Senate Budget and Fiscal Review—John Laird, Chair

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 Agenda

Senator Laura Richardson, Chair
Senator María Elena Durazo
Senator Kelly Seyarto

Judgeship and Facility Needs in California Courts

Wednesday, October 21, 2026, 1 p.m.
Compton Courthouse, Department 3, Room 400
200 West Compton Boulevard, Compton, California 90220

Consultant: Nora Brackbill

I. Judicial Need and Allocation of New Judgeships

- Drew Soderborg, Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Placer County and Chair of the Data Analytics Advisory Committee
- Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer, Judicial Council of California
- Honorable Jacqueline C. Jackson, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Riverside County
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Director Budget Services, Judicial Council of California Court

II. Judicial Salaries

- Drew Soderborg, Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Honorable Judge Laura Walton, Los Angeles Superior Court-Norwalk Courthouse, Vice-President of the California Judges Association
- Honorable Judge Tania Vallejo, Orange County Superior Court, Secretary/Treasurer of the California Judges Association
- Honorable Justice Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District and Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Director Budget Services, Judicial Council of California Court

III. Court Construction

- Drew Soderborg, Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Honorable Justice Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District and Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee
- Erika Sperbeck, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council of California
- Honorable Judge Sergio C. Tapia II, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County
- Tamer Ahmed, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

IV. Facility Modifications and Maintenance

- Drew Soderborg, Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Honorable Justice Brad R. Hill, Administrative Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District and Chair of the Court Facilities Advisory Committee
- Erika Sperbeck, Chief Administrative Officer, Judicial Council of California
- David Slayton, Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County and Chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee
- Tamer Ahmed, Director, Judicial Council Facilities Services
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

V. Public Comment

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a Senate Committee hearing, or in connection with other Senate services, may request assistance at the Senate Rules Committee, 1020 N Street, Suite 255 or by calling (916) 651-1505. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

BACKGROUND

Judgeships

Judicial Need. Since 2001, California has assessed the need for judicial officers in the superior courts using a weighted caseload methodology. The Judicial Council uses a time study to estimate caseweights, a measure of how long different types of cases take judicial officers to process. These caseweights were updated in 2026 using data from 18 participating courts[1]. These caseweights, three-year average filings, and an estimate of the judicial workday are used to calculate the judicial need for each court. This is updated and reported to the Legislature every two years, pursuant to Section 69614 of the Government Code.

The Judicial Council approved the 2026 Judicial Needs Assessment (JNA) on October 16, 2026, using a 431-minute judicial workday[2]. The 2026 JNA estimates a need of 159 judges statewide. The absolute and percentage need by county, and the allocation order for the first 93 judgeships, are shown in the tables below from the 2026 JNA. The allocation order methodology considers both the absolute number of judges needed and the percentage need. The methodology also gives a greater weight to each court's first judgeship, to distribute positions more widely across the state.

Table 1. Number of New Judgeships Needed by Court Based on 431-Minute Workday Value (Sorted by Column D)

	A	B	C	D
Court	**Authorized and Funded Judicial Positions**	**2026 Assessed Judicial Need**	**Number of Judgeships Needed* (B−A)**	**Additional Judicial Need (C / A)**
Riverside	89.0	134.3	45	50.6%
Stanislaus	26.0	36.5	10	38.5%
Yuba	5.3	7.4	2	37.5%
Kern	47.0	62.7	15	31.9%
San Bernardino	103.0	134.6	31	30.1%
Madera	10.5	13.7	3	28.6%
Placer	15.5	20.2	4	25.8%
San Joaquin	35.5	44.8	9	25.4%
Tehama	4.3	5.7	1	23.1%
Merced	13.0	16.0	3	23.1%
Lake	4.7	6.7	1	21.3%
Tulare	25.0	30.8	5	20.0%
Sutter	6.3	7.3	1	15.9%
Shasta	13.0	16.0	2	15.4%
Fresno	53.0	61.8	8	15.1%
Sacramento	79.0	90.4	11	13.9%
Humboldt	8.0	9.4	1	12.5%
Orange	145.0	152.8	7	4.8%
Total			**159**	

