Meeting Materials for the

Court Facilities Advisory Committee

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING

NOVEMBER 4, 2026

Judicial Council *of* California

Court Facilities Advisory Committee

Court Facilities Advisory Committee
Open Public Meeting via Videoconference

November 4, 2026

CONTENTS

1	Agenda
	OPEN MEETING MATERIALS:
2	Draft CFAC Meeting Minutes: ➢ August 31, 2026
3	Director's Report: ➢ PowerPoint Slides
4	Draft Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects: ➢ PowerPoint Slides ➢ Draft Report to the Legislature
5	Draft Capital Outlay-Related Budget Change Concepts (BCCs) for Fiscal Year 2028–2029: ➢ PowerPoint Slides ➢ Four Draft BCCs
6	Court Facilities Advisory Committee Roster

Judicial Council *of* California

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN ELECTRONIC MEETING

November 4, 2026

4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Public Access: Join the Committee Meeting

Open to the public unless indicated as closed (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c), (d), and (e)(1)).

Meeting materials for open portions of the meeting will be posted on the Court Facilities Advisory Committee webpage on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Request for ADA accommodations should be made at least three business days before the meeting and directed to: JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the open meeting portion of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be emailed to cfac@jud.ca.gov.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the August 31, 2026, Court Facilities Advisory Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K))

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means. As such, the public may make comments in writing, in person, or remotely.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be emailed to or mailed or delivered to 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Chris Magnusson. Only written comments received by 4:00 PM on November 3, 2026, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

Remote Public Comment
Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must provide the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address. Requests to make a remote public comment must be received by 4:00 PM on November 3, 2026, via email to cfac@jud.ca.gov. The chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all individuals requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

III. Discussion and Possible Action Items (Items 1–3)

Item 1
Director's Report (No Action Required – Information Only)

Discussion of issues affecting the judicial branch courthouse construction program.

Presenter: Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services

Item 2
Draft Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects (Action Required)

Review of a mandated report to the Legislature by January 10, 2027, on a roadmap to accelerate and streamline courthouse construction projects. The committee's review of this draft report is in advance of its consideration by the Judicial Council at its upcoming meeting in December 2026.

Presenter: Mr. Jagan Singh, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services

Item 3
Draft Capital Outlay-Related Budget Change Concepts for Fiscal Year 2028–2029 (Action Required)

Review of capital outlay-related 2028–29 Budget Change Concepts (BCCs) on projects reassessment and program support; budget packages and advanced planning; funding for fiscal years 2028–29 through 2032–33; and construction funding for the build out of shelled space in the Chatsworth Courthouse in Los Angeles County. The committee's review of these draft BCCs is in advance of their consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee at its upcoming meeting in February 2027.

Presenters: Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Judicial Council Facilities Services

IV. Adjournment

Adjourn

Judicial Council *of* California

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING (DRAFT)

August 31, 2026

12:00 p.m. – 1:20 p.m.

Public Videocast for Open Meeting

Members Present: Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Hon. Eric J. Wersching, Vice-Chair
Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.
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.)
Hon. Lisa M. Rogan
Hon. Sergio C. Tapia II
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Hon. Tana L. Coates, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County
Mr. Michael Powell, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County

Ms. Katy Grant, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Monterey County
Mr. Darrell Lee, Project Manager, Hensel Phelps
Mr. Sean McGreal, Principal ZGF Architects
Mr. John Petty, Operations Manager, Hensel Phelps

Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Kim Bobic, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Robert Carlson, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Zulqar Helal, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Satyendra Jenamani, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Gunther Kastenholz, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Kristin Kerr, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services
Mr. James Koerner, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Harry O'Hagin, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Deepika Padam, Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Troy Pennington, Architect, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Sadie Price, Facilities Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Akilah Robinson, Associate Analyst, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Laine Rugen, Senior Project Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Ms. Erika Sperbeck, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council Executive Office
Ms. Maggie Stern, Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services
Ms. Nirlip Syan, Attorney, Judicial Council Legal Services
Ms. Peggy Symons, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Facilities Services

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the open meeting to order at 12:00 p.m., roll was taken, and opening remarks were made.

Public Videocast

A live videocast of the open meeting was made available to the public through the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) web page on the California Courts website.

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 May 29, 2026. *(Motion: Kelly; Second: Tapia)*.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–3)

Item 1

Monterey – New Fort Ord Courthouse: 100 Percent Schematic Design Review

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation of the completed 100 percent Schematic Design of the Monterey–New Fort Ord Courthouse project located in city of Seaside. This presentation was a scheduled project milestone review. Mr. Gunther Kastenholz introduced this item and presented slides 1–3, Mr. Sean McGreal presented slides 4–31, and Mr. Darrell Lee presented slides 32–35 consistent with the materials (Tabs 3A–B for agenda Item 1), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting.

In addition, the following comments were made:

- On the first floor, a jury deliberation room was included for the courthouse's future flexibility in caseload should a jury box be added to the courtroom for civil trials.
- The building's exterior skin includes hand-laid bricks for durability because of the marine environment and for cost effectiveness within the project budget compared to a decorative precast product.
- Deviations to the facilities standards include smaller holding cores owing to the limited number of in-custody defendants and two additional seats (from 14 to 16 seats) in the jury boxes of the large/standard civil courtrooms.
- The project does not include a basement owing to the site's high water table nor wood on the exterior because of the marine environment. The performance criteria specifies exterior materials, such as aluminum panels, to be resilient to the marine environment air.

Action: The advisory committee—with 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 completed 100 percent Schematic Design and to proceed with Design Development. (*Motion: Highberger; Second: Orozco)*

Item 2
San Luis Obispo – New San Luis Obispo Courthouse: Site Acquisition Review

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation of the site acquisition of the San Luis Obispo–New San Luis Obispo Courthouse project located in the city of San Luis Obispo. This presentation was a scheduled project milestone review.

Previously at its public meeting in June 2023, the CFAC reviewed and approved the site selection for the 1.4-acre Kimball Property site in downtown San Luis Obispo. The project site is across the street (Santa Rosa Street) from the existing main courthouse. As required, Judicial Council Facilities Services returned to present site acquisition details for direction prior to requesting State Public Works Board (SPWB) review and approval.

Presiding Judge Tana L. Coates, of the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County, expressed her gratitude for the new courthouse being planned in proximity to the existing courthouse for ensuring the community's access to justice and for all the committee's and Judicial Council staff's work and support on the project.

Ms. Kim Bobic presented this item consistent with the materials (Tabs 4A–B for agenda Item 2), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting.

In addition, the following comment was made:

- Through purchase of the property for the project site, the County of San Luis Obispo will relocate all existing, onsite county staff parking spaces to other locations as determined by the county.

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

1. Recommend this project is submitted to the SPWB for site acquisition approval.

   (Motion: Wersching; Second: Warwick)

Item 3
Update to the California Trial Court Facilities Standards

Summary: The CFAC received a presentation on the draft update to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* for 2026. The update incorporates changes to codes and best management practices since the 2023 edition.

The facilities standards define the minimum space and the functional, technical, and security requirements for the design of new court facilities in the state of California. They reflect best practices and successful solutions as the basis for design and construction of functional, durable, maintainable, efficient, and secure contemporary court facilities. Many of the design criteria and performance standards may be applicable to substantial court renovation projects or building

system upgrades in existing court buildings, buildings shared with other related justice agencies, leased facilities, and tenant improvements.

Judge Eric J. Wersching, CFAC Vice-Chair, introduced the item, and Ms. Deepika Padam presented this item consistent with the materials (Tabs 5A–C for agenda Item 3), which were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting.

Judge Wersching noted that as the Standards provide important guidance to architects and builders, conveying Judicial council expectations with respect to every aspect of courthouse construction, they require revising over time to reflect code updates and incorporate lessons learned from projects. He emphasized savings to the project schedule and budget through the application of the courtroom templates (under the Standards' section titled, *Catalog of Courtroom Layouts for California Trial Courts).* He also recognized efforts made by Judicial Council staff, consultants, Information Technology Advisory Committee leadership and staff, and the CFAC's workgroup to develop the draft update to the Standards.

Ms. Padam indicated the need for publicly posting the draft update to the Standards to collect any comments and returning to the advisory committee to present those comments along with a final draft for a recommendation to present it to the Judicial Council for adoption.

In addition, the following comment was made:

- In new construction projects, electrical panels are sized to account for electric vehicle charging stations and other onsite demands, while when such charging stations or other onsite demands are planned for an existing courthouse site, building electrical panels are assessed to determine whether upgrade is required through a facility modification. Discussion should be had with local utilities for understanding how increasing site power demands should be accommodated through power from the local grid.

Action: The advisory committee—with abstentions of Administrative Presiding Justice Brad R. Hill, who had stepped away temporarily from the meeting, and judges Donald Cole Byrd and William F. Highberger, Ex-Officio non-voting members—voted to approve the following motion:

1. Approve the draft *California Trial Court Facilities Standards, 2026 Edition* for a two-week public comment period and return a final draft to the advisory committee for a review and recommendation to the Judicial Council through an action-by-email.

   (*Motion: Kelly; Second: Lu)*

Adjournment to Closed Education Session

There being no further business, the open meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:20 p.m., and the advisory committee moved to its closed education session.

Approved by the advisory body on _____.

Director’s Report

Update on Placer—Tahoe Courthouse Renovation Project

Court Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting

November 4, 2026

Project Scope

- Acquisition in FY 2026–27.
- Renovate existing building.
- Total Project Cost ~ $24M.



Change in Scope

- Relocate Court into a new shared facility—the New Tahoe Justice Center.
- Placer Court is supporting.
- Requires Legislative approval.

Future Site of the New Tahoe Justice Center



Q & A

Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects

Report to the Legislature

Court Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting

November 4, 2026

Legislative Requirement

Budget Act of 2026 (SB 111), Item 0250-490, Provision 1: Judicial Council, in consultation with DOF, reports a roadmap to accelerate and streamline courthouse construction.

Due on or before January 10, 2027, to the budget subcommittees of each house, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, and the Legislative Analyst's Office.

Report must address:

- Common barriers and potential solutions
- Use of contract or outside project management expertise.
- Pre-planning and acquisition approaches
- Timeline and management of funding phases.
- Potential use of progressive design-build
- Any other approaches to accelerate capital outlay.
- Judicial branch project management capacity and needs.
- Recommendations, including potential statutory changes and resource needs.

How the Roadmap Was Developed

Leadership workshops within Facilities Services to identify recurring barriers across acquisition, design, permitting, and construction.

Review of project records for completed and ongoing projects; time estimates drawn from project master schedules.

Peer agency practices from the Department of General Services (DGS) and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR).

DOF consultation: Department of Finance feedback has been incorporated.

AHJ consultation: SFM, DSA-Accessibility Review, BSCC input captured.

Guiding balance: accelerate delivery while maintaining appropriate oversight, stakeholder engagement, and risk mitigation.

Design-Build Results to Date

Project	County	CR	Budget	Status
New Lakeport Courthouse	Lake	4	$87M	Completed Sept. 2026—one day early, within budget
New Ukiah Courthouse	Mendocino	7	$151M	Projected Oct. 2027—seven months early, within budget
New Sixth Appellate District Courthouse	Santa Clara	1	$92M	On time, within budget; Oct. 2028
New Fort Ord Courthouse	Monterey	7	$167M	Awarded spring 2026; Nov. 2029

Design-build shifts design coordination and error risk to the Design-Build Entity; project teams report more collaborative issue resolution than under CMR.

Recommendations

Judicial Council practices and capacity | Acquisition | Design-Build | Additional approaches

Judicial Council Practices and Capacity

Add project management staff (PMs, Senior PMs, Managers, Principal Manager, support) based on the PM Resource Management Tool workload analysis.

Fund capital outlay planning and studies to strengthen COBCPs and identify site and scope risks earlier.

Assign a project manager in January when a project is proposed in the Governor's Budget, so PAG formation and procurement can start early.

Continue consultant project managers when Judicial Council staff are not available (IDIQ pool).

Evaluate project management practices including communication protocols against DGS, CDCR, and industry best practices.

Review internal operations supporting delivery: funding transactions, procurement, design reviews, permitting, and vendor payments.

Acquisition Phase: Estimated Time Savings

2 months

Streamline Project Advisory Group

6 → 4 months

Form the PAG earlier and engage justice partners and the community sooner to reach site consensus.

5 months

Single annual Performance Criteria Architect procurement

7 → 2 months

Combine all projects in the annual budget into one procurement under existing authority.

Acquisition Phase: CEQA and Site Acquisition

Environmental Review (CEQA)

- Use the level of review CEQA permits—Statutorily or categorically exempt, Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or EIR when necessary—consistent with other state agencies.
- Seek project-specific exemptions for unique circumstances through legislation or the budget process.
- Legislature could consider a statutory CEQA exemption for certain classes of courthouse construction.

Site Acquisition

- Allow purchase options as an additional acquisition method.
- Create a library of standard contract forms.
- Judicial Council and DGS compare processes and forms, and DGS adopts a fixed 45-day review, saving **up to two months**
- Legislature could consider exempting Judicial Council acquisitions from DGS review.

Design-Build Phase and Permitting

Progressive design-build authority, similar to DGS under Public Contract Code §10198 (i) —earlier DBE engagement and streamlined performance criteria.

Access compliance review by the Judicial Council using Certified Access Specialists, in lieu of DSA (as at CDCR)—fewer authorities having jurisdiction.

State Fire Marshal: added or dedicated plan reviewers; delegate fire-rated wall inspection to the Judicial Council Inspector of Record; allow video inspections.

