

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	CODES
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT						22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT						22010100
STATE COURTS						15
STATE COURT SYSTEM						1501.00.00.00
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
FAC REPAIRS, RENOV/IMPROV						080037
GENERAL REVENUE FUND						1000 1
	-STATE	3,720,880				

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FAC REPAIRS, RENOV/IMPROV IT COMPONENT? NO

The Supreme Court is requesting \$3,720,880 in non-recurring funding to complete major repairs needed at the Supreme Court Building. The Supreme Court Building has been in continued usage since 1948 and is a historical landmark of our state. Since 2004, we have received fixed capital outlay appropriations that have greatly reduced our deferred maintenance backlog and greatly increased security of the facility, but we need to complete the backlog and protect the investment already made to the building. \$1,000,000 in FY 2012-13 was appropriated to begin this Major Maintenance Repair project.

Roof Replacement:

The original 1948 roof has reached the end of its useful and cost effective life. In 1988 it was repaired during the last expansion to the building. In 2004 more repairs were made to extend its life, but 63 years of Florida's harsh climate and numerous storms have taken a tremendous toll on the roof. The court is constantly repairing holes and positioning containers in-place to keep the rain from damaging the building finishes and causing indoor air quality problems. The original roof is 38,000 square feet and the 1988 expansion roof is 12,000 square feet. The original roof is composed of 31,500 square feet of copper panels; 2,000 square feet flat tile; 2,000 square feet buildup; 2,500 square feet membrane; and one dome. The construction cost for the roof replacement includes:

Replacement of all original roof components:	\$1,694,650
Replacement of lightning protection:	\$32,000

Building Sealant:

The original 1948 building exterior finishes have been deteriorating due to high humidity and age, and is causing the building's waterproofing coating to come off and collect water. The building finishes need to be removed down to the original concrete, resealed, and the waterproofing system reapplied. In FY 2005-2006 the court received approximately \$500,000 to waterproof the building. The project was under the Department of Management Services supervision. The appointed architect and contract manager had previously waterproofed the building in years past and recommended modifying this project to only replace expansion joint seals and wash and paint the building. Problems began to develop with the original substrates of the original waterproofing. This caused much of the new work to peel-off and created additional repairs for the project and its funding. Consultants were hired and the architect developed new repair recommendations to deal with the problem areas. Because the project's scope was already designed and the contract manager had awarded the project, there was no way to secure a change order to continue waterproofing replacement due to a lack of additional funds. Because waterproofing was not replaced for the entire facility at that time [due to new repairs during the project], over time, the building's waterproofing has continued to deteriorate causing it to fail and allow water to enter the building. The construction cost for the building sealant includes:

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT						22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT						22010100
STATE COURTS						15
STATE COURT SYSTEM						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

Waterproof exterior walls of building: \$800,000

ADA Upgrades:

The Supreme Court Building needs additional Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) upgrades to better serve the public and employees. ADA compliant access to the Justice Bench area of the courtroom can be met by construction of a ramp at the rear entrance of the courtroom. The main courtroom entrance would become ADA complaint with the installation of an automatic door opener. Also sought is installation/replacement of handrails to ADA standards at all emergency exits and rear parking lot areas.

Building ADA upgrades: \$75,000

Total construction cost:		\$2,601,650
DMS Fees:	3%	\$78,050
Architects Fees:	10%	\$260,165
Design Phas Fee:	1.2%	\$31,220
Construction Phase Fee:	8%	\$208,132
General Conditions/Overhead and Profit	8.8%	\$228,945
Permits:	2.02%	\$52,553
Contingency:	10%	\$260,165

Budget Request Total: \$3,720,880 (non-recurring)

SITE HARDENING 080052

GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE 1,143,349 1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: SITE HARDENING IT COMPONENT? NO

The Supreme Court is requesting \$1,143,349 in non-recurring funds to finish the perimeter security hardening of the Florida Supreme Court Building. In March, 2008, the Supreme Court voluntarily reverted \$1,400,000 in non-recurring 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 FY 2007-2008.

