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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

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

As a result, many code provisions relating to court facilities are obsolete, in whole or in part. The Law Revision Commission:\(^1\) studied this area and recommends various statutory revisions to remove material made obsolete by trial court restructuring.

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

**Background**

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

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

Those topics are discussed in order here.

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

Historically, each county had a superior court, as well as one or more municipal or justice courts with limited jurisdiction.\(^2\) 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). 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).
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 occurred:

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

**Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act.** Under this 1997 legislation, the
state assumed full responsibility for funding trial court operations. The goal was
to eliminate disparities in funding from county to county, helping to ensure equal
service in courts across the state.

**Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act ("TCEPGA").** This
legislation was enacted in 2000. It established a new personnel system for trial
court employees, in which they are employed by the superior court itself (not by
the county or the state).

**Treatment of Trial Court Facilities**
The above-described trial restructuring reforms did not resolve the proper treatment of
trial court facilities. Instead, the Trial Court Funding Act created the Task Force on Court
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
Revision of Codes”); J. Clark Kelso, Analysis of Existing Court Staffing Statutes (DRAFT: Jan. 24, 2000)
on file with Commission).

33 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 169, 177 (2003) (“Court facilities have historically been county
structures.”).


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.”).


12. See, e.g., Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 2140 (May 9, 2000).
throughout the state, and to make recommendations for specific funding responsibilities among the entities of government (i.e., state and/or county) with regards to court facilities maintenance and construction.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Of particular note, the Act set a deadline for each county to negotiate agreements transferring its court facilities (and responsibility for maintaining those facilities) to the

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.
state. The court facility transfers took longer than expected, but they were essentially completed by the end of 2009.

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

Role of the Law Revision Commission in Trial Court Restructuring

At the direction of the Legislature, the Law Revision Commission was involved in trial court restructuring from the outset. In 1993-94, the Commission helped to draft the constitutional revisions necessary to accomplish trial court unification. It later drafted the extensive statutory revisions necessary to accommodate county-by-county unification.

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

Since then, the Commission has continued to review the codes and periodically recommend revisions to reflect trial court unification, enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act, and enactment of the TCEPGA. Virtually all of the Commission’s proposed legislation on trial court restructuring has become law.

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 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).


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

Because court facilities issues were unsettled, the Commission did not address such issues in its 2001 report or later work on trial court restructuring.29 Recently, however, the Commission turned to those issues and reached conclusions on how to update various


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.
court facilities statutes to reflect the trial court restructuring reforms, including the
enactment and implementation of the Trial Court Facilities Act.
Those conclusions are described below. The discussion starts with the court facility
statutes in Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code and then turns to other court
facility statutes.
The Commission’s work on trial court restructuring is ongoing. It will address other
unresolved matters as time permits.\footnote{30}

\textbf{Chapter 10 of Title 8 (Sections 73301-74988)\footnote{31}}

Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code (Sections 73301 to 74988) contains
many old statutes relating to court facilities.\footnote{32} Much of the chapter appears to be obsolete.
The discussion below (1) describes some history of the chapter, (2) identifies “typical”
articles in the chapter and explains why they appear to be obsolete, and (3) explains why
some of the other articles also require revisions to reflect trial court restructuring.

\textbf{History}

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

Due to trial court unification and the enactment of the TCEPGA, almost all of that
material became obsolete.\footnote{34} For that reason, all but one of these articles was repealed in
2002, on the Commission’s recommendation.\footnote{35}

\footnote{30. For a description of the trial court restructuring projects that remained unfinished as of February 1,
2018, see CLRC Staff Memorandum 2018-5. For information on later progress, see
www.clrc.ca.gov/J1405.html.}

\footnote{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 \textit{infra} notes 86-90 & accompanying text.}

\footnote{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 \textit{infra}.}

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

\footnote{34. See \textit{TCR: Part 1, supra} note 25, at 16-17.}

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 \textit{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 \textit{TCR: Part 1, supra} note 25, at 402-09.
However, some of the articles in Chapter 10 of Title 8 contained a small amount of material that was not yet clearly obsolete. For example, it would have been premature to delete court facility provisions, because policy-makers had not yet resolved the proper treatment of court facilities. To preserve that material, each such article was simultaneously reenacted in a much-reduced form, as recommended by the Commission.36

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

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

(1) A section that describes one or more municipal court districts.

