

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposal (COBCP) - Cover Sheet
 DF-151 (REV 07/21)

Fiscal Year 2022-23	Business Unit 0250	Department Judicial Branch	Priority No. 6
-------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------

Budget Request Name 0250-126-COBCP-2022-GB	Capital Outlay Program ID 0165	Capital Outlay Project ID 0000099
--	--	---

Project Title
 Plumas County – New Quincy Courthouse

Project Status and Type
 Status: New Continuing Type: Major Minor

Project Category (Select one)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CRI <i>(Critical Infrastructure)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> WSD <i>(Workload Space Deficiencies)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> ECP <i>(Enrollment Caseload Population)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> SM <i>(Seismic)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> FLS <i>(Fire Life Safety)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> FM <i>(Facility Modernization)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> PAR <i>(Public Access Recreation)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> RC <i>(Resource Conservation)</i>

Total Request (in thousands) \$ 7,063	Phase(s) to be Funded Acquisition & Performance Criteria	Total Project Cost (in thousands) \$ 100,891
---	--	--

Budget Request Summary

The Judicial Council of California requests \$7,063,000 General Fund for the Acquisition (\$3,961,000) and Performance Criteria (\$3,102,000) phases of the New Quincy Courthouse in Plumas County. The project will provide construction of a new 3-courtroom courthouse of approximately 54,000 square feet (SF) in the city of Quincy. The estimated total project cost is \$100,891,000. The project includes secure parking for judicial officers and approximately 120 surface parking spaces with solar power generation capability. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 1.88 acres. The project will use a design-build delivery method. The project will replace the existing Quincy Courthouse.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed	CCCI 7892
--	---	---------------------

Requires Provisional Language <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Budget Package Status <input type="checkbox"/> Needed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Needed <input type="checkbox"/> Existing
---	--

Impact on Support Budget

One-Time Costs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Swing Space Needed	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Future Savings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Generate Surplus Property	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Future Costs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? Yes No
Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By McCormick	Date 12/21/2021	Reviewed By Mirzaei/Theodorovic	Date 12/21/2021
Chief Administrative Officer John Wordlaw	Date 1/3/2022	Administrative Director Martin Hoshino	Date 1/3/2022

Department of Finance Use Only	
Principal Program Budget Analyst Koreen H van Ravenhorst	Date submitted to the Legislature 1/10/2022

A. COBCP Abstract:

Plumas County – New Quincy Courthouse – \$7,063,000 for Acquisition and Performance Criteria. The project includes the construction of a new 3-courtroom courthouse of approximately 54,000 square feet (SF) in the city of Quincy. The project includes secure parking for judicial officers and approximately 120 surface parking spaces, 80 of which will include solar power generation capability. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 1.88 acres. Total project costs are estimated at \$100,891,000, including Acquisition (\$4,387,000), Performance Criteria (\$3,102,000), and Design-Build (\$93,402,000). The design-build amount includes \$77,899,000 for the construction contract, \$2,337,000 for contingency, \$3,416,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$9,750,000 for other project costs. The Acquisition is scheduled to begin in July 2022 and complete in June 2023. Performance Criteria is scheduled to begin in June 2023 and will be approved in January 2024. Design-Build is scheduled to begin in July 2024 and will be completed in December 2027.

The Judicial Council of California is requesting reactivation of this project. Due to insufficient resources in the Immediate and Critical Needs Account, the Judicial Council, at its August 26, 2016 meeting, made a policy decision to place some projects on hold until proper funding could be restored. The impact of the Judicial Council direction to this project was to immediately stop the project in the Acquisition phase until funding is restored. The estimated total project cost of \$100,891,000 includes \$426,000 for Acquisition expenditures that incurred under the prior authority.

B. Purpose of the Project:

Problem: The existing condition and capacity of the Superior Court County of Plumas Courthouse facilities were evaluated pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 847 which revised Government Code section 70371.9 and required the Judicial Council of California to reassess projects identified in its *Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and Prioritization Methodology* adopted on October 24, 2008. The reassessment which is the basis for the judicial branch's Trial Court Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, was submitted to the Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review and the Assembly Committee on Budget in December 2019.

