The Task Force on Court Facilities

455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

Meeting Report

December 8 & 9, 1999
Double Tree Hotel, Costa Mesa, CA

ATTENDEES:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS:

PRESENT:
Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair
Mr. Greg Abel
Mr. Wylie Aitken
Hon. Joan B. Bechtel (Dec. 8)
Ms. Yvonne Campos
Mr. John Clarke
Mr. Hector De La Torre
Sheriff Robert T. Doyle
Mr. David Janssen
Hon. Michael Nail
Hon. Wayne Peterson
Hon. Charles V. Smith
Mr. Anthony Tyrrell
Hon. Diane Elan Wick

ABSENT:

Mr. Mike Courtney
Hon. Jerry Eaves
Hon. Gary Freeman
Mr. Fred Klass

TASK FORCE STAFF:
Mr. Robert Lloyd, Project Coordinator / Senior Facilities Planner
Ms. Pat Bonderud, Facilities Planner
Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner

PRESENTERS:
Mr. Jeff Buck, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall
Mr. Andy Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall
Mr. Tom Gardner, Vitetta Group
Mr. Ken Jandura, Spillis Candela & Partners
Ms. Kathleen Halaszynski, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall
Mr. Jay Smith, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall
Hon. Kathleen E. O'Leary, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Orange County
Hon. William McDonald, Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE:
Ms. Kit Cole, Vitetta Group
Mr. Simon Park, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall
Mr. Dan Smith, Daniel C. Smith & Associates/Vitetta Group
Ms. Kim Steinjann, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Medenhall

GUESTS:
Mr. Elliot Aheroni, Los Angeles County
Mr. Peter Conlin, Superior Court, County of Orange
Mr. Rick Dostal, Orange County
Mr. Jim Fournier, Orange County
Ms. Jean Guccione, Daily Journal
Mr. Ron Julian, Superior Court, County of Orange
Ms. Catherine Knighten, Orange County
Mr. Rubin Lopez, California State Association of Counties
Mr. Jack Miller, San Diego County
Mr. Nick Marinovitch, San Diego County
Mr. Garry Raley, Superior Court, Riverside County
Mr. John Van Whervin, Superior Court, County of Los Angeles
Mr. Jonathan Wolin, Administrative Office of the Courts

VI. OPENING REMARKS – Justice Daniel Kremer

1) Justice Kremer opened the Task force meeting at 10:05 AM.

2) The Task force reviewed and unanimously approved the meeting report from the September 8 & 9, 1999 meeting in Murphys (meeting #8).
3) Justice Kremer explained that the task force will transition in this meeting from developing guidelines into documenting the condition of court facilities and identifying the needed capital investment. As part of this process, the task force must consider the effects of consolidation and look for operational efficiencies that might mitigate the need for space. The task force will also be developing its recommendations for facilities ownership and financing.
4) The evaluation and planning process will be in full production between January and August 2000. Staff will propose that the task force's committees be restructured to ensure that the large number of court facility evaluations and capital investment plans generated are reviewed by task force members. If approved, the new committees will meet Thursday (12/9) to establish committee procedures and meeting schedules.
5) Using San Mateo as an example, the planning process will be reviewed to determine the appropriate level of detail that should be addressed in the county capital investment plans.
6) Orange County will make a presentation at noon, December 8.
7) A motion was made to approve the proposed Interim Report No. 1, "Preliminary Determination: Appellate Court Facilities Guidelines" (dated December 8, 1999), as written. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved by the Task force. A hard copy of the report will be sent to all appellate court justices for review and comment. Compact discs will be sent to other interested parties.
8) A motion was made to approve the proposed Interim Report No. 1, "Preliminary Determination: Facility Guidelines for Technology in the Courthouse" (dated December 8, 1999), as written. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved by the Task force.
9) Comments on the "Preliminary Determination: Trial Court Facilities Guidelines" dated October 1, 1999 were compiled and distributed to Task force members. Because of the number and complexity of the review comments, staff recommended that they be referred to the Standards/Evaluation Committee for consideration. Under the reorganization proposal, this would be the committee's last function before it is dissolved. The recommendation was approved by consensus.
10) Anne R. Bernardo's letter dated November 12, 1999 on behalf of the Council of California Law Librarians was reviewed. The letter urged the task force to reconsider its decision not to address the law libraries' facility needs in its study. Judge Peterson recommended that the task force reconsider its position. The matter was referred to the Standards/Evaluations Committee.

