



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

August 10, 2015

10:00 AM–3:00 PM

Judicial Council of California – San Francisco Office

Subcommittee Members Present: Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, Chair
Hon. Donald C. Byrd
Mr. Stephen Castellanos, FAIA
Hon. Keith D. Davis
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Brad R. Hill, CFAC Chair
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick

Subcommittee Member Absent: Mr. Kevin Stinson

Others Present: The following Judicial Council staff was present:
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
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Capital Program
Ms. Kristine Metzker, Capital Program
Ms. Kelly Quinn, Capital Program
Mr. Scott Shin, Capital Program
Mr. Loren Smith, Capital Program
Ms. Peggy Symons, Capital Program
Mr. Robert Uvalle, 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 May 28, 2015, Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Shasta County—New Redding Courthouse: 50 Percent Design Development Review

Ms. Metzker introduced Ms. Peggy Symons, Judicial Council Project Manager, who led the project's 50 percent design development presentation. The project team previously presented to the subcommittee on March 24, 2015 where the project team was approved to move forward into design development of the preliminary plans phase with no mandated directives.

Ms. Symons introduced Mr. Jim Tully, Principal of NBBJ, and Ms. Leslie Synnestvedt, Project Manager of NBBJ, who reviewed the site plan, floor plans and building design, which was very similar to what was presented during the 100 percent schematic design review. Mr. Tully reviewed updates to the exterior design and floor plans since the project received approval to proceed with design development on March 24th.

The subcommittee questioned if there was room for expansion in the new courthouse in case there was a need for more courtrooms in the future. Mr. Tully confirmed that the training room and ADR suite, currently located on Level 3, would be an ideal candidate for expansion of courtrooms if this was needed in the future.

Mr. Tully reviewed the change to the front exterior design of the building. The exterior design presented in March incorporated more glass. As a result of discussions with the judges as well as further energy analysis, the current design has a columnar expression for a more traditional appearance, as well as maximizing energy efficiency.

Ms. Symons confirmed that the project is currently on budget based on the cost estimate prepared by the architect. The subcommittee questioned the increase in the cost from the FY 2010–11 design-to-budget to the FY 2015–16 design-to-budget. Ms. Symons informed the subcommittee that budget is adjusted per the CCCI and the average increase between FY 2009–10, when the budget was developed, to the FY 2015–16 budget was 1.9 percent per year.

Action: The CCRS—with the abstention of Judge Highberger as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member, abstention of Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley and Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Retired) as members of the Superior Court of Shasta County, and with the exception of Mr. Kevin Stinson who was absent—voted unanimously on the following motion:

1. The 50 percent design development report be accepted—confirming the project is within budget, scope and schedule—and the project team 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

Los Angeles County—Hollywood Courthouse Project Status Update

Justice Johnson introduced Hon. William F. Highberger, Judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 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 when the project team was approved to move forward to pursue the renovation and expansion of the existing Hollywood Courthouse.

The geotechnical study materials were presented. Per the report, it is possible that an earthquake fault underlies a corner of the existing building. The report also indicates a new building could be constructed at the south edge of the site, away from the potential fault.

Two project options were presented. Option 1 proposes a new building be constructed on the existing site instead of the renovation project previously authorized. The scope would include a four story building with a basement. Mr. Castellanos questioned whether a structural engineer had reviewed this option to determine if location near the fault would cause an increased cost to the project.

Option 2 proposes that a new site be acquired for a new building. This option would require an additional \$32 to \$50 million in funding. It was suggested that the existing site is valuable and could possibly be traded for a site further from the fault. Mr. Hirschfeld reported that a search for a new site would cause an 18 month delay to the project.

Judge Jahr asked about the status of county participation in the project. Judge Highberger stated that the team had reached a previous agreement with the county for their financial participation and that program increases would be controlled and costs would be reduced where ever possible. Judge Jahr asked that the next presentation to the CCRS include an update on the negotiations with the county.

The site does not provide parking to meet the CCRS metric onsite. Judge Highberger mentioned that the existing below grade parking at the north of the site may be retained but that it needs further study by the structural consultant.

Regarding potential cost increases to the project, Justice Hill indicated that should the project cost increase substantially above the current authorized budget, the Court Facilities Advisory Committee—not the CCRS—should review this issue and make a decision.

Action: The CCRS—with the abstention of Judge Highberger as an Ex-Officio, non-voting member and as a member of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, and with the exception of Mr. Kevin Stinson who was absent—voted unanimously on the following motion:

1. Judicial Council staff develop a revised space program, test-fit plans, budget, schedule, and design build performance standards for the new project;
2. A structural engineering study of the potential to retain the underground parking near the fault and the effect of the fault on the cost of the new building will be presented to CCRS.
3. The project team will report back to the CCRS for approval of the project scope and, if there is more than a minimal cost increase, to the CFAC prior to submittal to the Judicial Council and the DOF; and
4. Judicial Council staff will submit a scope change and funding request to the DOF revising the scope from an addition/renovation to a new building;

The team was instructed to report back to CCRS at the 50 percent and 100 percent design development phases during the design/build phase of the project. Bridging documents will not be developed for this option.

Item 3

Sacramento County—New Sacramento Criminal Courthouse: Pre-Design Review

Ms. Metzker introduced Mr. Mike Smith, Judicial Council Project Manager, who was designated to lead the project’s pre-design presentation. The project was placed on indefinite delay by the Judicial Council in January 2013, with approval to complete the purchase of land for the project. In September 2014, legislation was approved allocating funding for the preliminary plans and working drawings phases of the project.

The project team intended to request approval to proceed with Option 1, construction of one new courthouse of 50 courtrooms rather than building a 44-courtroom courthouse and renovating the Schaber Courthouse for 6 courtrooms. The materials available to CCRS members indicated that the new building would cost over \$50 million more than a new 44-courtroom courthouse with a minimal renovation of the Schaber Courthouse (Option 2A). The court indicated that in seeking approval to move forward with Option 1, they are not requesting diversion of any SB 1407 funds now allocated to other projects.

CCRS members asked questions about the cost of the full renovation of the Schaber Courthouse proposed in Option 2B, how the empty space would be used in Options 2A and B, and for a copy of the FY 12-13 COBCP. Members discussed that a request to increase the project cost by \$50 million should be referred to the full CFAC.

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

1. Refer the proposal and other available options to the full CFAC for a decision making process.

Justice Hill requested that staff provide the presentation prepared for the CCRS to the full CFAC with a request for specific questions, which will be the focus of the future CFAC presentation.

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 September 25, 2015.