The Infrastructure Plan project rankings were established through a detailed and systematic analysis of the following criteria:

- The general physical condition of the building.
- Needed improvement to the physical condition of buildings to alleviate the totality of risks associated with seismic conditions, fire & life safety conditions, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, and environmental hazards.
- Court security features within buildings.
- Access to court services.
- Overcrowding.
- Projects that replace or renovate courtrooms in court buildings where there is a risk to court users due to potential catastrophic events.

Through this assessment process Plumas County Courthouse facilities affected by this project were determined to be deficient in all categories. This project is ranked in the Immediate Need priority group, and consequently is one of the highest priority trial court capital-outlay projects for the judicial branch. The Reassessment of Trial Court Capital-Outlay Project is located here:

https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lr-2019-JC-reassessment-trial-court-capital-outlay-projects-gov70371_9.pdf

Program Need: The New Quincy Courthouse will accomplish the following immediately needed improvements to the Superior Court and enhance its ability to serve the public:

- Enhances the public's access to justice by offering basic services such as self-help, not currently provided to county residents due to overcrowding and lack of space.

- Provides in-custody holding facility, jury assembly area, jury courtrooms, self-help area, and judicial parking that are currently lacking.
- Incorporates records currently stored off-site in rental units.
- Improves security surveillance from multiple points of ingress/egress to one main entrance/exit.
- Provides zones of separation between court staff, public, and in-custody, thus, overall improving security.
- Improves public safety by replacing seismically deficient facility that is non-compliant with current fire, life, safety, and ADA codes.
- Vacates and surrender the historic courthouse space to the county.
- Avoids over \$1.7 million in future deferred maintenance and security system refresh expenditures.

The Superior Court of Plumas County uses a centralized model, with all operations provided in Quincy, the county seat. All satellite court locations in Portola, Greenville, and Chester have been closed. All court services are centrally provided in Quincy at the historic Quincy Courthouse. Two judges conduct all proceedings, and a part-time commissioner is used for child support cases. Visiting judges are used as needed to cover personal leave and address any conflicts of interest. Between 2010 and 2014, all satellite court locations around the county were closed due to budget reductions and staff shortages. To better serve the population, the court is in the process of implementing a new case management system with public portals, which will increase remote access to services.

Based on the 2020 Judicial Needs Assessment, the Plumas Court does not have a need for additional judgeships at this time.

There is only one Superior Court occupied facility in Plumas County. The facility is located in Quincy, the county seat. There are facilities in Portola, Chester, and Greenville that were previously occupied by the Court, but are no longer occupied due to budget cuts and staffing shortages. The facilities are summarized in the table below.

	Name	City	No. of Courtrooms	Type	Owner	Year Built
1	Quincy Courthouse	Quincy	2	Courthouse	County	1920
2	Portola Court Facility (Closed)	Portola	Closed	Courthouse	County	1950
3	Plumas/Sierra Regional Courthouse (Closed)	Portola	Closed	Courthouse	JCC	2009
4	Chester Civic Complex (Closed)	Chester	Closed	Courthouse	County	1986
5	Greenville Justice Court (Closed)	Greenville	Closed	Courthouse	County	1906

Infrastructure Deficiencies in Facilities Affected by Project: If a new Quincy Courthouse project is completed the court could vacate and surrender the historic courthouse space to the county and terminate a lease for records storage. The findings of the Infrastructure Reassessment are summarized below for the facilities affected by this project.

1. Quincy Courthouse (County-Owned)

2019 Assessment Data

Age	100 years
Number of Courtrooms	2 courtrooms
10 Year Facility Condition Index (FCI)	Poor Condition
FEMA P-154 Seismic Rating	High Risk Seismic Rating
Deferred Maintenance	\$ 1,703,520
Annual O&M Costs	\$ 31,729
Security System Refresh Costs	Not assessed

The Quincy Courthouse faces multiple challenges including space shortages, inadequate security and circulation, ADA compliance issues, and general building deficiencies. The facility has a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) P-154 High Risk Seismic rating.

The two courtrooms in this building hear criminal, civil, family, juvenile, probate, arraignment, and traffic cases. The building lacks adequate separation among judges, jurors, the public, defendants, and in-custodies. Security screening is deficient and the building lacks separation of circulation between staff, public, and in-custodies.