(2) A section on court facilities and sessions in those districts.37

Articles in this category include the ones pertaining to Butte,38 Fresno,39 Glenn,40 Humboldt,41 Imperial,42 Kings,43 Marin,44 Mariposa,45 Mendocino,46 Napa,47 Santa Barbara,48 Siskiyou,49 Yolo,50 and Yuba51 Counties.


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

**Municipal courts no longer exist.** The municipal and superior courts in every county have unified their operations in the superior court,\(^52\) which serves the entire county.\(^53\) Consequently, statutory descriptions of municipal courts or their districts\(^54\) are generally obsolete.

**Superior court sessions are governed by other law.** Soon after the trial court restructuring reforms, the Legislature enacted a provision on superior court sessions, which serves to facilitate the objectives of those reforms.\(^55\) That provision, now codified as Section 69740,\(^56\) authorizes each superior court to determine the number and location of sessions of the court. It expressly overrides any other law on the subject.\(^57\)

Accordingly, statutory language that conflicts with or duplicates Section 69740 should be repealed. A good example is a section relating to Humboldt County, 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.”).


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.)
to the court, the … locations where sessions of the court may be held other than in the county seat shall be as determined by the board of supervisors.”

Counts and their boards of supervisors are no longer responsible for trial court facilities. Some provisions in Chapter 10 of Title 8 give the local board of supervisors authority over trial court facilities. For example, a statute pertaining to Mendocino County says: “The location of permanent court facilities … shall be as determined by the board of supervisors.” Now that court facilities belong to the state and counties are no longer responsible for them, such statutory language is obsolete.

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

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

---

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

(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,

The Commission thus recommends that the typical articles in Chapter 10 of Title 8 (the articles pertaining to Butte, Fresno, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Kings, Marin, Mariposa, Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, Yolo, and Yuba Counties) be repealed.\textsuperscript{65}

\textit{Variations That Also Warrant Revisions (Madera, Merced, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo Counties; “General Provisions”; Section 24261)}

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

- \textit{Madera County.} The article on Madera County is similar to the typical articles and suffers from some of the same flaws,\textsuperscript{66} but it also includes a stand-alone section on transportation of prisoners by the Madera County sheriff.\textsuperscript{67} To the best of the Commission’s knowledge, that section remains current and should be retained. The rest of the article should be repealed.\textsuperscript{68}

- \textit{Merced County.} The article on Merced County is similar to the typical articles and suffers from the same flaws,\textsuperscript{69} but it also includes a section relating to the marshal of the Merced County Municipal Court.\textsuperscript{70} There no longer is a marshal in Merced County,\textsuperscript{71} so the whole article can be repealed.\textsuperscript{72}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Compare} Section 73698.6 (facilities for Central Valley Municipal Court District of Fresno County) \textit{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.
\item 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 \textit{infra}.
\item See Sections 73750, 73756.
\item See Section 73758.
\item See proposed repeals of Sections 73750 & 73756 & Comments \textit{infra}.
\item See Sections 73790, 73792.
\item See Section 73796.
\item 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 \textit{infra}.
\item 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.
\item 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 \textit{Trial Court Restructuring Clean-Up: Obsolete References to Marshals} (April 2019).
\item See proposed repeal of Sections 73790-73796 & Comments \textit{infra}.
\end{itemize}
• **North County Judicial District (San Diego County).** The article on the North County Judicial District in San Diego County is similar to the typical articles and suffers from the same flaws, but it also includes a section on judicial benefits, which pertains to the municipal court district identified in the introductory section. Those two sections should be retained, because the Commission has deferred work on the intersection of trial court restructuring and judicial benefits. The other section should be repealed.

• **San Luis Obispo.** The article on San Luis Obispo County consists of a single section, which pertains to the local superior court (not a municipal court). Like the typical articles, that section specifies a court location and addresses court sessions. The article thus appears to be obsolete for the reasons discussed above.

• **General Provisions (Section 73301).** Article 1 is entitled “General Provisions” and consists of a single provision (Section 73301), which was enacted in 1953 just after the California Constitution was amended to replace various types of inferior courts with municipal and justice courts. The section was intended to protect employees of superseded courts who succeeded to positions in newly created municipal courts. In all likelihood, it is obsolete. It pertains to employees of courts that were long ago superseded by municipal courts, which in turn were eliminated through trial 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 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).
One other provision is worth mentioning here. Section 24261 is not located in Chapter 10 of Title 8, but it is similar to some of the provisions in that chapter because it specifies a court location and imposes requirements regarding court sessions. Those aspects of the section are obsolete for the reasons explained above.

