



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

March 24, 2015

10:00 AM–12:30 PM

Judicial Council of California – San Francisco Office

**Subcommittee
Members Present:**

Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair
Hon. Donald C. Byrd
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Brad R. Hill, CFAC Chair
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Mr. Kevin Stinson
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick

**Subcommittee
Member Absent:**

Mr. Stephen Castellanos, FAIA
Hon. Keith D. Davis

Others Present:

The following Judicial Council staff was present:
Ms. Keby Boyer, Communications
Ms. S. Pearl Freeman, Capital Program
Mr. William J. Guerin, Capital Program
Ms. Angela Guzman, Capital Program
Mr. Clifford Ham, Capital Program
Mr. Burt Hirschfeld, Real Estate and Facilities Management
Ms. Donna Ignacio, Capital Program
Ms. Kristine Metzker, Capital Program
Ms. Kelly Quinn, Capital Program
Mr. Nick Turner, Real Estate and Facilities Management
Mr. Robert Uvalle, Capital Program
Mr. Ed Ellestad, Office of Security
Mr. Bruce Newman, Capital Program
Ms. Nora Freiwald, Capital Program
Ms. Peggy Symons, Capital Program
Mr. Loren Smith, Capital Program

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Remarks

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM, and Ms. Kristine Metzker, staff to the subcommittee, took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 23, 2015, Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee meeting and the minutes of the March 13, 2015 Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee action by email.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Riverside County—New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse: 50 Percent Design Development Report Back

Ms. Metzker informed the subcommittee that the Riverside County—New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse project team presented the 50 percent design development package on November 4, 2014. At that meeting, the subcommittee did not approve the 50 percent review and requested the following of the project team:

- Study options and provide a cost analysis for the HVAC system and the addition of a mechanical penthouse and provide a life cycle cost analysis for each option.

The team prepared a project report that was included in the meeting materials. The report provided additional information regarding the more cost effective HVAC system validated by the life cycle cost analysis and an optional roof top mechanical penthouse. The report also included information regarding a budget overrun due to additional site development costs.

As a result of the review, the project team recognized the need for an increase to the hard construction budget to incorporate the additional site development costs and inclusion of the proposed HVAC system and mechanical penthouse.

Action: The CCRS—with the abstention of Judge Highberger as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member and with the exception of Hon. Keith D. Davis and Mr. Stephan Castellanos who were absent—voted unanimously on the following motions:

1. Approve the requested increase to the construction budget to cover the cost of the site improvements, proposed HVAC system, and the addition of the mechanical penthouse.
2. Approve the project to move forward with the completion of design development of the preliminary plans phase, which includes the submittal of the 100 percent design

development report to the subcommittee prior to obtaining the State Public Works Board approval.

Item 2

Shasta County—New Redding Courthouse: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review

Ms. Metzker introduced Ms. Peggy Symons, Judicial Council Project Manager, who led the project's 100 percent schematic design presentation. The project team previously presented to the subcommittee on January 9, 2014 where the project team was approved to move forward with preliminary plans. Although the project was approved to proceed with preliminary plans, the subcommittee mandated the following directive of the project team which has been incorporated into the overall project:

- Provide court set holding areas between all courtrooms recognizing that the square footage previously presented would change based on the addition of the holding area.

Ms. Symons introduced Mr. Jim Tully, Principal of NBBJ, and Mr. Ev Ruffcorn, Lead Designer of NBBJ, who reviewed the project site and building design; which included providing information on new courthouse location, exterior design, parking, site analysis, and site circulation.

Mr. Tully also reviewed the floor plans of the new courthouse and elaborated on the court functions per floor. The courtrooms have been designed to follow the Judicial Council proposed courtroom layouts in regards to the courtroom width and height. The subcommittee questioned whether or not the court preferred to have more audience seating in the courtrooms instead of the attorney/client rooms. Although the current design includes attorney/client rooms, the court will determine if additional attorney/client rooms will be removed to accommodate more courtroom seating.

The project team recognized that energy costs are important and have designed the building to be as efficient as possible. Mr. Tully presented some of the sustainability features on the project, which included factors related to the building orientation, site planning and development, storm water management plan goals, landscape, daylight and views, water efficiency, lighting and mechanical systems.

Mr. Edward Ellestad, Judicial Council Senior Security Coordinator, provided a security review on the project. He informed the subcommittee that central holding meets current holding metrics for capacity. The security control room will monitor building security systems. Mr. Ellestad continued by informing the subcommittee that inmates will be delivered via vehicle through a secure sally port to holding. The current site design shows more than the minimum setback. The subcommittee questioned what else could be done to keep vehicles from the building. Mr. Tully informed the subcommittee that the setback will be enforced through retaining walls, bollards, parking posts, etc.

Mr. Tully provided information regarding the structural system, mechanical/plumbing systems, electrical system, low-voltage components, and preliminary building exterior and interior materials. The subcommittee questioned on the use of automated sunshades. Mr. Ruffcorn informed the subcommittee that this was one option that the project team is reviewing. The subcommittee suggested that the team contact other design teams that have researched automated sunshades or louvers. Mr. Tully also provided information on the preferred HVAC system and presented the life cycle cost analysis for the HVAC distribution system.

Ms. Symons confirmed that the project is currently on budget based on the cost estimate prepared by the architect.

Action: The CCRS—with the abstention of Judge Highberger as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member, abstention of Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley as a member of the Superior Court of Shasta County and with the exception of Hon. Keith D. Davis and Mr. Stephan Castellanos who were absent—voted unanimously on the following motion:

1. The 100 percent schematic design report be accepted—confirming the project is within budget, scope and schedule—and the project team move forward into design development of the preliminary plans phase.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:40 AM.

Approved by the subcommittee on May 28, 2015.