

"Placerville, a Unique Historical Past Forging into a Golden Future"



City Manager's Report
March 24, 2015 City Council Meeting
Prepared By: M. Cleve Morris
Item#: 12.2

Subject: Consider sending a letter to the California Judicial Council regarding the City's position on the relocation of the Downtown Courthouse.

Background: For many years the County has been anticipating the need to construct a new courthouse for El Dorado County. In fact, as early as when the new jail facility was built, discussion was taking place regarding a new courthouse. In 2002, the State adopted the Trial Courts Facilities Act, SB1732, which shifted the governance of California's courthouses from the counties to the State and laid the groundwork for the final step in trial court unification: the transfer of court facilities to the State. The State took over operation of all courts and began the transfer process that was required by SB1732. (See attached Fact Sheet, Exhibit A)

The goal of SB1732 was to improve the Security and safety of all facilities by:

- Bringing fire and life safety systems up to current codes;
- Improving accessibility for persons with disabilities;
- Remediating areas with hazardous materials such as asbestos;
- Upgrading hazardous and inadequate electrical and lighting systems;
- Replacing heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning systems; and
- Facilitating seismic retrofit projects.

In 2008, SB1407 was passed, which provided funding to address the physical condition of courts. In October of 2008, the Judicial Council identified 41 "Immediate and Critical Need" courthouse projects. The Placerville Courthouse also fell into that category of one of the Immediate and Critical Need courthouses. In addition to this process, the Judicial Council continued the process of transferring court facilities to the State. However, in October of 2009, the State elected not to take possession of the Placerville Courthouse due to several issues. In a letter dated October 29, 2009 (See attached Exhibit B), the Court stated:

"Considering several issues including the age of this facility, existing environmental conditions at the site and AOC's long-term plan for building a new courthouse in this community, our office has exercised an option not to transfer this facility to the AOC at present."

In other words, ownership of the Historic Placerville Courthouse remains with El Dorado County.

Discussion: As a result of the discussion and request of the Council at the last meeting, staff proposed the following questions to the Judicial Council. The answers from the Judicial Council, shown in blue, are provided by Laura Sainz, Manager, Environmental Compliance and Sustainability.

1. The EIR identifies Alternative 2 as the environmentally superior alternative. Does that change the direction of the Judicial Council regarding the preferred alternative?

No. EIRs *require* alternative analysis and many times a smaller project is one of the alternatives that are reviewed. However, as noted on page 4-7 of the draft EIR, the Reduced Size Alternative does not meet the overall project objectives, therefore it is not a feasible option. The project objectives include:

- Develop a new courthouse facility to improve safety and security by increasing secure movement within the building and to provide sufficient capacity to the public, litigants, jurors, and families who are served by California's courts;
- Improve access to justice by providing consolidated facilities to meet the Superior Court's demands, locate court services proximate to each other, and provide improved accessibility to the public including complying with the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) requirements;
- Locate a new courthouse within proximity to existing El Dorado County government functions;
- Create a modern, secure courthouse for centralized proceedings for El Dorado County, and for the provision of basic services currently not adequately provided including appropriately-sized jury assembly and deliberation rooms, adequately-sized in-custody holding, attorney interview/witness waiting rooms, and security screening for all Superior Court users;
- Locate a courthouse facility adjacent to the El Dorado County jail to allow for the secure and efficient transfer of in-custody detainees between the facilities;
- Provide for additional and efficient parking for courthouse users; and
- Create operational efficiencies and on-going savings through the consolidation of Superior Court services.

Since Alternative 2 does not meet any of the project objectives, we cannot pursue it. The existing Main Street courthouse is so physically constrained, there is no way we could meet our objectives at the site.

2. If Alternative 2 were selected, has any discussion taken place regarding what court functions would stay in the existing courthouse and what would move to the new courthouse? If so, what are they?

Since Alternative 2 is not feasible, and again, does not meet the project objectives, there has been no discussion related to this option.

3. If Alternative 2 were selected, would improvements be made to the existing courthouse? If so, do we know what those improvements would be and what would they cost?

Since Alternative 2 is not feasible, and again, does not meet the project objectives, there has been no discussion related to this option.

4. Has a report been done outlining the structural and other deficiencies of the existing courthouse and the potential cost to repair those deficiencies? What are those deficiencies and what would they cost to repair?

Again, the existing Main Street courthouse is so physically constrained there was no way we could consolidate functions at this site. Therefore, we have not estimated any costs related to the building.