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

**Other Court Facilities Statutes**

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

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

The Commission discusses each group of proposed reforms in the order listed. The 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 1, 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.
Completion of Report by the Task Force on Court Facilities (Sections 77650-77655; Section 77201.3)

As previously discussed, the Task Force on Court Facilities completed its assigned work long ago. Consequently, the article governing it (Sections 77650-77655) is largely obsolete. The Commission recommends repealing all but one section in the article. The remaining section (Section 77655) makes the findings of the task force inadmissible in “any action brought by trial courts to compel a county to provide facilities that the trial court contends are necessary and suitable.” In case that section might still have some utility, the Commission recommends amending it to read clearly as a stand-alone section.

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

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

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

- Section 25351.3. Among other things, subdivision (a) of Section 25351.3 permits a board of supervisors to “[a]cquire land for and construct, lease, sublease, build, furnish, refurnish, or repair buildings for municipal or superior courts ….” Similarly, subdivision (c) says that “leases for municipal or superior courts … may be entered into without advertising for bids ….” Because municipal courts no longer exist, Section 25351.3 should be amended to delete its references to such courts. In addition, subdivision (e) should be revised to reflect that counties and their boards of supervisors are no longer required to “provide adequate quarters for courts.”

---

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.
• Section 25560.4. Under specified circumstances, Section 25560.4 permits a board of supervisors to dedicate unused parkland “for the erection and maintenance of one or more buildings to house any municipal or superior court ….“99 This municipal court reference is obsolete and should be deleted.100

• Sections 71002 and 71383. Section 71002 says that the board of supervisors of each county is responsible for providing facilities, supplies, and equipment for the local municipal court(s). The section is obsolete because municipal courts no longer exist and counties are no longer responsible for providing court facilities or funding court operations. Other provisions contain comparable language pertaining to the superior courts,101 so Section 71002 can simply be repealed.102 There is no need to amend it to apply to the superior courts instead of the municipal courts. Section 71383 should also be repealed, because it merely defines a term for purposes of Section 71002.103

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

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

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

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

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.
to replace “board of supervisors” with “superior court,” to reflect the transfer of responsibilities under the Trial Court Funding Act.105

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

• **Los Angeles County (and possibly Orange and Riverside Counties).** Under Section 68073.5, the *board of supervisors* in a county “having a population of 3,000,000 or more” may give court personnel the same access to dining and parking facilities in or adjacent to *court* buildings in the county that county personnel receive in or adjacent to other county buildings. Historically, Los Angeles was the only county with a population over 3,000,000; Orange and Riverside Counties would also qualify if the statute refers to current population figures instead of the historical figures that are used to classify the counties.106 In any case, Section 68073.5 appears to be obsolete due to the transfers of court buildings from the counties to the state. The Commission recommends that it be repealed.107

• **Sacramento County.** Under specified circumstances, Section 14672.5 authorizes the state to lease a particular parcel of property to the City of Folsom (located in Sacramento County) for up to fifty years for a “police station, *courthouse*, or city hall.”108 The property in question is not currently being leased to the City of Folsom for a courthouse, and such a lease would not seem to be necessary for the future either. Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, the state is responsible for court facilities, not the counties, much less the City of Folsom. Accordingly, Section 14672.5 should be amended to delete the reference to a courthouse.109

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

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

As authorized by statute,110 many counties established Courthouse Construction Funds to finance construction of court facilities. Under the Trial Court Facilities Act, any amount in a county’s Courthouse Construction Fund must be transferred to the state111 at the *later* of the following dates:

---

105. See proposed amendment of Section 69504 & Comment *infra*.
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) The date of the last transfer of responsibility for court facilities from the county to the Judicial Council or December 31, 2009, whichever is earlier.

(2) The date of the final payment of the bonded indebtedness for any court facility that is paid from that fund is retired. ¹¹²

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

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

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

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

¹¹² Section 70402(a) (emphasis added).


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.