II. REVIEW OF WORK PLAN AND SCHEDULE – Mr. Robert Lloyd

1) Mr. Lloyd compared the requirements of AB 233 with work the task force has completed or planned:
   a) Completed tasks:
      (1) "Examine existing standards for court facility construction."
      (2) "Review and provide recommendations on concepts regarding security; operational flexibility; alternate dispute resolution; meeting space; special needs of children, families, victims and disabled persons; technology; the dignity of the participants; and any other special needs of court facilities."
   b) Remaining tasks:
      (1) Evaluation and Planning:
         - "Document the state of existing court facilities."
         - "Document the need for new or modified court facilities and the extent to which current court facilities are fully utilized."
         - "Document the impacts of state actions on court facilities and other state and local justice system facilities."
         - "The impact which creating additional judgeships has upon court facility and other justice system facility needs."

- "The effects which trial court coordination and consolidation have upon court and justice system facilities needs."

(2) Mitigate need for additional court facilities:
- "Review and recommend operational changes which may mitigate the need for additional court facilities, including the implementation of methods to more fully utilize existing facilities."
- "Administrative and operational changes which can reduce or mitigate the need for added court or justice system facilities."

(3) Finance, Organization & Implementation:
- "Document the funding mechanisms currently available for maintenance, operation, construction, and renovation of court facilities."
- "Recommend specific funding responsibilities among the various entities of government for support of trial court facilities and facilities maintenance, including, but not limited to, full state responsibility or continued county responsibility."
- "Recommend funding sources and financing mechanisms for support of court facilities and facility maintenance."
- "The currently available funding options for constructing or renovating court facilities."
- "A proposed transition plan if responsibility is to be changed."

2) Mr. Lloyd proposed the following restructuring of task force committees. The proposal is designed to better handle the large number of county evaluations/plans that require review and approval.

a) Dissolve the Standards and Evaluation and the Needs and Projection Committees and reassign their members to two new committees: Planning – North and Planning – South. The Planning Committee – North would be responsible for counties in the northern half of the state while the Planning Committee – South would cover the southern counties. The Finance Committee would remain and continue its work on ownership, financing, and transition recommendations.

b) The two planning committees would oversee the consultant's evaluation of court facilities and the development of county capital investment plans. The committees' responsibilities would include:
- Providing consultant teams with advice and direction,
- Reviewing and approving county plans (subject to a consent agenda approval by the task force),
- Identifying county plans and/or issues that require task force review and approval,
- Participating in task force meeting presentations, and
- Representing the task force at the initial court/county interview and/or exit interview (optional).

c) The consultants will survey court facilities in three teams – Southern California, Bay Area, and Northern / Central California. A schedule will be issued weekly from January to August 2000 identifying interviews and inspections that are scheduled for the following month.

d) The proposed committee membership was:

Planning Committee – North	Planning Committee – South
Ms. Joan Bechtel	Mr. Wylie Aitken
Mr. Mike Courtney	Ms. Yvonne Campos
Mr. Robert Doyle	Mr. John Clarke
Mr. Gary Freeman	Mr. Hector De La Torre
Judge Michael Nail	Judge Wayne Peterson
Mr. Anthony Tyrrell	

3) Formation of a Space Mitigation Working Group was also proposed. This working group would be responsible for identifying and evaluating operational changes that may mitigate

the need for additional court facilities. The working group would have seven members including a:

- judge from a large court,
- court executive from a medium-size court,
- judge or court executive from a small court,
- county administrative officer or assistant from a large county,
- county administrative officer or assistant from a small county,
- member of the bar
- AOC Trial Court Service representative

An AOC facilities planner would coordinate staff support for the group.

5) To reflect the new task force organization, the following modified meeting format was adopted:
   Day 1 - Update on Finance Committee activities regarding ownership, finance and transition
   Update on Planning Committees activities including issues referred to the task force by committee.
   Day 2 - Committee work sessions
6) The task force's Second Interim Report is due January 1, 2000. Three additional meetings prior to the report's due date were unanimously approved:

Date	Location	Agenda
August 30 & 31, 2000	Santa Barbara/Ventura	Review draft Second Interim Report
October 18 & 19, 2000	Redding	Review final draft Second Interim Report
December 6 & 7, 2000	San Bernardino	Approve Second Interim Report

III. FACILITY EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT - Mr. Andy Cupples and Mr. Jeff Buck

Mr. Cupples and Mr. Buck presented the data collection process and the status of county court facility evaluations/plans. The focus for this meeting was the content and presentation of county court facility evaluations and capital plans.

