

Memorandum 2019-36

**Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6):  
Court Facilities (Comments on Tentative Recommendation)**

Earlier this year, the Commission approved a tentative recommendation in this study. See Tentative Recommendation on *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities* (Feb. 2019) (hereafter, “Court Facilities TR”).<sup>1</sup>

The tentative recommendation has since been widely circulated for comment. In addition to sending it to the traditional and electronic mailing lists for this study, the staff took various other steps to ensure that it reached potentially affected parties. Among other things, for each of the many county-specific reforms in the proposal, we sent individualized communications to representatives of the affected county and the local superior court, alerting them to the proposed reform and providing instructions on how to comment. All other superior courts and counties were also notified of the tentative recommendation.

The Commission received the following comments on the tentative recommendation:

	<i>Exhibit p.</i>
• David Brodie, Chief Deputy County Counsel for San Diego County (4/16/19) .....	1
• Robert Burns, County Counsel for Lassen County (4/10/19) .....	2
• Sheri Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court for Los Angeles County Superior Court (5/1/19) .....	3
• Nancy Eberhardt, Court Executive Officer for San Bernardino County Superior Court (4/29/19) .....	4
• Charles Martel, Supervising Attorney, Legal Services/Leadership Services Division, Judicial Council (4/30/19) .....	7
• Philip Pogledich, County Counsel for Yolo County (4/12/19) .....	8

1. Any California Law Revision Commission document referred to in this memorandum can be obtained from the Commission. Recent materials can be downloaded from the Commission’s website ([www.clrc.ca.gov](http://www.clrc.ca.gov)). Other materials can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s staff, through the website or otherwise.

The Commission welcomes written comments at any time during its study process. Any comments received will be a part of the public record and may be considered at a public meeting. However, comments that are received less than five business days prior to a Commission meeting may be presented without staff analysis.

The comments are discussed below.

Because most of the comments were supportive or neutral in nature, the staff prepared a draft of a final recommendation, which is attached after the comments. It is closely similar to the tentative recommendation. The staff made routine changes to convert a tentative recommendation to a final recommendation (including removal of Notes and other text soliciting comments on specific issues). We also deleted some statutory provisions that the Commission did not propose to change. Aside from changes like those, the staff made only a few revisions, which are described in the discussion of the comments below.

Unless otherwise noted, all further statutory references in this memorandum are to the Government Code.

COMMENTS SUPPORTING ALL OR PART OF THE TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION  
OR TAKING A NEUTRAL STANCE

Much of the input on the tentative recommendation was favorable or neutral. For example, David Brodie from the San Diego Office of the County Counsel wrote: “Our office supports the Commission’s recommendation to repeal Gov’t Code § 73956.”<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Nancy Eberhardt, the Court Executive Officer for San Bernardino Superior Court, said that her court “agrees with the revisions” specific to San Bernardino County.<sup>3</sup> Philip Pogledich, the County Counsel for Yolo County, reported that “[w]e have reviewed the proposed changes that specifically affect Yolo County and have no comments or concerns.”<sup>4</sup>

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, Sherri Carter (Court Executive Officer) wrote more but the bottom line is similar:

The Court has reviewed the recommendation in full. We have only one comment regarding the Commission’s recommendation to leave Government Code § 76219 unchanged. The Court agrees with this approach. Three of our courthouses, the Michael D. Antonovich Antelope Valley Courthouse, the Airport Courthouse, and the Chatsworth Courthouse, still have outstanding debt governed by Government Code § 76219; therefore, it is important that the statute remains intact at this time.

The Court does not have any comments on the Commission’s other recommendations outlined in the tentative recommendation.

---

2. Exhibit p. 1.  
3. Exhibit p. 4.  
4. Exhibit p. 8.

We appreciate the Commission's engagement on these issues and look forward to continuing to work with the Commission as it completes its work on the J-1405; Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring study.<sup>5</sup>

The lack of input from many other stakeholders notified of the tentative recommendation suggests that they are also unconcerned about it. It is impossible to know whether that is because they did not take time to review the proposal, or because they reviewed the proposal and found it unobjectionable.

#### COMMENTS ON SECTION 76101.5

The tentative recommendation includes the following amendment of Section 76101.5:

**§ 76101.5 (amended). Transfers between Courthouse Construction Fund and Criminal Justice Facilities Fund in county of 1st or 47th class**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 76101.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

76101.5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article or Article 3 (commencing with Section 76200), following a public hearing, the board of supervisors of a county of the first class ~~or a county of the 47th class which~~ that has established both a Courthouse Construction Fund and a Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund pursuant to the provisions of this chapter may by resolution provide for the transfer of deposits from one fund to the other.

**Comment.** Section 76101.5 is amended to reflect:

(1) The enactment of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act, 1997 Cal. Stat. ch. 850 (see generally Sections 77000-77655) and the related Trial Court Facilities Act, 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082 (see generally Sections 70301-70508).

(2) The closure of the Courthouse Construction Fund for Lassen County.

The section is also amended to make a technical correction.

See Sections 28020 (Lassen County population is 14,960), 28068 (county with population of more than 14,600 and less than 15,000 is county of 47th class), 28085 (when new federal census is taken, county remains in old classification until reclassified by Legislature).

The preliminary part (narrative portion) of the tentative recommendation explains:

---

5. Exhibit p. 3.

*Lassen and Los Angeles Counties.* Section 76101.5 authorizes “a county of the first class or a county of the 47th class” (i.e., Los Angeles County or Lassen County) to transfer deposits from its Courthouse Construction Fund to its Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund and vice versa. Lassen County no longer has a Courthouse Construction Fund, so the Commission recommends amending this section to delete the reference to “a county of the 47th class.”<sup>6</sup>

The Commission’s conclusion that “Lassen County no longer has a Courthouse Construction Fund” was based on information in a document prepared by the Judicial Council.<sup>7</sup> Robert Burns (Lassen County Counsel) reports, however, that this conclusion is incorrect:

[T]he tentative recommendation contemplates a statutory change which would eliminate Lassen’s Courthouse Construction Fund. The premise of the recommendation is that “Lassen County no longer has a Courthouse Construction Fund” ....

I have been assured by my elected Lassen County Auditor, Ms. Diana Wemple, that Lassen *does* have a Courthouse Construction Fund into which funds continue to be deposited. An inquiry has begun to determine the source of these funds and the legitimacy of their continued collection. In the meantime, May 1 (deadline for submission of comments) is coming soon and I wanted to report to you that it appears premature to make this statutory change until we know more.<sup>8</sup>

Similarly, Charles Martel (Supervising Attorney for the Judicial Council) says:

[N]otwithstanding the [Judicial Council document], it appears that Lassen County may still be holding funds in its Courthouse Construction Fund. The county and Judicial Council are currently discussing the transfer of those funds to the state pursuant to section 70402. Though the county’s ability to transfer funds from its Courthouse Construction Fund to its Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund pursuant to section 76101.5 is almost certainly not relevant to resolution of that issue, in light of those on-going discussions, it might be wise to briefly delay the proposed revision to section 76101.5 through a short sunset clause (the five year sunset clause proposed with respect to section 70624 on page 20 of the Tentative Recommendation seems too long to be used in this case).<sup>9</sup>

---

6. Court Facilities TR at 19 (footnotes omitted).

7. See Judicial Council of California, *Receipts and Expenditures from Local Courthouse Construction Funds: Report to the Budget and Fiscal Committees of the Legislature* (12/18/17), Attachment 12. A copy of this report is attached to the First Supplement to Memorandum 2018-31.

8. Exhibit p. 2 (emphasis in original).

9. Exhibit p. 7.

Given this input, it appears inappropriate to proceed at this time with the proposed amendment of Section 76101.5 in its current form. The simplest way of handling the matter (Option #1) would be to delete that amendment (and the corresponding discussion in the preliminary part) from the Commission's proposal. The Commission could revisit the matter later, after the issues relating to Lassen County's Courthouse Construction Fund have been resolved.

Alternatively, the Commission could use a sunset clause approach, as Mr. Martel suggests ("Option #2). Because Section 76101.5 pertains to both Lassen County and Los Angeles County, however, it would not be sufficient to add a sunset clause to the existing section. It would also be necessary to add a new version of Section 76101.5 to the codes, which would apply only to Los Angeles County and would become operative when the other version sunsets.

That could be accomplished by replacing the amendment in the tentative recommendation with the following:

**§ 76101.5 (amended). Transfers between Courthouse Construction Fund and Criminal Justice Facilities Fund in county of 1st or 47th class**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 76101.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

76101.5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this article or Article 3 (commencing with Section 76200), following a public hearing, the board of supervisors of a county of the first class or a county of the 47th class which has established both a Courthouse Construction Fund and a Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund pursuant to the provisions of this chapter may by resolution provide for the transfer of deposits from one fund to the other.

(b) This section shall remain in effect only until [insert date], and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, which becomes effective on or before [insert date], deletes or extends that date.

**Comment.** Section 76101.5 is amended to add a sunset clause, which is intended to afford time for resolution of issues relating to closure the Courthouse Construction Fund for Lassen County.

See Sections 28020 (Lassen County population is 14,960), 28068 (county with population of more than 14,600 and less than 15,000 is county of 47th class), 28085 (when new federal census is taken, county remains in old classification until reclassified by Legislature).

**§ 76101.5 (added). Transfers between Courthouse Construction Fund and Criminal Justice Facilities Fund in county of 1st or 47th class**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 76101.5 is added to the Government Code to read:

76101.5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this article or Article 3 (commencing with Section 76200), following a public hearing, the board of supervisors of a county of the first class that has established both a Courthouse Construction Fund and a Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund pursuant to the provisions of this chapter may by resolution provide for the transfer of deposits from one fund to the other.

(b) This section shall become operative on [insert date].

**Comment.** Section 76101.5, operative on [insert date], would apply only to Los Angeles County. See Sections 28020 (Los Angeles County population is 7,032,075), 28022 (county with population of 4,000,000 or more is county of 1st class), 28085 (when new federal census is taken, county remains in old classification until reclassified by Legislature).

Conforming revisions of the preliminary part would also be necessary.

**Which approach would the Commission like to follow? Input on the relative merits of the two options would be helpful.**

For the sake of simplicity, the staff implemented Option #1 in the attached draft. That choice is not intended as a recommendation; it does not reflect an evaluation of the relative merits of the two options.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 70624

The tentative recommendation includes the following amendment of Section 70624:

**§ 70624 (amended). Surcharge in San Bernardino County**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 70624 of the Government Code is amended to read:

70624. (a) In addition to the uniform filing fee authorized pursuant to Section 70611, 70612, 70613, 70614, 70650, 70651, 70652, 70653, 70655, or 70670, after giving notice and holding a public hearing on the proposal, the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County may impose a surcharge not to exceed thirty-five dollars (\$35) for the filing in superior court of (1) a complaint, petition, or other first paper in a civil, family, or probate action or special proceeding, and (2) a first paper on behalf of any defendant, respondent, intervenor, or adverse party. The county shall notify in writing the superior court and the Administrative Office of the

Courts of any change in a surcharge under this section. If a surcharge under this section is imposed on a filing fee, the distribution that would otherwise be made to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund under subdivision (c) of Section 68085.3 or subdivision (c) of Section 68085.4 shall be reduced as provided in Section 70603. This section shall apply to fees collected under Sections 70611, 70612, 70613, 70614, 70650, 70651, 70652, 70653, 70655, and 70670, beginning January 1, 2006.

(b) The surcharge shall be in an amount determined to be necessary by the board of supervisors to supplement the Courthouse Construction Fund, to be deposited in that fund and used solely for the purposes authorized for expenditures from that fund, including, but not limited to, earthquake retrofitting, renovation, and remodeling of all portions of the Central San Bernardino Courthouse in need of retrofitting, renovation, or remodeling, whether or not necessitated by the retrofitting work, including the original courthouse built in 1926 and all subsequent additions thereto. Expenditures made from the Courthouse Construction Fund that are funded from the surcharge shall be made in order of priority to ensure that all necessary earthquake retrofitting of the Central San Bernardino Courthouse will be completed. Collection of the surcharge authorized by this section shall terminate upon repayment of the amortized costs incurred, or 30 years from the sale of the bond, whichever occurs first. However, the surcharge shall not apply in instances in which no filing fee is charged or the filing fee is waived. If the amortized costs have been repaid, or 30 years have passed since the sale of the bond, the county shall notify in writing the superior court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

(c) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2026, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute that is enacted on or before January 1, 2026, deletes or extends that date.

**Comment.** Section 70624 is amended to add a sunset clause.

The preliminary part explains:

*San Bernardino County.* Section 70624 authorizes a filing fee surcharge in San Bernardino County to supplement that county's Courthouse Construction Fund. Collection of that surcharge "shall terminate upon repayment of the amortized costs incurred, or 30 years from the sale of the bond, whichever occurs first." According to Judicial Council staff, San Bernardino County recently paid off the debt for the courthouse construction projects in question. That development might mean that (1) the surcharge under Section 70624 should cease pursuant to the express terms of that section, (2) San Bernardino County should transfer the remainder of its Courthouse Construction Fund to the state pursuant to Section 70402, and (3) upon completion of that transfer, Section 70624 would be ripe for repeal. Apparently, however, there is an

unresolved issue regarding this matter and there are ongoing discussions about it between the county and the Judicial Council. To allow for resolution of that issue while ensuring that Section 70624 is eventually repealed, the Commission tentatively proposes to add a five-year sunset clause to the section.<sup>10</sup>

Although the preliminary part explains the purpose of the sunset clause, the proposed Comment does not. It occurred to the staff that it might be helpful to revise the Comment to say:

**Comment.** Section 70624 is amended to add a sunset clause, which is intended to afford time for resolution of issues relating to closure of the Courthouse Construction Fund for San Bernardino County.

The attached draft recommendation incorporates this revision. **Is the revision acceptable to the Commission?**

#### APPROVAL OF A FINAL RECOMMENDATION

After considering the matters discussed above, and any other issues that are raised at or before the upcoming meeting, **the Commission needs to decide whether to approve the attached draft as a final recommendation (with or without revisions), for publication and submission to the Legislature.**

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Gaal  
Chief Deputy Counsel

---

10. Court Facilities TR at 19-20 (footnotes omitted).

**EMAIL FROM DAVID BRODIE, CHIEF DEPUTY, OFFICE OF COUNTY  
COUNSEL, SAN DIEGO COUNTY (4/16/19)**

**Re: Law Revision Commission Seeks Comment on New Tentative Recommendation**

Barbara,

Thank you for seeking input from our office on the Law Revision Commission's recommendations.

Our office supports the Commission's recommendation to repeal Gov't Code § 73956.

David Brodie

David Brodie, Chief Deputy  
Office of County Counsel  
1600 Pacific Highway, Rm. 355  
San Diego CA 92101  
Phone 619.531.4871 Fax 619.531.6005  
[david.brodie@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:david.brodie@sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of Lassen, California  
**OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL**



Robert M. Burns, Lassen County Counsel  
221 South Roop Street, Ste. 2  
Susanville CA 96130

April 10, 2019

Ms. Barbara Gaal  
Chief Deputy Counsel  
California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-2  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

RE: Comments from Lassen County Relative to the tentative recommendation on  
*Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities*

Dear Ms. Gaal,

Lassen County is in receipt of your email correspondence dated February 22, 2019 soliciting review and comments related to the tentative recommendation of the Commission identified above.

Specifically, and as it relates to Lassen County in particular, the tentative recommendation contemplates a statutory change which would eliminate Lassen's Courthouse Construction Fund. The premise of the recommendation is that "Lassen County no longer has a Courthouse Construction Fund" (from page 19 of the tentative recommendation; citing footnote 131, referencing footnote 117).

I have been assured by my elected Lassen County Auditor, Ms. Diana Wemple, that Lassen *does* have a Courthouse Construction Fund into which funds continue to be deposited. An inquiry has begun to determine the source of these funds and the legitimacy of their continued collection. In the meantime, May 1 (deadline for submission of comments) is coming soon and I wanted to report to you that it appears premature to make this statutory change until we know more.

If you have any questions, feel free.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Burns", is written over the word "Sincerely,".

Robert M. Burns



SHERRI R. CARTER  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER / CLERK OF COURT

111 NORTH HILL STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3014

***Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles***

May 1, 2019

California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-2  
Pala Alto, CA 94303  
c/o: Ms. Barbara Gaal, Chief Deputy Counsel

**RE: Tentative Recommendation – Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities (February 2019)**

Dear Ms. Gaal:

The Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles (Court) is in receipt of your correspondence dated February 26, 2019 soliciting our feedback on the California Law Revision Commission's (Commission) [tentative recommendation on Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring \(Part 6\): Court Facilities](#).

The Court has reviewed the recommendation in full. We have only one comment regarding the Commission's recommendation to leave Government Code § 76219 unchanged. The Court agrees with this approach. Three of our courthouses, the Michael D. Antonovich Antelope Valley Courthouse, the Airport Courthouse, and the Chatsworth Courthouse, still have outstanding debt governed by Government Code § 76219; therefore, it is important the statute remains intact at this time.

The Court does not have any comments on the Commission's other recommendations outlined in the tentative recommendation. We appreciate the Commission's engagement on these issues and look forward to continuing to work with the Commission as it completes its work on the J-1405; Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring study.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Sherri R. Carter".

Sherri R. Carter

**EMAIL FROM NANCY EBERHARDT, COURT EXECUTIVE OFFICER,  
SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY (4/29/19)**

**Re: Law Revision Commission Study of Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court  
Restructuring (Part 6)**

Dear Ms. Gaal:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment to your proposed revisions per the attached.

The Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, agrees with the revisions as proposed.

Sincerely,

NANCY CS EBERHARDT  
Court Executive Officer  
Superior Court of San Bernardino County, Court Executive Office  
247 West Third Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
W: (909) 708-8769 F: (909) 708-8782  
[www.sb-court.org](http://www.sb-court.org)  
[neberhardt@sb-court.org](mailto:neberhardt@sb-court.org)

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

4000 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD, ROOM D-2  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303-4739  
650-494-1335



February 26, 2019

RECEIVED  
MAR 04 2019

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Nancy CS Eberhardt  
Court Executive Officer  
San Bernardino County Superior Court  
San Bernardino Justice Center  
247 W. Third St., 11th Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0302

**Re: Law Revision Commission Study of Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6)**

Dear Ms. Eberhardt:

The Law Revision Commission seeks comments on its tentative recommendation on *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities*. To receive timely consideration, comments should be submitted by **May 1, 2019**.

