

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

<b>Requesting Entity</b>	Court Facilities Advisory Committee
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse - Chatsworth Buildout
-----------------------	--

**Proposal Summary**

The Judicial Council of California requests \$34.8 million in one-time General Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 for the Construction phase of the buildout of six courtrooms, support space, and upgraded holding facilities at the Chatsworth Courthouse for relocating six courtrooms and associated operations from the Spring Street Courthouse in the County of Los Angeles. A total request of \$41.1 million for the total cost of the project is proposed over two fiscal years, based on \$6.3 million for the project’s first two phases (Preliminary Plans and Working Drawings) included in the Governor’s proposed budget for FY 2026–27. The total project cost of \$41.1 million would be requested in FY 2027–28 if funding is not included in the Budget Act of 2026 (FY 2026–27). This funding request is necessary due to the of federal government’s planned divestment of the Spring Street building, which the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is leasing in the Civic Center area of downtown Los Angeles.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed fund source: General Fund

**Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) \***

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>2027-28 (BY)</b>	<b>2028-29 (BY+1)</b>	<b>2029-30 (BY+2)</b>	<b>2030-31 (BY+3)</b>	<b>2031-32 (BY+4)</b>
<b>Capital Outlay</b>	\$34,847,000	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	\$34,847,000	0	0	0	0
One-time	\$34,847,000	0		0	0
Ongoing	0	0	0	0	0

\*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

**Problem or Issue**

The Judicial Council was informed by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), that the federal government is divesting from the building that is currently housing the Spring Street Courthouse in downtown Los Angeles and that the lease for the superior court, which expires on December 31, 2028, will not be extended. This request is necessary to build out and relocate 6 of the existing 24 courtrooms and operations to the Chatsworth Courthouse. Of the remaining 18 existing courtrooms, only 17 courtrooms

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

require relocation across six court districts in 9 existing courthouses, which is a separate project included for funding in the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2026–27.

The Judicial Council is obligated to ensure continued equal access to justice by relocating the superior court's courtrooms and operations from the Spring Street Courthouse prior to the end of the lease expiration. However, this obligation is challenged by significant financial constraints. The facility's large number of courtrooms and the scale of its operations require substantial resources, which exceed the current funds of the statewide facility modification program.

To ensure the buildout of six courtrooms is ready to accommodate all six existing judicial officers with assigned caseload by December 2028, it is essential \$34.8 million in funds for Construction are encumbered in FY 2027–28 for maintaining a schedule that assumes approximately one year for design and bid/award and one year for construction/move-in.

The superior court faces a significant challenge in moving from the Spring Street Courthouse, as there are six court departments with assigned civil caseload that require relocation. In addition, upgrading the existing Chatsworth Courthouse holding facilities addresses the current deficiency that disallows criminal case matters originating in the superior court's North Valley District from being heard in the Chatsworth Courthouse. These matters are currently heard outside the district at the Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center (located in the Central District). The Chatsworth Courthouse will remain indefinitely in the Judicial Council's portfolio to provide public service, investing in this facility helps further the longevity of these assets, ensuring safety and access to justice.

### **Background/History of Problem**

The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is one of the primary tenants of the federally owned building at 312 North Spring Street in the civic center area of downtown Los Angeles. Other building tenants include the U.S. Attorney, U.S. Small Business Administration, National Labor Relations Board, and GSA field office. The court's lease is for a portion of the building's space, which is approximately 202,000 square feet, to operate a 24-courtroom, civil courthouse, known as the Spring Street Courthouse. This courthouse's courtrooms hear a variety of civil case types organized by complex litigation, personal injury, independent calendar, limited civil, and civil trials.

The Superior Court of Los Angeles County is divided into 12 districts (Central, East, West, North, North Central, North Valley, Northeast, Northwest, South, South Central, Southeast, and Southwest) with full-service operations in all litigation types, except for juvenile dependency, probate, and mental health in each district. Administrative functions and certain civil case types are centralized and headquartered in the Central District in the civic center of downtown Los Angeles, and optional venue filing rules place a disproportionate amount of the family, civil, and criminal case load in the Central District. Caseload originating within each district is assigned to one or more courthouses in the district, except as just noted. Each district should have the capacity to address the caseload that originates in that district (but allowing for the extra burdens placed on the Central District for certain cases countywide).