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.
• **Merced County.** Section 76225 says that if Merced County does not transfer certain court facilities to the state on or before April 1, 2007, it must pay the state back for the construction funds used for those facilities. Merced County met the specified deadline, so the section should be repealed.\(^{118}\) Along similar lines, Section 76223(e) should be revised to reflect that the event it describes as a contingency (enactment of legislation that transfers responsibility for court facilities to the state and also permits transfer of associated bonded indebtedness and revenue sources) has actually occurred.\(^{119}\)

• **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.”\(^{120}\) Reportedly, 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 proposes to add a five-year sunset clause to the section.\(^{121}\)

• **San Diego County.** Another statute that refers to a Courthouse Construction Fund is Section 6250,\(^{122}\) which permits the San Diego City Council and the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County to create, by joint powers agreement, a redevelopment agency to be known as the “San Diego Courthouse, Jail, and Related Facilities Development Agency.” The section’s reference to a Courthouse Construction Fund is not out-of-date, because San Diego County apparently still has such a fund.\(^{123}\) However, the section is obsolete for other reasons: (1) the contemplated new agency does not appear to have been created and if it were created, it would have the powers and duties of a redevelopment agency, but redevelopment agencies no longer exist, and (2) the section allocates substantial control over courthouse planning and construction to the city, county, and contemplated 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.
the judicial branch in the Trial Court Facilities Act. The Commission thus recommends that Section 6250 be repealed.

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

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

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

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

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


126. See CLRC 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 CLRC Staff Memorandum 2018-63, Exhibit pp. 1-4).
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PROPOSED LEGISLATION

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

§ 216 (amended). Jury deliberation rooms

SEC. _____. Section 216 of the Code of Civil Procedure is amended to read:

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

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT CODE

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

SEC. _____. Section 6520 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

(b) The agency shall be governed by a board of directors composed of one city council
member and one citizen designated by the San Diego City Council; one supervisor and
one citizen designated by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors; two citizens
appointed by the presiding judge of the superior court effective during his or her term of
presidence; the Sheriff of San Diego County; the president or designee of the San Diego
County Bar Association; and one citizen designated by the District Attorney of San Diego
County; all of whom shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing power and without
further compensation.

(e) The City of San Diego and the County of San Diego shall each have the power of
noneconcurrence over any action taken by the board of directors, provided that a motion
for reconsideration is made by a member of the board of directors immediately following
the vote of the board of directors approving such action, and further provided that the city
council or the board of supervisors votes to nullify such action, by a majority vote of its
membership, within 30 days:

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

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

Comment. Section 6520 is repealed 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).
California Redevelopment Ass’n v. Matosantos, 53 Cal. 4th 241, 267 P.3d 580, 135 Cal. Rptr. 3d
683 (2011).

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

SEC. ____. Section 14672.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

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

Comment. Section 14672.5 is amended to reflect 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).

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

SEC. ____. Section 24261 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

Comment. Section 24261 is repealed to reflect:
(1) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities
Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court
operations). See also Sections 68070 (court rules), 70311-70312 (responsibility for court
operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(2) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its
sessions).

§ 25351.3 (amended). Acquisition, rental, improvement, furnishing, and repair of real
property and facilities
SEC. ____. Section 25351.3 of the Government Code is amended to read:
25351.3. In addition to its other powers and duties, the board of supervisors may do
any or all of the following:
(a) Acquire land for and construct, lease, sublease, build, furnish, refurbish, or repair
buildings for municipal or superior courts and for convention and exhibition halls, trade
and industrial centers, auditoriums, opera houses, music halls and centers, motion picture
and television museums, and related facilities used for public assembly purposes for the
use, benefit and enjoyment of the public, including offstreet parking places for motor
vehicles, ways of ingress and egress, and any other facilities and improvements necessary
or convenient for their use.
(b) Acquire land and construct buildings, structures and facilities thereon, in whole or
in part, with county funds or it may, by contract or lease with any nonprofit association or
corporation, provide for the acquisition of land or the construction of buildings, structures
and facilities, or all or any part thereof, for public assembly purposes, upon the terms the
board may determine.
(c) Lease, pursuant to Section 25371, any real property owned by the county and
available for public assembly purposes to any person, firm, corporation, or nonprofit
association or corporation for public assembly purposes, with the person, firm,
corporation, or nonprofit association or corporation to lease the real property, as
improved, back to the county for use for the purposes stated in the lease. Any lease
authorized by the board under this subdivision, except leases for municipal or superior
courts, which may be entered into without advertising for bids, shall be awarded to the
lowest responsible bidder after public competitive bidding conducted in the manner
determined by the board. Notice inviting bids shall be published pursuant to Section 6066
in a newspaper as the board may direct.
(d) Enter into a lease or sublease, without advertising for bids therefor, of buildings,
structures, and facilities or any of them with any nonprofit association or corporation
which agrees to use the buildings, structures, and facilities so leased to it for the public
assembly purposes for which they were or are to be built; or contract, without advertising,
for bids with any nonprofit association or corporation for the maintenance, operation, and
management of the buildings, structures, and facilities, or any part thereof used for public
assembly purposes, including the scheduling and promotion of events therein, for a
specified term, not to exceed 40 years, upon terms and conditions as may be agreed upon.

