



Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2026–27

SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA COURTS OF APPEAL
SUPERIOR COURTS OF CALIFORNIA
JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Adopted by the Judicial Council
July 18, 2025

Submitted to the California Department
of Finance August 4, 2025



Judicial Council of California

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	REASSESSMENT OF TRIAL COURT CAPITAL-OUTLAY PROJECTS.....	2
	A. Process	2
	B. Statewide List of Capital-Outlay Projects.....	2
	C. Revision of Prioritization Methodology.....	3
III.	INTEGRATING CLIMATE CHANGE INTO PLANNING AND INVESTMENT.....	3
IV.	EXISTING FACILITIES	4
V.	DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS	4
VI.	PROPOSAL	4
	A. Trial Court Capital-Outlay Project Funding Requests for FY 2026–27.....	4
	B. No Appellate Court Capital-Outlay Project Funding Requests for FY 2026–27 ...	7
	Appendix A: Status Report: Immediate and Critical Need Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects (July 18, 2025).....	8

I. INTRODUCTION

The California judicial branch consists of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, trial courts, and the Judicial Council. The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) consolidated the costs of operating California's trial courts at the state level. The act was based on the premise that state funding of court operations was necessary to provide more uniform standards and procedures, economies of scale, structural efficiency, and access for the public.

Following on this act, the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Sen. Bill 1732; Stats. 2002, ch. 1082) specified that counties and the state pursue a process that would ultimately result in full state assumption of the financial responsibility and equity ownership of all court facilities. To address maintenance costs in existing court facilities and the renovation or construction of new court facilities, the Trial Court Facilities Act required counties to contribute to the ongoing operation and maintenance of court facilities based on historical expenditures for facilities transferred to the state. The act also established a dedicated revenue stream to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund for the design, construction, or renovation of these facilities.

Recognizing the growing demand to replace California's aging courthouses, additional legislation was enacted. Senate Bill 1407 (Stats. 2008, ch. 311) authorizes various fees, penalties, and assessments to be deposited in the Immediate and Critical Needs Account (ICNA) to support the construction, renovation, and operation of court facilities, including the payment of rental costs associated with completed capital-outlay projects funded with lease revenue bonds. However, these revenues have been lower than expected, which led to the curtailment of the Judicial Council's capital program.

On June 27, 2018, when the Budget Act of 2018 was passed, the judicial branch courthouse construction program was allocated \$1.3 billion for the continuing phases of 10 trial court capital-outlay projects in the following counties: Glenn, Imperial, Riverside (in both Indio and midcounty regions), Sacramento, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne. This highly encouraging support for the construction program also memorialized a notable change in the program's source of funding: the sale of lease revenue bonds to finance a project's construction was backed by the General Fund rather than the ICNA.

Since 2008, SB 1407 projects had relied on the ICNA, which is forecast to have a negative fund balance as early as fiscal year (FY) 2026–27 owing to the continual decline of its sources of revenue—fines and fees. In FY 2021–22, for the State Court Facilities Construction Fund (SCFCF)—the other source from which the courthouse construction program is funded—to remain solvent and the Judicial Council to maintain program service levels, the ICNA and SCFCF were combined.

The Judicial Council completed facility master plans for each of the 58 counties in December 2003. Those plans were consolidated into a statewide plan approved by the Judicial

Council in February 2004 as the *Trial Court Five-Year Capital-Outlay Plan*, which ranked 201 projects for future development. Changes to this initial statewide plan have been approved incrementally since 2004. The most recently developed statewide list of trial court capital-outlay projects and the five-year plan for trial court capital-outlay projects are described below.

II. REASSESSMENT OF TRIAL COURT CAPITAL-OUTLAY PROJECTS

Government Code section 70371.9 required the Judicial Council to conduct a reassessment of all trial court capital-outlay projects that had not been fully funded up to and through the Budget Act of 2018 (FY 2018–19) and to submit the report by December 31, 2019, to two legislative committees. This reassessment produced the [Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects](#), prioritized on needs- and cost-based scores from the application of the council’s [Revision of Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects](#).

