Learning Objectives

• Understand how the existence, location, arrangement, efficiency, and usability of court facilities significantly impact the level and quality of court services as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of court and clerk of court staff

• These concerns must be addressed when designing or remodeling court facilities

• Another important aspect of facilities is physical access, as required by the Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards (ABAAS) and related state and local laws and regulations
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GSA REGIONS FOR COURTS
SERVICE VALIDATION INITIATIVE (SVI)

Judiciary and GSA Working Collaboratively

**Group 1**, Appraisal Methodology and ROI Pricing Validation
**Group 2**, Overtime Utility Estimating and Energy Savings Policies
**Group 3**, Space Assignment, Classification, and Rent Validation

Groups 1-4 Commenced **September 2014**

**Group 5**, Building Management, Service Requests, and Building Operations
Commenced **December 2014**

**Recommendations (and Deliverables) Report**
**June 2015**

**Chartered Action Teams Commenced**
**Summer 2015**

Critical Areas Identified

- Communication and Training
- Methodologies for Efficient Resolution of Concerns
- Information, Tools, and Resources
- Business Processes and Protocols
- Policy Clarification and Application
SVI ACTION TEAMS AND DELIVERABLES UNDERWAY

- **Group 1**: Appraisal Methodology and ROI Pricing Validation
  - 2008 Return on Investment Memorandum of Agreement
- **Group 2**: Overtime Utilities Estimating and Energy Savings Policies
  - Overtime Utility Program Enhancement
  - Server Room Best Practices
  - Energy Cost Savings Sharing
- **Group 3**: Space Assignment, Classification, and Rent Validation
  - Occupancy Agreement Process
  - Concerns Escalation Process
  - Space Re-measurement and Space Audit Process
- **Group 4**: Scope of Work Development, Cost Estimating, Project Management, and RWA Processing
  - Project Requirements
  - Project Planning Documents
  - eRETA and VCSS Improvements
  - Post Completion Project Survey
- **Group 5**: Building Management, Service Requests, and Building Operations
  - Building Management Satisfaction Survey (Judiciary Sponsored)
  - JNET link to GSA Policies and Resources
  - Customer Service added as GSA Core Competency
  - Facilities Management Meetings held in all Judiciary occupied facilities
The Judicial Conference of the United States (JCUS) endorsed the following in September 2013

- **No Net New Policy** under which any increase in square footage within a circuit needs to be offset by an equivalent reduction in square footage within the same fiscal year, subject to the following exclusions: new courthouse construction, renovation, or alteration projects approved by Congress.*

- **Three Percent Space Reduction Target** by the close of FY 2018, prorated among the circuits based on the square footage occupied by each, taking into consideration the amount of square footage allotted to the circuit under the current version of the *US Courts Design Guide*, contingent upon the judiciary having access to funding to analyze, design, and implement space reductions. This target is subject to the following exclusions: new courthouse construction, renovation, or alteration projects approved by Congress.*

- **Each Circuit Judicial Council** will formulate a space and rent management plan on how the space reduction policies will be implemented.

It is the expectation of the JCUS that the GSA will work cooperatively with the Judiciary to achieve this reduction target.

*The baseline is space holdings as of the beginning of FY 2013 (October 1, 2012) and the net national space reduction target is 870,305 useable square feet (USF).*
ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS (AMP)

Discussion Overview:

- Background
- Asset Management Planning (AMP) Process
  - Long-Range Facilities Plans (LRFPs)
  - Facility Benefit Assessments (FBAs)
  - Annual Urgency Evaluation (UE) Results List
- Courthouse Project Priorities (CPP) List
BACKGROUND

- The Judiciary has had a long-range facilities planning program since 1988.

- Approved by the JCUS in 2008, the AMP process was developed to address cost containment concerns and provide an objective, consistently applied methodology for identification of space needs, potential solutions, and relative urgency compared to other courts nation-wide.

- The AMP process captures lessons learned from past planning programs and incorporates changes recommended by the GAO in related reports.