5. A statement was made by opponents to the move of the courthouse that Alternative 2 is a less expensive option. Is that true? If it is true, does it include any improvements to the existing courthouse?

Since Alternative 2 is not feasible, and again, does not meet the project objectives, there has been no discussion related to this issue.

6. Is reopening the Draft EIR an option?

Not at this time. We evaluated and discussed the closure of the courthouse functions at the Main Street building in the draft EIR. We also received and responded to comments related to the closure of the building in the final EIR. Our CEQA/EIR evaluation, discussion and response to comments will not change.

7. Last question: Is keeping the existing courthouse open really an option?

Not likely, since again – it does not meet our project objectives.

Based on this information, it appears highly unlikely that the EIR would be opened up for additional comments. The final EIR states:

“The changes described below update, refine and amplify the design information and analyses presented in the Draft EIR. No new significant impacts are identified, and no information is provided that would reflect a substantial increase in severity of a significant impact that would not be mitigated by measures agreed to by the project applicant. In addition, no new or considerably different project alternatives or mitigation measures have been identified. Finally, there are no changes or set of changes that would reflect fundamental inadequacies in the Draft EIR. Recirculation of any part of the EIR therefore is not required.”

In addition, it is quite clear that Alternative 2 is not an option being considered by the State due to the fact that it does not meet the project objectives. These questions have been asked in the past with the same answers, but staff wanted to receive them in writing.

The decision to move the courts is not one that was made by the City or the County. The decision is that of the Judicial Council, based on legislation that gave responsibility for the Courts to the State. There is also no requirement that a courthouse be located in El Dorado County. In a report written by former Supervisor Jack Sweeney (See attached Exhibit C), he states that one of the considerations of the State was to consolidate the court functions of El Dorado County with that of Sacramento County and look at potential facilities in Rancho Cordova.

The Placerville Courthouse is approximately 18,560 sq. ft. The courts currently use approximately 11,745 sq. ft. at Building C. Together, the courts currently use 30,305 sq. ft. in two locations in Placerville. Based on their analysis, the Courts have identified the needs of the new courthouse at 88,000 sq. ft., close to five times the size of the current courthouse and almost three times the size of the Main Street courthouse and Building C. This alone shows the great need for appropriate space for the courts.

Following is a timeline for the Court Process:

- A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 23, 2012. The 30-day public review comment period for the NOP ended on May 22, 2012. The NOP was distributed in particular to governmental agencies, organizations, and persons interested in the proposed project. The NOP was circulated to the public, interested parties, and local, state, and federal agencies. Its purpose was to inform interested parties that the proposed project could have significant effects on the environment and to solicit their comments as to the scope of the EIR. An abbreviated NOP, which included information regarding the public scoping meeting, was also published in the local paper.
- A public scoping meeting for the EIR was held on May 15, 2012.
- A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were filed with the State Clearinghouse on October 16, 2014. An official 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR was established by the State Clearinghouse, ending on December 1, 2014. A Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR was published in the Mountain Democrat on October 15, 2014, and sent to appropriate public agencies, and property owners in the vicinity of the property area. The Draft EIR was also published on the Judicial Council's website.
- Copies of the Draft EIR were also available for public review at the following locations:

El Dorado County Library
345 Fairlane Court
Placerville, CA 95667

City of Placerville
Planning Division - public counter
3101 Center Street
Placerville, CA 95667

- A public meeting to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held on November 6, 2014. Comments received during this meeting are summarized in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR.
- A Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Report was released on February 25, 2015. A 10-day comment period closed on March 6, 2015.

(See attached distribution and sign-in lists, Exhibit D)

Options:

Three options are presented for Council consideration:

1. Authorize staff to forward a letter (see attached Exhibit E), signed by Mayor Borelli, to the Judicial Council, requesting that the comment period for the Draft EIR be reopened to allow additional comments.
2. Continue with the process as is currently occurring, which is for City staff to continue to participate in meetings with County staff to facilitate the relocation of court operations.
3. Authorize City staff to forward a letter (see attached Exhibit F) to the Judicial Council supporting the efforts to relocate the courthouse within Placerville City limits and requesting that the State assist in whatever way possible to mitigate anticipated economic impacts to the downtown area and facilitate the repurposing of the Historic Placerville Courthouse.

Cost: No cost is anticipated at this time.

Budget Impact: None.

Recommendation: Consider sending a letter to the California Judicial Council regarding the City's position on the relocation of the Downtown Courthouse.



