



Judicial Council of California

Court Facilities Advisory Committee

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

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

May 2, 2024

12:40 PM – 3:00 PM

Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center in Los Angeles / Public Videocast

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas (Ret.), Vice-Chair
Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd (by video)
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)
Hon. Patricia L. Kelly
Ms. Krista LeVier
Hon. Gary R. Orozco (by video)
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Mr. Lee Seale
Mr. Larry Spikes
Hon. Sergio C. Tapia II
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.
Hon. Eric J. Wersching

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Hon. Keith D. Davis (Ret.)
Hon. Robert J. Trentacosta

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

Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Judge, Superior Court of Mendocino County (by video)
Ms. Kim Turner, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Mendocino County (by video)
Mr. Jim Bruce, Design and Construction Manager, Kitchell CEM (by video)
Mr. Martin Eiss, Associate Principal, Fentress Architects (by video)
Ms. Kahyun Lee, Associate Principal, Fentress Architects (by video)
Mr. David Canada, Project Manager, Hensel Phelps (by video)
Mr. John Petty, Operations Manager, Hensel Phelps (by video)
Ms. Kate Cury, Producer and Experience Designer, Gensler
Mr. Jeian Jeong, Experience Design Lead, Gensler
Mr. Kevin Kilmer, Design Director, Gensler
Mr. Paul Natzke, Studio Director, Gensler
Mr. Leo Su, Senior Experience Designer, Gensler
Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Bob Beavon, Media Technician, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services
Mr. Robert Carlson, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Mr. Jack Collins, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Adam Dorsey, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council Executive Office
Ms. Michelle Ellison, Attorney II, Judicial Council Legal Services (by video)
Mr. Zulqar Helal, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Ms. Kristin Kerr, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services (by video)
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Pella McCormick, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Bruce Newman, Senior Facilities Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Mr. Harry O'Hagin, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Mr. Christine Ortmann, Media Technician, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services
Ms. Deepika Padam, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Mr. Robert Shue, Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Ms. Maggie Stern, Attorney II, Judicial Council Legal Services (by video)
Ms. Peggy Symons, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)
Ms. Sadie Varela, Facilities Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services (by video)

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order, Roll Call, and Opening Remarks

To better accommodate remote participants/listeners, the chair reordered the agenda items, switching original Item 3 (five-year plan/capital outlay budget change proposals) with original Item 2 (New Ukiah Courthouse 100 Percent Schematic Design) as reflected herein, and called the open meeting to order at approximately 12:40 p.m. Roll was taken, and opening remarks were made.

The chair thanked the leadership of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County for allowing the committee to convene its in-person/videoconference meeting in the Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center in downtown Los Angeles. Assistant Presiding Judge Sergio C. Tapia II and Judge Eric J. Wersching were welcomed as new members of the committee.

Public Videocast

A live videocast of the meeting was made available to the public through the advisory body web page on the California Courts website listed above.

Facility Tours

The chair thanked the leadership of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County for hosting the committee to tour and discuss existing conditions of the Stanley Mosk Courthouse and the Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center earlier in the day prior to the start of the committee meeting. The tours focused on the many deficiencies related to security, physical, and functional conditions in each building, which are described in the *Los Angeles Superior Court Long-Range Planning Study* completed by Judicial Council Facilities Services for the superior court in April 2024 and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/Facilities_Los_Angeles_Planning_Study.pdf.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–4)

Item 1

Director’s Report (No Action – Information Only)

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

2024–25 Budget:

- The Governor’s Proposed Budget for FY 2024–25 included \$89.5 million for the design-build phase of the active Court of Appeal—New Sixth Appellate District Courthouse project. At budget subcommittee hearings of the state Assembly and Senate in March 2024, legislative members had few questions about Judicial Council facility items including the project for the Sixth Appellate District.
- The May Revision to the Governor’s Budget is anticipated to be released on May 14, 2024.

Today’s Meeting Agenda:

- Agenda items are largely focused on preparation for budget requests for FY 2025–26.

- As informed and directed by today’s actions, the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* and *Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals* (COBCPs) for FY 2025–26 will be submitted for consideration at the Judicial Council’s July 2024 business meeting:
 - The five-year plan and COBCPs are due to the California Department of Finance (DOF) in early-August 2024.
 - The agenda item on the five-year plan and COBCPs provides details regarding the proposed adjustments to the plan due to court requests, additional analysis, and the projected outcome of the Budget Act of 2024 (FY 2024–25).
 - A contributor to the five-year plan adjustments is the completion of the [*Los Angeles Superior Court Long-Range Planning Study*](#), which determined the following:
 - That the superior court intends to continue its centralized service model with facilities concentrated in downtown Los Angeles, rather than distributing dockets from the 100-courtroom Stanley Mosk Courthouse to courthouses within outlying districts;
 - That prior plans involving any phased demolition/renovation of the Stanley Mosk Courthouse and Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center were impractical and economically unviable and that new-construction projects, including identifying new sites (with possible reuse of the Mosk site) in downtown Los Angeles, are needed to completely replace these facilities; and
 - That the priority of the superior court’s 17 projects identified in the Judicial Council’s *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* requires adjusting.

Capital Program Status Update:

- There are currently 23 active projects: 1 in activation, 6 in construction, 8 in design, and 8 in acquisition.
- Capital projects in Imperial, Glenn, and Shasta counties have completed construction, and the buildings are open to the public.
- The new courthouse project in Menifee for the Superior Court of Riverside County is in the activation phase and expected to open to the public next month.
- Projects for the superior courts are in various phases as follows:
 - Riverside (in Indio), Sacramento, Sonoma, and Stanislaus are in the construction and expected to complete in 2025.
 - Lake and Mendocino are in design-build. The new courthouse project in Lakeport has received its guaranteed maximum price (GMP) and is within budget.
 - Fresno, Los Angeles, Monterey, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, and Solano are in site selection.