BSCC: prioritize review of courthouse detention areas; train project managers on BSCC standards.

Right-size internal reviews: reassess Building Official Unit reviews under design-build risk transfer; electronic review/permit tracking tool by spring 2027.

Release working-drawing funds at GMP submittal to avoid design pauses (Lakeport and Ukiah lessons learned).

Additional Delivery Methods Listed

Public-Private Partnership

Long-term private financing, delivery, and operation. Used once (George Deukmejian Courthouse, 2013). Complex; requires legislative approval.

Lease-Purchase / Build-to-Suit

Developer designs, builds, and finances; likely costlier than state-funded design-build. An option when capital funding is limited.

Prefabrication and Modular

Off-site fabrication of repeatable spaces. Standardizing modular components could take up to 12 months to study and adopt.

Statutory Changes and Resource Needs

Recommendation	Action Type
Progressive design-build authority (similar to PCC § 10198 (i))	Statutory
Shift access compliance review from DSA to the Judicial Council	Statutory
Project management staffing	Resources (2027–28 BCP)
Capital outlay planning and studies funding	Resources

Report Schedule



CFAC review and recommendation

Judicial Council review and consideration of approval

Statutory deadline

Requested Actions

1. Recommend that the Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects be submitted to the Judicial Council for review and to consider approval for submission to the Legislature.

2. Delegate to the CFAC Chair and Vice-Chair the review and approval of any changes to the report following CFAC approval.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL *of* CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council
HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. STACY BOULWARE EURIE
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. TAMARA L. WOOD
Chair, Rules Committee

VACANT
Chair, Technology Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

Ms. Marta Ann Alcumbrac
Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Charles Crompton
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Mary J. Greenwood
Hon. Ash Kalra
Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo
Mr. Craig M. Peters
Hon. Michael Rhoads
Ms. Dena Stone
Ms. Alekxia Torres Stallings
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg
Hon. Eric J. Wersching

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Hon. Nicole C. Bershon
Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Benjamin J. Cassady
Hon. Rodney A. Cortez
Mr. Chad Finke
Mr. Charles Johnson
Mr. David W. Slayton

MS. MICHELLE CURRAN
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

January 8, 2027

Hon. John Laird
Chair, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
1020 N Street, Room 502
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hon. Jesse Gabriel
Chair, Assembly Committee on Budget
Vice-Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
1021 O Street, Suite 8230
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: *Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects*, as required under provision 1 of section 7, item 0250-490 of Senate Bill 111 (Budget Act of 2026)

Dear Senator Laird and Assembly Member Gabriel:

Under provision 1 of section 7, item 0250-490 of Senate Bill 111 (Budget Act of 2026; Stats. 2026, ch. 21), the Judicial Council, in consultation with the California Department of Finance, is submitting this mandated report, *Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects.*

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Tamer Ahmed, director, Facilities Services, at 916-643-6917 or Tamer.Ahmed@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Michelle Curran
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

MC/TA/cm

DRAFT

Enclosures

cc: Hon. Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District
Cara L. Jenkins, Legislative Counsel
Erika Contreras, Secretary of the Senate
Eric Dang, Counsel, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Monique Limón
Emelyn Rodriguez, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas
Shaun Naidu, Policy Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas
Drew Soderborg, Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Morgan Baskin, Fiscal & Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Amy Jarvis, Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance
Justin Adelman, Assistant Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance
Mark Jimenez, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Henry Ng, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Sally Lukenbill, Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance
Sydney Tanimoto, Assistant Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance
Koreen van Ravenhorst, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Amanda Garcia, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Stephanie Jordan, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Mark McKenzie, Staff Director, Senate Appropriations Committee
Hans Hemann, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Nicholas Liedtke, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Andrew Ironside, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Nora Brackbill, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Shiran Zohar, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Elizabeth Enea, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Erika Sperbeck, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Tamer Ahmed, Director, Facilities Services, Judicial Council
Fran Mueller, Deputy Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Jagan Singh, Deputy Director, Facilities Services, Judicial Council
Peggy Symons, Principal Manager, Facilities Services, Judicial Council
Alona Daniliuk, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

DRAFT

JUDICIAL COUNCIL *of* CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council
HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. STACY BOULWARE EURIE
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. TAMARA L. WOOD
Chair, Rules Committee

VACANT
Chair, Technology Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

Ms. Marta Ann Alcumbrac
Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Charles Crompton
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Mary J. Greenwood
Hon. Ash Kalra
Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo
Mr. Craig M. Peters
Hon. Michael Rhoads
Ms. Dena Stone
Ms. Alekxia Torres Stallings
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg
Hon. Eric J. Wersching

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Hon. Nicole C. Bershon
Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Benjamin J. Cassady
Hon. Rodney A. Cortez
Mr. Chad Finke
Mr. Charles Johnson
Mr. David W. Slayton

MS. MICHELLE CURRAN
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Report title: *Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects*

Statutory citation: Provision 1 of section 7, item 0250-490 of Senate Bill 111 (Budget Act of 2026)

Date of report: January 8, 2027

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with provision 1 of section 7, item 0250-490 of Senate Bill 111 (Budget Act of 2026; Stats. 2026, ch. 21).

The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

The Judicial Council, in consultation with the California Department of Finance, is required to submit this mandated report, *Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects*, to the Legislature on or before January 10, 2027.

The Judicial Council has consulted with and received input from the California Department of Finance on this report, which focuses on common barriers that have hindered the planning, acquisition, design, and construction process and provides the Judicial Council's recommendations to accelerate projects while maintaining appropriate oversight and risk mitigation measures.

The full report can be accessed on the California courts website.

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by contacting Facilities Services at 888-225-3583 or facilities@jud.ca.gov.

DRAFT

January 8, 2027

Roadmap to Accelerate and Streamline Courthouse Construction Projects

Report to the Legislature Under Provision 1 of Section 7, Item 0250-490 of Senate Bill 111 (Budget Act of 2026)

DRAFT

Judicial Council *of* California

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Patricia Guerrero
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

Michelle Curran
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Erika Sperbeck
Chief Administrative Officer

FACILITIES SERVICES
Tamer Ahmed
Director

Jagan Singh
Deputy Director

Contracting with
Cypress Construction Management, LLC
Primary Author of Report

DRAFT

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
Key Findings Overview 1
Summary of Recommendations and Potential Efficiencies 2
I. INTRODUCTION 1
Purpose 1
Judicial Council Capital Outlay Program 1
II. COMMON BARRIERS AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS 6
Approach to Barrier Identification and Validation 6
Regulatory and Compliance Barriers and Potential Solutions 6
Real Estate and Site Acquisition Barriers and Potential Solutions 7
Procurement and Contracting Barriers and Potential Solutions 12
III. OPPORTUNITIES TO LEVERAGE CONTRACT OR OUTSIDE PROJECT MANAGEMENT EXPERTISE 13
Current Use of Program Management 13
Indefinite Delivery / Indefinite Quantity Consultant Strategy 13
Use of Contract Project Managers 13
IV. CHANGES IN PREPLANNING AND ACQUISITION APPROACHES 13
Obtain Capital Outlay Planning and Studies Funding 13
V. POTENTIAL USE OF PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD 14
Current Design-Build Delivery Experience and Results 14
Progressive Design-Build Model Overview 14
DGS Progressive Design-Build Approach 15
Abbreviated Performance Criteria and Guaranteed Maximum Price Development 15
Earlier Design-Build Entity Engagement With Authorities Having Jurisdiction 16
Design Review, Peer Review, and Code Checks of Design-Build Projects 16
Lessons From the Lakeport and Ukiah Design-Build Projects 17
Statutory and Regulatory Authority Required 17
VI. EVALUATION OF JUDICIAL BRANCH PROJECT MANAGEMENT CAPACITY AND NEEDS 18
Current Project Management Capacity, Workload, and Staffing Needs 18

DRAFT

Approach to Capital Design and Construction Management Staffing of Capital Projects.....19
Review of Judicial Council Internal Operations That Support Design and Construction of Capital Projects.....20
VII. ADDITIONAL APPROACHES TO ACCELERATE CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS.....20
Alternative Delivery Methods.....20
Technology and Innovation Opportunities.....22
Best Practices From Other Branches, Departments, and Agencies.....23
APPENDIX A CURRENT PROJECT PORTFOLIO AND PIPELINE.....24
Active and Completed Projects for Fiscal Year 2026–27.....24
Currently Funded Projects.....24
Five-Year Plan Pipeline.....25

DRAFT

Executive Summary

For the judicial branch to fulfill its mission to provide equal access to justice for all Californians, the Judicial Council must build and maintain safe, accessible, functional courthouses throughout the state. Building California's courthouses is complex and requires strong partnerships with counties, contractors, and state control agencies. Currently, courthouses take 8-15 years to complete. The Judicial Council is committed to continuous improvement, being accountable to those we serve, to our partners and stakeholders, and to policymakers.

Key Findings Overview

Under the Budget Act of 2026, item 0250-490, provision 1, the Judicial Council has prepared a roadmap to accelerate and streamline courthouse construction for projects as specified.

> On or before January 10, 2027, the Judicial Council, in consultation with the Department of Finance, shall report on a roadmap to accelerate and streamline courthouse construction projects. The report shall be provided to the relevant budget subcommittees of the Legislature in each house, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, and the Legislative Analyst's Office. The report shall identify common barriers and potential solutions; opportunities to leverage contract or outside project management expertise; changes in pre-planning and acquisition approaches; changes in the timeline and management of funding phases; the potential use of progressive-design build; and any other approaches as determined by the Judicial Council to help accelerate capital outlay projects. The report shall also evaluate the project management capacity and needs of the Judicial Branch to support additional construction projects. The report shall include recommendations to the Legislature including, but not limited to, potential statutory changes and resource needs.

In consultation with and input from the Department of Finance and state partners, the Judicial Council identified common barriers that have hindered the planning, acquisition, and design and construction processes. Using past and present projects, common and systematic issues were identified and discussed in this report. Many of these items are the result of well-intentioned historical efforts to be good stewards and partners as well as mitigate risks that have extended project durations. The Judicial Council endeavored to balance its recommendations to accelerate and streamline projects while maintaining appropriate oversight, stakeholder engagement, and risk mitigation measures.

This report addresses each of the major phases used for project delivery. These phases include acquisition, which includes site selection, environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the acquisition of property; performance criteria, where the specific size, scope, unique site conditions, and technical design requirements are prepared; and design-build, where the design-build entity is selected by the Judicial Council and the project

DRAFT

is designed, permitted, and constructed. Additionally, the Judicial Council has evaluated its project management staffing and other related staffing needs to support construction projects. This report includes recommendations and potential statutory changes and resource needs.

It is worth noting that the shift by the Judicial Council in 2021 to design-build delivery was a major step taken to mitigate many of the problems that had historically beset courthouse construction projects. Many earlier projects delivered under a construction management at risk (CMR) approach encountered conflicts between the design team and the contractor. Unlike CMR, design-build shifts the responsibility for design coordination and errors, including risk related to cost and schedule impacts, to the design-build entity. Currently, four projects have been completed or are underway using design-build: Lakeport, Ukiah, Fort Ord, and the Sixth Appellate District Court. Based on the Judicial Council's current project cost controls and schedule key performance indicators, these projects to date show few of the past design and construction-related issues or negative cost/schedule impacts.

Summary of Recommendations and Potential Efficiencies

Recommendations from the report are presented by category, including Judicial Council project management and related practices and capacity, the acquisition phase, the performance criteria phase, and the design-build phase. Some recommendations include time savings obtained from the overall schedules of completed and ongoing projects. It is important to note that the benefits of some recommendations may not be realized immediately, as capital outlay projects take several years to complete.

Judicial Council Project Management and Related Practices and Capacity

The Judicial Council has evaluated its project management and related practices and capacity for courthouse acquisition, design, and construction procedures, and approach to risk management. In some cases, this evaluation considers current best practices at other state agencies. We have developed recommendations to address some of the identified barriers, but some potential efficiencies require further study.

Increase current project management staffing to meet workload

To assess the workload and project management capacity, the Judicial Council has developed a customized Project Manager Resource Management Tool that provides Judicial Council leadership with an objective framework for measuring workload demand, evaluating organizational capacity, and identifying staffing needs. Based on this analysis, the Judicial Council will require additional project management resources in its Project Management Unit (PMU) to adequately support both current and projected workload demands pursuant to the Budget Acts of 2027 and potentially 2028, in part included in the 2027–28 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan. The recommended staffing increases include additional project managers, senior project managers, and managers in the PMU, principal manager personnel, and support staff. Refer to section VI for more discussion.

DRAFT

Obtain capital outlay planning and studies funding
Provide funding to improve the quality of capital outlay budget change proposals, and provide pre-project planning and studies. Refer to section IV for further discussion.

Evaluate Judicial Council project management and communication protocols
Assess Judicial Council project management, processes, procedures, and communication protocols. Additionally, review other state agency project management practices and industry best practices for potential enhancements to Judicial Council procedures and practices, including communication protocols for both internal and external stakeholders. This evaluation is expected to be completed in early 2027, with an implementation plan to follow. Refer to section VI for further discussion.

Continued use of consultant project managers when Judicial Council staff are not available
The Judicial Council currently contracts with consultant project managers for new courthouse projects when Judicial Council staffing is not available. While this approach is necessary to manage new courthouse projects, it does come with tradeoffs. The Judicial Council intends to continue this approach. Refer to section III for further discussion.