M. Cleve Morris, City Manager

Attachments:

Exhibit A: Court Fact Sheet

Exhibit B: October 29, 2009 Letter from Judicial Council

Exhibit C: Report from Former County Supervisor Jack Sweeney

Exhibit D: EIR Process Distribution and Sign-In Lists

Exhibit E: Draft Letter to Judicial Council requesting re-opening the Draft EIR

Exhibit F: Draft Letter to Judicial Council requesting assistance in repurposing the Historic Main Street Court House

Exhibit A

Fact Sheet



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA
94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

FACT SHEET

August 2009

Transfer of Court Facilities

With the transfer of more than 500 of California's 532 court facilities from local to state jurisdiction, the Judicial Council has made noteworthy progress in the creation of a single, comprehensive court facilities infrastructure. This monumental structural reform will enable increased efficiency in court operations, enhance court safety, and help ensure equal access to justice for all Californians.

The Administrative Office of the Courts expects to complete the remaining transfers by the end of 2009, a milestone that will mark an important transition, leading to greater fiscal and administrative accountability for the judicial branch as well as visible benefits for all court users.

The State's Role

In 2001, the State of California Task Force on Court Facilities recommended that the state assume full maintenance and operational responsibility for all court facilities in the state. These recommendations resulted in the passage of the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002, which placed the state's responsibility for court facilities with the Judicial Council and its staff agency, the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

After the transfer of each trial court facility, the Judicial Council assumes full policymaking responsibility for the building, with ongoing input from county and community representatives. Staff members at transferred facilities remain employees of the courts, which have been independent employers since passage in 2000 of the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act.

Office of Court Construction and Management

In fulfillment of its new responsibility, the AOC in August 2003 established the Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM) to lead the implementation of the Trial Court Facilities Act. OCCM has implemented facility transfers in partnership with county administrative staff and collaborated with county and court officials to establish long-term facilities master plans for the trial courts. It also plans

capital outlay and funding to support the design and construction of new and renovated courthouses and manages real estate and facilities for the superior courts, Courts of Appeal, and other judicial branch organizations.

Benefits to Public

The transfers have several important benefits for Californians.

Access to justice for all Californians

Fair and equal administration of justice depends on the availability of sufficient, safe, and accessible facilities so everyone can have their day in court. OCCM has begun to address the shortage of space, antiquated facilities, and inadequate infrastructure that threaten the ability of the justice system to accommodate the needs of residents and businesses.

Increased safety and security at California courthouses

The transfers and resultant leveraging of resources throughout the state will enable the AOC to readily address life, health, and safety issues while correcting security and operational deficiencies—principally by:

- Bringing fire and life safety systems up to current codes;
- Improving accessibility for persons with disabilities;
- Remediating areas with hazardous materials such as asbestos;
- Upgrading hazardous and inadequate electrical and lighting systems;
- Replacing heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning systems; and
- Facilitating seismic retrofit projects.

Resource sharing and efficiency

The transfers and the subsequent unified, statewide administration of court buildings enable the Judicial Council to leverage shared resources and knowledge across all 58 California counties. This produces greater efficiencies and savings through large-scale purchasing power and enhanced delivery of programs and services.

Reduced burden on counties

The transfers reduce the burden on county governments, who no longer have to provide and maintain facilities for state court operations.

Promotion of innovative programs

The savings generated by trial court unification, state funding, and unified facilities administration will help provide the courts with the resources needed to develop and implement innovative programs that increase Californians' access to justice.

An Urgent Need

There is an urgent need for construction and renovation in California's court buildings.

- Twenty-five percent of courtrooms have no space for a jury box.
- Forty-one percent of court facilities have no way to bring in-custody defendants to courtrooms without using public hallways where the defendants pass by witnesses, potential jurors, victims, and other court users.
- Sixty-eight percent of court buildings do not have up-to-date fire and life safety systems (including sprinklers, proper exits, and emergency lighting).
- Seventy-eight percent do not have adequate access for persons with disabilities.

Funding for Improvements

Addressing the state's aging, deficient court buildings and providing for population growth, so that all Californians can have their day in court, are critical needs. Substantial long-term funding is required to renovate, replace, and create new court facilities. The passage of SB 1407 in 2008, landmark legislation that established a revenue stream from court fees and fines that will fund up to \$5 billion in courthouse construction, was the major first step in funding California's urgently needed courthouse improvements. The Trial Court Capital Outlay Plan includes another 112 projects for which funding has not been secured. While it implements the 41 projects funded by SB 1407, the judicial branch will continue to explore other means to fund the state's ongoing need for courthouse infrastructure improvements.

