



# **Site Selection and Acquisition Policy for Judicial Branch Facilities**

---

August 14, 2009



Judicial Council of California

## 1. Goals and Principles Guiding Site Selection and Acquisition

Successful implementation of the trial and appellate court capital outlay program is grounded in the following goals and principles to be applied to each capital outlay project in the context of selecting a site for a new court facility:

- 1.1. Strive to maximize the efficiency of each dollar appropriated by making timely decisions.
- 1.2. The scope of the project shall not be reduced, which would jeopardize the quality and functionality of the building.
- 1.3. Projects should be sited in areas that are accessible to the public.
- 1.4. As long as the three goals and principles (stated above) are met, siting a new courthouse should strive to meet historical and local preferences.
- 1.5. The Judicial Council of California will work in partnership with the court(s) to implement this policy.

## 2. Definitions

- 2.1. Acquisition: Purchase or conveyance of land and/or building for court facilities.
- 2.2. Contaminated Sites: Sites that are directly or indirectly polluted.
- 2.3. Controversial Sites: Sites or matters related to site selection and/or acquisition for new court facilities, which include unresolved issues or disputes about criteria, cost, location, potential environmental impacts or any other feature of a specific site or sites, which are raised by members of the staff of the Judicial Council, the Project Advisory Group, the court or courts involved in the project, the local or regional jurisdictions, the public or private business entities.
- 2.4. Court Facilities: Buildings or other structures used for court operations or functions, including grounds appurtenant and/or parking.
- 2.5. Eminent Domain: The right of government to take private property for public purpose. Eminent domain is governed by California Code of Civil Procedure, sections 1230.010 et seq.
- 2.6. Lease: Term-based transaction with third party for land, buildings and/or parking for court facilities.
- 2.7. Priority Criteria: Those project, technical, or economic criteria that must be met to support a project that meets the goals and principles of site selection and acquisition articulated in Section 3. Decision Making Authority. (See section 9.1.)
- 2.8. Site Selection: The process of establishing appropriate criteria, potential locations, and evaluation of options for locating for new court facilities.
- 2.9. State Public Works Board (SPWB): Under the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (SB1732-Dunn), Section 70304 (b), acquisition and construction of court facilities is subject to the Property Acquisition Law, Government Code Section 15850 et seq. Under that statute, site acquisitions are subject to approval by the SPWB. The SPWB was

created by the California Legislature to oversee the fiscal matters associated with construction of projects for state agencies, and to select and acquire real property for state facilities and programs.

### **3. Decision Making Authority – Role of the Administrative Director**

- 3.1. Whenever a capital project for a Judicial Branch facility is funded in the State Budget for site selection and acquisition, the Administrative Director or his or her designee will, upon recommendation by staff of the Judicial Council:
  - 3.1.1. Have the authority to establish criteria for selection of sites for specific projects;
  - 3.1.2. Approve sole source justification of any specific site;
  - 3.1.3. Have the authority to approve selection of sites prior to submittal to the SPWB;
  - 3.1.4. Have the authority to approve negotiated terms of acquisition prior to submittal to the SPWB;
  - 3.1.5. Have the authority to acquire court facility sites and to execute required documentation to acquire those sites without further Judicial Council approval; and
  - 3.1.6. Refer to the Judicial Council the approval decision for the selection and acquisition of those recommended sites that the Administrative Director, in his or her discretion, with input from the Judicial Council staff, determines are controversial, as that term is defined in Section 2 or as otherwise required or deemed appropriate by the Administrative Director, or by the Executive and Planning Committee of the Judicial Council.<sup>1</sup>

### **4. Role of the Project Advisory Group (PAG) in Site Evaluation and Selection**

- 4.1. The PAG is established by California Rules of Court, rule 10.184(d).<sup>2</sup>
- 4.2. The Judicial Council Project Manager chairs the PAG.
- 4.3. For new Judicial Branch facilities, the PAG will provide input to the Judicial Council. Input may include participating in: (a) defining objective and consistent site selection criteria; (b) determining which sites should be evaluated prior to site selection; and (c) determining the preferred and alternative site or sites or sites to be submitted to the SPWB. In every case the Administrative Director shall make the final site selection, except for those site selection decisions referred to the Judicial Council in section 3.1.6 above.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Rules of Court, rule 10.11 outlines responsibilities of Executive and Planning Committee:

<sup>2</sup> California Rules of Court, rule 10.184(d): “Advisory group for construction projects: The Judicial Council, in consultation with the leadership of the affected court, must establish and work with an advisory group for each court construction or major renovation project. The advisory group consists of court judicial officers, other court personnel, and others affected by the court facility. The advisory group must work with the Judicial Council on issues involved in the construction and renovation, from the selection of a space programmer and architect through occupancy of the facility.”

- 4.4. The Presiding Judge or a designated sitting judge shall represent the Court and other non-Judicial Council members of the Project Advisory Group and will sign off on the site selection criteria and recommended site presented to the Administrative Director.

## 5. Evaluation and Selection of Site Types

This section identifies the characteristics of sites, and the conditions under which such sites may or may not be selected for new Judicial Branch facilities.

- 5.1. Conditions and Characteristics of Sites to be Evaluated and Selected. This section identifies the conditions under which certain types of sites shall be evaluated and selected as prospective sites for new judicial branch facilities. Each of these site types will have certain merits and some site types introduce potential risks, schedule delays, or associated higher costs to the project. In developing the conditions under which each site type may be selected for a new Judicial Branch facility, the Judicial Council's intent is to support the goals and principles articulated in Section 1.
- 5.2. Downtown Site. Downtown sites include sites in densely developed areas of large cities and those compact areas in smaller cities that are locally known as the downtown. They may include civic center areas and other areas of concentrated office, governmental, or institutional uses.

Preference may be given to siting a new Judicial Branch facility in a downtown area, presuming said site meets other high priority criteria, upon the following:

- 5.2.1. The acquisition can be accomplished within the appropriated site acquisition budget, does not increase the total project budget, and does not result in schedule delays; or
  - 5.2.2. The acquisition results in an increase of no more than 5% to the appropriated site acquisition budget (still requires DOF/PWB augmentation under the current capital outlay system) and does not increase the total project budget (i.e., savings are found in the design and construction of the project to offset increase in the site acquisition costs), and does not delay the project schedule; or
  - 5.2.3. All project cost increases resulting from the acquisition are paid for by other public and/or private entities, including but not limited to cost increases due to infrastructure updates, environmental due diligence, escalation resulting from schedule delays and related costs; and
  - 5.2.4. There are no alternative sites that meet high priority criteria available for the courthouse within the demographic area to be served by the project.
- 5.3. Site Near Jail Facility. Sites near county and city jails are those that are directly adjacent or on the same parcel as an existing jail facility. Preference may be given to siting a new Judicial Branch facility near a jail facility, presuming said site meets other high priority criteria, only if:
    - 5.3.1. The acquisition can be accomplished within the appropriated site acquisition budget, does not increase the total project budget, and does not result in schedule delays; or