A copy of the press release for the tentative recommendation is enclosed for your convenience. You can access the tentative recommendation electronically at: <http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Misc-Report/TR-J1405.pdf>.

The Commission would appreciate input on any aspect of its tentative recommendation. The following provision in the proposal relates specifically to San Bernardino County:

Gov't Code § 70624 (see pp. 19-20, 31-32)

Please also examine the entries for your county in the tables on pages 44 (Gov't Code § 76000(e)), 49-51 (Gov't Code § 77201.3(a)(1)), and 51-52 (Gov't Code § 77201.3(a)(2)(A)).

Background materials and further information on the Commission's study are available at: [www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html](http://www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html). If you have any questions, you can reach me at [bgaal@clrc.ca.gov](mailto:bgaal@clrc.ca.gov) or (650) 494-1335.

Thank you very much for considering this matter. Comments from knowledgeable sources are invaluable in the Commission's study process.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gaal  
Chief Deputy Counsel

File: J-1405

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

4000 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD, ROOM D-1  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303-4739  
650-494-1335



NEWS RELEASE  
February 20, 2019  
*For Immediate Release*

Contact: Barbara Gaal  
Chief Deputy Counsel  
650-494-1335

## Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities

### Request for Public Comment

In the past, California had several types of trial courts (superior courts, municipal courts, and justice courts). Those courts were county-operated, funded primarily by the counties, and largely staffed with county employees. Court facilities belonged to the counties, which were responsible for building and maintaining them.

Around the turn of the century, three major reforms of California's trial court system occurred:

- (1) *Trial court unification*. Municipal and justice courts were eliminated; all trial court operations were consolidated in the superior court in each county.
- (2) *Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act*. Under this Act, the state assumed full responsibility for funding and operating the trial courts, instead of placing that responsibility primarily on the counties.
- (3) *Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act*. This Act established a new personnel system for trial court employees, in which they became employees of the court itself, instead of the county or the state.

At the request of the Legislature, the Law Revision Commission helped to draft the extensive constitutional and statutory revisions necessary to implement these major reforms. Since then, the Commission has done much additional work to update the codes to reflect the restructuring of the trial courts.

The Trial Court Funding Act did not resolve issues relating to court facilities. Instead, it created a task force on court facilities, which made recommendations that became the basis for the Trial Court Facilities Act enacted in 2002.

Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, the judicial branch became primarily responsible for court facilities. The Act specified a process for transferring the court facilities in each county to the state. Those transfers were essentially complete by 2009.

Many statutes relating to court facilities now appear to be obsolete, in whole or in part. The Commission tentatively recommends various revisions to remove obsolete material. The Commission seeks comment on its proposed revisions.

The tentative recommendation is available at [www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html](http://www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html). Comments can be in any format. The Commission often substantially revises its recommendations as a result of public comment. To receive timely consideration, comments should be submitted to [bgaal@clrc.ca.gov](mailto:bgaal@clrc.ca.gov) by **May 1, 2019**.

**EMAIL FROM CHARLES MARTEL, SUPERVISING ATTORNEY,  
JUDICIAL COUNCIL (4/30/19)**

**Re: Comment on Tentative Recommendation: *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities***

Good afternoon Barbara,

With re: the section 76101.5 reference to Lassen County on page 19 – notwithstanding the cited *CCF Report* (fn 131), it appears that Lassen County may still be holding funds in its Courthouse Construction Fund. The county and Judicial Council are currently discussing the transfer of those funds to the state pursuant to section 70402. Though the county’s ability to transfer funds from its Courthouse Construction Fund to its Criminal Justice Facilities Construction Fund pursuant to section 76101.5 is almost certainly not relevant to resolution of that issue, in light of those on-going discussions, it might be wise to briefly delay the proposed revision to section 76101.5 through a short sunset clause (the five year sunset clause proposed with respect to section 70624 on page 20 of the Tentative Recommendation seems too long to be used in this case).

With regards,

Charley

---

**Charles R. Martel**, Supervising Attorney  
Legal Services | Leadership Services Division  
Judicial Council of California  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
415-865-4967 | [charles.martel@jud.ca.gov](mailto:charles.martel@jud.ca.gov) | [www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

**EMAIL FROM PHILIP POGLEDICH, COUNTY COUNSEL,  
COUNTY OF YOLO (4/12/19)**

**Re: Law Revision Commission Seeks Comment on Tentative Recommendation**

Barbara,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment, and my apologies for responding so long after our initial exchange. We have reviewed the proposed changes that specifically affect Yolo County and have no comments or concerns.

A handful of other issues came up in the course of reviewing this with County staff. Having now researched each of those issues, I do not believe it is appropriate to raise them for your consideration. Those issues are either beyond the purview of the Law Revision Commission or lack a compelling basis.

Thanks,  
Phil

Philip J. Pogledich  
County Counsel  
County of Yolo  
625 Court Street, Room 201  
Woodland, CA 95695  
Tel: (530) 666-8275  
Fax: (530) 666-8279

#J-1405

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

# **CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION**

**STAFF DRAFT**

RECOMMENDATION

Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring  
(Part 6): Court Facilities

May 2019

California Law Revision Commission  
c/o UC Davis School of Law  
Davis, CA 94303  
650-494-1335  
<commission@clrc.ca.gov>



## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

In the past, California had several types of trial courts (superior courts, municipal courts, and justice courts). Those courts were county-operated, funded primarily by the counties, and largely staffed with county employees. Court facilities belonged to the counties, which were responsible for building and maintaining them.

Around the turn of the century, three major reforms of California's trial court system occurred:

- (1) *Trial court unification*. Municipal and justice courts were eliminated; all trial court operations were consolidated in the superior court in each county.
- (2) *Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act*. Under this Act, the state assumed full responsibility for funding and operating the trial courts, instead of placing that responsibility primarily on the counties.
- (3) *Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act*. This Act established a new personnel system for trial court employees, in which they became employees of the court itself, instead of the county or state.

At the request of the Legislature, the Law Revision Commission helped to draft the extensive constitutional and statutory revisions necessary to implement these major reforms. Since then, the Commission has done much additional work to update the codes to reflect the restructuring of the trial courts.

The Trial Court Funding Act did not resolve issues relating to court facilities. Instead, it created a task force on court facilities, which made recommendations that became the basis for the Trial Court Facilities Act enacted in 2002.

Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, the judicial branch became primarily responsible for court facilities. The Act specified a process for transferring the court facilities in each county to the state. By 2009, all of those transfers were essentially complete.

Many statutes relating to court facilities now appear to be obsolete, in whole or in part. The Commission studied this area and recommends various statutory revisions to remove obsolete material, as detailed herein.

This recommendation was prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 71674 and Resolution Chapter 158 of the Statutes of 2018.



STATUTES MADE OBSOLETE BY TRIAL COURT  
RESTRUCTURING (PART 6):  
COURT FACILITIES

1 California’s trial court system was dramatically restructured around the turn of the  
2 century. Issues relating to court facilities were resolved later; development and  
3 implementation of a new approach to court facilities was essentially completed by 2009.

4 As a result, many code provisions relating to court facilities are obsolete, in whole or  
5 in part. The Law Revision Commission<sup>1</sup> studied this area and recommends various  
6 statutory revisions to remove material made obsolete by trial court restructuring.

7 The Commission explains its proposed revisions below, after providing some  
8 background information. Unless otherwise indicated, all statutory references are to the  
9 Government Code.

10 **Background**

11 To provide context for the Commission’s proposed reforms, it is necessary to present  
12 background information on:

- 13 • Trial court restructuring.
- 14 • Related reforms pertaining to court facilities.
- 15 • The Commission’s role in these matters.

16 Those topics are discussed in order here.

17 ***Restructuring of California’s Trial Court System***

18 Historically, each county had a superior court, as well as one or more municipal or  
19 justice courts with limited jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup> The trial courts were county-operated, funded

---

1. Any California Law Revision Commission document referred to in this recommendation can be obtained from the Commission. Recent materials can be downloaded from the Commission’s website ([www.clrc.ca.gov](http://www.clrc.ca.gov)). Other materials can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s staff, through the website or otherwise.

2. See former Cal. Const. art. VI, §§ 4, 5; *Trial Court Unification: Constitutional Revision (SCA 3)*, 24 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1, 21 (1994) (hereafter “*TCU: Constitutional Revision*”) (“In each county there is a superior court and one or more municipal or justice courts depending on population.” (footnotes omitted)); see also *id.* at 71-72 (showing text of former Cal. Const. art. §§ 4, 5 & proposed revisions); 2 B. Witkin, *California Procedure Courts* §164, at 236-37 (5th ed. 2008).

1 primarily by the counties, and largely staffed with county employees.<sup>3</sup> Court facilities  
2 belonged to the counties, which were responsible for building and maintaining them.<sup>4</sup>

3 Around the turn of the century, three major reforms occurred:

4 *Trial court unification.* Justice courts were eliminated statewide through a  
5 ballot measure approved by the voters in 1994.<sup>5</sup> Four years later, the voters  
6 approved a measure that permitted trial court unification on a county-by-county  
7 basis: On a vote of a majority of the municipal court judges and a majority of the  
8 superior court judges in a county, the municipal and superior courts in that county  
9 could unify their operations in the superior court.<sup>6</sup> By early 2001, the trial courts  
10 in all of California’s 58 counties had unified.<sup>7</sup> Each county now has a unified  
11 superior court, which handles all trial court operations in that county.

12 *Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act.* Under this 1997 legislation,<sup>8</sup> the  
13 state assumed full responsibility for funding trial court operations.<sup>9</sup> The goal was  
14 to eliminate disparities in funding from county to county, helping to ensure equal  
15 service in courts across the state.<sup>10</sup>

16 *Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (“TCEPGA”).* This  
17 legislation was enacted in 2000.<sup>11</sup> It established a new personnel system for trial  
18 court employees, in which they are employed by the superior court itself (not by  
19 the county or the state).<sup>12</sup>

## 20 ***Treatment of Trial Court Facilities***

21 The above-described trial restructuring reforms did not resolve the proper treatment of  
22 trial court facilities. Instead, the Trial Court Funding Act created the Task Force on Court  
23 Facilities, which was “charged to review and report the status of court facilities

---

3. See, e.g., Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 233 (June 10, 1997); *Trial Court Unification: Revision of Codes*, 28 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 51, 76-79 (1998) (hereafter, “TCU: Revision of Codes”; J. Clark Kelso, Analysis of Existing Court Staffing Statutes (DRAFT: Jan. 24, 2000) (on file with Commission).

4. See, e.g., *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 2* (hereafter, “TCR: Part 2”), 33 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 169, 177 (2003) (“Court facilities have historically been county structures.”).

5. See 1994 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 113 (SCA 7 (Dills)) (Prop. 191, approved Nov. 8, 1994).

6. See 1996 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 36 (SCA 4 (Lockyer)) (Prop. 220, approved June 2, 1998).

7. See <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/unidate.pdf>.

8. 1997 Cal. Stat. ch. 850; see generally Sections 77000-77655.

9. See Section 77200 (“On and after July 1, 1997, the state shall assume sole responsibility for the funding of court operations, as defined in Section 77003 and Rule 10.810 of the California Rules of Court as it read on January 1, 2007.”).

10. See Section 77100(c) (“Local funding of trial courts may create disparities in the availability of the courts for the resolution of disputes and the dispensation of justice.”); see also Section 77100(d) (“The method of funding trial courts should not create financial barriers to the fair and proper resolution of civil and criminal actions.”).

11. 2000 Cal. Stat. ch. 1010; see generally Sections 71600-71675.

12. See, e.g., Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 2140 (May 9, 2000).

1 throughout the state, and to make recommendations for specific funding responsibilities  
2 among the entities of government (i.e., state and/or county) with regards to court  
3 facilities maintenance and construction.”<sup>13</sup>

4 The task force visited court facilities throughout the state and submitted its final report  
5 to the Legislature in 2001, as required by statute.<sup>14</sup> It found that many of the facilities  
6 were in poor condition and in need of repair, renovation, or maintenance.<sup>15</sup>

7 The overarching recommendation of the task force was that “responsibility for trial  
8 court facilities funding and operation be shifted from the counties to the state.”<sup>16</sup> The task  
9 force gave four main reasons for that recommendation, which the Legislature endorsed in  
10 the Trial Court Facilities Act, enacted in 2002.<sup>17</sup> A key theme was that *the judiciary*  
11 should control both court operations and court facilities:

12 (1) The *judicial branch* of government is now wholly responsible for its  
13 programs and operations, with the exception of trial court facilities. The *judiciary*  
14 should have the responsibility for all of its functions related to its operations and  
15 staff, including facilities.

16 (2) *Uniting responsibility for operations and facilities* increases the likelihood  
17 that operational costs will be considered when facility decisions are made, and  
18 enhances economical, efficient, and effective court operations.

19 (3) The state, being solely responsible for creating new judicial positions,  
20 drives the need for new court facilities.

21 (4) Equal access to justice is a key underpinning of our society and the rule of  
22 law. It is also a paramount goal of the Judicial Council, the policymaking body of  
23 the judicial branch. The state can best ensure uniformity of access to all court  
24 facilities in California.<sup>18</sup>

25 Consistent with those findings, the Trial Court Facilities Act grants the judicial branch  
26 broad authority with respect to court facilities, while still ensuring that other voices are  
27 heard and taken into account.<sup>19</sup>

28 Of particular note, the Act set a deadline for each county to negotiate agreements  
29 transferring its court facilities (and responsibility for maintaining those facilities) to the  
30 state.<sup>20</sup> The court facility transfers took longer than expected, but they were essentially  
31 completed by the end of 2009.<sup>21</sup>

---

13. Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 1732 (April 16, 2002), p. 1.

14. See Section 77654; Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 1732 (April 16, 2002), p. 2.

15. See Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 1732 (April 16, 2002), p. 2.

16. 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 1 (legislative findings for the Trial Court Facilities Act).

17. 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082 (SB 1732 (Escutia)); see generally Sections 70301-70403.

18. 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 1 (emphasis added). For further background on the Trial Court Facilities Act, see Assembly Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 1732 (June 25, 2002); Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 1732 (April 16, 2002).

19. See, e.g., Section 70391.

20. See former Section 70321 (2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 4) (“The Judicial Council, in consultation with the superior court of each county and the county shall enter into agreements concerning the transfer

1 Some of the court facility situations were complex. For example, there were  
2 courthouses with historical significance, ones that were subject to a bonded indebtedness,  
3 facilities that were in bad repair or seismically unsafe, buildings that were used by a court  
4 but also for other purposes (e.g., a city hall, jail, or district attorney’s office), and various  
5 other complications. The unusual situations received special treatment as needed.<sup>22</sup>

6 ***Role of the Law Revision Commission in Trial Court Restructuring***

7 At the direction of the Legislature, the Law Revision Commission was involved in trial  
8 court restructuring from the outset. In 1993-94, the Commission helped to draft the  
9 constitutional revisions necessary to accomplish trial court unification.<sup>23</sup> It later drafted  
10 the extensive statutory revisions necessary to accommodate county-by-county  
11 unification.<sup>24</sup>

12 After the trial courts in all counties unified, the Commission prepared a massive report  
13 proposing further statutory revisions (and a few constitutional revisions) to reflect the  
14 elimination of the municipal courts. As requested by the Legislature, that 2001 report  
15 also included proposed legislation to reflect the enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act  
16 and the TCEPGA.<sup>25</sup>

17 Since then, the Commission has continued to review the codes and periodically  
18 recommend revisions to reflect trial court unification, enactment of the Trial Court  
19 Funding Act, and enactment of the TCEPGA.<sup>26</sup> Virtually all of the Commission’s  
20 proposed legislation on trial court restructuring has become law.<sup>27</sup>

---

of responsibility for court facilities from that county to the Judicial Council.... Transfer of responsibility may occur not earlier than July 1, 2004, and not later than June 30, 2007.”).

21. See, e.g., Section 70321 (“The Judicial Council, in consultation with the superior court of each county and the county shall enter into agreements concerning the transfer of responsibility for court facilities from that county to the Judicial Council.... Transfer of responsibility may occur not earlier than July 1, 2004, and not later than December 31, 2009.”).

22. See, e.g., Sections 70325 (building subject to bonded indebtedness), 70326 (deficient building), 70327-70328 (seismically unsafe building), 70329 (historical building), 70331 (building with ongoing construction project), 70341-70344 (shared use building).

23. See *TCU: Constitutional Revision*, *supra* note 2; see also 1993 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 96; *Trial Court Unification: Transitional Provisions for SCA 3*, 24 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 627 (1994).

24. See *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 3; see also 1997 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 102; 1998 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 91; *Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 344 of the Statutes of 1999 (Senate Bill 210)*, 29 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 657 (1999).

25. See *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 1*, 32 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1 (2002) (hereafter, “*TCR: Part 1*”).

26. See *TCR: Part 2*, *supra* note 4; *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 3*, 36 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 341 (2006) (hereafter, “*TCR: Part 3*”); *Trial Court Restructuring: Appellate Jurisdiction of Bail Forfeiture*, 37 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 149 (2007) (hereafter, “*TCR: Bail Forfeiture (2007)*”); *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 4*, 37 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 171 (2007) (hereafter, “*TCR: Part 4*”); *Trial Court Restructuring: Transfer of Case Based on Lack of Jurisdiction*, 37 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 195 (2007); *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 5*, 39 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 109 (2009) (hereafter, “*TCR: Part 5*”); *Trial Court Restructuring: Rights and Responsibilities of the County as*

1 Throughout this work, the Legislature, the Governor, and the general public made the  
2 key policy decisions; the Commission was not involved in such decision-making. Instead,  
3 the Commission’s role was to use its drafting expertise to conform the codes and the  
4 California Constitution to the new policies governing California’s trial court system,  
5 without disrupting other existing policy choices.<sup>28</sup>

6 Because court facilities issues were unsettled, the Commission did not address such  
7 issues in its 2001 report or later work on trial court restructuring.<sup>29</sup> Recently, however,  
8 the Commission turned to those issues and reached conclusions on how to update various  
9 court facilities statutes to reflect the trial court restructuring reforms, including the  
10 enactment and implementation of the Trial Court Facilities Act.