Modify design review and permitting procedures to streamline design and permitting timelines
The Judicial Council performs various reviews of plans and specifications during the design phase of its design-build projects. The number and types of reviews could be streamlined, which could reduce the overall design and permitting timeline. Additionally, an electronic tracking tool is under development to provide more accurate status of the individual reviews and permits, as well as timeline data. This review will be completed by spring 2027. Refer to section II for further discussion.

Review Judicial Council internal processes that support design and construction of courthouses
This review will examine how to streamline various internal procedures, including funding-related transactions, procurement and contracting practices, design reviews and permitting, and payments to vendors. This review will examine the current roles and responsibilities; internal business processes; procedures, and staffing. The timeline for this review is under development. Refer to section VI for further discussion.

Streamline site purchase documents and processes
The site acquisition purchase process can be streamlined, resulting in time savings, if existing internal processes and procedures are streamlined, dedicated legal support staff focused on acquisitions provided, and a library of standardized contract forms created. The Judicial Council anticipates two separate reviews: one review would examine internal processes, procedures, and standardization of the various property acquisition contract forms; a second review would focus on changes to the current Judicial Council Site Selection and Acquisition Policy. The process and procedure review will be completed by summer 2027. Refer to section II for further discussion.

DRAFT

Leverage courthouse design standards
California courthouse design is guided by the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* (*CTCFS*). The CTCFS were originally established in 2006, are regularly updated, and were developed to guide building system design and provide templates for the design of various courthouse elements including courtrooms. Refer to section II for further discussion.

Acquisition Phase

Streamline the Project Advisory Group site selection process
The Project Advisory Group (PAG) is created at the beginning of each courthouse project for the purpose of identifying potential sites for the Judicial Council to evaluate as part of the site selection/site acquisition process. The timeline to establish the PAG with the local court and recommend preferred sites for the future courthouse is about six months. This timeline can be reduced to about four months, for an estimated savings of two months, by streamlining the process and establishing the PAG earlier.

The accelerated establishment of the PAG would allow for development of earlier engagement strategies with local justice partners and the community to obtain a consensus on potential sites for the new courthouse sooner in the acquisition phase timeline. Refer to section II for further discussion.

Refine California Environmental Quality Act approach
Currently, the Judicial Council prepares environmental impact reports (EIRs) on the majority of new courthouse projects to mitigate the risk of challenges to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process when other environmental review processes are available under CEQA. Below are three options related to CEQA.

1. Judicial Council will more closely follow the various levels of environmental review permitted under CEQA. The available environmental determinations include that a project is statutorily or categorically exempt, or may provide for the use of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, and, when necessary, a full environmental impact report. This approach is consistent with how other state agencies approach CEQA. Refer to section II for further discussion.

2. A second option is for the Judicial Council to request an exemption from CEQA to expedite a project when there are unique circumstances. Such an exemption could be made through the annual state budget process. Refer to section II for further discussion.

3. Another option is for the Legislature to consider a statutory change exempting certain classes of courthouse construction from CEQA.

Coordinate with Department of General Services for timely review of property acquisition real estate purchase documents and property appraisals

1. The Judicial Council and the Department of General Services (DGS) will compare

DRAFT

acquisition processes and forms to ensure that site acquisition documents are prepared in a manner that facilitates expeditious review and processing.

2. The Judicial Council requests that the DGS Real Estate Services Division (RESD) agree to perform the site acquisition package within a fixed period to strengthen project planning and management. A streamlined review of recent DGS property acquisition documents could save up to two months if a 45-calendar-day review period is adopted by DGS. Refer to section II for further discussion.

3. Another option is for the Legislature to consider a statutory change exempting Judicial Council property acquisitions from DGS review because the Judicial Council has in-house expertise for real estate functions.

Include the use of purchase options as another site acquisition method
The Judicial Council recommends, when appropriate, the use of purchase options as an additional method for acquiring a site for a new courthouse. The use of purchase options in certain situations confirms the purchase of a site, with the actual land purchase and transfer of title occurring at a future specified date. Refer to section II for further discussion.

Reduce the procurement and selection timeline for contracting with the performance criteria architect
For each courthouse project, a performance criteria architect is hired to assist in site selection/acquisition and prepare the project performance criteria used to design and construct a courthouse. The timeline to advertise for proposals, evaluate the proposals, interview the shortlisted design firms, and execute a contract is approximately seven months. This timeline can be reduced to an average of two months by streamlining the current procurement/selection process to combine all projects proposed in the annual State Budget into one procurement/selection process, which could be accomplished under the Judicial Council's existing design-build statute and contracting policies. Refer to section II for further discussion.

Design-Build Phase

Update Judicial Council design-build authority
The Judicial Council recommends that it be granted authority to deliver projects using progressive design-build as defined in Public Contract Code section 10198(i) (Progressive design-build). We understand that both DGS and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) have experienced success with progressive design-build. Granting the Judicial Council progressive design-build authority will provide another project delivery tool that could save time. Refer to section V for further discussion.

Obtain responsibility for Access Compliance interagency plan review and permitting
The Judicial Council recommends that it be given statutory authority for access compliance review and permitting of courthouse design from the DGS Division of the State Architect (DSA). Currently there are four authorities having jurisdiction (AHJs) involved in the approval of a

DRAFT

project. This effort will reduce that number to three, streamlining the permitting process. The DSA and the Judicial Council need to coordinate the requirements of this request. Refer to section II for further discussion.

Coordinate resource requirements with the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM)
The Judicial Council acknowledges the impact our project workload has on the resources available to the OSFM. We desire to coordinate with the OSFM to identify the best approach to address resource availability for both plan review and inspection. Discussed in additional detail in section II, the options being explored by the Judicial Council are:

1. Close collaboration with the OSFM to identify appropriate staffing levels for plan review and inspections in alignment with the expected project pipeline and project budget approvals;

2. Identification of dedicated OSFM staff for the plan review, permitting, and inspections of Judicial Council projects;

3. Delegation of fire-rated wall inspections to the project Inspector of Record when appropriate to meet construction schedule deadlines; and

4. The implementation of video inspection technology for fire-rated walls when the OSFM is unavailable to visit the project site to perform the inspection in person.

DRAFT

I. Introduction

Purpose

The following discussion identifies the Judicial Council's existing policies and organizational structure, roles, and responsibilities to provide background and context for the recommendations included in this report.

Judicial Council Capital Outlay Program

Capital outlay authority

The Judicial Council of California, supported by Judicial Council staff, has established the Capital Program Management Policy as the guiding policy for the planning, acquisition, and construction of appellate and trial court facilities under authority of Government Code sections 70391(b) and 69204(b) and rule 10.181 of the California Rules of Court.

The Judicial Council is the administrative and policymaking body of the California courts. The council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice. Judicial Council staff help implement the council's policies. The council carries out this mission primarily through the work of its internal committees, advisory committees, and task forces.

The Court Facilities Advisory Committee as a standing advisory committee to the Judicial Council provides ongoing oversight of the judicial branch capital construction program for trial and appellate courts throughout the state. The committee oversees the work of Judicial Council staff in its effort to implement the judicial branch's statewide capital improvement program and makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for action.

The Judicial Council Facilities Services office encompasses planning, design, construction, renovation, maintenance, and lifecycle support for judicial facilities statewide. The program requires coordinated delivery of multiple concurrent projects while maintaining project budgets, schedule certainty, quality, safety, and uninterrupted court operations.

The Facilities Services office oversees a portfolio of approximately 430 properties throughout the state, including project management, operation, and maintenance. Facilities Services is also responsible for overseeing the construction of 80 capital projects identified in the *Reassessment of Trial Court Capital Outlay Projects* as adopted by the Judicial Council on November 14, 2019. Currently, 20 active projects are fully funded for a total project cost of $3.8 billion. In addition, Facilities Services oversees approximately 1,300 facility modification projects annually, with an annual facilities modification budget of $80 million, including but not limited to special projects for new judgeships, development of lactation facilities, deferred maintenance, and other projects.

DRAFT

The Judicial Council currently has authority to contract its capital construction projects under three delivery models: traditional design-bid-build, construction manager at risk, and design-build. Most new courthouse projects will use design-build delivery.

Roles within Facilities Services

- Executive management sets out direction, standards, procedures, capital strategies, fund allocation strategies, and program priorities.

- Project management manages all capital outlay projects and implements project-specific delivery adhering to Facilities Services standards and procedures.

- Planning supports funding requests, needs assessments, and project budgets.

- Risk management monitors the program for compliance with safety standards and insurance requirements. It assists executive management with developing standard procedures and templates to identify and mitigate risks.

- The Building Official Unit (BOU) administers the quality compliance process for all construction documents prior to design-build entity (DBE) submission of plans to external authorities having jurisdiction (AHJs) for review and approval. The BOU also issues the building permit once all AHJs have approved the plans.

Current Project Delivery Lifecycle

The Judicial Council has adopted the use of design-build as the preferred project delivery method for major projects since 2021. In this delivery method, a single entity provides design and construction services for a project under a single contract in accordance with the performance criteria provided by the Judicial Council.

Each Judicial Council courthouse project is typically reviewed three times by the Court Facilities Advisory Committee during the acquisition and performance criteria phases to ensure it is within the previously approved scope, budget, and schedule and is consistent with Judicial Council policies and procedures. All meetings are open, and the public can comment on the project as part of the Judicial Council's policy of transparency, being a good partner, and providing the opportunity for community engagement.

Unlike most state-owned buildings, selecting the location of a courthouse is complex, as local justice partners including the county, the county sheriff, and district attorney, all have input. There is typically local business and community interest in the new site as well. Working with stakeholders can lengthen site selection timelines but the Judicial Council endeavors to balance state and local interests to provide equal access to justice.

Certain projects such as the courthouses in Santa Clarita, Quincy, and Nevada City have faced local community resistance in determining a new site. In the case of Santa Clarita, the Judicial Council has evaluated 35 prospective properties since summer 2022 and is completing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process to finalize its preferred site.

DRAFT

For Quincy, the local community was provided opportunities to learn about the project on several occasions, and the Judicial Council is using the CEQA process to engage the community with public comment in late 2026.

Site acquisition for the new Nevada City Courthouse has delayed the project for several years due to objections by various community groups, despite the well-documented deficiencies with the existing facility. A detailed study had to be funded to document why the existing site could not meet the needs of the court and current design standards. The study was the only way to identify a location that could be agreed upon by the court, the county and its justice partners, and Nevada City.

Typically, new courthouse projects are funded in three phases: acquisition, performance criteria, and design-build, as described below.

1. The acquisition phase includes the evaluation and selection of potential sites for new courthouse facilities, environmental review, and the steps required for acquiring the selected site. There are two distinct tasks during the acquisition process: During site selection various sites are identified and evaluated for merit for a new courthouse facility, culminating in approval by the Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) and the State Public Works Board (SPWB) to proceed to site acquisition. Site acquisition begins after CFAC and SPWB approval of the preferred site(s) and includes the negotiation of terms and development of purchase agreement(s) and the performance of due diligence tasks including the environmental review process, geotechnical studies, appraisals, and additional studies or testing as appropriate. The Judicial Council has broad authority for site acquisition under Government Code section 70391(b). The site acquisition procedures are defined further in the Judicial Council's *Site Selection and Acquisition Policy for Judicial Branch Facilities* (August 14, 2009).

2. The performance criteria phase includes the preparation of a project summary including scope description; a project space plan including program, functional space relationships, and a blocking/stacking plan; site design considerations including traffic, parking, site utilities requirements, and environmental mitigations; the Judicial Council's *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* (*CTCFS*), which is a guide to designing a superior courthouse; and reference materials unique to the project site.

3. The design-build phase typically includes the selection of the design-build entity (DBE), the pre–guaranteed maximum price (GMP) phase, and the post-GMP phase. This phase is more fully described in section V.

DRAFT

Baseline Project Duration

The planned duration for each of these phases is established in tables 1 through 3, with the range dependent on the size and complexity of the project.

Table 1. Small Courthouse (1–4 courtrooms)

Phase	Average Duration (months)
Acquisition	36–60
Performance Criteria	8–12
Design-Build	30–39

Table 2. Medium Courthouse (5–14 courtrooms)

Phase	Average Duration (months)
Acquisition	36–60
Performance Criteria	8–14
Design-Build	36–52

Table 3. Large Courthouse (15+ courtrooms)

Phase	Average Duration (months)
Acquisition	36–60
Performance Criteria	12–18
Design-Build	48–84

External Approval and Oversight Entities

Several state entities are involved in the funding, approval, design review, and permitting of a new courthouse project. These entities include:

- California Department of Finance (DOF) Capital Outlay Unit, which oversees and manages the state's physical infrastructure planning, budgeting, and project approval processes;
- State Public Works Board, which oversees the fiscal management of state construction projects, acquires land and property for state programs, and issues long-term lease-revenue bonds to finance capital projects;
- Department of General Services, Real Estate Services Division, which reviews and approves key site acquisition documents for the Department of Finance and the State Public Works Board;

DRAFT

- Department of General Services, Division of the State Architect, which reviews and permits courthouse design documents for access compliance;
- Office of the State Fire Marshal, which reviews and permits courthouse design documents and inspects courthouse construction for fire and life safety;
- Board of State and Community Corrections, which reviews and approves courthouse detention areas during the design phase and inspects courthouse detention areas during construction for compliance with correctional standards; and
- Judicial Council staff, who assign an International Code Council (ICC)–certified construction inspector of record (IOR) for each project. The IOR confirms compliance with all permitted construction documents and coordinates with the Office of the State Fire Marshal for fire and life safety inspections.

Each of these state entities has a specific review/approval responsibility for a new courthouse project to obtain and approve the acquisition of land, review the project's design for code compliance, issue permits, and approve the construction for occupancy and use.