- 5.3.2. The acquisition results in an increase of no more than 5% to the appropriated site acquisition budget (still requires DOF/PWB augmentation under the current capital outlay system) and does not increase the total project budget (i.e., savings are found in the design and construction of the project to offset increase in the site acquisition costs), and does not delay the project schedule; or
- 5.3.3. All project cost increases resulting from the acquisition are paid for by other public and/or private entities, including but not limited to cost increases due to providing unanticipated infrastructure to support the new courthouse and escalation resulting from schedule delays;
- 5.3.4. The County commits to maintaining primary in-custody housing at the jail site for the anticipated lifecycle of the new courthouse; and
- 5.3.5. There is adequate public transportation serving the jail and its immediate vicinity.
- 5.4. Greenfield Site. Greenfield sites are sites that are undeveloped and may require the project to fund infrastructure (e.g., roads, electrical, water, sewer) to support the courthouse project. Preference may be given to siting a new Judicial Branch facility on a Greenfield site, presuming said site meets other high priority criteria, only if:
  - 5.4.1. The acquisition can be accomplished within the appropriated site acquisition budget, does not increase the total project budget, and does not result in schedule delays; or
  - 5.4.2. The acquisition results in an increase of no more than 5% to the appropriated site acquisition budget (still requires DOF/PWB augmentation under the current capital outlay system) and does not increase the total project budget (i.e., savings are found in the design and construction of the project to offset increase in the site acquisition costs), and does not delay the project schedule; or
  - 5.4.3. All project cost increases resulting from the acquisition are paid for by other public and/or private entities, including but not limited to the cost increases due to providing unanticipated infrastructure to support the new courthouse, site clean-up, and escalation resulting from schedule delays; and
  - 5.4.4. There is adequate public transportation serving the site or within a reasonable proximity.
- 5.5. Conditions and Characteristics of Sites That Will Not Be Selected. State law and sound fiscal policy dictate not siting Judicial Branch facilities on sites with specific conditions. The Judicial Council shall not site new Judicial Branch facilities on sites that meet one or more of the following:
  - 5.5.1. Violate the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code sections 2621 et seq.).
  - 5.5.2. Are located within a 100-year floodplain, as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, unless adequate and appropriate mitigation measures are approved by the Judicial Council, incorporated into the project and substantially reduce or eliminate the specific conditions.

- 5.5.3. Are contaminated sites, or sites that are directly or indirectly polluted. These sites may or may not qualify as a “brownfield” under the Brownfield Act.
- 5.5.4. Are located in an area with a known or anticipated water, development, or sewer moratorium, unless an express waiver from these restrictions can be promptly secured from the authorized entity.
- 5.5.5. Require additional costs—infrastructure, clean-up—to develop that would result in a need to augment, through the DOF/PWB current capital outlay system, the total project budget.
- 5.5.6. Will result in cost increases to the project that will not be paid for by either another entity or the current property owner and would, therefore, result in a reduction to project scope.
- 5.5.7. Create schedule delays that will unreasonably negatively affect court operations and potentially increase construction costs.

## **6. Use of Eminent Domain**

Use of eminent domain by other governmental entities to assemble or acquire properties for courthouses may be appropriate as determined by the Judicial Council in consultation with the local court.

## **7. Selection of Competitive Sites for PWB Approval**

- 7.1. In all site selections, Judicial Council staff will seek to identify at least two or more sites that best meet the site selection criteria and will have the authority to negotiate terms of acquisition with two, or multiple, sellers.
- 7.2. In those cases where multiple sites are not available, where specific sites which meet the high priority criteria have been offered to the state at no cost, or where there is a specific economic or other benefit to the state of a single site which meets the high priority criteria, a sole source justification for that property may be prepared by Judicial Council for consideration and approval by the Administrative Director, as indicated in Section 3 above. The sole source justification will describe the basis of site location subject to the standardized site criteria for evaluation and will explain and defend the economic or other benefit or opportunity of the site selection and acquisition to the state, based on its unique financial considerations or other features.

## **8. Site Selection Criteria**

- 8.1. This policy provides sample criteria for site selection to support objective and consistent guidelines by which the Judicial Council shall evaluate and ultimately select real property sites for location of new Judicial Branch facilities.
- 8.2. Judicial Council staff will consider and recommend sites for selection and acquisition that best meet the established criteria, including sites, locations, and proposals that will provide specific economic benefit or opportunities to the state.
- 8.3. The use of standardized criteria for selection of sites, the objective and consistent evaluation of available properties against these criteria, and the creation of a standard

process of competitive solicitation of properties, shall guide Judicial Council staff in recommendations to the Administrative Director and to the Judicial Council, as appropriate, for site acquisitions for facilities.

8.4. The Judicial Council, in selecting specific criteria, shall:

- 8.4.1. Establish consistent and objective priority criteria for identifying project-specific site requirements for new Judicial Branch facilities;
- 8.4.2. Provide a structured and comprehensive method to determine the general and specific site location criteria for a project; and
- 8.4.3. Provide demonstrable measures for competitive evaluation of potential sites that have been identified.

