

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15						
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT										22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT										22010100
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										080000
FLOORING REPLACEMENT										080025

GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE 190,000 1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FLOORING REPLACEMENT IT COMPONENT? NO

Replacement of Courtyard Flooring: The existing tile flooring on the north and south side courtyards was installed in 1989. The tiles have settled causing changes of elevation which creates an unsafe tripping condition. The courtyards are used by the Florida Supreme Court Building staff and for egress of emergency stair exits. In addition, due to the changes in elevation, water drainage in the courtyards has deteriorated to less than an effective system. The existing tile floor will need to be demolished and a new tile floor will need to be installed. There is a total of 6,000 square feet (3,000 for each courtyard).

The breakdown is as follows:

- \$6.12 per square foot to remove the existing tile
- \$10.12 per square foot to install the slab work
- \$10.00 per square foot for the new tile

Total \$26.24 per square foot times 6,000 square feet = \$157,440

If this project is not funded there could be some trip and fall accidents. For the safety of all court employees and visitors the flooring needs to be replaced.

The budget for this project is as follows:

- Construction 157,440
- DMS Fees \$6,160
- Architect & Engineering Fees \$8,400
- Construction Manager and Permit Fees \$18,000

Total Budget Request: \$190,000 (non-recurring)

SUPREME COURT-COURT RM REN 080038

GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE 220,000 1000 1

=====

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15						
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT										22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT										22010100
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: SUPREME COURT-COURT RM REN IT COMPONENT? NO

Supreme Court Americans with Disabilities Act Access to the Bench, Spectator Seating, and the Well - As one would expect with a facility constructed in the 1940s, the Supreme Court Building contains features that present barriers to access by individuals with disabilities. The Court is committed to full compliance with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design and the Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "accessibility codes").

The current design of the judges' bench at the Supreme Court Building is not accessible to persons who use wheelchairs, walkers, scooters, and other mobility devices. The Court will install a mechanical lift to provide vertical access to the bench. Additionally, the bench will be reconfigured to allow adequate maneuvering space for a wheelchair or other mobility device.

Five wheelchair spaces are required in assembly areas, such as courtrooms, based on the fixed seating capacity. Wheelchair seating locations must adjoin an accessible route, not overlap into the main aisle, and be dispersed throughout the courtroom. In order to provide integrated wheelchair seating, the Court will modify four existing benches around the courtroom.

The counsel stations and lectern are located in an area referred to as the "well." Railing around the well needs to be removed to provide accessibility to persons who use wheelchairs, walkers, scooters, and other mobility devices. After the railing is removed the floor will be repaired.

If this funding is not provided, the Supreme Court Courtroom will not be fully accessible to Floridians with disabilities and will not be in full compliance with the intent of the accessibility codes.

The budget for this project is as follows:

Construction	\$179,206
DMS Fees	\$7,794
Architect & Engineering Fees	\$10,500
Construction Manager and Permit Fees	\$22,500

Total Budget Request: \$220,000 (non-recurring)

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS AMOUNT CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT						22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT						22010100
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
SITE HARDENING						080052
GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE	900,000					1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: SITE HARDENING IT COMPONENT? NO

Site Hardening: This issue is a request for \$900,000 in non-recurring funding to install a bollard system at the Supreme Court Building's garages, which continues the security hardening of the facility. With the original appropriation in FY 2005-2006 and an additional appropriation in FY 2006-2007, a large portion of the recommended site hardening issues that were made in a security assessment conducted by both the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and a security consulting firm have been completed or are nearing completions:

- * Securing main entrance lobby
- * Entrance and exit doors hardening
- * Upgrading access control and CCTV systems
- * Securing the ventilation and garage fire proofing
- * Security window replacement

In March, 2008, the Supreme Court voluntarily reverted \$1,400,000 in nonrecurring General Revenue funds for site hardening from the FY 2006-2007 appropriation. These funds were reverted in Section 10, House Bill 7009 to assist in mitigating the critical general revenue deficit being experienced by the State during Fiscal Year 2007-2008.