Current Project Portfolio and Pipeline

For a detailed summary of capital outlay and other significant projects, see Appendix A.

DRAFT

II. Common Barriers and Potential Solutions

Approach to Barrier Identification and Validation

To complete this analysis, Facilities Services conducted workshops with its leadership team and reviewed completed and ongoing project records to identify common barriers that have historically impeded the progress of site acquisition, approval, and construction of courthouse projects. Additionally, we have considered project management and project delivery best practices in the industry and with other public agencies. This report contains recommendations and identifies options that could expedite or streamline site acquisition, preparation of performance criteria, project approvals, permitting, and construction of projects while still maintaining appropriate levels of project oversight and risk mitigation. Estimated times for various activities and durations are derived from project overall schedules for completed and ongoing projects.

Regulatory and Compliance Barriers and Potential Solutions

Project Advisory Group

Per California Rules of Court, rule 10.184(d), the Project Advisory Group (PAG) is established at the beginning of each new courthouse project and provides input from site acquisition through completion of construction. One purpose of the PAG is to work jointly with the Judicial Council to create a list of potential courthouse sites during the site selection process. The PAG typically includes the local court, the local sheriff, the county, and local justice partners. From previously completed courthouse projects, the timeline for creation of the PAG through the recommendation of a list of potential sites is approximately six months. This part of the site selection process can be streamlined to four months but may require earlier creation of the PAG.

By starting earlier and developing community engagement strategies, the overall PAG effort for site selection can be reduced, thus reducing the overall acquisition phase timeline. One recommendation is to assign the project manager once it is confirmed that a new project is proposed in the January Governor's Budget. Assigning a project manager early provides the opportunity for project management activities such as the formation of the PAG before the Budget is approved. It is estimated that two months could be saved in site selection.

Environmental Review

The Judicial Council's current practice is to maximize public input as part of the environmental review process. The commitment to provide the opportunity for public comment is in part to be a good partner and mitigate the risk of legal challenges to the overall environmental review process. However, this level of environmental review is not always necessary.

The process and timelines for completing CEQA can vary widely depending on the size and complexity of the project. CEQA requires state and local public agencies to identify, disclose,

DRAFT

and reduce or avoid the significant environmental impacts of proposed discretionary projects. Key steps in the CEQA process include:

1. Preliminary Review: The lead agency checks if the activity is a project under CEQA and whether it qualifies for a statutory or categorical exemption (such as minor repairs or specific infill projects);

2. Initial Study: If not exempt, the agency conducts a preliminary evaluation to see if the project may cause significant environmental harm;

3. Determination Documents;

4. Negative Declaration: Issued if the study shows no significant environmental impacts;

5. Mitigated Negative Declaration: Issued if potential impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level through agreed-upon changes; and

6. Environmental Impact Report: Required if the project may cause substantial or unavoidable significant impacts.

The Judicial Council, consistent with what other state and local agencies practice, will perform only the necessary environmental reviews per CEQA. The level of public input will be consistent with CEQA. Additionally, community and stakeholder input will still be available through the Judicial Council's various project review meetings, which are all public. By adhering to these guidelines, the time required to perform CEQA can be minimized and be more consistent with other state agencies.

If appropriate because of unique project circumstances, the Judicial Council could seek an individual project CEQA exemption. This could be done with stand-alone legislation or as part of the budget process. For example, Public Resources Code sections 21080.01, 21080.02, 21080.03, and 21080.07 exempt individual prison projects from CEQA.

As an example, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) received a CEQA exemption for the San Quentin Rehabilitation Center project in 2023. Additionally, construction of the CDCR state prison project at Pelican Bay was exempted from CEQA.

Another potential option would be for the Legislature to exempt certain classes of new courthouse projects from CEQA given the priority to build new courthouses.

Real Estate and Site Acquisition Barriers and Potential Solutions

Department of General Services Review of Site Acquisition Documents

The Department of General Services (DGS) reviews key real estate documents prior to Department of Finance (DOF) and State Public Works Board (SPWB) approval of site acquisition. A completed Judicial Council site acquisition package typically includes an

DRAFT

appraisal; a property condition report; and title, easement, and mineral rights studies. Once SPWB approves the site acquisition, the Judicial Council can execute the agreements to purchase the selected site.

The DGS review process can take several months. The Judicial Council has two recommendations for consideration to accelerate this timeline:

1. Collaborate with DGS real estate staff to align quality expectations and procedures for the submission of site acquisition documents, and to develop a shared understanding related to strategies for appraisals. Regular meetings with DGS and the Judicial Council would ensure that site acquisition documents are prepared in a manner that facilitates expeditious review and processing.

2. DGS could agree to a fixed timeline of no more than 45 calendar days for DGS to review and process site acquisition documents. A fixed duration for this review will make Judicial Council project schedules more dependable, reducing the overall site acquisition timeline. This does not eliminate the need to amend the site acquisition package if DGS finds issues.

Another option is for the state Legislature to exempt Judicial Council property acquisition from DGS review because the Judicial Council has in-house expertise

Site Acquisition Purchase Document Process
For each property acquisition, numerous ancillary agreements with the selling owner and adjacent property owners must be negotiated. Many times, the Judicial Council is required to negotiate with one or more local government entities, which can lengthen the overall negotiation timeline. These agreements may have to do with asset protection, maintaining easements and protection of joint use facilities, use of swing space, street easements, or demolition and abatement agreements. The list is unique to each site and can be the result of a complicated negotiation process.

For each agreement, Judicial Council Real Estate is dependent on legal support for the development and review of terms and conditions. Due to resource constraints and competing priorities, this support can often take months to schedule or be assigned to outside counsel. Dedicated legal support staff focused on acquisitions would streamline the overall property purchase process. Current ongoing efforts to create a library of standardized contract forms will also streamline future property purchases. Changes may also be necessary to the Judicial Council Site Selection and Site Acquisition Policy.

Site Acquisition Purchase Options
In some situations, the sale date of a property is restrained by other factors, such as the need for continued occupancy by the existing owner. In these situations, the use of a purchase option can serve as an alternate method for acquiring a site. The use of purchase options confirms the

DRAFT

purchase of a site, with the actual land purchase and transfer of title occurring at a future specified date.

California Trial Court Facilities Standards

Recognizing the need to standardize courthouse design, the Judicial Council developed the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* (*CTCFS*) in 2006, with the most recent update published in December 2026. *CTCFS* contains templates for courtroom design and other related spaces such as judicial officer chambers and jury deliberation rooms and guidance for other courthouse spaces. It promotes buildings that are functional, durable, maintainable, and efficient and provide long-term value to the public, the judicial branch, courthouse occupants, the community in which they are located, and the court users and taxpayers of California.

Interagency Plan Review and Permitting

Judicial Council Building Official Unit plan review, code review, and peer review

Under current Judicial Council procedures, during the design and construction phases of all active projects, the Building Official Unit (BOU) performs a review of all construction documents, including code compliance and peer review, before the plans are submitted to any authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) for plan review and permitting. All aspects of the construction plans must first be found acceptable by the BOU before the design-build entity, which is contractually assigned responsibility for all permitting, submits them to the appropriate AHJ. This procedure was implemented as a quality assurance and risk mitigation measure when the Judicial Council's primary delivery method for capital construction projects was construction manager at risk (CMR).

In the CMR delivery method, the Judicial Council is primarily responsible as the project owner for design and permitting, while the CMR hired by the Judicial Council assumes construction performance risk; therefore, delays to the permitting process or additional costs and delays during construction resulting from deficient design in the construction documents are the responsibility of the Judicial Council. The establishment of a thorough review process for all construction documents in this context served a valuable purpose.

The Judicial Council has shifted away from CMR and is now delivering capital projects under the design-build delivery method, in which the design-build entity (DBE) is assigned the risk of both design and construction under one contract agreement. The risks previously held by the Judicial Council, as the owner primarily responsible for complete and timely construction documents and permits, are now the responsibility of the DBE.

As such, the Judicial Council will develop an action plan and perform an assessment of all building systems and design elements to identify key systems and elements of the DBE's construction documents, which should continue to be reviewed by the BOU, while deferring other systems and design elements entirely to the DBE, which holds the risk as assigned in its agreement with the Judicial Council.

DRAFT

Another effort underway is to better track the status of the various reviews and permits within the BOU or the permit reviews performed by the AHJs. The Judicial Council is developing an electronic tracking tool that will provide real-time status of the reviews and permits on each project. The new tracking tool will provide reporting and timeline data that will help assess how to better streamline these necessary activities. This effort is expected to be completed in spring 2027.

Office of the State Fire Marshal plan review and inspection

1. *Assign Office of State Fire Marshal (OSFM) staff dedicated for plan review and permitting of Judicial Council projects.* As the Judicial Council is ramping up staff to take on increased project workload, it is logical to assume the permitting workload for the OSFM would increase as well. Historically, this agency is already heavily burdened; projects for review typically have a waiting time before permitting review begins. This is known as "bin time." One potential solution is for the OSFM to dedicate plan reviewers to Judicial Council projects, hire additional plan reviewers, or both. The OSFM has indicated that the precise level of staffing that will be needed to support the newly funded projects cannot be determined until the project schedules are more clearly defined. The Judicial Council and OSFM will coordinate to identify appropriate OSFM staffing levels for plan review and inspections in alignment with project budget approvals.

2. *Delegate fire inspection to the Judicial Council inspector of record (IOR) for fire-rated walls.*

    a. Fire-rated wall inspection is a good example of when complex framing installations require close and frequent inspections. In compliance with state law, for each project the Judicial Council assigns an IOR to perform all elements of commercial building inspection, credentialed at a minimum by one of the following inspection authorities:

        - the International Code Council (ICC);
        - the American Construction Inspector's Association (ACIA);
        - the Division of the State Architect (DSA); or
        - the Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI).

        These credentialing organizations require ongoing maintenance of credentials through testing current competency with updates to the California Building Code (CBC), which governs all elements of commercial building inspection, including fire-rated walls.

        During the life of a project, the IOR inspects all aspects of the construction to ensure compliance with permitted plans. However, the IOR must contact the OSFM deputy inspector to inspect all fire and life safety-related construction, including fire-rated

DRAFT

wall construction. Typically, OSFM deputy inspectors have multiple project assignments and are not always available when requested. Additionally, statewide fire events can create emergency situations where staff are pulled away from construction projects, further impacting construction timelines. If the OSFM deputy inspector is unavailable to do the required inspection, this can delay construction. To streamline the inspection process and potentially speed up construction, the Judicial Council recommends that the OSFM delegate the inspection of fire-rated walls to the Judicial Council IOR when schedule needs dictate.

b. Further, we have discussed with the OSFM the incorporation of video technology for OSFM fire-rated wall inspections when the OSFM cannot come to the site to perform the inspection in person. This could streamline the inspection and avoid construction delays.

Division of the State Architect

Currently, the Judicial Council submits its completed project designs to the Division of the State Architect (DSA) for compliance with accessibility requirements. The DSA review and permitting process takes six to ten weeks depending on the project and number of review comments that require correction. Compliance with accessibility requirements could be streamlined during the plan review process if the Judicial Council were to obtain an exemption from the DSA and self-certify accessibility compliance. Other state agencies, such as the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, are exempt from DSA review; and the accessibility compliance review is performed internally by a Certified Access Specialist (CASp).

If exempted, Judicial Council staff or consultants would be required to have the same CASp certification to certify compliance. Certification and credential maintenance is administered by the DSA, and governed by the California Code of Regulations, Title 21. All plan review and field inspections by the Judicial Council CASp would safeguard the quality and accessibility requirements identified in CBC, Chapter 11B *Accessibility to Public Buildings* are enforced on Judicial Council projects, to the same standard as DGS, CDCR, and other state agency projects.

If this recommendation was to be implemented, the current permitting process would be simplified because fewer AHJs would be required to stamp the project design as code compliant. This recommendation is currently being reviewed by the DSA.

Board of State and Community Corrections

The Judicial Council is working with the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) to prioritize review of courthouse detention areas and adhere to BSCC standards for the design and construction of detention areas within courthouses. Additionally, BSCC recommended that Judicial Council project managers receive training on BSCC standards. Implementation of these recommendations will streamline the permitting process and mitigate construction impacts.

DRAFT

Procurement and Contracting Barriers and Potential Solutions

The procurement process for retaining project consultants can be time intensive. To reduce the timeline for the site acquisition phase, the Judicial Council proposes combining all projects included in the annual State Budget into a single annual procurement, which would create a pool of available consultants. The procurement process would commence prior to the approval of the annual State Budget so that the site selection process can begin as soon as is practical once the State Budget is approved. Adoption of this recommendation can streamline the hiring timeline for performance criteria firms from an average of seven months to two months, saving five months. Similar consultant procurements have occurred at other state agencies.

DRAFT

III. Opportunities to Leverage Contract or Outside Project Management Expertise

Current Use of Program Management

The Judicial Council currently employs a strategy of staff augmentation using program management, construction management, and staff augmentation contracts to hire project managers. This strategy has been incorporated into the staffing discussion in section VI.

Indefinite Delivery / Indefinite Quantity Consultant Strategy

The indefinite delivery / indefinite quantity (IDIQ) procurement process establishes a pool of consultants that can provide contracted project managers to the Judicial Council as needed, depending on workload.

Use of Contract Project Managers

The Judicial Council Project Management Unit uses both Judicial Council employee project managers and contracted project managers. This approach is necessary due to the shortage in the industry of qualified staff who can be hired within the Judicial Council's current salary structure. However, relying on contractors is not ideal, as their use can result in inconsistencies in performance and higher turnover rates. Additionally, decision-making is more cumbersome on projects managed by contracted consultants because they must get their Judicial Council supervisor to approve all decisions.

