



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

COURT FACILITIES  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/cfac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/cfac.htm)  
[cfac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:cfac@jud.ca.gov)

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

**MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING**

May 28, 2015  
1:00 PM–3:00 PM  
Teleconference

---

**Subcommittee Members Present:** Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair  
Hon. Donald C. Byrd  
Hon. Keith D. Davis  
Hon. Samuel K. Feng  
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley  
Hon. William F. Highberger  
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)  
Hon. Gary R. Orozco  
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick

**Subcommittee Member Absent:** Mr. Stephen Castellanos, FAIA  
Mr. Kevin Stinson

**Others Present:** The following Judicial Council staff was present:  
Mr. Ed Ellestad, Office of Security  
Ms. S. Pearl Freeman, Capital Program  
Mr. William J. Guerin, Capital Program  
Ms. Angela Guzman, Capital Program  
Mr. Clifford Ham, Capital Program  
Ms. Lisa Hinton, Capital Program  
Ms. Donna Ignacio, Capital Program  
Ms. Kristine Metzker, Capital Program  
Mr. Bruce Newman, Capital Program  
Ms. Kelly Quinn, 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 1:00 PM and welcomed Hon. Steven E. Jahr (retired) as a new member to the Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee. Ms. Kristine Metzker, staff to the subcommittee, took roll call.

**Approval of Minutes**

The subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes of the March 24, 2015 Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee meeting and the minutes of the May 18, 2015 Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee action by email.

---

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

---

**Item 1**

**Application of December 2014 Updated New Judgeship Needs to Courthouse Capital Projects**

Ms. Metzker presented background on the updated new judgeship needs to courthouse capital projects. In January 2014, staff presented to the subcommittee information on December 2013 Judicial Council action on a biannual update to the New Judgeships assessment. At that time, the council opted to defer formalizing a prioritization list of new judgeships until funding was made available. Therefore, without a council approved list there was no basis for making changes to capital project scope. CCRS agreed that no scope changes would occur. In December 2014, the council approved a report that the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee presented. The approved assessment included allocation of the next 250 new judgeships, which results in potential changes to the allocation used in scoping several of the current capital projects. As a result of the December 2014 council action approved a list of the next 100 new judgeships; staff prepared and presented information to the CCRS for discussion and direction on potential project scope changes. Ms. Metzker confirmed that the potential cost impacts associated with each of the new judgeships is the budget for an unfinished, shelled courtroom. The tenant improvements would be funded with new judgeships monies when the judgeships are authorized and funded. Subcommittee questioned as to whether or not the Department of Finance was accepting proposals of shelled space and Ms. Metzker confirmed that DOF has requested that future courtrooms be shelled on some previous projects.

Ms. Metzker provided information on seven capital projects currently underway that are potentially affected by the December 2014 new judgeships update. In addition to Ms. Metzker's presentation, various court officials also provided comments related to their project.

1. El Dorado County – New Placerville Courthouse  
Court is allocated one new judgeship which is in the third set of 50 new judgeships, which was not previously allocated. The capital project is currently in the acquisition phase. The new courthouse is likely to be a low-rise building and it is possible to design

the building and site to include the additional courtroom in the future but it will cost substantially more compared to including it in the scope now. Changing the scope now would have minimal impact. Potential cost impact for including the additional courtroom is \$3,784,000. Hon. Suzanne Kingsbury, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of El Dorado County, and Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of El Dorado County, requested that the new judgeship be included as a shelled courtroom in the project now.

2. Imperial County – New El Centro Courthouse

Court is allocated two new judgeships—one new judgeship is an AB 159 and the second new judgeship is in the third group of 50—which were not previously allocated. The capital project is currently in the working drawings phase. The building and site have been designed to provide for a future addition to the two-story building with two new court sets. Building the addition in the future compared to including the space in the initial construction will cost more; however changing the scope now will delay the project. The project delay for a scope change and redesign is estimated to be one year. Potential cost impact for including the additional courtrooms is \$6,157,000. Ms. Tammy Grimm, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Imperial County, requested that the two new judgeships not be included in the project to avoid substantial schedule delay.

