



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**

May 17, 2017
10:30 AM – 12:15 PM

Judicial Council of California – San Francisco Office

Subcommittee Members Present: Hon. Brad R. Hill, CFAC Chair
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, CFAC Vice-Chair
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Mr. Kevin Stinson
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

Subcommittee Members Absent: Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson, CCRS Chair
Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA
Hon. Keith D. Davis

Others Present: The following Judicial Council staff/others were present:

Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County (by phone)
Mr. Darrell E. Parker, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County (by phone)
Ms. Angela Braun, Senior Judicial Services Manager, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County (by phone)
Ms. Janette Pell, Director of General Services, County of Santa Barbara (by phone)
Ms. Beverly Taylor, Chief Probation Officer, County of Santa Barbara (by phone)

Hon. Mark A. Mandio, Judge, Superior Court of Riverside County
Mr. Alan Counts, Chief Deputy of Administration, Superior Court of Riverside County
Mr. Chris Talbot, Deputy Executive Officer of Facilities, Superior Court of Riverside County (by phone)
Mr. Kal Benuska, Principal, John A. Martin & Associates (by phone)
Mr. Sam Hoelscher, Project Executive, Clark Construction Group
Mr. Ryan Hollien, Senior Project Architect, Perkins+Will
Mr. Rick Lloyd, Vice President, MGAC
Mr. Andrew Reilman, Principal, Integral Group (by phone)
Mr. Cliff Robertson, Preconstruction Executive, Clark Construction Group
Mr. Nick Seierup, Design Principal, Perkins+Will

Mr. Mike Courtney, Director, Capital Program (by phone)
Mr. Ed Ellestad, Supervisor, Security Operations - Real Estate and Facilities Management
Ms. S. Pearl Freeman, AIA, Manager, Capital Program
Ms. Nora Freiwald, Project Manager, Capital Program
Ms. Pella McCormick, Deputy Director, Capital Program
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Senior Facilities Analyst, Capital Program
Ms. Kristine Metzker, Planning Manager, Capital Program
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Administrative Specialist, Capital Program

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order, Opening Remarks, and Approval of Meeting Minutes

Administrative Presiding Justice Brad. R. Hill, CFAC chair, called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM. His opening remarks were captured verbatim in the archived webcast video available at http://jcc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=461&meta_id=20822.

The subcommittee voted unanimously (with the exceptions of Hon. Donald Cole Byrd and Hon. William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and the members who were absent as shown above) to approve the minutes from its meeting held on December 1, 2016, and its action by email on April 5, 2017.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Santa Barbara County–New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse: Study Discussion

As this subcommittee meeting had been broadcasted live via webcast video, the archived webcast video for this portion of the meeting is available at http://jcc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=461&meta_id=20823.

Mr. Mike Courtney, Judicial Council Capital Program Director, stated that when last presented in March 2016, the capital project was approximately \$8 million over budget and that the project team had been directed to study different options to bring it back within budget. He indicated that since that time, the project has been studied but that the cost overage remains, which is now between \$4–5 million. He introduced the superior court’s concept to address this issue, which was to study a possible partnership with the county which would make contributions of land and funding that may allow the Judicial Council’s authorized budget combined with additional funding from the county cover the cost of a joint court-county facility. He noted that many discussions would need to take place to determine whether or not such a facility would be co-owned or if the county would become a tenant, as well as to determine the financing for the facility’s construction.

Mr. Courtney explained that cost of the study—of approximately \$75,000—would be applied toward working with the design team to analyze the new site and size of the facility and to produce a cost estimate that can be compared to the reconfiguration options the team has already prepared. He clarified that the financial and maintenance/responsibility issues would be addressed separately by Judicial Council staff and not out of the cost of the study, noting that the results from both the study and research provided by Judicial Council staff would then be combined in a report to the CFAC to answer the question of whether or not the project can be returned within budget.