Symbols of Democracy

The system of justice in the United States is a living symbol of the success of democratic ideals, and the buildings that enable the public to fully engage this system play a central role in the judicial branch. Well-designed and well-maintained courthouses help create a safe and secure environment for witnesses, victims, litigants, jurors, court staff, and judges; minimize the impact of family disputes on children; keep official records safe; and protect confidentiality.

Courthouses are places where every Californian can exercise their right to be heard and have their day in court. Safe, secure, and accessible facilities are critical to

protecting these constitutional rights. In the words of Chief Justice Ronald M. George, “Our judicial system does not need, want, or expect palaces. But it does deserve facilities that are secure, well maintained, and adequate to serve the public’s needs.”

Legislative Background

Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850)

Assembly Bill 233 made funding of court operations a state responsibility and provided the courts with their first statewide funding system.

Proposition 220

Passed by California voters in 1998, Proposition 220 authorized the voluntary unification of each county’s superior and municipal courts into a single trial court system.

Trial Court Facilities Act (Sen. Bill 1732; Stats. 2002, ch. 1082)

Senate Bill 1732 shifted the governance of California’s courthouses from the counties to the state, laying the groundwork for the final step in trial court unification: the transfer of court facilities.

Senate Bill 10

SB 10, enacted in 2006, revised the Trial Court Facilities Act to allow the transfer of buildings with a seismic level V rating to the state so long as liability for all earthquake-related damage remains with the counties to the same extent as if the court facilities had not transferred to the state.

Assembly Bill 1491

AB 1491 extends through December 31, 2009, the period during which facility transfer agreements can be executed, allows for the transfer of multiple buildings through a single agreement, and creates a tiered payment structure for facility transfers executed after certain dates.

Contact:

AOC Office of Court Construction and Management (OCCM), 415-865-4900,
occm@jud.ca.gov

Additional resources:

OCCM Web site, www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/occm

Exhibit B

Judicial Council Letter of October 29, 2009

C. A. O.
EL DORADO COUNTY

2009 NOV -2 PM 1:41



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION AND MANAGEMENT

2255 North Ontario Street, Suite 200 • Burbank, California 91504-3120
Telephone 818-558-3060 • Fax 818-558-3114 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. OBORES
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD O. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

LEE WILLOUGHBY
Director, Office of Court
Construction and Management

October 29, 2009

Mr. Robert Lauritzen
El Dorado County Environmental Health Department
Placerville Office
2850 Fairlane Court, Bldg -C
Placerville, Ca 95667

Dear Mr. Lauritzen:

SUBJECT: Limited Phase II investigation at the Main Street Courthouse, Placerville, California.

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is in receipt of your letter dated September 30, 2009, in which your office has requested a work plan for the geophysical survey by October 30, 2009, at the above referenced facility. As you may recall the AOC conducted an environmental due diligence Phase I and follow-up limited Phase II for this facility with an eye to initiate the facility transfer as part of the state-wide Court Facility Transfer Program under the SB 1732 mandate.

Considering several issues including the age of this facility, existing environmental conditions at the site and AOC's long-term plan for building a new courthouse in this community, our office has exercised an option not to transfer this facility to the AOC at present. In other words the ownership of this property still remains with the El Dorado County.

We have informed the El Dorado County staff regarding your requested actions and we suggest that in the future you may wish to communicate with them directly. If you have need for any additional information relating to this facility, please feel free to call me at (818) 558 3117.

Sincerely,
Pradip Desai, REA II
Environmental Analyst

cc: Mr. Steve Sundman, AOC
Ms. Kelly Webb, Principal Administrative Analyst, El Dorado County Chief Administrative Office

PD:bb

Exhibit C

Report by James R. Sweeney

The Courts and The County

By James R. "Jack" Sweeney

September 2, 2014

(Please see March 17, 2015 Addendum below)

This story is prompted by the current "negotiations" between the County of El Dorado (County) and the State of California Administration of the Courts(AOC). Currently there is an effort to replace the current court facilities, primarily those located on Main Street in Placerville and in Building C with a new facility that would hopefully be within the City Limits of the City of Placerville. Preferably, the "New Courthouse" would be on a site that is near to and a part of the County Administrative Facilities. These negotiations have been ongoing for about four years.

I have always believed that before you can move forward you must learn something of the past and that is the reason for this tale. I believe I am qualified to prepare such a story as I have been closely acquainted with the governance of this County all of my life. In 1940, during my second year on this earth and in this county, my father was appointed as the County Recorder; he served as such through 1980.