3. Kings County – New Hanford Courthouse

Court's new judgeship allocation increases from one to two new judgeships, which is in the third group of 50. The capital project is in construction and therefore, implementing a scope change now would stop construction and delay the completion of the project. There are currently two shelled courtrooms designed into the project, one of which that could be used for this new judgeship and finished in the future when funding becomes available. There is no potential cost impact for this change assuming the full tenant improvement funding will be provided with each new judgeship.

4. Sacramento County – New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse

Court is allocated eight fewer new judgeships than previously provided. To update the scope of work for this project, the project team is currently using the reduced new judgeship allocation of 3 instead of 11 as proposed when the project was originally scoped. The capital project is in pre-schematic phase. The project will most likely need a scope change and will result in minimal schedule impact. The new courthouse will be a high-rise structure and therefore it will be very difficult to modify the building in the future. The project cost impact will depend on which of the project scope options, that are currently being studied, will be selected. The project is scheduled to present to the subcommittee in August 2015 where the project team will elaborate on the project scope options. Hon. Robert Hight, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Sacramento County, and Hon. Lloyd Connelly, Judge of the Superior Court of Sacramento County, voiced concern regarding the reduction of new judgeships and requested that additional data be presented to the subcommittee in August to justify the need of all eleven new judgeships instead of three based on their research findings. Justice Johnson confirmed

that a decision is not required at this time considering that the project team is scheduled to present to the subcommittee in August, at which time the court will provide a written report to the subcommittee comprised of the justification of the new judgeships needs. There was no further action requested at this time for this project.

5. Shasta County – New Redding Courthouse

Court's new judgeship allocation increases from two to three new judgeships, which is in the AB 159 group. The capital project is in the design development phase and implementing a scope change now would cause substantial delay to the schedule. The new courthouse will be a high-rise structure and therefore it will be very difficult to modify the building in the future. The project is being designed with space to include future court sets, so it may be possible to add the third new judgeship courtroom without impacting the current authorized building gross square footage. Potential cost impact for including the additional courtroom is \$3,529,000. Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Shasta County, requested that the additional new judgeship not be included in the project to avoid substantial schedule delay.

6. Stanislaus County – New Modesto Courthouse

Court's new judgeship allocation increases from 4 to 5, which is in the third group of 50. The capital project will soon start the schematic design phase and implementing a scope change now would result in minimal schedule impact. The new courthouse will be a high-rise structure and therefore it will be very difficult to modify the building in the future. Potential cost impact for including the additional courtroom is \$4,033,000. Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County, requested that the new judgeship be included as a shelled courtroom in the project now.

7. Tehama County – New Red Bluff Courthouse

Court is allocated one new judgeship not previously provided and is in the third group of 50. The capital project is in construction and therefore, implementing a scope change now would stop construction and delay the completion of the project. The project is designed to accommodate a future hearing room for a new judgeship. There is no potential cost impact for this change assuming the full tenant improvement funding will be provided with each new judgeship. Ms. Metzker informed the subcommittee that the court requested that the additional new judgeship not be included in the project to avoid substantial schedule delay.

**Action:** The CCRS—with the abstention of Judge Highberger as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member, Judge Jahr and Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley as past/current Superior Court of Shasta County staff (for the Shasta project), and with the exception of Mr. Stephan Castellanos and Mr. Kevin Stinson who were absent—voted unanimously on the following motions:

1. El Dorado County – New Placerville Courthouse  
Approve to include the addition of the shelled courtroom with a project cost impact of \$3,784,000 and direct Judicial Council staff to prepare documentation recognizing this project scope change.
2. Imperial County – New El Centro Courthouse  
Approve that no further action be taken for this project.
3. Kings County – New Hanford Courthouse  
Approve that no further action be taken for this project.
4. Sacramento County – New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse  
Continue with resolution on this project until August 2015 meeting subject to be made based on written report from the court regarding new judgeship information.
5. Shasta County – New Redding Courthouse  
Approve that no further action be taken for this project.
6. Stanislaus County – New Modesto Courthouse  
Approve to include the addition of the shelled courtroom with a project cost impact of \$4,033,000 and direct Judicial Council staff to prepare documentation recognizing this project scope change.
7. Tehama County – New Red Bluff Courthouse  
Approve that no further action be taken for this project.