A. Process

The reassessment of the capital-outlay projects can be summarized by five main endeavors:

1. Revise the prioritization methodology—developing needs- and cost-based criteria to rank projects within priority groups—consistent with Government Code section 70371.9.
2. Assess facilities occupied by trial courts for physical condition, security, access to court services, and overcrowding.
3. Develop court facility plans and court needs-based projects.
4. Apply the prioritization methodology to all projects.
5. Develop a statewide list of prioritized projects.

B. Statewide List of Capital-Outlay Projects

The *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* has been developed from the application of the revised prioritization methodology to the capital projects identified by the court facility plans, of which there is one for each county. As defined in the methodology, trial court capital-outlay projects are considered those that *increase a facility’s gross area, such as a building addition; substantially renovate a major portion of a facility; comprise a new facility or an acquisition; or change the use of a facility, such as the conversion from noncourt use to court use.*

Details of the list are as follows:

- There are 80 projects for 41 of the 58 trial courts.
- These 80 projects affect 165 of the approximate total of 450 facilities in the judicial branch’s real estate portfolio.
- The total cost of each need group is Immediate, \$2.3 billion; Critical, \$7.9 billion; High, \$1.3 billion; Medium, \$1.6 billion; and Low, \$100 million.

- Of the 80 projects, 56 are for new construction and 24 are for renovation or addition.
- The total cost for the 56 new construction projects is estimated at \$10.6 billion; the total cost for the 24 renovation or addition projects is estimated at \$2.6 billion.
- The total cost of all 80 projects is estimated at \$13.2 billion.

C. Revision of Prioritization Methodology

The methodology involves a two-step process:¹ Step 1 identifies:

- The general physical condition of the buildings;
- Needed improvement to the physical condition of buildings to alleviate the totality of risks associated with seismic conditions, fire and life safety conditions, Americans with Disabilities Act requirements, and environmental hazards;
- Court security features within buildings;
- Access to court services;
- Overcrowding; and
- Capital-outlay projects that replace or renovate courtrooms in court buildings where there is a risk to court users due to potential catastrophic events.

Step 2 involves applying the needs- and cost-based criteria to rank projects within the priority groups. In the most essential terms, the methodology can be described as:

- Needs-based criteria = priority group; and
- Needs- and cost-based criteria = rank within priority group.

III. INTEGRATING CLIMATE CHANGE INTO PLANNING AND INVESTMENT

The Judicial Council has supported climate adaptation and sustainability practices in the construction, operations, and maintenance of the approximately 450 court facilities that house California's court system. The council's capital program focuses on proven design approaches and building elements that can improve court facilities and result in cost-effective, sustainable buildings. Strategies include protecting, conserving, and restoring water resources; installing water reuse systems; and improving energy efficiency. Other strategies include promoting a healthy indoor environment, using environmentally friendly building materials, recycling materials during construction and demolition, and using flexible designs that anticipate future changes and enhance building longevity. The Judicial Council also designs its buildings to achieve at least Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver certification equivalency.

In December 2020, the Judicial Council's Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee approved a [sustainability plan](#) that focuses primarily on ensuring that new construction practices

¹ For more detailed information, see Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Court Facilities: Reassessment of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* (Nov. 5, 2019), agenda item 19-129 of the Judicial Council meeting of Nov. 14, 2019, jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7862663&GUID=C63B6E8E-6A8D-476C-BF8F-634132CB381F.

comply with state sustainability initiatives and help reduce the judicial branch’s impact on climate change. Additional goals include reducing greenhouse gas emissions, energy usage, and utility costs by pursuing energy efficiency measures such as leveraging grant opportunities and third-party financing options; educating staff, key stakeholders, and service providers on specific energy-saving practices and broader sustainability issues; conserving other natural resources through improved data collection and baseline tracking; and improving the power resiliency of the judicial branch’s portfolio through on-site renewable energy generation and storage systems.

IV. EXISTING FACILITIES

The facilities of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts encompass not only the public courtroom spaces but the chambers and workspaces where judicial officers and courtroom staff prepare for proceedings; secure areas, including holding cells; and building support functions. Currently, the Judicial Council administrative facilities are located in San Francisco and Sacramento, with office space totaling approximately 253,000 usable square feet.

