



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 MEETING

November 9, 2021

10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Videoconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Vice-Chair
Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Mr. Stephan Castellanos, FAIA
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

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Keith D. Davis (Ret.)
Hon. Robert J. Trentacosta
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

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

Hon. Dalila C. Lyons, Judge and Executive and Planning Committee Liaison,
Superior Court of Los Angeles County
Mr. Kevin J. Lane, Clerk/Executive Officer and CJER Liaison, Court of Appeal,
Fourth Appellate District

Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Deputy Director, Facilities Services
Mr. Jeremy Ehrlich, Attorney II, Legal Services
Mr. Ed Ellestad, Supervisor, Facilities Services
Ms. Rose Livingston, Senior Analyst, Executive Office
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Facilities Services
Mr. Charles Martel, Supervising Attorney, Legal Services
Ms. Pella McCormick, Director, Facilities Services
Ms. Deepika Padam, Manager, Facilities Services
Mr. Jim Peterson, Principal Manager, Facilities Services
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Facilities Services
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Facilities Services
Ms. Lynette Stephens, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services
Ms. Maggie Stern, Attorney II, Legal Services
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Deputy Director, Budget 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 10:00 a.m., roll was taken, and opening remarks were made.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory committee voted unanimously (with abstention of members absent from the meeting and exceptions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, as Ex-Officio, non-voting members) to approve the minutes of its meeting held on June 16, 2021.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–2)

Item 1

Director’s Report (No Action – Information Only)

Summary: The Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) received an update on the following topics:

- Status of active courthouse capital projects/studies.
- Recently-completed projects for Siskiyou and Tuolumne courts.
- Revision to the *Judicial Branch Capital Program Management Manual*.

Ms. Pella McCormick presented this item consistent with the materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20211109-materials.pdf.

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

Item 2

Capital Program Updates (No Action – Information Only)

Summary: The CFAC received an update on the following capital program topics:

- Courthouse of the Future.
- Touchpoints during the Design-Build Delivery Method.

Consistent with the materials for Item 2 of the agenda/Tab 3 that were posted online for public viewing of in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20211109-materials.pdf, Mr. Jagan Singh presented slides 15–27 and 30–43 and Ms. Pella McCormick presented slides 28–29.

Moreover, the following statements were made:

For the Courthouse of the Future:

- The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) is looking at what can be considered as a hybrid courtroom environment, which can include different options and implications for facility space needs as shown in the chart on presentation Slide 17:
 - Option 1 – Judicial officers/staff in person and all others remote.
 - Option 2 – Judicial officers/staff/counsel in person and all others remote.
 - Option 3 – Judicial officers/staff/counsel in person and limited number of others that can attend in person.
- The NCSC’s study is to be released sometime next year.

For the touchpoints during the Design-Build Delivery Method:

- The advisory committee was reminded that at its meeting in February 2020 (under Info. Item 1 of the agenda/Tab 5 of the meeting materials available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-200205-materials.pdf), steps were outlined/benefits discussed for the courthouse construction program to transition from its predominant delivery method of construction manager at risk (CMAR) to design-build.
- Slide 30 outlines the advisory committee’s review touchpoints as follows:

Capital Project Touchpoint	Design-Build Review
Pre-site Acquisition	Committee Presentation
Performance Criteria Development	Committee Presentation
100% Schematic Design	Committee Presentation
50% Design Development	No Review Required
100% Design Development	Written Report Only

- Slide 30 provides a flow chart of the design-build process including the advisory committee’s review touchpoints (listed in the chart above).
- In terms of building materials, exterior finishes are typically determined at the level of schematic design and interior finishes are typically determined at design development.
- Post-occupancy evaluations are not part of the design-build entity’s responsibility and will be completed by Judicial Council Facilities Services’ Quality Compliance Unit.

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 business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Approved by the advisory body on February 7, 2022.