My life's work has been as a Land Surveyor, this brought me to do lots of research as to historical titles and locations. This work also brought me into contact with all levels of the county government; from the clerical staff up and through the Board of Supervisors. I was so involved that I served as a County Supervisor from 1985 through 1992 and from August 2003 through 2012. I was one of the original negotiators for the New Courthouse Site.

To understand fully the current negotiations one needs to visit the relationship between the Courts and the County over the past transitional years. Here is a mini overview of that historical relationship. Negotiations must be based on prior relationships; not created in a void of background information.

Let us begin the historic review with a story that is based on a reading of the minute books of the Board of Supervisors. In or around 1940 some animus existed between the Superior Court Judge and the Supervisors. The Judge determined he needed to use the Board Meeting room for a courtroom and made his request to the Board. They refused to vacate their meeting room! The Judge went back to his courtroom and dictated an order to the Board to provide him with their meeting room for court purposes. The Board was advised to follow that order and did so. Lesson learned; from that time forward the relationship between the Courts and the County improved.

Over the years the Courts and the County each grew to need more space. The County realized that the Courts were in fact part of the County Services and did well in providing the Courts with space. When the County moved from the Main Street facility, it was refurbished for the Courts.

The County built a new facility at South Lake Tahoe (I believe in the late 1970's) that houses the Courts and other county offices and the county jail. This facility has been redone a couple of times.

About 1991 the County purchased another building at South Lake Tahoe and during one of the renovations of the South Lake Tahoe Courthouse the Courts temporarily made use of portions of that building. Unfortunately, when they returned to the main building they did not return that space for the County use

In or during 1997 the County remodeled the lower level of Building C to accommodate the Courts, provided them with office and counter space on the main floor and allowed for a part time use of the Planning Commission meeting room.

And then it happened, the animus returned thanks to the taking from the County of all space occupied by what had become State Courts better known as the Administration of the Courts or AOC. This was through an Act of the Legislature that took, by legislative fiat, such spaces.

The AOC deemed all of the space, whether occupied or on loan or used partially, was to be transferred to the AOC. So the County, having been cooperative and concerned that its courts be properly housed, was forced to give title to the State AOC. And now, if the County wants those properties back, the County must purchase them or trade for them.

And, then, Maybe a new courthouse!!!!!!

With a great amount of cooperation between the County, the City of Placerville, and the local Judges, the effort began to convince the State (the AOC) that this County was deserving of funding for a new Courthouse. After many hearings and agonizing meetings we made the short list for funding. This kicked off the many years of "negotiations" wherein the AOC simply always said the same thing; that is, "the new site must have access and utilities in place".

The County offered a site, next to the County Jail, that had an access road and all utilities in place. After some study and discussion, the AOC suggested that another adjacent site would better suit their desires. While the second site was easier to build on, it did not have road and utilities to the site. The County negotiated with the owner and obtained an option to purchase the site.

In an effort to make up for the lack of utilities to the second site, the County put in an additional \$1,500,000. The County and the City agreed to make certain improvements to the adjacent interchange to facilitate the Courts increased traffic. The interchange improvements would cost the City and County a total of \$15 to \$18 million. Please see the letter dated August 28, 2012 from the Board of Supervisors to Justice Brad Hill, Chair, Facilities Working Group for more detail.

So, the County will be obtaining the site that was chosen by the AOC staff and contributing nearly \$20,000,000 to provide the State Courts with a new Courthouse on which they will spend \$80,000,000! The County will get back some of its space that was taken by legislative fiat! How now can the State want more blood money from the locals?

Al Fin!

The Courts and The County

By James R. "Jack" Sweeney

March 17, 2015

(Addendum to September 2, 2014 paper)

Independent of the overall discussion of the Courts, there has been an ongoing discussion about keeping the Main Street facility as a Courthouse. Very simply, the State Court system as managed by the Administration of the Courts (AOC) has continuously held that the costs of rehabilitation of the Main Street facility exceeded any useful benefits. Further, part of the effort they were making in building a new courthouse was to place all of the West Slope courts in one facility.

The transfer documentation was approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 18, 2008, Legistar item 08-1441 agenda item #53. The direction for this documentation is from California Government Code 70301 et seq.

While the Courts occupy the total main Street facility, they have only accepted the "Transfer of Responsibility" and not the Transfer of Title due to the "deficiencies" of the facility.

I was one of two County Supervisors that did the negotiations with the Courts for the site. Our first choice and strongest was to keep the Courts within the City Limits of Placerville! The AOC came up with other sites and the principle alternative was at Ponderosa Road. That site was unacceptable due to the traffic demands of the project. Another alternative was to combine some Sacramento County courts and site it in Rancho Cordova.