The bollard system will consist of retractable and fixed bollards to control access to the building's garages. The bollards can withstand an impact of up to 5 tons at a speed of 55 mph. The Florida Department of Management Services (DMS) and their construction management firm estimate the cost at \$900,000 to install a bollard system in the North and South garages of the Supreme Court Building.

When the Supreme Court Building was originally constructed in 1948, concepts such as domestic terrorism and weapons of mass destruction were largely unknown. The security assessment noted the facility and grounds were comparatively unprotected when compared with the Capitol Complex. The previous site hardening appropriation has greatly improved the security of the building but the garages located underneath the facility remain extremely vulnerable compared to the Capitol Complex garages. An attack aimed at the garages could cause extensive damage to the Court Building, interrupt operations, and injure staff. The additional funding will strengthen the entrances to the Court's garages, continuing the security hardening of the facility.

The budget for this project is as follows:

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT						22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT						22010100
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

Bollards construction \$538,000
 DMS fees \$25,000
 Architect & Engineer fees \$62,000
 Construction Management fees \$260,000
 Permits \$15,000

Total Budget Request: \$900,000 (non-recurring)

FIRE SYSTEM-DMS MGD 082108

GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE 350,000 1000 1

=====

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FIRE SYSTEM-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

Fire Suppression System: Installed in 1988, the fire pump for the Florida Supreme Court Building has reached the end of its useful life, which is based on a mechanical equipment industry standard life cycle of 20 years. The fire pump, the main component of the system, is not connected to emergency power creating a lack of protection during a power failure. The fire pump is required by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), code 13, Edition 1999, and needs to be operational at all times and to be inspected and certified by the NFPA, code 25 at regular intervals throughout the year. Funds are requested to replace the pump and bring it to present code standards according to NFPA, code 13.

The fire pump system is essential to the operation of the Florida Supreme Court Building. If this project is not funded, major failure, damage and disruption of the Florida Supreme Court building operations could occur.

The budget for this project is as follows:

Equipment cost and installation \$249,500
 DMS Fees \$4,500
 Architect & Engineering Fees \$26,000
 Construction Manager and Permit Fees \$70,000

Total Budget Request: \$350,000 (non-recurring)

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS AMOUNT CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT						22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT						22010100
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						<u>9999.99.99.99</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
TOTAL: MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
TOTAL ISSUE.....	1,660,000					
TOTAL: OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						<u>9999.99.99.99</u>
BY FUND TYPE						
GENERAL REVENUE FUND.....	1,660,000					1000

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
2ND DCA-A/C RENOVATION						080036
GENERAL REVENUE FUND						1000 1
	-STATE	400,312				

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 2ND DCA-A/C RENOVATION IT COMPONENT? NO

Second District Court of Appeal, HVAC Renovation and Mold Remediation - The Second District Court of Appeal requests \$400,312 for cleaning/replacing the air handler and duct work in the east portion of the Lakeland headquarters. The Lakeland headquarters was originally built in 1961; the east end of the building (courtroom, conference room, lobby, and clerk's office) was added in 1986. The air handler on the east side of the building was placed into service in 1986 and it has exceeded its useful life. More importantly, the entire HVAC system on the east end is not functioning properly, resulting in numerous environmental and air quality issues. An August 2009 investigative survey to determine the material and operational conditions of the mechanical equipment and air distribution devices found the following deficiencies:

Mechanical failures, combined with the age of the system, have resulted in a considerable buildup of mold and other irritants in the air handler and the ductwork. These irritants are believed to be contributing to employees' eye and respiratory irritation.

