

# Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects

---

OCTOBER 24, 2008

UPDATE TO METHODOLOGY ADOPTED  
AUGUST 25, 2006



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
OF THE COURTS

---

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION  
AND MANAGEMENT

## Contents

I.	Purpose of the Methodology .....	1
II.	Definitions.....	1
A.	Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects .....	1
B.	2004 RCP Ratings.....	2
C.	Terms Used in Measurement of Access-to-Court-Services Criterion .....	2
D.	Ratings, Points, Scores, and Groups .....	2
III.	Prioritizing Projects Based on Program Objectives.....	3
IV.	Scoring and Evaluation of Projects.....	3
A.	Available Data for Each Criterion .....	3
B.	Level 1 Buildings.....	6
C.	Seismic Condition.....	7
D.	Calculation of RCP Ratings for Projects Affecting More Than One Existing Facility .....	7
E.	Scoring and Evaluation .....	8
F.	Developing Priority Groups Rather Than a Ranked Projects List.....	10
G.	Project Phase Adjustments.....	10
H.	No Substitutions of Projects Between Groups.....	11
V.	Funding Process.....	11
A.	Establishment of Project List.....	11
B.	Changes to Project List .....	12
C.	How Requests for Funding Will Be Determined.....	12
VI.	Process for Adding or Deleting Projects in the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan.....	13
Appendix A		
A.	Definitions and Data Sources for 2004 RCP Data for Use in the Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects.....	A-1
B.	2004 RCP Ratings for Security, Overcrowding, and Physical Condition Criteria .....	A-1
C.	Data in 2004 Form RCP-1—Buildings Affected by the Project .....	A-3
D.	Data in Form RCP-2—Level 1 Buildings .....	A-3
E.	Data in Form RCP-2 Section 3—Source of Ratings for Physical Condition, Security, and Overcrowding Criteria .....	A-4
F.	Description of Column Headings in RCP-2 Form for Building Physical Condition and Building Functional Condition.....	A-4
G.	Building Physical Condition—Source of Ratings for Physical Condition Criterion .....	A-5
H.	Building Functional Condition—Source of Ratings for Security and Overcrowding Criteria .....	A-7
1.	Security Criterion Ratings.....	A-7
2.	Overcrowding Criterion Ratings.....	A-8

## I. PURPOSE OF THE METHODOLOGY

This methodology has been prepared to develop a set of prioritized groups of trial court capital-outlay projects and to guide AOC staff in recommending to the Judicial Council the submission of funding requests for such projects to the executive branch.

This methodology has been developed to:

- Clearly link prioritization criteria to the main objectives of the Judicial Council and the trial court capital-outlay program;
- Develop a simple and transparent prioritization methodology; and
- Leverage assessments of the 2003 Procedure and its available data to the greatest extent possible.<sup>1</sup>

The methodology has three main components, which work to:

- Establish criteria that furthers the main objectives of the trial court capital-outlay program;
- Develop prioritized groups of projects rather than an individually ranked projects list; and
- Establish guidelines for recommending capital-outlay projects for funding consistent with Senate Bill 1407.

## II. DEFINITIONS

### A. Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects

*Trial court capital-outlay projects* (projects) are considered those that increase a facility's gross area, such as a building addition; that substantially renovate a major portion of a facility; that comprise a new facility or an acquisition; or that change the use of a facility, such as the conversion from non-court use to court use.

---

<sup>1</sup> In August 2003, the Judicial Council adopted a procedure for prioritizing trial court capital-outlay projects, entitled *Trial Court Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan—Prioritization Procedure and Forms* (2003 Procedure).

The list of projects—referred to as the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan (the plan)—is defined in the Judicial Branch Assembly Bill 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year (Five Year Plan) adopted annually by the council and submitted to the Department of Finance.<sup>2</sup>

## **B. 2004 RCP Ratings**

*Review of Capital Project (RCP)*—Prioritization ratings were designed to measure each of the 16 original criteria in the 2003 Procedure. This prioritization methodology will use the RCP ratings for physical condition, security, and space shortfall (i.e., overcrowding), recorded on the 2004 RCP forms, which were created from implementing the 2003 Procedure. The 2004 RCP ratings were based on information from the Task Force on Court Facilities (the task force) and the 2002–2003 Facilities Master Plans (Master Plans). In this methodology, the 2004 RCP total weighted score for physical condition, security, and space shortfall will be used as a basis for measuring the Physical Condition, Security, and Overcrowding criteria, as outlined in section IV.A. The Overcrowding criterion will be measured by use of either the 2004 RCP rating for space shortfall or, when available, updated information on current area to update the RCP rating.<sup>3</sup>

## **C. Terms Used in Measurement of Access-to-Court-Services Criterion**

This methodology uses the relative deficiency in judicial resources among the 58 superior courts to measure relative access to current court services. The following data is compared to measure this deficiency for each court:

- *Assessed Judgeship Needs (AJN)* is the need for judgeships based on the three-year average filings most recently available. This measure translates current filings into weighted caseload, based on the judicial workload standards adopted by the council, and then translates the weighted caseload into an assessment of judgeship needs.
- *Authorized Judicial Positions (AJP)* is the current number of judges, commissioners, and referees authorized for each court. AJP does not account for vacancies or temporary subordinate judicial officers.

## **D. Ratings, Points, Scores, and Groups**

The term *rating* applies to the 2004 RCP ratings (defined above) and the relative deficiency in judicial resources (defined above) used as a basis to evaluate each project against the four criteria outlined in section IV.A. A corresponding number of *points*—ranging from 1 to 5—are assigned to ratings for the Physical Condition, Security, and Overcrowding criteria, as indicated below in

---

<sup>2</sup> The first prioritized list was adopted by the council in February 2004. This list was modified by project substitutions, allowed by a December 2004 Judicial Council policy and presented in the *Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Fiscal Year 2006–2007*, which was adopted by the council on June 1, 2005. In August 2006, the council adopted a new methodology for prioritizing capital outlay projects and the first prioritized list of trial court capital projects—the plan—using the methodology. The August 2006 methodology was the basis for the plans adopted by the council in April 2007 and April 2008. Each plan is presented in the *Judicial Branch Assembly Bill 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for that fiscal year.

<sup>3</sup> Courts and counties may provide updated information on current area through the Senate Bill 1732 facility transfer process or when conditions have changed.

Table 10 of section IV.E. Points from 0 to 5—in half-point increments—are assigned to the rating percentages for the Access-to-Court-Services criterion in Table 11 of section IV.E. below. *Scores* for each project are equal to the sum total of the points for each of the four criteria. Project *groups* result from sorting, based on total project scores. Five project groups will be established by the council, as outlined below in Table 13 of section IV.F. Projects in the highest-scoring group (i.e., Immediate Need) will have scored the highest points relative to other projects in other priority groups.