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	POS	AMOUNT	
STATE COURT SYSTEM						22000000
PGM: SUPREME COURT						22010000
COURT OPER/SUPREME COURT						22010100
STATE COURTS						15
STATE COURT SYSTEM						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

When the Florida Supreme Court Building was originally constructed in 1948, concepts such as domestic terrorism and weapons of mass destruction were mostly unknown. The Supreme Court facility may be exposed to a major attack. This funding will allow completion of the security assessment recommendations and move this facility closer to the standard of security similar to the Capitol Complex.

The Supreme Court has already designed and installed the infrastructure to support the bollards operation and integration into the court's security system under the initial site hardening project.

Construction costs include:

Installation of bollards in targeted locations: \$749,000

Total construction cost:		\$749,000
DMS Fees:	2.65%	\$19,849
Architects Fees:	10%	\$74,900
Design Phase Fees:	2%	\$14,980
Construction Phase Fees:	13%	\$97,370
General Conditions/Overhead and Profit:	10%	\$74,900
Permits:	5%	\$37,450
Contingency:	10%	\$74,900

Budget Request Total: \$1,143,349 (non-recurring)

TOTAL: MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
TOTAL ISSUE.....	4,864,229					
TOTAL: STATE COURT SYSTEM						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
BY FUND TYPE						
GENERAL REVENUE FUND.....	4,864,229					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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	
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						1501.00.00.00
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEM						080043
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	327,462				1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEM IT COMPONENT? NO

The Second District Court of Appeal requests \$327,462 to replace two air handlers. The Lakeland headquarters was originally built in 1961; this is now the west end of the building. The east end of the building (courtroom, conference room, lobby, and clerk's office) was added in 1986. Both air handlers were placed into service at that time. In 2004, the court replaced the building's chiller and the air conveyance system (i.e., supply, return and exhaust) on the west end of the building.

The building's air handlers were recently cleaned and are currently operational but their age indicates that they have exceeded their useful life expectancy. In addition, the air conveyance system on the east side of the building should be replaced.

Replace two air handlers and conveyance system on east side of building:		\$227,900
Asbestos and Lead Survey:		\$8,000
Architect/Mechanical Plans and Oversight:	19.74%	\$45,000
DMS Management Fee:	4.15%	\$11,562
Construction contingency:	12.46%	\$35,000

Budget Request Total: \$327,462 (non-recurring)

DCA-HVAC RENOVATION 080101

GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	122,624	795,579			1000 1
----------------------	--------	---------	---------	--	--	--------

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: DCA-HVAC RENOVATION IT COMPONENT? NO

(1) The Third District Court of Appeal requests \$80,661 to acquire and install twenty-one Variable Air Volume (VAV) boxes for the courthouse Annex Building's Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system located in Miami.

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	
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
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

The court's current pneumatic VAV boxes were installed in 1990 when the Annex Building was first constructed. As the aged VAV boxes malfunction or break, they cannot be repaired because replacement parts have often times been discontinued. Malfunctioning VAV boxes no longer control airflow; they put out maximum air flow. This not only causes the room to get too cold, but it also puts an undue burden on the HVAC system and wastes energy.

The FY 2006-2007 engineering study recommended that the existing VAV boxes be replaced with pressure independent boxes which will improve the efficiency, quality, reliability and control of the air distribution system. Installation of the new VAV boxes will include the retrofitting or replacement of all controlling systems contained within the space above the ceiling systems.

The replacement of the outdated VAV boxes would enable office users to independently control air temperatures, thereby increasing the overall efficiency of the Energy Management System. The new VAV boxes will be connected to the central system, like the existing VAV boxes. This will allow central monitoring and control of the entire courthouse HVAC components, making the entire system more reliable and efficient. The frequency drive in the air conditioning system regulates the speed of the fan motor. Currently the frequency drive unit is operating at 98% of the motor speed. It is estimated that when the digital VAV boxes are installed, the frequency drive will modulate the speed of the motor down to about 47%. Decreasing the speed of the motor will translate into energy savings.

Failure to fund this request will result in the possibility of an HVAC failure as the malfunctioning VAV boxes do not restrict the flow of air and overload the HVAC system. In addition, energy costs will continue to be unnecessarily elevated as the flow of air cannot be controlled.