- Process deliverables include a district-wide Long-Range Facilities Plan (LRFP), a Facility Benefit Assessment (FBA) score, and an Urgency Evaluation (UE) ranking.
AMP Process At-A-Glance

1. Identify districts to undergo development of a new LRFP and schedule site visit
2. Develop LRFP Planning Handbook and deliver to court
3. Conduct pre-site visit videoconference
4. Conduct on-site planning session
5. Needs Assessment
   - Caseload, personnel, operational, and space data; input from judges, court unit managers, and subject matter experts
6. Physical Assessment
   - Facility Benefit Assessments (FBAs); floor plans; courtroom / chambers inventories; and GSA real property information
7. Draft Preliminary Housing Strategy options for each courthouse
8. Conduct Housing Strategy working session with court
9. Final Preliminary Housing Strategies and Draft LRFP
10. Complete Urgency Evaluation
11. LRFP Recommends New Construction
12. GSA performs Feasibility Study
13. New Construction
14. Courthouse Project Priorities (CPP) List
15. Renovation
16. GSA Capital Planning Process
There are two primary calculations involved in the AMP scoring process:

– The Facility Benefit Assessment (FBA) rating; and
– The Urgency Evaluation (UE) ranking
A set of 328 weighted FBA factors are applied to measure how well a courthouse meets operational requirements.

The factors were developed by a national working group composed of space professionals and court managers.

Each court component in a given courthouse is individually assessed using the weighted factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court of Appeals</th>
<th>District Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy Court</td>
<td>Probation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Services</td>
<td>Federal Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy Administrator</td>
<td>General Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FBA Scoring Criteria

The 328 factors are grouped into one of four weighted categories:

- **Building Condition (30%)** – general condition of space and building systems
- **Space Functionality (30%)** – adjacencies and flow of internal layout
- **Security (25%)** – safety features, circulation patterns, and prisoner movement
- **Space Standards (15%)** – size and proportion per the *U.S. Courts Design Guide*
Within the four categories, the factors associated with each court component are grouped and weighted:
The FBA factor checklist is completed during the LRFP site visit by the team architect.

All courthouses within a given district are assessed using the checklist to document ratings and comments.

The factor ratings are thoroughly reviewed by AO and court staff before entering them into the computer model.

Based on a scale of 0 to 100, individual courthouse and city-wide FBA results are generated.
## Asset Management Planning: Facility Benefit Assessment (FBA)

Assesses how well the facility supports (benefits) the operations of the court; 1-100 with 100 an ideal courthouse or city. City-wide benefit assessment includes fragmentation and facility ownership, and is used in the urgency evaluation.

### Sorted by FBA 2016 AMP Annual Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>GSA Building Number</th>
<th>Facility (Courthouse) Name</th>
<th>Ownership Year Built</th>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>Facility Benefit Assessment: Main Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Building (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
URGENCY EVALUATION (UE) PROCESS

- Results in an annual list that ranks urgency of space needs by court location.
- Relies on baseline data collected for each district’s Long-Range Facilities Plan, as well as annually updated data on caseload growth and chambers and courtroom needs.
- Scaled from 0 to 100 – the higher the score, the greater the urgency of need.
- Final results subject to review by the Judicial Conference of the U.S. (JCUS) Space and Facility Committee; they are then used to identify candidates for GSA Prospectus Project Feasibility Studies.
- Current UE results were completed in March 2016; the next update will be in Winter/Spring 2017.
Urgency Evaluation Criteria and Weights

City-Wide Benefit Assessment 40%

Building Condition 30%
- Space Functionality 30%
- Security 25%
- Space Standards 15%

Number of Additional Chambers 30%
- Current Need 22.5%
- Future Need 7.5%

Number of Additional Courtrooms w/Courtroom Sharing 20%
- Current Need 15%
- Future Need 5%

Caseload Growth 10%

Chambers Hierarchy
- District Judge (100%)
- Senior District Judge (75%)
- Bankruptcy Judge (50%)
- Magistrate Judge (50%)

Courtroom Hierarchy
- District Judge (100%)
- Senior District Judge (75%)
- Bankruptcy Judge (50%)
- Magistrate Judge (50%)
### 2016 UE RESULTS LIST EXCERPT

#### Asset Management Planning: Urgency Evaluation Results

Yearly evaluation results are used to assist in the assessment and prioritization of space needs. A higher urgency evaluation rating (number) represents a more urgent need.