---

*Compared to the Superior Court (Part 1)*, 39 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 157 (2009) (hereafter, *TCR: Court & County #1*); *Trial Court Restructuring: Appellate Jurisdiction of Bail Forfeiture*, 41 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 265 (2011) (hereafter, “*TCR: Bail Forfeiture (2011)*”); *Trial Court Restructuring: Writ Jurisdiction in a Small Claims Case*, 41 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 315 (2011) (hereafter, “*TCR: Writ Jurisdiction*”); see also *Civil Procedure: Technical Corrections*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 479 (2000); *Authority of Court Commissioner*, 33 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 673 (2003).

27. See 1998 Cal. Stat. ch. 931 (implementing recommendation on *TCU: Revision of Codes*); 1999 Cal. Stat. ch. 344 (implementing follow-up legislation recommended by Commission); 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784 (implementing statutory revisions in recommendation on *TCR: Part 1*); 2002 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 88 (ACA 15 (Wayne)) (Prop. 48, approved Nov. 5, 2002) (implementing constitutional revisions in recommendation on *TCR: Part 1*); 2003 Cal. Stat. ch. 149 (implementing recommendation on *TCR: Part 2*); 2007 Cal. Stat. ch. 43 (implementing recommendation on *TCR: Part 3*); 2008 Cal. Stat. ch. 56 (implementing recommendations on *TCR: Part 4* and *Transfer of Case Based on Lack of Jurisdiction*); 2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 212, §§ 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 (partially implementing recommendation on *TCR: Part 5*); 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 470 (implementing recommendations on *TCR: Court & County #1*, *TCR: Writ Jurisdiction*, and *TCR: Bail Forfeiture (2011)*, and partially implementing recommendation on *TCR: Part 5*); see also 2001 Cal. Stat. ch. 44 (implementing recommendation on *Civil Procedure: Technical Corrections*); 2004 Cal. Stat. ch. 49 (implementing recommendation on *Authority of Court Commissioner*).

28. See *TCU: Constitutional Revision*, *supra* note 2, at 13 (“The Commission has not been authorized to report to the Legislature concerning the wisdom or desirability of trial court unification, and has not considered the question.”); *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 3, at 60 (“[T]he Commission has narrowly limited its recommendations to generally preserve existing procedures in the context of unification. The objective of the proposed revisions is to preserve existing rights and procedures despite unification, with no disparity of treatment between a party appearing in municipal court and a similarly situated party appearing in superior court as a result of unification of the municipal and superior courts in the county.”); 2000 Cal. Stat. ch. 1010, § 14 (enacting Section 71674, which only directed Commission to “determine whether any provisions of law are obsolete as a result of the enactment of [the TCEPGA], the enactment of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 ..., or the implementation of trial court unification, and ... recommend to the Legislature any amendments to remove those obsolete provisions.”); 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784, § 360 (amending Section 71674 to continue Commission’s authority to “determine whether any provisions of law are obsolete as a result of the enactment of [the TCEPGA], the enactment of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 ..., or the implementation of trial court unification, and ... recommend to the Legislature any amendments to remove those obsolete provisions.”).

29. See *TCR: Part 1*, *supra* note 25, at 21; *TCR: Part 2*, *supra* note 4, at 176-77.

1 Those preliminary conclusions are described below. The discussion starts with the  
2 court facility statutes in Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code and then turns to  
3 other court facility statutes.

4 The Commission’s work on trial court restructuring is ongoing. It will address other  
5 unresolved matters as time permits.<sup>30</sup>

#### 6 **Chapter 10 of Title 8 (Sections 73301-74988)**<sup>31</sup>

7 Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code (Sections 73301 to 74988) contains  
8 many old statutes relating to court facilities.<sup>32</sup> Much of the chapter appears to be obsolete.

9 The discussion below (1) describes some history of the chapter, (2) identifies “typical”  
10 articles in the chapter and explains why they appear to be obsolete, and (3) explains why  
11 some of the other articles also require revisions to reflect trial court restructuring.

#### 12 ***History***

13 Aside from Article 1, each article currently in Chapter 10 of Title 8 pertains to a  
14 particular county or one or more judicial districts within a county (generally, municipal  
15 court districts). In the past, most of these articles consisted of many sections, in which the  
16 Legislature (acting pursuant to a constitutional requirement) prescribed in detail the  
17 number, qualifications, and compensation of municipal court judges, officers, and  
18 employees.<sup>33</sup>

19 Due to trial court unification and the enactment of the TCEPGA, almost all of that  
20 material became obsolete.<sup>34</sup> For that reason, all but one of these articles was repealed in  
21 2002, on the Commission’s recommendation.<sup>35</sup>

22 However, some of the articles in Chapter 10 of Title 8 contained a small amount of  
23 material that was not yet clearly obsolete. For example, it would have been premature to

---

30. For a description of the trial court restructuring projects that remained unfinished as of February 1, 2018, see Commission Staff Memorandum 2018-5. For information on later progress, see [www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html](http://www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html).

31. Section 24261 is similar in important ways to some of the statutes in Chapter 10 of Title 8, so it is also discussed here. See *infra* notes 86-90 & accompanying text.

32. Chapter 10 of Title 8 is entitled “Other Municipal Courts Districts.” That title is misleading and potentially confusing. There no longer are any municipal court districts and some of the provisions in Chapter 10 expressly relate to superior courts (see, e.g., Sections 74602, 74820.2, 74820.3, 74984, 74988).

The Commission recommends renaming the chapter “County-Specific Provisions.” See proposed amendment of Chapter 10 heading & Comment *infra*.

33. See *TCR: Part 1, supra* note 25, at 16-17; see also Tentative Recommendation on *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring* (Nov. 2001) (hereafter, “2001 TR”), pp. 383-584.

34. See *TCR: Part 1, supra* note 25, at 16-17.

35. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784, §§ 403-405, 407-411, 413-415, 417, 419-421, 423-424, 426, 428, 430, 432, 434, 436-438, 440-442, 444-446, 448-450, 452, 454-457, 459, 461, 463, 465, 481-485, 487, 489, 491, 493, 495, 497; see also *TCR: Part 1, supra* note 25, at 355-421. Article 32.3 relating to San Joaquin County (former Gov’t Code §§ 74820 *et seq.*) was not repealed in its entirety, but much of it was repealed. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784, §§ 466, 470-480; see also *TCR: Part 1, supra* note 25, at 402-09.

1 delete court facility provisions, because policy-makers had not yet resolved the proper  
2 treatment of court facilities. To preserve that material, each such article was  
3 simultaneously reenacted in a much-reduced form, as recommended by the  
4 Commission.<sup>36</sup>

5 ***Typical Articles (Butte, Fresno, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Kings, Marin, Mariposa,***  
6 ***Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, Yolo, and Yuba Counties)***

7 Many of the reenacted articles consist of only two code sections:

- 8 (1) A section that describes one or more municipal court districts.  
9 (2) A section on court facilities and sessions in those districts.<sup>37</sup>

10 Articles in this category include the ones pertaining to Butte,<sup>38</sup> Fresno,<sup>39</sup> Glenn,<sup>40</sup>  
11 Humboldt,<sup>41</sup> Imperial,<sup>42</sup> Kings,<sup>43</sup> Marin,<sup>44</sup> Mariposa,<sup>45</sup> Mendocino,<sup>46</sup> Napa,<sup>47</sup> Santa  
12 Barbara,<sup>48</sup> Siskiyou,<sup>49</sup> Yolo,<sup>50</sup> and Yuba<sup>51</sup> Counties.

---

36. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784, §§ 406, 412, 416, 418, 422, 425, 427, 429, 431, 433, 435, 439, 443, 447, 451, 453, 458, 460, 462, 464, 486, 488, 490, 492, 494, 496; see also *TCR: Part 1, supra* note 25, at 357-58, 360-61, 363-64, 365-67, 369-70, 371-72, 372-75, 365-76, 377-78, 378-79, 379-80, 382-83, 385, 387-88, 391-92, 392-93, 396, 397-98, 399, 400-01, 412, 414-15, 416-17, 417-18, 419-20.

37. For example, “Article 3. Kings County” consists of the following provisions:

73390. This article applies to the municipal court for the County of Kings. The court referred to in this article shall be the successor of the court to be established by the consolidation of the Corcoran, Hanford, and Lemoore Judicial Districts by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kings, and it shall be known as the Kings County Municipal Court.

73396. Facilities for the court shall be maintained in the Cities of Hanford, Corcoran, Lemoore, and (if incorporated pursuant to Section 73391.5) Avenal, and in such other locations within the County of Kings as are designated by the board of supervisors. The court shall hold sessions at each facility as business requires. At the direction of the court, arraignment of criminal defendants who are in custody at the Kings County Jail facility shall be held in the court facility located in Hanford.

38. Article 37 (Sections 74934-74935.5).

39. Article 10.5 (Sections 73698-73698.6).

40. Article 30.1 (Sections 74760-74764).

41. Article 9.5 (Sections 73660-73661).

42. Article 11.5 (Sections 73730-73732).

43. Article 3 (Sections 73390-73396).

44. Article 12 (Sections 73770-73771).

45. Article 12.2 (Sections 73783.1-73783.3).

46. Article 12.3 (Sections 73784-73784.10).

47. Article 38 (Sections 74948-74950).

48. Article 28 (Sections 74640-74640.2).

49. Article 29.6 (Sections 74720-74724).

50. Article 39 (Sections 74960-74962).

51. Article 35.5 (Sections 74915-74916).

1 For one or more of the following reasons, these “typical” articles now appear to be  
2 obsolete:

3 *Municipal courts no longer exist.* The municipal and superior courts in every  
4 county have unified their operations in the superior court,<sup>52</sup> which serves the  
5 entire county.<sup>53</sup> Consequently, statutory descriptions of municipal courts or their  
6 districts<sup>54</sup> are generally obsolete.

7 *Superior court sessions are governed by other law.* Soon after the trial court  
8 restructuring reforms, the Legislature enacted a provision on superior court  
9 sessions, which serves to facilitate the objectives of those reforms.<sup>55</sup> That  
10 provision, now codified as Section 69740,<sup>56</sup> authorizes each superior court to  
11 determine the number and location of sessions of the court. It expressly overrides  
12 any other law on the subject.<sup>57</sup>

13 Accordingly, statutory language that conflicts with or duplicates Section 69740  
14 should be repealed. A good example is a section relating to Humboldt County,  
15 which says: “In order that the citizens of the county may have convenient access

---

52. See <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/unidate.pdf>.

53. See Cal. Const. art. VI, § 4 (“In each county there is a superior court of one or more judges.”).

A few sections in Chapter 10 of Title 8 state that jurors for a particular municipal court “shall be drawn from the entire county.” See Sections 73783.3, 74916(b). Because municipal courts no longer exist and every superior court serves the entire county, there is no need to retain those county-specific statements that jurors “shall be drawn from the entire county.”

54. See, e.g., Sections 74640 (“There are in the County of Santa Barbara two municipal court districts, known as the Santa Barbara Municipal Court and the North Santa Barbara Municipal Court.”), 74760 (“The Glenn County Municipal Court District shall supersede the Glenn County Judicial District and shall embrace the entire County of Glenn.”), 74915 (“This article applies to the municipal court established in a judicial district embracing the County of Yuba. This court shall be known as the Yuba County Municipal Court.”).

55. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1008, § 25.

56. The provision was initially codified as Section 69645, but was later renumbered on the Commission’s recommendation. See *TCR: Part 2, supra* note 4, at 175-76.

57. Section 69740 provides:

69740. (a) *Notwithstanding any other provision of law*, each trial court shall determine the number and location of sessions of the court necessary for the prompt disposition of the business before the court. In making this determination, the court shall consider, among other factors, the impact of this provision on court employees pursuant to Section 71634, the availability and adequacy of facilities for holding the court session at the specific location, any applicable security issues, and the convenience to the parties and the public served by the court. Nothing in this section precludes a session from being held in a building other than a courthouse.

(b) In appropriate circumstances, upon agreement of the presiding judges of the courts, and in the discretion of the court, the location of a session may be outside the county, except that the consent of the parties shall be necessary to the holding of a criminal jury trial outside the county. The venue of a case for which session is held outside the county pursuant to this section shall be deemed to be the home county of the court in which the matter was filed. Nothing in this section shall provide a party with the right to seek a change of venue unless otherwise provided by statute. No party shall have any right to request the court to exercise its discretion under this section.

(c) The Judicial Council may adopt rules to address an appropriate mechanism for sharing of expenses and resources between the court holding the session and the court hosting the session.

(Emphasis added.)

1 to the court, the ... locations where sessions of the court may be held other than  
2 in the county seat shall be as determined by the board of supervisors.”<sup>58</sup>

3 *Counties and their boards of supervisors are no longer responsible for trial*  
4 *court facilities.* Some provisions in Chapter 10 of Title 8 give the local board of  
5 supervisors authority over trial court facilities. For example, a statute pertaining  
6 to Mendocino County says: “The location of permanent court facilities ... shall be  
7 as determined by the board of supervisors.”<sup>59</sup> Now that court facilities belong to  
8 the state and counties are no longer responsible for them, such statutory language  
9 is obsolete.<sup>60</sup>

10 *Statutes specifying court locations are inconsistent with the Trial Court*  
11 *Facilities Act and other recent developments relating to court facilities.* Chapter  
12 10 of Title 8 also includes some provisions that make it mandatory to have a court  
13 facility in a particular location. For example, one section states that facilities for  
14 the Central Valley Municipal Court “shall be maintained in the Cities of  
15 Coalinga, Firebaugh, Fowler, Kerman, Kingsburg, Parlier, Selma, Reedley, and  
16 Sanger, and the communities of Caruthers and Riverdale; and in such other  
17 locations within the County of Fresno as are designated by the board of  
18 supervisors...”<sup>61</sup>

19 Requirements like these appear to be inconsistent with the more recently  
20 enacted Trial Court Facilities Act, which gives the judicial branch broad authority  
21 to determine court locations and specifies a process for the judicial branch to use  
22 in making such determinations. In particular, Section 70391 expressly gives the  
23 Judicial Council control over court facilities, while also specifying some  
24 constraints (such as requirements to consult or cooperate with trial courts,  
25 counties, or others about various matters).<sup>62</sup>

---

58. Section 73661. Chapter 10 of Title 8 contains many other provisions that conflict with or duplicate Section 69740. See, e.g., Sections 73396 (“... The court shall hold sessions at each facility as business requires. At the direction of the court, arraignment of criminal defendants who are in custody at the Kings County Jail facility shall be held in the court facility located in Hanford.”), 73732 (“... The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated by the board of supervisors.”).

59. Section 73784.10.

60. There are many other examples in Chapter 10 of Title 8. See, e.g., Sections 74916(a) (“Facilities for the court shall be maintained at the county seat and at court facilities provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors...”), 74962 (“Facilities for the court shall be maintained at or near the county seat and at court facilities provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors.”).

61. Section 73698.6. There are many other examples. See, e.g., Sections 73561 (facilities for the Monterey County Municipal Court “shall be maintained in the Cities of Salinas and Monterey and at court facilities provided elsewhere in accordance with law”), 74935.5 (“There shall be maintained in both the City of Gridley and the Town of Paradise branch court facilities ...”).

62. In key part, Section 70391 provides:

70391. The Judicial Council, as the policymaking body for the judicial branch, shall have the following responsibilities and authorities with regard to court facilities, in addition to any other responsibilities or authorities established by law:

(a) Exercise *full* responsibility, jurisdiction, control, and authority as an owner would have over trial court facilities the title of which is held by the state, including, but not limited to, the acquisition and development of facilities.

1 Other recent legislation on court facilities further confirms that the Legislature  
2 and the Governor have vested broad authority for such matters in the judiciary,  
3 while imposing procedural constraints to ensure that other voices are heard and  
4 taken into account.<sup>63</sup> That new approach apparently overrides the earlier statutes  
5 specifying precisely where court facilities must be located. Indeed, the Legislature  
6 and the Governor recently approved sales of court facilities in some places where  
7 a municipal courthouse is mandatory under provisions in Chapter 10 of Title 8.<sup>64</sup>

---

(b) Exercise *the full range* of policymaking authority over trial court facilities, including, but not limited to, planning, construction, acquisition, and operation, to the extent not expressly otherwise limited by law.

(c) *Dispose of surplus court facilities* following the transfer of responsibility under Article 3 (commencing with Section 70321), *subject to all of the following* ....

....  
(e) Establish policies, procedures, and guidelines for ensuring that the courts have adequate and sufficient facilities, including, but not limited to, facilities planning, acquisition, construction, design, operation, and maintenance.

(f) *Establish and consult with local project advisory groups on the construction of new trial court facilities*, including the trial court, the county, the local sheriff, state agencies, bar groups, including, but not limited to, the criminal defense bar, and members of the community. ....

(g) *Manage court facilities in consultation with the trial courts.*

(h) Allocate appropriated funds for court facilities maintenance and construction, subject to the other provisions of this chapter.

(i) Manage shared-use facilities to the extent required by the agreement under Section 70343.

(j) Prepare funding requests for court facility construction, repair, and maintenance.

(k) Implement the design, bid, award, and construction of all court construction projects, except as delegated to others.

(l) Provide for capital outlay projects that may be built with funds appropriated or otherwise available for these purposes as follows:

(1) Approve five-year and master plans for each district.

(2) Establish priorities for construction.

(3) *Recommend to the Governor and the Legislature the projects to be funded by the State Court Facilities Construction Fund.*

(4) *Submit the cost of projects proposed to be funded to the Department of Finance for inclusion in the Governor's Budget.*

(m) *In carrying out its responsibilities and authority under this section, the Judicial Council shall consult with the local court for:*

(1) Selecting and contracting with facility consultants.

(2) Preparing and reviewing architectural programs and designs for court facilities.

(3) Preparing strategic master and five-year capital facilities plans.

(4) Major maintenance of a facility.

(Emphasis added.)

63. For example, Section 68106 requires a trial court to give the public notice and an opportunity to submit comments before closing any courtroom. The section also requires advance notice to the Legislature. For further information on this legislation, see 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 41, § 22, 2011 Cal. Stat. ch. 687, § 1; 2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 720, § 13; Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 973 (June 21, 2011); Assembly Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 973 (April 12, 2011); Senate Rules Committee Analysis of SB 857 (Oct. 6, 2010), p. 2.