[1] https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=16048648&GUID=8F839EE6-9875-4487-B6CD-8AF51DB2EBBA
[2] https://newsroom.courts.ca.gov/news/judicial-council-approves-updated-parameters-assess-judicial-workload-and-need; https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=16061918&GUID=D4C3176A-7768-4DA2-A194-D3ABB0811CA7

Table 2. Allocation Order of New Judgeships Based on 2026 Needs Assessment (431-Minute Workday Value)

Court	Allocation Order	Court	Allocation Order	Court	Allocation Order
Riverside	1	Tehama	32	Placer	63
San Bernardino	2	Fresno	33	Sacramento	64
Riverside	3	Riverside	34	Riverside	65
Kern	4	Tulare	35	San Bernardino	66
Stanislaus	5	Kern	36	Kern	67
San Bernardino	6	Placer	37	Fresno	68
Riverside	7	San Bernardino	38	Riverside	69
San Joaquin	8	Humboldt	39	San Joaquin	70
Sacramento	9	Riverside	40	Stanislaus	71
Fresno	10	San Joaquin	41	San Bernardino	72
Riverside	11	Stanislaus	42	Riverside	73
Placer	12	Riverside	43	Sacramento	74
Tulare	13	San Bernardino	44	Riverside	75
Kern	14	Sacramento	45	San Bernardino	76
San Bernardino	15	Kern	46	Kern	77
Stanislaus	16	Madera	47	Tulare	78
Madera	17	Riverside	48	Orange	79
Riverside	18	Sutter	49	Riverside	80
Yuba	19	Fresno	50	San Bernardino	81
Lake	20	San Bernardino	51	Madera	82
Merced	21	Merced	52	Fresno	83
Shasta	22	Riverside	53	Riverside	84
San Bernardino	23	Shasta	54	Stanislaus	85
San Joaquin	24	San Joaquin	55	San Joaquin	86
Riverside	25	Orange	56	Kern	87
Kern	26	Tulare	57	Placer	88
Orange	27	Kern	58	Riverside	89
Sacramento	28	Stanislaus	59	San Bernardino	90
Riverside	29	San Bernardino	60	Sacramento	91
San Bernardino	30	Riverside	61	Riverside	92
Stanislaus	31	Yuba	62	Merced	93

Source: *Report to the Legislature: 2026 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment*[3]

[3] https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=16061918&GUID=D4C3176A-7768-4DA2-A194-D3ABB0811CA7

New judgeships are authorized by statute and funded through the budget. 50 new judgeships were authorized by SB 56 (Dunn), Chapter 390, Statutes of 2005, and funded that year. 50 additional new judgeships were authorized by AB 159 (Jones), Chapter 722, Statutes of 2007, and funded across the 2018, 2019, and 2022 budgets. SB 75 (Roth), Chapter 482, Statutes of 2023 authorized 26 new judgeships. The 2026 Budget Act includes $100 million one-time and $44 million ongoing to support those authorized judgeships, and associated facility projects.

Judicial Salaries. Judicial salary increases are determined as outlined in Section 68203 of the Government Code, which states that judges should receive "the average percentage salary increase for the current fiscal year for California state employees". Increases from the last ten years are in the table below from the Administration. For 2026, the standard statutory salary for a superior court judge is $244,727.

Fiscal Year	Judges Salary Calculation	Judges Salary Increase
2015-16	2.40%	2.40%
2016-17	1.52%	1.52%
2017-18	4.23%	4.23%
2018-19	3.69%	3.69%
2019-20	3.46%	3.46%
2020-21	-7.94%	0.00%
2021-22	4.88%	4.88%
2022-23	2.71%	2.71%
2023-24	3.16%	3.16%
2024-25	2.62%	2.62%
2025-26	-0.18%	0.00%

The statute accounts for the impacts of furlough or personal leave programs, but doesn't address other benefits, which are determined by the Judicial Branch and by local courts. State-level benefits include a retirement program; health, dental, and vision benefits; and various other benefits and programs. Counties may provide additional supplemental benefits.