Dedication Ceremonies:

- Mr. Chris Magnusson presented images (meeting materials Tab 1B for agenda Item 1) from two courthouse dedication ceremonies held respectively on April 11 and 12, 2024: Shasta—New Redding Courthouse and Glenn—Willows Courthouse Renovation and Expansion.

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

Item 2**Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan and Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals for Fiscal Year 2025–26**

Summary: The CFAC reviewed the capital projects proposed in the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* and COBCPs for fiscal year 2025–26. This plan informs capital project funding requests for upcoming and outlying fiscal years. For consideration of funding in the Budget Act of 2025 (FY 2025–26), submission of the plan and COBCPs are required in advance of DOF’s deadline.

Ms. Pella McCormick introduced the item making the following statements:

- Through FY 2023–24, funding has been appropriated for 11 of the 80 projects on the Judicial Council’s *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*.
- Though the merits of the judicial branch’s courthouse capital projects are not being contested, the Governor’s capital funding plan addresses the state’s current financial circumstances by significantly slowing funding appropriations that will impact the rate at which projects are completed:
 - Ten courthouse capital projects will complete acquisition or design phases and be placed “on hold” until a future funding year; and
 - One project per year will restart, pushing the timeframe to complete the last of the 11 projects with a current appropriation from 2030 to 2037.
- The Administration has indicated that once state revenues stabilize, capital program funding will likely be reinstated.
- The *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* presented today assumes state revenues will recover by FY 2025–26, such that funding will be restored for active projects and for new-start projects based on the established pattern of three per fiscal year.
- Strategically, it is important for the Judicial Council’s plan to be prepared for the financial recovery and to be poised to accelerate the capital program once funding becomes available.

Consistent with the materials (Tab 3A–C.7 for original agenda Item 3), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20240502-materials.pdf, Mr. Chris Magnusson presented slides 1–9 and 12–13, and Mr. Jagan Singh presented slides 10–11. Mr. Singh noted that in addition to providing the long lifespan for better value, Option 2—Renovation of the Existing Clearlake Courthouse provides the best functional layout eliminating the need for structural columns within the courtroom. Following the presentation and committee discussion and as described below, the CFAC took separate actions on the capital project for Superior Court of Lake County and the five-year plan and COBCPs.

Lake—Clearlake Courthouse Project

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

1. Approve the capital project scope for the Superior Court of Lake County as Option 2—Renovation of the Existing Clearlake Courthouse for a request for initial funding in FY 2025–26.

(Motion: Jahr; Second: Warwick)

Five-year Plan and Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals for Fiscal Year 2025–26

Action 2: The advisory committee—with the abstentions of Judge Gary R. Orozco, Ms. Krista LeVier, and judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

2. Approve the five-year plan and COBCPs for submission to the Judicial Council for review and approval.

(Motion: Tapia; Second: Fowler-Bradley)

Action 3: The advisory committee—with the abstentions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

3. Approve the delegation of the review of the committee’s report to the Judicial Council to the CFAC Chair and Vice-chair.

(Motion: Wersching; Second: Kelly)

Item 3

Mendocino—New Ukiah Courthouse: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review

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

Consistent with the materials (Tabs 2A–B for original agenda Item 2), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at

www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20240502-materials.pdf, Mr. Robert Shue introduced the project and project team, including Ms. Kim Turner, Court Executive Officer, and Judge Ann C. Moorman of the Superior Court of Mendocino County, as well as provided closing remarks, Mr. John Petty presented slides 1–3, Ms. Kahyun Lee presented slides 4–7 and 16–27, Mr. Martin Eiss presented slides 8–15, and Mr. Dave Canada presented slides 28–30.

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

1. Approve the project’s 100 Percent Schematic Design to proceed with Design Development.

(Motion: Highberger; Second: LeVier)

Item 4

Update to the California Trial Court Facilities Standards

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation on the draft update to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards*. Various code provisions and best management practices have changed over time and since the last version was adopted by the Judicial Council in November 2020.

Judge Patricia M. Lucas, CFAC Vice-Chair, introduced the item, and Ms. Deepika Padam presented this item consistent with the materials (Tabs 4A–C for agenda Item 4), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20240502-materials.pdf.

Judge Lucas stated that as the Standards provide important guidance to architects and builders, conveying Judicial council expectations with respect to every aspect of courthouse construction, they require revising over time to reflect code updates and incorporate lessons learned from projects. She emphasized savings to the project schedule and budget through the application of the courtroom templates (under the Standards’ section titled, *Catalog of Courtroom Layouts for California Trial Courts*). She also recognized efforts made by Judicial Council Facilities Services staff and the committee’s workgroup to develop the draft update to the Standards.

Ms. Padam indicated the need for publicly posting the draft update to the Standards to collect any comments and returning to the committee to present those comments along with a final draft for a recommendation to present the final draft to the Judicial Council for adoption.

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

1. Approve the Draft Update for a four-week public comment period and to return to the committee for review of the Final Draft for a recommendation to the Judicial Council.

(Motion: Warwick; Second: Orozco)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m., and the committee moved to the Closed Session.

CLOSED SESSION (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(D))

Closed Item 1

Update to the California Trial Court Facilities Standards

Review of courtroom security-related topics in the draft update to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards*.

In accordance with rule 10.75(d)(5) of the California Rules of Court, the Chair has exercised discretion to close this portion of the meeting to discuss security plans or procedures or other matters that if discussed in public would compromise the safety of the public or of judicial branch officers or personnel or the security of judicial branch facilities or equipment, including electronic data.

Adjourned closed session at 3:30 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on June 25, 2024.