Large amounts of untreated air are being drawn into the above-ceiling return air plenum recently identified by a Test & Balance Professional Engineer (P.E.). The source air is coming in through openings to the external building envelope both during daytime and nighttime hours. These openings and the integrity to the cooling system should be corrected immediately due to the large quantities of extra energy being expended unnecessarily to treat this air. Another concern pointed out is the limited filtration to the existing air handlers that should be improved to achieve better occupant overall comfort and minimize complaints. Mold and fungi are being produced from this condition through the air handler, duct-work, variable air volume (VAV) boxes, and around register grills. A number of judges and employee occupants are complaining about the condition.

Replacing this equipment will ensure a more cost efficient means of cooling the building, as well as address the immediate health issues.

Asbestos and Lead Survey	\$8,000
Architect/Mechanical Plans	\$45,000
Replace/clean air handler and ductwork	
on the east end of the building	\$287,900
Independent test and balance	\$12,850

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15						
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
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

Construction Contingency \$35,000
 DMS Fee \$11,562

TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST: \$400,312 (non-recurring)

2ND DCA/EXT BLDG SEALANT

080048

GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	41,800								1000 1
----------------------	--------	--------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 2ND DCA/EXT BLDG SEALANT IT COMPONENT? NO

Second District Court of Appeal, Clean and Seal Building Envelope - The Second District requests \$41,800 to pressure wash and seal the exterior building envelope at its Lakeland headquarters and replace deteriorating window gaskets and seals. The harsh Florida weather causes the sealants and coating on the building envelope to rapidly deteriorate, allowing water intrusion. Regular pressure washing and application of sealants is required preventative maintenance. This was last completed in 2003. If this request is not funded, the integrity and energy efficiency of the building envelope will be compromised.

Clean and Seal Building Envelope \$38,000
 10% Contingency \$3,800

TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST: \$41,800 (non-recurring)

3RD DCA BLDG REM-DMS MGD

080179

GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	3,484,990	1,970,649	941,277						1000 1
----------------------	--------	-----------	-----------	---------	--	--	--	--	--	--------

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 3RD DCA BLDG REM-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS AMOUNT CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

Third District Court of Appeal, Remodeling of the Court Building for Security and Core Systems Upgrade - The Court is requesting \$6,396,916 to remodel the courthouse entrance, first and second floors, and library, and to upgrade the core building systems. Remodeling the entrance will provide a more secure workplace for judges, court personnel, and visitors. With the exception of the addition of a courtroom ADA ramp during FY 2009-2010 and some ceiling /lighting replacement, the first and second floors of the courthouse have not been remodeled since the building's construction in 1976. The building's 34-year-old mechanical and electrical core systems have not been replaced since they were originally installed in 1976.

In order to complete the courthouse renovation in a logical and cost effective manner, this project has been separated into three phases. Phase I totaling \$3,484,990, Phase II totaling \$1,970,649, and Phase III totaling \$941,277. It is requested that Phase I, II and III be funded in FY 2010-2011, FY 2011-2012 and FY 2012-2013, respectively.

Alternatively, due to the aged mechanical infrastructure and lack of appropriate and mandatory life safety systems, it is requested that, if Phase I funds cannot be appropriated, a secondary request be considered to address the critical systems that are in dire need of replacement. Alternative funding totaling \$1,880,450 for those systems are as follows: Main Building Air Conditioner/Chiller system, including two air handlers, digital energy management systems, two variable speed drives, variable air volume (VAV) boxes and mechanical systems - \$1,095,575; Emergency Generator System with emergency and exit lighting - \$505,050 and, Elevator controls and Fire Alarm System - \$279,825. Specifics regarding those systems are set forth within the Phase I narrative.

During FY 2006-2007 the Court, working with the Department of Management Services, hired the architectural firm of Spillis Candela now known as AECOM, to conduct a study addressing security problems relating to the building's 1976 open air design. The study included all public areas, the Clerk's and Marshal's Offices, court library, courtroom, staff lounge, and lawyer's lounge. Spillis recommended re-designing the entrance to the building and remodeling the first and second floors due of the building's failing mechanical and electrical core components. The engineering portion of the study determined that the original 34-year-old air handler units were inadequate to handle the increased load resulting from a building reconfiguration and were not energy-efficient by current standards. In order to bring the elevators and fire alarm system up to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), funds have been included for those upgrades as well.