City-level results sorted by Urgency Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ALN</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FLS</td>
<td>Fort Levis</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>WBE</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EEY</td>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KMF</td>
<td>Menomonee</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TIN</td>
<td>Peshtigo</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UTK</td>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WPK</td>
<td>Manitowoc</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TN6</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MVH</td>
<td>Marinette</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TN6</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ALN</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PMN</td>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HKC</td>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KHF</td>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OWH</td>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YK</td>
<td>Sheboygan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2016 UE Results List can be found in its entirety on the JNET at:

Home » Facilities & Security » Facilities » 2016 Urgency Evaluation Results List
COURTHOUSE PROJECT PRIORITIES (CPP) LIST

- The CPP is the judiciary’s list of courthouse construction funding priorities as approved by the JCUS.
- The CPP is developed using the results of the AMP process, including a given location’s LRFP-recommended housing strategy, FBA score, and UE score and ranking.
- The JCUS reviews and approves the list each year at its September session.
- In order to be considered for placement on the CPP, the following is required:
  - Completion of a district-wide LRFP under the AMP process
  - Calculation of a UE score as documented and ranked in the Annual UE Results list
  - Completion of a GSA feasibility study that concurs new construction is needed in order to meet a given court’s space needs
  - Approval of the GSA feasibility study by the respective court and circuit
  - A recommendation from the JCUS Committee on Space and Facilities
- The CPP is divided into two parts
  - Part I consists of the judiciary’s courthouse construction funding priorities for the next budget year
  - Part II consists of a list of the judiciary’s outyear courthouse construction priorities
  - The primary factor in determining project prioritization on both lists is the UE score
The Federal Judiciary Courthouse Project Priorities (CPP) is the judiciary’s list of courthouse construction funding priorities as approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States (Judicial Conference). The CPP was developed using the results of the Asset Management Planning (AMP) process. Approved by the Judicial Conference in 2008, AMP is a comprehensive facility planning tool designed to identify the judiciary’s most urgent space needs, address cost-containment concerns, and incorporate applicable industry best practices.

The AMP process incorporates rigorous facility assessments and applies standards that support several of the objectives in the “Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary.” Each courthouse nationwide is assessed to determine current and future needs, identify preliminary housing solutions as needed, and calculate the relative urgency of need compared to other courts nationwide. Factors considered include building condition, building functionality, security, compliance with space standards, courtroom and chambers needs, and caseload and personnel growth. The resulting data and analysis is compiled in a long-range facilities plan for each judicial district. In addition, an Urgency Evaluation (UE) Results List that ranks space urgency by court location on a "worst first” basis is developed. Each location’s score is updated annually until a project is placed on Part I of the CPP, at which time its score is “frozen” to ensure certainty of planning for site acquisition, design, and funding requests.

The CPP is divided into two parts. Part I, which is provided immediately below, consists of the judiciary's courthouse construction funding priorities for FY 2017. Part II, on the following page, identifies outyear courthouse construction priorities.