**9. Site Evaluation, Selection, and Acquisition Process**

This section outlines the process for evaluating sites for possible selection, selecting sites for presentation to the SPWB, and acquiring sites for new Judicial Branch facilities.

- 9.1. Use of Standardized Site Criteria: For all new Judicial Branch facilities, the Judicial Council shall select sites for preliminary evaluation based on site selection criteria. The Judicial Council will approve the priority and full set of final criteria prior to conducting any property identification or solutions. The Judicial Council will develop a weighting system for each project to identify priority criteria. The Judicial Council may establish unique weighting to reflect the specific requirements of a project. The Judicial Council must describe the basis for the weighing of criteria for each project. For each project, the Presiding Judge will approve the weighing system.
- 9.2. Identification of a Potential Site or Sites: Once the priority and full set of criteria are approved by the Judicial Council for a particular project, the Judicial Council will solicit and identify competitive proposals for sites that meet the site criteria. In the case of projects in which a specific site has been proposed for donation, or discounted purchase, or which provide some other specific and unique economic or other benefit or opportunity to the state, the Judicial Council will also solicit competitive proposals that meet the site criteria to provide an alternative if the donation or discounted purchase cannot be accomplished.
- 9.3. Evaluation of Identified Sites: Once a site or sites have been identified, the Judicial Council will determine which sites will be pursued competitively. The sites will be given a priority by the weighting and point-assignment system developed in the criteria stage described in Section 8. Specific sites which have been proposed for donation, or discounted purchase, or which provide some other specific and unique economic or other benefit or opportunity to the state, shall be evaluated by the same criteria as competitively solicited sites; except that in those cases where multiple sites are not available, where specific sites have been offered to the state at no cost, or where there is a specific economic or other benefit to the state of a single site, one site may be evaluated, for which a sole source justification will be prepared, as described in Section 7 above, if that sole source site meets the identified high priority selection criteria.
- 9.4. Site Investigation/Due Diligence: Once a site or sites have been identified for further evaluation the Judicial Council will engage in due diligence activities on each site. Due diligence will include but not be limited to title review; environmental review; appraisal; and may

also include surveys; geotechnical studies; and other additional studies/testing as warranted.

- 9.5. Administrative Director Approves Site Selection: Judicial Council staff shall submit to the Administrative Director a memorandum summarizing the site selection criteria and recommendation for selection of the preferred and one or more alternate sites or the justification for a sole source selection. After resolving any “Controversial Sites” issue, if any, pursuant to section 3.1.6, the Administrative Director will direct staff to proceed to presenting the site selection to the SPWB by signing approval on the staff memorandum.
- 9.6. Selection of Sites and Presentation to SPWB: Judicial Council staff presents the preferred and one or more alternate sites to the SPWB for approval.
- 9.7. Negotiation of Terms: Terms of acquisition will be negotiated by the Judicial Council after approval of selection by the SPWB.
- 9.8. Administrative Director Approves Site Acquisition: After negotiation of terms is concluded, Judicial Council staff present to the Administrative Director for approval all acquisition related documents.
- 9.9. Site Acquisition Approval and Presentation to the SPWB: After the Administrative Director approves all acquisition related documents, Judicial Council staff present the proposed acquisition to the SPWB for approval.

#### **10. Site Selection Criteria, Ranking, and Approval Form**

The following pages present a form that will be used for initially recording the site selection criteria, and then scoring those criteria, ranking a minimum of two sites, and indicating the approval of the Presiding Judge for the court, the Director of Judicial Council Facilities Services, and the Administrative Director.