Phase I

The Court is requesting \$3,484,990 for Phase I, FY 2010-2011, to upgrade the failing courthouse core mechanical and electrical core systems. This improvement will greatly increase utility efficiency, provide necessary air conditioning to renovated areas, enhance life/safety assets and reduce future maintenance and repair expense for aging core systems. Also, in order to initiate the planning of the security reconfiguration and interior remodeling in a timely manner (Phase II), the Court is also requesting that the Phase II design fees be included in Phase I.

The following systems will be replaced during Phase I:

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15						
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

Mechanical Infrastructure and Energy Management System

The current 90-ton chiller, which was installed in 1998, is obsolete and not energy efficient. Further, the Phase II renovation will increase the load of the courthouse air conditioning system, thereby necessitating a chiller of 120 tons. Maintaining the existing chiller would be cost-prohibitive due to increased repair, maintenance, and utility expenses. The existing courthouse and courtroom air handlers, which were installed in 1976, are obsolete and not energy-efficient. In order to maximize efficiency with a new 120-ton chiller, the air handler replacements should match the output requirements of the new chiller. To improve the Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system control and monitoring capabilities, the engineers also recommended replacement of the 1976 pneumatic control system with a direct digital control energy management system and two variable speed drives. The variable speed drives would eliminate the need to replace the existing duct work, and would result in a more energy-efficient overall building operation.

VAV Boxes and Mechanical Distribution Systems

The current pneumatic Variable Air Volume (VAV) boxes were installed in 1976. The FY 2006-2007 engineering study recommended that they be replaced with pressure independent boxes which will improve the quality, reliability and control of the air distribution system. Installation of the VAV boxes will include the retrofitting or replacement of all controlling systems contained within the space above the ceiling systems. Also, the installation of additional VAV boxes would enable office users to independently control air temperatures thereby increasing the overall efficiency of the HVAC system. The addition of a voice and data cabling tray system will enhance cable conduit space by reducing the number of existing cables which have been added to the building over the past 34 years.

Life Support Systems

The FY 2006-2007 engineering study recommended replacing the court's outdated fire alarm system to include the alarm panel and all remote sensor devices. This upgrade would meet the ADA requirements. The Court requests funds to upgrade two elevators for life safety with digital controls, and new door operation controls which comply with current Miami-Dade County Code and ADA requirements. In order to comply with F.S. 633.085(1), and bring all fire safety equipment, including elevators, up to State fire code, it is imperative that the Court receive funding to make the necessary repairs and upgrades.

Emergency Generator System

This fixed capital budget request includes the addition of a new 150KW standby emergency generator to replace a failed uninterruptible power supply and serve the life safety systems. These systems include designated luminaries for means of egress illumination, stairway illumination, and exit signage. All life safety items would be served from this emergency generating system, along with any other essential equipment, such as support for the Voice/Data network, telephone system, card access, and security systems. The generator would provide emergency power during the frequent power interruptions resulting from the lightning storms in South Florida. In addition, it would be utilized to provide limited power following outages from tropical storms and hurricanes, allowing the Court to operate on an emergency basis until full power is restored.

Impact Windows for Building Annex

AECOM, the architectural firm which prepared the drawings for impact windows for the main building and building annex,

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS AMOUNT CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

discovered that the existing window frames in the building annex do not have a tie beam. The building annex was added in 1989-90, whereas the main building was completed in 1976. As a result of the missing tie beam, the structural opening will not support the installment of impact resistant windows or shutters without major reconstruction of the window frame and supporting walls. Due to the discovery of this structural defect, the Court did not have sufficient funds for the building annex windows, and is therefore including a budget request in order to install the rest of the impact windows in the building annex.