IV. Changes in Preplanning and Acquisition Approaches

Obtain Capital Outlay Planning and Studies Funding.

The Judicial Council has a listing of its prioritized projects included in its annual Five-Year Infrastructure Plan. However, the Judicial Council does not typically perform specific project studies for projects ahead of capital outlay budget change proposal (COBCP) submission. While the relevant information for COBCP preparation is currently provided, more detailed early site planning or courthouse-specific scoping is not typically prepared, leaving the project open to cost and schedule risks. To enhance the COBCP process, the Judicial Council recommends performance of additional pre-project studies and site-related planning. This additional effort would better define the proposed courthouse program requirements and identify potential sites with any unique environmental concerns that could impact cost and schedule. This additional information could mitigate future risks related to the project's scope, site, cost, and schedule.

DRAFT

V. Potential Use of Progressive Design-Build

Current Design-Build Delivery Experience and Results

The Judicial Council decided in 2020 to adopt the design-build delivery method. Considering the design-build methods used successfully by the Department of General Services and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Judicial Council adopted a two-step design-build model. The Judicial Council design-build statute was enacted by the Legislature in 2021 with the passage of Assembly Bill 143 (Gov. Code, § 70398.2; Stats. 2021, ch. 79).

It is too early for the Judicial Council to declare its design-build model a success for the delivery of California courthouses, but the first group of design-build projects are all within their authorized guaranteed maximum price (GMP) and on or ahead of schedule. The first project, in Lake County, was recently completed one day early. The second project, in Mendocino County, is currently projected to complete in October 2027, seven months early. The third design-build project, in Santa Clara County, is currently on time and within budget and projected to complete in fall 2028. The last design-build project currently underway, in Monterey County, was awarded to the design-build entity in spring 2026 and projected to complete in fall 2029.

To date, all four project teams report a more positive overall experience, with an emphasis on collaborative and team-based approaches in day-to-day problem-solving and issue resolution. When scope, cost, or schedule issues surface, the project teams work together to reach solutions that keep the project moving forward.

Progressive Design-Build Model Overview

Progressive design-build (PDB) is a collaborative project delivery method in which an owner selects the design-build team primarily based on qualifications, experience, and approach rather than a fixed construction price. After selection, the owner and design-builder work together to progressively develop the project's scope, design, schedule, risk allocation, and cost before establishing a final price or guaranteed maximum price (GMP) and proceeding with construction.

A defining characteristic of progressive design-build is earlier engagement of the design-builder compared to other design-build models. Rather than requiring proposers to develop extensive designs and confirm the price during procurement or upon selection, the owner brings the selected team on board and works jointly with them to validate project goals, evaluate alternatives, identify risks, and refine the design and determine the cost of the work. This approach promotes transparency through open-book costing and allows key decisions to be informed by real-time input from designers, constructors, and stakeholders before the GMP is approved by the owner.

The PDB process is commonly structured in two phases. During phase 1, or the preconstruction phase, the owner and design-builder collaborate to advance the design, establish project requirements, investigate risks, and develop a detailed cost proposal or GMP. Once sufficient

DRAFT

design definition has been achieved and the owner approves the GMP, the parties proceed with phase 2, or the design-build phase, which includes completion of design and construction. If the parties cannot agree on the final project's price or terms, the owner retains the right to complete the project with another design-build team. By prioritizing qualifications, collaboration, and transparency, PDB can improve innovation, reduce procurement costs, enhance risk management, and increase the likelihood of achieving project objectives related to cost, quality, and schedule.

DGS Progressive Design-Build Approach

The DGS progressive design-build model was authorized on a limited basis for three projects. Public Contract Code section 10198 describes the PDB process that DGS followed. In summary, this section identifies that in the PDB model, the design-build entity (DBE) is selected early in the project using qualifications as the main factor. Cost can be an option in the best value selection process on a basis determined by the DGS. As part of the DBE request for qualifications and the basis of selection, DGS evaluates the DBE's experience on past projects, the DBE's design team and its listed trade partners, key DBE project staff, and their experience with design-build. Finally, DGS includes performance criteria, or owner project requirements, in the RFQ as well.

The PDB process is typically two phases, with the first phase being preconstruction, which includes some level of design services and a GMP price proposal from the DBE. The DGS process requires that the DBE submit a phase 1 code package for approval by the OSFM, but DGS does not require the phase 1 code package to be OSFM approved at the time of the GMP. If the GMP is accepted by DGS, the project then moves to phase 2, the design-build phase. In phase 2, the DBE completes the design, obtains all required permits, and constructs the project. At the end of the project, any funds not expended are returned to the DGS.

Abbreviated Performance Criteria and Guaranteed Maximum Price Development

The amount of performance criteria used on design-build projects varies depending on the type of project and the amount of information the owner determines is necessary to define it. Traditionally, owners included schematic designs as well to more fully define the project when asking for a price from the design-build team with its proposal. The growing use of progressive design-build has changed the need to develop extensive criteria, as the design-build entity is hired earlier in the project schedule, permitting the owner and the DBE to jointly design the project with abbreviated performance criteria.

The Judicial Council's design-build model currently uses abbreviated performance criteria that include a project summary with scope description, the project budget, and overall schedule; a project space plan including program and functional space relationships; a blocking/stacking plan; site design considerations including, traffic, parking, site utility requirements, and environmental mitigation; the Judicial Council's *California Trial Court Facilities Standards* (*CTCFS*), which is a guide to designing a superior courthouse; and reference materials unique to

DRAFT

the project site. The amount of performance criteria prepared can also depend on the experience of the owner with design-build and their level of risk tolerance.

The timing and development of the GMP depends directly on the amount of information previously prepared by the owner and the amount of design information the owner requires the DBE to complete prior to the submission of the GMP. The GMP is developed in the preconstruction phase; if the preconstruction phase is too short, the GMP includes more contingencies and qualifications and is less reliable. A longer preconstruction period yields greater design definition and a more reliable GMP proposal with fewer contingencies or qualifications. The key is balancing the length of preconstruction against the amount of design definition to obtain a reliable GMP. The establishment and acceptance of the GMP typically permit the second, or design-build phase, to begin.

Earlier Design-Build Entity Engagement With Authorities Having Jurisdiction

It is considered an industry best practice to be proactive with each authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) over a project as early as possible. Early engagement can eliminate redesign, improve permit approval timelines, and avoid rework during construction. On courthouse projects, the AHJs are:

- Office of the State Fire Marshal for fire and life safety systems;
- Division of the State Architect for accessibility compliance; and
- Board of State and Community Corrections for oversight of the detention facility portion of a courthouse.

The Judicial Council currently engages with the appropriate AHJ early in the schematic design process to make the AHJ aware of the project and timeline and to begin discussing any unique project code issues or requirements. This engagement is particularly important for large or high-rise courthouse projects, which have complex fire and life safety systems.

Design Review, Peer Review, and Code Checks of Design-Build Projects

The Judicial Council performs various design reviews, peer reviews and code checks on its projects with the goal of avoiding past mistakes that have led to cost and schedule impacts during construction. The level of review may have been based on construction manager at risk (CMR) delivery, where the Judicial Council has liability for design. Under design-build delivery, the Judicial Council's liability for design is greatly reduced, as it shifts to design-builder. This shift of liability could result in a reconsideration of the number of design reviews, peer reviews, and code checks performed prior to the issuance of permits by the different permitting agencies. A thorough review of these different reviews is recommended to confirm their necessity on design-build projects, which will take time to complete given the limited number of design-build projects carried out by the Judicial Council to date.

DRAFT

Lessons From the Lakeport and Ukiah Design-Build Projects

GMP Establishment—Working Drawings

On both projects, the GMP was based on approved design development drawings. The time lag between the completion of the design development drawings, compilation of the GMP, and Judicial Council approval of the GMP caused funding for design to be halted. Releasing the funding for working drawing development when the GMP is submitted would provide for a more streamlined project delivery. The actual authorization to proceed with working drawings could still be subject to Judicial Council approval based on confidence that the DBE will meet the GMP target.

Other Lessons Learned

On the Lakeport project, initial site access was delayed pending Judicial Council readiness to monitor compliance with environmental mitigation measures. Part of this delay involved the time required by the Judicial Council to contract for the required services. To mitigate future risks, key mitigation monitoring services are assigned to the construction manager.

Statutory and Regulatory Authority Required

The Judicial Council recommends it be given the authority to use progressive design-build delivery as defined in Public Contract Code section 10198(i) (Progressive design-build). This will enable the Judicial Council to take full advantage of progressive design-build and use the most modern delivery for its capital program. Progressive design-build will enable the Judicial Council to streamline its performance criteria process and engage the design-build entity earlier to achieve time savings.

DRAFT

VI. Evaluation of Judicial Branch Project Management Capacity and Needs

Current Project Management Capacity, Workload, and Staffing Needs

The Facilities Services office is led by a director and deputy director and includes about 140 staff who deliver capital construction projects, operate and maintain the substantial facilities portfolio, and lead emergency planning and security coordination functions. As part of the Judicial Council's commitment to accountability and continuous improvement, leadership has been evaluating the structure and resources of the office to strengthen oversight, capacity, and communication both internally and externally. Additionally, the 2026-27 Budget included a significant influx of capital construction resources without corresponding support resources. In response, the Judicial Council has redirected existing resources to the office, including the addition of a deputy director and additional project management positions and funding. While redirecting existing resources impacts other operational areas and is not sustainable in the long term, it reflects the Judicial Councils prioritization of this program.

Further, for several months, the Judicial Council has been examining its staffing needs for project management capacity prior to the influx of funding for additional courthouse projects authorized in the 2026–27 Budget. As the size and complexity of the capital outlay portfolio increased, the Judicial Council identified the need for a consistent, data-driven approach to evaluate staffing requirements for project managers and related functions, assess staffing adequacy per project, and forecast future staffing requirements.

The Judicial Council Project Management Unit (PMU) manages a substantial and growing portfolio of active and planned projects statewide. In addition to current workload commitments, future staffing projections incorporate projects identified in the Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, facility modification program, court-funded renovations, deferred maintenance projects, specialized efforts such as solar power, and anticipated courtroom renovation initiatives related to new judgeships. This expanding portfolio will continue to increase demand for project management resources over the planning horizon.

To assess the workload, a customized Project Manager Resource Management Tool was developed that provides Judicial Council leadership with an objective framework for measuring workload demand, evaluating organizational capacity, and identifying staffing needs. The tool incorporates project characteristics, delivery methods, phase durations, and planned levels of effort to produce a repeatable methodology for workforce planning and resource allocation. The approach is modeled after resource management practices used by other public-sector project delivery organizations, including the Department of General Services.

Based on the workload analysis, Judicial Council will require additional project management resources in its Project Management Unit to adequately support both current and projected workload demands. The recommended staffing increases include additional project managers,

DRAFT

senior project managers, managers, principal managers, and support staff in the PMU. These added positions will require additional support staff functions within Facilities Services and other offices within the Judicial Council to deliver these projects.

The PMU continues to experience challenges filling authorized project management positions, resulting in prolonged vacancies and increased reliance on consultant resources. These vacancies reduce available internal capacity and contribute to workload imbalances among existing staff. The workload assessment indicates that many project managers (including senior project managers) are assigned responsibilities that exceed sustainable capacity levels. In several instances, staff are simultaneously managing major capital projects and multiple facility modification projects, creating competing priorities and increasing the risk of schedule delays, cost impacts, and reduced project oversight. The analysis demonstrates that total project management demand currently exceeds available staffing capacity, even when consultant resources are considered.

Approach to Capital Design and Construction Management Staffing of Capital Projects

The Judicial Council is evaluating its current approach to the overall management, contract administration, construction management, and budgeting of its capital projects. This evaluation will examine budgeting of capital projects; the scope of work and duties of the various consultants involved in the design (performance criteria), construction management, and testing/inspection firms; and internal business processes. As part of this effort, we are examining the best practices at the Department of General Services and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

The scope of the evaluation will include how project managers use existing systems, processes, and procedures established for the management and delivery of capital projects, including:

- Schedule and cost management;
- Day-to-day project management activities and the overall project management approach, contract administration processes, and tools used by the project managers (PMs);
- PMs' understanding and support of and compliance with established systems and procedures;
- PMs' level of confidence and belief that current systems and procedures support and enhance their ability to deliver capital projects;
- Communication among PMs and their respective managers and Facilities Services executive management in making timely decisions and reporting project information; and
- Collaboration and communication between project team members and partners.

DRAFT

This type of evaluation will take several months to complete. Irrespective of the results of the project management evaluation, the Judicial Council will now assign project managers to new courthouse projects when the project is proposed in the annual State Budget. This will permit the preparation of initial project activities, such as beginning the procurement process for various consultants and identification of potential sites. The results of the Judicial Council project management evaluation will be shared and additional resources requested as appropriate.

Review of Judicial Council Internal Operations That Support Design and Construction of Capital Projects

There are several internal Judicial Council operations, processes, functions, and procedures that support the design and construction management of a new courthouse project. These include funding-related transactions, procurement and contracting practices, site acquisition processes, design reviews and permitting, and payments to vendors. This review will examine current roles and responsibilities, internal business processes, and procedures and related staffing to look for opportunities to streamline and improve timelines.

VII. Additional Approaches to Accelerate Capital Outlay Projects

Alternative Delivery Methods

The budget language requiring this report requests a discussion and evaluation of "any other approaches that could accelerate capital outlay projects." This section reviews alternative contracting methods used by public agencies in California for public facilities and includes a discussion about technology that is impacting the construction of buildings.