It is my opinion that we did well to get the new Courthouse sited near the existing jail and within the City Limits of Placerville. Other alternatives would have been a disservice to our community.

Exhibit D

EIR Process Distribution and Sign-In Lists

Mailing List for El Dorado Courthouse CEQA Availability of Draft EIR

#	Name	Title	Address	City	State	Zip
1	Assembllymember Beth Gaines	State Capitol	State Capitol, Room 2117	Sacramento	CA	94249-0010
3	Assembllymember Beth Gaines	District Office	8799 Auburn-Folsom Road, Suite #A	Granite Bay	CA	95746
4	Senator Ted Gaines	State Capitol	State Capitol, Room 2000	Sacramento	CA	95814
5	Senator Ted Gaines	District Office	2140 Professional Drive, Suite #140	Roseville	CA	95661
10	Honorable Suzanne N Kingsbury	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
11	Honorable James R Wagoner	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
12	Tania G. Ugrin-Capobianco - Court Exec. Officer	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
13	Supervisor Ron Mikulaco	Supervisor District 1 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
14	Supervisor Shhiva Frentzen	Supervisor District 2 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
15	Supervisor Brian Veerkamp	Supervisor District 3 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
16	Supervisor Ron Briggs	Supervisor District 4 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
17	Supervisor Norma Santiago	Supervisor District 5 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
18	Terri Daly- Chief Administrative Officer	El Dorado County	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
19	Vern Pierson - District Attorney	El Dorado County	515 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
20	Robyn Truitt Drivon - County Counsel	El Dorado County	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
21	Brian J. Richard - Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County	3974 Durock Road, Suite 205	Shingle Springs	CA	95682
22	Teri M. Monterosso - Chief Public Defender	El Dorado County	630 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
23	John D' Agostini - Sheriff	El Dorado County	300 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
24	Mayor Carl Hagen	Office of the Mayor	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
25	Vice Mayor Patti Borelli	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
26	Councilmember Carol Patton	Placerville City Council	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
27	Councilmember Linda Watkins	Placerville City Council	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
28	Councilmember Wendy Thomas	Placerville City Council	3102 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
29	M. Cleve Morris - City Manager	City Manager's Office	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
30	City Attorney - John Driscoll	City Attorney's Office	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
31	Planning Division	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
32	City Clerk Susan Zito	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
33	County Recorder William Schultz	County of El Dorado	360 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
34	Chief of Police Scott Helle	City of Placerville	730 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
35	Compliance and Enforcement Division	Environmental Management Department	2850 Fairlane, Bldg. C	Placerville	CA	95667
36	El Dorado Air Quality Management District	AQMD	330 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
37	El Dorado County Library	City of Placerville	345 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
38	Jennifer M Gates - Field Services Director	California Preservation Foundation	5 Third Street, Suite 424	San Francisco	CA	94103