Budget

The budget for Phase I, FY 2010-2011, of the project as set forth above is as follows:

Construction	\$2,497,741
DMS Fees	\$59,466
Architectural & Engineering Fees (Phase I)	\$249,774
Architectural & Engineering Fees (Phase II)	\$159,728
Contingency Fees	\$374,661
Art Allowance	\$143,620
PHASE I TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST:	\$3,484,990 (Non-Recurring)

Phase II

Once the mechanical and electrical components are in place, the Court will start Phase II. The Court is requesting \$1,970,649 for Phase II during FY 2011-2012 of the project to reconfigure the entrance to the main courthouse building for centralized security, renovation of two exterior bathrooms to meet ADA requirements; replacement of exterior glass for security purposes to prevent intrusion into the building; renovation of the downstairs area consisting of the Clerk's and Marshal's Office, and installation of security bollards. All design fees for Phase II reconfiguration will have been expended with Phase I funding.

The following areas will be addressed during Phase II:

Entrance Security Reconfiguration

The FY 2006-07 study recommended the architectural reconfiguration of a portion of the existing exterior atrium into an enclosed lobby space, including a security monitoring station. The reconfiguration included all public areas, the Clerk's and Marshal's Offices, courtroom, and staff lounge. The recommendation also included renovating two exterior bathrooms to satisfy ADA requirements, and replacing and installing additional exterior glass and bollards for security purposes to prevent intrusion into the building.

Clerk's Office Remodeling

The Clerk's Office has not been renovated since 1976 and has outgrown its workspace. While the Clerk's Office would gain

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2014-15	
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
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

additional space needed by remodeling the Clerk's Office, it will not meet current space needs. In addition, only two or three visitors can utilize the public area of the Clerk's Office at one time due to the cramped conditions in that room. The remodeling would modify the Clerk's public entry area into a secure, usable waiting area allowing additional room for the installation of desktop computers which the public may use in the future. This reconfiguration will also upgrade the public area to meet ADA requirements.

Marshal's Office

The Marshal's Office, designed and completed in 1976, has outgrown its current space. Rather than add onto the building, which would be more costly, the Court will remodel the court library. The Court would then be able to use part of the library for the Clerk's and Marshal's Offices. The cost would include corridor ceiling and lighting upgrades for the first floor, first floor painting, and the addition of signage to meet ADA requirements.

Lawyer's Lounge

The fire-rated doors leading into the Lawyer's Lounge must be replaced with fire-rated doors which must be ADA compliant.

Budget

The budget for Phase II, FY 2012-2013, of the project as set forth above is as follows:

Construction	\$1,597,281
DMS Fees	\$41,932
Contingency Fees	\$239,592
Art Allowance	\$91,844
PHASE II TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST:	\$1,970,649 (non-recurring)

Phase III

The Court is requesting \$941,277 for Phase III, FY 2012-2013, to architecturally remodel the remaining portion of the Library space into different usage and repave the existing visitor/employee's parking lots.

The following areas will be addressed during Phase III:

Court Library Remodeling

Over the last few years, dramatically reduced library subscriptions has freed up floor space for other needs. A portion of Library space will be utilized during the Phase II reconfiguration of the Marshal's and Clerk's Offices. The remaining space, which has yet to be determined, will be remodeled to provide work space for the Court. The remodeling will include mechanical, electrical, and architectural improvements, which will enhance the Court's operations.

Paving of the Visitor and Employee Parking Lots

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15						
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

Except for minor repairs and asphalt sealing, the 85,500 square foot visitor and employee parking lots have not been repaved since 1976. It is anticipated that during the course of Phases I and II, the heavy equipment construction traffic will severely deteriorate the already-worn surface area. Due to the age of the asphalt, the only recourse is to totally repave the area after both Phases I and II are completed.