This building does not have a formal jury assembly space. The court calls between 45 and 125 jurors, as needed, to support approximately two jury trials per month. Except for one courtroom and chambers that were built in 2008, none of the court space is ADA compliant. In addition, there is no file storage or space for records management. The facility has over \$1.7 million in deferred maintenance and needed security system refresh.

If the New Quincy Courthouse is completed the court will vacate and surrender the existing historic courthouse to the county.

C. Relationship to the Strategic Plan:

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 whose 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 Council's strategic plan Goal VI: "Branch wide 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, and Diversity", Goal IV: "Enhancing the Quality of Service and Justice Provided to the Public" and Goal VII: "Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch".

D. Alternatives:

Alternative 1: Build a new 3-courtroom courthouse.

This alternative will construct a new, 3-courtroom courthouse of approximately 54,000 SF in the City of Quincy. The estimated total project cost is \$100,891,000. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 1.88 acres. The project includes secure parking for judicial officers and approximately 120 surface parking spaces.

Advantages:

- Enhances the court's ability to serve the residents of Plumas County by providing a new, modern, and secure courthouse.
- Allows the court to vacate and surrender the existing historic courthouse to the county.
- Allows the court to keep all records on-site and relinquish costly off-site rental units.
- Incorporates modern technology into the operation and facility structure and improve staff flow and public access to services.
- Provides Plumas County residents basic services not currently provided.
- Avoids over \$1.7 million in future deferred maintenance and security system refresh expenditures.
- Removes a FEMA P-154 High Risk Seismic Risk rated facility from service.

Disadvantages:

- This alternative requires authorization of funds for site acquisition and related soft costs, design, and construction.

Alternative 2: Renovation of Existing Courthouse.

The existing historic Quincy Courthouse will be renovated and reconfigured to improve the space and more closely align the renovated court space with the Judicial Council Standards. A detailed estimate was not prepared for this alternative as preliminary investigations deemed the solution impracticable. Implementation of this Alternative is constrained by site configuration, county ownership of the buildings, and disruption to court and county operations. A renovation without a sizable expansion does not remedy overcrowding.

Advantages:

- This option will improve security, correct infrastructure deficiencies, and more closely align the renovated court space with Judicial Council space standards.

Disadvantages:

- The county holds the title for the historic Quincy Courthouse. The Judicial Council has no right to renovate or expand on the sites without the cooperation and collaboration of the county.

- The Quincy Courthouse is integrated in a multipurpose historic county administrative building. Pursuant to the Joint Occupancy Agreements, the costs of facility modifications and renovations are shared between the county and state.
- The building infrastructure systems are not separated into county and state components. Upgrading infrastructure within the court's space will likely affect the infrastructure systems building-wide and will necessitate renovations in county exclusive areas.
- This alternative will be disruptive to court and county operations and incur costs for swing space while renovations are ongoing.
- This alternative does not remedy the overcrowding due to the shortage of space.
- This alternative requires authorization of funds for acquisition, design, and construction.

Alternative 3: Defer this project.

Advantages:

- No additional commitment of resources.

Disadvantages:

- This is an urgently needed project. The existing facility does not provide basic services to Plumas County residents due to overcrowding; proper security; ADA compliance requirements; conflicts in travel paths for judges, staff, the public, and in-custody defendants; lack of jury assembly area and jury courtrooms; no self-help area; and no secure judicial parking.
- Requires future expenditure of over \$1.7 million for deferred maintenance and needed security system refresh.
- Leaves a FEMA P-154 High Risk Seismic Risk rated facility in service.

E. Recommended Solution:

1. Which alternative and why?

The recommended option is Alternative 1: Approve the construction of a new, 3-courtroom courthouse. This alternative provides the best solution for the superior court and for the benefit of all county residents.

2. Detailed scope description.

The project will provide construction of a new, 3-courtroom courthouse of approximately 54,000 SF in the City of Quincy. In addition to including one arraignment and two multi-purpose courtrooms, the project will allow the court to provide basic services not currently provided to county residents due to space restrictions (e.g. self-help) and to incorporate records currently stored in off-site rental units; reduce security surveillance from multiple points of ingress/egress to one main entrance/exit; provide zones of separation between staff, public, and in-custody improving overall security; address ADA requirements; incorporate modern technology into the operation and facility structure; and improve staff flow and public access to services. The project includes secure parking for judicial officers and approximately 120 surface parking spaces, 80 of which will include solar power generation capability. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 1.88 acres.