64. In particular,

- *Compare* Section 73396 (facilities for Kings County Municipal Court “shall be maintained in the Cities of ... Corcoran, Lemoore, and ... Avenal ....”) *with* <http://www.kings.courts.ca.gov> (Kings County Superior Court is located in Hanford). See also <https://www.lsi.org/kings-court-closures>; [http://hanfordsentinel.com/news/local/corcoran-avenal-courts-slated-to-close/article\\_dc484536-e22e-5604-84af-61fe2e186dd.html](http://hanfordsentinel.com/news/local/corcoran-avenal-courts-slated-to-close/article_dc484536-e22e-5604-84af-61fe2e186dd.html).

1 The Commission thus recommends that the typical articles in Chapter 10 of Title 8 (the  
2 articles pertaining to Butte, Fresno, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Kings, Marin, Mariposa,  
3 Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, Yolo, and Yuba Counties) be  
4 repealed.<sup>65</sup>

5 ***Variations That Also Warrant Revisions (Madera, Merced, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo***  
6 ***Counties; “General Provisions”; Section 24261)***

7 A few articles in Chapter 10 of Title 8 differ from the typical articles described above.  
8 Some of the atypical articles also appear to warrant revisions:

- 9 • *Madera County.* The article on Madera County is similar to the typical  
10 articles and suffers from some of the same flaws,<sup>66</sup> but it also includes a  
11 stand-alone section on transportation of prisoners by the Madera County  
12 sheriff.<sup>67</sup> To the best of the Commission’s knowledge, that section remains  
13 current and should be retained. The rest of the article should be repealed.<sup>68</sup>
- 14 • *Merced County.* The article on Merced County is similar to the typical  
15 articles and suffers from the same flaws,<sup>69</sup> but it also includes a section  
16 relating to the marshal of the Merced County Municipal Court.<sup>70</sup> There no  
17 longer is a marshal in Merced County,<sup>71</sup> so the whole article can be  
18 repealed.<sup>72</sup>

- 
- *Compare* Section 73698.6 (facilities for Central Valley Municipal Court District of Fresno County) with <http://www.fresno.courts.ca.gov/courthouses> (locations of Fresno County Superior Court). See also <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jul/23/local/la-me-court-cuts-20120723>; <http://abc30.com/archive/8755339>.

65. See proposed repeals of Sections 73390-73396, 73560-73561, 73660-73661, 73698-73698.6, 73730-73732, 73770-73771, 73783.1-73783.3, 73784-73784.10, 74640-74640.2, 74720-74724, 74760-74764, 74915-74916, 74934-74935.5, 74948-74950 & 74960-74962 & Comments *infra*.

66. See Sections 73750, 73756.

67. See Section 73758.

68. See proposed repeals of Sections 73750 & 73756 & Comments *infra*.

69. See Sections 73790, 73792.

70. See Section 73796.

71. See Section 26638.15; Merced County Ordinance No. 1687 (effective Jan. 15, 2003); Merced County Bd. of Supervisors, Minutes (Dec. 3, 2002), pp. 4, 16; see also Section 69921.5. To make certain that repealing Section 73796 would have no adverse effect on any former marshal, deputy marshal, or family member, the proposed legislation would include a savings clause. See proposed uncodified provision *infra*.

In contrast to Merced County, Shasta County still has a marshal and the article on Shasta County focuses entirely on the marshal. That article (Sections 74984-74988) should be retained.

The article on San Joaquin County (Sections 74820-74820.3) also focuses on court security, not court facilities. The Commission has addressed it in a tentative recommendation relating to marshals. See Tentative Recommendation on *Trial Court Restructuring Clean-Up: Obsolete References to Marshals* (April 2019).

72. See proposed repeal of Sections 73790-73796 & Comments *infra*.

- 1 • *North County Judicial District (San Diego County)*. The article on the North  
2 County Judicial District in San Diego County is similar to the typical  
3 articles and suffers from the same flaws,<sup>73</sup> but it also includes a section on  
4 judicial benefits,<sup>74</sup> which pertains to the municipal court district identified in  
5 the introductory section.<sup>75</sup> Those two sections should be retained, because  
6 the Commission has deferred work on the intersection of trial court  
7 restructuring and judicial benefits.<sup>76</sup> The other section should be repealed.<sup>77</sup>
- 8 • *San Luis Obispo*. The article on San Luis Obispo County consists of a single  
9 section, which pertains to the local superior court (not a municipal court).<sup>78</sup>  
10 Like the typical articles, that section specifies a court location<sup>79</sup> and  
11 addresses court sessions.<sup>80</sup> The article thus appears to be obsolete for the  
12 reasons discussed above.<sup>81</sup>
- 13 • *General Provisions (Section 73301)*. Article 1 is entitled “General  
14 Provisions” and consists of a single provision (Section 73301), which was  
15 enacted in 1953,<sup>82</sup> just after the California Constitution was amended to  
16 replace various types of inferior courts with municipal and justice courts.<sup>83</sup>  
17 The section was intended to protect employees of superseded courts who  
18 succeeded to positions in newly created municipal courts. In all likelihood,  
19 it is obsolete. It pertains to employees of courts that were long ago  
20 superseded by municipal courts, which in turn were eliminated through trial  
21 court unification around the turn of the century. The Commission thus

---

73. See Sections 73950, 73956. Unlike comparable sections in the typical articles, Section 73956 contains some material relating to the local marshal. That material does not concern employment terms and it is obsolete because San Diego County no longer has any marshals.

74. See Section 73952.

75. The introductory section (Section 73950) says: “This article applies to the Municipal Court of the North County Judicial District.”

76. Similarly, the articles on the El Cajon Judicial District (Sections 73640-73642), Riverside County (Sections 74130-74145), the South Bay Judicial District (Sections 74740-74742), and the San Diego Judicial District (Sections 74340-74342) should be retained. Each of those articles focuses solely on judicial benefits.

77. See proposed repeal of Section 73956 *infra*.

78. See Section 74602.

79. The first sentence of Section 74602 states: “Facilities for the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court shall be maintained in the City of San Luis Obispo, and may be maintained at any other location within the county.”

80. The last three sentences of Section 74602 state:

74602.... The court may hold sessions at each facility, as business requires. At the direction of the presiding judge, any subordinate judicial officer may perform his or her duties at any court location. At the direction of the court, arraignment of criminal defendants who are in custody at the San Luis Obispo County Jail facility shall be held at that facility.

81. See *supra* notes 55-58 & 61-65 & accompanying text.

82. For the final 1953 version of Section 73301, see 1953 Cal. Stat. ch. 1623, § 1.

83. For background on this reform, see 2 B. Witkin, *California Procedure Courts* §§ 163-164, at 235-37 (5th ed. 2008).

1 recommends that Article 1 be repealed.<sup>84</sup> To make certain there would be no  
2 adverse effect on any former court employee or family member, the  
3 proposed legislation would include a savings clause.<sup>85</sup>

4 One other provision is worth mentioning here. Section 24261 is not located in Chapter  
5 10 of Title 8, but it is similar to some of the provisions in that chapter because it specifies  
6 a court location<sup>86</sup> and imposes requirements regarding court sessions.<sup>87</sup> Those aspects of  
7 the section are obsolete for the reasons explained above.<sup>88</sup>

8 The remainder of the section requires superior court judges to “establish rules ... for  
9 the dispatch of official business ...” That language is unnecessary, because another  
10 provision addresses the same subject more thoroughly.<sup>89</sup> Like much of the material in  
11 Chapter 10 of Title 8, Section 24261 appears to be ripe for repeal.<sup>90</sup>

### 12 **Other Court Facilities Statutes**

13 Aside from Chapter 10 of Title 8, the codes contain many other statutes relating to  
14 court facilities, some of which appear to need revisions to reflect trial court restructuring.  
15 The Commission’s proposed revisions fall into several groups (with some instances of  
16 overlap):

- 17 • Revisions relating to the Task Force on Court Facilities.
- 18 • Obsolete references to the municipal courts.
- 19 • Revisions necessitated by the transfer of responsibility for trial court  
20 operations and facilities.
- 21 • Updates due to changes in the status of Courthouse Construction Funds or  
22 similar matters.

23 The Commission discusses each group of proposed reforms in the order listed. The  
24 Commission then turns to the possibility of updating the Trial Court Facilities Act itself.

---

84. See proposed repeal of Sections 73301-73301 *infra*.

85. See proposed uncodified provision *infra*. This savings clause would be identical to the savings clause in the big trial court restructuring bill that was enacted in 2002 on the Commission’s recommendation. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784, § 622; see also *TCR: Part I, supra* note 25, at 20, 566.

86. The first clause states that “judges of the superior court shall have chambers at the county seat ....”

87. Section 24261 says that superior court rules shall “establish ... hours for the dispatch of official business” and “must require that the courts shall be open for the transaction of judicial business on days on which an election is held throughout the State where county offices are open for the transaction of county business during such election days pursuant to ordinance.”

88. See *supra* notes 55-58 & 61-65 & accompanying text.

89. See Section 68070.

90. See proposed repeal of Section 24261 & Comment *infra*.

1 **Completion of Report by the Task Force on Court Facilities (Sections 77650-77655; Section**  
 2 **77201.3)**

3 As previously discussed, the Task Force on Court Facilities completed its assigned  
 4 work long ago.<sup>91</sup> Consequently, the article governing it (Sections 77650-77655) is largely  
 5 obsolete. The Commission recommends repealing all but one section in the article.<sup>92</sup>

6 The remaining section (Section 77655) makes the findings of the task force  
 7 inadmissible in “any action brought by trial courts to compel a county to provide  
 8 facilities that the trial court contends are necessary and suitable.” In case that section  
 9 might still have some utility, the Commission recommends amending it to read clearly as  
 10 a stand-alone section.<sup>93</sup>

11 The proposed amendment would also update a cross-reference to a provision that was  
 12 moved to the Trial Court Facilities Act in 2002.<sup>94</sup> A similar correction should be made in  
 13 Section 77201.3, which relates to county remittances (not to the Task Force on Court  
 14 Facilities).<sup>95</sup>

15 **Obsolete References to Municipal Courts (Gov’t Code §§ 25351.3, 25560.4, 71002, 71383,**  
 16 **76219)**

17 In addition to the obsolete municipal court references already discussed, the  
 18 Commission determined that several other court facility statutes contain municipal court  
 19 references that are obsolete. Those statutes are discussed below.

- 20 • *Section 25351.3.* Among other things, subdivision (a) of Section 25351.3  
 21 permits a board of supervisors to “[a]cquire land for and construct, lease,  
 22 sublease, build, furnish, refurnish, or repair buildings for *municipal* or  
 23 superior courts ....”<sup>96</sup> Similarly, subdivision (c) says that “leases for  
 24 *municipal* or superior courts ... may be entered into without advertising for  
 25 bids ....”<sup>97</sup> Because municipal courts no longer exist, Section 25351.3  
 26 should be amended to delete its references to such courts. In addition,  
 27 subdivision (e) should be revised to reflect that counties and their boards of  
 28 supervisors are no longer required to “provide adequate quarters for  
 29 courts.”<sup>98</sup>

---

91. See *supra* notes 13-19 & accompanying text.

92. See proposed repeals of Sections 77650, 77651, 77652, 77653 & 77654 & Comments *infra*.

93. See proposed amendment of Section 77655 & Comment *infra*.

94. See *id.* Section 77655 cross-refers to “Section 68073,” which no longer exists. When the Trial Court Facilities Act was enacted, former Section 68073 was repealed and renumbered as Section 70311. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 3; see also Section 70311(e).

95. See proposed amendment of Section 77201.3 & Comment *infra*. Like Sections 77655 and 77201.3, Section 77201 cross-refers to “Section 68073.” As specified in Section 77200(a), however, Section 77201 only applied until June 30, 1998. Section 68073 was not renumbered until much later, so it appears unnecessary and inappropriate to amend Section 77201 to reflect the renumbering of Section 68073.

96. Emphasis added.

97. Emphasis added.

98. See proposed amendment of Section 25351.3 & Comment *infra*.

- 1 • *Section 25560.4.* Under specified circumstances, Section 25560.4 permits a  
2 board of supervisors to dedicate unused parkland “for the erection and  
3 maintenance of one or more buildings to house any *municipal* or superior  
4 court ...”<sup>99</sup> This municipal court reference is obsolete and should be  
5 deleted.<sup>100</sup>
- 6 • *Sections 71002 and 71383.* Section 71002 says that the board of supervisors  
7 of each county is responsible for providing facilities, supplies, and  
8 equipment for the local municipal court(s). The section is obsolete because  
9 municipal courts no longer exist and counties are no longer responsible for  
10 providing court facilities or funding court operations. Other provisions  
11 contain comparable language pertaining to the superior courts,<sup>101</sup> so Section  
12 71002 can simply be repealed.<sup>102</sup> There is no need to amend it to apply to  
13 the superior courts instead of the municipal courts. Section 71383 should  
14 also be repealed, because it merely defines a term for purposes of Section  
15 71002.<sup>103</sup>

16 ***Transfer of Responsibility for Trial Court Operations and Facilities (Code Civ. Proc. § 216;***  
17 ***Gov’t Code §§ 14672.5, 68073.5, 69504)***

18 Many of the revisions discussed above relate to the transfer of responsibility for trial  
19 court operations and facilities from the counties to the state. In addition to those  
20 revisions, the Commission proposes to revise some other court facility statutes for similar  
21 reasons.

22 In particular, Code of Civil Procedure Section 216 requires the board of supervisors of  
23 each county to provide jury deliberation rooms, which “which shall have suitable  
24 furnishings, equipment, and supplies, and shall also have restroom accommodations for  
25 male and female jurors.” Because counties are no longer responsible for trial court  
26 operations and facilities, the Commission recommends amending the section to require  
27 each court to provide jury deliberation rooms, instead of the board of supervisors.<sup>104</sup>

28 Similarly, Section 69504 says that the “board of supervisors of each county shall  
29 purchase and provide for the installation of the Flag of the United States and the Bear  
30 Flag of California in each superior courtroom in the county.” The Commission proposes

---

99. Emphasis added.

100. See proposed amendment of Section 25560.4 & Comment *infra*.

101. See Sections 70301(d), 70311-70312.

102. See proposed repeal of Section 71002 & Comment *infra*.

103. See proposed repeal of Section 71383 & Comment *infra*. The Commission searched the codes to determine whether any conforming revisions would be necessary to reflect the repeal of Section 71383. The only section that cross-refers to Section 71383 is Penal Code Section 1463.5, which mentions “the audit performed pursuant to Section 71383 of the Government Code.” The current version of Section 71383 has nothing to do with audits (it defines “board of supervisors”), so the cross-reference in Penal Code Section 1463.5 appears to be incorrect. Determining how to fix it would entail research unrelated to court facilities. The Commission plans to address the matter in a later study.

104. See proposed amendment of Code Civ. Proc. § 216 & Comment *infra*.

1 to replace “board of supervisors” with “superior court,” to reflect the transfer of  
2 responsibilities under the Trial Court Funding Act.<sup>105</sup>

3 The following county-specific statutes also require revisions to reflect the shift in  
4 responsibilities for trial court operations and facilities:

- 5 • *Los Angeles County (and possibly Orange and Riverside Counties)*. Under  
6 Section 68073.5, the *board of supervisors* in a county “having a population  
7 of 3,000,000 or more” may give court personnel the same access to dining  
8 and parking facilities in or adjacent to *court* buildings in the county that  
9 county personnel receive in or adjacent to *other county* buildings.  
10 Historically, Los Angeles was the only county with a population over  
11 3,000,000; Orange and Riverside Counties would also qualify if the statute  
12 refers to current population figures instead of the historical figures that are  
13 used to classify the counties.<sup>106</sup> In any case, Section 68073.5 appears to be  
14 obsolete due to the transfers of court buildings from the counties to the state.  
15 The Commission recommends that it be repealed.<sup>107</sup>
- 16 • *Sacramento County*. Under specified circumstances, Section 14672.5  
17 authorizes the state to lease a particular parcel of property to the City of  
18 Folsom (located in Sacramento County) for up to fifty years for a “police  
19 station, *courthouse*, or city hall.<sup>108</sup> The property in question is not currently  
20 being leased to the City of Folsom for a courthouse, and such a lease would  
21 not seem to be necessary for the future either. Under the Trial Court  
22 Facilities Act, the state is responsible for court facilities, not the counties,  
23 much less the City of Folsom. Accordingly, Section 14672.5 should be  
24 amended to delete the reference to a courthouse.<sup>109</sup>

25 A special set of statutes that warrant reevaluation in light of the transfer of  
26 responsibility for court operations and facilities is comprised of the ones relating to  
27 Courthouse Construction Funds. Those statutes are discussed below.

28 ***Status of Courthouse Construction Funds and Related Matters (Gov’t Code §§ 6250, 70624,***  
29 ***76000, 76223, 76225)***

30 As authorized by statute,<sup>110</sup> many counties established Courthouse Construction Funds  
31 to finance construction of court facilities. Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, any  
32 amount in a county’s Courthouse Construction Fund must be transferred to the state<sup>111</sup> at  
33 the *later* of the following dates:

---

105. See proposed amendment of Section 69504 & Comment *infra*.

106. Compare Sections 28020 & 28022 with [http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-1/documents/E-1\\_2018PressRelease.pdf](http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-1/documents/E-1_2018PressRelease.pdf).

107. See proposed repeal of Section 68073.5 & Comment *infra*.

108. Emphasis added.

109. See proposed amendment of Section 14672.5 & Comment *infra*.

110. See Section 76100.

111. Specifically, counties are supposed to transfer such amounts to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund.

1 (1) The date of the last transfer of responsibility for court facilities from the  
2 county to the Judicial Council or December 31, 2009, whichever is earlier.

3 (2) The date of the final payment of the bonded indebtedness for any court  
4 facility that is paid from that fund is retired.<sup>112</sup>

5 Because all of the court facilities transfers are complete and it is well past December  
6 31, 2009, the trigger for transferring a Courthouse Construction Fund is now when a  
7 county makes “the final payment of the bonded indebtedness for any court facility that is  
8 paid from that fund ...” That date will vary from county to county: Some counties still  
9 have a Courthouse Construction Fund; others do not.<sup>113</sup>

10 The Commission reviewed the statutes referring to Courthouse Construction Funds to  
11 determine whether any of them need revisions to reflect (1) transfer of such a fund to the  
12 state or (2) other aspects of trial court restructuring. A number of other such statutes  
13 appear to warrant attention.