### Part I: Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Courthouse Construction Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>FY 2017 Funding Request</th>
<th>Previously Funded</th>
<th>Est. Total (Site/Design, Construction)</th>
<th>Site Acquired</th>
<th>Status as of 4/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middle District of Tennessee</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>185.14</td>
<td>214.53</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Design - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern District of Ohio</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>87.58</td>
<td>101.90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Design - 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Western District of N.Carolina</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>Courthouse Annex</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>150.79</td>
<td>164.66</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>Design - 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southern District of Iowa</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>423.51</td>
<td>481.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- All actual and estimated site, design, and construction costs are provided by the General Services Administration (GSA).
- Judicial courtroom sharing policies have been applied to the planning and design of all projects.
- All projects have been assessed using the AMP process. UE scores are frozen as of the year the location was added to Part I to ensure certainty of planning for site acquisition, design, and funding requests, and the scores are no longer shown on Part I.
The judiciary also identifies outyear courthouse construction priorities which are contained in Part II of the CPP. These projects have been assessed under the AMP process and prioritized based on the project location’s UE score. As projects in Part I are funded and constructed, the project(s) in Part II that are highest ranked at that time may potentially move to Part I. Until a project is moved to Part I, its UE score will be refreshed each year to capture changes in courtroom needs, chambers needs, and caseload growth, and as a result, its place in the prioritization of Part II projects may change.

### Part II: CPP Outyear Courthouse Construction Priorities (Based on July 2014 Urgency Evaluation Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>July 2014 UE Score</th>
<th>Future Request/Unfunded Site/Design</th>
<th>Previously Funded Site/Design Construction</th>
<th>Est. Total (Site/Design, Construction)</th>
<th>Site Acquired</th>
<th>Status (as of 4/2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of South Carolina</td>
<td>Greenville, SC</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>89.80</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Design - 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern District of Alabama</td>
<td>Anniston, AL</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>**41.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Identified Design - 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern District of Georgia</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
<td>Construct Annex; Reno. Existing</td>
<td>37.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Redesign - 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western District of Texas</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>34.98</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>130.80</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Design - 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle District of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Harrisburg, PA</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.80</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Design - 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle District of Tennessee</td>
<td>Chattanooga, TN</td>
<td>New Courthouse</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>132.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District of Virginia</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>Courthouse Annex</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>104.70</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Design - 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

* Funding estimates provided in Part II are programming estimates determined by GSA and are subject to change upon further development of design documents.

** Includes design supplement and construction.

- Judiciary courtroom sharing policies have been applied to the planning and design of all projects.
- All projects have been assessed under the AMP process.
The *U.S. Courts Design Guide* has three major objectives:

- Serves as a planning tool for federal judges and judicial personnel involved in the design of a federal court facility

- Provides relevant information for the GSA and A/E team to plan, program, design and collaborate with the judiciary

- Provides policy guidance for the overall planning, programming and design of federal court facilities
Planning. The planning phase includes evaluation of workloads, staffing levels, procedures, organizations, and administrative requirements.

Programming. The programming phase translates functional requirements into a space needs (housing) plan and defines the project’s design objectives.

Design. Drawings and specifications for constructing the facility are developed in the design phase through an iterative process of increasing detail.

Construction. Materials and labor are organized to implement the design in the construction phase.
**SPACE MEASUREMENT STANDARDS**

- **Net square footage (NSF)** is the square footage allocated to an assigned space, such as an office, workstation, storage space, or conference room. The sum of all net areas in the building is the total assigned space, also called net square footage. The NSF criteria in the *Design Guide* do not include space for circulation among programmed spaces.

- **Circulation space** includes corridors, aisles, and other similar space required for occupants to access means of egress and all other functions in and serving their space.

- **Usable square footage (USF)** is a measure of usable area constituting the basis upon which the U.S. Courts will pay rent.

- **Rentable square footage (RSF)** is the quantity of square footage tenants pay for in a building. It includes the USF each tenant actually occupies, plus a pro-rated portion of other building spaces, such as a lobby, that are used by all tenants of the building.

- **Gross square footage (GSF)** is the total enclosed area of a building, including exterior walls.
PLANNING FOR COURTHOUSES

Courthouse Zoning and Building Circulation

Figure 3.1
General Organizational Relationships
Program Stacking

Figure 3.2
Typical Stacking Diagram
• **U.S. Court of Appeals (USCA):** Since the USCA does not conduct trials as does the district court, it requires only two circulation systems: public and restricted.