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

---

**Impact of Denial of Proposal**

Timely access to justice for all Californians is a judicial branch priority. Without relocating the court departments and judicial officers currently serving at the Spring Street Courthouse to adequate courtrooms within existing superior courthouses, court users will need to wait longer to have their civil case assigned to a judicial officer, to receive a judgment, or to have their matter resolved.

**Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal**

Upon approval of this budget proposal, Judicial Council Facilities Services will be able to fund this buildout to accommodate the Spring Street Courthouse court departments and judicial officers in six existing courtrooms within the Chatsworth Courthouse. These six existing court departments will be accommodated to maintain service to the public within the court's North Valley District. The outcome of this proposed capital outlay project will be reliable, safe, and improved courtrooms, support space, and upgraded holding facilities that ensure the efficient utilization of the judicial resources for the public's access to timely justice. The proposal ensures a fiscally responsible approach that minimizes adverse impacts on the court's program and operations, while leveraging an existing courthouse building to accommodate judicial officers and support staff.

This capital outlay project will be accountable through the Court Facilities Advisory Committee and will follow the established policy and procedures for approval and commitment of funds. The Judicial Council provides reporting to the Legislature on the expenses related to the capital outlay program.

This funding request advances the diversity, equity, and inclusion priorities of the Administration by ensuring that residents from every California county have access to buildings that are designed, built, and maintained according to standards (such as the federal Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Building Code) that ensure full access by all individuals regardless of their abilities. The essence of the 2002 enabling legislation of the judicial branch's facilities program is equity across the state, and the goals of uniformly safe, secure, and well-maintained facilities remain the same.

**Required Review/Approval**

Court Facilities Advisory Committee  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations**

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Goal II: Independence and Accountability  
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  
Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence  
Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

---

**Approval**

*I certify that I have reviewed this concept and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.*

**Director Signature:** *Tamer Ahmed*

**Contact Name:** Jagan Singh

DRAFT

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

<b>Requesting Entity</b>	Court Facilities Advisory Committee
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	Capital Outlay Project Reassessment and Program Support
-----------------------	---

**Proposal Summary**

The Judicial Council of California requests 3.0 positions and \$13.7 million General Fund in (FY) fiscal year 2027–28 and \$4.6 million ongoing beginning in FY 2028–29 to provide court facilities planning services and oversight for facility modifications and capital projects.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed fund source: General Fund

**Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) \***

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>2027-28 (BY)</b>	<b>2028-29 (BY+1)</b>	<b>2029-30 (BY+2)</b>	<b>2030-31 (BY+3)</b>	<b>2031-32 (BY+4)</b>
<b>Positions</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Personal Services</b>	\$755,000	\$714,000	\$714,000	\$714,000	\$714,000
<b>Operating Expenses &amp; Equipment</b>	\$12,900,000	\$3,900,000	\$3,900,000	\$3,900,000	\$3,900,000
<b>Total</b>	\$13,655,000	\$4,614,000	\$4,614,000	\$4,614,000	\$4,614,000
One-time	\$9,000,000	0	0	0	0
Ongoing	\$4,655,000	\$4,614,000	\$4,614,000	\$4,614,000	\$4,614,000

\*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

**Problem or Issue**

The Judicial Council lacks sufficient resources to support critical court facilities planning for facility modifications and capital projects, and expansion services to focus on strengthening court facilities planning and management to support new judgeships, capital projects, and infrastructure sustainability.

Key areas of need include program management consultants, and the implementation of a web-based project management tool for capital projects. Additional funding is also needed for providing staffing to oversee the facilities program and prioritize capital projects.

The proposal includes one-time funding of \$9 million to begin a reassessment of capital projects, with target completion in 2029 This reassessment will include facility condition assessments (FCAs) to identify

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

the capital reserves for infrastructure lifecycle repair and replacement needs over the ten-year lifecycle. The FCA projections become the basis for the Facility Condition Index, which is an integral component of the capital project scoring methodology.

To support these efforts, the proposal includes 3.0 positions to provide appropriate facilities program support: 1.0 Senior Project Manager, 1.0 Project Manager, and 1.0 Senior Facilities Analyst. These positions will provide necessary support for managing capital projects and ensuring compliance with environmental and safety regulations.