1) Status of Survey Work: San Mateo, Calaveras, Yolo, Riverside, Los Angeles and Contra Costa counties are all in various stages of review. San Mateo was used as a prototype for developing and testing procedures and report format.
2) Mr. Cupples briefly reviewed the evaluation and planning process that was presented in detail at the September 8 & 9 1999 (Murphys) meeting.
3) Mr. Cupples reviewed the basic terminology used in the county reports and previewed the decisions required by the task force at this meeting.
4) Report Structure:
   a) Section 1.0 - Introduction
      Provides information on the project background and methodology.
   b) Section 2.0 - County-Wide Plan
      Discusses each county's court facility needs and possible facility development options. This section contains the following subsections:
      (1) Section 2.1 - General Overview
          Provides a general description of the court system, number of judicial positions by assignment, and a summary of current facility resources.
      (2) Section 2.2 - Current Space Utilization
          Documents current space utilization in all court buildings, including courtrooms and support space.
      (3) Section 2.3 - Facilities Evaluation
          Summarizes the overall physical and functional condition of each building, all courtrooms, and support space. Compares adequate and marginal space to courts needs to determine a space shortfall. Analyzes the most suitable uses for existing space to identify possible facility assets that could be applied against needs.

(4) Section 2.4 - Projected Growth/Long Term Needs
Summarizes the specific county growth forecast and related space needs. Develops an "order of magnitude" cost estimate for upgrading existing facilities, based on current use, and for providing facilities to meet future needs.

(5) Section 2.5 - Development Options
Based upon the physical, functional and spatial evaluation, outlines options for improving current facilities and providing facilities for meeting current and future court needs. This analysis considers issues such as court unification, operational efficiencies, and future geographic growth patterns.

(6) Section 2.6 - Capital Planning Scenario
Examines in detail one specific development option to refine estimates and identify short and long-range capital costs.

c) Section 3.0 – Building Database
Provides summary data that was analyzed in preparing sections 2.1 through 2.4 including site information, descriptions of buildings and sites, current space utilization, facility condition, space shortages, and diagrammatic floor plans showing building components and space occupied by building tenants. Detailed data, by space and component, is contained in the computer database and can be retrieved as needed.

5) After the draft report is completed, it will be sent to the county and court for review and comment. Mr. Cupples indicated that the county and court would have eight weeks to review the draft. Task force members felt that an eight-week review cycle was lengthy, agreeing to shorten it to four weeks.

IV. ORANGE COUNTY COURT FACILITIES – Hon. Kathleen E. O'Leary & Hon. William McDonald

1) The Orange County court has a facilities committee that plans for the future. They have 6 locations with 127 courtrooms. This includes some "make-shift" facilities that helped accommodate their growth and evolution from a rural to a metropolitan community.
2) The Central Justice Center is slated for a major renovation over the next seven years at an estimated cost of over $50 million. This project addresses only the serious building deficiencies, not cosmetic ones. The original reflecting pool in the front of this courthouse leaked, so it will be filled in. In response to a lawsuit, the public areas of the building are now being upgraded to meet ADA requirements. Secured parking is now being installed – none currently exists.
3) Weapons screening is being expanded from two to six facilities. Only two facilities have in-custody sallyports.
4) A new court facility is planned for the south county and will consolidate multiple court locations.
5) The court is expecting five new judicial positions but has no space for them.
6) The court often finds itself in conflict with the county over facility responsibilities within courthouse.

V. PRESENTATION BY SAN MATEO COUNTY OFFICIALS

This presentation was cancelled due to airline flight cancellations encountered by the presenters.

VI. COUNTY PLANNING PROGRESS REPORT – SAN MATEO COUNTY – Mr. Jeff Buck & Ms. Kathleen Halazynski

Mr. Buck prefaced the presentation by thanking San Mateo county for allowing the consultants to use their court facilities as a prototype for developing the procedures, content and format of the county evaluation and planning reports. Since San Mateo served as a pilot county, they were asked to review the consultants work and recommendations on short notice. In accordance with the survey protocol, the San Mateo report will be formalized and forwarded to the court and county for their official review and comment. Mr. Buck then reviewed the content of the prototype report.