Mailing List for El Dorado Courthouse CEQA NOP and Scoping Meeting

#	Name	Title	Address	City	State	Zip
1	Assemblymember Alyson Huber	State Capitol	P.O. Box 942849 State Capitol, Room 2117	Sacramento	CA	94249-0007
2	Assemblymember Alyson Huber	State Capitol		Sacramento	CA	94249-0010
3	Assemblymember Alyson Huber	District Office	221 West Oak Street, Suite A	Lodi	CA	95240
4	Senator Ted Gaines	State Capitol	State Capitol, Room 2008	Sacramento	CA	95814
5	Senator Ted Gaines	District Office	2140 Professional Drive, Suite #140	Roseville	CA	95661
6	Senator Barbara Boxer	US Senate Office	112 Hart Senate Office Building	Washington	DC	20510
7	Senator Barbara Boxer	District Office	501 I Street, Suite 7-600	Sacramento	CA	95814
8	Senator Diane Feinstein	District Office	One Post St., Ste. 2450	San Francisco	CA	94104
9	Representative Tom McClintock	US Representative, 4th District	8700 Auburn-Folsom Road Suite 100	Granite Bay	CA	95746
10	Honorable Suzanne N Kingsbury	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
11	Honorable James R Wagoner	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
12	Tania G. Ugrin-Capobianco - Court Exec. Officer	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
13	Supervisor John Knight	Supervisor District 1 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
14	Supervisor Ray Nutting	Supervisor District 2 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
15	Supervisor James Sweeney	Supervisor District 3 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
16	Supervisor Ron Briggs	Supervisor District 4 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
17	Supervisor Norma Santiago	Supervisor District 5 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
18	Terri Daly - Chief Administrative Officer	El Dorado County	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
19	Vern Pierson - District Attorney	El Dorado County	515 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
20	Louie B Green - County Counsel	El Dorado County	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
21	Gregory S Sly - Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County	3974 Durock Road, Suite 205	Shingle Springs	CA	95682
22	Rick Meyer - Chief Public Defender	El Dorado County	630 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
23	John D Agostini - Sheriff	El Dorado County	300 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
24	Mayor Mark Acuna	Office of the Mayor	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
25	Vice Mayor Wendy Mattson	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
26	Councilmember Patricia Borelli	Placerville City Council	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
27	Councilmember Carl Hagen	Placerville City Council	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
28	Councilmember David Machado	Placerville City Council	3102 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
29	M. Cleve Morris - City Manager	City Manager's Office	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
30	Brian Briggs - Department of Planning	City of Placerville	City Hall 2nd Fir 3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
31	Chief George Nielsen - Chief of Police	City of Placerville	730 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
32	Compliance and Enforcement Division	Environmental Management Department	2850 Fairlane, Bldg. C	Placerville	CA	95667
33	El Dorado Air Quality Management District	AQMD	330 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
34	El Dorado County Library	City of Placerville	345 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
35	Susan Zito - Certified Municipal's Clerk	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
36	Jennifer M Gates - Field Services Director	California Preservation Foundation	5 Third Street, Suite 424	San Francisco	CA	94103

Mailing List for New Placerville Courthouse Final EIR Availability

First Name	Job Title	Address	City	State	Postal Code
Assemblymember Beth Gaines	State Capitol	State Capitol, Room 2117	Sacramento	CA	94249-0010
Assemblymember Beth Gaines	District Office	8799 Auburn-Folsom Road, Suite #A	Granite Bay	CA	95746
Senator Ted Gaines	State Capitol	State Capitol, Room 2008	Sacramento	CA	95814
Senator Ted Gaines	District Office	2140 Professional Drive, Suite #140	Roseville	CA	95661
Honorable Suzanne N Kingsbury	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
Honorable James R Wagoner	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
Tania G. Ugrin-Capobianco - Court Exec. Officer	Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado	2850 Fairlane Court, Building C	Placerville	CA	95667
Supervisor Ron Mikulaco	Supervisor District 1 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Supervisor Shiva Frentzen	Supervisor District 2 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Supervisor Brian Veerkamp	Supervisor District 3 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Supervisor Ron Briggs	Supervisor District 4 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Supervisor Norma Santiago	Supervisor District 5 - Board of Supervisors	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Terri Daly - Chief Administrative Officer	El Dorado County	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Vern Pierson - District Attorney	El Dorado County	515 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Robyn Truitt Drivon - County Counsel	El Dorado County	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Brian J. Richart - Chief Probation Officer	El Dorado County	3974 Durock Road, Suite 205	Shingle Springs	CA	95682
Teri M. Monterosso - Chief Public Defender	El Dorado County	630 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
John D' Agostini - Sheriff	El Dorado County	300 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Mayor Carl Hagen	Office of the Mayor	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Vice Mayor Patti Borelli	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Councilmember Carol Patton	Placerville City Council	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Councilmember Tisha Williams	Placerville City Council	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Councilmember Wendy Thomas	Placerville City Council	3102 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
M. Cleve Morris - City Manager	City Manager's Office	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
City Attorney - John Driscoll	City Attorney's Office	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Planning Division	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
City Clerk Susan Zito	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
County Recorder William Schultz	County of El Dorado	360 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Chief of Police Scott Helle	City of Placerville	730 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Compliance and Enforcement Division	Environmental Management Department	2850 Fairlane, Bldg. C	Placerville	CA	95667
El Dorado Air Quality Management District	AQMD	330 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
El Dorado County Library	City of Placerville	345 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
Jennifer M Gates - Field Services Director	California Preservation Foundation	5 Third Street, Suite 424	San Francisco	CA	94103
John Quidachay	Save Our County	3344 Dusty Gold Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Sue Taylor	Save Our County	PO Box 961	Camino	CA	95709
Kirk Callan Smith	Save Our County	3347 Coon Hollow Road	Placerville	CA	95667
John V. Briggs	Save Our County	1020 Wallace Road	Placerville	CA	95667
Heidi Mayerhofer	Save Our County	376 Main Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Lisa M. Johnson	Save Our County	3440 Excalibur Road	Placerville	CA	95667
ESA to send PRINTED COPIES OF Final EIR TO:					
El Dorado County Library	City of Placerville	345 Fairlane	Placerville	CA	95667
Planning Division - public counter	City of Placerville	3101 Center Street	Placerville	CA	95667
Kelly Webb	Office of the Chief Administrator	330 Fair Lane	Placerville	CA	95667
Laura Sainz	Judicial Council	2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, 4th Floor	Sacramento	CA	95833
John Koster	Judicial Council	2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, 4th Floor	Sacramento	CA	95833
JCC to send copy of Final EIR TO:					
Trevor Cleak	Central Valley Regional WQCB	11020 Sun Center Drive, No. 200	Rancho Cordova	CA	95670
Angela Calderaro	CA Dept F&W	1701 Nimbus Road	Rancho Cordova	CA	95670
Tina Bartlett	CA Dept F&W	1701 Nimbus Road	Rancho Cordova	CA	95670