## Site Selection Criteria

Superior Court of California - County of \_\_\_\_\_, New \_\_\_\_\_ Courthouse

Date of Advisory Team Meeting: Month, Day, Year

	<b>SITE SELECTION CRITERIA</b> (% indicates weighted importance)	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>			<b>Site 1 (Name)</b>	<b>Site 2 (Name)</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>
	<b>SITE FEATURES</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Acceptable or Neutral</b>	<b>Not Preferred</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Points</b>	
<b>SC 1.</b>	<b>Required Site Area/Site Coverage</b>						
SC 1.1	Minimum site area identified is ____ acres	Site area is within ____% of optimum area (____ ac)	Area is between ____% of optimum area (____ AC)	Site area is ____% over or under of optimum area (____ AC)			
SC 1.2	Parking for ____ vehicles	Site has ability for required parking (____ spaces)	Site has potential for ____ vehicles	Site has potential for less than ____ vehicles			
SC 1.3	Expansion Capability for future addition(s) of building	Site has expansion potential	Site has limited expansion potential	Site has no expansion potential			
SC 1.4	Expansion Capability for Parking	Site has expansion potential	Site has limited expansion potential	Site does not have expansion potential			
<b>SC 2.</b>	<b>Location Preferences/Adjacencies (modify depending on project scope/case type)</b>						
SC 2.1	Existing or proposed new pre-trial Holding Facility	Just adjacent to site	Within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of site	Beyond ____ mile of site			
SC 2.2	District Attorney	Just adjacent to site	Within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of site	Beyond ____ mile of site			
SC 2.3	Public Defender	Just adjacent to site	Within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of site	Beyond ____ mile of site			
SC 2.4	Probation	Within ____ mile radius (safe transport of detainees)	Within ____ miles of site (w/ access to major roads)	Beyond ____ miles of site (Difficult to transport detainees)			
SC 2.5	Local retail and eating areas	Within courthouse site or just adjacent to site	Within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of site	Beyond ____ mile of site			
SC 2.6	Social Services	Within courthouse site or just adjacent to site	Within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of Site	Site beyond ____ mile of Site			
SC 2.7	Public Transportation	Just adjacent to site	Within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of site	Site beyond ____ mile of Site			
SC 2.8	Public Open Space	Site adjacent to POS	Site within ____ blocks walking distance (< ____ mi) of POS	Site beyond ____ mile of POS			
<b>SC 3.</b>	<b>Security Concerns</b>						
SC 3.1	Ability to provide a 20' setback if required	Site provides for more than ____' setback	Site provides for ____' setback	Site provides for less than ____' setback			
<b>SC 4.</b>	<b>Sustainability/LEED Credits</b>						
SC 4.1	Site Elevation	Site elevation greater than 5ft above 100-yr flood'	Site elevation is at 5 ft above 100-yr flood	Site elevation not 5 ft above 100-yr flood			
SC 4.2	Solar orientation	Site/surrounds enhance natural daylight to project	Site/surrounds partially support natural daylight to project	Site/surrounds prevent natural daylight to project			
SC 4.3	Re-Use	Site has potential for re-use	Site has some potential for re-use	Site has little potential for re-use			

