



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT FACILITY MODIFICATION  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95833-4336  
Telephone 916-263-7885 • Fax 916-263-1966 • TDD 415-865-4272

---

## MEMORANDUM

---

Date	Action Requested
January 12, 2015	Please Review
To	Deadline
Members of TCFMAC	January 16, 2015
From	
Judge David E. Power, Chair Judge William F. Highberger, Vice-Chair	
Subject	
Placer County Superior Court Roseville Arrestment Court Proposal	

---

We want to provide some additional information in support of the staff's recommendation that we approve funding at our upcoming January 16, 2015 meeting in the approximate amount of \$2.0 million for the Placer County Superior Court/Roseville Arrestment Court project.

This is a unique project with substantial benefit for the Facilities Program, as such, in addition to its many benefits to the residents of Placer County. In particular, the completion of this project will allow the Facilities Program to close and dispose of the obsolete and expensive-to-maintain one-courtroom Jail Court in Auburn.<sup>1</sup> This project should be considered a one-off and not as a "Priority 3—Needed"<sup>2</sup> or as work done under any of our other Priority ranking categories. It is nevertheless a valuable project which can only be funded if we allow some of the \$15 million increase in FM funding for this fiscal year to be used in this fashion. There is no other source of funding available to the Judicial Council to fund this project at this time if we withhold FM funding.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court's interest in the Jail court will be exchanged for an interest in the new Jail building so as to permit the branch to spend money in the new Jail building for the arrestment courtroom improvements. This will terminate the branch's responsibility for operating and maintaining the old Jail Court.

<sup>2</sup> Per our Prioritization Methodology: "Priority 3—Needed. A Priority 3 ranking is appropriate where addressing a Facility Modification will reduce long-term maintenance or repair costs or improve the functionality, usability, and accessibility of a court facility. Such a condition is not hindering to the most basic functions of the facility, but its correction will improve court operations."

Historically the Placer County Jail was in Auburn, the county seat. A one-courtroom Jail Court constructed on a barracks/hospital site adjacent to the Jail has been used up to now for arraignment calendars. As the population of the county grew, particularly in the Sacramento suburbs in and around Roseville, the County itself built a new criminal courthouse in Roseville (the Bill Santucci Justice Center, opened in 2007). As part of the County's master plan for this location, they also envisioned building a replacement jail next to the Santucci Justice Center connected by an underground tunnel. The same master plan included space in the shell of the new jail structure for a one-courtroom arraignment court to reduce custody-transfer time and expense. The jail was finished in 2014, but for lack of a finished arraignment courtroom therein, the arraignments continue to occur in the Auburn Jail Court some 20 miles away (uphill and into winter conditions).

We estimate that the total cost of building out the arraignment courtroom in the Roseville Jail, including some additional, new holding capacity immediately adjacent to the courtroom itself will be \$2.9 million. Placer County has agreed to make a substantial contribution to the total project cost, probably in the neighborhood of \$900,000. This is greatly appreciated since it will reduce the cost to the branch for this worthwhile project. The County itself will obtain significant cost savings itself by eliminating the transfer expense from Roseville to the Auburn Jail Court.

We have previously approved the build out and improvement of courtroom spaces in existing courthouses as P3 expenses (several years ago when routine funding for some P3's was possible), but this is the first time that we would be approving the creation of courtroom space in a building which presently has no court-exclusive space. It is for this reason that we do not think that this should be considered a P3 even as we urge approval of this expense.

Having visited the location, we do think that there is great value to the court itself in having an arraignment court in the new jail structure itself and not to try to handle all these custody cases by moving this many people via the tunnel into one or more courtrooms in the Santucci Justice Center. The court itself benefits by no longer having to operate the satellite Jail Court since supervision and support functions are already in place at the Santucci Justice Center.

There are two major hurdles to execution.

1. The current JC equity in the old jail will need to be transferred to the new facility. While the county is interested in completing this action, until it is complete the project is at risk.
2. Also, while the county has verbally agreed to fund their portion of the facility, the overall estimates will need to be confirmed through the development of the formal design document set. Only until that time will the project be formally bid and the current estimates validated. At that point the county would need to confirm in writing their willingness to fund the share of costs associated with the installation of the holding portion of the project.

Assuming this expense is approved, Pat and Jerry remain confident that we will have enough remaining FM funding for FY2014/15 to cover all P2's which are ready for review. We expect there will also be some available funds to cover additional P3 energy-efficiency projects and

January 12, 2015

Page 3

other P3 infrastructure needs (most likely deteriorated roofing systems). We believe that this arraignment court is of higher value to the branch as compared to whatever P3 infrastructure requests may remain unfunded at the end of this fiscal year.