Lease-Purchase or Build-to-Suit

One project delivery method used by the State of California is lease-purchase, or build-to-suit. A state lease-purchase or build-to-suit project is when the state leases a facility with an option to gain ownership, making rental payments only after occupancy. Lease-purchase projects have been previously approved in the executive branch for a variety of projects including office buildings and California Highway Patrol field offices.

Under a lease-purchase model, a development company is selected to perform the design, construction, and financing. The development company is normally hired with a two-step procurement. The first step is to create a list of qualified firms that are issued a request for proposal, with final selection based on lease rate, proposed design, or both.

If using the lease-purchase method, the Judicial Council should purchase a site for which all developers submit a proposal. An option is for the Judicial Council to obtain a purchase option and assign the responsibility to purchase the selected site to the selected developer.

DRAFT

The lease-purchase method is likely considered a capitalized lease and may have to be authorized by the Legislature. While a courthouse project can be delivered using the lease-purchase method, it is likely more expensive when compared to a state-funded design-build project due to private-sector financing costs. This delivery method could be an option for the state to consider when state funding for capital projects is limited.

Public-Private Partnerships

Another project delivery method is public-private partnership, sometimes referred to as P3. A P3 is a long-term contractual agreement between a government agency and a private-sector company to fund, build, and operate public infrastructure or services. Although not a usual form of public project delivery, the use of P3 has been increasing across the United States, including in California, for infrastructure involving transportation, utility, and building projects.

P3 project agreements typically include:

- A term or agreement duration of 20 to 30 years or longer.
- Financing from the private-sector company to provide up-front capital or to design and construct the project. Repayment by the public entity comes in different forms depending on the project type. Common forms of repayment are government availability payments, lease payments, user fees (like tolls), or a mix of these.
- Project risks are shared by the party best suited to manage them (government handles regulation/policy; private partner handles construction, design, and operations).
- Models such as design-build-finance-operate-maintain or build-own-operate-transfer.

The use of public-private partnerships typically requires the approval of the Legislature. One P3 project implemented by the Judicial Council was the completion of the George Deukmejian Courthouse in Los Angeles County in 2013. For this project, the Judicial Council, working with the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency, provided an entitled project site. A private-sector company then financed building design, construction, maintenance, and operations. The repayment period is 35 years, after which the ownership of the courthouse will be transferred to the Judicial Council. The project was authorized by the Budget Act of 2007 for acquisition and the authority to enter into a multiyear lease purchase agreement. (Gov. Code, § 70391.5.)

P3 projects are highly complex. The benefits and risks related to the P3 process, as well as the financial viability, should be carefully evaluated with the services provided by the private-sector entity and the repayment period.

DRAFT

Technology and Innovation Opportunities

Prefabrication

Prefabrication in construction means manufacturing building parts (like walls, panels, trusses, or mechanical skids) in a controlled factory setting before transporting and assembling them on the job site. Categories of prefabrications include:

- Manufacturing specific subassemblies or parts off-site;
- Modular construction: A subset of prefabrication where complete building components, such as restrooms, electrical closets, and utility rooms, are constructed off-site; and
- Off-site construction: An umbrella term that includes all planning, design, and building done away from the final site.

Today, prefabrication is currently being used in buildings of all sizes throughout the state. Common trade applications include:

- Structural: Steel frames, precast concrete slabs and beams;
- Envelope: Exterior wall panels, window wall systems; and
- Mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems including heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) ductwork, piping spools, electrical raceways, subpanels, and prepackaged bathroom plumbing assemblies.

Key benefits of prefabrication can include:

- Speed: Parallel factory production and site prep cut project timelines;
- Quality: Indoor assembly lines using computer-aided design (CAD) and building information modeling (BIM) tools reduce human error and produce tighter tolerances;
- Safety: Controlled factory floors can reduce heavy job site hazards and weather delays;
- Sustainability: Exact material optimization lowers waste and site pollution; and
- Labor efficiency: Skilled-trade shortages are mitigated by requiring smaller on-site crews.

The larger the courthouse project, the greater the opportunities are for the above benefits to be realized because there are a greater number of repeatable spaces that could be constructed off-site.

DRAFT

Operational Shifts
The use of design-build can increase the use of prefabrication because key trade contractors can influence the design of a courthouse to permit increased use of prefabrication. The decision to prefabricate is best left in the hands of the design-build team because prefabrication requires:

- Early decision making, designs, clash avoidance, and tolerances must be locked in during early digital modeling to support field execution;
- Logistics and procurement, which rely on just-in-time delivery, component-based sourcing, and heavy lifting/crane plans; and
- Trade coordination, which requires up-front alignment between architects, fabricators, and contractors.

Applying prefabrication to courthouse construction shifts the strategy from a standard commercial build to an institutional, high-security, high-performance framework requiring advanced coordination to navigate the strict California Building Code, seismic mandates, and strict security profiles.

Modular Construction
The next potential area for prefabrication is modular construction, where components of the building are manufactured off-site and then installed in the building as part of the courthouse construction process. For courthouse projects to be adaptable to modular construction, it is recommended that the Judicial Council carefully study which components or program spaces would be acceptable before selecting off-site manufacture. This is best done by adopting standardized program and code requirements for each component. Potential building spaces include toilet rooms, electrical closets, intermediate distribution frame closets, holding cells, jury deliberation rooms, judges' bench, jury box, clerk spaces, and possibly judicial officer chambers. The Judicial Council could include this information in *CTCFS* and all courthouse projects for design-build procurements and evaluate the use of modular construction with the selected design-build team. It is estimated that this type of study could take as much as 12 months to be prepared and approved for use.

Best Practices From Other Branches, Departments, and Agencies
The Judicial Council team developing this report has extensive experience with capital projects procured by the Department of General Services and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. All discussion and recommendations throughout this report are consistent with the best practices for program, project, and construction management of these departments.

DRAFT

Appendix A
Current Project Portfolio and Pipeline

The information below is referenced in section I.

Active and Completed Projects for Fiscal Year 2026–27

As of the submission of this report, the Judicial Council has successfully delivered one completed design-build project, within the authorized GMP and on schedule, and has three active design-build projects, each of which is within budget and on schedule, and two construction manager at risk (CMR) projects with planned completion this fiscal year.

Table A.1. Completed Projects

Project	County	Courtrooms	Budget ($M)	Completed
New Lakeport Courthouse	Lake	4	87	September 2026

Table A.2. Active Projects

Project	County	Courtrooms	Budget ($M)	Scheduled Completion
New Indio Juvenile & Family Courthouse (CMR)	Riverside	5	86	December 2026
New Modesto Courthouse (CMR)	Stanislaus	27	395	March 2027
New Ukiah Courthouse	Mendocino	7	151	October 2027
New Sixth Appellate District Courthouse	Santa Clara	1	92	October 2028
New Fort Ord Courthouse	Monterey	7	16	November 2029

CMR = Construction manager at risk

Currently Funded Projects

Including all projects with current funding, the Judicial Council has nine design-build projects in the acquisition or performance criteria phase.

DRAFT

Table A.3. Fully Funded Design-Build Projects in Acquisition or Performance Criteria Phase

Project	County	Court-rooms	Budget ($M)	Anticipated Completion
New Solano Hall of Justice	Solano	12	334	2032
New Quincy Courthouse	Plumas	2	100	2032
New San Luis Obispo Courthouse	San Luis Obispo	12	351	2032
New Santa Clarita Courthouse	Los Angeles	24	674	2033
New Nevada City Courthouse	Nevada	6	202	2034
New Fresno Courthouse	Fresno	36	965	2034
New Tracy Courthouse	San Joaquin	2	69	2034
New East County Courthouse	Kern	4	70	2037
Tahoe Courthouse Renovation	Placer	1	24	2037

Additionally, there are six fully funded design-bid-build projects.

Table A.4. Fully Funded Design-Bid-Build Projects

Project	County	Court-rooms	Budget ($M)	Anticipated Completion
Butte County Juvenile Hall Addition and Renovation	Butte	1	6	2027
Sutter County Courthouse Judgeship	Sutter	1	7	2027
San Joaquin Courthouse Judgeship	San Joaquin	1	6	2027
Kings County Courthouse Judgeship	Kings	1	8	2028
Spring Street Courthouse—Chatsworth Buildout	Los Angeles	6	30	2028
Clearlake Courthouse Renovation	Lake	1	25	2032

Five-Year Plan Pipeline

Fifteen new design-build projects are included in the judicial branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for fiscal year 2027–28.

DRAFT

Table A.5. Five-Year Infrastructure Plan—Design-Build

Project	County	Court-rooms	Budget Phase Funded	Budget ($M)	Planned FY Start
New Richmond Courthouse	Contra Costa	6	All	182	2027–28
New San Francisco Hall of Justice	San Francisco	24	All	883	2027–28
New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse	Orange	4	All	145	2027–28
New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	Santa Barbara	8	All	257	2027–28
New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse—Mosk Replacement	Los Angeles	100	Acq.	277	2028–29
New Placerville Courthouse	El Dorado	6	Acq./PC	11	2028–29
New Inyo County Courthouse	Inyo	2	Acq./PC	5	2029–30
New Victorville Courthouse	San Bernardino	31	Acq.	12	2029–30
New Mariposa Courthouse	Mariposa	2	Acq./PC	5	2029–30
New Santa Cruz Courthouse	Santa Cruz	9	Acq./PC	11	2030–31
New San Diego Juvenile Courthouse	San Diego	10	Acq.	16	2030–31
New Riverside Juvenile Courthouse	Riverside	5		TBD	2031–32
New Tulare North County Courthouse	Tulare	14		TBD	2031–32
New West Covina Courthouse	Los Angeles	15		TBD	2031–32
New Eastlake Courthouse	Los Angeles	6		TBD	2031–32

Acq. = Acquisition
FY = Fiscal year
PC = Performance criteria
TBD = To be determined

There is one new design-bid-build project included in the five-year plan.

Table A.6. Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Design-Bid-Build

Project	County	Courtrooms	Budget ($M)	Planned FY Start
Fresno Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse Renovation	Fresno	2	12	2028–29

FY = Fiscal year

DRAFT

DRAFT Capital Outlay-Related Budget Change Concepts

Fiscal Year 2028–29

Court Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting

November 4, 2026

Budget Change Concepts

- **Budget Change Concepts (BCCs) are integral to the Judicial Council's budget development process, which occurs annually as follows:**
  - In **October,** Judicial Council staff develop draft BCCs.
  - **Prior to January,** advisory committees provide initial review of all BCCs.
  - All BCCs are submitted in **January** to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (JBBC).
  - JBBC holds public meetings in **February** and **May** to make a recommendation to the Judicial Council on which BCCs should become Budget Change Proposals (BCPs).
  - The Judicial Council makes a final determination in **July** on which BCPs should be submitted to the Department of Finance—capital outlay-related in **August** and all others in **September.**

Capital Outlay-Related BCCs

- **The CFAC provides initial review of all capital outlay-related BCCs** while, respectively, the Trial Court Facility Modification and Court Security advisory committees review the other facility-related BCCs.
- **Four capital outlay-related BCCs are proposed in FY 2028–29:**
  - **Capital Outlay Projects Reassessment and Program Support.**
  - **Statewide: Budget Packages and Advanced Planning.**
  - **Capital Outlay Funding: Fiscal Years 2028–29 through 2032–33.**
  - **Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse - Chatsworth Buildout.**

Capital Outlay-Related BCCs, *continued*

- **Capital Outlay Projects Reassessment and Program Support.**
  - A combination of one-time/ongoing funds for staffing and facilities planning, facility modifications and capital projects including reassessment of all unfunded capital projects.
- **Statewide: Budget Packages and Advanced Planning.**
  - Ongoing funds for planning studies and budget packages for capital outlay projects.
- **Capital Outlay Funding: Fiscal Years 2028–29 through 2032–33.**
  - One-time funds for capital projects—aka, the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*.
- **Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse - Chatsworth Buildout.**
  - Construction funds for the build out of shelled space in the Chatsworth Courthouse to assist the Spring Street Courthouse relocation to other court facilities in Los Angeles County.

Requested Action

1. Approve the four, draft, capital outlay-related Budget Change Concepts for Judicial Branch Budget Committee consideration at its upcoming meeting in February 2027.

[For BS use only]
Tracking Number: FY-##

DRAFT Judicial Branch
2028–29 Budget Change Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

Requesting Entity (Advisory Body):
Court Facilities Advisory Committee

Requesting Program or Subprogram:
Judicial Council Facilities Services

Proposal Title:
Capital Outlay Project Reassessments and Program Support

Proposal Summary:
The Judicial Council of California requests 20.3 positions and $28.7 million in fiscal year (FY) 2028−29, which includes $9.5 million ongoing General Fund (GF) and $19.1 million one-time GF, and 39.0 positions and $14.1 million ongoing beginning in FY 2029−30. This request will provide court facilities planning services, oversight for facility modifications, and management of capital projects. With the 2026 Budget Act funding to accelerate progress on the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* and facilities for new judgeships, the Judicial Council will require additional staffing and/or consulting resources to address these projects. The $9.5 million one-time GF funding request for FY 2028−29 will support a reassessment of all unfunded courthouse capital-outlay projects and support for additional construction projects.

Does this proposal require legislation 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 (0001)

Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousand[1])

Fiscal Year	2028–29 (BY)	2029–30 (BY+1)	2030–31 (BY+2)	2031–32 (BY+3)	2032–33 (BY+4)
Positions	20.3	39.0	39.0	39.0	39.0
Personal Services	5,664,000	10,224,000	10,224,000	10,224,000	10,224,000

[1] Include all costs associated with the request, including costs for other offices and courts.