Budget

The budget for Phase III, FY 2012-2013, of the project as set forth above is as follows:

Construction	\$704,898
DMS Fees	\$19,622
Architectural & Engineering Fees	\$70,490
Contingency Fees	\$105,735
Art Allowance	\$40,532
PHASE III TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST:	\$941,277 (non-recurring)

TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST: \$6,396,916 (non-recurring)

5TH DCA BLDG RENO-DMS MGD 080181

GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE 589,285 1000 1

=====

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 5TH DCA BLDG RENO-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

Fifth District Court of Appeal, Upgrades of Court Building, Front Reception/Lobby Area, Courtroom and Judicial Conference Room The Fifth District Court of Appeal requests \$589,285 in Fixed Capital Outlay funds to upgrade our historic building's twenty-eight year-old front reception/lobby area, courtroom and judicial conference room. Upgrades are to include improved security screening area to accommodate x-ray, magnetometer equipment and security personnel; improved lighting and sound systems in the courtroom and conference room; and enhanced accessibility for disabled persons from the main entrance to the courtroom.

Phase I
 Schematic Design \$4,600

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

Phase II
 Architecture and Engineering \$23,625

Phase III
 Construction (4,965 SQ. FT. @ \$80 / SQ. FT) \$397,200

Other Projected Costs
 Inflation 10% \$39,720
 Contingency 5% \$19,860
 Construction Manger At Risk \$44,700
 DMS Management Fee (15%) \$59,580

TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST: \$589,285 (non-recurring)

2ND DCA BLDG RENOVATIONS						080917
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	947,500	1,369,450			1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 2ND DCA BLDG RENOVATIONS IT COMPONENT? NO

Second District Court of Appeal, Lakeland Building Alteration and Renovation - The Second District Court of Appeal requests \$2,316,950 to address necessary alteration, expansion and site hardening of the existing court building in Lakeland, which, in its present state, suffers from limited space, inappropriate arrangements of space, and offers little in the way of security and access for individuals with disabilities. This project is necessary to modify an existing facility to accommodate changing use requirements, to appreciably extend the useful life of the facility, to upgrade an obsolete facility for more efficient use, and to restore capacity for judicial office space. This modification will alter a gross space of 14,680 square feet, most of which was placed into service in 1986.

The personnel assigned to the district's Lakeland headquarters include those of six judges, the clerk's office, central staff, and the marshal's offices. The present facility, which reflects three vintages of construction, suffers from an inefficient internal circulation pattern, inadequate electrical and data service, and insufficient square footage for the clerk of court's staff and file maintenance functions. Specifically:

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN	AG FCO PLAN		
FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15						
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM										22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL										22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT										22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY										9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

Deputy clerks are hampered by overcrowded conditions and work spaces that provide inadequate seating and work surfaces. Deputy clerks presently occupy workstations of approximately 54 square feet; to provide ergonomically appropriate functional work space, each workstation should be approximately 80 square feet.

The court's case file records have overwhelmed nearly all of the available spaces within the building. Approximately 2,032 square feet of otherwise usable office space, in addition to the law library, is presently committed to the storage of court records that cannot be maintained within the space available for the clerk of court. Since 1998, the court has leased offsite file storage space at an annual cost of \$5,436.

The court's storefront and lobby need to be expanded and reconfigured to accommodate a hardened entrance security checkpoint in order to properly screen visitors, monitor equipment, and control anyone that needs to be taken aside to be searched. As constructed, the court's single security officer has a very limited view of the public entrance and public parking areas. The addition of basic security equipment (X-Ray and metal detector) has impeded access into the building and the available space upon entry is very limited for all users. The space limitation impedes the ability of the security officer to maintain proper control over the entrance or to respond to a security incident. In addition, the elimination of the lawyer's waiting area will necessitate additional seating in the court's lobby. The proposed relocation of the marshal's offices will permit the marshal more direct access to the security station and will allow the court's administrative offices to be connected to both the private and public corridors. The lobby, public restrooms, clerk's public counter, and courtroom need to be altered to accommodate full ADA compliant access to the bench, the podium, and public seating areas.