• **U.S. District Court (USDC) and U.S. Magistrate – Judges:** The USDC conducts jury trials for both civil and criminal cases and other court proceedings. The court requires public, restricted, and secure circulation patterns.

• **U.S. Bankruptcy Court (USBC):** The USBC hears only civil cases. Like the USCA, the USBC needs only two circulation systems: public and restricted. In some locations, jury trials may be held by bankruptcy courts. When this occurs, the USBC should use a vacant USDC courtroom.
PLANNING FOR COURTHOUSES

U.S. Court of Appeals Adjacency Relationships
PLANNING FOR COURTHOUSES

U.S. District Court Adjacency Relationships
PLANNING FOR COURTHOUSES

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Adjacency Relationships
Exceptions to the Design Guide

• Authority of the Circuit Judicial Councils
  To approve requests for new or modified space, and to enforce adherence to design guidelines.

• Authority of the Committee on Space and Facilities and the Judicial Conference of the United States
  To approve the following exceptions to the Design Guide standards rests with the Committee on Space and Facilities and the Judicial Conference: (1) exceeding the total envelope for either the court unit or the project as a whole, (2) changing the standard configurations for judges’ chambers and courtrooms, and (3) exceeding the plumbing standards.

The Committee will review the Circuit’s request and make a recommendation to the Conference for action.
COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES

Barrier – Free Accessibility

It is the policy of the Judicial Conference that federal court facilities conform with the Architectural Barriers Act Accessibility Standards (ABAAS).

• Courtroom areas used by the public must be accessible to people with disabilities:
  - Public seating
  - Litigants’ tables
  - Jury box
  - Witness box
  - Lectern

• Private work areas must be adaptable to accessibility.


**COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES**

*Ceiling Height*

Courtroom ceiling heights must be in proportion to the size of the space and the number of people using the space and reflect the solemnity of proceedings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
<th>Ceiling Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEET</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPELLATE COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Banc Courtroom</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Courtroom</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Work Room¹</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges’ Conference/Robing Room²</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT JUDGE COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Judge Courtroom</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Proceedings Courtroom</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Witness Rooms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Work Room¹</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges’ Conference/Robing Room²</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAGISTRATE AND BANKRUPTCY JUDGE COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate Judge Courtroom</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy Judge Courtrooms</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Witness Rooms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Work Room¹</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges’ Conference/Robing Room²</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Only one per courthouse, not one per court
² Provided only when chambers are located in a remote location from the courtroom

Ceiling heights that exceed these maximum heights are considered an exception.
Courtrooms and Associated Spaces

Appellate Panel Courtroom

Figure 4.2
Appellate Panel Courtroom, 1800 NSF (167.2 Nm²)
COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES

District Judge Courtroom

Figure 4.5
U.S. District Court Special Proceedings Courtrooms, 3000 NSF (278.7 Nm²)
COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES

Magistrate Judge Courtroom

Figure 4.10
Magistrate Judge Courtroom – Corner Bench, 1800 NSF (167.2 Nm²)
COURTROOMS AND ASSOCIATED SPACES

Bankruptcy Judge Courtroom

Figure 4.12
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge’s Courtroom – Center Bench, 1800 NSF (167.2 Nm²)
JUDGES’ CHAMBERS SUITES

U.S. Court of Appeals

Chief Judge’s Chambers Suite:
• 1 Chief judge
• 3 law clerks
• 3 judicial assistants (or 4 law clerks and 2 judicial assistants) if there are 5 or more authorized judgeships
• 6 visitors

Circuit Judge’s Chambers Suite:
• 1 Judge
• 3 law clerks, and 2 judicial assistants (or 4 law clerks and 1 judicial assistant)
• 2 visitors
U.S. District Court

Chief Judge’s Chambers Suite

• Chief judge
• 2 law clerks
• 1 judicial assistant (or 3 law clerks)
• 6 to 10 visitors
• The chief judge may have a third law clerk or second judicial assistant if there are five or more authorized judgeships in the district

District Judge’s Chambers Suite.