### III. PRIORITIZING PROJECTS BASED ON PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Four Judicial Council and trial court capital-outlay program objectives are the basis for establishing focused criteria for the prioritization of trial court capital projects. These criteria will establish the priorities among all projects. The program objectives are the following:

- **To improve security**, as security represents one of the greatest influences on a court's operational costs and its ability to deliver safe, fair, and equal access to justice for all its users.
- **To reduce overcrowding**, as overcrowding hampers a court's ability to provide efficient and fair service to the public, as well as reasonable and adequate facility conditions within which the public and staff conduct court business.
- **To correct physical hazards**, such as fire, health and safety, and seismic hazards.<sup>4</sup> Poor physical conditions are unsafe for both the public and staff, as well as increase operational costs.
- **To improve access to court services** by striving to meet all objectives noted above for those courts that have relatively fewer resources to serve the public.

### IV. SCORING AND EVALUATION OF PROJECTS

#### A. Available Data for Each Criterion

Each of the four objectives indicated above relate to the following specific criteria and available data. The source of the data used for the Security, Overcrowding, and Physical Condition criteria, and how the original task force or master plan data is used, is described in Appendix A. Table A-1 in Appendix A provides the formulas used to translate the task force or master plan evaluation into the ratings used in this methodology.

1. **Security criterion**, as measured by a total of the weighted scores for the two security criteria in the 2004 RCP ratings. Security ratings range from a low of 0 to a high of 80,

---

<sup>4</sup> Factoring seismic condition into the scoring and evaluation of a project is addressed in section IV.C.

and an example of how the Rating Assigned to Project is determined is shown below in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**  
**Sample Security Criterion Evaluation Data**

BUILDINGS AFFECTED BY CAPITAL PROJECT (2002–2003 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN)		BUILDING AREA DATA		PRIORITIZATION CRITERION SECURITY RATING			
Bldg./ Site I.D.	Existing Facility	Current Facility Area	Percentage of Total Area	Judicial Staff Circulation	Secure Circulation	Total	Rating Assigned to Project
A1	Main Courthouse	80,000	100%	40.00	40.00	80.00	<b>80.00</b>

2. **Overcrowding criterion**, which is a measure of the difference between current component gross square feet (CGSF) of area occupied by a court and the area that the court should occupy, according to the Trial Court Facilities Guidelines prepared by the task force. In this methodology, this criterion is measured by use of either the 2004 RCP rating for space shortfall or, when available, updated information on current area to update the RCP rating. Overcrowding ratings range from a low of 0 to a high of 160, and an example of how the Rating Assigned to Project is determined is shown below in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**  
**Sample Overcrowding Criterion Evaluation Data**

BUILDINGS AFFECTED BY CAPITAL PROJECT (2002–2003 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN)		BUILDING AREA DATA		PRIORITIZATION CRITERION OVERCROWDING RATING			
Bldg./ Site I.D.	Existing Facility	Current Facility Area	Percentage of Total Area	Current Facility Area	Guidelines Area	Total	Rating Assigned to Project
A1	Main Courthouse	80,000	100%	80,000	100,000	32.00	<b>32.00</b>

3. **Physical Condition criterion**, as measured by the total of the weighted scores for overall physical condition, life safety, and Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance in the 2004 RCP ratings. Physical Condition ratings range from a low of 0 to a high of 180, and an example of how the Rating Assigned to Project is determined is shown below in Table 3. How seismic condition will be factored into the evaluation of the physical condition criterion trial court projects is discussed in section IV.C. below.

**TABLE 3**  
**Sample Physical Condition Criterion Evaluation Data**

BUILDINGS AFFECTED BY CAPITAL PROJECT (2002–2003 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN)		BUILDING AREA DATA		PRIORITIZATION CRITERION PHYSICAL CONDITION RATING				Rating Assigned to Project
Bldg./ Site I.D.	Existing Facility	Current Facility Area	Percentage of Total Area	Overall Building Physical Condition	Life Safety	ADA Compliance	Total	
A1	Main Courthouse	80,000	100%	61.00	30.00	30.00	121.00	<b>121.00</b>

4. **Access-to-Court-Services criterion**, as measured by the relative deficiency in judicial resources among the projects in each of the 58 superior courts. This deficiency will be expressed as the current need for judicial resources as a percentage of AJP—the difference between AJN and AJP. For Superior courts currently possessing a deficiency in judicial resources—based on a current assessment of statewide need for new judges adopted by the council—the AOC will provide AJN and AJP data to each court for the purposes of applying the methodology. This courtwide allocation of current authorized judicial positions and assessed judicial need will then be assigned to each project by the court in collaboration with the AOC. For courts with no current need for additional judges or those that only have one location, the courtwide AJN and AJP data determined by the California Judicial Workload Assessment will be applied. Current court-level Office of Court Research (OCR) data indicates that the rating percentages for the Access-to-Court-Services criterion range from more than 100 percent to less than -80 percent.

An example of how the Rating Assigned to Project (Current Need—Percentage of AJP) is determined for courts with one location is shown below in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**  
**Sample Access-to-Court-Services Criterion Evaluation Data  
for Courts with One Location**

Court	AJN	AJP	AJN-AJP	Rating Assigned to Project (Current Need—Percentage of AJP)
Central County Court	16	11	5	<b>45%</b>

An example of how the Rating Assigned to Project (Current Need—Percentage of AJP) is determined for courts with more than one location is shown below in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**  
**Sample Access-to-Court-Services Criterion Evaluation Data**  
**for Courts with More than One Location**

<u>Court</u>	<u>AJN</u>	<u>AJP</u>	<u>AJN-AJP</u>	<u>Rating Assigned to Project (Current Need—Percentage of AJP)</u>
Northern County Court	16	11	5	<b>45%</b>
1. Project A	11	7	4	<b>57%</b>
2. Project B	4	3	1	<b>33%</b>
3. Project C	1	1	0	<b>0%</b>

## **B. Level 1 Buildings**

*Level 1* is a term that was initially developed by the task force to label or categorize facilities possessing limited value as real estate assets. Level 1 buildings were therefore not incorporated into any long-term solutions to court facility problems. The task force did not survey or develop any numerical evaluation of the physical or functional conditions of Level 1 buildings.

There are approximately 54 trial court projects that affect Level 1 buildings. In this methodology, ratings for all Level 1 buildings will be the average rating for each criterion, derived from the 2004 RCP scores of all buildings affected by the projects in the previously adopted list of 201 trial court capital projects. If courts provide substantiating documentation as to why a Level 1 building should get more than the average ratings, this information will be reviewed by AOC staff and considered in the final evaluation of the project affecting the Level 1 building.

The ratings to be applied to Level 1 buildings are presented in Table 6.

**TABLE 6**  
**Ratings Applied to Level 1 Buildings**

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Average 2004 RCP Score</u>	<u>Maximum Possible Score</u>
Security .....	42.82	80
Overcrowding .....	81.52	160
Physical Condition .....	65.34	180



### C. Seismic Condition

If legislation is adopted that allows the state to accept transfer of responsibility for or title to court facilities with an uncorrected seismic condition, then the seismic condition of buildings affected by projects will be factored into the evaluation as follows: Projects that replace or renovate a building with an uncorrected seismic condition will receive the maximum points (i.e., 5 of 5 possible points) for the Physical Condition criterion.