Due to increasing caseloads, the Second District is eligible for one additional judge and related personnel. Eliminating the lawyer's lounge and law library and relocating the judge's conference room and the marshal's offices will significantly expand the space available to the clerk. The proposed renovation will free up space currently required and will maximize the court's ability to accommodate short-term growth.

The scope of the necessary expansion and alteration covers a section of the building that has been intact for almost 25 years. If the project contemplated is not funded, the court's case maintenance activities, administrative activities, and utilization of space will continue to be increasingly inefficient. More importantly, the marshal's ability to secure the safety of the public and employees will remain compromised.

FY 2010-11: Architect and Phase I Construction

The second district requests \$947,500 beginning in Fiscal Year 10-11:

Architect and engineering fees for schematic, design development, construction documents, bid/negotiation and Phase I construction	\$100,000
Demolition and construction for court	

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

conference room and marshal's offices \$750,000
 Construction contingency \$75,000
 DMS FEES \$22,500
 Phase I Budget Request: \$947,500

FY 2011-12: Architect and Phases II and III Construction

The second district requests \$1,369,450 beginning in Fiscal Year 11-12 to complete construction on Phases II, clerk's offices, and Phase III, lobby expansion.

Architect construction Phase II and Phase III fees \$23,000
 Demolition and construction for the clerk's offices and the lobby expansion \$1,194,500
 Construction contingency \$119,450
 DMS FEES \$32,500

Phase II and III Budget Request: \$1,369,450

TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST TOTAL: \$2,316,950 (non-recurring)

TOTAL: MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
TOTAL ISSUE.....	5,463,887	3,340,099	941,277			

SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
1ST DCA COURT BLDG-DMS MGD						080172

GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	3,501,161				1000 1
----------------------	--------	-----------	--	--	--	--------

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2010-2011 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: 1ST DCA COURT BLDG-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

First District Court of Appeal, Courthouse Expansion - With the Legislative funding in place for the new courthouse facility, construction has begun and is scheduled for completion by the Fall of 2010. In preparation and planning for the

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS AMOUNT CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						9999.99.99.99
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000

furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) in the new courthouse building an outline of the funding needs have been produced. \$3,501,161 is requested for furniture, fixtures, and equipment.

Note: The amount requested for FY 2010-2011 is \$2,246,673 less than the \$5,747,834 that was requested for this FF&E issue in FY 2009-2010. Through architectural adjustments and stronger negotiations with manufacturers and suppliers we were able to significantly lower our requested amount for FY 2010-2011.

Technology Systems	
Audio Visual	\$419,520
File Systems/Shelving	
LEKTRIEVERS	\$328,862
Library	\$30,963
IT/Shop	\$7,300
Storage Carts	\$41,300
Workroom Surface	\$5,200
Filing	\$11,400
Sub Total	\$425,025
Office Systems	
Clerk's	\$182,550
Suites	\$260,250
JA's	\$133,200
Meeting Room/Break	\$122,181
Courtrooms/Commons	\$688,275
Robe/Conference Room	\$302,854
Law Clerks	\$118,600
Marshal's	\$46,560
Sub Total	\$1,854,470
Exterior	
Walk and Park	\$27,898
Site Furnishings	\$51,017
Sub Total	\$78,915
Miscellaneous	
Installation	\$294,001
Moving	\$100,000

	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 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: DIST COURTS OF APPEAL						22100000
COURT OPER/APPELLATE COURT						22100600
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						99
OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						<u>9999.99.99.99</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000
Equipment (x-ray/shredder/etc.)			\$78,000			
Contingency			\$251,230			
Sub Total			\$723,231			
TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST			\$3,501,161 (non-recurring)			

TOTAL: OTHER FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						<u>9999.99.99.99</u>
BY FUND TYPE						
GENERAL REVENUE FUND.....	8,965,048	3,340,099	941,277			1000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	