1) Section 1- Introduction
The same format will be used for all counties to describe how information is organized, the evaluation and planning process and basic rules and assumptions used in evaluating court facilities and developing capital investment options. Supervisor Bechtel asked that the pages be renumbered to indicate the report section. She also suggested that titles be enlarged. Mr. Abel said he thought the report was well done. Mr. Janssen noted that the evaluation/planning process is very complicated and must be explained so that those unfamiliar with it can understand it. Mr. Abel agreed, saying that he wants to understand what he's signing-off on and be able to explain it. Justice Kremer suggested that the introduction contain a brief explanation supplemented by a more detailed appendix. Mr. Abel suggested that Children's Waiting Room be added under Court Building Interview, page 1.12.

2) Section 2 - County-Wide Summary
   a) Section 2.1 - General Overview: In San Mateo County the area that follows the Highway 101 corridor is heavily populated. Along this corridor lies the court's principal facilities: the Hall of Justice in Redwood City, the San Mateo facility and the South San Francisco facility. The coastal areas of the county are rural with no court facilities. Growth in the county is predicted to follow the Highway 101 corridor. The court assigns a mixed civil and criminal caseload to most of its judges which demands multi-purpose jury courtrooms with in-custody holding facilities.
   b) Section 2.2 - Current Space Utilization: Although the Redwood City Hall of Justice is principally a courthouse, it shares space with several county agencies including the board of supervisors. The San Mateo and South San Francisco facilities are former municipal courts that only house court functions. The San Mateo court is in a residential area and is lightly used. 80% of San Mateo's courtrooms are used for criminal cases; 92% of their courtrooms are jury capable (have a jury box).
   c) Section 2.3 - Facilities Evaluation: The process is designed to flag deficiencies so that solutions can be proposed. Facilities are rated spatially, functionally, and physically. San Mateo Court's facilities are generally in good physical condition, but many courtrooms are not equipped to handle in-custody defendants. However, they do have 2 marginal and 1 deficient building (Jail Annex).

      The functional evaluation rated facilities on seventeen criterion including location, adjacencies, access, quality of environment, image of justice portrayed, and security. Under the prototype evaluation procedure, a facility was deemed deficient if in-custody defendants had to be taken through public circulation corridors and marginal if they had to be moved through private corridors. In-custody courtrooms were rated deficient if they did not have an adjacent holding cell. A deficient rating for in-custody circulation and holding would override an adequate functional rating for other criteria. Sheriff Doyle asked how the Marin County Civic Center courtrooms that have a holding tank (connected to courtroom by security corridors) between floors instead of holding cells adjacent to each courtroom would be rated. Mr. Cupples said that such a facility would, absent other problems, be rated as adequate. Members noted that holding cells in or near the courtroom are not only needed for safety and security but also improve court operations by minimizing delay waiting for defendants. Judge Nail noted that 80% of criminal cases involve in-custody defendants.

      An existing space is rated adequate if it is 80% of the size suggested in the task force's court facility guidelines. Judge Peterson questioned whether existing space should be compared to the full guideline or a reduced size, noting his preference for using the full guideline. Mr. Aitken shared Judge Peterson's concern, noting that facilities in Orange County are woefully inadequate. Mr. Janssen noted that the guidelines were developed for new construction. AB 233 requires the task force to establish acceptable standards for construction, renovation, and remodeling of court facilities. Because of the difficulty in establishing reasonable guidelines for existing

facilities, the task force decided to use the new construction guidelines as a benchmark for evaluating existing facility space. If the new construction guidelines were used as an absolute criteria most existing facilities would fail even though they may function adequately. With the 80% rule, spaces that are smaller than the space guideline but still function would rate adequately overall. If an existing space is 60% to 80% of the guideline it is rated marginal, triggering a closer review of its functionality. If its less than 60% the space is deficient and is reviewed for recycling to other uses. Mr. Janssen noted that the counties were very concerned about rating existing facilities against new standards and that the 80% rule was a very pragmatic and reasonable approach to evaluating them. Mr. Lloyd pointed out that building codes do not require existing space be brought up to current code. Justice Kremer noted that the task force has already decided not to apply a new space guideline to existing space. Judge Peterson expressed concern that use of the 80% rule for existing facilities would have the effect of lowering the space guideline for new facilities.

The physical condition of facilities are rated on the cost to renovate. A 60% score reflects the value of a facility that is in acceptable condition. In other words, the facility would require an investment of 40% of its replacement cost to fix all of the deficiencies. Because all physical deficiencies can be corrected by investing money, the threshold for an adequate rating is set at 60%. A score of 40% – 60% receives a marginal rating. Mr. Abel asked that the cost table used for developing estimates be included in each report as an appendix.