Mailing List for New Placerville Courthouse Final EIR Availability

Steve Pedretti	El Dorado Co Community Development Agency	2850 Fairlane Court	Placerville	CA	95667
Eric Fredericks	Caltrans	2379 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150	Sacramento	CA	95833
Sharon Scherzinger	El Dorado Co Transport Commission	2828 Easy Street, Suite One	Placerville	CA	95667

Exhibit E

Mayor's Proposed Letter Requesting Reopening

Laura Sainz
Administrative Office of the Courts
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95833

Dear Ms. Sainz:

The City of Placerville has been part of the discussion of a new court house in El Dorado County for many years. The current historic court house built in 1912 has been a prominent fixture in our downtown since it was constructed. The anticipation of relocating the court facility outside of the downtown area has caused concern to some of our citizens and businesses. Some feel the action will have a severe detrimental economic effect on our downtown businesses. We as a City Council understand those concerns and want to make sure we are doing all we can to alleviate those concerns.

In October 16, 2014, the Judicial Council released the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the El Dorado County Courthouse for distribution and comment. The 45 day comment period ended on December 1, 2015. The Draft EIR was distributed and advertised in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. However, some in our community did not receive the notice and would like to have the opportunity to comment and express their concerns. For this reason, we are requesting that the Judicial Council consider re-opening the Draft EIR for a 30 day period, in order to allow additional comments on the Environmental effects of the project.

We appreciate any consideration you can give to this request and pledge our support in accommodating this request. Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

Patty Borelli
Mayor

Exhibit F

Mayor's Proposed Letter Requesting Assistance

Laura Sainz
Administrative Office of the Courts
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95833

Dear Ms. Sainz:

The City of Placerville has been part of the discussion of a new court house in El Dorado County for many years. The current historic court house built in 1912 has been a prominent fixture in our downtown since it was constructed. The anticipation of relocating the court facility outside of the downtown area has caused concern to some of our citizens and businesses. Some feel the action will have a severe detrimental economic effect on our downtown businesses. We as a City Council understand those concerns and want to make sure we are doing all we can to alleviate those concerns.

Over the past 4 years we have been involved in the discussions regarding relocation of the court house functions. We have provided input and asked important questions to assist us in understanding the need for the move. If it were an option to keep the current court house functions in our downtown going forward, we would support that decision. However, it is my understanding from previous discussions with Judicial Council staff, that keeping the court house functions in their current location is not an option due to many factors including, security, structural stability of the building, size of the building, ADA accessibility, parking, and other building health hazards.

Based on our understanding that keeping the court functions in their current location is not an option, we have supported and participated in the study and discussion to relocate the Court house operations. And with that understanding, we continue to support and assist in the process to relocate the court house operations. As you know, we have appointed a Blue Ribbon Committee to begin the process of identifying reuse alternatives for our Historic Main Street Court House. We anticipate many studies that will be necessary to determine the best reuse for this historic building, and following our discussion with you at the Final Draft EIR meeting, we are pleased that the state has expressed a willingness to assist with an economic impact and reuse study, including identifying funding sources for the repurpose of the historic courthouse. We feel strongly that this study will be a critical aspect of ensuring that our blue ribbon committee has the tools they need to successfully repurpose this historic asset and help the state mitigate the environmental impacts noted in the EIR. The Historic Main Street Courthouse is an integral part of downtown Placerville so it is vital that we repurpose her in such a way that she remains a vibrant contributor to the main street economy. As such, we request your support and assistance both financially and otherwise to make sure that this historic building remains a viable and important part of our downtown.

Sincerely,

Patty Borelli
Mayor