



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

COURT FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION OF MEETING

May 17, 2017

1:00 PM – 2:30 PM – Open Session

Judicial Council of California – San Francisco Office

**Advisory Body
Members Present:** Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Hon. Robert D. Foiles
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)
Hon. Laura J. Masunaga
Mr. Stephen Nash
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Ms. Linda Romero Soles
Mr. Kevin Stinson
Mr. Val Toppenberg
Hon. Robert J. Trentacosta
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

**Advisory Body
Members Absent:** Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA
Hon. Keith D. Davis
Hon. Jeffrey W. Johnson
Mr. Larry Spikes

Others Present: The following Judicial Council staff/others were present:
Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Los Angeles County
(by phone)
Mr. Afshar Jalalian, Executive Principal, Rutherford + Chekene
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
Mr. Clifford Ham, Senior 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 SESSION OF MEETING

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

The chair called the open session of the meeting to order at 1:00 PM and opening remarks were made. The chair's opening remarks were captured verbatim in the archived webcast video available at http://jcc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=461&meta_id=20827.

The advisory committee voted unanimously (with the abstention of all members absent from the August 2016 meeting, and 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 August 11, 2016.

OPEN SESSION – DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

Item 1

Los Angeles County–New Hollywood Courthouse: Site Discussion

As this advisory committee 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=20828.

Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, provided a summary of the project's history, indicating that:

- it was authorized for initial funding in FY 2009–2010 as a new-courthouse project to replace the existing Mental Health Courthouse, a facility with a long list of significant security, functional, and physical problems;
- in 2013, the court had proposed a cost-savings strategy to house its mental health calendars/operations by renovating the under-utilized, existing state-owned Hollywood Courthouse. However, this plan soon became infeasible upon discovery of an earthquake fault line running through the site that limited the amount of money that could be spent to improve the existing conditions of the building (i.e., if more than 50 percent of the value of the building was spent on its improvement, then the occupants would be required to fully vacate.) The plan to reuse that building/property then changed in scope to: demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new building at an onsite location considered a safe distance from the earthquake fault;
- in October 2016, and while the new courthouse building was being planned, the roof trusses of the existing Mental Health Courthouse began to fail, and due to its structural compromise, the mental health calendars/operations were forced to relocate overnight from this facility to the Metropolitan Courthouse—the only available court space that accommodated this temporary solution;
- owing to the many deteriorated conditions of the existing Mental Health Courthouse, and the costs now required to make it habitable, the court does not plan to return its operations in the future;
- given the space in the Metropolitan Courthouse only provides a temporary solution—having many deficiencies for conducting mental health calendars/operations such as inadequate number of

single-cell in-custody holding facilities, the conflict of mixing in-custody criminal and mental health populations, and the lack of space for mental health professionals/justice partners—another move must be planned at this time to an available, stand-alone facility: the existing Hollywood Courthouse;

- as the same limitation on improving the conditions of the existing Hollywood Courthouse still exists (as described above), only minor alterations can be made to open the facility as planned in July 2017. This move provides a temporary solution but eliminates the possibility of demolishing the existing courthouse to allow construction of a new building on the existing site; and
- for the reasons stated, the court requests that the project remain on the list of active Senate Bill 1407 courthouse capital projects—as a new courthouse project to now replace temporary space for its mental health calendars/operations in the existing Hollywood Courthouse—and that site acquisition funding be restored to acquire a new property with the site selection process commencing as soon as possible.

Presiding Judge Daniel J. Buckley of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County indicated that every court in the state has been experiencing a dramatic increase in mental health issues, and because there is an expectation that this population of court users will continue to grow dramatically, a new courthouse facility will allow the court the ability to deal with this issue.

Action: The advisory committee—with the exception 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. To approve the Superior Court of Los Angeles County’s request for the project to remain on the list of active courthouse capital projects, to restore the project’s site acquisition budget, and to begin the site selection process as soon as possible.

OPEN SESSION – INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

Info Item 1

Seismic Risk Rating of California Superior Court Buildings: Summary of Findings

As this advisory committee meeting had been broadcasted live via webcast video, the archived webcast video for this portion of the meeting—including the verbatim opening remarks and closing statements made by Administrative Presiding Justice Brad. R. Hill, CFAC chair—is available at http://jcc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=461&meta_id=20829.

Mr. Clifford Ham, Judicial Council Senior Project Manager, and Mr. Afshar Jalalian, Executive Principal, from Rutherford + Chekene, presented the summary of findings on the seismic risk rating of superior court buildings consistent with the PowerPoint slides included in the project materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting. Mr. Ham indicated that the Judicial Council’s seismic risk rating database is contained within its report—*Seismic Risk Rating of California Superior Court Buildings* report dated March 1, 2017—available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/Seismic-Risk-Rating-of-California-Superior-Court-Buildings.pdf. During the presentation, the following comments were made:

- The 2015/16 update to the Judicial Council’s court buildings seismic database (derived from 2003 statewide seismic assessment program that determined the seismic performance of court buildings considered for transfer of title or management responsibility from the counties to the state) determined that the majority—or 145 of the total 227 court structures classified as seismic Risk Level V or worse—still did not pass the acceptable life-safety performance level.
- Because not all seismic Risk Level V court buildings are equally vulnerable to damage during a seismic event—for example, a court building with an unreinforced masonry-bearing-wall system is at higher risk of structural failure compared to a court building with a steel moment-frame system that is of similar size and in the same location—seismic risk ratings (SRR) were developed to determine the relative risk to life-safety among these buildings in the Judicial Council’s inventory.
- The methodology for the SRR was based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s HAZUS modeling algorithm, and the SRR provides a tool to rate and prioritize these buildings by their severity of risk of collapse or significant injury or loss of life. The SRR categories are: *Very High Risk*, *High Risk*, *Moderate Risk*, *Acceptable Risk*, and *Not Enough Information*. The *High Risk* and *Moderate Risk* categories were defined consistent with the rankings systems employed by other California agencies or entities, such as the state Department of General Services, California’s Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, University of California, and Stanford University. The *Very High Risk* category was defined from the *High Risk* category by including buildings known to have very poor performance (such as unreinforced masonry-bearing-wall systems) in regions of high seismic activity thereby posing the highest risk to life-safety.
- Buildings within the *Very High Risk* and *High Risk* categories—which together comprise approximately 25 percent of all buildings within the inventory—were recommended as the highest priority for mitigation of risk or seismic retrofit. A rough-order-of-magnitude retrofit cost, shown in a range, was developed to present an estimated program-wide budget.
- Next steps include Judicial Council staff selecting/directing consultants to develop, based on certain criteria, renovation feasibility studies of 20–25 buildings with the highest SRR. These studies would focus on individual court buildings, include a renovation scope, cost model, and project schedule, and be developed with the level of content suitable for inclusion in a future appropriations request for funding. These reports are planned for completion in late-2017 or early-2018.

At the conclusion of the presentation, the advisory committee took no action as this item had only been presented at this time for informational purposes.

**ADJOURNMENT TO EDUCATION SESSION (CLOSED TO PUBLIC) AND
ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the open session of the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 PM. The advisory committee meeting was also adjourned at this time, as the committee had met during the lunch hour to conduct its education session of the meeting, which was closed to the public and not subject to Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 10.75.

Approved by the advisory body on July 19, 2017.