### D. Calculation of RCP Ratings for Projects Affecting More Than One Existing Facility

For projects affecting only one building, the ratings of the single building will be used as shown above in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. In the case of multiple buildings affected by a project, the proportional share of the court-occupied area of each building is used to determine each criterion's rating. As shown below in Tables 7, 8, and 9, the proportional share of court-occupied area of each building is multiplied by the total of each criterion's rating to develop the portion of the rating for that building affected by the project. For each criterion, these portions are then summed to develop the total rating.

**TABLE 7**  
**Sample Security Criterion Evaluation Data—Multiple Buildings**

BUILDINGS AFFECTED BY CAPITAL PROJECT (2002–2003 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN)		BUILDING AREA DATA		PRIORITIZATION CRITERION SECURITY RATING			
Bldg./ Site I.D.	Existing Facility	Current Facility Area	Percentage of Total Area	Judicial Staff Circulation	Secure Circulation	Total	Portion of Rating Assigned to Project
A1	Main Courthouse.....	80,000	80%	40.00	40.00	80.00	<b>80 x .80 = 64.00</b>
B1	Branch Courthouse.....	20,000	20%	40.00	40.00	80.00	<b>80 x .20 = 16.00</b>
	<b>Totals.....</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>100%</b>				<b>80.00</b>

**TABLE 8**  
**Sample Overcrowding Criterion Evaluation Data—Multiple Buildings**

BUILDINGS AFFECTED BY CAPITAL PROJECT (2002–2003 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN)		BUILDING AREA DATA		PRIORITIZATION CRITERION OVERCROWDING RATING			
Bldg./ Site I.D.	Existing Facility	Current Facility Area	Percentage of Total Area	Current Facility Area	Guidelines Area	Total	Portion of Rating Assigned to Project
A1	Main Courthouse.....	80,000	80%	80,000	100,000	32.00	<b>32 x .80 = 25.60</b>
B1	Branch Courthouse.....	20,000	20%	20,000	40,000	80.00	<b>80 x .20 = 16.00</b>
	<b>Totals.....</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>100%</b>				<b>41.60</b>

**TABLE 9**  
**Sample Physical Condition Criterion Evaluation Data—Multiple Buildings**

BUILDINGS AFFECTED BY CAPITAL PROJECT (2002–2003 FACILITIES MASTER PLAN)		BUILDING AREA DATA		PRIORITIZATION CRITERION PHYSICAL CONDITION RATING				
Bldg./ Site I.D.	Existing Facility	Current Facility Area	Percentage of Total Area	Overall Building Physical Condition	Life Safety	ADA Compliance	Total	Portion of Rating Assigned to Project
A1	Main Courthouse .....	80,000	80%	61.00	30.00	30.00	121.00	<b>121 x .80 = 96.80</b>
B1	Branch Courthouse ....	20,000	20%	75.00	40.00	40.00	155.00	<b>155 x .20 = 31.00</b>
<b>Totals</b>		<b>100,000</b>	<b>100%</b>					<b>127.80</b>

### E. Scoring and Evaluation

Projects will be evaluated—relative to one another—based on the ratings of each criterion indicated above. Each criterion is equally weighted, and the maximum possible ratings are translated into points, as described below in Tables 10 and 11.

For Security, Overcrowding, and Physical Condition criteria, points range from 1 to 5, in one-point increments, as illustrated in Table 10.

**TABLE 10**  
**Assignment of Points to Each Criterion's Range of Possible Ratings**  
**Security, Overcrowding, and Physical Condition Criteria**

Criterion	Maximum Rating	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Security.....	80	0–16	17–32	33–48	49–64	65–80
Overcrowding .....	160	0–32	33–64	65–96	97–128	129–160
Physical Condition.....	180	0–36	37–72	73–108	109–144	145–180

The point range for the Access-to-Court-Services criterion, as denoted below in Table 11, is from 0 to 5, in half-point increments that reflect the broad range of relative deficiency in judicial resources among the projects in 58 counties.

**TABLE 11**  
**Access-to-Court-Services Criterion**

<b>Rating Assigned to Project (Current Need— Percentage of AJP)</b>	<b>Points Assigned</b>
0% or below	0.0
1–10%	0.5
11–20%	1.0
21–30%	1.5
31–40%	2.0
41–50%	2.5
51–60%	3.0
61–70%	3.5
71–80%	4.0
81–90%	4.5
91–100%+	5.0

The ratings of facilities affected by a project are assigned a specific number of points—ranging from 0 to 5—depending upon the criterion, as outlined in Tables 10 and 11. When a score for a project is calculated, the points for each of the four criteria are added together. The maximum score (i.e., number of points achievable) for a project is 20, and the minimum score is 3. An example of the minimum criteria ratings needed to achieve maximum points and final project score is delineated below in Table 12.

**TABLE 12**  
**Minimum Criterion Ratings to Achieve Maximum Points and Total Project Score**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Minimum Rating to Receive Maximum Points</b>	<b>Points Received</b>
Security .....	65	5
Overcrowding.....	129	5
Physical Condition .....	145	5
Access to Court Services .....	91%	5
<b>Total Score .....</b>		<b>20</b>

Projects with a high number of points are considered to significantly support the key objectives of the Judicial Council and the capital program. Consequently, projects scoring a greater number of points will have a correspondingly higher priority over projects scoring fewer points.

## F. Developing Priority Groups Rather Than a Ranked Projects List

In this methodology, projects are categorized into five groups to develop a prioritized list of trial court capital projects, referred to as the Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan (the plan). When this methodology is applied, scored projects will then be placed into one of five priority groups, as outlined below in Table 13. All projects within each group will have the same priority for implementation, as they similarly support key council and program objectives.

Each group's priority is based on the corresponding range of points that a project might receive. For example, projects addressing all objectives of the capital improvement program in significant ways and receiving the highest point total will fall under the Immediate and Critical Need groups and will be considered the first eligible for available funding. Each of the other groups—High, Medium, and Low Needs—represent sets of projects that address fewer of the capital program's objectives.

The list of project groups to be developed by application of this methodology is presented below in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**  
**Prioritized Groups of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects**

Groups	Point Range
Immediate Need	To be determined by the Judicial Council.
Critical Need	
High Need	
Medium Need	
Low Need	

## G. Project Phase Adjustments

After AOC staff develops a final draft list of ranked project groups based on applying the methodology described above, staff will then make any necessary adjustments to projects in those groups, concerning phasing relative to the Master Plan implementation plans. The final list of priority project groups will incorporate any such phasing adjustments.

For example, should the second-phase of a multiphase project fall in a higher priority group than its first phase, staff will switch the group assignment of those projects, in order to correct the phasing discrepancy. As a result, the first-phase project will move to the higher-priority group, and the second-phase project will take the place of the first in its lower-priority group.

These phasing corrections, if required, will be documented in a report to the Judicial Council that details the results of this methodology's application.