• Judge
• 2 law clerks
• 1 judicial assistant (or 3 law clerks and no judicial assistant)
• 6 to 10 visitors
JUDGES’ CHAMBERS SUITES

U.S. Magistrate Judge and U.S. Bankruptcy Court

Judge’s Chambers Suite:
• 1 Judge
• 1 law clerk
• 1 judicial assistant (or 2 law clerks and no assistant)
• 6 to 10 visitors
The Judicial Conference Committee on Information and Technology is responsible for development and oversight of judiciary policy regarding courtroom technology.

Current judiciary policy (2001):
Each courtroom will be equipped with an audiovisual system infrastructure and wiring and recommends portable video presentation and video conferencing systems which can be moved between various courtrooms in a building.

There are two basic types of courtroom technology projects:

- The first type of project is the design and installation of courtroom technology in newly constructed courthouses or in courthouses undergoing major renovations or alterations.

- The second type of project is the new installation or upgrade of courtroom technology in existing courthouses.
Courthouse security requires coordination of architectural design, allocation of security personnel, and security systems and equipment.

- **Interior security**: Separation of public, restricted, and secure circulation patterns and provision of secure prisoner holding and interview facilities are essential security design elements.

- **Public Entrance**: Only one public entrance, with a lobby large enough to hold visitors during peak periods, must be provided, configured and sized to allow security systems to be part of the architectural design and circulation path from the entrance.

- **Exterior security** includes considerations of site, parking, lighting, access control at building entrances, and intrusion-detection/alarm systems.

All security systems and equipment must be consistent with the GSA’s *ISC Security Design Criteria for New Federal Office Buildings and Major Modernization Projects*. 
INTEGRATED WORKPLACE INITIATIVE

*Alternative Workplace Strategies, JCUS approved September 2014*

- Results in more efficient use of space than traditional office/cubicle layouts
- Complements a mobile workforce and Integrated Workplace Initiative (IWI)
- Provides collaborative work environments and modern information technologies
- Standards and guidance for display monitors and supporting technologies for individual and collaborative workspaces are being developed
Program Overview

In FY 2016, Congress appropriated $947.8 million to the General Services Administration (GSA) for the construction of new courthouses:

1. Nashville, TN
2. Toledo, OH
3. Charlotte, NC
4. Des Moines, IA
5. Greenville, SC
6. Anniston, AL
7. Savannah, GA
8. San Antonio, TX
9. Harrisburg, PA (Partial Funding)

The appropriation also included $53 million for new construction and acquisition of federal buildings that jointly house U.S. courthouses and other federal agencies in Greenville, MS and Rutland, VT.
Portfolio Management

The AO Space and Facilities Division (SFD) and GSA are managing this effort as a portfolio

- Speed Dates
- Performance Management Tool and Master Schedule
- Stakeholder Partnering Sessions and Weekly Coordination Meetings
FY 2016 COURTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Nashville, TN- New Courthouse

Project Summary:

- New courthouse will be located in Central Business District of Nashville, TN.
- Allows for the consolidation of courthouse operations into one stand alone facility
- There are two exceptions to the *U.S. Courts Design Guide* – an alternative dispute resolution suite and expanded juror assembly room.

**CPP Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courtroom and Chambers</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
<th>Design Build (Bridging)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Plan</th>
<th>District, Magistrate, Circuit Library, Probation, USMS, U.S. Attorney, GSA, and U.S. Senate Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>339,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judiciary District/Circuit</th>
<th>Tennessee Middle (TNM)/6th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GSA Region</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Budget</th>
<th>$193,544,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
<th>December 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
QUESTIONS?

**Anna Franz**, Chief, Space and Facilities Division  
202-502-1344

**Reema Gupta**, Chief, Program Management Branch  
202-502-3958

**Suzanne Allan**, Chief, Long Range Planning Team  
202-502-1184