As part of the evaluation process, existing marginal and deficient spaces are compared against the guidelines to determine their highest potential conforming use ("optimum use"). This is helpful in identifying alternative uses for existing space when developing planning options. In essence, the planning process compares needs against existing facilities and their best use in conformance with the guidelines.

Mr. Cupples noted that the most suitable use for an existing space (compared to guidelines) may not reflect its current use nor be consistent with the court's service delivery and operating models. The goal of the planning process is to use the information on existing facilities and growth projections to craft development options that reflect the court's service delivery objectives and operating procedures. He noted that AB 233 requires the task force to identify operational changes that might mitigate the court's need for space. The consultant team would typically develop its county plans to support the local court-operating model, unless there were obvious changes that would impact space utilization. Mr. Lloyd noted that the evaluation teams were composed of architects and planners, not court operational efficiency experts.

d) Section 2.4 - Projected Growth.
This section utilizes the space forecasts that were developed by Justice Planning Associates (JPA) and approved by the task force. JPA used 18 years of historical data on arrests, convictions, case filings, and dispositions as well as the Department of Finance's population projections to project judges and staff over the next 20 years in five-year increments. To forecast court facilities space needs, DMJM converted the judge and staff projections into a model architectural program using the task force's guidelines. The resulting space needs forecast was compared against the counties current inventory of space developed from the "optimum use" analysis. The difference between the forecasted need and existing adequate space generates the county's space "shortfall." This section ends with an "order of magnitude" estimate for upgrading existing facilities and eliminating the space shortfall. The estimates are

computer generated and do not reflect specific development proposals that would refine and, typically, reduce the costs.

Mr. Janssen and Judge Peterson expressed concern about the task force's ability to predict future needs based upon eighteen years of history. Judge Peterson noted that the San Diego court has fewer judges than predicted 10 years ago. Justice Kremer noted that the task force had reviewed the forecasts and methodology, determined them credible, and approved them.

e) Section 2.5 - Development Options
This section explores options of how to meet current and future court facility needs. The options reflect the evaluations of existing facilities, forecasted needs, and interviews with county and court executives. It also considers current county master plans. The options are very general ("50,000 foot view"). They are not negotiated with the counties and/or courts and, therefore, can generate controversy with them. They are not intended as a master plan, but rather options than can be reasonably cost estimated to define the future range of capital investment that a county's court facilities may need over the next twenty years. The recommended options may not reflect local political concerns. As such, the task force's recommendations should include funds for developing comprehensive court facility master plans for each county.

Before developing the options, a planner must review the shortfall analysis generated in Section 2.4 and the underlying space program to determine if adjustments are warranted. For example, a courtroom that was undersized but judged adequate would generate a space need in the computer model that, in reality, was not required.

In San Mateo, the court assigns both criminal and civil cases to most of its judges. Therefore, in developing the options, the consultants strived to create multi-purpose courtrooms to eliminate the current problem with a lack of courtroom holding facilities and separate in-custody circulation. Mr. Abel noted that the trial court funding act mandated that all courts accept all filings at all locations. Some courts have interpreted this as requiring all courts to be multifunctional.

Mr. Cupples noted that all of the courtrooms used in the San Mateo planning options were in-custody capable and sized at the top end of guideline range (1800 square feet). 1800 square feet was chosen to offset smaller existing courtrooms that were judged "adequate" but smaller than the minimum guideline size (1500 square feet).

f) Section 2.6 - Capital Planning Scenario
This section explores a specific development plan representing a reasonable course of action. The section develops a time phased capital investment plan that categorizes facilities needs as long or short term.

VI. DISCUSSION AND VOTE

1) Dissolve the Standards/Needs and Needs/Projections Committee and form a Planning Committee-North and a Planning Committee - South:
   a) Supervisor Smith noted that counties were not represented on the Planning Committee – South. He proposed that either he or Mr. Eaves be reassigned to the committee. [Mr. Smith subsequently volunteered to switch committees.] Judge Wick motioned to approve the proposal with this change, Mr. Aitken seconded and it passed unanimously.
2) Form Mitigation Working Group:
   a) Mr. Tony Tyrrell moved to approve the proposal, it was seconded and unanimously approved.
3) Organization of county evaluation/planning report:

a) The task force unanimously approved the overall organization of the evaluation and planning report with the following changes:
   - Add an executive summary.
   - Add table of contents
   - Add a glossary with definitions of commonly used terms,
   - Rework the introduction and prepare a detailed appendix explaining the methodology and data tables.
   - Revise page numbers to indicate the report section and page within the section.