**Background/History of Problem**

In 2002, California shifted responsibility for courthouse funding and operation from counties to the state under the Trial Court Facilities Act (Sen. Bill 1732; Stats. 2002, ch. 1082). Since then, the Judicial Council has worked to address space shortages, antiquated facilities, and infrastructure needs. Since 2002, 32 trial court capital outlay projects have been completed: 28 new courthouses and four major renovations of existing buildings. Of the state's 58 trial courts, 28 benefit from these completed projects. Another six capital projects are projected to complete by the end of 2026.

In 2019, a reassessment of all unfunded projects was required by Government Code section 70371.9, producing the council's *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*. This list of 80 projects impacts 41 trial courts and approximately 165 facilities that represent more than one-third of the judicial branch's real estate portfolio. Since this list was developed in 2019, only a total of 12 of the 80 projects have received initial funding and are underway.

In addition to new construction, the Judicial Council manages approximately 430 facilities statewide, many over 50 years old. Facility modifications are necessary to ensure the facilities meet modern operational needs, including technology for hybrid and remote access to justice. Larger and more complex capital renewal projects are necessary to maintain infrastructure and support court operations. The usefulness of the existing portfolio requires more investigation and study to develop budget packages that fully describe and anticipate the project scope, cost, and schedule.

To effectively manage and prioritize these projects, the Judicial Council requires updated systems and new staffing resources.

**Impact of Denial of Proposal**

Delay in facilities program funding affects advancement of the Judicial Council's programs of court facilities planning, facility modifications, and capital projects that correct or replace court facilities with deficiencies hindering service to the public. Each project that becomes fully funded and completed expands the public's physical, remote, and equal access to the courts.

Deficiencies hindering service not only impact public access to the courts but also pose risks to court staff working in inadequate facilities. Many court buildings are outdated, with aging infrastructure that may not meet modern safety, accessibility, or operational standards. Delays in facility modifications and capital renewal projects can lead to structural deficiencies, insufficient workspace, and inadequate environmental

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

controls, creating potential hazards for judicial officers, court employees, and the public. Without adequate funding to address these facility deficiencies, court staff are at greater risk of working in unsafe or substandard conditions, ultimately affecting the judiciary's ability to provide essential services effectively.

**Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal**

The Judicial Council will be able to advance its programs of court facilities planning, facility modifications, and capital projects, supporting the completion of planning studies, adding a consultant for program management services, implementing a web-based project management tool, adding staff needed to provide oversight and coordination of various aspects of the facilities program, and preparing for another reassessment of capital projects.

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee provides ongoing oversight of capital projects in the Judicial Council's five-year infrastructure plan and courthouse construction program.

This funding request advances the diversity, equity, and inclusion priorities of the Administration by ensuring that residents from every California county have access to buildings that are designed, built, and maintained according to standards (such as the federal Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Building Code) that ensure full access by all individuals regardless of their abilities. The essence of the 2002 enabling legislation of the judicial branch's facilities program is equity across the state, and the goals of uniformly safe, secure, and well-maintained facilities remain the same.

**Required Review/Approval**

Court Facilities Advisory Committee  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations**

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Goal II: Independence and Accountability  
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  
Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence  
Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

**Approval**

*I certify that I have reviewed this concept and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.*

Director Signature: *Tamer Ahmed*

Contact Name: Jagan Singh

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

<b>Requesting Entity</b>	Court Facilities Advisory Committee
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	Statewide: Budget Packages and Advanced Planning
-----------------------	--

**Proposal Summary**

The Judicial Council of California requests \$500,000 ongoing General Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 for statewide planning and studies. The proposed funding will allow the completion of planning studies and budget packages for capital outlay projects. The planning studies will inform and validate scope, schedule, and budget for projects by developing budget packages, assessing the number of courtrooms needed, and supporting preliminary site searches.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed fund source: General Fund

**Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) \***

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>2027-28 (BY)</b>	<b>2028-29 (BY+1)</b>	<b>2029-30 (BY+2)</b>	<b>2030-31 (BY+3)</b>	<b>2031-32 (BY+4)</b>
<b>Capital Outlay</b>	\$500,000	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	\$500,000	0	0	0	0
One-time	0	0		0	0
Ongoing	\$500,000	0	0	0	0

\*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

**Problem or Issue**

The Judicial Council does not have a dedicated funding source for planning studies. As court operations and services are always evolving, planning studies are an important resource for evaluating how these changes affect project scopes, schedules, and budgets. A court may need to consolidate operations from multiple locations, provide new services such as public lactation facilities, or accommodate space for future new judgeships and support staff. Planning studies are also important for identifying preliminary site search areas, including test fits of possible site sizes to determine whether the estimated building footprint and parking needs can function within the site's boundaries. When developing a Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposal (COBCP), the Judicial Council uses court construction cost data from completed projects to determine the budget for future projects. However, each project is different and depending on the unique



**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

set of circumstances may require analysis of potential site locations, utility improvements, swing space, and the effect on other facilities court operations and service to the public.