Construction:		\$66,800
Architectural/Engineering Fees:	5.75%	\$3,841
Contingency Fees:	14.18%	\$10,020
Total FY 2013/14:		\$80,661

(2) The Fifth District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$41,963 in FY 2013/14 and \$675,579 in FY 2014/15 to update critical components of the Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system. Specifically, the court requests funds to conduct a power quality study of the HVAC electrical system, replace one chiller and air-handling units and install a new system-wide electronic HVAC control system at the court's facility in Daytona Beach.

The Fifth DCA facility was built in 1980. In 2000, the building was expanded. During that expansion, one air-handler and one air chiller were added to the HVAC system. The older portion of the building still utilizes the original chiller and three air-handler units. While the newer components located in the expanded portion of the facility were updated with direct electronic control mechanisms, the original HVAC components still rely on pneumatic air control terminals. The pneumatic controls are outdated and unreliable. The court has expended considerable amounts trying to repair and update the system.

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN									
FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18						
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										<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR										990M000

The unit fails to communicate properly with the main control system which causes the HVAC system to shut down improperly. This damages the chillers and compressors, creates uneven building temperatures that can produce mold and mildew growth, and results in difficult work conditions due to extreme temperature swings. The court is located in Volusia County where summer temperatures can reach into the upper nineties and winter temperatures in the twenties.

In addition to being unreliable, the outdated controls are inefficient and cause a significant increase in energy consumption. Installation of system-wide electronic air terminals that are digitally controlled and the automation of the control system functions will allow the HVAC to operate more efficiently and reduce energy consumption.

In order to proceed with the HVAC system renovation, the court must first conduct a power quality study to determine the best way to correct or mitigate the intermittent fluctuations to the power supply particularly to the existing HVAC system. Design fees are also necessary to address any electrical revisions required to facilitate the installation of the new HVAC control system. The estimated cost of the study and design is \$41,963. These funds are requested in FY 2013/14.

Once the electrical issues are addressed, the court may then proceed with the replacement of the circa 1980 air chiller, three air-handling units and various components. Following the installation of these components, system-wide automated controls will link all HVAC components to a centralized computer. The estimated replacement cost for the chiller, air-handling units and the system-wide control system is \$675,579. These funds are requested in FY 2014/15.

If this project is not funded, it will result in higher energy consumption and increased bills, damage to the chillers and compressors and decreased productivity. Additionally, temperature variations can produce mold and mildew that may be hazardous to court personnel and visitors.

Total Project: \$717,542

Total FY 2013/14: \$41,963

(3) The Fourth District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$120,000 in FY 2014/15 to update critical components of the Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system. Specifically, the court requests funds to replace an aging cooling tower and remove an obsolete chiller.

The existing cooling tower was installed in 1991. The cooling tower has an estimated life expectancy of less than 5 years which has been far exceeded. Since the installation of the tower, the court has undergone a facility expansion of 5,000 square feet of office space and the replacement of its chillers. The cooling tower was not replaced at that time and cannot meet the peak demands of the new system. It has also deteriorated with age. The shell of the Marley cooling tower is made from a fiberglass resin compound which is resistant to decay. Building codes for South Florida no longer permit this material in new construction. All new construction must be stainless steel or galvanized metal. Additionally, the existing cooling tower does not meet greater than 140 mph wind load requirements.

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN									
FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18						
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

Attributable to the deteriorating condition of the cooling tower is the small pad where the chiller, pumps, and old chiller are located. The Trane chiller unit was left in place for possible use as a redundancy unit for the new system. This is no longer necessary. The lack of charging to the Trane chiller has rendered it obsolete and costly to attempt to recharge. If the Trane chiller is removed, it will free up limited space and permit greater airflow to support the existing equipment and cooling tower thereby extending their useful lives. There is no marketable value to the Trane chiller except for scrap.

If this issue is not funded, the useful life of the HVAC system may be compromised and the potential for repeated and costly repairs may be likely.

Total FY 2014/2015: \$120,000

Budget Request Total FY 2013/14: \$122,624

FACILITIES REPAIR & MAINT										080956
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	19,239								1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FACILITIES REPAIR & MAINT IT COMPONENT? NO

The Fifth District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$19,239 to replace exterior sealants on the east elevation panels, windows and pre-cast joints reseal windows at the court's facility located in Daytona Beach.