Operating Expenses & Equipment	23,032,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Local Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	28,696,000	14,124,000	14,124,000	14,124,000	14,124,000
One-time	19,132,000	0	0	0	0
Ongoing	9,564,000	14,124,000	14,124,000	14,124,000	14,124,000

Problem Statement:
The Judicial Council lacks sufficient funding to support critical court facilities planning for unfunded courthouse capital-outlay projects. The proposal of one-time funding of $19.1 million consists of: $8.3 million to address temporary personnel contracts; $6.5 million for consultants' assessment of court needs and plans development; $3 million for facility condition assessments (FCAs) to begin a reassessment of all unfunded courthouse capital-outlay projects targeting completion in 2029; and $1.3 million for litigation support. Included in the ongoing funding request is $3.9 million annually to secure a project management tool and program management services. The Judicial Council's last reassessment was in 2019, and it is on a 10-year cycle for each reassessment. Each reassessment ensures the Judicial Council puts forth the most-needed capital projects for funding.

The Budget Act of 2026 provided the Judicial Council with funding to begin four new capital projects and continue the next phase for nine previously approved court construction projects. This funding was $1.9 billion ($179.7 million from the General Fund and $1.7 billion from the Public Buildings Construction Fund). The Budget Act of 2026 also provided $99.9 million to begin funding 13 new judgeships over the next five years, which represents half of the 26 judgeships authorized by SB 75 (Stats. of 2023, ch. 482). To support all projects, the Judicial Council will require additional staffing and/or consulting resources to address the expanded and accelerated scope of projects.

In 2002 the responsibility of California's courthouse 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, 36 trial court capital-outlay projects have been completed: 32 new courthouses and four major renovations of existing buildings. Of the state's 58 trial courts, 31 have benefited from these completed projects. Another four capital projects are projected to be completed by the end of 2027.

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 were 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, 16 of the 80 projects have received initial funding: one has been completed and 15 are underway.

Justification:
To support these efforts, Judicial Council Facilities Services conducted an analysis of staffing workload analysis based on industry best practices in delivery projects and programs. This analysis included comparison of effort and tasks required to be completed by every project type, project durations, allocated hours per month available to manage tasks, historical project durations, historical actual durations, and future capital projects that follow the five-year infrastructure plan and non-capital projects. This analysis included determining staffing workload and staffing salary compensation, resulting in an estimated staffing costs of $10.1 million. To support the needed efforts additional project management resources will be required to scope, plan, design, and oversee execution, Legal Services are needed to provide additional support for procurement, contracts, disputes, and litigation, and additional support from Human Resources will be required for talent acquisition and management. Additional support is needed to address the overall increase in contract volume across the full lifecycle, volume of Service Work Orders and FI$CAL entries along with additional engineering and inspection support. The 39 positions in the table below support workload associated with new capital-outlay projects, facilities for new judgeships, and existing courthouse projects statewide:

Staff Position	No. of Positions
Senior Project Manager	6
Project Manager	9
Associate Analyst	2
Manager, Project Management	3
Principal Manager I	2
Administrative Coordinator	1
Fiscal Analyst	1
Engineer	1
Construction Inspector	1
Engineer Specialist	1
Senior Facility Analyst	3
Associate Fiscal Analyst	2
Administrative Specialist	1
Senior Human Resource Analyst	1

Attorney II	2
Fiscal Supervisor	1
Senior Fiscal Analyst	1
Principal Manager II	1
Total	**39**

The project management and supervisory positions identified above are supported by an independent workload assessment of the Judicial Council Facilities Services Project Management Unit completed in August 2026, which applied a resource management tool modeled on resource planning practices used by other state agencies, namely Department of General Services. The assessment converts project characteristics, including project count, delivery method, project phase, phase duration, and planned monthly level of effort, into measurable labor-hour demand and compares that demand against the net assignable capacity of each project manager, calculated from 2,080 annual gross hours and 1,776 annual productive hours. The current portfolio demands approximately 7,038 monthly hours, equivalent to 42 project management positions measured against 16 currently authorized positions, a gross shortfall of 26 positions that is reduced to approximately 15 after crediting contracted resources presently performing project management work. Supervisory and support positions were derived from span-of-control ratios benchmarked against other state agencies, namely the Department of General Services, which maintain three-to-five project managers per manager and approximately three managers per principal manager. The methodology is transparent and repeatable, allowing staffing forecasts to be independently recalculated as project conditions change.

Beyond direct project management, the expanded program generates proportional workload in the technical, contractual, fiscal, and administrative functions that support project delivery. Facilities Services requests one additional Principal Manager II position to distribute the expanding workload more effectively and improve span of control. Currently, the existing Principal Manager II oversees six direct reports, including Principal Managers I, Managers, and Supervisors. This proposal would add two additional direct reports. Under the proposed structure, the office will have two Principal Manager II positions, each with four direct reports. One portfolio will oversee the Project Management Unit and Real Estate Unit, while the second will oversee Facilities Operations, Program Support, Emergency Planning and Security, and the Building Official Unit. This alignment also eliminates direct management from the Director. Engineering, inspection, and facility analysis positions are needed to perform design review, constructability and code review, construction inspection, commissioning support, and facility condition analysis across approximately 430 facilities totaling more than 22 million square feet. These responsibilities are currently absorbed by existing staff or performed through temporary project-specific contracts. Legal support is needed to address increased solicitation, contract, amendment, dispute, and litigation activity resulting from additional active projects and the accelerated procurement schedule established under the five-year infrastructure plan. Fiscal positions are required to process the corresponding growth in service work orders, invoices,

encumbrances, and FI$CAL transactions, and to maintain fund-source accounting across capital outlay, deferred maintenance, facility modification, and court-funded renovation programs. A Senior Human Resources Analyst is needed to support recruitment and classification activities for new positions. The workload analysis identified this work as time-sensitive because of documented challenges in filling existing project management vacancies. Administrative positions provide contract administration, records management, reporting, and scheduling support.

The Judicial Council will endeavor to hire all roles within the fiscal year, targeting completion of the hiring within nine months to ensure there are adequate resources to complete the approved program. In the meantime, the Judicial Council has contracts in place to temporarily retain some of the services needed. The Judicial Council is seeking $8.3 million for these contracted services until the positions are filled. Management classifications including Supervisors, Managers, and Principal Managers will be hired directly with no contract dollars allocated for temporary work, similar to administrative support staff within Budget Services, Accounting, Human Resources, and Legal Services.

In addition to the legal support staff requested above, the Judicial Council seeks $1.3 million for contract legal services (litigation defense) related to its program for FY 2028–29.

Salary adjustments are necessary to recruit and retain several hard to fill positions. The Judicial Council is asking for an additional $215,000 for targeted salary adjustments that are needed to stay competitive.

Departmentwide and Statewide Considerations:
This funding request will uphold the originating legislative directives aimed at making courthouses throughout the state accessible and functional. Additionally, it aligns with the priorities of diversity, equity, and inclusion set by the Newsom administration. It ensures that residents from every county in California have access to buildings that are designed, built, and maintained according to standards such as the federal Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessible Design and the California Building Code, which ensure full access to 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 remains unchanged.

Outcomes and Accountability:
The Judicial Council will be able to perform critical court facilities planning by completing its reassessment of all unfunded courthouse capital-outlay projects by its target completion in 2029. This reassessment will consider changes that have taken place over the 10-year timeframe to facility conditions, methodology criteria, and court operations, such as the

increased use of remote hearings and adaptation to the hybrid work environment. It will also allow for the development of appellate court capital projects.

The Judicial Council's Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) provides oversight of the council's five-year infrastructure plan and courthouse construction program. To ensure accountability, Judicial Council Facilities Services is obligated to work with the committee throughout the reassessment effort. The CFAC will ultimately make a recommendation to the council to formally adopt the updated prioritization methodology for implementation as well as an updated statewide list of capital projects.

Under the trailer bill provisions of the Budget Act of 2026, the Judicial Council is required to provide a report to the Legislature outlining strategies to accelerate and streamline courthouse construction by January 10, 2027.

Implementation Plan:
Regarding the capital projects reassessment, with approval of this budget proposal, the Judicial Council will allocate funds for the following activities to target completion in 2029:

1. Assessment of trial court needs and plans development
2. Facility condition assessments
3. Updating the current prioritization methodology
4. Project evaluation and scoring
5. Development of an updated *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects,* in addition to the development of any needed appellate court capital projects

Capital projects are ranked based on scores determined by the updated prioritization methodology. FCAs—of facilities occupied by the trial courts—identify infrastructure systems and components requiring immediate repair or replacement based on their useful life expectancy, projecting capital funding needs over a 10-year life cycle. FCAs are the basis for the Facility Condition Index (FCI), which is an integral component of the prioritization methodology. Current FCAs only project needs through 2029 and are slowly becoming outdated. New FCAs would project needs through 2039, which is needed to apply the latest FCI to update the scores of existing projects in the Judicial Council's *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects* or, if applicable, develop the score of a new project not currently on this list.

The Budget Act of 2026 accelerates progress on the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan*, allowing four new projects to begin and the next phases to continue of nine previously approved court construction projects. Implementation is contingent on the funding of positions to meet the workload analysis.

Supplemental Information:
The 2019 reassessment effort produced the Judicial Council's latest *Statewide List of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*, prioritized on needs- or cost-based scores from the application of the council's *Revision of Prioritization Methodology for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects*.

Impacted Program or Subprogram:
This proposal impacts Judicial Council Facilities Services and supports capital-outlay planning, facility condition assessments, project prioritization, and statewide courthouse construction activities. Approval of the proposal will support reassessment of unfunded courthouse capital-outlay projects, planning for facilities associated with new judgeships, and delivery of courthouse construction projects statewide. The proposal will also support FCAs, project prioritization activities, and program oversight necessary to manage the expanded capital project portfolio.

Required Review/Approval:
Court Facilities Advisory Committee
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Choose from drop down, advisory bodies who should review this proposal.

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.

Office Director/Leadership Signature: Type your name to enter signature.

Contact Name: Jagan Singh

[For BS use only]
Tracking Number: FY-##

DRAFT Judicial Branch
2028–29 Budget Change Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

Requesting Entity (Advisory Body):
Court Facilities Advisory Committee

Requesting Program or Subprogram:
Judicial Council Facilities Services

Proposal Title:
Statewide: Budget Packages and Advanced Planning

Proposal Summary:
The Judicial Council of California requests $500,000 ongoing General Fund beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2028–29 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 help confirm project scope, schedule, and budget for projects by developing budget packages, evaluating the number of courtrooms needed, and supporting the preliminary project site searches.

Does this proposal require legislation 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 (0001)

Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousand[1])

Fiscal Year	2028–29 (BY)	2029–30 (BY+1)	2030–31 (BY+2)	2031–32 (BY+3)	2032–33 (BY+4)
Positions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal Services	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Local Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000

[1] Include all costs associated with the request, including costs for other offices and courts.

One-time	0	0	0	0	0
Ongoing	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000

Problem Statement:
The number of studies the Judicial Council has been able to perform has been limited, funded by the courts themselves or 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 or recently completed planning studies include:

1. New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse Feasibility Study (in progress).
2. *Los Angeles Superior Court Long-Range Planning Study.*
3. *Superior Court of San Francisco County: New Hall of Justice Feasibility Study,* which is available under Tab 03B of the June 25, 2024, CFAC meeting materials.
4. *New Nevada City Courthouse Planning Study.*
5. *Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District: New Courthouse Feasibility Study,* which is available under Tab 03A of the June 17, 2022, CFAC meeting materials.
6. Placer Tahoe Courthouse Study at Tahoe Justice Complex, which is available under Tab 03B of the March 22, 2023, CFAC meeting materials.

Justification:
The Judicial Council does not have a dedicated funding source for planning studies. As court operations and services continue to evolve, planning studies are a valuable 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 project site search areas including test fits of sizes of prospective sites, 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 set of circumstances may require analysis of potential project site locations, utility improvements, swing space, and the effect on other facilities court operations and service to the public.

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, testing of site feasibility, or without planning for space for new judgeships and support staff in new or existing buildings.

Departmentwide and Statewide Considerations:
The Judicial Council, as the policymaking body for the judicial branch, has the following responsibilities and authorities with regard to court facilities, in addition to any other responsibilities or authorities established by law:

- Exercise full responsibility, jurisdiction, control, and authority as an owner would have over trial court facilities the title of which is held by the state, including but not limited to the acquisition and development of facilities.
- Exercise the full range of policymaking authority over trial court facilities, including but not limited to planning, construction, acquisition, and operation, to the extent not expressly otherwise limited by law.
- Establish policies, procedures, and guidelines for ensuring that the courts have adequate and sufficient facilities, including but not limited to facilities planning, acquisition, construction, design, operation, and maintenance.
- Allocate appropriated funds for court facilities maintenance and construction.
- Prepare funding requests for court facility construction, repair, and maintenance.
- Implement the design, bid, award, and construction of all court construction projects, except as delegated to others.
- Provide for capital-outlay projects that may be built with funds appropriated or otherwise available for these purposes according to an approved five-year infrastructure plan for each court.

The provision of this capital outlay request is directly related to the judicial branch's strategic plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. By providing the trial courts with the facilities required to carry out the judiciary's constitutional functions, the proposed project immediately addresses this goal. In addition, the proposed project supports the Judicial Council's commitment to Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion; Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; and Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch.

