial Council action to adopt update to new judgeship requirements.	
22	Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	Reassess. Explore renovation option.	
23	Placer	New Tahoe Area Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project
24	Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project
25	Riverside	New Hemet Courthouse (Mid-Cnty Reg)	Reassess. Explore lease option.	
26	Riverside	New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse (Desert Reg)	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project
27	Sacramento	New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Reduce number of courtrooms from 44 to 42 to reflect reduction of 2 new judgeships, pending fall 2012 Judicial Council action to adopt update to new judgeship requirements, in addition to 10% reduction
28	San Diego	New Central San Diego Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	3%
29	San Joaquin	Renovate Juvenile Justice Center	Reduce Costs Now	2%

**Summarized Requirements for SB 1407 Project Cost Reductions:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012**

Reassess – Projects in this category will be examined for significant ways to reduce costs, including significantly reducing square footage, undertaking renovations instead of new construction, evaluating lease options, and using lower-cost construction methods where feasible.

Reduce Costs Now – Projects in this category will move forward now and reduce costs in addition to the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the Judicial Council in December 2011. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Minimum Cost Reduction – Projects reducing costs now will be reduced by the minimum cost reduction ranging from 2 to 10 percent or more as specified in the table below. The unescalated hard construction budget (of each project’s currently-authorized total budget) will be reduced by (a) these minimum cost reductions, in addition to (b) the four-percent reduction that was mandated by the council in December 2011. In summary, the total of all cost reductions to each SB 1407 project’s unescalated hard construction budgets since December 2011 would now range from 6 to 14 percent or more. All projects moving forward that reduce costs now will be expected to meet or exceed the minimum cost reductions listed in the table below. Lower-cost construction methods will be implemented where feasible.

Cost Reduction Demonstration Projects – Projects qualifying for demonstration are established to demonstrate the effective implementation and utility of lower-cost construction methods, with a target to limit overall costs to those of alternative, low-cost construction methodologies, such as tilt-up construction. Other projects that are candidates for lower-cost construction methods shall look to these demonstration projects as models.

	County	Project Name	Recommendation	Minimum Cost Reduction (see definition above)
30	Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	Reassess - Explore renovation option.	
31	Santa Clara	New Santa Clara Family Justice Center	Reduce Costs Now	3% (to SB 1407 funds only)
32	Shasta	New Redding Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	10%
33	Sierra	New Downieville Courthouse	Canceled in December 2011	na
34	Siskiyou	New Yreka Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	10% or more
35	Solano	Renovation to Fairfield Old Solano Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	2%
36	Sonoma	New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	10%
37	Stanislaus	New Modesto Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	10% with no additional funds for new judgeship
38	Sutter	New Yuba City Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	3%
39	Tehama	New Red Bluff Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project
40	Tuolumne	New Sonora Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	Cost Reduction Demonstration Project
41	Yolo	New Woodland Courthouse	Reduce Costs Now	3%



Principles of Cost Reduction:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012

These principles will be used as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. Application of these principles should not compromise safety, security, and functionality for the courts.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
	Phases/Program Level					Principle
	Site Acquisition	Preliminary Plans	Working Drawings	Construction	Program Wide	
1	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Jury deliberation room – use of uni-sex toilet room vs. separate facilities. Delete sink and countertop in the jury deliberation room.
2	x	x	x			Principles for Design and Construction Review and Space Design and Interior Finishes: Review Project security threat assessments to responsibly reduce special construction measures.
3	x	x	x			Principles for Size and Scope Review: Right size Judgeship allocations & courtroom counts in Programs - current Judicial Positions Equivalent (JPE), vacant and part-time courtrooms.
4		x				Principles for Design and Construction Review and Review Proposed building type and Exterior Appearance: Examine tilt up building alternatives where appropriate.
5		x	x		x	Principles for Design and Construction Review: Perform Value Engineering in a structured and industry standard method at the conclusion of each programming and design phase – the goal is to validate the scope and cost regardless of the Project's overall budget compliance situation.
6	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Reduce central holding and courtroom holding. Require actual demand study on central holding capacity; confirm Sheriff count is accurate and necessary. Develop with Superior Court an operational plan which reduces in court building holding bay.
7	x	x				Minimize court files (electronic storage, removal of archives, proactive disposal).