The courthouse, built in 1980, is constructed of pre cast coquina panels with expansion joints consisting of a urethane sealant, and aluminum framed windows. This surface requires treatment with a clear waterproofing sealant every 5 years to eliminate water intrusion as the exterior panels are porous. Over the course of time, the urethane sealant used to seal expansion joints deteriorates and cracks allowing water intrusion. Voids in the expansion joints causes water damage to walls, carpets, ceiling tiles and can also breed molds and endanger interior air quality. The court facility is less than 100 feet from the Intracoastal Waterway and approximately one mile from the Atlantic Ocean making the facility vulnerable to gale and hurricane force wind driven rains.

The proposed project would include removal of pre-cast joint sealants, installing a perimeter cove bead of urethane sealant in expansion joints and East elevation window frames. A clear water proofing sealant would be applied to the exterior panels (East-side only). This project is needed to insure the protection of the building structure and contents

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
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						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

from water damage along with protecting inside air quality.

If this project is not funded, the structural and interior contents of the building will be compromised and the court personnel may be exposed to mold borne illness.

The estimated cost to replace exterior sealant on the east elevation panels, windows and pre-cast joints is \$ 19,239.

Total: \$19,239

Budget Request Total: \$19,239

PAVING, STATEWIDE						081600
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	30,450				1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: PAVING, STATEWIDE IT COMPONENT? NO

The Second District Court of Appeal requests \$30,450 to reconstruct its driveway so that the connection provides a sufficient width and turn radius for vehicles to safely enter the court's parking area.

The public entrance to the Lakeland courthouse is located on Memorial Boulevard, which is on Highway 92, a 4-lane divided highway with heavy car and truck traffic. The posted speed limit is 35 mph, yet it is often exceeded. The court's driveway is only 24 feet wide for 2-way traffic (i.e., "in" movement and "out" movement). Due to the limited turn radius and width of the driveway, vehicles turning in must come to a near stop on the highway before completing the turn. Employees and visitors frequently report that they fear being rear-ended before they can complete the turn. On May 25, 2012, there was a three vehicle accident with injuries involving someone entering the court's driveway.

The driveway width and outside radius need to be increased in order to relieve interference between the entering and exiting traffic, which adversely affects traffic flow and creates a safety hazard for vehicles that are attempting to enter the court's parking area. If this issue is not funded, employees, visitors and other motorists may be at risk of serious injury.

Construction: \$26,500
 Engineering Fee: 9.43% \$2,500
 DMS Management Fee: 5.47% \$1,450

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
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						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000

Budget Request Total: \$30,450

ROOF REPLACE/REPAIR-STWIDE						082528
GENERAL REVENUE FUND -STATE	75,000					1000 1

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: ROOF REPLACE/REPAIR-STWIDE IT COMPONENT? NO

The Fifth District Court of Appeal requests \$75,000 to replace 30 large skylights at the court's facility located in Daytona Beach. The original part of the court facility, built in 1980, included a number of large skylights that provide natural light in the public parts of the building (courtroom, lobby and library) as well as the hallways. The skylights are an integral part of the roof structure and in addition to providing light, prevent rain and wind intrusion.

In the 2004 hurricanes, one skylight was destroyed and subsequently replaced. The remaining skylights are original. Age has caused them to crack, cloud and leak. Many of the existing skylights have been repaired with roofing tape. In addition, the skylights do not meet current building code requirements and are very energy inefficient.

The court facility is less than 100 feet from the Intracoastal Waterway and approximately one mile from the Atlantic Ocean, making the facility susceptible to gale and hurricane force winds. If the skylights are not replaced, energy costs will remain high, and the risk of a catastrophic failure is great should one be destroyed causing significant interior damage. Such a failure would cause extensive damage to the interior of the building and its contents.

Total: \$75,000

Budget Request Total: \$75,000

TOTAL: MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR						990M000
TOTAL ISSUE.....	574,775	795,579				

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
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
SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
EMERGENCY GENERATOR SYSTEM						080032
GENERAL REVENUE FUND						1000 1
	-STATE	203,947				

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: EMERGENCY GENERATOR SYSTEM IT COMPONENT? NO
 The Third District Court of Appeal requests \$203,947 to purchase an emergency, natural-gas fueled, electrical generator system for the courthouse complex located in Miami.

