



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

COURT FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

**COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
COURTHOUSE COST REDUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 23, 2015
10:30 AM–12:00 PM
Teleconference

**Subcommittee
Members Present:**

Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair
Mr. Stephen Castellanos, FAIA
Hon. Keith D. Davis
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Mr. Kevin Stinson
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick

**Subcommittee
Member Absent:**

Hon. Donald C. Byrd

Others Present:

The following Judicial Council staff was present:
Ms. Eunice Calvert-Banks, Real Estate and Facilities Management
Mr. Dennis Duncan, Office of Security
Mr. Ed Ellestad, Office of Security
Ms. S. Pearl Freeman, Capital Program
Mr. William J. Guerin, Capital Program
Ms. Angela Guzman, Capital Program
Mr. Burt Hirschfeld, Real Estate and Facilities Management
Ms. Donna Ignacio, Capital Program
Ms. Kristine Metzker, Capital Program
Mr. Raymond Polidoro, Capital Program
Ms. Kelly Quinn, Capital Program
Mr. Scott Shin, Capital Program
Mr. Nick Turner, Real Estate and Facilities Management
Mr. Robert Uvalle, Capital Program

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Remarks

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM, and Ms. Kristine Metzker, staff to the subcommittee, took roll call.

The subcommittee acknowledged the passing of Judicial Council staff member Mr. Malcolm Franklin. Mr. Franklin was the Senior Manager of the Judicial Council's Office of Security. The group paused for a moment of silence to honor Mr. Franklin.

Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes of the November 4, 2014, Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Los Angeles County—Hollywood Courthouse Modernization: 50 Percent Bridging Documents Review

Ms. Metzker introduced Mr. Scott Shin, Judicial Council Project Manager, who led the project's 50 percent bridging documents review presentation. The project team previously presented to the subcommittee in February 2014 where the project team was approved to move forward to pursue the renovation and expansion of the existing Hollywood Courthouse as opposed to a new construction project. The project team also presented to CCRS in May 2014 where they provided a project status update and additional information regarding the design/build project criteria. There was no action requested from the subcommittee at the time. The project team informed the subcommittee that they would provide a status update as the project moves forward.

Mr. Shin introduced Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, who provided project background information on the conditions at the existing Mental Health Courthouse, the cost benefits associated with re-working the underutilized existing Hollywood Courthouse, the co-location of Los Angeles county justice partners for operational efficiency and productivity, the negotiations with Los Angeles County regarding their share of capital expense and building operations costs via long-term lease, and the design build project delivery method selected to save time and cost.

Hon. William F. Highberger, Judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, presented the project status summary which included providing historical background on the project. The project was originally authorized to be a new construction project in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-2013. As the project moved forward, completing site acquisition became a difficult task. In September 2013, the project team provided an alternate solution to the new construction which included the renovation and expansion of the existing Hollywood Courthouse. This new plan was approved by CCRS in February 2014 and incorporated into the FY 2014-2015 Budget Act,

which included changing the financing method originally intended for the project by reverting the site acquisition funding previously appropriated and returning those funds to the SB 1407. Remaining project funds were allocated to the renovation of the Hollywood Courthouse with a slight expansion. The design build performance criteria and design build selection process was approved by the Judicial Council in June 2014.

As a result of the new plan, the Superior Court of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County needed to revisit the space program, which has now been finalized and the lease agreement is pending execution. AC Martin, the architectural and engineering firm selected for the original capital project, is currently working on the bridging documents which will be provided to contractors who will be responsible for working drawings and the construction of the project. Judge Highberger also compared the previously authorized new construction/new site project to the current authorized design build project, in regards to number of courtrooms, total building gross area, and budget information, highlighting the savings of over \$30 million.

Ms. Sherri Carter, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, presented the space program allocated between the court and county within the existing building and the addition. She added that it was necessary to increase the size of the existing courthouse to accommodate new holding cells and the non-jury courtroom. She related that the additional holding cells were imperative because of the unique nature of the defendants attending court there.

Mr. Shin introduced staff from AC Martin who led the remainder of the presentation. Mr. Doug Fisher, Project Director of AC Martin, reviewed the project site and surrounding area, which included identifying various freeway accesses adjacent to the site, reviewing ambulance and Department of Mental Health vehicle parking, off-site parking, public transportation and in-custody bus route circulation. The subcommittee questioned whether or not the off-site juror/county parking lot, illustrated on the site context map, was owned by the county or the Judicial Council. Judge Highberger confirmed that the parking lot is currently owned by a local church and the Judicial Council will lease a portion of the parking lot.

Mr. Fisher also reviewed the first and second floor plans by explaining where the court and county spaces are located. The project team is mindful of sustainability noting the re-use of an existing courthouse and developed site. They will also seek to obtain more energy efficient mechanical and lighting systems and ensure that these and other improvements will bring the project to meet Cal Green/Title -24 standards.

Mr. Edward Ellestad, Judicial Council Senior Security Coordinator, provided a security review on the project. He informed the subcommittee that for this particular project, we have deviated from the standard holding metric due to the unique nature of the in-custodies held in this courthouse. There is a higher ratio of individual cells opposed to group holding cells. Also unique to this project is the in-custody physician interview spaces in addition to the attorney client interview areas. There are two holding control rooms located on the first floor and the second floor. The subcommittee questioned whether or not each of the rooms will be designed to

duplicate each other in case one loses functionality. As a security measure, the subcommittee recommends this duplicative capacity if economically feasible for projects. Mr. Ellestad responded that the design is not that far along but confirmed that duplicative controls are appropriate for this project and will be studied in future phases. Mr. Ellestad also provided information regarding the weapons screening locations and how in-custodies will be delivered or persons civilly committed will arrive.

Mr. Fisher provided information regarding the structural system, mechanical systems, and preliminary building exterior design approach. The project team will focus on representing the dignity of the court by conveying a welcoming environment as well as adapt to the complex urban environment by using durable and cost effective materials.

Mr. Clifford Ham, Judicial Council Principal Architect, summarized the design peer review conducted on February 6, 2015 which included discussion on floor plans and concepts presented to the subcommittee. The project team will conduct another peer review session in March.

The project team also provided the 50 percent bridging documents review summary report, updated site plan, elevations and floor plans, project schedule update and project cost estimate and budget review.

Action: The CCRS—with the abstention of Judge Highberger as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member and with the exception of Hon. Donald C. Byrd who was absent—voted unanimously on the following motion:

1. The 50 percent bridging documents report be accepted—confirming the project is within budget, scope and schedule—and the project team move forward with 90 percent bridging documents.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.

Approved by the subcommittee on March 24, 2015.