Principles of Cost Reduction:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012

These principles will be used as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. Application of these principles should not compromise safety, security, and functionality for the courts.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
	Phases/Program Level					Principle
	Site Acquisition	Preliminary Plans	Working Drawings	Construction	Program Wide	
8	x					<u>Review property purchase budget</u> - in relation to recent experience or needs based on site selection approval SPWB. As site selection becomes more focused and clarified, the budget for property purchase is re-evaluated and adjusted to reflect actual need, this is an ongoing process.
9	x	x				<u>Review Courtroom parking ratio</u> - confirm actual need from traffic study supplied by independent traffic consultant. Current parking needs (and purchase of property to accommodate parking) typically have been determined by an estimated per Courtroom ratio ranging from 35 to 45 parking spaces per courtroom. Traffic study confirms the actual parking needs. Reduced parking requirements could result in reduced land purchases and will reduce construction costs. Pursue offsite parking agreements in lieu of purchasing land and building parking. Reduce amount provided to 85% of the projected parking demand (per emerging best design practice) and no parking in urban sites.
10	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Confirm basic functional and staffing requirements for possible size reductions.
11	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Consider secure ongrade parking in lieu of basement level parking.
12	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Increase ratio of jury deliberation rooms to courtrooms from 2:1 to 3:1.
13	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Re-visit the need for two attorney client conference rooms for each courtroom.
14	x	x	x			Principles for Size and Scope Review: Recommend spectator seating in courtrooms be benches in lieu of individual seats.
15	x	x				Mandate Court Reporters workstation outside the courtroom be in modular workstations in a shared room.



Principles of Cost Reduction:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012

These principles will be used as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. Application of these principles should not compromise safety, security, and functionality for the courts.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
	Phases/Program Level					Principle
	Site Acquisition	Preliminary Plans	Working Drawings	Construction	Program Wide	
16	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Review and remove redundant workstations at counter and back of office in clerk's areas.
17		x				Principles for Design and Construction Review and Space Design and Interior Finishes: Reduce Courtroom design redundancy - increase the sharing of best results from court projects within OCCM. Consider utilizing courtroom designs with standardized elements incorporated into possibly 3-6 courtroom floor template layouts with chambers. Providing some limited choices and variables within a standard template to mitigate redundant investigations and expensive solutions. Realize the benefits of a less customized approach.
18		x				Project delivery strategies: Consider Completion Guarantee or other means of construction completion incentives.
19	x	x			x	Streamline Public Works Board approvals process. (This would require action from Executive & Legislative branches enacted.)
20		x	x			Change the building code classification of courtroom as an assembly occupancy – seek classification as a business occupancy; requires acceptance and action by Executive Branch agencies; reduces construction complexity especially in smaller court buildings.
21		x	x			Change building code requirement for rated corridors in holding areas with more than 6 occupants – allow non-rated exit corridors from court floor holding areas.
22	x	x	x	x	x	Change “bidding” procedures to allow GMAX based on documents submitted for regulatory review (approximately 75% working drawing milestone); and allow release of early subcontract awards immediately after GMAX approval(would require acceptance by the state Executive Branch agencies.)
23					x	Trial Court Standards have a range of sizes, amounts or dimension for court building elements – utilize the smaller size in any range shall be the default for design. Trial Court Standards Table 2.2.



