

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN									
FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21						
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
STATE COURTS										15
STATE COURT SYSTEM										1501.00.00.00
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										080000
3RD DCA BLDG REM-DM										080179
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	6,482,222								1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2016-2017 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 3RD DCA BLDG REM-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

3RD DCA - COURT BUILDING REMODELING FOR SECURITY AND BUILDING SYSTEM UPGRADES - DMS MGD:

The Third District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$6,482,222 during FY 2016-2017 to finish the multi-year, interlocking, phased security, ADA and core systems upgrade and renovation project for which funding was approved by the legislature during the FY 2013-2014 and FY 2014-2015 legislative sessions.

Phase I funding in the amount of \$2,092,455 was provided to the Court during the FY 2013-2014 legislative session. The purpose of the appropriation was to fund a Public Area Facility Evaluation and Security Study of the court facility, including the main court building, constructed in 1976, and the subsequently constructed Annex building. These funds are being used to install a fire sprinkler system, required by the South Florida Building Code, throughout the second floor of the main court building and Annex, install ADA compliant bathrooms on the second floor of both the main court building and Annex, complete the installation of wind resistant impact windows in the Annex, and to perform related ceiling and lighting work.

The Public Area Facility Evaluation and Security Study funded by the legislature was completed by AECOM (formerly Spillis Candela), which has extensive, national and global experience in projects of this nature, in December, 2014. AECOM recommended, as long had Spillis Candela based upon its experience as the Court's architectural and engineering firm of record since 1976, that the present open courtyard space be repurposed into an enclosed, secure lobby space, that the court security station be relocated from its present location in the back corner of the courtyard to the front of a reconfigured court entrance, that the clerk's and marshal's work spaces on the first floor be reconfigured so that the marshal's office is positioned adjacent to the relocated court security station, and the clerk's office be repositioned to an accessible, safe and secure location off the repurposed lobby space. The Study also identified a host of additional design and construction requirements mandated by the Revised 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act, which were not previously known to the Court.

The legislature funded Phase II of the project in FY 2014-2015 in the sum of \$2,700,000. Consistent with the Public Area Facility Evaluation and Security Study, the Court is moving forward as planned with the reconfiguration and upgrades to the first floor clerk's and marshal's office work areas. These two work areas have not been updated since the original court building was constructed in 1976. The employees of the clerk's office work off thirty-eight year old, pre-computer era work stations, serviced by inadequately safeguarded electrical wiring. The increased responsibilities of the marshal's office, occasioned by expanded post-9/11 security demands and greater requirements placed on the office's

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST FY 2016-17	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2017-18	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2018-19	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2019-20	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2020-21	POS	
AMOUNT		AMOUNT		AMOUNT		AMOUNT		AMOUNT		
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
STATE COURTS										15
STATE COURT SYSTEM										<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

finance and accounting, human resources, and information technology components since the work space was laid out in 1976, have caused the office to outgrow its space. The Phase II appropriation will be used to reconfigure the clerk's and marshal's office to reflect current needs, and to relocate the marshal's office to the front of the building consistent with AECOM's recommendation that the court security station be repositioned to the front of the courthouse from its present back corner location in the courtyard. It will also enable the Court to separate all private areas of circulation from the public areas of the courthouse building in accordance with present-day security requirements. For security reasons, a more complete description of the physical structure creating the risks, and the final design and construction work necessary to complete this presently ongoing project is being separately submitted under seal.

During Phase III, the court security station will be repositioned from its present back corner location to the front of the building entrance, adjacent to the marshal's office, so that building security will have a clear line of sight to the building approach, an adequate screening area that complies with the Revised 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act, and prompt assistance from the court's marshal and deputy marshal in the event of an emergency. The repositioning of the court security station will necessitate installation of additional exterior glass on the west-facing front of the courthouse, where the repositioned court security station will now be located, and construction of a small roof over the remaining 36% of the roofed area of the courtyard which is presently uncovered (64% has been covered for weather purposes since the original 1976 construction) to effectuate a single, safe entrance through which the public can enter the court building, be observed by court security as they traverse the newly reconstituted public area to the Office of the Clerk, Marshal, lawyers' waiting area, courtroom or await the arrival of a judge or court staff member from the non-public portion of the courthouse.

Phase III also includes the replacement of the current security surveillance and control access systems in the courthouse, which are presently at end of life (having been installed in the early 1990s); completion of the installation of the fire sprinkler system required by the South Florida Building Code on the first floor of the original court building; relocation of the court's IT server room to a dry and safe location; upgrade of the court's two thirty-eight year old elevators with digital controls for life safety purposes, new door operator controls that comply with current Florida and Miami-Dade County Fire Code requirements, and 2010 ADA regulations; the acquisition of an emergency generator so that the Court can be operational during natural disasters and frequent South Florida power outages, and ameliorate the present high risk of sewer and water backflow into the courthouse from the County Lift Station adjacent to the court building during such outages; upgrade the public restrooms used by visitors to the Court, which are not air conditioned and do not comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act; and upgrade the public access paths to the courthouse to comply with the 2010 ADA accessibility mandates; re-paving the court's thirty-eight year old parking lots; and related improvements necessary to the secure, efficient operation of the court.