The leases, subleases, or contracts shall provide that, at least annually, there shall be paid to the county the net revenue, if any, from the operation and use of the facilities, remaining after the payment of expenses and costs, if any, for maintenance, operation or management, interest, and principal payments upon loans to the nonprofit corporation or association for purposes of maintenance, operation, or management, and any other expenses, and after providing maintenance and operation reserves. The lease, sublease, or contract shall also provide that, upon its expiration, all of the assets of the nonprofit association or corporation after payment or discharge of its indebtedness and liabilities shall be transferred to the county.

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

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

Comment. Section 25351.3 is amended to reflect:

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

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

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

SEC. ____. Section 25560.4 of the Government Code is amended to read:

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

Comment. Section 25560.4 is amended to reflect unification of the municipal and superior courts pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution.
§ 68073.5 (repealed). Dining and parking facilities in or adjacent to court building in county with population over three million

SEC. ____. Section 68073.5 of the Government Code is repealed.
68073.5. In any county having a population of 2,000,000 or more, the board of supervisors may, with respect to any dining facility, or garage or other vehicular parking facility, in or adjacent to the county courthouse and other court buildings in such county, provide the courts occupying such buildings and the judges, officers of the court, attaches and jurors quartered therein, with the same accommodations as to use, access, occupancy and, excepting jurors, with the same participation in the operational administration thereof, as are furnished, made available to, or enjoyed by the departments, officers and employees of the county with respect to similar facilities in or adjacent to other county buildings.

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

§ 69504 (amended). Flags for courtrooms

SEC. ____. Section 69504 of the Government Code is amended to read:
69504. The board of supervising a superior court of each county shall purchase and provide for the installation of the Flag of the United States and the Bear Flag of California in each superior courtroom in the county.

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

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

SEC. ____. Section 70394 of the Government Code is repealed.
70394. (a) The Judicial Council shall establish a task force on county law libraries. The task force is charged with identifying the needs related to county law library operations and facilities, and identifying and making recommendations for funding county law library operations, facility improvements, and expansion;
(b) The task force shall consist of three representatives from the judicial branch of government, as selected by the Administrative Director of the Courts, three representatives of the counties, as selected by the California State Association of Counties, and three county law library administrators, as selected by the Council of California County Law Librarians. The Administrative Director of the Courts shall designate one of these representatives as chairperson of the task force.
(e) The Administrative Office of the Courts shall provide staff support for the task force and shall develop guidelines for procedures and practices for the task force.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

§ 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, which is intended to afford time
for resolution of issues relating to closure of the Courthouse Construction Fund for San
Bernardino County.

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

SEC. ____. Section 71002 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

Comment. Section 71002 is repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts pursuant to former Article VI, Section
5(e), of the California Constitution.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities
Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court
operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),
70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

§ 71383 (repealed). “Board of supervisors”

SEC. ____. Section 71383 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 10. OTHER MUNICIPAL COURTS DISTRICTS
COUNTY-SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Comment. The heading of Chapter 10 is amended to properly reflect the current content of the
chapter. Municipal courts as separate entities no longer exist. They were eliminated through trial
court unification, which occurred on a county-by-county basis. See former Cal. Const. art. VI,
Section 5(e). The last remaining municipal courts were eliminated on February 8, 2001, when the
trial courts in Kings County unified their operations in the superior court.
§§ 73301-73301 (repealed). General provisions

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

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

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


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

§§ 73390-73396 (repealed). Kings County

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

Comment. Sections 73390-73396 are repealed to reflect:

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

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

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

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

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

Article 3. Kings County

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.

§§ 73560-73561 (repealed). Monterey County

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

Comment. Sections 73560-73561 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Monterey County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective December 18, 2000.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 7. Monterey County

§§ 73660-73661 (repealed). Humboldt County
SEC. ____. Article 9.5 (commencing with Section 73660) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code is repealed.

Comment. Sections 73660-73661 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Humboldt County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 10, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 9.5. Humboldt County

§§ 73698-73698.6 (repealed). Fresno County
SEC. ____. Article 10.5 (commencing with Section 73698) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code is repealed.