Principles of Cost Reduction:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012

These principles will be used as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. Application of these principles should not compromise safety, security, and functionality for the courts.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
	Site Acquisition	Preliminary Plans	Working Drawings	Construction	Program Wide	Principle
24	x	x	x	x	x	Centralization of design efforts (A/E) - utilize sharing and reuse of previous designed court sets and details.
25	x	x	x			<u>Review soft costs for consultant services</u> - based on recent experiences and actual expenditures. Recent findings and determinations based on site needs could result in reduced services and costs. Review Design Fees if contract has not been executed; geotechnical Services, Surveying and Special Consultants; project management fees; Commissioning fees, etc.
26	x					<u>Review relocation budgets</u> - in relation to recent experiences or verify need based on sites under review and consideration. Recent findings have identified potential reductions of these budgets.
27		x	x	x		<u>Review CEQA soft costs</u> - in relation to recent experience and required level based on site determination. In concert with the property selection clarification, the CEQA needs for a selected property is also adjusted.
28	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Utilize conference rooms for case settlement conferences and court proceedings that do not require public access.
29	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Confirm need for fungible courtrooms - Delay at the initial build out: jury boxes, holding cells, and/or elevators to central holding if not needed for current calendar and foreseeable future or eliminate altogether which compromises future flexibility.
30	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Consider the reduction of the enclosed entry areas at security line and provide more exterior waiting with overhangs and covered arcades in more temperate climate zones.
31	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Consider centralized coffee break out stations rather than individual offices or chambers.
32		x	x			Principles for Design and Construction Review: Proposed building type and Exterior Appearance: Perform life cycle costs analysis in systems design alternatives, building systems design, and interior materials decisions. (Standards 2011 edition - section 1.C)



Principles of Cost Reduction:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012

These principles will be used as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. Application of these principles should not compromise safety, security, and functionality for the courts.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
	Phases/Program Level					Principle
	Site Acquisition	Preliminary Plans	Working Drawings	Construction	Program Wide	
33		x	x	x		Principles for Design and Construction Review: Continue design according to Cal Green building standards and not participate in formal LEED certification process.
34		x	x			Principles for Design and Construction Review: Space Design and Interior Finishes: Consider standardization of systems furniture products to a single source or two. Allows for controlled selection and cost, plus reduced design and coordination efforts.
35	x	x				Project delivery strategies: Consider using Pre-Qualified Design-Bid-Build delivery for projects less than \$40M.
36		x				Space Program: Storage and re-use of mock-ups
37		x				Space Program: Review floor to floor heights and consider options for any reductions
38		x	x			Use building technology, construction types that is the least intensive practical for the size and requirements of a project.
39	x	x	x			Principles for Size and Scope Review: Create & mandate the reporting & review of deviations from Trial Court Facilities Standards (required by Rule of Court 10.180(c) to control excess space or systems design requested by courts or to make exceptions for special court operational needs.
40	x	x				Consider using increased video arraignment if space reduction is achievable.
41	x					Consider court building sites be located adjacent to public transit routes, to reduce the demand for parking at the court building.
42	x	x				Develop metrics on the number of weapons screening stations – based on through put times and population counts – rather than current rule-of-thumb estimation.
43	x	x	x	x	x	Consider all activities in each phase that could have a compressed schedule to capture opportunities and avoid cost escalations which increase later project phases.



Principles of Cost Reduction:
Ratified by the Court Facilities Working Group, April 13, 2012

These principles will be used as a resource to guide the collaborative efforts of the courts, the AOC, and the design teams in reducing SB 1407 project costs. Application of these principles should not compromise safety, security, and functionality for the courts.

a	b	c	d	e	f	g
	Phases/Program Level					Principle
	Site Acquisition	Preliminary Plans	Working Drawings	Construction	Program Wide	
44	x	x				Principles for Size and Scope Review: Reduce Self-help Center space requirements and need.
45	x					Principles for Design and Construction Review: Evaluate grossing factors applied – goal to maintain unless exceptions dictate for project cost reduction.
46	x	x				Project delivery strategies: Consider Design Assist by Construction Manager earlier in the Design Process.
47	x	x				Project delivery strategies: Partial Design Build –Enhanced CM @ Risk process to provide Design Building with major sub-contractors.
48	x	x				Project delivery strategies: Consider Full Design Build delivery.
49		x				Project delivery strategies: Prequalify smaller list of Contractors or Construction Managers.
50	x					Consider locations closer to jail facilities. Wherever possible.
51					x	Consider Bulk purchase agreements if feasible.
52						Consider Lease vs. Owned options