## **H. No Substitutions of Projects Between Groups**

Substitutions of projects between groups will not be allowed. All project phase corrections will be made by the AOC, as described above.

## **V. FUNDING PROCESS**

### **A. Establishment of Project List**

The Judicial Council will adopt a list of all Immediate and Critical Need Priority Group projects to be funded by SB 1407. This list will be reviewed by the Executive and Planning Committee or any other council-appointed body with responsibility for advising the AOC on facility matters. In making a recommendation to the council on this list of projects, AOC staff will follow these principles:

1. Should more than one project for a court or for a specific area in a court be included in the same group, AOC staff will consult with the court to determine the court's highest priority project that is consistent with the Master Plan implementation schedule for its respective county. Request for funding for the subsequent projects will be based on funding availability and the application of the process described below in section V.C. and D.
2. The Judicial Council will consider the status of transfer from county jurisdiction to the state in approving funding requests.
3. The Judicial Council will determine an appropriate number of projects within each court.
4. AOC staff will review—with court input—the Master Plan size and budget of each project in order to update and confirm project funding requirements relative to available funding and judgeship needs. Judgeship needs will be based on revised county-level-adjusted judgeship projections that have been developed by the OCR.
5. Given the lack of adequate funding in SB 1407 for all Immediate and Critical Need Priority Group projects, the council may select projects based on additional subcriteria. Evaluation of these subcriteria will be conducted by AOC staff:
  - 5.1. Rating for security criterion;
  - 5.2. Economic opportunity; and
  - 5.3. Replacement or consolidation of disparate small, leased, or owned space that corrects operational inefficiencies for the court.

Each of these subcriteria is defined as follows:

Rating for Security Criterion. This is defined as the 2004 RCP rating for security, which is the total of the weighted scores for the two security criteria in the 2003 Procedure. These scores range from a low of 0 to a high of 80. When this subcriterion is applied for

selection purposes, projects with the highest possible 2004 RCP rating for security will gain funding preference over all other projects within their group. Use of the security rating is consistent with the council and program objective of improving security in court facilities.

Economic Opportunity. Economic opportunities include, but are not limited to, free or reduced costs of land for new construction, viable financing partnerships or fund contributions by other government entities or private parties that result in lower project delivery costs, cost savings resulting from adaptive reuse of existing facilities, operational efficiencies from consolidation of court calendars and operations, operational savings from sharing of facilities by more than one court, and building operational costs savings from consolidation of facilities.

Consideration of economic opportunity allows the council to request funding for projects that have documented capital or operating savings for the state. AOC staff will work in collaboration with local courts to evaluate and document the economic opportunity of each eligible project.

Replacement or Consolidation of Disparate Small, Leased, or Owned Space that Corrects Operational Inefficiencies for the Court. Small leased or owned spaces could include: modular buildings, small private leases, or small court space in county buildings. For example, some downtown courts lease one or two courtrooms within a short distance from the main courthouse, which creates operational inefficiencies for staff and judges. Consolidation of judicial and facility resources supports a more cost-effective court system.

## **B. Changes to Project List**

Any additions or deletions to the list of projects to be funded by SB 1407 shall be adopted by the Judicial Council. The Executive and Planning Committee or any other council-appointed body with responsibility for advising the AOC on facility matters will review recommended changes to the list.

## **C. How Requests for Funding Will Be Determined**

The Administrative Director of the Courts is authorized by the Judicial Council to determine when projects from the council-adopted list of trial court capital projects to be funded by SB 1407 are submitted to the DOF for funding approval, based on application of this methodology and availability of funding. Selected funding requests will be documented in the annual update of the Judicial Branch's Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.

In accordance with Government Code section 70371.5, the AOC will consider and apply economic opportunities—as similarly defined in section 70371.5 (e) and in Section V.A. of this methodology—that exist for each capital project selected by the Judicial Council for a funding recommendation to be submitted to the DOF. The AOC will consider an economic opportunity only if assured it is viable and can be realized. If a project is selected for funding based on an

economic opportunity that is withdrawn after the project is approved, the AOC may recommend to the Judicial Council to delay or cancel the project. The term “withdrawn” is interpreted to include any economic opportunity that cannot be realized for some reason, and can include but not be limited to situations in which a government or private entity can no longer deliver a promised land or cash contribution to a project in a timely manner. For projects where no or minimal viable economic opportunity exists, the AOC will evaluate the adverse cost implications—due to escalation of project costs—of delaying projects.

To comply with the legislative intent of SB 1407, priority will be given to projects that have one or more identified and viable economic opportunities when selecting projects for submission of a funding request to the DOF.

#### VI. PROCESS FOR ADDING OR DELETING PROJECTS IN THE TRIAL COURT CAPITAL-OUTLAY PLAN

If a court wishes to add or delete projects in the plan, the court may submit a written request to the AOC, providing the project name, its description including size, number of courtrooms, and type of calendars planned, and other descriptive information about the project. The AOC will present this information to the Executive and Planning Committee or any other council-appointed body with responsibility for advising the AOC on facility matters for their consideration and direction. AOC staff will include any changes in the next annual update to the Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.

## APPENDIX A

**A. Definitions and Data Sources for 2004 RCP Data for Use in the Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects**

The 2004 RCP data on security, space shortfall, and physical condition will be used to evaluate three criteria—Security, Overcrowding, and Physical Condition—in this methodology. Each of these ratings is described in detail below.

**B. 2004 RCP Ratings for Security, Overcrowding, and Physical Condition Criteria**

In August 2003, the Judicial Council adopted a way to prioritize trial court capital-outlay projects. The prioritization procedure is described in *Five-Year Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan—Prioritization Procedure and Forms* (2003 Procedure), which includes a detailed description of the source of the data used to develop the RCP (Review of Capital Project—Prioritization) ratings. The RCP ratings were designed to record and present the data needed to measure each criterion and to develop a rating and a weighted score for each project.

This methodology will use the RCP ratings for security, overcrowding, and physical condition, recorded in the 2004 RCP forms created by implementing the 2003 Procedure. The 2004 RCP forms used information from the Task Force on Court Facilities (task force) and the 2002–2003 facilities master plans (master plans).

Table A1 presents how the task force or master plan data was translated into the ratings used in this methodology.