The Supreme Court is located in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex in San Francisco (103,300 square feet) and the Ronald Reagan State Building in Los Angeles (7,600 square feet). The Courts of Appeal are organized into six districts, which operate in nine different locations in approximately 508,000 usable square feet. The Fresno and Riverside appellate courts are housed in standalone, state-owned facilities; the other courts are colocated in other leased or state-owned space. The trial courts are located in all 58 counties, in more than 430 facilities and 2,100 courtrooms covering approximately 16 million square feet of usable area and more than 21 million square feet of space under Judicial Council responsibility and management.

V. DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

The primary drivers of court facility needs include providing a safe and secure facility; improving poor functional conditions; addressing inadequate physical conditions, including seismically deficient facilities; and expanding the public’s physical, remote, and equal access to the courts.

VI. PROPOSAL

A. Trial Court Capital-Outlay Project Funding Requests for FY 2026–27

The five-year plan for trial court capital-outlay projects in the table below proposes funding in FY 2026–27 for nine projects on the Judicial Council’s approved statewide list of projects as referenced in Appendix A, *Status Report: Immediate and Critical Need Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*. This proposal is based on funding support in the Governor’s proposed budget for FY 2025–26, that was adjusted by the May Revision to the Governor’s Budget released on May 14, 2025: \$118.2 million General Fund for six active capital-outlay projects for the superior courts of Butte, Fresno, Los Angeles, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, and Solano Counties. The Governor’s proposed budget identified several risk factors that could negatively impact

California’s economy and state revenues, including stock market volatility and policy changes from the federal administration, such as tariffs. The Governor’s administration now projects a statewide budget shortfall of \$12 billion owing to reduced revenues and increased program costs.

At its public meeting on March 12, 2025, the Judicial Council’s Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) directed cost reduction by end of 2025 for the Kern—New East County Courthouse and Orange—New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse projects. With recommendation from its Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee, the CFAC approved cost reductions for both projects at its public meeting on September 25, 2025, which are reflected in the table below. Also, at its public meeting on May 23, 2025, the CFAC recommended approval of capital-outlay budget change proposals for the nine projects in year 1 (FY 2026–27) of this five-year plan including cost reduction for the San Joaquin—New Tracy Courthouse project, which is reflected in the table below.

Consistent with the Governor’s proposed budget for FY 2025–26, adjusted by the May Revision, the outcome of the Budget Act of 2025 (FY 2025–26), and the Judicial Council’s ratification of its CFAC’s actions on March 12 and 23, 2025, the judicial branch’s five-year plan for trial court capital-outlay projects is presented in the following table.

**Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)**

			1		2		3		4		5		
County	Project Name	Courtrooms	FY 2026–27		FY 2027–28		FY 2028–29		FY 2029–30		FY 2030–31		
BY 1 Continuation	San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	12	\$ 320,265	B								
	Solano	New Solano Hall of Justice (Fairfield)	12	\$ 316,779	B								
	Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	6	\$ 1,491	D	\$ 195,583	B						
	Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	2	\$ 2,276	D	\$ 69,598	B						
	Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse	24	\$ 12,460	D	\$ 627,033	B						
BY 1 Starts	Lake	Clearlake Courthouse Renovation	1	\$ 1,107	P	\$ 1,605	W	\$ 21,845	C				
	San Joaquin	New Tracy Courthouse	2	\$ 3,503	D	\$ 65,854	B						
	Kern	New East County Courthouse	3	\$ 4,765	AS			\$ 1,643	D	\$ 64,014	B		
	Placer	Tahoe Courthouse Renovation	1	\$ 5,357	AS			\$ 1,082	D	\$ 17,540	B		
BY 2 Con.	Fresno	New Fresno Courthouse	36			\$ 925,288	B						
BY 2 Starts	Contra Costa	New Richmond Courthouse	6			\$ 19,846	AS			\$ 2,580	D	\$ 208,069	B
	San Francisco	New San Francisco Hall of Justice	24			\$ 67,230	AS			\$ 14,972	D	\$ 800,828	B
	Orange	New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse	4			\$ 15,251	AS			\$ 1,595	D	\$ 113,313	B
BY 3 Starts	Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	8					\$ 11,528	D	\$ 235,614	B		
	Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (Mosk Replacement)	100					\$ 276,479	AS			\$ 49,148	D
	El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	6					\$ 9,176	AS			\$ 2,973	D
BY 4 Starts	Fresno	Fresno Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse Renovation	2							\$ 1,333	PW	\$ 8,798	C
	Inyo	New Inyo County Courthouse	2							\$ 4,125	AS		
	San Bernardino	New Victorville Courthouse	31							\$ 12,140	AS		
BY 5 Starts	Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	2									\$ 3,570	AS
	Santa Cruz	New Santa Cruz Courthouse	9									\$ 11,801	AS
	San Diego	New San Diego Juvenile Courthouse	10									\$ 16,481	AS
		Totals	303	\$ 668,003		\$ 1,987,288		\$ 321,753		\$ 353,913		\$ 1,214,981	