With the support of the legislature, the Court teamed with DMS and AECOM, which has extensive national and global experience in courthouse security, ADA and operational requirements, to produce a systematic and interlocking plan in which its many parts combine to produce a logical, cost effective design to address the immediate and serious security risks faced by the Court in its urban location, and multiple ADA non-compliance issues, which the Court is not free to dismiss. The interdependence of each element of the renovation and upgrade plan on the other, especially the security component, cannot be overemphasized. The Court respectfully requests full funding of this project in the amount of

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST FY 2016-17	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2017-18	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2018-19	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2019-20	POS	AG FCO PLAN FY 2020-21	POS	
AMOUNT		AMOUNT		AMOUNT		AMOUNT		AMOUNT		

STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
STATE COURTS										15
STATE COURT SYSTEM										<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

\$6,482,222 for the benefit and safety of the Court, its employees and the public it serves.

Construction Costs	\$5,747,042
Architectural and Engineering Fees	\$ 499,000
State Fire Marshal & Contingency Costs	\$ 117,708
DMS Fees	\$ 117,472

Budget Request Total: \$6,482,222 (non-recurring)

SPECIAL PURPOSE										990S000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										080000
4TH NEW COURT BLDG										080071
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	4,775,757								1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2016-2017 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 4TH NEW COURT BLDG DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL NEW COURTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION - DMS MGD:

The Fourth District Court of Appeal requests \$4,775,757 to complete construction of a new courthouse and a new parking garage to serve the court and seven executive branch departments currently operating on the state-owned property on which the courthouse is being constructed.

The construction will be performed over three fiscal years. The legislature provided funding for Fiscal years 2014-15 and 2015-16 in the amounts of \$7,145,763 and \$12,008,689, respectively. Fiscal year 2016-17 costs are estimated to be \$4,775,757 to complete the project.

The completion of this project will provide a new courthouse for the Fourth District Court of Appeal with a significant useful life. The current 45-year-old courthouse suffers from moisture and mold intrusion and is non-compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act and a United States Marshals' Service security assessment. Major renovation would be costly and short-lived. The new courthouse will provide a modern and efficient location for the court's operations, provide greater security, reduce operational and maintenance costs, and provide better access to public transportation which benefits the public and court employees.

Construction of the new courthouse on the state-owned property will reduce the current available ground parking for the

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST FY 2016-17 POS	AMOUNT	AG FCO PLAN FY 2017-18 POS	AMOUNT	AG FCO PLAN FY 2018-19 POS	AMOUNT	AG FCO PLAN FY 2019-20 POS	AMOUNT	AG FCO PLAN FY 2020-21 POS	AMOUNT	
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
STATE COURTS										15
STATE COURT SYSTEM										<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE										990S000

seven executive branch departments currently operating on the property. Therefore, construction of the new parking garage will provide secure parking for the courthouse employees while enhancing parking for the public and the departments' users.

Back-end financing of a portion of the project still is planned to occur by selling the existing courthouse property in approximately 2018. The current estimated market value of the existing courthouse property is \$3.3 million.

Construction Costs \$4,683,505
 DMS Fees \$ 92,252

Budget Request Total: \$4,775,757 (non-recurring)

FACILITY STUDY-DMS 080171

GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE 100,000 1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2016-2017 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FACILITY STUDY-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

FACILITY SPACE STUDY - DMS MGD:

The Second District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$100,000 to proceed with Department of Management Services (DMS) managed program analysis to identify the court's current and future space needs for the judicial, clerk of court, and marshal units of the court, site selection, schematic designs, and other professional services necessary to accurately plan and budget for a consolidated courthouse facility in Tampa.

The Second DCA has long outgrown its courthouse in Lakeland, necessitating the utilization of leased office space for over 35 years. An analysis of the historical and present facility operations of the Second DCA provides the following information:

- 1) The courthouse in Lakeland cannot be rehabilitated to provide for the district's core operations;
- 2) There is no longer a functional justification for the continued division of the court and the expense of operating from two facilities; and,
- 3) Tampa is the population and filing center for the district and changing the location to Tampa would be more geographically accessible to litigants and the public.

	COL A03	COL A06	COL A07	COL A08	COL A09	
	AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	
	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
STATE COURTS						15
STATE COURT SYSTEM						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000

In 1979 the Florida Supreme Court's Commission on the Florida Appellate Court Structure concluded that Tampa was an appropriate geographical location for hearing large numbers of appeals. The Commission, and the Supreme Court, recommended that Tampa be the location of a newly constituted district to be created. In 1980, the legislature authorized a Tampa branch to deal with the very large numbers of appeals originating in Hillsborough and Pinellas counties and also reflecting the new central and west coast moiety of the district's new geographical distribution. See section 35.05, Florida Statutes.

Nearly 50% of the district's filings originate in Hillsborough and Pinellas counties; the district's Tampa location provides litigants, their lawyers, law students, and the general public with ready access to their court within an existing legal community. Further, it saves time and money for the court's employees and judges by eliminating what otherwise would be a long daily commute. Nine of the court's 16 judges are currently located in leased space in Tampa, at an annual cost of \$525,000 for rent, \$18,000 for courier costs, plus the associated administrative and operating costs for IT and security.

The deficiencies of the Lakeland headquarters include immediate and long-term operating, capital and facility renewal liabilities related to: deferred maintenance, renewal, and energy efficiency improvements; aging building components well past their lifecycle renewal; deficiencies in Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance; and a highly inefficient and ineffective use of interior space for court operations and security functions.

Architectural and Engineering Tasks \$ 95,000
 DMS Fees \$ 5,000

Budget Request Total: \$100,000 (non-recurring)

TOTAL: SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000
TOTAL ISSUE.....	4,875,757					
TOTAL: STATE COURT SYSTEM						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
BY FUND TYPE						
GENERAL REVENUE FUND.....	11,357,979					1000