**TABLE A1**  
**Task Force or Master Plan Evaluations Translated into**  
**Rating Used in the Prioritization Methodology**

<u>Task Force or Master Plan Evaluation</u>	<u>Translate to Common Scale</u>	<u>Formula to Translate Task Force to Rating Used in Methodology</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Rating used in Methodology</u>
1. <u>Security</u> .....				
a. 0 = Deficient.....	NA	$10 - 0 = 10$	4	$10 \times 4 = 40$
b. 5 = Marginal.....	NA	$10 - 5 = 5$	4	$5 \times 4 = 20$
c. 10 = Adequate .....	NA	$10 - 10 = 0$	4	$0 \times 4 = 0$
2. <u>Overcrowding</u> .....	Current area/Guidelines area	$1 - (\text{Current area/Guidelines area}) \times 160$	160 in formula at left	0 to 160
3. <u>Physical Condition</u> .....				
a. Overall Physical Condition	100 - Task Force	$((100 - \text{Rating Used}) / 10) \times 10$	10 in formula at left	0 to 180
4. <u>Life Safety and ADA</u>				
a. 5 = 100% of replacement cost to upgrade .....	10.0	NA	4	$10.0 \times 4 = 40$
b. 4 = 75% of replacement cost to upgrade .....	7.5	NA	4	$7.5 \times 4 = 30$
c. 3 = 50% of replacement cost to upgrade .....	5.0	NA	4	$5.0 \times 4 = 20$
d. 2 = 25% of replacement cost to upgrade .....	2.5	NA	4	$2.5 \times 4 = 10$
e. 1 = Like new condition.....	0.0	NA	4	$0.0 \times 4 = 0$

A completed set of RCP-1 and RCP-2 forms for a project are included at the end of this document to identify where the data used in this methodology is presented on RCP-1 and RCP-2 forms. The AOC has hard copies of the completed forms on file for each capital-outlay project (project) that record the ratings used to develop the ranked list of projects presented in the *Judicial Branch AB 1473 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, Fiscal Years 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 (adopted on February 24, 2006) (Five-Year Plan)*.<sup>7</sup>

Similar to the 2003 Procedure, this methodology uses the 2004 RCP ratings based on the proportional share of the area of each building affected by the project. For example, two existing court facilities are affected by a single capital project. Facility A1 is 80,000 square feet, and facility B1 is 20,000 square feet. Given this method, the rating for each criterion will be the total of 80 percent of the rating for facility A1, plus 20 percent of the rating of facility B1.

<sup>7</sup> In December 2003, the courts received draft versions of these forms for their review before the evaluation of each project was finalized.

The following sections describe the location of the information and data in the 2004 RCP forms that will be used in this prioritization methodology.

### C. Data in 2004 Form RCP-1—Buildings Affected by the Project

RCP-1 form is the basis for the list of buildings affected by the project in this methodology. Sections 2A and 2B of the form list the name of the facility affected by the capital project and the site/building ID, which is the letter/number identification of each facility.<sup>8</sup>

The RCP-1 form lists the current facility area for each building affected by the project. In all cases, component gross square feet (CGSF) will be used in this methodology.<sup>9</sup> Project names that will be used in this methodology will be based on the names listed in the Five-Year Plan.<sup>10</sup>

### D. Data in Form RCP-2—Level 1 Buildings

An RCP-2 form exists for each building affected by a capital project. Specific information in the RCP-2 form used in this methodology includes the following (letter E. corresponds to the item in the RCP-2 form):

E. Is this a Level 1 building in the Task Force on Court Facilities County Report? Level 1 was the term assigned by the task force to buildings that were determined to have limited value as a real estate asset and therefore were not viewed by the task force as part of a long-term solution to a court's facility problems. Level 1 buildings were not evaluated by the task force, and therefore, no numerical ratings exist for physical condition, security, or overcrowding.

The Master Plan and the Task Force County Report Table 2.2, Trial Court Building Occupancy, identifies the buildings determined as Level 1 buildings by the task force. In this methodology, Level 1 buildings will be assigned the average rating for each criterion, based on the 2004 RCP ratings of all non-Level-1 buildings affected by all 201 projects identified in the Five Year Plans for Fiscal Years 2005-2006, 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 (adopted February 24, 2006), as shown in the table below:

**TABLE A2**  
**Ratings Applied to Level 1 Buildings**

Criterion	Average 2004 RCP Rating	Maximum Possible Rating
Security.....	42.82	80
Physical Condition .....	65.34	180
Overcrowding .....	81.52	160

<sup>8</sup> This information is also recorded in each RCP-2, section 2B.

<sup>9</sup> The 2003 Procedure used both CGSF and building gross square feet (BGSF).

<sup>10</sup> Note that the RCP-1 form presents a project name in section 1A. This name, which is from the master plan, may differ from the name presented in the Five-Year Plan. Project names have been simplified and standardized in the Five-Year Plan.

**E. Data in Form RCP-2 Section 3—Source of Ratings for Physical Condition, Security, and Overcrowding Criteria**

This section contains the 2004 RCP ratings for physical condition, security, and, unless updated with more current information from the building transfer process, overcrowding. The basis for the ratings to be used in this methodology will be described in more detail below.

The basis for the ratings is largely the facility assessment documented in the master plan, based on verification of the task force evaluation through site visits. When a master plan provides an updated numerical rating of condition, the master plan rating was used in the 2004 RCP form. If the master plan provided a narrative description, the master plan narrative was compared to the narrative and rating documented in the Task Force County Report. A task force rating was then adjusted up or down if an adjustment could be justified by reference to the master plan condition description. If no adjustment could be justified by the master plan narrative on condition, then the task force rating for the particular physical or functional condition was used.

**F. Description of Column Headings in RCP-2 Form for Building Physical Condition and Building Functional Condition**

The 2003 Procedure employed a scoring system to translate ratings of each condition criteria into scores from 0 to 10.

Below are definitions of the terms used in the column headings of the RCP-2 form for the first two general condition criteria—Building Physical Condition, which includes the ratings used for this methodology's Physical Condition criterion, and Building Functional Condition, which includes the ratings used for the Security and Overcrowding criteria:

- **Measure:** This is a formula or scale that shows how the Rating Used Here is converted into a score from 0 to 10.
- **TF Rating:** This is the rating assigned to a criterion by the task force.
- **Rating Used Here:** This is the rating used in this form to calculate the score. When the Rating Used Here is different from the task force rating, the reviewer described the reason for the changed rating in the Comments section of Building Physical Condition or Building Functional Condition.
- **Score:** The number of points that result from translating the Rating Used Here, based on the formula or scale shown in the Measure column.
- **Weight:** The value this criterion has, relative to other criteria.
- **Weighted Score:** The Score multiplied by the Weight. **The Weighted Score is the “rating” used in this methodology for each building affected by a capital project.**

- **Maximum Weighted Score:** The score received if the highest possible score for the criterion was received. This is the maximum number of points an existing facility could receive for the criteria, based on the Score and the Weight.

#### **G. Building Physical Condition—Source of Ratings for Physical Condition Criterion**

As in the 2003 Procedure, in this methodology the physical condition rating of a facility is the sum of three weighted scores: the Overall Building Physical Condition rating, which is a composite score of primary building systems; the Life Safety system rating; and the rating for the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance system. The maximum possible rating for Physical Condition is 180 in this methodology.

As indicated above, either the task force report or the master plan was the source of the data used to determine the weighted score of each of these three components, which are described below (the letter/number reference refers to letter/number location of data in the RC-2 form). The task force rating for the physical condition of each building is found in the County Report in section 3, Building Evaluation. The ratings of each of the 12 primary building systems are located in a table, following the narrative on building physical conditions, entitled “Building System Evaluation.” Refer to Example 1: Building System Evaluation from Task Force County Report, for an excerpt of the task force report that presents the source of these ratings when the task force rating was used.