Outcomes and Accountability:
With approval of this proposal, the Judicial Council 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.
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 Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan.
7. Plan for project scope changes (e.g., from new construction to renovation) as directed by the Judicial Council's Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC).

The proposed funding would allow the Judicial Council to conduct studies and/or prepare budget packages for future projects. The candidate study projects would be selected based on complexity. Projects that would require study include those that have complex construction due to urban settings, require swing space evaluation, determination of utility availability, and construction phasing. The Judicial Council's statewide list has many courthouse capital projects in the five-year infrastructure plan that are in urban settings or will require evaluation for swing space. Not all projects would require a study.

Planning studies and budget packages for capital outlay projects are accountable through the Judicial Council's CFAC and will follow the established policy and procedures for approval and commitment of funds.

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. The proposed project 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.

Implementation Plan:
Beginning in FY 2028–29, Judicial Council Facilities Services will identify capital outlay projects based on project complexity and planning needs. Selected work will include planning studies and budget packages that evaluate project alternatives; develop space programs; assess site feasibility, utilities, swing space, and construction phasing; and define project scope, schedule, and budget. Study and budget package recommendations will be presented to the CFAC for review and approval.

Supplemental Information (If Applicable):
NA.

Impacted Program or Subprogram:
This proposal impacts the Judicial Council capital outlay program by providing ongoing funding for planning studies and budget packages for future trial and appellate court capital outlay projects. The work will support the development of project scopes, schedules, budgets, space programs, site evaluations, swing space options, construction phasing, and plans for accommodating future judgeships and support staff.

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.

Office Director/Leadership Signature: Type your name to enter signature.

Contact Name: Jagan Singh

[For BS use only]
Tracking Number: FY-##

DRAFT Judicial Branch
2028–29 Budget Change Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

Requesting Entity (Advisory Body):
Court Facilities Advisory Committee

Requesting Program or Subprogram:
Judicial Council Facilities Services

Proposal Title:
Capital Outlay Funding: Fiscal Years 2028−29 through 2032−33

Proposal Summary:
The Judicial Council of California requests $116 million General Fund and $1.0 billion Public Buildings Construction Fund totaling $1.2 billion one-time funding in fiscal year (FY) 2028–29 for five capital outlay projects, including four new and one continuing project. A total request of $2.0 billion is proposed over five years of initial and/or continuing phases for 17 capital outlay projects. This request is estimated based on the projects in the Judicial Council's latest plan for capital outlay and would be adjusted for any project phases supported in the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2028–29. Page 6 presents the draft projects table titled *Draft Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects.* The Court Facilities Advisory Committee (CFAC) will review any updates to the projects table in March 2027 and review a complete draft *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2028–29* in May 2027 for recommendation to the Judicial Council in July 2027.

Does this proposal require legislation 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 thousand[1])

Fiscal Year	2028–29 (BY)	2029–30 (BY+1)	2030–31 (BY+2)	2031–32 (BY+3)	2032–33 (BY+4)

[1] Include all costs associated with the request, including costs for other offices and courts.

Positions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal Services	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	1,157,941,000	523,502,000	29,775,000	70,053,000	258,057,000
Local Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,157,941,000	523,502,000	29,775,000	70,053,000	258,057,000
One-time	1,157,941,000	523,502,000	29,775,000	70,053,000	258,057,000
Ongoing	0	0	0	0	0

Problem Statement:
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, 36 trial court capital-outlay projects have been completed: 32 new courthouses and four major renovations of existing buildings. Of the state's 58 trial courts, 31 have benefited from these completed projects. Another four capital projects are projected to be completed by the end of 2027.

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, 16 of the 80 projects have received initial funding: one has been completed and 15 are underway.

Justification:
The Judicial Council courthouse construction program funding request is based on the projects outlined in the council's latest plan for capital outlay and would be adjusted for any project phases supported in the Governor's proposed budget for FY 2028–29. The capital outlay plan will be updated once the *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2028–29* has been approved by the CFAC and the Judicial Council. The five-year infrastructure plan is updated annually for Judicial Council adoption.

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. Small courthouse guidelines—for low-rise facilities of 1–4 courtrooms to achieve affordability, operational efficiency, and civic integrity while upholding the same standards of dignity, safety, and functionality as larger justice facilities and adapting scale, cost, and complexity to local conditions, have been added to the *California Trial Court Facilities Standards, 2026 Edition.*

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.

Departmentwide and Statewide Considerations:
The Judicial Council, as the policymaking body for the judicial branch, has the following responsibilities and authorities with regard to court facilities, in addition to any other responsibilities or authorities established by law:

- Exercise full responsibility, jurisdiction, control, and authority as an owner would have over trial court facilities for which title is held by the state, including but not limited to the acquisition and development of facilities.
- Exercise the full range of policymaking authority over trial court facilities, including but not limited to planning, construction, acquisition, and operation, to the extent not expressly otherwise limited by law.
- Establish policies, procedures, and guidelines for ensuring that the courts have adequate and sufficient facilities, including but not limited to facilities planning, acquisition, construction, design, operation, and maintenance.
- Allocate appropriated funds for court facilities maintenance and construction.
- Prepare funding requests for court facility construction, repair, and maintenance.
- Implement the design, bid, award, and construction of all court construction projects, except as delegated to others.
- Provide for capital-outlay projects that may be built with funds appropriated or otherwise available for these purposes according to an approved five-year infrastructure plan for each court.

The provision of this capital-outlay request is directly related to the judicial branch's strategic plan Goal VI: Branchwide Infrastructure for Service Excellence. By providing the trial courts with the facilities required to carry out the judiciary's constitutional functions, the proposed project immediately addresses this goal. In addition, the proposed project supports the judicial

branch's commitment to Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion; Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public; and Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch.

Outcomes and Accountability:
The CFAC provides ongoing oversight of the Judicial Council's five-year infrastructure plan and courthouse construction program. Each fully funded and completed project 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.

Implementation Plan:
The CFAC will review updates to the draft five-year capital outlay projects table in March 2027 and review the complete draft *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan* for Fiscal Year 2028–29 in May 2027. The committee's recommended plan will be presented to the Judicial Council in July 2027. Following approval and appropriation of funding, Judicial Council Facilities Services will implement the authorized project phases in accordance with the approved scope, schedule, and budget for each project.

Supplemental Information (If Applicable):
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*. The attached draft Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects identifies the proposed project phases and estimated funding by fiscal year. Project costs will be updated in the final five-year infrastructure plan.

Impacted Program or Subprogram:
This proposal impacts the judicial council capital outlay program and the trial courts associated with the funded projects by advancing the replacement or renovation of court facilities needed to support court operations and public access to justice.

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.

Office Director/Leadership Signature: Type your name to enter signature.

Contact Name: Jagan Singh

November 2026 Court Facilities Advisory Committee Review
DRAFT Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects[1]

(Dollars in Thousands)

	County	Project Name	Courtrooms	BY 1: FY 2028–29	Phase	BY 2: FY 2029–30	Phase	BY 3: FY 2030–31	Phase	BY 4: FY 2031–32	Phase	BY 5: FY 2032–33	Phase
BY 1 Cont.	Fresno	New Fresno Courthouse	36	$1,041,614	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BY 1 Starts	Contra Costa	New Richmond Courthouse	6	$ 18,842	AS	-	-	-	-	$ 2,061	D	$ 163,664	B
	San Francisco	New San Francisco Hall of Justice	24	$ 70,460	AS	-	-	-	-	$ 17,851	D	-	-
	Orange	New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse	4	$ 15,587	AS	-	-	-	-	$ 1,803	D	-	-
	Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	8	$ 11,438	D	$ 236,413	B	-	-	-	-	-	-
BY 2 Starts	Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (Mosk Replacement)	100	-	-	$ 277,437	AS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	6	-	-	$ 8,271	AS	-	-	$ 2,401	D	-	-
	Fresno	Fresno Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse Renovation	2	-	-	$ 1,381	PW	$ 10,396	C	-	-	-	-
BY 3 Starts	Inyo	New Inyo County Courthouse	2	-	-	-	-	$ 3,528	AS	-	-	$ 1,802	D
	San Bernardino	New Victorville Courthouse	31	-	-	-	-	$ 12,844	AS	-	-	-	-
	Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	2	-	-	-	-	$ 3,007	AS	-	-	$ 1,431	D
BY 4 Starts	Santa Cruz	New Santa Cruz Courthouse	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 10,833	AS	-	-
	San Diego	New San Diego Juvenile Courthouse	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 16,531	AS	-	-
	Riverside	New Riverside Juvenile Courthouse	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 18,573	AS	-	-
BY 5 Starts	Tulare	New Tulare North County Courthouse	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 16,605	AS
	Los Angeles	New West Covina Courthouse	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 24,371	AS
	Los Angeles	New Eastlake Courthouse	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 50,184	AS
	-	***Totals***	***280***	***$1,157,941***	-	***$ 523,502***	-	***$ 29,775***	-	***$ 70,053***	-	***$ 258,057***	-

Table Footnote:

1. Estimated project phase costs do not include construction cost escalation from August 2026 to July 2027. 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

[For BS use only]
Tracking Number: FY-##

DRAFT Judicial Branch
2028–29 Budget Change Concept

(4 Page Maximum Length)

Requesting Entity (Advisory Body):
Court Facilities Advisory Committee

Requesting Program or Subprogram:
Judicial Council Facilities Services

Proposal Title:
Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse - Chatsworth Buildout

Proposal Summary:
The Judicial Council of California requests $46.1 million one-time Public Buildings Construction Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2028–29 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. The total project cost is $52.4 million, which includes $6.3 million appropriated in the Budget Act of 2026 (FY 2026–27) for the Preliminary Plans and Working Drawings phases. This funding request is necessary due to the 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. The Construction phase includes holdover (of 150 percent of the monthly base rent) and additional rent for the court to operate the Spring Street Courthouse in its current location through the end of 2029 until project completion.

Does this proposal require legislation 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:
Public Buildings Construction Fund (00660)

Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousand[1])

Fiscal Year	2028–29 (BY)	2029–30 (BY+1)	2030–31 (BY+2)	2031–32 (BY+3)	2032–33 (BY+4)

[1] Include all costs associated with the request, including costs for other offices and courts.

Positions	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Personal Services	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	46,135,000	0	0	0	0
Local Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Total	46,135,000	0	0	0	0
One-time	46,135,000	0	0	0	0
Ongoing	0	0	0	0	0

Problem Statement:
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 hears 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).

Justification:
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. This request is necessary to build out and relocate six of the existing 24 courtrooms and operations to the Chatsworth Courthouse. The remaining courtrooms require relocation across six court districts in nine existing courthouses, which is a separate project whose funding was appropriated in the Budget Act of 2026 (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. However, this obligation is challenged by significant financial constraints, which exceed the current funds of the statewide facility modification program. The superior court's lease expires on December 31, 2028, and therefore, the Construction phase includes holdover (of 150 percent of the monthly base rent) and additional rent for the court to operate the Spring Street Courthouse in its current location through the end of 2029 until project completion.

To ensure all courtrooms are ready to accommodate all existing judicial officers with assigned caseloads by December 2029, it is essential that funding for construction is encumbered in FY 2028–29.

The superior court faces a significant challenge in moving from the Spring Street Courthouse, as there are six court departments with assigned civil caseloads 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). As 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 this asset, ensuring safety and access to justice.

Departmentwide and Statewide Considerations:
Timely access to justice for all Californias is a judicial branch priority. Without relocating the court departments and judicial officers currently serving at the Spring Street Courthouse to the Chatsworth Courthouse, 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:
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. Conducting a project to build out shelled space within the Chatsworth Courthouse efficiently utilizes an existing courthouse facility on predeveloped land, allowing the superior court to continue operations in a long-term capital asset and without bifurcating operations in the North Valley District.

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.

Implementation Plan:
To ensure all courtrooms are ready to accommodate existing judicial officers with assigned caseloads by December 2029, construction phase funding will be encumbered in FY 2028–29 to maintain the project schedule. The schedule assumes a July 2028 start for bid/award and construction activities, with project completion and court occupancy by the end of 2029.

Supplemental Information (If Applicable):
NA.

Impacted Program or Subprogram:
This proposal impacts Judicial Council capital outlay program by providing funding for the construction and buildout of six courtrooms, associated support space, and upgraded holding facilities at the Chatsworth Courthouse. The project supports the relocation of court operations from the Spring Street Courthouse following the federal government's divestment of the building.

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

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

Office Director/Leadership Signature: Type your name to enter signature.

Contact Name: Jagan Singh

Court Facilities Advisory Committee

As of November 4, 2026

Hon. Brad R. Hill, Chair
Administrative Presiding Justice of the
Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Hon. Eric J. Wersching, Vice-Chair
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Hon. JoAnn M. Bicego
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Siskiyou

Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Glenn

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Attorney at Law

Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Former Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

Hon. William F. Highberger
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District

Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.)
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

Hon. Patricia L. Kelly
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

Ms. Krista LeVier
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Lake

Hon. Elaine Lu
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Ms. Kyria Martinez
County Administrative Officer,
County of Kings

Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Fresno

Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Solano

Hon. Lisa M. Rogan
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Ms. Anabel Z. Romero
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

Hon. Sergio C. Tapia II
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.
Attorney at Law

Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Court Facilities Advisory Committee

As of November 4, 2026

SUBCOMMITTEES

Courthouse Cost Reduction Subcommittee

Hon. Steven E. Jahr (Ret.), Chair
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Ms. Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Hon. William F. Highberger
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.
Hon. Eric J. Wersching

Independent Outside Oversight Consultant Subcommittee

Vacant, Chair
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

Subcommittee on Courthouse Names

Vacant, Chair
Hon. Donald Cole Byrd
Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.