



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

February 5, 2020

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Teleconference

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

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA
Hon. Robert J. Trentacosta

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

Ms. Valerie Eacret, Project Manager, Advance Design Consultants, Inc.
Mr. Joshua Roper, Vice President, Salter, Inc.

Ms. Cindy Van Schooten, Assistant Court Executive Officer and CJER Liaison,
Superior Court of Shasta County

Mr. Mike Courtney, Director, Facilities Services
Mr. Jack Collins, Manager, Facilities Services
Mr. Jeremy Ehrlich, Attorney II, Legal Services
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Facilities Services
Mr. Charles Martel, Supervising Attorney, Legal Services
Ms. Pella McCormick, Deputy Director, Facilities Services
Mr. Paul Menard, Manager, Facilities Services
Ms. Deepika Padam, Supervisor, Facilities Services
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Facilities Services
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Facilities Services
Mr. John Wordlaw, Chief Administrative Officer, Executive Office

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order, Roll Call, and Opening Remarks

The chair called the open meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., took roll call, and opening remarks were made.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory committee voted unanimously (with the abstention of all members absent from the meeting, and the exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members and of the members who were absent as shown above) to approve the minutes of its joint meeting with the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on Dec. 19, 2019.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–2)

Item 1

Update to the California Trial Court Facilities Standards

Summary: The advisory committee reviewed the plan to update the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards*. Various code provisions and best management practices have changed over time.

Mr. Mike Courtney presented this item consistent with materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-200205-materials.pdf. He indicated that the update to the standards would be coordinated by staff but that Vanir Construction Management, Inc., who serves as Judicial Council Facilities Services' Program Manager, would provide resources for word processing, an outside engineering consultant would review the mechanical and electrical criteria, and another consultant would review structural and fire codes to determine whether any new code requirements necessitated updating chapters that are relevant.

The vice-chair volunteered as chair of a working group of the advisory committee, to be created to guide staff in updating the standards.

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

1. An update to the standards commences, including a process for public review/comment of the near-final draft prior to a future meeting at which the advisory committee would make its final recommendation to the Judicial Council.
2. A working group of the advisory committee be created to guide staff in updating the standards.

Item 2

Request to Rename the West Justice Center in Westminster

Summary: The advisory committee reviewed the request from the Superior Court of Orange County to rename the existing West Justice Center in the City of Westminster after former appellate court justice Stephen K. Tamura. Prior to this presentation, the naming request was reviewed by the advisory committee’s Subcommittee on Courthouse Names at its public meeting held on January 17, 2020. At that meeting, the subcommittee approved request for review and consideration by the full advisory committee, making the following recommendation: The naming request, as described in the Court’s letter, be submitted to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee for confirmation and Judicial Council for final approval.

Judge Keith D. Davis, chair of the advisory committee’s Subcommittee on Courthouse Names, and Mr. Chris Magnusson presented this item consistent with materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-200205-materials.pdf.

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

1. Affirm the Subcommittee on Courthouse Names’ recommendation, which is to approve the Superior Court of Orange County’s naming proposal and direct its submission to the Judicial Council for ratification at its meeting in March 2020.
2. Delegate to the advisory committee’s chair and vice-chair and chair of the Subcommittee on Courthouse Names the review of the report to the Judicial Council.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Info Item 1

Design-Build Project Delivery Method (No Action Required – Information Only)

Summary: The advisory committee received an informational presentation on the use of the design-build delivery method for capital projects of the judicial branch courthouse construction program. Mr. Mike Courtney presented this item consistent with materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-200205-materials.pdf. In addition, he made the following comments:

- Utilizing this delivery method for a capital project neither increases nor reduces its cost estimate but that the typical three-year appropriation process—for funding its preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction phases—would reduce to two years. With this efficiency—of gaining a project’s construction appropriation sooner—one-to-two years could be saved in the overall delivery process, giving it a better chance of meeting its budget.

- With the knowledge of an upcoming fiscal year budget for capital projects, the architect developing a capital project's performance criteria would likely be hired early, since they would assist with the technical aspects of design throughout the life of the project.
- It is recommended that this delivery method be used for all new construction projects, and for most, if not all, renovation projects, carefully consideration should be made as to whether this method or the construction manager at risk delivery method is used. It is important to determine the precise delivery method at the start of the project.

Action: The advisory committee took no action as this item had only been presented for informational purposes.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further open meeting business, the open meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

C L O S E D S E S S I O N

Closed Action Item 1

Design Standards

Rule 10.75(d)(2)

In accordance with rule 10.75(d)(2) of the California Rules of Court, the Chair has exercised discretion to close this portion of the meeting to discuss claims, administrative claims, agency investigations, or pending or reasonably anticipated litigation naming, or reasonably anticipated to name, a judicial branch entity or a member, officer, or employee of such an entity.

Adjourned closed session at 3:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on July 10, 2020.