



Judicial Council of California

Court Facilities Advisory Committee

<https://courts.ca.gov/advisory-body/court-facilities-advisory-committee>
cfac@jud.ca.gov

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 5, 2024

12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

Public Videocast

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)
Hon. Patricia L. Kelly
Ms. Krista LeVier
Hon. Elaine Lu
Ms. Kyria Martinez
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Mr. Lee Seale
Hon. Sergio C. Tapia II
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.
Hon. Eric J. Wersching

Advisory Body Members Absent: None

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

Hon. Mary J. Greenwood, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District
Mr. Baltazar Vazquez, Clerk/Executive Officer, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District
Ms. Marina Meyere, Managing Attorney, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District
Mr. Peter Birkholz, Principal, Page & Turnbull

Hon. S. Robert Tice-Raskin, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Nevada County
Ms. Laila Waheed, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Nevada County
Mr. Alan Bright, Senior Design Principal, HOK

Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Kim Bobic, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Robert Carlson, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Jack Collins, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Alisha Dutta, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Zulqar Helal, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Pella McCormick, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Harry O'Hagin, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Erin Stagg, Attorney II, Judicial Council Legal Services
Ms. Maggie Stern, Attorney II, Judicial Council Legal Services
Ms. Peggy Symons, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Sadie Varela, Facilities Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m., roll was taken, and opening remarks were made. Judge Elaine Lu and Ms. Kyria Martinez were welcomed as new members of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC).

Public Videocast

A live videocast of the meeting was made available to the public through the advisory body web page on the California Courts website listed above.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory committee voted—with abstentions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—to approve the minutes of the CFAC meeting held on August 9, 2024. (*Motion: Warwick; Second: Orozco*)

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–2)

Item 1

New Sixth Appellate District Courthouse: Performance Criteria Review including 100 Percent Schematic Design

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation of the capital project’s Performance Criteria including 100 Percent Schematic Design as performance criteria bridging documents, which was a scheduled milestone review.

Administrative Presiding Justice Mary J. Greenwood of the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District provided opening remarks by thanking Judicial Council staff and the project team as well as the CFAC for assisting the court with its space needs given the level of interest shown by technology companies in its current location and the amount of new development and redevelopment—for private commercial and residential space but not for government space—taking place within the court’s immediate neighborhood and within the downtown area. She expressed her gratitude for project reusing an existing state-owned property, eliminating future lease costs, locating the future new courthouse in a place of dignity and graciousness, which is the city of Sunnyvale’s civic center, and being moved forward to this point in the schedule for the CFAC’s review of the performance criteria milestone.

Consistent with the materials (Tabs 3A–B for agenda Item 1), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20241105-materials_1.pdf, Ms. Kim Bobic introduced this item and presented slides 1–10 and 24–26, and Mr. Peter Birkholz presented slides 11–23.

Action: The advisory committee—with the abstentions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

1. To approve the project's Performance Criteria including 100% Schematic Design to proceed to the state Department of Finance and State Public Works Board (SPWB) for approval and proceed with the project's Request for Qualifications for Design-Build Entity (DBE) and Request for Proposal for DBE.

(Motion: Byrd; Second: Tapia)

Item 2

Nevada – New Nevada City Courthouse: Site Selection Review

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation of the capital project's Site Selection, which was a scheduled milestone review and included both the preferred USDA Forestry Service Office and alternate Cement Hill Road sites in Nevada City.

Presiding Judge S. Robert Tice-Raskin of the Superior Court of Nevada County provided opening remarks that the members of the superior court's bench are pleased the plans for the new courthouse are well underway, as the Judicial Council understands the critical need for a new courthouse to provide the Nevada County community with a state-of-the-art justice center given the existing courthouse is well past its prime. He expressed thanks and gratitude to everyone participating in this collaborative public works project, noting the thoughtful feedback received from the scores of Nevada County community members, who sent letters, email, and petitions to the superior court and to the CFAC. He stated that all input will always be welcome as part of this important process. He expressed his gratitude to the community members who have participated in the project's local Project Advisory Group, as they have provided invaluable information to Judicial Council staff and the criteria architect. He thanked Judicial Council staff, the criteria architect, and all professionals involved for the extensive hours to prepare a comprehensive and objective analysis of the various potential options for siting the new courthouse project. He also expressed his gratitude for the project being moved forward to this point in the schedule for the CFAC's review of the site selection milestone and asked that the committee take action today to help advance the project as expeditiously as possible.

Consistent with the materials (Tabs 4A–B for agenda Item 2), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20241105-materials_1.pdf, Ms. Alisha Dutta introduced this item and presented slides 1–8 and 17–18, and Mr. Alan Bright presented slides 9–16.

In addition, the following comments were made:

1. Presiding Judge Tice-Raskin indicated that members of the public have asked why there must be preferred and alternate sites identified for the project instead of single site, and he asked if the Judicial Council's position could be explained for the benefit all listening in on/watching the meeting. In response, Ms Pella McCormick indicated that the California Environmental Quality Act process for capital projects requires the evaluation of two sites—a preferred site and an alternate site—for projects to move forward for review by the SPWB.

2. Offsite, hillside views into the planned secure parking area of the preferred USDA Forestry Service Office site should be studied for consideration of mitigation when the project proceeds into design.

Action: The advisory committee—with the abstentions of judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

1. Approve the project’s site selection of the preferred and alternate sites to proceed to SPWB for approval and the project’s return for future review and approval of site acquisition, conditioned that Judicial Council staff share the public comments received on this item (Tabs 4C–F for agenda Item 2) with SPWB for their benefit of understanding the concerns expressed and need for the preferred site.

(Motion: Highberger; Second: Wersching)

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on March 12, 2025.