This budget request includes the addition of a new 300 kilowatt (KW) standby emergency generator which will not only supply electricity during a power outage, but will also replace the court's failed and uninterruptible power supplies that serve the life safety systems. Those systems include designated luminaries for means of egress illumination, stairway illumination, and exit signage. As a temporary measure, the court currently has a limited number of lighting fixtures containing battery backup ballasts which provide emergency egress lighting for approximately 15 minutes. The requested emergency generating system will support all life safety items such as security/fire alarm systems, telephone system, voice/data network, servers and other essential equipment. The generator would also provide emergency power during the frequent power interruptions resulting from the lightning storms in South Florida. In addition, it would be utilized to provide power following outages from tropical storms and hurricanes, allowing the court to continue its operations.

Recently the local natural gas utility, Florida City Gas, extended their service to an area adjacent to the court, which has provided an opportunity to acquire a natural-gas fueled generating system at a lower cost as opposed to a diesel fueled generator with an in-ground fuel tank. The natural-gas fueled generating system should provide power indefinitely as long as the gas lines are operational. A previous funding request for this fixed capital outlay project had been estimated at \$505,050 as opposed to the current request of \$203,947.

Failure to fund this request would not only cause the court to interrupt its operations during a power outage but, due to inadequate life safety support, also jeopardizes the welfare of employees, visitors and vendors during an emergency evacuation of the courthouse.

Construction: \$168,900
 Building Escalation: 5.75% \$9,712
 Contingency Fees: 15% \$25,335

Budget Request Total: \$203,947

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
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
SPECIAL PURPOSE						9905000
FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY						080000
FACILITY STUDY						080062
GENERAL REVENUE FUND						1000 1
	-STATE	390,000				

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FACILITY STUDY IT COMPONENT? NO

(1) The Third District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$100,000 to contract with an architect to plan a design to update two other areas to comply with the revised 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design and make the public areas of the Miami courthouse accessible to all Floridians, including those with disabilities.

In 2007, Chief Justice R. Fred Lewis directed the courts to conduct a Court Accessibility Survey to determine the accessibility of court facilities within each district. The survey identified six areas in the Third DCA that are not in compliance. These are: public parking, main entrance, lobby, public bathrooms, courtroom and the public area of Clerk of Court's Office. The courthouse areas requiring remediation to address ADA compliance issues are described below.

This request addresses ADA compliance and court security issues with the main entrance and the public area of the Clerk's office. Below the issues are described.

Main Entrance

The main entrance to the courthouse has not been renovated since its original design in 1976. The courthouse was designed with a novel approach that embraced both the tropical environment and the concept of open government. The front of the court building is an open-air, free-flowing structure. While this novel open-air design won several design awards in its day, these same features and the accessibility of the main entrance poses significant security issues that cannot be resolved without reconstruction. Furthermore, the area in which the security checkpoint is currently located does not meet the 2010 ADA requirements and these issues cannot be addressed without relocation of the security area.

The public entrance to the courthouse consists of one set of double doors that lack the required automatic door openers. Each leaf has a width of 30 in. due to their outdated push-bar mechanisms. In addition, the doors require more than 8.5 pounds of force to open and they lack hardware to be operable with a closed fist. Every time a person in a wheelchair visits the court, both doors need to be held open by court security personnel. Once visitors pass the entrance doors, they need to go through the security checkpoint. Because there is only 35 in. of space between the door and the security barriers, court personnel must hold the doors open until the visitor clears the checkpoint.

Additionally, the security barriers that consist of a magnetometer and scanning equipment only leave a space 26 in. wide adjacent to the security screening devices, which is far less than the required 36 in. wide accessible route. The security equipment must be turned off to allow passage of wheelchairs through the 29.5 in. wide magnetometer, while court security personnel provide assistance.

COL A03		COL A06		COL A07		COL A08		COL A09		CODES
AGY REQUEST	AG FCO PLAN									
FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18						
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										<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN										9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE										990S000

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. Based on the inadequacy of the existing security area, Spillis' recommendations included the re-design of the entrance to the building. This study needs to be expanded to include the existing accessibility issues.