Court Facilities

The Judicial Council currently manages approximately 22 million square feet of facility space, with most of that in the more than 430 buildings and 2,100 courtrooms occupied by the trial courts. Responsibility for trial court facilities was shifted from the counties to the state by SB 1732 (Escutia), Chapter 1082, Statutes of 2002, also known as the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002.

The Judicial Council relies on multiple sources of funding for facility construction, maintenance, and repairs, depending on the type and scale of the project. This includes some ongoing funding for maintenance and smaller projects, and some one-time, dedicated appropriations for larger projects, as listed below.

- Preventative maintenance, building operations, and small repairs are funded through an ongoing allocation of about $198 million ($104 million from the Court Facilities Trust Fund, including $98 million from county contributions, and the remainder from General Fund). This funding has been increased in recent years to account for increases in the square footage managed by the Judicial Council.

- More significant repairs and facility modifications are funded through an annual $80 million allocation ($65 million State Court Facilities Construction Fund and $15.4 million General Fund). Occasionally, one-time General Fund allocations are provided for specific large projects, or to address backlogs of deferred maintenance.

- Capital outlay projects, which involve new construction or major renovations with significant footprint increases or changes of use, typically receive dedicated General Fund and/or bond allocations.

- Debt service for some completed projects and administrative costs, including staff, project management, operations, compliance, legal, and other functions, are funded out of the State Court Facilities Construction Fund.

The following sections include more information about the identification and prioritization of projects within these funding streams.

Capital Outlay Projects. In a November 2019 assessment of its facilities, the Judicial Branch identified a need for a total of 80 trial court capital outlay projects—56 new buildings and 24 renovations—totaling $13.2 billion[4]. These include 18 immediate need projects ($2.3 billion), 29 critical need projects ($7.9 billion), 15 high need projects ($1.3 billion), 9 medium need projects ($1.6 billion), and 9 low need projects ($100 million). However, the Legislative Analyst's Office notes that due to cost increases and other adjustments since 2019, it is likely that at least $21 billion is needed to complete the projects on the list[5].

The projects were identified through Court Facility Plans, which were created by each county in collaboration with the Judicial Council. These projects were consolidated into a statewide list,

[4] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/legislative-reports/lr-2019-jc-reassessment-trial-court-capital-outlay-projects-gov70371_9.pdf
[5] https://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/5113

categorized by need, and ranked. Los Angeles completed an additional long-range planning study in 2024, which evaluated the overall needs and goals of that court system and resulted in some modifications to their projects[6].

The criteria used to rank the projects is outlined in Section 70371.9 of the Government Code. The Judicial Council separates these into needs-based and cost-based criteria, listed below. The needs-based criteria were used to identify the category of each project, and the cost-based criteria were used to rank projects within categories. The November 2019 assessment includes the scores and resulting rankings for each of the trial court capital outlay projects.

The needs-based criteria include:

(1) Projects that improve security, reduce overcrowding, correct physical hazards, and improve access to court services, as outlined in the *Update to Trial Court Capital-Outlay Plan and Prioritization Methodology* adopted on October 24, 2008[7].

(2) The level of seismic risk, environmental hazards, and other health and safety hazards.

(3) The impact on court users, including, but not limited to, the level of public access to court services, such as accessibility to the courthouse.

The cost-based criteria include:

(4) The cost avoidance or savings that would be achieved due to the project through operational or organizational efficiencies created for the court or the state.

(5) Ways to minimize increased ongoing costs, including, but not limited to, trial court security and operating and maintenance costs.

(6) A comparison of the cost to repair or renovate the existing facility versus the cost of replacement.

(7) The projected cost of each proposed project, per court user.

(8) The total costs spent on the project as of the date of the assessment.