3. Basis for cost information.

Estimated total project costs are based on conceptual space program and three-page estimate.

4. Factors/benefits for recommended solution other than the least expensive alternative.

The recommended option is Alternative 1: Construct a new, 3-courtroom courthouse. The recommended option will accomplish the following immediately needed improvements to the Superior Court and enhance its ability to serve the public:

- Improves court operational efficiency, access to justice, and overall public service by relieving overcrowding.
- Improves security by providing one point of ingress/egress to one main entrance/exit.
- Provides a modern safe and secure courthouse in compliance with current codes.
- Incorporates records currently stored in off-site rental units to one location.
- Incorporates modern technology into the operation and facility structure.
- Improves staff flow and the public's access to services.
- Avoids over \$1.7 million in future deferred maintenance and security system refresh expenditures.
- Removes a FEMA P-154 High Risk Seismic Risk rated facility from service.

5. Complete description of impact on support budget.

Impact on the trial court operation budgets for 2022–23 will not be material. It is anticipated that this project will affect trial court operations budgets in fiscal years beyond the current year.

Impact on the sheriff security funding for 2022–23 will not be material. It is anticipated that this project will affect sheriff security budgets in future fiscal years.

It is anticipated that there will be ongoing costs of \$191,000 for Judicial Council funded O&M and security. The county facility payments established pursuant to Government Code Section 70353 with the transfer of each county facility replaced by this project will be used to partially offset ongoing operations and maintenance costs of the new facility.

As additional programmatic workload and funding drives the need for additional administrative funding, an administrative overhead cost has been included in each capital outlay budget change proposal. The additional funding of \$152,000 will be used to support successful implementation of this request.

6. Identify and explain any project risks.

Any construction project carries risk of increased scope due to discovery of unknown subsurface site conditions throughout the design and construction process that can alter the projected construction cost. These risks can be mitigated or minimized by concurrently developing a prioritized itemization of project features that can be reduced in scope, alternatively approached, or eliminated without affecting the building functionality. The list should be updated at the completion of each stage of the design process in connection with the preparation and review of the updated estimates. Some risk is inherent with transfer of real property from one entity to another, regarding schedule and ancillary appropriation timing for funds. Risk is always inherent in the construction and ownership of real property and improvements. Standard risk management procedures are used to control and/or delegate these risks.

The risks associated with not developing a replacement court facility, as responsibility for the facilities it will replace has transferred to the state, are equally compelling. Given the existing physical conditions and practical limitations of improving these facilities, they will generate liabilities for the state the longer they remain unaddressed.

7. List requested interdepartmental coordination and/or special project approval (including mandatory reviews and approvals, e.g. technology proposals).

Inter-agency cooperation will be required among state, county, and local jurisdictional authorities for successful completion of this project. The project will be reviewed by the State Fire Marshal, the Board of State and Community Corrections for compliance with corrections standards, and Department of State Architect for fire/life/safety and accessibility. The State Fire Marshal will perform inspections, required by the California Building Code for fire/life/safety, during the construction phase.

F. Consistency with Government Code Section 65041.1:

Does the recommended solution (project) promote infill development by rehabilitating existing infrastructure and how? Explain.

The recommended solution does not include the rehabilitation of existing infrastructure. Rehabilitating the existing structure is disruptive and costly due to the lack of suitable swing space. The Judicial Council has no right to renovate or expand the historic Quincy Courthouse without the cooperation and collaboration of the county.

Does the project improve the protection of environmental and agricultural resources by protecting and preserving the state's most valuable natural resources? Explain.

The branch is committed to selecting sites with no or least impact to these resources by utilizing previously developed land with existing infrastructure. This project will complete a thorough and responsible CEQA process.

Does the project encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that infrastructure associated with development, other than infill, support efficient use of land and is appropriately planned for growth? Explain.

The Judicial Council will establish a Project Advisory Group to develop site selection criteria that addresses proximity to public transportation, availability of existing infrastructure, and proximity and relationship to other land uses and current development patterns.

The Project Advisory Group will consist of representatives from the local court, the county (including personnel from county administration, district attorney, public defender, sheriff, probation department, etc.), the city (including personnel from city management, planning, and redevelopment agency), the local community, and local Bar Association.