**Background/History of Problem**

The number of studies the Judicial Council has been able to perform has been limited, paid for by the courts or funded through the state budget process. Not every court can afford a planning study. The requested ongoing funding is based on analysis of the actual cost of the completed studies and the experience and knowledge of council staff. Examples of in-progress/recently completed planning studies include:

1. *New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse Feasibility Study* (in progress/referenced during the September 25, 2025, Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) meeting).
2. *Los Angeles Superior Court Long-Range Planning Study*, which is available at [courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/los-angeles-planning-study.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/los-angeles-planning-study.pdf).
3. *New San Francisco Hall of Justice Feasibility Study*, which is available at [courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20240625-materials.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20240625-materials.pdf) (under Tab 03B of the June 25, 2024, CFAC meeting materials).
4. *New Nevada City Courthouse Planning Study*, which is available at [courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/facilities\\_nevada\\_planning\\_study.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/facilities_nevada_planning_study.pdf).
5. *Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District: New Courthouse Feasibility Study*, which is available at [courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20220617-materials.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20220617-materials.pdf) (under Tab 03A of the June 17, 2022, CFAC meeting materials).
6. *Placer Tahoe Courthouse Study at Tahoe Justice Complex*, which is available at [courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20230322-materials.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/cfac-20230322-materials.pdf) (under Tab 03B of the March 22, 2023, CFAC meeting materials).

**Impact of Denial of Proposal**

Denial of this proposal would result in only trial and appellate courts that can afford studies benefiting their COBCPs and budget packages. Also, certain projects could become more costly without comparison of different project options, preparation of detailed space programs, and testing of site feasibility or without planning for space for new judgeships and support staff in new or existing buildings.

**Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal**

Upon approval of this budget proposal, Judicial Council Facilities Services will be able to do the following:

1. Improve how a capital outlay project's scope, schedule, and budget are defined to assist COBCP preparation.
2. Compare different project options such as new construction or renovation.

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

3. Develop detailed space programs.
4. Evaluate the feasibility of phased construction and swing space options.
5. Test proposed sizes of new buildings to inform site acquisition acreage requests.
6. Plan for accommodating space for new judgeships and support staff in new or existing buildings (comparing costs of construction to long-term leases), which may also affect projects within the Judicial Council's *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* and the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*.
7. Plan for project scope changes (e.g., from new construction to renovation) as directed by the CFAC.

Candidate study projects would be selected based on complexity, such as complex construction due to urban settings, swing space evaluation, determination of utility availability, and phased construction. There are many complex capital projects in the council's statewide list and five-year plan.

Planning studies and budget packages for capital outlay projects are accountable through the CFAC and will follow the established policy and procedures for approval and commitment of funds. The Judicial Council makes such budget packages and studies available to the Legislature.

Primary drivers of court facility need include providing a safe and secure facility, improving poor functional conditions, addressing inadequate physical conditions including seismically deficient facilities, and expanding the public's physical, remote, and equal access to the courts. This funding request also advances the diversity, equity, and inclusion priorities of the Administration by ensuring that residents from every California county have access to buildings that are designed, built, and maintained according to standards (such as the federal Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Building Code) that ensure full access by all individuals regardless of their abilities. The essence of the 2002 enabling legislation of the judicial branch's facilities program is equity across the state, and the goals of uniformly safe, secure, and well-maintained facilities remain the same.