14 One of those statutes, Section 76000, applies to all counties. Subdivision (e) of that  
15 section says that a particular penalty “shall be reduced in each county by the additional  
16 penalty amount assessed by the county for the local courthouse construction fund  
17 established by Section 76100 as of January 1, 1998, *when the money in that fund is*  
18 *transferred to the state under Section 70402.*”<sup>114</sup> The same provision also includes a table  
19 specifying how much each county shall charge, which was last updated in 2010.<sup>115</sup> That  
20 table appears to need updating, because some Courthouse Construction Funds seem to  
21 have been transferred to the state since 2010.<sup>116</sup> Despite broadly circulating a tentative  
22 recommendation seeking input on that point, the Commission does not yet have sufficient  
23 information to determine how to update the table. Nonetheless, the Commission included  
24 a proposed amendment of that section in this recommendation, because there is an  
25 incorrect cross-reference in it.<sup>117</sup>

26 The Commission also found some county-specific provisions that refer to a Courthouse  
27 Construction Fund and seem to require revisions to reflect trial court restructuring. Those  
28 provisions are as follows:

---

112. Section 70402(a) (emphasis added).

113. See generally Judicial Council of California, *Receipts and Expenditures from Local Courthouse Construction Funds: Report to the Budget and Fiscal Committees of the Legislature* (12/18/17) (hereafter, “*CCF Report*”), Attachment 12. A copy of this report is attached to the First Supplement to Commission Staff Memorandum 2018-31.

The most recent data in the report is for the period from 7/1/15 to 6/30/16. The report shows that many Courthouse Construction Funds still existed at the end of that period. That remains true now.

114. Emphasis added.

115. See 2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 720, § 26.

116. In fiscal year 2013-2014, for instance, Butte and Yuba counties reportedly paid off the bonded indebtedness for court facilities funded through their Courthouse Construction Funds. See *CCF Report*, *supra* note 113, at Attachment 10, n.3. Presumably, those counties thereafter transferred the balance in their Courthouse Construction Funds to the state, as required by Section 70402(a). That development would seem to require an adjustment of the amounts for those counties in the table in Section 76000(e).

117. See proposed amendment of Section 76000 & Comment *infra*.

- 1 • *Merced County*. Section 76225 says that if Merced County does not transfer  
2 certain court facilities to the state on or before April 1, 2007, it must pay the  
3 state back for the construction funds used for those facilities. Merced  
4 County met the specified deadline, so the section should be repealed.<sup>118</sup>  
5 Along similar lines, Section 76223(e) should be revised to reflect that the  
6 event it describes as a contingency (enactment of legislation that transfers  
7 responsibility for court facilities to the state and also permits transfer of  
8 associated bonded indebtedness and revenue sources) has actually  
9 occurred.<sup>119</sup>
- 10 • *San Bernardino County*. Section 70624 authorizes a filing fee surcharge in  
11 San Bernardino County to supplement that county’s Courthouse  
12 Construction Fund. Collection of that surcharge “shall terminate upon  
13 repayment of the amortized costs incurred, or 30 years from the sale of the  
14 bond, whichever occurs first.”<sup>120</sup> Reportedly, San Bernardino County  
15 recently paid off the debt for the courthouse construction projects in  
16 question. That development might mean that (1) the surcharge under Section  
17 70624 should cease pursuant to the express terms of that section, (2) San  
18 Bernardino County should transfer the remainder of its Courthouse  
19 Construction Fund to the state pursuant to Section 70402, and (3) upon  
20 completion of that transfer, Section 70624 would be ripe for repeal.  
21 Apparently, however, there is an unresolved issue regarding this matter and  
22 there are ongoing discussions about it between the county and the Judicial  
23 Council. To allow for resolution of that issue while ensuring that Section  
24 70624 is eventually repealed, the Commission proposes to add a five-year  
25 sunset clause to the section.<sup>121</sup>
- 26 • *San Diego County*. Another statute that refers to a Courthouse Construction  
27 Fund is Section 6250,<sup>122</sup> which permits the San Diego City Council and the  
28 Board of Supervisors of San Diego County to create, by joint powers  
29 agreement, a redevelopment agency to be known as the “San Diego  
30 Courthouse, Jail, and Related Facilities Development Agency.” The  
31 section’s reference to a Courthouse Construction Fund is not out-of-date,  
32 because San Diego County apparently still has such a fund.<sup>123</sup> However, the  
33 section is obsolete for other reasons: (1) the contemplated new agency does  
34 not appear to have been created and if it were created, it would have the  
35 powers and duties of a redevelopment agency, but redevelopment agencies  
36 no longer exist, and (2) the section allocates substantial control over  
37 courthouse planning and construction to the city, county, and contemplated  
38 agency, but that is inconsistent with the broad allocation of such power to

---

118. See proposed repeal of Section 76225 & Comment *infra*.

119. See proposed amendment of Section 76223 & Comment *infra*.

120. Section 70624(b).

121. See proposed amendment of Section 70624 & Comment *infra*.

122. See Section 6250(d).

123. See *CCF Report*, *supra* note 113, at Attachment 12.

1 the judicial branch in the Trial Court Facilities Act.<sup>124</sup> The Commission thus  
2 recommends that Section 6250 be repealed.<sup>125</sup>

3 ***Reexamination of the Trial Court Facilities Act (Gov't Code §§ 70301-70508)***

4 In addition to examining the statutes discussed above, the Commission considered the  
5 possibility of updating the Trial Court Facilities Act to reflect that some of the events it  
6 requires (such as the court facilities transfers) have already occurred. On close  
7 examination, however, the Commission realized that the obsolete material is closely  
8 entangled with statutory material that remains current. The Commission therefore  
9 concluded that it would be unduly complicated and burdensome to update the Act at this  
10 time.<sup>126</sup>

11 The chapter containing the Trial Court Facilities Act also contains a separately-enacted  
12 section that created a Task Force on County Law Libraries.<sup>127</sup> That section (Section  
13 70394) should be repealed because the task force report was due long ago and the task  
14 force no longer exists.<sup>128</sup>

15 Although the task force was created to find a stable funding source for law libraries,  
16 concerns regarding law library funding persist.<sup>129</sup> The Commission is not authorized to  
17 study that matter and does not propose to address it here.

---

124. See proposed repeal of Section 6250 & Comment *infra*.

125. See 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 5 (1st Ex. Sess.); California Redevelopment Ass'n v. Matosantos, 53 Cal. 4th 241, 267 P.3d 580, 135 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683 (2011).

126. See Commission Staff Memorandum 2018-63; Minutes (Dec. 2018), p. 5. The Commission also took a look at the San Joaquin County Regional Justice Facility Financing Act (Sections 26290-26293.4), the Orange County Regional Justice Facilities Act (Sections 26295-26298.58), and the County Regional Justice Facilities Financing Act (Sections 26299.000-26299.083). The Commission will address those Acts separately, not in this tentative recommendation.

127. Section 70394 was enacted as 2003 Cal. Stat. ch. 394, §§ 1, 2.

128. Under Section 70394, the task force report was due “on or before January 1, 2005.”

129. See Letter from Sandra Levin (Council of California County Law Librarians) to the Commission (Nov. 30, 2018) (attached to First Supplement to Commission Staff Memorandum 2018-63, Exhibit pp. 1-4).



## Contents

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE .....	23
§ 216 (amended). Jury deliberation rooms .....	23
GOVERNMENT CODE .....	23
§ 6520 (repealed). San Diego Courthouse, Jail, and Related Facilities Development Agency.....	23
§ 14672.5 (amended). Lease of unimproved property to City of Folsom for police station, courthouse, or city hall .....	24
§ 24261 (repealed). Superior court chambers, rules, and hours of operation.....	24
§ 25351.3 (amended). Acquisition, rental, improvement, furnishing, and repair of real property and facilities.....	25
§ 25560.4 (amended). Dedication of unused parkland for court facility .....	26
§ 68073.5 (repealed). Dining and parking facilities in or adjacent to court building in county with population over three million .....	27
§ 69504 (amended). Flags for courtrooms.....	27
§ 70394 (repealed). Task Force on County Law Libraries .....	27
§ 70624 (amended). Surcharge in San Bernardino County .....	28
§ 71002 (repealed). Municipal court facilities, supplies, and equipment .....	29
§ 71383 (repealed). “Board of supervisors” .....	29
Heading of Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 73301) (amended).....	29
§§ 73301-73301 (repealed). General provisions.....	30
§§ 73390-73396 (repealed). Kings County .....	30
§§ 73560-73561 (repealed). Monterey County.....	31
§§ 73660-73661 (repealed). Humboldt County .....	31
§§ 73698-73698.6 (repealed). Fresno County .....	31
§§ 73730-73732 (repealed). Imperial County .....	32
§ 73750 (repealed). Madera County Municipal Court District .....	32
§ 73756 (repealed). Court facilities and sessions .....	33
§§ 73770-73771 (repealed). Marin County .....	33
§§ 73783.1-73783.3 (repealed). Mariposa County .....	34
§§ 73784-73784.10 (repealed). Mendocino County .....	34
§§ 73790-73796 (repealed). Merced County.....	34
§ 73956 (repealed). Court facilities and sessions .....	35
§§ 74602-74602 (repealed). San Luis Obispo County .....	36
§§ 74640-74640.2 (repealed). Santa Barbara County.....	36
§§ 74720-74724 (repealed). Siskiyou County .....	37
§§ 74760-74764 (repealed). Glenn County .....	37
§§ 74915-74916 (repealed). Yuba County .....	38
§§ 74934-74935.5 (repealed). Butte County .....	38
§§ 74948-74950 (repealed). Napa County .....	39
§§ 74960-74962 (repealed). Yolo County.....	39
§ 76000 (amended). Added penalties.....	40
§ 76223 (amended). Construction of court facilities in Merced County .....	42
§ 76225 (repealed). Reimbursement of court construction funds in Merced County if transfers do not occur on time .....	42
§ 77201.3 (amended). County remittances commencing on July 1, 2006 .....	43
§ 77650 (repealed). Task Force on Court Facilities.....	47
§ 77651 (repealed). Composition of task force .....	47
§ 77652 (repealed). Staff support for task force and guidelines for procedures and practices.....	48
§ 77653 (repealed). Duties of task force .....	48
§ 77654 (repealed). Timeline for task force .....	49
§ 77655 (amended). Inadmissibility of task force findings .....	50
UNCODIFIED .....	50
Uncodified (added). Savings clause — rights and benefits.....	50



## PROPOSED LEGISLATION

### CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

1  
2 **§ 216 (amended). Jury deliberation rooms**

3 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 216 of the Code of Civil Procedure is amended to read:

4 216. (a) At each court facility where jury cases are heard, the ~~board of supervisors~~  
5 court shall provide a deliberation room or rooms for use of jurors when they have retired  
6 for deliberation. The deliberation rooms shall be designed to minimize unwarranted  
7 intrusions by other persons in the court facility, shall have suitable furnishings,  
8 equipment, and supplies, and shall also have restroom accommodations for male and  
9 female jurors.

10 ~~(b) If the board of supervisors neglects to provide the facilities required by this section,~~  
11 ~~the court may order the sheriff or marshal to do so, and the expenses incurred in carrying~~  
12 ~~the order into effect, when certified by the court, are a county charge.~~

13 ~~(c)~~ (b) Unless authorized by the jury commissioner, jury assembly facilities shall be  
14 restricted to use by jurors and jury commissioner staff.

15 **Comment.** Section 216 is amended to reflect enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of  
16 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations”  
17 defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312  
18 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility &  
19 authority for court facilities).

### GOVERNMENT CODE

20  
21 **§ 6520 (repealed). San Diego Courthouse, Jail, and Related Facilities Development Agency**

22 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 6520 of the Government Code is repealed.

23 ~~6520. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Supervisors of San~~  
24 ~~Diego County and the City Council of the City of San Diego may create by joint powers~~  
25 ~~agreement, the San Diego Courthouse, Jail, and Related Facilities Development Agency,~~  
26 ~~hereinafter referred to as “the agency,” which shall have all the powers and duties of a~~  
27 ~~redevelopment agency pursuant to Part 1 (commencing with Section 33000) of Division~~  
28 ~~24 of the Health and Safety Code as well as all the powers of a joint powers agency~~  
29 ~~pursuant to this chapter, with respect to the acquisition, construction, improvement,~~  
30 ~~financing, and operation of a combined courthouse-criminal justice facility, including a~~  
31 ~~parking garage, and other related improvements, hereinafter referred to as “the facility.”~~

32 ~~(b) The agency shall be governed by a board of directors composed of one city council~~  
33 ~~member and one citizen designated by the San Diego City Council; one supervisor and~~  
34 ~~one citizen designated by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors; two citizens~~  
35 ~~appointed by the presiding judge of the superior court effective during his or her term of~~  
36 ~~presidenc; the Sheriff of San Diego County; the president or designee of the San Diego~~

1 ~~County Bar Association; and one citizen designated by the District Attorney of San~~  
2 ~~Diego County; all of whom shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing power and~~  
3 ~~without further compensation.~~

4 ~~(c) The City of San Diego and the County of San Diego shall each have the power of~~  
5 ~~nonconcurrency over any action taken by the board of directors, provided that a motion~~  
6 ~~for reconsideration is made by a member of the board of directors immediately following~~  
7 ~~the vote of the board of directors approving such action, and further provided that the~~  
8 ~~city council or the board of supervisors votes to nullify such action, by a majority vote of~~  
9 ~~its membership, within 30 days.~~

10 ~~(d) The county may transfer to the agency county funds in either a Courthouse~~  
11 ~~Temporary Construction Fund or a County Criminal Justice Facility Temporary~~  
12 ~~Construction Fund, or both, to be expended for purposes of the facility.~~

13 ~~(e) In addition to those funds, (1) the agency's governing body may allot up to 15~~  
14 ~~percent of the fines and forfeitures received by the City of San Diego pursuant to Section~~  
15 ~~1463 of the Penal Code from the service area of the downtown courts, as defined by the~~  
16 ~~agency, for expenditure by the agency for the purposes specified in subdivision (a); (2)~~  
17 ~~the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego may allot to the agency any state or~~  
18 ~~federal funds received for purposes of the facility; and (3) the agency may expend any~~  
19 ~~rent, parking fees, or taxes received on leasehold interests in the facility, for the purposes~~  
20 ~~specified in subdivision (a).~~

21 **Comment.** Section 6520 is repealed to reflect:

22 (1) The enactment of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act, 1997 Cal. Stat. ch. 850  
23 (see generally Sections 77000-77655) and the related Trial Court Facilities Act, 2002 Cal. Stat.  
24 ch. 1082 (see generally Sections 70301-70508).

25 (2) The elimination of redevelopment agencies. See 2012 Cal. Stat. ch. 5 (1st Ex. Sess.);  
26 California Redevelopment Ass'n v. Matosantos, 53 Cal. 4th 241, 267 P.3d 580, 135 Cal. Rptr. 3d  
27 683 (2011).

28 **§ 14672.5 (amended). Lease of unimproved property to City of Folsom for police station,**  
29 **courthouse, or city hall**

30 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 14672.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

31 14672.5. Notwithstanding Section 14670, the Director of General Services, with the  
32 consent of the Department of Corrections, may lease to the City of Folsom a parcel of  
33 approximately five acres of unimproved real property situated in the County of  
34 Sacramento within Rancho Rio de Los Americanos for a period not to exceed 50 years  
35 for a police station, ~~courthouse~~, or city hall.

36 **Comment.** Section 14672.5 is amended to reflect the enactment of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial  
37 Court Funding Act, 1997 Cal. Stat. ch. 850 (see generally Sections 77000-77655) and the related  
38 Trial Court Facilities Act, 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082 (see generally Sections 70301-70508).

39 **§ 24261 (repealed). Superior court chambers, rules, and hours of operation**

40 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 24261 of the Government Code is repealed.

41 ~~24261. The judges of the superior court shall have chambers at the county seat and~~  
42 ~~establish rules and hours for the dispatch of official business; provided that such rules~~

1 ~~must require that the courts shall be open for the transaction of judicial business on days~~  
2 ~~on which an election is held throughout the State where county offices are open for the~~  
3 ~~transaction of county business during such election days pursuant to ordinance.~~

4 **Comment.** Section 24261 is repealed to reflect:

5 (1) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
6 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
7 operations). See also Sections 68070 (court rules), 70311-70312 (responsibility for court  
8 operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

9 (2) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
10 sessions).

11 **§ 25351.3 (amended). Acquisition, rental, improvement, furnishing, and repair of real**  
12 **property and facilities**

13 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 25351.3 of the Government Code is amended to read:

14 25351.3. In addition to its other powers and duties, the board of supervisors may do  
15 any or all of the following:

16 (a) Acquire land for and construct, lease, sublease, build, furnish, refurnish, or repair  
17 buildings for ~~municipal~~ or superior courts and for convention and exhibition halls, trade  
18 and industrial centers, auditoriums, opera houses, music halls and centers, motion picture  
19 and television museums, and related facilities used for public assembly purposes for the  
20 use, benefit and enjoyment of the public, including offstreet parking places for motor  
21 vehicles, ways of ingress and egress, and any other facilities and improvements necessary  
22 or convenient for their use.

23 (b) Acquire land and construct buildings, structures and facilities thereon, in whole or  
24 in part, with county funds or it may, by contract or lease with any nonprofit association  
25 or corporation, provide for the acquisition of land or the construction of buildings,  
26 structures and facilities, or all or any part thereof, for public assembly purposes, upon the  
27 terms the board may determine.

28 (c) Lease, pursuant to Section 25371, any real property owned by the county and  
29 available for public assembly purposes to any person, firm, corporation, or nonprofit  
30 association or corporation for public assembly purposes, with the person, firm,  
31 corporation, or nonprofit association or corporation to lease the real property, as  
32 improved, back to the county for use for the purposes stated in the lease. Any lease  
33 authorized by the board under this subdivision, except leases for ~~municipal~~ or superior  
34 courts, which may be entered into without advertising for bids, shall be awarded to the  
35 lowest responsible bidder after public competitive bidding conducted in the manner  
36 determined by the board. Notice inviting bids shall be published pursuant to Section 6066  
37 in a newspaper as the board may direct.