A. **Overall Building Physical Condition.** The overall rating of the facility’s physical condition established by the task force and verified by the Master Plan. Overall Building Physical Condition refers to the assessment of the condition of facility systems to establish the probable level of capital investment needed to restore the facility to a condition suitable for long term use as a court facility. The physical condition rating in the task force county report indicates the “value” of the facility as a percentage of its replacement value. The task force scale was from 0 to 100 percent, with the scale as follows:

- > 60% = Adequate
- 40–60% = Marginal
- < 40% = Deficient

The overall facility rating as determined by the task force is the composite of individual ratings for each of the following primary building systems, also referred to as the Shell and Core Systems:

- General Structure
- Exterior Wall
- Roof
- ADA Compliance
- Vertical Transportation
- Life Safety
- Fire Protection
- Graphics/Signage
- Plumbing Systems
- HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning System)
- Electrical Systems
- Communications/Technical Systems

Each of the above systems was given a rating, based on a scale from 1 to 5, defined as:

- 0 = Not applicable; system not required.
- 1 = Like new condition; no renewal required.
- 2 = 25% of total replacement cost to upgrade; minor renovation/renewal required.
- 3 = 50% of total replacement cost to upgrade; moderate renovation/renewal required.
- 4 = 75% of total replacement cost to upgrade; substantial renovation/renewal required.
- 5 = 100% of total replacement cost to upgrade; element replacement required. Element is necessary, but is in sufficiently bad condition to warrant replacement.

B. Life Safety. The rating refers to the degree of improvement necessary (relative to the total value of the life safety system) to enhance life safety in the event of an emergency. The life safety system includes fire alarm systems, smoke detection systems, fire extinguishers, emergency lighting, emergency exit door hardware, exit signs, and adequate means of egress, as defined and required by local building codes.

C. ADA Compliance. The ADA Compliance rating refers to the degree of improvement necessary relative to the total value of the ADA compliance system to bring the building's accessibility into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### Example 1: Building System Evaluation Table—Source of Physical Condition Criterion Rating from Task Force County Report, Section 3: Building Evaluation

California Court Facilities Study  
Friday, September 08, 2000

#### **BUILDING SYSTEMS EVALUATION**

System	Rating	Comments
<b>Primary Building Systems</b>		
General Structure	2	The general structure is in good condition.
Exterior Wall	1	The entire exterior was painted in 1997.
Roof	5	Needs replacement: major leaks
ADA Compliance	2	Adequate
Vertical Transportation	1	Adequate
Life Safety	2	Adequate
Fire Protection	3	Need to replace some fire protection systems through out building.
Graphics/Signage	3	Need replacement
Plumbing Systems	5	Original sewer/water and fixtures.
HVAC Systems	5	Cooling tower, chillers and chilled water pumps replaced in 1995 and in good condition. Air handling & duct system original and needs replacement.
Electrical Systems	5	Original electrical through-out building.
Comm/Tech Systems	1	New system.
<b>Overall Building Rating:</b>	<b>58.19%</b>	<b>Marginal (excludes seismic retrofit requirements)</b>
<b>Tenant Area Systems</b>		
TI Plumbing Distribution	2	Original fixtures.
TI HVAC Distribution	5	Courts wing supply return fans and duct work & mech. systems should be replaced, office wing supply and return fan units should be replaced, duct work is not in need of replacement.
TI Electrical Distribution	5	Most sub panels distribution systems are original and should be replaced as the tenants require more electrical power.
TI Comm/Tech Distribution	5	Should be replaced.

## H. **Building Functional Condition—Source of Ratings for Security and Overcrowding Criteria**

### 1. **Security Criterion Ratings**

The total of the weighted scores for the two security conditions related to secure and separate circulation for judges and staff, the public and in-custody individuals is the basis for the security rating used in this methodology. The methodology will not use the evaluation of building security, which refers to the degree of compliance with guidelines for security and control of access in and out of the facility. The source of the data used to determine the weighted score of each of these two components is described below (letter/number reference refers to letter/number location of data in the RCP-2 form). The maximum possible rating for Security is 80 in this methodology.

As indicated above, either the task force report or the master plan was the source of the data used to determine the weighted score of each of these two components, which are described below. The task force security evaluation of each building is found in the Task Force County Report in section 3, Building Evaluation. The ratings of each of the eight functional building systems are located in a table entitled “Building Functional Evaluation.” Refer to Example 2 for a table from the task force report that identifies the two security ratings when the task force rating was used.

**F. Security:** Two criteria indicate how secure an existing facility is:

**1. Judicial/Staff Circulation:** Refers to the degree of compliance with guidelines for private circulation paths exclusively dedicated to permit the judiciary and staff to enter and move through the facility separate and secure from both the public and in-custody individuals.

**2. Secure Circulation:** Refers to the degree of compliance with guidelines for a separate, secure means by which in-custody individuals are brought into the facility and moved from holding areas to the courtroom. A secure circulation route is completely separated from areas used by the public and by the judiciary and court staff.

The task force rating system for each functional component, including the three security criteria defined above, was based on a scale from 0 to 10, as follows:

0 = Deficient: Functional condition fails in one or more major aspects

5 = Marginal: Functional condition has notable deficiencies

10 = Adequate: Functional condition is acceptable or better

N/A = Not Applicable: Functional element is not applicable for this facility.


## Example 2: Building Functional Evaluation—Source of Security Criterion Rating from Task Force County Report, Section 3: Building Evaluation

California Court Facilities Study  
Friday, December 22, 2000

### **BUILDING FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION:**

Each major functional aspect of the building as a whole was evaluated in terms of court use. Rating values were assigned as follows: "10" for adequate; "5" for marginal, and "0" for deficient conditions.

The Rating Summary was determined by taking the total "score" divided by the eight elements involved to determine an average, this was then converted to a percentage score, consistent with the way results of other aspects of the evaluation process are illustrated. Percent ratings less than 60% are deemed "Deficient" overall; from 60% to 79.99% deemed "Marginal"; and 80% or more deemed "Adequate" for the purposes of this Study.



Building Functional Elements	Rating	Comments
Functional Zoning/Organization	5	Highly fragmented facility
Public Circulation	10	Adequate
Judicial/Staff Circulation	10	Adequate
Secure Circulation	0	Non existent.
Image	5	1950's building in marginal condition.
Building Security	10	Metal detector at main entrance, some card access doors
Public Amenities	10	Adequate
Quality of Environment	10	Adequate
<b>Rating Summary:</b>	<b>75.00%</b>	<b>Marginal</b>

### **Functional Comments:**

1950's building with adequate public circulation and generally functional spaces. The facility currently lacks sufficient storage and clerical staff areas.

## 2. Overcrowding Criterion Ratings

There are two sources of data for the Overcrowding criterion. Updated current facility areas based on current information from the building transfer process will be used, if available, in this methodology. In cases where the AOC has updated information on the CGSF of court occupied area identified through the SB 1732 facility transfer process, the AOC will recalculate the space shortfall using the formula employed by the 2003 Procedure (see below).