**Required Review/Approval**

Court Facilities Advisory Committee  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations**

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Goal II: Independence and Accountability  
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  
Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence  
Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

---

**Approval**

*I certify that I have reviewed this concept and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.*

**Director Signature:** *Tamer Ahmed*

**Contact Name:** Jagan Singh

DRAFT

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

<b>Requesting Entity</b>	Court Facilities Advisory Committee
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	Capital Outlay Funding: Fiscal Year 2027–28 through 2031–32
-----------------------	---

**Proposal Summary**

The Judicial Council of California requests \$27 million General Fund and \$1.438 billion Public Buildings Construction Fund one-time totaling \$1.5 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 for eight capital outlay projects, including four new and four continuing projects. A total request of \$4.2 billion is proposed over five years of initial and/or continuing phases for 21 capital projects. This request is estimated based on the projects in the Judicial Council’s latest plan for capital outlay but adjusted on the assumption that the funding for the three project phases supported in the Governor’s proposed budget for FY 2026–27 will be included in the Budget Act of 2026. Page 4 presents the draft projects table titled *Draft Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*. The CFAC will review any updates to the projects table in March 2026 as well as review a complete draft *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2027–28* in May 2026 for recommendation to the Judicial Council in July 2026.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes ☐ No ☒

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes ☐ No ☒

Proposed fund source: General Fund and Public Buildings Construction Fund

**Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) \***

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>2027-28 (BY)</b>	<b>2028-29 (BY+1)</b>	<b>2029-30 (BY+2)</b>	<b>2030-31 (BY+3)</b>	<b>2031-32 (BY+4)</b>
<b>Capital Outlay</b>	\$1,464,842	\$866,417	\$321,753	\$353,913	\$1,214,981
<b>Total</b>	\$1,464,842	\$866,417	\$321,753	\$353,913	\$1,214,981
One-time	\$1,464,842	\$866,417	\$321,753	\$353,913	\$1,214,981
Ongoing					

\*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

**Problem or Issue**

The Judicial Council courthouse construction program funding request is based on the projects outlined in the council’s latest plan for capital outlay. However, it is adjusted under the assumption that the funding for the three project phases supported in the Governor’s proposed budget for FY 2026–27 will be included in the Budget Act of 2026. The capital outlay plan will be updated once the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2027–28* has been approved by the CFAC and the Judicial Council. The five-year infrastructure plan is updated annually for Judicial Council adoption.

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

This plan represents the funding priority for projects in the Judicial Council's *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* and five-year infrastructure plans for trial and appellate court facilities. Primary drivers of court facility needs include providing safe and secure facilities, improving poor functional conditions, addressing inadequate physical conditions including seismically deficient facilities, and expanding the public's physical, remote, and equal access to the courts. For smaller projects in the range of 1–4 courtrooms, the CFAC aims to reduce their cost per courtroom and lessen their risk from being skipped over for funding by the Governor for larger projects with more economical costs per courtroom.

**Background/History of Problem**

In 2002, the responsibility of California's courthouses funding and operation shifted from the counties to the state under the Trial Court Facilities Act (Sen. Bill 1732, Stats. 2002, Ch. 1082). With this shift, the Judicial Council began to address the shortage of space, antiquated facilities, and inadequate infrastructure that threaten the ability of the justice system to accommodate the needs of residents and businesses. Addressing the state's aging and deficient court buildings requires substantial long-term funding to renovate, replace, and create new court facilities. Since 2002, 32 trial court capital outlay projects have been completed: 28 new courthouses and four major renovations of existing buildings. Of the state's 58 trial courts, 28 benefit from these completed projects. Another six capital projects are projected to complete by the end of 2026.

The need to renovate or replace trial court facilities statewide is reflected in the Judicial Council's *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*. This list contains 80 projects affecting 41 trial courts and approximately 165 facilities, which represent more than one-third of the facilities in the judicial branch's real estate portfolio. (The other 17 trial courts had operational needs that translated into noncapital projects, such as facility modifications addressed under a separate program.) Government Code section 70371.9 required the Judicial Council to conduct a reassessment of all trial court capital outlay projects that had not been fully funded up to and through the Budget Act of 2018 (FY 2018–19). Through this reassessment and with trial court input, this list was produced. Since this list was developed in 2019, 12 of the 80 projects have received initial funding and are underway.

**Impact of Denial of Proposal**

Delay in capital outlay funding postpones advancement of the Judicial Council's five-year infrastructure plan and the funding of capital projects from the Judicial Council's *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*. Funding delays inhibit the Judicial Council's ability to replace or renovate a significant portion of the facilities in the judicial branch's real estate portfolio. This causes trial courts to continue to operate from facilities with deficiencies that hinder service to the public.

**Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal**

The CFAC provides ongoing oversight of the Judicial Council's five-year infrastructure plan and courthouse construction program. If the funding for the three project phases in the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2026–27 is included in the Budget Act of 2026 (FY 2026–27), then the courthouse construction program would advance as follows: one active project (New San Luis Obispo Courthouse) would advance, becoming fully funded to complete design-build and removed from the five-year plan, and two active projects (New Nevada City and New Quincy courthouses) would advance to develop

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

performance criteria. Each project that becomes fully funded and completed expands the public's physical, remote, and equal access to the courts.

This funding request advances the diversity, equity, and inclusion priorities of the Administration by ensuring that residents from every California county have access to buildings that are designed, built, and maintained according to standards (such as the federal Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Building Code) that ensure full access by all individuals regardless of their abilities. The essence of the 2002 enabling legislation of the judicial branch's facilities program is equity across the state, and the goals of uniformly safe, secure, and well-maintained facilities remain the same.

**Required Review/Approval**

Court Facilities Advisory Committee  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations**

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion  
Goal II: Independence and Accountability  
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public  
Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence  
Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

**Approval**

*I certify that I have reviewed this concept and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.*

Director Signature: *Tamer Ahmed*

Contact Name: Jagan Singh

Tracking  
Number:

**Judicial Branch**  
**2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept**  
**(4 Page Maximum Length)**

**January 2026 Court Facilities Advisory Committee Action**  
**DRAFT Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects<sup>1</sup>**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

			1		2		3		4		5	
County	Project Name	Courtrooms	FY 2027–28		FY 2028–29		FY 2029–30		FY 2030–31		FY 2031–32	
BY 1 Continuation	Nevada	New Nevada City Courthouse	6	\$ 195,583	B							
	Solano	New Solano Hall of Justice (Fairfield)	12	\$ 316,779	B							
	Fresno	New Fresno Courthouse	36	\$ 925,288	B							
	Los Angeles	New Santa Clarita Courthouse	24	\$ 12,460	D	\$ 627,033	B					
BY 1 Starts	Lake	Clearlake Courthouse Renovation	1	\$ 1,107	P	\$ 1,605	W	\$ 21,845	C			
	San Joaquin	New Tracy Courthouse	2	\$ 3,503	D	\$ 65,854	B					
	Kern	New East County Courthouse	3	\$ 4,765	AS			\$ 1,643	D	\$ 64,014	B	
	Placer	Tahoe Courthouse Renovation	1	\$ 5,357	AS			\$ 1,082	D	\$ 17,540	B	
BY 2 Cont.	Plumas	New Quincy Courthouse	2			\$ 69,598	B					
BY 2 Starts	Contra Costa	New Richmond Courthouse	6			\$ 19,846	AS			\$ 2,580	D	\$ 208,069
	San Francisco	New San Francisco Hall of Justice	24			\$ 67,230	AS			\$ 14,972	D	\$ 800,828
	Orange	New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse	4			\$ 15,251	AS			\$ 1,595	D	\$ 113,313
BY 3 Starts	Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	8					\$ 11,528	D	\$ 235,614	B	
	Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (Mosk Replacement)	100					\$ 276,479	AS			\$ 49,148
	El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	6					\$ 9,176	AS			\$ 2,973
BY 4 Starts	Fresno	Fresno Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse Renovation	2							\$ 1,333	PW	\$ 8,798
	Inyo	New Inyo County Courthouse	2							\$ 4,125	AS	
	San Bernardino	New Victorville Courthouse	31							\$ 12,140	AS	
BY 5 Starts	Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	2									\$ 3,570
	Santa Cruz	New Santa Cruz Courthouse	9									\$ 11,801
	San Diego	New San Diego Juvenile Courthouse	10									\$ 16,481
		<b>Totals</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>\$ 1,464,842</b>		<b>\$ 866,417</b>		<b>\$ 321,753</b>		<b>\$ 353,913</b>		<b>\$ 1,214,981</b>

**Table Footnote:**

- Estimated project phase costs do not include construction cost escalation from May 2025 to April 2026. Costs will be updated in the final version of the five-year plan.

**Table Legend:**

BY = Budget Year; S = Study; A = Acquisition; P = Preliminary Plans; W = Working Drawings; C = Construction; D = Performance Criteria; B = Design-Build