38 (d) Enter into a lease or sublease, without advertising for bids therefor, of buildings,  
39 structures, and facilities or any of them with any nonprofit association or corporation  
40 which agrees to use the buildings, structures, and facilities so leased to it for the public  
41 assembly purposes for which they were or are to be built; or contract, without  
42 advertising, for bids with any nonprofit association or corporation for the maintenance,  
43 operation, and management of the buildings, structures, and facilities, or any part thereof

1 used for public assembly purposes, including the scheduling and promotion of events  
2 therein, for a specified term, not to exceed 40 years, upon terms and conditions as may be  
3 agreed upon. The leases, subleases, or contracts shall provide that, at least annually, there  
4 shall be paid to the county the net revenue, if any, from the operation and use of the  
5 facilities, remaining after the payment of expenses and costs, if any, for maintenance,  
6 operation or management, interest, and principal payments upon loans to the nonprofit  
7 corporation or association for purposes of maintenance, operation, or management, and  
8 any other expenses, and after providing maintenance and operation reserves. The lease,  
9 sublease, or contract shall also provide that, upon its expiration, all of the assets of the  
10 nonprofit association or corporation after payment or discharge of its indebtedness and  
11 liabilities shall be transferred to the county.

12 (e) If the county has a population in excess of 4,000,000, without advertising for bids  
13 therefor, grant any real property owned by the county, or lease, for a term not to exceed  
14 99 years, any real property owned by the county, to any city, district, or other public  
15 entity for any of the above public assembly purposes, without consideration, except the  
16 agreement of the grantee or lessee to use the real property for the public assembly  
17 purposes specified, and upon terms and conditions which may be agreed upon by the  
18 board and the grantee or lessee.

19 The amendment to this section enacted by Chapter 755 of the Statutes of 1963 shall not  
20 be construed to ~~affect or modify the~~ have affected or modified the then-existing duty of  
21 any county or board of supervisors to provide adequate quarters for ~~courts but is~~ courts.  
22 That amendment was intended to provide an alternative method of financing the  
23 acquisition of property and buildings for use for courthouse purposes.

24 **Comment.** Section 25351.3 is amended to reflect:

25 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts pursuant to former Section 5(e) of Article  
26 VI of the California Constitution.

27 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
28 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
29 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
30 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

31 **§ 25560.4 (amended). Dedication of unused parkland for court facility**

32 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 25560.4 of the Government Code is amended to read:

33 25560.4. The board of supervisors of any county may, by a four-fifths vote of the  
34 members, use or dedicate any portion of any land acquired by the county by means of  
35 special assessment proceedings for park purposes, for the erection and maintenance of  
36 one or more buildings to house ~~any municipal or a~~ a superior court, or one or more  
37 departments or divisions ~~of any one or more of such courts~~ thereof, if the portion of the  
38 land to be so used or dedicated has not been used by the public for park purposes for a  
39 period of more than 10 years.

40 **Comment.** Section 25560.4 is amended to reflect unification of the municipal and superior  
41 courts pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution.

1 **§ 68073.5 (repealed). Dining and parking facilities in or adjacent to court building in**  
2 **county with population over three million**

3 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 68073.5 of the Government Code is repealed.

4 ~~68073.5. In any county having a population of 3,000,000 or more, the board of~~  
5 ~~supervisors may, with respect to any dining facility, or garage or other vehicular parking~~  
6 ~~facility, in or adjacent to the county courthouse and other court buildings in said county,~~  
7 ~~provide the courts occupying such buildings and the judges, officers of the court, attachés~~  
8 ~~and jurors quartered therein, with the same accommodations as to use, access, occupancy~~  
9 ~~and, excepting jurors, with the same participation in the operational administration~~  
10 ~~thereof, as are furnished, made available to, or enjoyed by the departments, officers and~~  
11 ~~employees of the county with respect to similar facilities in or adjacent to other county~~  
12 ~~buildings.~~

13 **Comment.** Section 68073.5 is repealed to reflect enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of  
14 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations”  
15 defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312  
16 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (judicial branch responsibility &  
17 authority for court facilities).

18 **§ 69504 (amended). Flags for courtrooms**

19 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 69504 of the Government Code is amended to read:

20 69504. The ~~board of supervisors~~ superior court of each county shall purchase and  
21 provide for the installation of the Flag of the United States and the Bear Flag of  
22 California in each superior courtroom in the county.

23 **Comment.** Section 69504 is amended to reflect enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of  
24 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 68073.1 (“The court shall  
25 assume responsibility for any ... equipment for which is title is transferred to the court pursuant  
26 to this section, including ... replacement of such ... equipment.”); 77003 (“court operations”  
27 defined), 68085 (purposes of Trial Court Trust Fund include funding of trial court operations);  
28 77200 (state funding of trial court operations); Cal. R. Ct. 10.810, Function 10 (“equipment ...  
29 and furnishings”). See also Sections 68507 (Secretary of Judicial Council to purchase and  
30 provide for installation of flags in appellate courts); 70311-70312 (responsibility for court  
31 operations & facilities), 70391 (judicial branch responsibility & authority for court facilities).

32 **§ 70394 (repealed). Task Force on County Law Libraries**

33 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 70394 of the Government Code is repealed.

34 ~~70394. (a) The Judicial Council shall establish a task force on county law libraries. The~~  
35 ~~task force is charged with identifying the needs related to county law library operations~~  
36 ~~and facilities, and identifying and making recommendations for funding county law~~  
37 ~~library operations, facility improvements, and expansion.~~

38 ~~(b) The task force shall consist of three representatives from the judicial branch of~~  
39 ~~government, as selected by the Administrative Director of the Courts, three~~  
40 ~~representatives of the counties, as selected by the California State Association of~~  
41 ~~Counties, and three county law library administrators, as selected by the Council of~~  
42 ~~California County Law Librarians. The Administrative Director of the Courts shall~~  
43 ~~designate one of these representatives as chairperson of the task force.~~

1 ~~(e) The Administrative Office of the Courts shall provide staff support for the task~~  
2 ~~force and shall develop guidelines for procedures and practices for the task force.~~

3 ~~(d) The duties of the task force shall include all of the following:~~

4 ~~(1) Review the state of existing county law libraries.~~

5 ~~(2) Examine existing standards for county law library operations.~~

6 ~~(3) Document the funding mechanisms currently available for the maintenance and~~  
7 ~~operation of county law library facilities.~~

8 ~~(4) Recommend funding sources and financing mechanisms for support of county law~~  
9 ~~library operations and facility maintenance.~~

10 ~~(c) The task force shall be appointed on or before March 1, 2004. The task force shall~~  
11 ~~submit its report and recommendations to the Judicial Council and the Legislature on or~~  
12 ~~before January 1, 2005.~~

13 ~~(f) The Judicial Council shall implement this section using existing resources. Any~~  
14 ~~costs for counties and county law librarians to assist in the implementation of this section~~  
15 ~~shall be at county or county law librarians' expense, respectively.~~

16 **Comment.** Section 70394 is repealed because the task force it created no longer exists.

17 **§ 70624 (amended). Surcharge in San Bernardino County**

18 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 70624 of the Government Code is amended to read:

19 70624. (a) In addition to the uniform filing fee authorized pursuant to Section 70611,  
20 70612, 70613, 70614, 70650, 70651, 70652, 70653, 70655, or 70670, after giving notice  
21 and holding a public hearing on the proposal, the Board of Supervisors of San  
22 Bernardino County may impose a surcharge not to exceed thirty-five dollars (\$35) for the  
23 filing in superior court of (1) a complaint, petition, or other first paper in a civil, family,  
24 or probate action or special proceeding, and (2) a first paper on behalf of any defendant,  
25 respondent, intervenor, or adverse party. The county shall notify in writing the superior  
26 court and the Administrative Office of the Courts of any change in a surcharge under this  
27 section. If a surcharge under this section is imposed on a filing fee, the distribution that  
28 would otherwise be made to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund under  
29 subdivision (c) of Section 68085.3 or subdivision (c) of Section 68085.4 shall be reduced  
30 as provided in Section 70603. This section shall apply to fees collected under Sections  
31 70611, 70612, 70613, 70614, 70650, 70651, 70652, 70653, 70655, and 70670, beginning  
32 January 1, 2006.

33 (b) The surcharge shall be in an amount determined to be necessary by the board of  
34 supervisors to supplement the Courthouse Construction Fund, to be deposited in that fund  
35 and used solely for the purposes authorized for expenditures from that fund, including,  
36 but not limited to, earthquake retrofitting, renovation, and remodeling of all portions of  
37 the Central San Bernardino Courthouse in need of retrofitting, renovation, or remodeling,  
38 whether or not necessitated by the retrofitting work, including the original courthouse  
39 built in 1926 and all subsequent additions thereto. Expenditures made from the  
40 Courthouse Construction Fund that are funded from the surcharge shall be made in order  
41 of priority to ensure that all necessary earthquake retrofitting of the Central San

1 Bernardino Courthouse will be completed. Collection of the surcharge authorized by this  
2 section shall terminate upon repayment of the amortized costs incurred, or 30 years from  
3 the sale of the bond, whichever occurs first. However, the surcharge shall not apply in  
4 instances in which no filing fee is charged or the filing fee is waived. If the amortized  
5 costs have been repaid, or 30 years have passed since the sale of the bond, the county  
6 shall notify in writing the superior court and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

7 (c) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2026, and as of that date is  
8 repealed, unless a later enacted statute that is enacted on or before January 1, 2026,  
9 deletes or extends that date.

10 **Comment.** Section 70624 is amended to add a sunset clause, which is intended to afford time  
11 for resolution of issues relating to closure of the Courthouse Construction Fund for San  
12 Bernardino County.

13 **§ 71002 (repealed). Municipal court facilities, supplies, and equipment**

14 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 71002 of the Government Code is repealed.

15 ~~71002. The board of supervisors shall provide suitable quarters for the municipal~~  
16 ~~courts, including heating, lighting, and janitorial services, and shall supply them with~~  
17 ~~furniture, books, and supplies necessary for carrying out their duties, including supplies~~  
18 ~~and equipment for the preparation and maintenance of duplicate records of the court or a~~  
19 ~~division of the court when sessions are held at more than one place.~~

20 **Comment.** Section 71002 is repealed to reflect:

21 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts pursuant to former Article VI, Section  
22 5(e), of the California Constitution.

23 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
24 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
25 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
26 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

27 **§ 71383 (repealed). “Board of supervisors”**

28 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 71383 of the Government Code is repealed.

29 ~~71383. As used in Section 71002, “board of supervisors” means county or city and~~  
30 ~~county.~~

31 **Comment.** Section 71383 is repealed to reflect the repeal of Section 71002.

32 **Heading of Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 73301) (amended)**

33 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The heading of Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 73301) of Title 8 of  
34 the Government Code is amended to read:

35 ~~CHAPTER 10. OTHER MUNICIPAL COURTS DISTRICTS~~  
36 COUNTY-SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

37 **Comment.** The heading of Chapter 10 is amended to properly reflect the current content of the  
38 chapter. Municipal courts as separate entities no longer exist. They were eliminated through trial  
39 court unification, which occurred on a county-by-county basis. See former Cal. Const. art. VI,

1 Section 5(e). The last remaining municipal courts were eliminated on February 8, 2001, when the  
2 trial courts in Kings County unified their operations in the superior court.

3 **§§ 73301-73301 (repealed). General provisions**

4 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 1 (commencing with Section 73301) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the  
5 Government Code is repealed.

6 **Comment.** The article comprised of Section 73301 is repealed as obsolete. Section 73301  
7 pertains to employees of courts that were long ago superseded by municipal courts, which in turn  
8 were eliminated through trial court unification, a process that was completed in early 2001.

9 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

10 Article 1. General Provisions

11 73301. Persons who succeeded to positions in the municipal court upon its establishment  
12 shall receive credit for continuous prior service in superseded courts and in the sheriff's  
13 department or constabulary of the county, and, in addition to the minimum rate, such persons  
14 shall receive the annual increments commensurate with such years of prior service up to the  
15 maximum rate set. This section applies to municipal courts provided for in former Articles 3, 7,  
16 12, 13, 15, 18, 22, 23, 29, 31, and 32 of this chapter.

17 **§§ 73390-73396 (repealed). Kings County**

18 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 3 (commencing with Section 73390) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the  
19 Government Code is repealed.

20 **Comment.** Sections 73390-73396 are repealed to reflect:

21 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Kings County pursuant to former  
22 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective February 8, 2001.

23 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
24 of 2002. See Sections 77003 ("court operations" defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
25 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
26 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

27 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
28 sessions).

29 (4) The incorporation of Avenal and the repeal of former Section 73391.5 (see 2002 Cal. Stat.  
30 ch. 784, § 405).

31 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

32 Article 3. Kings County

33 73390. This article applies to the municipal court for the County of Kings. The court referred  
34 to in this article shall be the successor of the court to be established by the consolidation of the  
35 Corcoran, Hanford, and Lemoore Judicial Districts by the Board of Supervisors of the County of  
36 Kings, and it shall be known as the Kings County Municipal Court.

37 73396. Facilities for the court shall be maintained in the Cities of Hanford, Corcoran,  
38 Lemoore, and (if incorporated pursuant to Section 73391.5) Avenal, and in such other locations  
39 within the County of Kings as are designated by the board of supervisors. The court shall hold  
40 sessions at each facility as business requires. At the direction of the court, arraignment of  
41 criminal defendants who are in custody at the Kings County Jail facility shall be held in the court  
42 facility located in Hanford.

1 §§ 73560-73561 (repealed). Monterey County

2 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 7 (commencing with Section 73560) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the  
3 Government Code is repealed.

4 **Comment.** Sections 73560-73561 are repealed to reflect:

5 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Monterey County pursuant to former  
6 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective December 18, 2000.

7 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
8 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
9 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
10 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

11 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
12 sessions).

13 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

14 Article 7. Monterey County

15 73560. This article applies to the Monterey County Municipal Court District, which  
16 encompasses the entire County of Monterey.

17 73561. Facilities for the court shall be maintained in the Cities of Salinas and Monterey and  
18 at court facilities provided elsewhere in accordance with law. The court shall determine the  
19 nature and frequency of sessions held at court locations.

20 §§ 73660-73661 (repealed). Humboldt County

21 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 9.5 (commencing with Section 73660) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
22 the Government Code is repealed.

23 **Comment.** Sections 73660-73661 are repealed to reflect:

24 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Humboldt County pursuant to former  
25 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 10, 1998.

26 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
27 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
28 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
29 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

30 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
31 sessions).

32 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

33 Article 9.5. Humboldt County

34 73660. There is in the County of Humboldt a single municipal court district known as the  
35 Humboldt County Municipal Court District.

36 73661. In order that the citizens of the county may have convenient access to the court, the  
37 location of permanent court facilities and locations where sessions of the court may be held other  
38 than in the county seat shall be as determined by the board of supervisors.

39 §§ 73698-73698.6 (repealed). Fresno County

40 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 10.5 (commencing with Section 73698) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
41 the Government Code is repealed.

42 **Comment.** Sections 73698-73698.6 are repealed to reflect:

1 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Fresno County pursuant to former  
2 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 1, 1998.

3 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
4 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
5 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
6 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

7 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
8 sessions).

9 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

10 Article 10.5. Fresno County

11 73698. This article applies to the Central Valley Municipal Court District of Fresno County.  
12 The court referred to in this article shall become operative upon the consolidation of the  
13 Coalinga, Firebaugh, Fowler-Caruthers, Kerman, Kingsburg-Riverdale, Parlier-Selma, Reedley-  
14 Dunlap, and Sanger Judicial Districts by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Fresno.

15 73698.6. Facilities for the court shall be maintained in the Cities of Coalinga, Firebaugh,  
16 Fowler, Kerman, Kingsburg, Parlier, Selma, Reedley, and Sanger, and the communities of  
17 Caruthers and Riverdale; and in such other locations within the County of Fresno as are  
18 designated by the board of supervisors. The court shall hold sessions at each facility as business  
19 requires. At the direction of the court, arraignment of criminal defendants who are in custody at  
20 the Fresno County Detention Facility shall be held at the court facility located at the Fresno  
21 County Detention Facility.

22 **§§ 73730-73732 (repealed). Imperial County**

23 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 11.5 (commencing with Section 73730) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
24 the Government Code is repealed.

25 **Comment.** Sections 73730-73732 are repealed to reflect:

26 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Imperial County pursuant to former  
27 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 22, 1998.

28 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
29 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
30 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
31 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

32 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
33 sessions).

34 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

35 Article 11.5. Imperial County

36 73730. There is hereby created a municipal court district which embraces the entire County  
37 of Imperial. This article applies to the municipal court established within the district, which shall  
38 be known as the Imperial County Municipal Court.

39 73732. Facilities for the court shall be maintained, at or near the county seat and at court  
40 facilities provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors.  
41 The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations  
42 designated by the board of supervisors.

43 **§ 73750 (repealed). Madera County Municipal Court District**

44 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 73750 of the Government Code is repealed.

1 ~~73750. There is in the County of Madera, on and after the effective date of this section,~~  
2 ~~a single municipal court district known as the Madera County Municipal Court District.~~

3 **Comment.** Section 73750 is repealed to reflect:

4 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Madera County pursuant to former  
5 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 1, 1998.

6 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
7 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
8 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
9 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

10 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
11 sessions).

12 **§ 73756 (repealed). Court facilities and sessions**

13 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 73756 of the Government Code is repealed.

14 ~~73756. Facilities for the district shall be maintained at the court facilities provided~~  
15 ~~within each division. The presiding judge shall determine the nature and frequency of~~  
16 ~~sessions held at the court facilities within each division.~~

17 **Comment.** Section 73756 is repealed to reflect:

18 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Madera County pursuant to former  
19 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 1, 1998.

20 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
21 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
22 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
23 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

24 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
25 sessions).

26 **§§ 73770-73771 (repealed). Marin County**

27 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 12 (commencing with Section 73770) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
28 the Government Code is repealed.

29 **Comment.** Sections 73770-73771 are repealed to reflect:

30 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Marin County pursuant to former  
31 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 11, 1998.

32 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
33 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
34 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
35 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

36 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
37 sessions).

38 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

39 Article 12. Marin County

40 73770. This article applies to the judicial district of the Marin County Municipal Court.

41 73771. A branch court shall be maintained at an appropriate location in the former Western  
42 Judicial District.

1 §§ 73783.1-73783.3 (repealed). Mariposa County

2 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 12.2 (commencing with Section 73783.1) of Chapter 10 of Title 8  
3 of the Government Code is repealed.

4 **Comment.** Sections 73783.1-73783.3 are repealed to reflect:

5 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Mariposa County pursuant to former  
6 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.