Table Legend:

BY = Budget Year

S = Study

A = Acquisition

P = Preliminary Plans

W = Working Drawings

C = Construction

D = Performance Criteria

B = Design-Build

B. No Appellate Court Capital-Outlay Project Funding Requests for FY 2026–27

The active Court of Appeal—New Sixth Appellate District Courthouse project is fully funded; therefore, no funding is requested nor five-year plan presented for appellate court capital-outlay projects. This project was authorized in the Budget Act of 2023 (FY 2023–24) for \$2.8 million General Fund for its performance criteria phase and in the Budget Act of 2024 (FY 2024–25) for \$89.5 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for its design-build phase.

A permanent location is needed for the Sixth Appellate District of the Court of Appeal, which handles cases from the counties of Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz from a leased facility. The court decides over 900 appeals annually, in addition to disposing of 500 writ petitions.

Since it was established in 1984, the Sixth Appellate District has adjudicated cases out of leased space in a commercial office building in downtown San Jose in Santa Clara County. With the court’s lease expiring in the near term and the impending significant rate increases in a highly competitive rental market with limited vacancy making relocation an inevitability, a feasibility study was developed. The study compared the costs of continuing the long-term lease with construction of a permanent building on a state-owned property available for redevelopment in the city of Sunnyvale in Santa Clara County.

At the Court Facilities Advisory Committee’s public meeting on May 26, 2022, the feasibility study and its findings were presented and discussed. Subsequently, at the committee’s public meeting on June 17, 2022, the committee included costs for a capital-outlay project in this five-year plan for construction of a new courthouse on the state-owned property in Sunnyvale based on the economic, public service, and operational benefits. The updated feasibility study and findings presented at that meeting are available under tab 3 of the meeting materials at courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20220617-materials.pdf. Additional information on this project is available on its webpage at courts.ca.gov/facilities/court-appeal-new-sixth-appellate-district-courthouse.

Appendix A:
Status Report: Immediate and Critical Need Trial Court
Capital-Outlay Projects (July 18, 2025)

Status Report: Immediate and Critical Need Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects



County	Project Name	Priority Group	Courtrooms	Group Score	Funding Status
Immediate Need					
Lake	New Lakeport Courthouse	Immediate Need	4	22.0	Fully funded; funding authorized in 2021 Budget Act (FY 2021–22).
Mendocino	New Ukiah Courthouse	Immediate Need	7	19.2	Fully funded; funding authorized in 2021 and 2022 Budget Acts.
Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	Immediate Need	6	18.6	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2023 Budget Act (FY 2023–24).
Butte	Butte County Juvenile Hall Addition and Renovation	Immediate Need	1	18.6	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2021 Budget Act (FY 2021–22).
Monterey	New Fort Ord Courthouse	Immediate Need	7	18.5	Fully funded; funding authorized in 2021 and 2023 Budget Acts.
Lake	Clearlake Courthouse Renovation	Immediate Need	1	17.9	Unfunded; proposed again for initial funding in FY 2026–27. Project changed from new construction to renovation.
San Bernardino	San Bernardino Juvenile Dependency Courthouse Addition and Renovation	Immediate Need	2	17.6	Fully funded; funding authorized in 2021 and 2023 Budget Acts.
Solano	New Solano Hall of Justice (Fairfield)	Immediate Need	12	17.6	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2022 Budget Act (FY 2022–23).
Fresno	New Fresno Courthouse	Immediate Need	36	17.5	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2022 Budget Act (FY 2022–23).
Kern	New Ridgecrest Courthouse	Immediate Need	2	17.4	Withdrawn at the court's request/court may make future request to restore.
Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	Immediate Need	2	17.2	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2022 Budget Act (FY 2022–23).
Stanislaus	New Modesto Courthouse Courtroom Renovation	Immediate Need	3	17.1	Fully funded; funding authorized in 2020 Budget Act (FY 2020–21).
Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse	Immediate Need	24	17.0	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2022 Budget Act (FY 2022–23).
San Luis Obispo	New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	Immediate Need	12	16.9	Partially funded; initial funding authorized in 2022 Budget Act (FY 2022–23).
San Joaquin	New Tracy Courthouse	Immediate Need	2	16.9	Unfunded; proposed again for initial funding in FY 2026–27.
Kern	New Mojave Courthouse	Immediate Need	3	16.4	Consolidated into New East County Courthouse.
Kern	New East County Courthouse	Immediate Need	3	16.4	Unfunded; proposed again for initial funding in FY 2026–27.
Placer	Tahoe Courthouse Renovation	Immediate Need	1	16.4	Unfunded; proposed again for initial funding in FY 2026–27. Project changed from new construction to renovation.
Critical Need					
Contra Costa	New Richmond Courthouse	Critical Need	6	16.1	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2027–28.
San Francisco	New San Francisco Hall of Justice	Critical Need	24	15.9	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2027–28.
Orange	New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse	Critical Need	4	15.8	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2027–28.
Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	Critical Need	8	15.7	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2028–29.
Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (Mosk Replacement)	Critical Need	100	15.5	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2028–29. Project increased from 47 to 100 courtrooms, rescored from 15.3 to 15.5, and moved up in Critical Need Group.