Public Area of Clerk of Court Office

The Clerk's Office has not been renovated since 1976 and has outgrown its workspace. Only two visitors can utilize the public area of the Clerk's Office at one time due to the cramped conditions in that area. This area is only accessible through a set of hinged double doors. The doors require more than 8.5 pounds of force to open and they lack hardware that is operable with a closed fist.

The service counter, which is provided for the distribution of court information or court business transactions, is at a height of 42.5 in. and has no area that meets the 36 in. counter height requirement for accessibility. There is security glass that extends from the top of the counter to the ceiling, making minor repairs to the counter not feasible. In addition, the counsel table work surface, utilized to review the materials provided by the Clerk's Office, does not meet the ADA width and height requirements. Both the service counter and work surface need to be replaced.

In order to address the issues of the main entrance and the public area of the Clerk's Office in a systematic way that will address accessibility compliance and also conform to Court Security Standards, the court is requesting funding to contract the services of an architectural firm to devise a uniform design and a systematic plan.

Failure to fund this request will keep the physical structure of the court in its current, outdated condition and in non-compliance with the standards set forth in the ADA. Furthermore, this will negatively impact persons with disabilities by imposing unnecessary and undue hardships for use of court facilities. These persons will continue to suffer diminished access because court facilities will not be readily accessible to or usable by persons with disabilities.

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

(2) The Fourth District Court of Appeal (DCA) requests \$50,000 in funding for a comprehensive architectural and engineering study to address the current deficiencies in both Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance and court security. The results of the study will be used to develop a Fixed Capital Outlay issue to correct current deficiencies.

The Fourth DCA has occupied its current facility since 1970, and was constructed prior to the 1991 ADA Standards for Accessible Design and recent 2010 ADA Amendments. Amendments to the ADA and a review of the original entry design and construction indicate numerous deficiencies. Those deficiencies include the entryway, exterior ramps, security screening space, public restrooms, attorney tables located in the courtroom, the clerk's office, and wheelchair access to the court bench from the judge's robing room. The legislature had provided the court with funds to address an ADA issue several years ago. However, the majority of those funds were offered up in an exercise to address a revenue shortfall in the State Courts Revenue Trust Fund.

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	CODES
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
SPECIAL PURPOSE						9905000

The U.S. Marshals Service completed a security audit on April 17, 2012 and determined deficiencies in design. The Fourth DCA is currently awaiting the official results from the audit. The court has insufficient resources to provide adequate security to judges, staff, court documents, and the user public.

Failure to take corrective action may result in significant monetary liability to the state. Additionally, if this issue is not funded, the safety of court personnel and the public may be in jeopardy as well as the integrity of court documents.

Total: \$50,000 (non-recurring)

(3) The District Courts of Appeal request \$240,000 in non-recurring funding to conduct a comprehensive statewide study of the district court of appeal maintained facilities. This request is being filed as a placeholder and will be updated during the FY 2013/14 Supplemental Legislative Budget Request (LBR) process. The purpose of this comprehensive study is to provide an adequate long term maintenance plan by evaluating and identifying any building deficiencies, major building system/component replacements, and propose remediation and/or renovation. Additionally, the proposed study will focus on ADA compliance and security integrity.

The District Courts of Appeal are responsible for maintaining four facilities located in Lakeland, Miami, West Palm Beach and Daytona Beach. The facilities range in age from 32-52 years old. These aging structures require remediation and in some cases renovations to keep the courts operational and in compliance with building codes and laws. The requested study requires professional architectural and engineering expertise currently not available to the courts. The court will contract with a qualified vendor and follow all procurement guidelines and applicable laws. This request would provide \$240,000 to study each of the four district court facilities. These figures are preliminary estimates and may be revised during the FY 2013/14 Supplemental LBR process based on information received from potential vendors.

If this issue is not funded, serious building deficiencies or compliance issues may continue and possibly worsen.