7 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
8 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
9 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
10 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

11 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
12 sessions).

13 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

14 Article 12.2. Mariposa County

15 73783.1. This article applies to the municipal court established in a judicial district  
16 embracing the County of Mariposa.

17 73783.3. Facilities for the court shall be maintained at the county seat and at court facilities  
18 provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors. The court  
19 shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated  
20 by the board of supervisors. Jurors shall be drawn from the entire county.

21 §§ 73784-73784.10 (repealed). Mendocino County

22 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 12.3 (commencing with Section 73784) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
23 the Government Code is repealed.

24 **Comment.** Sections 73784-73784.10 are repealed to reflect:

25 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Mendocino County pursuant to former  
26 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective August 3, 1998.

27 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
28 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
29 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
30 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

31 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
32 sessions).

33 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

34 Article 12.3. Mendocino County

35 73784. This article applies to and establishes the Mendocino County Municipal Court  
36 District, which shall embrace the entire County of Mendocino, and shall supersede the Anderson,  
37 Arena, Long Valley, Round Valley, and Ten Mile Judicial Districts and the Mount San Hedrin  
38 Municipal Court District.

39 73784.10. The location of permanent court facilities and locations where sessions of the  
40 court may be held other than in the county seat shall be as determined by the board of  
41 supervisors.

42 §§ 73790-73796 (repealed). Merced County

43 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 12.5 (commencing with Section 73790) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
44 the Government Code is repealed.

1 **Comment.** Sections 73790-73796 are repealed to reflect:

2 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Merced County pursuant to former  
3 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective August 3, 1998.

4 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
5 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
6 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
7 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

8 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
9 sessions).

10 (4) Elimination of the marshal’s office in Merced County. See Section 26638.15; Merced  
11 County Ordinance No. 1687 (effective Jan. 15, 2003); Merced County Bd. of Supervisors,  
12 Minutes (Dec. 3, 2002), pp. 4, 16; see also Section 69921.5.

13 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

14 Article 12.5. Merced County

15 73790. There is hereby created a municipal court district which embraces the entire County  
16 of Merced. This article applies to the municipal court established within the district, which shall  
17 be known as the Merced County Municipal Court.

18 73792. Facilities for the court shall be maintained at or near the county seat and at court  
19 facilities provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors.  
20 The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations  
21 designated by the board of supervisors.

22 73796. There shall be one marshal of the Merced County Municipal Court. The marshal shall  
23 receive a salary on range 68.5.

24 When a vacancy occurs in the office, a majority of the superior and municipal court judges  
25 shall appoint the marshal and the marshal shall serve at their pleasure.

26 **§ 73956 (repealed). Court facilities and sessions**

27 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 73956 of the Government Code is repealed.

28 ~~73956. The headquarters of the municipal court and the clerk and marshal of the North  
29 County Judicial District shall be located within the City of Vista or such other place as  
30 shall be designated by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego. The  
31 municipal court shall hold sessions at its headquarters and at a department at a location  
32 within the City of Escondido and at such other location or locations within the North  
33 County Judicial District as shall be designated by the board of supervisors. The clerk and  
34 marshal of the North County Judicial District shall maintain branch offices at a location  
35 within the City of Escondido as shall be designated by the board of supervisors. The  
36 Escondido branch office shall maintain the same office hours as the headquarters offices  
37 and shall provide facilities for complete municipal court services, including the filing of  
38 original complaints and other documents and the posting of bail, and the board of  
39 supervisors shall provide facilities within the City of Escondido for the complete  
40 transaction of business of the court including the holding of jury trials.~~

41 **Comment.** Section 73956 is repealed to reflect:

42 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in San Diego County pursuant to former  
43 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective December 1, 1998.

44 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
45 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court

1 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
2 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

3 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
4 sessions).

5 (4) Elimination of the marshal's office in the area.

6 **§§ 74602-74602 (repealed). San Luis Obispo County**

7 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 27 (commencing with Section 74602) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
8 the Government Code is repealed.

9 **Comment.** The article comprised of Section 74602 is repealed to reflect:

10 (1) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
11 of 2002. See Sections 77003 ("court operations" defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
12 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
13 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

14 (2) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
15 sessions).

16 (3) Enactment of the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act. See Sections  
17 71601(i) ("subordinate judicial officer"), (m) ("trial court employee"), 71634(d) (trial court has  
18 right to determine assignments and transfers of trial court employees).

19 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

20 Article 27. San Luis Obispo County

21 74602. Facilities for the San Luis Obispo County Superior Court shall be maintained in the  
22 City of San Luis Obispo, and may be maintained at any other location within the county. The  
23 court may hold sessions at each facility, as business requires. At the direction of the presiding  
24 judge, any subordinate judicial officer may perform his or her duties at any court location. At the  
25 direction of the court, arraignment of criminal defendants who are in custody at the San Luis  
26 Obispo County Jail facility shall be held at that facility.

27 **§§ 74640-74640.2 (repealed). Santa Barbara County**

28 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 28 (commencing with Section 74640) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
29 the Government Code is repealed.

30 **Comment.** Sections 74640-74640.2 are repealed to reflect:

31 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Santa Barbara County pursuant to  
32 former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective August 3, 1998.

33 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
34 of 2002. See Sections 77003 ("court operations" defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
35 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
36 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

37 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
38 sessions).

39 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

40 Article 28. Santa Barbara County

41 74640. There are in the County of Santa Barbara two municipal court districts, known as the  
42 Santa Barbara Municipal Court and the North Santa Barbara County Municipal Court.

43 74640.2. In order that the citizens residing in each division of the North Santa Barbara  
44 County Municipal Court may have convenient access to the court, sufficient court facilities,

1 including staff and other necessary personnel, shall be maintained in each division at the  
2 following sites or as otherwise designated by the board of supervisors:

- 3 (a) In the Santa Maria Division, in the City of Santa Maria.
- 4 (b) In the Lompoc Division, in the City of Lompoc.
- 5 (c) In the Solvang Division, in the City of Solvang.

6 **§§ 74720-74724 (repealed). Siskiyou County**

7 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 29.6 (commencing with Section 74720) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
8 the Government Code is repealed.

9 **Comment.** Sections 74720-74724 are repealed to reflect:

10 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Siskiyou County pursuant to former  
11 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 4, 1998.

12 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
13 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
14 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
15 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

16 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
17 sessions).

18 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

19 Article 29.6. Siskiyou County

20 74720. The Siskiyou County Municipal Court District shall supersede the Western,  
21 Southeastern, and Dorris/Tulelake Judicial Districts and shall embrace the entire County of  
22 Siskiyou.

23 74724. The court shall maintain facilities at Yreka, Dorris, Weed, and other locations  
24 determined by the court. The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions to be  
25 held at additional court locations.

26 **§§ 74760-74764 (repealed). Glenn County**

27 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 30.1 (commencing with Section 74760) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
28 the Government Code is repealed.

29 **Comment.** Sections 74760-74764 are repealed to reflect:

30 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Glenn County pursuant to former  
31 Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 31, 1998.

32 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
33 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
34 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
35 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

36 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
37 sessions).

38 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

39 Article 30.1. Glenn County

40 74760. The Glenn County Municipal Court District shall supersede the Glenn County  
41 Judicial District and shall embrace the entire County of Glenn.

42 74764. The court shall maintain facilities at Willows and other locations determined by the  
43 court. The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions to be held at additional  
44 court locations.

1 §§ 74915-74916 (repealed). Yuba County

2 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 35.5 (commencing with Section 74915) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
3 the Government Code is repealed.

4 **Comment.** Sections 74915-74916 are repealed to reflect:

5 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Yuba County pursuant to former Article  
6 VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective April 16, 1999.

7 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
8 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
9 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
10 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

11 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
12 sessions).

13 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

14 Article 35.5. Yuba County

15 74915. This article applies to the municipal court established in a judicial district embracing  
16 the County of Yuba. This court shall be known as the Yuba County Municipal Court.

17 74916. (a) Facilities for the court shall be maintained at the county seat and at court facilities  
18 provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors. The court  
19 shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated  
20 by the board of supervisors.

21 (b) Jurors shall be drawn from the entire county.

22 §§ 74934-74935.5 (repealed). Butte County

23 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 37 (commencing with Section 74934) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
24 the Government Code is repealed.

25 **Comment.** Sections 74934-74935.5 are repealed to reflect:

26 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Butte County pursuant to former Article  
27 VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.

28 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
29 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
30 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
31 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

32 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
33 sessions).

34 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

35 Article 37. Butte County

36 74934. This article applies only to municipal courts established in the following judicial  
37 districts in Butte County:

38 (a) A district embracing the Cities of Chico and Paradise, designated as the North Butte  
39 County Judicial District headquartered in the City of Chico.

40 (b) A district embracing the Cities of Oroville, Biggs, and Gridley, designated as the South  
41 Butte County Judicial District which is hereby created and shall be headquartered in the City of  
42 Oroville.

43 74935.5. There shall be maintained in both the City of Gridley and the Town of Paradise  
44 branch court facilities, including staff and other necessary personnel, so that the citizens of those  
45 communities may utilize such facilities as needed for small claims, infractions (traffic), civil  
46 matters, and misdemeanors.

1 §§ 74948-74950 (repealed). Napa County

2 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 38 (commencing with Section 74948) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
3 the Government Code is repealed.

4 **Comment.** Sections 74948-74950 are repealed to reflect:

5 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Napa County pursuant to former Article  
6 VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.

7 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
8 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
9 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
10 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

11 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
12 sessions).

13 (4) Repeal of former Section 71342. See 2003 Cal. Stat. ch. 149, § 59; 33 Cal. L. Revision  
14 Comm’n Reports 169, 175-76, 224 (2003).

15 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

16 Article 38. Napa County

17 74948. This article applies to the municipal court district which embraces the entire County  
18 of Napa, which court shall be known as the Municipal Court for the County of Napa.

19 74950. Facilities for the court shall be maintained in the City of Napa, the City of Saint  
20 Helena, the City of Calistoga, and in such other locations within the County of Napa as are  
21 designated by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 71342. The court  
22 shall hold sessions at each facility as business requires.

23 §§ 74960-74962 (repealed). Yolo County

24 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Article 39 (commencing with Section 74960) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of  
25 the Government Code is repealed.

26 **Comment.** Sections 74960-74962 are repealed to reflect:

27 (1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Yolo County pursuant to former Article  
28 VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.

29 (2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act  
30 of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court  
31 operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),  
32 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

33 (3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its  
34 sessions).

35 **Note.** The text of the repealed article is set out below.

36 Article 39. Yolo County

37 74960. This article applies to the municipal court established within the municipal court  
38 district which embraces the entire territory of the County of Yolo lying within the exterior  
39 boundaries of such county, which court shall be known as the Yolo County Municipal Court.

40 74962. Facilities for the court shall be maintained at or near the county seat and at court  
41 facilities provided elsewhere as determined by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors.  
42 The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations  
43 designated by the board of supervisors.

1 **§ 76000 (amended). Added penalties**

2 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 76000 of the Government Code is amended to read:

3 76000. (a) (1) Except as otherwise provided elsewhere in this section, in each county  
4 there shall be levied an additional penalty in the amount of seven dollars (\$7) for every  
5 ten dollars (\$10), or part of ten dollars (\$10), upon every fine, penalty, or forfeiture  
6 imposed and collected by the courts for all criminal offenses, including all offenses  
7 involving a violation of the Vehicle Code or any local ordinance adopted pursuant to the  
8 Vehicle Code.

9 (2) This additional penalty shall be collected together with and in the same manner as  
10 the amounts established by Section 1464 of the Penal Code. These moneys shall be taken  
11 from fines and forfeitures deposited with the county treasurer prior to any division  
12 pursuant to Section 1463 of the Penal Code. The county treasurer shall deposit those  
13 amounts specified by the board of supervisors by resolution in one or more of the funds  
14 established pursuant to this chapter. However, deposits to these funds shall continue  
15 through whatever period of time is necessary to repay any borrowings made by the  
16 county on or before January 1, 1991, to pay for construction provided for in this chapter.

17 (3) This additional penalty does not apply to the following:

18 (A) Any restitution fine.

19 (B) Any penalty authorized by Section 1464 of the Penal Code or this chapter.

20 (C) Any parking offense subject to Article 3 (commencing with Section 40200) of  
21 Chapter 1 of Division 17 of the Vehicle Code.

22 (D) The state surcharge authorized by Section 1465.7 of the Penal Code.

23 (b) In each authorized county, provided that the board of supervisors has adopted a  
24 resolution stating that the implementation of this subdivision is necessary to the county  
25 for the purposes authorized, with respect to each authorized fund established pursuant to  
26 Section 76100 or 76101, for every parking offense where a parking penalty, fine, or  
27 forfeiture is imposed, an added penalty of two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50) shall be  
28 included in the total penalty, fine, or forfeiture. Except as provided in subdivision (c), for  
29 each parking case collected in the courts of the county, the county treasurer shall place in  
30 each authorized fund two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50). These moneys shall be taken  
31 from fines and forfeitures deposited with the county treasurer prior to any division  
32 pursuant to Section 1462.3 or 1463.009 of the Penal Code. The judges of the county shall  
33 increase the bail schedule amounts as appropriate to reflect the added penalty provided  
34 for by this section. In those cities, districts, or other issuing agencies which elect to  
35 accept parking penalties, and otherwise process parking violations pursuant to Article 3  
36 (commencing with Section 40200) of Chapter 1 of Division 17 of the Vehicle Code, that  
37 city, district, or issuing agency shall observe the increased bail amounts as established by  
38 the court reflecting the added penalty provided for by this section. Each agency which  
39 elects to process parking violations shall pay to the county treasurer two dollars and fifty  
40 cents (\$2.50) for each fund for each parking penalty collected on each violation which is  
41 not filed in court. Those payments to the county treasurer shall be made monthly, and the  
42 county treasurer shall deposit all those sums in the authorized fund. No issuing agency

1 shall be required to contribute revenues to any fund in excess of those revenues generated  
 2 from the surcharges established in the resolution adopted pursuant to this chapter, except  
 3 as otherwise agreed upon by the local governmental entities involved.

4 (c) The county treasurer shall deposit one dollar (\$1) of every two dollars and fifty  
 5 cents (\$2.50) collected pursuant to subdivision (b) into the general fund of the county.

6 (d) The authority to impose the two-dollar-and-fifty-cent (\$2.50) penalty authorized by  
 7 subdivision (b) shall be reduced to one dollar (\$1) as of the date of transfer of  
 8 responsibility for facilities from the county to the Judicial Council pursuant to Article 3  
 9 (commencing with Section 70321) of Chapter 5.7, except as money is needed to pay  
 10 for construction provided for in Section 76100 and undertaken prior to the transfer of  
 11 responsibility for facilities from the county to the Judicial Council.

12 (e) The seven-dollar (\$7) additional penalty authorized by subdivision (a) shall be  
 13 reduced in each county by the additional penalty amount assessed by the county for the  
 14 local courthouse construction fund established by Section 76100 as of January 1, 1998,  
 15 when the money in that fund is transferred to the state under Section 70402. The amount  
 16 each county shall charge as an additional penalty under this section shall be as follows:

Alameda	\$5.00	Marin	\$5.00	San Luis Obispo	\$5.00
Alpine	\$5.00	Mariposa	\$2.50	San Mateo	\$4.75
Amador	\$5.00	Mendocino	\$7.00	Santa Barbara	\$3.50
Butte	\$7.00	Merced	\$4.75	Santa Clara	\$5.50
Calaveras	\$3.00	Modoc	\$3.50	Santa Cruz	\$7.00
Colusa	\$6.00	Mono	\$4.00	Shasta	\$3.50
Contra Costa	\$5.00	Monterey	\$5.00	Sierra	\$7.00
Del Norte	\$7.00	Napa	\$3.00	Siskiyou	\$5.00
El Dorado	\$5.00	Nevada	\$4.75	Solano	\$5.00
Fresno	\$7.00	Orange	\$5.29	Sonoma	\$5.00
Glenn	\$4.00	Placer	\$4.75	Stanislaus	\$5.00
Humboldt	\$5.00	Plumas	\$7.00	Sutter	\$6.00
Imperial	\$6.00	Riverside	\$4.60	Tehama	\$7.00
Inyo	\$4.00	Sacramento	\$5.00	Trinity	\$4.50
Kern	\$7.00	San Benito	\$5.00	Tulare	\$5.00
Kings	\$7.00	San Bernardino	\$5.00	Tuolumne	\$7.00
Lake	\$7.00	San Diego	\$7.00	Ventura	\$5.00
Lassen	\$2.00	San Francisco	\$6.99	Yolo	\$7.00
Los Angeles	\$5.00	San Joaquin	\$3.75	Yuba	\$3.00
Madera	\$7.00				

1 **Comment.** Subdivision (d) of Section 76000 is amended to correct a cross-reference to a  
2 chapter in the Trial Court Facilities Act. This is not a substantive change.

3 **§ 76223 (amended). Construction of court facilities in Merced County**

4 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 76223 of the Government Code is amended to read:

5 76223. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following conditions pertain to  
6 the construction of court facilities in Merced County by the County of Merced for any  
7 construction pursuant to a written agreement entered into prior to January 1, 2004,  
8 between the board of supervisors and the presiding judge of the superior court:

9 (a) Revenue received in Merced County from civil assessments for Failure to Appear,  
10 pursuant to Section 1214.1 of the Penal Code, shall be available, in an annual amount not  
11 to exceed the amount agreed upon by the board of supervisors and the presiding judge of  
12 the superior court, for the purpose of augmenting other funds made available for  
13 construction.

14 (b) The presiding judge of the superior court may agree to make available court funds,  
15 up to a stated amount, other than funds received from the Trial Court Trust Fund or other  
16 state sources, in the courthouse construction fund.

17 (c) The total amounts deposited under subdivision (a) may not exceed in any fiscal  
18 year the amount payable on the construction costs less (1) any amounts paid by the  
19 courthouse construction fund and (2) any other amounts paid from other sources except  
20 for any amounts paid pursuant to subdivision (b).

21 (d) The total amounts deposited under subdivision (b) shall not exceed in any fiscal  
22 year the amount payable on the construction costs less (1) any amounts paid by the  
23 courthouse construction fund, (2) any amounts paid pursuant to subdivision (a) of this  
24 section, and (3) any other amounts paid from other sources except for any amounts paid  
25 pursuant to subdivision (b).