The Judicial Branch's proposed Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2027-28[8] includes a status update on the projects identified in the 2019 assessment. As of the 2026 Budget Act, all of the projects in the immediate need category are fully or partially funded. In addition, the 2026 Budget Act includes language to fund the first four projects in the critical category in the 2027-28 fiscal year, which is reflected in the Judicial Council's proposed plan. The proposed plan includes $1.8 billion over five years for 17 projects. The estimated total cost of these projects is $7.2 billion.

[6] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/los-angeles-planning-study.pdf
[7] https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-12/methodology-080124.pdf
[8] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/5year2728.pdf

In total, the 2026 Budget Act includes $1.7 billion Public Buildings Construction Fund, $62.1 million General Fund, and reappropriations of $118 million General Fund for specified courthouse construction projects, and language to fund additional courthouses upon appropriation in 2027-28. Funding by project and phase is listed at the end of this section.

Five-Year Plan for Trial Court Capital-Outlay Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

	County	Project Name	Courtrooms	BY 1: FY 2027–28	Phase	BY 2: FY 2028–29	Phase	BY 3: FY 2029–30	Phase	BY 4: FY 2030–31	Phase	BY 5: FY 2031–32	Phase
BY 1 Cont.	Fresno	New Fresno Courthouse	36	$1,041,614	B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BY 1 Starts	Contra Costa	New Richmond Courthouse	6	$ 18,842	AS	-	-	-	-	$ 2,061	D	$ 163,664	B
	San Francisco	New San Francisco Hall of Justice	24	$ 70,460	AS	-	-	-	-	$ 17,851	D	-	-
	Orange	New Orange County Collaborative Courthouse	4	$ 15,587	AS	-	-	-	-	$ 1,803	D	-	-
	Santa Barbara	New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	8	$ 11,438	D	$ 236,413	B	-	-	-	-	-	-
BY 2 Starts	Los Angeles	New Downtown Los Angeles Courthouse (Mosk Replacement)	100	-	-	$ 277,437	AS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	El Dorado	New Placerville Courthouse	6	-	-	$ 8,271	AS	-	-	$ 2,401	D	-	-
	Fresno	Fresno Juvenile Delinquency Courthouse Renovation	2	-	-	$ 1,381	PW	$ 10,396	C	-	-	-	-
BY 3 Starts	Inyo	New Inyo County Courthouse	2	-	-	-	-	$ 3,528	AS	-	-	$ 1,802	D
	San Bernardino	New Victorville Courthouse	31	-	-	-	-	$ 12,844	AS	-	-	-	-
	Mariposa	New Mariposa Courthouse	2	-	-	-	-	$ 3,007	AS	-	-	$ 1,431	D
BY 4 Starts	Santa Cruz	New Santa Cruz Courthouse	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 10,833	AS	-	-
	San Diego	New San Diego Juvenile Courthouse	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 16,531	AS	-	-
	Riverside	New Riverside Juvenile Courthouse	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 18,573	AS	-	-
BY 5 Starts	Tulare	New Tulare North County Courthouse	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 16,605	AS
	Los Angeles	New West Covina Courthouse	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 24,371	AS
	Los Angeles	New Eastlake Courthouse	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 50,184	AS
	-	***Totals***	***280***	***$1,157,941***	-	***$ 523,502***	-	***$ 29,775***	-	***$ 70,053***	-	***$ 258,057***	-

Table Legend:
BY = Budget Year
S = Study
A = Acquisition
P = Preliminary Plans
W = Working Drawings
C = Construction
D = Performance Criteria
B = Design-Build

Source: *Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for Fiscal Year 2027–28*[9]

[9] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/5year2728.pdf

Facility Modification Projects and Maintenance. For facility modifications, courts submit projects to the Judicial Council, who assigns them a category: (1) immediate or critical, (2) necessary but not yet critical, (3) needed, (4) does not meet current code or standards, (5) beyond rated life but serviceable, (6) hazardous materials, managed but not abated[10]. Within each category, the projects are ranked by five criteria: (1) justification and effect on the court, (2) safety, security, and risk management, (3) feasibility, (4) cost/benefit, and (5) design status (how ready the project is). The Judicial Council may also consider whether there is a planned capital outlay project that would affect the need for the facility modification.