In most cases, the weighted space shortfall score from the 2004 RCP is the basis for the Overcrowding rating used in this methodology. The task force report or master plan was the source of the data used to determine the weighted score for space shortfall, as described below (letter/number reference refers to the letter/number location of the data in the RCP-2 form).

The space shortfall rating measures the space currently occupied by the court, compared to that required to meet current needs based on the guidelines. The guidelines refer to the Trial Court Facilities Guidelines published by the Task Force on Court Facilities in March 2001 and adopted by the Judicial Council effective July 1, 2002. The guidelines describe acceptable standards for construction, renovation, and remodeling of court facilities. They include guidelines for how court facilities should be organized and secured to provide safe and operationally efficient courts. They also include space standards to use for developing an assessment of space needed by a facility. The maximum possible rating for Overcrowding is 160 in this methodology.

J. Current space available vs. space required by guidelines. The score is equal to the Current Facility Area divided by the Guidelines Area, subtracted from 1 and then multiplied by 10.

Court functions either partially occupy a facility, such as a leased facility or a county administrative building, or are located in standalone courthouses. For all facilities, CGSF figures are used. CGSF expressed the amount of “useable” area for a specific use.<sup>11</sup>

**Current Facility Area:** The current facility area is the numerator of the space shortfall, or Overcrowding, criterion. The RCP form records either the task force or both the master plan and task force information on CGSF of court area occupied by the court.

The Task Force recorded its assessment in Table 2.2: Trial Court Building Occupancy in the Task Force County Report, which is the number in the column entitled “Courts Component Gross Area.” Example 3 provides a sample of Table 2.2.


If the Master Plan updated this number because of an addition to or reduction of space since the task force survey, then the revised number can be found in the Master Plan Report and was then recorded in the “data used here” column. All area information has since been reviewed by the AOC in an effort to utilize to CGSF in this methodology.<sup>12</sup>

Guidelines Area: This number is the denominator of the equation for the rating for the space shortfall, or overcrowding, criterion.

### Example 3: Table 2.2: Trial Court Building Occupancy From Task Force County Report

California Court Facilities Study  
Thursday, September 07, 2000

**County-Wide Summary**  
**Table 2.2: Trial Court Building Occupancy**



Bldg. ID	Building	Primary Use	Number of Courtrooms	Total Component Net Area	Total Component Gross Area	CURRENT OCCUPANCY								Building Gross Area
						Courts Component Gross Area	%	Courts Related Component Gross Area	%	Other Agencies Component Gross Area	%	Building Support Component Gross Area	%	
A 1	Modesto Main Courthouse 1100 I Street Modesto,	Mixed	15	101,394	106,004	64,278	61%	24,786	23%			16,940	16%	108,824
B 1	Modesto Juvenile court. 2215 Blue Gum Modesto,	Mixed	2	6,817	7,456	4,842	65%	1,400	19%			1,214	16%	9,200
C 1	Ceres Municipal Court.	Courts only	1	2,613	2,700	2,249	83%					451	17%	2,985
D 1	Turlock Municipal Court.	Mixed	1	4,277	4,446	3,123	70%	406	9%			917	21%	4,735
E 1	Department 16 - Level 1 Survey Only 948 11th street. Modesto,	Mixed	1	912	960	960								4,025
F 1	Modesto Traffic Court - Level 1 Survey Only 2260 Floyd Avenue Modesto,	Mixed	1	1,400	1,400	1,400								1,400
<b>TOTAL ALL FACILITIES</b>			21	117,412	122,966	76,852	62%	26,592	22%			19,522	16%	131,169

<sup>11</sup> CGSF is defined as the aggregate floor area of all individual rooms in a specific use area, including related internal circulation, interior partitions and interior columns, chases serving the space, and other areas incidental to the use area. CGSF excludes the area required for public circulation and lobbies, mechanical and electrical spaces and distribution shafts, stairs, elevators, and other common building elements.

<sup>12</sup> The 2003 Procedure used CGSF for shared-use facilities and BGSF for court-only facilities. The new methodology will use CGSF in every case, for a standardized and consistent comparison among facilities.



The space required to meet current needs is found in the Task Force County Report at the end of Table F: Current Shortfalls Relative to Adequate Space. For each facility, the number is located in the column entitled "Space Required Relative to Current Use—Component Gross Area," which is the first of three column headings, and the row entitled "Totals for X County Courthouse Building." The Component Gross Area number for the space occupied by the court, which is the first of three numbers listed at the bottom of the identified column, is recorded here. See Example 4 for a sample of this Table F from the task force report.

#### Example 4: Table F: Space Required Relative to Current Use from Task Force County Report

California Court Facilities Study  
Thursday, August 17, 2000

Table F: Court Components - Shortfalls Based on Current Use - cont'd.

Site: <b>A Modesto Main Courthouse</b>			Building: <b>1 Modesto Main Courthouse</b>								
Component ID / Name	Courtroom Type Current Use	Jury or Non-Jury	Space Required Relative to Current Use			Current Shortfalls Relative to Adequate Space			Current Shortfalls Relative to Adequate + Marginal Space		
			Space Count	Component Gross Area	Component Net Area	Space Count	Component Gross Area	Component Net Area	Space Count	Component Gross Area	Component Net Area
08.02 Support Areas			1	467	350	0	-467	-350	0	-467	-350
08.02 Support Areas			1	467	350	0	-467	-350	0	-467	-350
08.03 Mediation/Hearing Rooms			1	400	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
08.03 Mediation/Hearing Rooms			1	400	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
08.04 Child Waiting			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
08.04 Child Waiting			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
09.00 COURT SECURITY OPERATIONS			5	1,373	1,030	0	-892	-669	0	-892	-669
09.01 Staff Office/Work Areas			3	1,013	760	0	-532	-399	0	-532	-399
09.01 Staff Office/Work Areas			3	1,013	760	0	-532	-399	0	-532	-399
09.02 Command Center			1	240	180	0	-240	-180	0	-240	-180
09.02 Command Center			1	240	180	0	-240	-180	0	-240	-180
09.03 Security Screening			1	120	90	0	-120	-90	0	-120	-90
09.03 Security Screening			1	120	90	0	-120	-90	0	-120	-90
10.00 IN-CUSTODY HOLDING			7	5,819	4,120	0	-5,327	-3,800	0	-5,327	-3,800
10.01 Vehicular Sallyport			2	2,250	1,800	0	-2,250	-1,800	0	-2,250	-1,800
10.01 Vehicular Sallyport			2	2,250	1,800	0	-2,250	-1,800	0	-2,250	-1,800
10.02 Central Holding			1	2,538	1,650	0	-2,538	-1,650	0	-2,538	-1,650
10.02 Central Holding			1	2,538	1,650	0	-2,538	-1,650	0	-2,538	-1,650
10.03 Support Areas			0	538	350	0	-538	-350	0	-538	-350
10.03 Support Areas			0	538	350	0	-538	-350	0	-538	-350
10.04 Attorney/Client Visiting			4	492	320	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.04 Attorney/Client Visiting			4	492	320	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals for Modesto Main Courthouse Building:</b>			<b>1014</b>	<b>122,943</b>	<b>88,958</b>	<b>-50</b>	<b>-61,580</b>	<b>-42,630</b>	<b>-43</b>	<b>-54,794</b>	<b>-39,680</b>
<b>Building Gross Area for Needs and Shortfalls (at 20% of CGSF)</b>				<b>24,589</b>			<b>-12,316</b>			<b>-10,959</b>	
<b>Total Building Gross Area for Needs and Shortfalls</b>				<b>147,531</b>			<b>-73,896</b>			<b>-65,753</b>	