## Site Selection Criteria

Superior Court of California - County of \_\_\_\_\_, New \_\_\_\_\_ Courthouse

Date of Advisory Team Meeting: Month, Day, Year

	<b>SITE SELECTION CRITERIA</b> (% indicates weighted importance)	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>			<b>Site 1 (Name)</b>	<b>Site 2 (Name)</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>
	<b>SITE FEATURES</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Acceptable or Neutral</b>	<b>Not Preferred</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Points</b>	
<b>SC 5.</b>	<b>Neighborhood Character/Immediate Surroundings</b>						
SC 5.1	Neighborhood Compatibility Parameters:	Courthouse on this site fits surrounding use	Courthouse on this site may fit surrounding use	Courthouse on this site does not fit surrounding use			
SC 5.2	Neighborhood Use Compatibility Parameters:						
SC 5.2.a	Residential (Single Family)	Beyond __ blocks (__ mile) of site	Within __ blocks walking distance (< __ mi) of site	Just adjacent to site			
SC 5.2.b	Local Retail Area	Within __ blocks walking distance (< __ mi) of site	Within __ blocks walking distance (__ mi) of site	Beyond __ mile of site			
SC 5.2.c	Large Scale Retail: Malls	Beyond __ miles of site	Within __ miles of site	Within __ mile of site			
SC 5.2.d	Governmental Buildings/Center	Within __ blocks walking distance (1/4 mi) of site	Within __ mile of site	Greater than __ mile from site			
SC 5.2.e	Industrial Areas	Beyond __ miles of site	Within __ miles of site	Within __ miles of site			
SC 5.2.f	Neighborhood Concerns to adjacent courthouse	No neighborhood concerns	Some neighborhood concerns	Extensive neighborhood concerns			
<b>SC 6.</b>	<b>Traffic and Transportation</b>						
SC 6.1	Proximately to public transportation	Within 1 - 3 blocks walking distance (< 1/8 mi) of site	Within __ blocks walking distance (__ mi) of site	Beyond __ mile of site			
SC 6.2	Proximately to public parking	Within 1 - 3 blocks walking distance (< 1/8 mi) of site	Within __ blocks walking distance (__ mi) of site	Beyond __ mile of site			
<b>SC 7.</b>	<b>Image and Visibility</b>						
SC 7.1	Visibility of Site to Public	Site is visible and easy to find	Site has moderate visibility	Site is remote and difficult to find			
<b>SC 8.</b>	<b>Local Planning Requirements/Initiatives</b>						
SC 8.1	Compliance with local comprehensive land use plan	Project at site would fully comply with land use plan	Project at site would partially comply with land use plan	Project at site does not comply with land use plan			
<b>SC 9.</b>	<b>Initiatives</b>						
SC 9.1	Site for courthouse supports County and City planning initiatives	Supports County and City planning initiatives	Somewhat supports County and City planning initiatives	Contrary to County and City planning initiatives			
<b>SC 10.</b>	<b>Budget</b>						
SC 10.1	Site Acquisition Cost	Donated	Under-market value	Market value			

## Site Selection Criteria

Superior Court of California - County of \_\_\_\_\_, New \_\_\_\_\_ Courthouse

Date of Advisory Team Meeting: Month, Day, Year

	<b>SITE SELECTION CRITERIA</b> (% indicates weighted importance)	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>			<b>Site 1 (Name)</b>	<b>Site 2 (Name)</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>
	<b>SITE FEATURES</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Acceptable or Neutral</b>	<b>Not Preferred</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Points</b>	
SC 10.2	Existing buildings and site improvements	Clear of buildings & other site improvements	Minor demolition required to clear site	Buildings/ improvements to be demolished			
SC 10.3	Utility improvements available	Existing service or available at property line	Utility service within ____ mile of site	Utility service greater than ____ mile			
SC 10.4	Local Economic Development Impact	Courthouse on this site supports economic revitalization	Courthouse is compatible with local economic levels	Courthouse on this site disrupts local economic levels			
<b>SC 11.</b>	<b>Environment</b>						
SC 11.1	Environmental mitigation measures required	CEQA Negative Declaration	Moderate mitigation required	Extensive Mitigation Required			
SC 11.2	If any existing structures are to be demolished is abatement necessary?	No abatement necessary	Some abatement necessary	Extensive abatement necessary			
SC 11.3	Previous environmental concerns, e.g. industrial, farming, wetlands	No previous environmental concerns	Some previous environmental concerns	Extensive previous environmental concerns			
SC 11.4	Archeological/cultural area	Site has no archeological or cultural issues	Some Archeological or cultural issues	Conflicting archeological or cultural issues			
<b>SC 12.</b>	<b>Physical Elements</b>						
SC 12.1	Topographic and hydrologic characteristics of the site	Site is generally leveled with proper drainage	Moderate earth movement required to level and drain site	Extensive earth movement req. or poor drainage			
SC 12.2	Unique Features or Landmarks, if on site	Courthouse complements unique features or landmarks	Courthouse does not conflict with existing landmarks	Courthouse conflicts with unique features/landmarks			
SC 12.3	Existing improvements and buildings	Minimum demolition and removal	Moderate demolition and removal	Extensive demolition and removal			
SC 12.4	Existing vegetation and landscape	Minimum demolition and removal	Moderate demolition and removal	Extensive demolition and removal			
<b>SC 13.</b>	<b>Public Streets and Alleys</b>						
SC 13.1	Adjacent right of way improvements required	Fits in existing grid without additional requirements	Moderate re-work of existing grid is required	Extensive road and street work is required			
SC 13.2	Traffic control devices/improvements required	No additional traffic control improvements required	Moderate traffic control improvements required	Extensive traffic control improvements required			