Facility modification projects are typically funded from the Judicial Council's annual allocations, which are used to target the highest priority projects. The Judicial Council noted that they are typically able to fund category (1) and many category (2) projects. Larger projects may be funded through dedicated General Fund allocations, depending on the budget condition and the needs of the branch. Projects funded in the 2026 Budget Act are listed at the end of this section. Projects that are not funded are placed on the deferred maintenance list.

Deferred maintenance broadly refers to facility needs that are not met by existing funding streams. In August 2026, the Judicial Branch identified 22,356 deferred maintenance projects totaling around $6.1 billion[11]. Of this estimated cost, the state would be responsible for around $4.4 billion. The remaining amount would generally be the responsibility of counties that share space in court facilities. The Judicial Council submits this project list to the Department of Finance each year. The projects are funded through Judicial Council's ongoing appropriations when feasible, or through dedicated General Fund allocations for deferred maintenance when the budget condition allows. For example, $188 million General Fund was provided in the 2021 Budget Act for deferred maintenance, of which $49.5 million was reverted in 2023 as a budget solution. The 2026 Budget Act included $150 million General Fund for courthouse deferred maintenance. The distribution by trial court is in the table below.

[10] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/jc-facility-modification-policy.pdf
[11] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/deferred-maintenance-report-fy-2026-27.pdf ; other reports available here: https://courts.ca.gov/programs-initiatives/facilities/program-overview-and-resources; https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/deferred-maintenance-report-fy-2027-28.pdf

2026 Budget Act Deferred Maintenance Funding Allocation

Courts	Project Count	Cost
Alameda	5	$6,686,214
Amador	2	$500,000
Calaveras	1	$400,000
Contra Costa	13	$11,589,118
Del Norte	1	$2,440,000
El Dorado	3	$3,000,000
Fresno	2	$2,600,000
Humboldt	1	$5,393,000
Kern	3	$13,649,818
Kings	1	$50,000
Los Angeles	21	$50,986,902
Merced	2	$252,000
Modoc	1	$300,000
Monterey	2	$500,000
Napa	2	$4,585,380
Orange	6	$8,590,430
Riverside	4	$16,603,000
San Bernardino	2	$2,869,220
San Diego	4	$2,454,125
San Francisco	2	$2,846,000
San Joaquin	1	$200,000
San Luis Obispo	1	$5,000
San Mateo	1	$1,994,490
Santa Barbara	1	$71,000
Santa Clara	5	$3,240,486
Santa Cruz	1	$297,000
Tulare	2	$56,000
Ventura	2	$340,817
Superior Court Grand Total	80	$142,500,000
Courts of Appeal	13	$7,500,000
Total	**93**	**$150,000,000**

Source: Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee Meeting Notice and Agenda for August 24, 2026[12]

State Court Facilities Construction Fund (SCFCF). The SCFCF was created to support construction and facility-related expenses through fine and fee revenues, and has total authorized expenditures of roughly $330 million annually. However, declining revenues have led to the shift of construction projects to General Fund, and the need for General Fund backfill in the tens of millions annually to support other activities funded out of the SCFCF, including facility modifications, maintenance, and debt service payments. The 2026 Budget Act includes $31 million General Fund in 2026-27 and $46 million General Fund in 2027-28 and ongoing to backfill the SCFCF.

[12] https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcfmac-2026082410-open-session-materials_1.pdf

Capital Outlay and Facility Modification Projects Funded in the 2026 Budget Act. The 2026 Budget Act includes the following resources and changes related to courthouse facilities and maintenance.