Total: \$240,000 (non-recurring)

Budget Request Total: \$390,000 (non-recurring)

FACILITY STUDY-DMS MGD						080171
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	100,000				1000 1
=====						

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	
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						1501.00.00.00
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: FACILITY STUDY-DMS MGD IT COMPONENT? NO

The Second District Court of Appeal (Second DCA) requests \$100,000 Fixed Capital Outlay to conduct a Department of Management Services (DMS) managed architectural/engineering study to assist decision-makers in planning for the current and future needs of the court. The purpose of the study would be to evaluate: the long-term needs of the court; the capacity for improving the Lakeland courthouse; and whether the lease or acquisition/construction of a consolidated facility would be in the best interest of the state, the court, and its users.

The space available in the Second DCA's Lakeland headquarters is grossly inadequate for the court's operations and, as a result, the court has leased office space in Tampa for the past 32 years, pursuant to the legislature's authorization of a branch office. (Section 35.05, Florida Statutes) Eight of the court's 14 judges are currently located in leased office space in Tampa, at an annual cost of \$25,000 for rent, \$21,000 for courier costs, plus the associated administrative and operating costs for information technology and security. In addition, the Florida Supreme Court has certified the need for a 15th judge on this court.

The term on the lease with Stetson University College of Law, Tampa Law Center was recently extended for a period of two years, resulting in a term ending date of June 30, 2015. The court may elect to extend the lease for an additional period of up to 8 years, upon written notice to Stetson no later than September 30, 2014.

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; indoor air quality concerns related to the poor operational condition of the air distribution system; and a highly inefficient and ineffective use of interior space for court operations and security functions.

For the reasons explained above, most importantly, the inadequacies of the Lakeland courthouse and the forthcoming lease negotiations with Stetson's Tampa Law Center, the Second DCA requires funding to evaluate the space requirements of the court and make recommendations to the decision makers who will consider how best to maximize the taxpayers' dollars in meeting those needs.

Budget Request Total: \$100,000

HURRICANE STORM SHUTTERS						080174
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	-STATE	88,845				1000 1
=====						

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	
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						1501.00.00.00
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN						9900000
SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000

AGENCY NARRATIVE:

2013-2014 BUDGET YEAR NARRATIVE: HURRICANE STORM SHUTTERS IT COMPONENT? NO

The Third District Court of Appeal requests \$88,845 to acquire and install hurricane storm shutters for the Annex Building of the courthouse complex. The courthouse building is located in a high risk hurricane zone. The annex is a two-story structure that houses six of the court's ten judicial suites and the court's main conference room, all of which are located on the second floor. The first floor space is an open covered parking area. The annex, which was constructed in 1990, has no impact resistant windows or protective storm window coverings.

The window envelopes have been weakened significantly due to age and wind driven rain that occurred during the three major hurricanes that impacted South Florida in the last seven years. During one of those storms, one judicial suite suffered significant water damage from water leaks, which required air quality testing and mold remediation actions to correct the problem. During the execution of a prior funded project, AECOM, the architectural firm which prepared the drawings for impact resistant windows, discovered that the existing window frames in all of the annex's judicial suites have no tie beams or supporting window structures required by the Miami-Dade County building code for impact windows. As a consequence, the structural openings will not support impact resistant windows without major reconstruction of the window frames and supporting walls. Storm shutters are therefore, the most cost-effective measure. They will not only protect the building contents, but will also prevent further window deterioration.

All windows on the second floor annex are fixed and cannot be opened. The building height and number of fixed windows that do not open necessitate the installation of roll-down, electric, motorized aluminum shutters. Prior to the arrival of a storm, the electric motorized shutters will be closed to completely cover and protect the windows. The shutters will meet the requirements of the Miami-Dade County building code specifications.

Failure to fund this budget request may jeopardize the integrity of the Annex Building during a hurricane. A category two, three or four storm impacting South Florida will breach the second floor windows and potentially destroy its interior, furnishings, and technology equipment.

Construction: \$73,578
 Building Escalation: 5.74% \$4,230
 Contingency Fees: 15% \$11,037

Budget Request Total: \$88,845

TOTAL: SPECIAL PURPOSE						990S000
TOTAL ISSUE.....		782,792				

=====

	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 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	
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>
TOTAL: STATE COURT SYSTEM						<u>1501.00.00.00</u>
BY FUND TYPE						
GENERAL REVENUE FUND.....	1,357,567	795,579				1000