## Site Selection Criteria

Superior Court of California - County of \_\_\_\_\_, New \_\_\_\_\_ Courthouse

Date of Advisory Team Meeting: Month, Day, Year

	<b>SITE SELECTION CRITERIA</b> (% indicates weighted importance)	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>			<b>Site 1 (Name)</b>	<b>Site 2 (Name)</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>
	<b>SITE FEATURES</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Acceptable or Neutral</b>	<b>Not Preferred</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Points</b>	
<b>SC 14.</b>	<b>Subsurface/Geotechnical Conditions</b>						
SC 14.1	Determine local geotechnical, subsurface and soils conditions	Soil conditions are favorable and ready for construction	Soil conditions may require moderate preparation	Soil conditions are uncertain or of potential high risk			
SC 14.2	Availability of Geotechnical reports	Geotechnical reports are readily available	Geotechnical study is underway	No geotechnical study has been started			
<b>SC 15.</b>	<b>Seismic Conditions/Requirements</b>						
SC 15.1	Determine state and local seismic requirements, parameters and zones	Standard seismic considerations	Moderate seismic considerations	High risk of seismic activity			
SC 15.2	Availability of seismic assessment reports	Seismic study conducted & report is readily available	Seismic study started; report is not yet available	No seismic study has been conducted at all			
<b>SC 16.</b>	<b>Utility Infrastructure/Local Systems' Capacity/Condition</b>						
SC 16.1	Power	Power available in top condition	Power may require upgrade	Power not available or may require additional resources			
SC 16.2	Sewer	Sewer available into condition	Sewer may require upgrade	Sewer not available or may require additional resources			
SC 16.3	Storm Runoff	Storm Runoff available in top condition	Storm Runoff may require upgrade	Storm runoff not available/may require add'l resources			
SC 16.4	Water	Water available in top condition	Water may require upgrade	Water not available or may require additional resources			
SC 16.4	Gas	Gas available in top condition	Gas may require upgrade	Gas not available or may require additional resources			
SC 16.5	Telephone	Telephone available in top condition	Telephone may require upgrade	Telephone not available/may require add'l resources			

## Site Selection Criteria

Superior Court of California - County of \_\_\_\_\_, New \_\_\_\_\_ Courthouse

Date of Advisory Team Meeting: Month, Day, Year

	<b>SITE SELECTION CRITERIA</b> (% indicates weighted importance)	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>			<b>Site 1 (Name)</b>	<b>Site 2 (Name)</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>
	<b>SITE FEATURES</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Acceptable or Neutral</b>	<b>Not Preferred</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Points</b>	
<b>SC 17.</b>	<b>Existing Use, Ownership and Control</b>						
SC 17.1	Current use of site	Currently vacant	Partially vacant and able to relocate	Occupied, not able to relocate			
SC 17.2	Current ownership	Public/Private ownership, single entity	Public/Private ownership, limited entities	Private ownership, multiple entities			
SC 17.3	Control	Available for negotiation or sale	Has been offered for sale	Not offered for sale			
<b>SC 18.</b>	<b>Final Site Score</b>						

Footnotes: Explanation of point ranking/rating/weighting

**Approvals:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Presiding Judge**  
 Superior Court of  
 \_\_\_\_\_ County

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Director, Facilities Services**  
 Judicial Council of California

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Administrative Director**  
 Judicial Council of California

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_