- **Courthouse Construction**. The budget includes $1.7 billion Public Buildings Construction Fund, $62.1 million General Fund, and reappropriations of $118 million General Fund for specified courthouse construction projects, and language to fund additional courthouses upon appropriation in 2027-28. The projects are pursuant to the Reassessment of Trial Court Capital Outlay Projects adopted by the Judicial Council on November 14, 2019, as updated in the Judicial Branch Five-Year Infrastructure Plan for 2026-27, which was adopted by the Judicial Council on July 18, 2025. This includes the following allocations by project and phase:

    - **Fresno County: New Fresno Courthouse.** The budget includes a reappropriation of $11.2 million General Fund for the acquisition phase and $18.1 million from the General Fund for the Performance Criteria phase of the Fresno County New Fresno Courthouse, which has been delayed due to an extended site selection process.

    - **Kern County: New East County Courthouse**. The budget includes $4.8 million General Fund for the acquisition and study phases, $1.6 million for the performance criteria phase, and $64.0 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

    - **Lake County: Clearlake Courthouse Renovation**. The budget includes $1.1 million General Fund for the preliminary plans phase, $1.6 million for the working drawings phase, and $21.8 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the construction phase.

    - **Los Angeles County: New Santa Clarita Courthouse.** The budget includes a reappropriation of $34.2 million General Fund for the acquisition phase of the New Santa Clarita Courthouse project due to an extended site selection process. The budget alco includes $12.5 million General Fund for the performance criteria phase and $627.0 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

    - **Nevada County: New Nevada City Courthouse.** The budget includes a reappropriation of $4.6 million General Fund for the Acquisition phase of the New Nevada City Courthouse project, which has been delayed due to the execution of the acquisition purchase agreement. The budget also includes $1.5 million General Fund for the Performance Criteria phase and $195.6 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

    - **Placer County: Tahoe Courthouse Renovation**. The budget includes $5.4 million General Fund for the acquisition and study phases, $1.1 million for the performance criteria phase, and $17.5 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

- **Plumas County: New Quincy Courthouse.** The budget includes a reappropriation of $1.4 million General Fund for the acquisition phase of the New Quincy Courthouse project, which has been delayed due to an extended site selection process. The budget also includes $2.3 million General Fund for the Performance Criteria phase and $69.6 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

- **San Joaquin County: New Tracy Courthouse.** The budget includes $3.5 million General Fund for the performance criteria phase and $65.9 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

- **San Luis Obispo County: New San Luis Obispo Courthouse.** The budget includes a reappropriation of $22.9 million General Fund for the acquisition phase and $7.9 million for the performance criteria phase of the New San Luis Obispo Courthouse project, which is delayed due to ongoing negotiations with the county. The budget also includes $320.3 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the Design-Build phase of the New San Luis Obispo Courthouse in San Luis Obispo County.

- **Solano County: New Solano Hall of Justice (Fairfield).** The budget includes a reappropriation of $12.1 million General Fund for the Acquisition Phase and $5.2 million General Fund for the Performance Criteria phase of the Solano County: New Solano Hall of Justice (Fairfield), which has been delayed due to an extended site selection process. The budget also includes $316.8 million Public Buildings Construction Fund for the design-build phase.

- **Orange Central Justice Center Facility Modification**. The budget includes $36 million General Fund and $3.6 million State Court Facilities Construction Fund (SCFCF) reimbursement authority in 2026-27, and $35 million one-time General Fund and $3.5 million SCFCF reimbursement authority in 2027-28 to complete various fire, life, and safety upgrades at the Central Justice Center in Orange County.

- **Kings, San Joaquin, and Sutter Counties: One New Shelled Courtroom for One New Judgeship in Each County.** The budget includes $20.6 million General Fund for new courtrooms in San Joaquin, Kings, and Sutter counties for their previously approved new judgeships.

- **Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse Relocation**. The budget includes two proposals to facilitate the relocation of courtrooms from the Spring Street Courthouse in Los Angeles:

  - $6.3 million General Fund to build out six courtrooms and associated space at the Chatsworth Courthouse.

  - $4.6 million General Fund for facility modifications to relocate 17 courtrooms to other existing courthouses within the county.