County	Project Name	Priority Group	Courtrooms	Group Score	Funding Status
Critical Need, <i>continued</i>					
El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	Critical Need	6	15.4	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2028–29.
Fresno	Fresno Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse Renovation	Critical Need	2	15.2	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2029–30.
Inyo	New Inyo County Courthouse	Critical Need	2	15.2	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2029–30.
San Bernardino	New Victorville Courthouse	Critical Need	31	15.2	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2029–30.
Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	Critical Need	2	14.9	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2030–31.
Santa Cruz	New Santa Cruz Courthouse	Critical Need	9	14.7	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2030–31.
San Diego	New San Diego Juvenile Courthouse	Critical Need	10	14.6	Unfunded; proposed for initial funding in FY 2030–31.
Riverside	New Riverside Juvenile Courthouse	Critical Need	5	14.6	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Tulare	New Tulare North County Courthouse	Critical Need	14	14.6	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Los Angeles	New West Covina Courthouse	Critical Need	15	14.5	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Los Angeles	New Eastlake Courthouse	Critical Need	6	14.5	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Kern	New Bakersfield Superior Courthouse	Critical Need	33	14.4	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Sonoma	New Sonoma Civil Courthouse	Critical Need	8	14.4	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
San Luis Obispo	New Grover Beach Branch Courthouse	Critical Need	1	14.2	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Alameda	New Alameda County Community Justice Center	Critical Need	57	14.1	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Imperial	Winterhaven Branch Courthouse Addition and Renovation	Critical Need	1	14.1	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Metropolitan Courthouse Renovation	Critical Need	14	14.1	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Los Angeles	New North Central Los Angeles Courthouse	Critical Need	12	14.1	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Riverside	New Palm Springs Courthouse	Critical Need	9	13.6	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Orange	New Orange South County Courthouse	Critical Need	16	13.6	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.
Los Angeles	Foltz Courthouse Renovation	Critical Need	60	13.4	Unfunded; proposal to be determined.

Notes:

1. The Los Angeles - New West Los Angeles Courthouse was reduced from 32 to 20 courtrooms, rescored from 16.6 to 13.3, and moved from Immediate Need to High Need Group.
2. The Los Angeles - New Inglewood Courthouse was reduced from 30 to 13 courtrooms, rescored from 16.3 to 8.7, and moved from Critical Need to Medium Need Group.
3. The Los Angeles - New Van Nuys Courthouse (East/new + West/renovation) was reduced from 55 to 42 courtrooms, rescored from 15.4 to 10.7, and moved from Critical Need to High Need Group.
4. The Los Angeles - Chatsworth Courthouse Renovation was reduced from 7 to 6 courtrooms, rescored from 14.9 to 3.8, and moved from Critical Need to Low Need Group.