## **Item 2**

### **Tuolumne County—New Sonora Courthouse: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review**

Ms. Metzker introduced Ms. Lisa Hinton, 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:

- Remove one jury deliberation room, children's waiting room, and three courtroom holding cells, as well as reduce five staff from the estimated number at move-in. The

subcommittee recognized that the square footage presented at the time would change based on the additional reductions identified during the pre-design presentation.

Ms. Hinton introduced Mr. Nick Docous, Principal of Lionakis, and Mr. Mike Novak, Project Architect of Lionakis, who reviewed the project site and building design; which included providing information on new courthouse location, exterior design, parking, site analysis, and site circulation. The new courthouse is part of an overall law and justice center, which includes a new juvenile center, new county jail, and two administrative office buildings that will house justice partners. The group reviewed a video of a model that was created to illustrate the site topography and proposed law and justice center. As depicted in the video, the site is not flat and the topography is different throughout the campus. Mr. Novak elaborated on the parking available for justice partners, staff, and public. The subcommittee questioned if the Superior Court of Tuolumne County (“Court”) was comfortable with staff using the same entry as judges. Hon. Donald I. Segerstrom, Jr., Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Tuolumne County, confirmed that they approved of the single point of entry for staff and judges from the staff parking lot considering that there could potentially be a bottleneck at the main entrance if staff used the same entrance with public. The subcommittee also questioned the maintenance cost of parking areas at different elevations versus having one large parking area. Mr. Docous responded that maintenance and operations costs for single and dual parking levels are the same as they both have the same parking area. Lionakis is utilizing the site by avoiding extensive grading which results in cost savings.

Mr. Novak also reviewed the floor plans of the new courthouse and elaborated on the court functions per floor. The subcommittee questioned the location of the deliberation rooms on the second floor currently located along the secure corridor and the amount of natural light entering the rooms considering the impact it may have on jurors during long deliberations. Judge Segerstrom informed the subcommittee that when the jury deliberation rooms were reduced to two, the Court wanted to ensure that these rooms had maximum flexibility and use as many courtrooms as possible. Therefore, the jury deliberation rooms were designed to have direct access from each court set. Judge Segerstrom also confirmed that the jury deliberation rooms will have access to natural light. Some of the subcommittee members also confirmed that they have not heard or received complaints regarding the absence of windows or natural light based on their experience with current courthouse conditions. Mr. Docous informed the group that the design team is reviewing the use of solar tubes to access natural light into the courthouse. Mr. Clifford Ham, Judicial Council Principal Architect, suggested the importance of re-locating the jury deliberation rooms to provide ample exterior views for jurors and allowing access of natural light. Justice Johnson recognized Mr. Ham’s concerns but acknowledged that the general practice of the subcommittee where the Court has strong preference, even if the subcommittee themselves disagree with it; will respect the Court’s design preference as long as it does not have a negative economic impact. Subcommittee also questioned the access to the jury deliberation rooms from the courtrooms. Mr. Docous informed the group that the Court requested that there be flexibility with accessing the jury deliberation rooms. There are two ways jurors can access the jury deliberation rooms: through a door located along the secure corridor or walking across the well to access the door into the jury deliberation room, which the Court approved.

Mr. Edward Ellestad, Judicial Council Senior Security Coordinator, provided a security review on the project. He informed the subcommittee that central/court holding meets current metrics for capacity. Building security and holding control systems will be monitored in the security control room. The subcommittee questioned if there will be duplicative controls. Mr. Novak added that the original design included a control room in holding and in the lobby, but through Judicial Council security review, it was established that security control would be operated from the lobby with key override in holding.

Mr. Novak provided information regarding the structural system, mechanical/plumbing systems, electrical system, sustainability features, and life cycle cost analysis for the HVAC distribution systems.

Ms. Hinton 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, and with the exception of Mr. Kevin Stinson 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 3:00 PM.

Approved by the subcommittee on August 10, 2015.