3) In-custody holding and circulation is an overriding criteria in the functional evaluation of courtrooms:
   a) A motion to approve these criteria was made by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Judge Wick. The motion was unanimously approved.
4) Confirm 80% rule:
   a) Judge Peterson proposed that existing space be rated as marginal if it is 70% of the task force's space guideline or less. Under this proposal existing space that is 80% of the guideline would be judged as adequate. A motion was made to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded approved on a vote of 12 to 1 with Mr. Janssen dissenting. He preferred to leave the threshold for a marginal rating at 60% of the guideline.
5) Level of planning…general shortfall analysis, multiple options, or specific planning scenario:
   a) Mr. Lloyd passed out a letter from John Maltbie, the San Mateo County manager, to CSAC. The letter expressed the county's concerns with the planning process while noting that the evaluation process is reasonable. The principal concern is that, by recommending specific planning options, the task force will undermine current county/court facility plans as well as those in development.
   b) The task force debated the level of detail that should be included in the evaluation/planning reports ranging from the computer generated shortfall analysis in Section 2.4 to the single planning scenario provided in Section 2.6. After discussion, the following proposal was made:
      (1) Consultants will prepare several development options based upon their evaluation of a county's existing court facilities, projection of future needs and interviews with county and court executives. The options will not be prioritized.
      (2) The evaluation results and the development options will be forwarded to the county and court requesting their review and comments within four weeks.
      (3) The consultant will evaluate the county's / court's response and, as appropriate, address their concerns in the final report. New options proposed by the county or court will be considered and incorporated into the report, where appropriate, as additional development alternatives.
   b) Judge Nail moved for approval of the above proposal. Supervisor Smith seconded. The proposal was unanimously approved.
5) The importance of having the ability to identify the costs of discrete elements of the task force's recommendations, such as security and holding facilities, was emphasized. This will be particularly useful for quantifying the task force's recommendations in its final report.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comment requested.

VII. PRESENTATION BY UNIFICATION WORKING GROUP – Judge Stephen Dombrink

Judge Dombrink was ill so this session was cancelled.

VIII. TOUR ORANGE COUNTY COURTHOUSE

1) The task force toured the historic county courthouse, which is now a museum. The Central Justice Center in Santa Ana was also toured.

IX. FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT – Tom Gardner, Vitetta Group

1) Task force responsibilities:
   a) Document the funding mechanisms currently available,
   b) Recommend specific funding responsibilities among the various entities,
   c) Recommend funding sources and financing mechanisms,
   d) Compile a proposed transition plan if there are changed responsibilities.
2) Key Questions:
   a) What are the general issues regarding ownership - can a state or local system best meet the needs for the future? Issues regarding ownership explored in committee meetings include:
      (1) Role of the county, the trial courts and AOC
      (2) Role of the local courts in remodeling existing facilities
      (3) Ownership responsibilities related to historical facilities and multi-use facilities
      (4) Security
      (5) Debt associated with existing facilities
      (6) Rules for governance (i.e., Brown Act)
      (7) Phased participation during transition
      (8) Task Force on Trial Court Employees
      (9) Ability of responsible entity to raise revenue
   b) What are some of the pros and cons associated with state versus local responsibility?
   c) What are some characteristics the committee has identified that could serve as a starting place for the new system?
      (1) Oversight responsibility
         (a) Newly authorized structure
            - Judicial Facilities Authority
            - Expanded AOC/Judicial Council
         (a) Traditional capital oversight
            - Department of Finance
            - Public Works Board
      (2) Administrative and operations responsibility
         (a) "In-house"
            - DGS, AOC, Judicial Council
            - California State Court Facilities Authority (could be formed through MOU of entities)
         (b) Contracting out
            - Facilities planning and programming
            - Construction management
            - Security
            - Maintenance
      (3) Financial responsibility alternatives
            - Grant program to local courts (state bonds)
            - Annual state budget allocation for maintenance
            - Major and minor capital outlay (state bonds and state budget allocation)
            - California State Court Facility Authority
            - Per judge lease payment (state funds, local bonds)
3) To narrow the options, the committee plans to first explore in its next meeting the feasibility of state ownership. It will try to identify areas of consensus and disagreement to determine if state ownership is a viable option.

XI. CLOSING REMARKS

1) The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:00 PM. The Finance Committee and North and South Planning Committees met immediately afterward. The next Task force meeting is scheduled for March 1st and 2nd in Napa.