Mr. Darrell E. Parker, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County, introduced the court and county representatives: from the Superior Court of Santa Barbara

County, Presiding Judge Patricia L. Kelly and Ms. Angela Braun, Senior Judicial Services Manager; and from the County of Santa Barbara, Ms. Janette Pell, Director of General Services, and Ms. Beverly Taylor, Chief Probation Officer. In addition, the court/county made the following comments:

- The county's probation department is looking to renovate its downtown location, which is in an unreinforced, concrete masonry building constructed in the 1950s. From the county's perspective, it would be more cost effective to demolish this building than to renovate. Therefore, co-locating the probation department and the superior court into a criminal justice facility in downtown Santa Barabara makes sense given their current adjacency;
- A joint court-county facility would allow both entities to gain efficiencies in shared queuing spaces, reception areas, public lobbies, public elevators, and public restrooms, as well as provide improved site access to sheriff in-custody transport buses from three downtown streets;
- The probation department is currently providing its services from multiple locations throughout the county, and a joint court-county facility would allow the opportunity for greater operational efficiencies through the consolidation of all functions countywide;
- To allow that a joint court-county facility be constructed in a single phase, there is an opportunity to free up a portion of the parking lot in between the new courthouse site and the existing probation department property in exchange for a portion of the land that would be vacated once the existing courthouse is demolished;
- There is an opportunity to redirect funding earmarked for renovating the existing probation department building toward the cost of a joint court-county facility; and
- The superior court is seeking approval for a feasibility study to evaluate the concept and cost of a joint court-county project. The county is willing to contribute \$25,000 toward the feasibility study's estimated total cost of \$75,000.

Action: The subcommittee—with the exceptions of Hon. Donald Cole Byrd and Hon. William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and the members who were absent as shown above—voted unanimously to approve the following motion:

1. Authorize Judicial Council staff to complete a feasibility study with the state's contribution not to exceed \$50,000 along with the county's contribution of \$25,000.

Item 2**Riverside County–New Mid-County Civil Courthouse: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review**

As this subcommittee meeting had been broadcasted live via webcast video, the archived webcast video for this portion of the meeting is available at

http://jcc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=461&meta_id=20824.

Ms. Nora Freiwald, Judicial Council Project Manager, introduced the project team for the New Mid-County Civil Courthouse: from the Superior Court of Riverside County, Judge Mark A. Mandio, Mr. Alan Counts, Chief Deputy of Administration, and Mr. Chris Talbot, Deputy Executive Officer of Facilities; from Perkins+Will, Mr. Nick Seierup, Design Principal, and Mr. Ryan Hollien, Senior Project Architect; and Mr. Rick Lloyd, Vice President, from MGAC. She indicated that the other team members—listed above under *Others Present*—were available to provide any needed information.

Mr. Seierup presented the project's 100 percent schematic design plans and drawings consistent with the PowerPoint slides included in the project materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting. During the presentation, the following comments were made:

- As a cost-savings measure for reducing the size of the project site, a shared parking agreement has been created with the property owner to the north for the long-term use of approximately 100 spaces for public parking;
- As a cost-savings measure, jury boxes will not be constructed in the four family law courtrooms; although they will be designed with the space for future build-out as needed;
- Infrastructure for electric vehicle charging stations is planned in the secured parking area; however, and based on advisory committee member comments, the team will explore the possibility of placing this only in the public parking area or within both the secure and public parking areas to the extent allowable by the project budget;
- Fixed bollards will be installed within the entry plaza as a security measure to protect the front of the building from unauthorized vehicles entry;
- The secured parking area will be enclosed by solid wall in addition to a security gate;
- The location of the jury assembly room on the building's third floor (and not the ground floor) allows prospective jurors the closest proximity to the third-floor civil courtrooms they will be serving, provides priority to the public's use of the self-help center on the ground floor, and reduces the cost of a larger ground-floor building footprint. Access to this room will be from both stairwell and elevators. The room will be equipped with vending facilities but not with separate restroom facilities in order to save cost. Moreover, restroom facilities located off the adjacent public corridor, which is similar in floorplan design to the New Woodland Courthouse in Yolo County, will adequately serve the size of jury panels planned for this building;

- The location of the child waiting room on the building's second floor (and not the ground floor adjacent to the self-help center) allows the closest proximity to the second-floor family law courtrooms and reduces the cost of a larger ground-floor building footprint;
- The use of the high-volume courtroom is planned for traffic, unlawful detainers, and small claims matters;
- Currently, court reporters are utilized in family law matters, and space for this function is provided in the family-law-courtroom layout; and
- The 33-percent reduction to the project's authorized FY 2009–2010 budget was accomplished in large part from eliminating criminal calendars/operations that had been originally planned for this courthouse. The court's growth in the southwest region of the county is in civil and family law caseload, and this change to calendar was not cost driven.

Action: The subcommittee—with the exceptions of Hon. Donald Cole Byrd and Hon. William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members, and the members who were absent as shown above—voted unanimously to approve the following motion:

1. The 100 percent schematic design report is accepted, 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 12:15 PM.

Approved by the subcommittee on July 19, 2017.