26 ~~(e) If legislation is passed and becomes effective transferring the responsibility for~~  
27 ~~court facilities to the state, and the legislation permits the transfer of the bonded~~  
28 ~~indebtedness or other encumbrance on court facilities together with revenue sources for~~  
29 ~~payment of the bonded indebtedness or other encumbrance, the~~ The revenue sources  
30 provided for by this section may also be transferred to the state.

31 (f) As used in this section, the costs of construction also includes the payment on the  
32 bonded indebtedness or other encumbrance used to finance the construction.

33 **Comment.** Section 76223 is amended to reflect enactment of the Trial Court Facilities Act,  
34 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082. See in particular Section 70321 (transfer of court facilities from county  
35 to Judicial Council) and Section 70325(a)(2) (county may transfer revenue sources to state,  
36 whereupon state becomes responsible for making payments on bonded indebtedness).

37 **§ 76225 (repealed). Reimbursement of court construction funds in Merced County if**  
38 **transfers do not occur on time**

39 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 76225 of the Government Code is repealed.

40 ~~76225. If Merced County has not executed the transfer of its responsibilities and titles~~  
41 ~~for the New Downtown Merced Courthouse, New Courts Building (Departments 1 to 3,~~  
42 ~~inclusive), Jail Court (Department 4), Department 5 Modular, Departments 7 and 8~~

Trailer, Adobe Building, Criminal Trailer, and Jury Assembly, to the state as required under Chapter 1082 of the Statutes of 2002, on or before April 1, 2007, then Merced County shall pay back to the state the construction funds used for these projects:

**Comment.** Section 76225 is repealed as obsolete.

**§ 77201.3 (amended). County remittances commencing on July 1, 2006**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77201.3 of the Government Code is amended to read:

77201.3. (a) Commencing with the 2006–07 fiscal year, and each fiscal year thereafter, except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, each county shall remit to the state the amounts described in this subdivision in four equal installments due on October 1, January 1, April 1, and May 1. The amounts listed in this subdivision are in lieu of the amounts listed in subdivision (b) of Section 77201.1. However, for purposes of the calculation required by subdivision (a) of Section 77205, the amounts in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 77201.1 shall be used.

(1) Each county shall remit to the state the amount listed below, which is based on an amount expended by the respective county for court operations during the 1994–95 fiscal year. The amount listed for Los Angeles County includes the twenty-three million five hundred twenty-seven thousand nine hundred forty-nine dollars (\$23,527,949) increase required by subdivision (g) of Section 77201.1.

Jurisdiction	Amount
Alameda	\$22,509,905
Alpine	—
Amador	—
Butte	—
Calaveras	—
Colusa	—
Contra Costa	11,974,535
Del Norte	—
El Dorado	—
Fresno	11,222,780
Glenn	—
Humboldt	—
Imperial	—
Inyo	—
Kern	9,234,511
Kings	—
Lake	—
Lassen	—
Los Angeles	198,858,596
Madera	—
Marin	—

Mariposa	—
Mendocino	—
Merced	—
Modoc	—
Mono	—
Monterey	4,520,911
Napa	—
Nevada	—
Orange	38,846,003
Placer	—
Plumas	—
Riverside	17,857,241
Sacramento	20,733,264
San Benito	—
San Bernardino	20,227,102
San Diego	43,495,932
San Francisco	19,295,303
San Joaquin	6,543,068
San Luis Obispo	—
San Mateo	12,181,079
Santa Barbara	6,764,792
Santa Clara	28,689,450
Santa Cruz	—
Shasta	—
Sierra	—
Siskiyou	—
Solano	6,242,661
Sonoma	6,162,466
Stanislaus	3,506,297
Sutter	—
Tehama	—
Trinity	—
Tulare	—
Tuolumne	—
Ventura	9,734,190
Yolo	—
Yuba	—

1 (2) (A) This paragraph sets forth the amount of the revenue maintenance of effort  
2 payment as modified by the reductions in Sections 68085.2 and 68085.7, including, if  
3 applicable, any adjustment made pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section  
4 68085.8.

1

Jurisdiction	Amount
Alameda	\$7,529,814
Alpine	58,459
Amador	261,618
Butte	797,512
Calaveras	298,247
Colusa	394,002
Contra Costa	3,136,407
Del Norte	120,598
El Dorado	732,606
Fresno	3,536,164
Glenn	293,014
Humboldt	933,601
Imperial	1,075,275
Inyo	610,438
Kern	5,247,051
Kings	759,717
Lake	133,003
Lassen	379,561
Los Angeles	47,023,566
Madera	1,025,684
Marin	2,010,028
Mariposa	131,611
Mendocino	441,037
Merced	1,600,227
Modoc	103,798
Mono	409,747
Monterey	2,662,998
Napa	710,832
Nevada	1,197,947
Orange	15,603,484
Placer	835,467
Plumas	154,384
Riverside	7,108,548
Sacramento	1,829,692
San Benito	270,940
San Bernardino	3,325,704
San Diego	13,501,132
San Francisco	3,123,814
San Joaquin	2,158,803

San Luis Obispo	1,754,131
San Mateo	2,527,355
Santa Barbara	3,117,677
Santa Cruz	1,495,691
Shasta	574,383
Sierra	41,810
Siskiyou	482,082
Solano	1,931,765
Sonoma	1,439,187
Stanislaus	1,079,927
Sutter	644,174
Tehama	627,958
Trinity	102,233
Tulare	1,345,686
Tuolumne	277,573
Ventura	2,283,494
Yolo	464,030
Yuba	273,437

1 (B) The amount remitted by the County of Santa Clara shall be ten million nine  
2 hundred sixty-one thousand two hundred ninety-three dollars (\$10,961,293) reduced as  
3 described in clauses (i) and (ii).

4 (i) The amount remitted by the County of Santa Clara pursuant to this paragraph for  
5 each fiscal year shall be reduced by an amount equal to one-half of the amount calculated  
6 by subtracting the budget reduction for the Superior Court of Santa Clara County for that  
7 fiscal year attributable to the reduction of the counties' payment obligation from thirty-  
8 one million dollars (\$31,000,000) pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 68085.6 from  
9 the net civil assessments received in that county in that fiscal year. "Net civil  
10 assessments" as used in this paragraph means the amount of civil assessments collected  
11 minus the costs of collecting those civil assessments, under the guidelines of the  
12 Controller.

13 (ii) The reduction calculated pursuant to paragraph (i) shall not exceed two million five  
14 hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000) in any fiscal year. If the reduction for a fiscal year  
15 reaches two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000), the amount that the  
16 county is required to remit to the state under this paragraph in that fiscal year and in each  
17 subsequent fiscal year shall be eight million four hundred sixty-one thousand two  
18 hundred ninety-three dollars (\$8,461,293).

19 (b) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, county remittances  
20 specified in subdivision (a) shall not be increased in subsequent years.

21 (c) Except for those counties with a population of 70,000, or less, on January 1, 1996,  
22 the amount a county is required to remit pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) shall  
23 be adjusted by the amount equal to any adjustment resulting from the procedures in

1 subdivisions (c) and (d) of Section 77201 as that section read on June 30, 1998, to the  
2 extent a county filed an appeal with the Controller with respect to the findings made by  
3 the Department of Finance. This subdivision shall not be construed to establish a new  
4 appeal process beyond what was provided by Section 77201, as that section read on June  
5 30, 1998.

6 (d) Any change in statute or rule of court that either reduces the bail schedule or  
7 redirects or reduces a county's portion of fee, fine, and forfeiture revenue to an amount  
8 that is less than (1) the fees, fines, and forfeitures retained by that county, and (2) the  
9 county's portion of fines and forfeitures transmitted to the state in the 1994–95 fiscal  
10 year, shall reduce that county's remittance specified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a)  
11 by an equal amount. Nothing in this subdivision is intended to limit judicial sentencing  
12 discretion.

13 (e) Nothing in this section is intended to relieve a county of the responsibility to  
14 provide necessary and suitable court facilities pursuant to Section ~~68073~~ 70311.

15 (f) Nothing in this section is intended to relieve a county of the responsibility for  
16 justice-related expenses not included in Section 77003 which are otherwise required of  
17 the county by law, including, but not limited to, indigent defense representation and  
18 investigation, and payment of juvenile justice charges.

19 **Comment.** Section 77201.3 is amended to reflect the renumbering of former Section 68073  
20 (see 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 3). This is not a substantive change.

#### 21 **§ 77650 (repealed). Task Force on Court Facilities**

22 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77650 of the Government Code is repealed.

23 ~~77650. The Task Force on Court Facilities is hereby established in state government  
24 and charged with identifying the needs related to trial and appellate court facilities, and  
25 options and recommendations for funding court facility maintenance, improvements, and  
26 expansion, including the specific responsibilities of each entity of government.~~

27 **Comment.** Section 77650 is repealed as obsolete. The Task Force on Court Facilities  
28 completed its assigned work and submitted its final report to the Legislature in 2001. Soon  
29 afterwards, the Legislature enacted the Trial Court Facilities Act, which endorsed and  
30 implemented the key recommendations of the Task Force on Court Facilities. See 2002 Cal. Stat.  
31 ch. 1082.

#### 32 **§ 77651 (repealed). Composition of task force**

33 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77651 of the Government Code is repealed.

34 ~~77651. The task force shall be composed of 18 members, appointed as follows:~~

35 ~~(a) Six members appointed by the Chief Justice who shall be from urban, suburban,  
36 and rural courts. Four representatives may be either trial court judges or trial court  
37 administrators. One representative shall be a justice of the courts of appeal.~~

38 ~~(b) Six members appointed by the Governor from a list of nominees submitted by the  
39 California State Association of Counties, who represent urban, suburban, and rural  
40 counties. Four representatives may be either county supervisors or county administrators.  
41 One representative shall be a person with court security responsibility.~~

1 ~~(e) Two members appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, one of whom shall~~  
2 ~~represent the State Bar or an associated attorney organization, neither of whom would be~~  
3 ~~eligible for appointment under subdivision (a) or (b).~~

4 ~~(d) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, one of whom shall~~  
5 ~~represent the State Bar or an associated attorney organization, neither of whom would be~~  
6 ~~eligible for appointment under subdivision (a) or (b).~~

7 ~~(e) The Director of General Services and the Director of Finance.~~

8 ~~(f) The Chief Justice shall designate one of these representatives as the chairperson of~~  
9 ~~the task force.~~

10 **Comment.** Section 77651 is repealed as obsolete. The Task Force on Court Facilities  
11 completed its assigned work and submitted its final report to the Legislature in 2001. Soon  
12 afterwards, the Legislature enacted the Trial Court Facilities Act, which endorsed and  
13 implemented the key recommendations of the Task Force on Court Facilities. See 2002 Cal. Stat.  
14 ch. 1082.

15 **§ 77652 (repealed). Staff support for task force and guidelines for procedures and practices**

16 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77652 of the Government Code is repealed.

17 ~~77652. The Judicial Council shall provide staff support for the task force and shall~~  
18 ~~develop guidelines for procedures and practices for the task force. The Department of~~  
19 ~~General Services, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst shall provide~~  
20 ~~additional support, at the request of the Judicial Council. The California State~~  
21 ~~Association of Counties is encouraged to provide additional staff support.~~

22 **Comment.** Section 77652 is repealed as obsolete. The Task Force on Court Facilities  
23 completed its assigned work and submitted its final report to the Legislature in 2001. Soon  
24 afterwards, the Legislature enacted the Trial Court Facilities Act, which endorsed and  
25 implemented the key recommendations of the Task Force on Court Facilities. See 2002 Cal. Stat.  
26 ch. 1082.

27 **§ 77653 (repealed). Duties of task force**

28 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77653 of the Government Code is repealed.

29 ~~77653. The duties of the task force shall include all of the following:~~

30 ~~(a) Document the state of existing court facilities.~~

31 ~~(b) Document the need for new or modified court facilities and the extent to which~~  
32 ~~current court facilities are fully utilized.~~

33 ~~(c) Document the funding mechanisms currently available for maintenance, operation,~~  
34 ~~construction, and renovation of court facilities.~~

35 ~~(d) Examine existing standards for court facility construction.~~

36 ~~(e) Document the impacts of state actions on court facilities and other state and local~~  
37 ~~justice system facilities.~~

38 ~~(f) Review and recommend operational changes which may mitigate the need for~~  
39 ~~additional court facilities, including the implementation of methods to more fully utilize~~  
40 ~~existing facilities.~~

41 ~~(g) Review and provide recommendations on concepts regarding security; operational~~  
42 ~~flexibility; alternative dispute resolution; meeting space; special needs of children;~~

1 families, victims, and disabled persons; technology; the dignity of the participants; and  
2 any other special needs of court facilities:

3 ~~(h) Recommend specific funding responsibilities among the various entities of~~  
4 ~~government for support of trial court facilities and facility maintenance including, but not~~  
5 ~~limited to, full state responsibility or continued county responsibility.~~

6 ~~(i) Recommend funding sources and financing mechanisms for support of court~~  
7 ~~facilities and facility maintenance.~~

8 **Comment.** Section 77653 is repealed as obsolete. The Task Force on Court Facilities  
9 completed its assigned work and submitted its final report to the Legislature in 2001. Soon  
10 afterwards, the Legislature enacted the Trial Court Facilities Act, which endorsed and  
11 implemented the key recommendations of the Task Force on Court Facilities. See 2002 Cal. Stat.  
12 ch. 1082.

13 **§ 77654 (repealed). Timeline for task force**

14 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77654 of the Government Code is repealed.

15 ~~77654. (a) The task force shall be appointed on or before October 1, 1997.~~

16 ~~(b) The task force shall meet and establish its operating procedures on or before~~  
17 ~~September 1, 1998, and submit its plan for the entire review of court facilities by October~~  
18 ~~1, 1998, to the Judicial Council, Legislature, and Governor.~~

19 ~~(c) The task force shall review all available court facility standards and make~~  
20 ~~preliminary determinations of acceptable standards for construction, renovation, and~~  
21 ~~remodeling of court facilities, and shall report those preliminary determinations to the~~  
22 ~~Judicial Council, the Legislature, and the Governor in an interim report on or before July~~  
23 ~~1, 1999.~~

24 ~~(d) The task force shall complete a survey of all trial and appellate court facilities in~~  
25 ~~the state and report its findings to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and the Governor~~  
26 ~~in a second interim report on or before January 1, 2001. The report shall document all of~~  
27 ~~the following:~~

28 ~~(1) The state of existing court facilities.~~

29 ~~(2) The need for new or modified court facilities.~~

30 ~~(3) The currently available funding options for constructing or renovating court~~  
31 ~~facilities.~~

32 ~~(4) The impact which creating additional judgeships has upon court facility and other~~  
33 ~~justice system facility needs.~~

34 ~~(5) The effects which trial court coordination and consolidation have upon court and~~  
35 ~~justice system facilities needs.~~

36 ~~(6) Administrative and operational changes which can reduce or mitigate the need for~~  
37 ~~added court or justice system facilities.~~

38 ~~(7) Recommendations for specific funding responsibilities among the entities of~~  
39 ~~government including full state responsibility, full county responsibility, or shared~~  
40 ~~responsibility.~~

41 ~~(8) A proposed transition plan if responsibility is to be changed.~~

1 ~~(9) Recommendations regarding funding sources for court facilities and funding~~  
2 ~~mechanisms to support court facilities:~~

3 ~~(e) The interim reports shall be circulated for comment to the counties, the judiciary,~~  
4 ~~the Legislature, and the Governor. The task force may also circulate these reports to users~~  
5 ~~of the court facilities:~~

6 ~~(f) The task force shall submit a final report to the Judicial Council, the Legislature,~~  
7 ~~and the Governor on or before July 1, 2001. The report shall include all elements of the~~  
8 ~~interim reports incorporating any changes recommended by the task force in response to~~  
9 ~~comments received:~~

10 ~~(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period from July 1, 1997 to~~  
11 ~~December 31, 2002, inclusive, the board of supervisors of each county shall be~~  
12 ~~responsible for providing suitable and necessary facilities for judicial officers and court~~  
13 ~~support staff for judicial positions created prior to July 1, 1996, to the extent required by~~  
14 ~~Section 68073. The board of supervisors of each county shall also be responsible for~~  
15 ~~providing suitable and necessary facilities for judicial officers and court support staff for~~  
16 ~~judgeships authorized by statutes chaptered in 1996 to the extent required by Section~~  
17 ~~68073, provided that the board of supervisors agrees that new facilities are either not~~  
18 ~~required or that the county is willing to provide funding for court facilities. Unless a~~  
19 ~~court and a county otherwise mutually agree, the state shall assume responsibility for~~  
20 ~~suitable and necessary facilities for judicial officers and support staff for any judgeships~~  
21 ~~authorized during the period from January 1, 1998, to December 31, 2002, inclusive:~~

22 **Comment.** Section 77654 is repealed as obsolete. The Task Force on Court Facilities  
23 completed its assigned work and submitted its final report to the Legislature in 2001. Soon  
24 afterwards, the Legislature enacted the Trial Court Facilities Act, which endorsed and  
25 implemented the key recommendations of the Task Force on Court Facilities. See 2002 Cal. Stat.  
26 ch. 1082.

27 **§ 77655 (amended). Inadmissibility of task force findings**

28 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Section 77655 of the Government Code is amended to read:

29 77655. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including Section ~~68073~~ 70311,  
30 the findings of the ~~task force~~ Task Force on Court Facilities created by Section 48 of  
31 Chapter 850 of the Statutes of 1997 shall not be considered or entered into evidence in  
32 any action brought by trial courts to compel a county to provide facilities that the trial  
33 court contends are necessary and suitable.

34 **Comment.** Section 77655 is amended to make it read clearly as a stand-alone section and  
35 reflect the renumbering of former Section 68073 (see 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 3). This is not a  
36 substantive change.

37 **UNCODIFIED**

38 **Uncodified (added). Savings clause — rights and benefits**

39 SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. If a right, privilege, duty, authority, or status, including but not limited to,  
40 a qualification for office, salary range, or employment benefit, is based on a provision of

1 law repealed by this act, and if a statute, order, rule of court, memorandum of  
2 understanding, or other legally effective instrument provides that the right, duty,  
3 authority, or status continues for a period beyond the effective date of the repeal, that  
4 provision of law continues in effect for that purpose, notwithstanding its repeal by this  
5 act.

---