County: **50 Stanislaus**

Facility/Site Information

The following pages present examples of an RCP-1 form for the New Modesto Courthouse project and pages 1-4 (of a total of 10) of the RCP-2 form for the existing Main Modesto Courthouse. Examples 1-4 present data from the Task Force County Report on the existing Main Modesto Courthouse. The arrows on the examples identify data identified with arrows on the RCP forms.

<b>FORM RCP-1</b>		<b>REVIEW OF CAPITAL PROJECT – PRIORITIZATION</b>	
		Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (SB 1732)	
Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus (50)			
<b>Section 1 – General Information</b>			
A. Project Name Modesto Phase I (01)		B. Type of Project Renovation <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
C. Project Location Existing Downtown Modesto Courthouse		D. Estimated Total Project Cost (2002 Dollars) \$21,300,000	
E. Proposed Project Start Q3 2005		F. Proposed Project Completion Q1 2009	
G. Comments  <p>The proposed project would consist of an eight-story building in the center of the existing courtyard. The first four stories of the new addition will be designated for court support functions, and the top four stories will be fit out for eight courtrooms.</p> <p>The project can begin after the interior courtyard has been cleared of the judges' parking and the vehicle sallyport and the clerk's office and sheriff's modular facilities have been relocated. The 1948 wing of the Hall of Records building should also be demolished.</p> <p>With the completion of this project, the occupants of the Hall of Records building and the Modesto Main Court North Wing can then be relocated to the new building, and the Hall of Records can be demolished. In addition, the traffic court in Modesto will be vacated.</p>			

<b>FORM RCP-1</b>		<b>REVIEW OF CAPITAL PROJECT – PRIORITIZATION</b>			
		Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (SB 1732)			
<b>Superior Court of California, County of</b> Stanislaus (50)					
<b>Section 2 – Existing facilities</b>					
A. Name of Existing Facility	B. Site / Building ID	C. Current Facility Area	E. Facility Area / Total Area of Facilities	F. Facility Score from RCP-2	G. Weighted Facility Score
Modesto Traffic Court - Level 1 Sun	F1	1,400	.02	860	18
Modesto Main Courthouse	A1	64,278	.98	336	329
D. Total Area of Facilities		65,678	H. Total Weighted Score		347
I. Comments (Include discussion of results of application of filters for the existing facilities from Section 5 of Form RCP-2.)					

<b>FORM RCP-2</b>		<b>REVIEW OF CAPITAL PROJECT – PRIORITIZATION</b>	
		Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (SB 1732)	
Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus (50)			
<b>Section 1 – General Information</b>			
A. Project Name Modesto Phase I (01)			
<b>Section 2 – Existing facility affected and evaluated on this form.</b> If multiple existing facilities are affected, list others under Comments and complete a separate Form RCP-2 for each.			
A. Name of Existing Facility Modesto Main Courthouse		B. Site ID / Building ID A1	
C. Building Address 1100 I Street		Modesto, California, 95354	
D. Occupancy		Court use only <input type="checkbox"/> Shared use <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
E. Is this a Level 1 building in the Task Force on Court Facilities County Report?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
F. If building is Level 1, what type? Modular <input type="checkbox"/> Records Storage only <input type="checkbox"/> Regular leased <input type="checkbox"/> Small court space in larger building <input type="checkbox"/>			
See Explanation of Forms for directions to complete Section 3 for Level 1 buildings.			
G. Comments  With the completion of the proposed project, two courtrooms and support staff of this building (North Wing) can relocate to the new building when constructed.			

Section 3 – Scoring of Project Need							
Scoring is based on the Task Force on Court Facilities rating as modified by the Master Plan.							
Building Physical Condition							
	Measure	TF Rating	Rating Used Here	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Maximum Weighted Score
A. Overall Building Physical Condition	Score = (100 – Rating Used) / 10	58	58	4.2	<b>10</b>	42	<b>100</b>
B. Life Safety	<u>Rating Used</u>						
	5						
	4						
	3	2	2	2.5	<b>4</b>	10	<b>40</b>
	2						
C. ADA Compliance	<u>Rating Used</u>						
	5						
	4						
	3	2	2	2.5	<b>4</b>	10	<b>40</b>
	2						
	1						
D. Comments							
The master plan consultant did not change overall physical evaluation score or change the Life Safety or ADA Scores.							

<b>Section 3 – Scoring of Project Need (continued)</b>							
Scoring is based on the Task Force on Court Facilities rating as modified by the Master Plan.							
Building Functional Condition							
	Measure	TF Rating	Rating Used Here	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Maximum Weighted Score
E. Overall Building Functional Condition	Score = (100 – Rating Used) / 10	75	63	3.7	<b>14</b>	51.8	<b>140</b>
F. Security							
1. Judicial/Staff Circulation	Score = 10 – Rating Used	10	6	4	<b>4</b>	16	<b>40</b>
2. Secure Circulation	Score = 10 – Rating Used	0	0	10	<b>4</b>	40	<b>40</b>
3. Building Security	Score = 10 – Rating Used	10	10	0	<b>4</b>	0	<b>40</b>
G. Comments							
<p>Since the Task Force rating, overall building functional condition rating has been downgraded by the master plan consultant due to the lack of Judicial/Staff circulation.</p>							

<b>Section 3 – Scoring of Project Need (continued)</b>							
Scoring is based on the Task Force on Court Facilities rating as modified by the Master Plan.							
Courtroom Condition							
	Measure	No. of Deficient Courtrooms	Total Existing Courtrooms	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Maximum Weighted Score
H. Current deficient Courtrooms	Score = (No. of Deficient Courtrooms/Total Existing Courtrooms) x 10	6	15	4	<b>10</b>	40	<b>100</b>
I. Comments Master plan consultant did not change the number of deficient courtrooms.							
Space Shortfall							
	Measure	Current Facility Area	Guidelines Area	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Maximum Weighted Score
J. Current space available vs. space required by Guidelines	Score = (1– Current Facility Area/Guidelines Area) x 10	64,278	122,943	4.77	<b>16</b>	76.35	<b>160</b>
K. Comments The building is too small for its current court operations.							
<b>L. Total Needs Score</b>						286	<b>700</b>