Comment. Sections 73698-73698.6 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Fresno County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 1, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its
sessions).

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

Article 10.5. Fresno County

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

§ 73698.6. Facilities for the court shall be maintained in the Cities of Coalinga, Firebaugh,
Fowler, Kerman, Kingsburg, Parlier, Selma, Reedley, and Sanger, and the communities of
Caruthers and Riverdale; and in such other locations within the County of Fresno 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 Fresno County Detention Facility shall be held at the court facility located at the Fresno
County Detention Facility.

§§ 73730-73732 (repealed). Imperial County

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

Comment. Sections 73730-73732 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Imperial County pursuant to former
Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 22, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities
Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court
operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities),
70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its
sessions).

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

Article 11.5. Imperial County

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

§ 73732. 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.
The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations
designated by the board of supervisors.

§ 73750 (repealed). Madera County Municipal Court District

SEC. ____. Section 73750 of the Government Code is repealed.

Comment. Section 73750 is repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Madera County pursuant to former
Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 1, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

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

§ 73756 (repealed). Court facilities and sessions

SEC. ____. Section 73756 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

Comment. Section 73756 is repealed to reflect:

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

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

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

§§ 73770-73771 (repealed). Marin County

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

Comment. Sections 73770-73771 are repealed to reflect:

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

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

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

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

Article 12. Marin County

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

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

§§ 73783.1-73783.3 (repealed). Mariposa County

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

Comment. Sections 73783.1-73783.3 are repealed to reflect:

(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Mariposa County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).

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

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

**Article 12.2. Mariposa County**

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

73783.3. 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. The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated by the board of supervisors. Jurors shall be drawn from the entire county.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Article 12.3. Mendocino County**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

(4) Elimination of the marshal’s office in Merced County. 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.

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

### Article 12.5. Merced County

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

73792. 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. The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated by the board of supervisors.

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

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

---

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

**SEC. _____.** Section 73956 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

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

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

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

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

(4) Elimination of the marshal’s office in the area.
§§ 74602-74602 (repealed). San Luis Obispo County

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

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

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

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

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

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

Article 27. San Luis Obispo County

74602. 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. 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.

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

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

Comment. Sections 74640-74640.2 are repealed to reflect:

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

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

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

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

Article 28. Santa Barbara County

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 County Municipal Court.

74640.2. In order that the citizens residing in each division of the North Santa Barbara County Municipal Court may have convenient access to the court, sufficient court facilities, including staff and other necessary personnel, shall be maintained in each division at the following sites or as otherwise designated by the board of supervisors:

(a) In the Santa Maria Division, in the City of Santa Maria.

(b) In the Lompoc Division, in the City of Lompoc.

(c) In the Solvang Division, in the City of Solvang.
§§ 74720-74724 (repealed). Siskiyou County

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

Comment. Sections 74720-74724 are repealed to reflect:
1. Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Siskiyou County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 4, 1998.
2. Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
3. Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 29.6. Siskiyou County

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

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

§§ 74760-74764 (repealed). Glenn County

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

Comment. Sections 74760-74764 are repealed to reflect:
1. Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Glenn County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective July 31, 1998.
2. Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
3. Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 30.1. Glenn County

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

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

§§ 74915-74916 (repealed). Yuba County

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

Comment. Sections 74915-74916 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Yuba County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective April 16, 1999.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 35.5. Yuba County

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.

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. The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated by the board of supervisors.

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

§§ 74934-74935.5 (repealed). Butte County

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

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

(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Butte County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 37. Butte County

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

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

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

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

§§ 74948-74950 (repealed). Napa County

SEC. ____. Article 38 (commencing with Section 74948) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code is repealed.
Comment. Sections 74948-74950 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Napa County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 38. Napa County

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

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

§§ 74960-74962 (repealed). Yolo County
SEC. ____. Article 39 (commencing with Section 74960) of Chapter 10 of Title 8 of the Government Code is repealed.
Comment. Sections 74960-74962 are repealed to reflect:
(1) Unification of the municipal and superior courts in Yolo County pursuant to former Article VI, Section 5(e), of the California Constitution, effective June 3, 1998.
(2) Enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and the related Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. See Sections 77003 (“court operations” defined), 77200 (state funding of trial court operations). See also Sections 70311-70312 (responsibility for court operations & facilities), 70391 (Judicial Council responsibility & authority for court facilities).
(3) Enactment of Section 69740(a) (trial court to determine number and location of its sessions).

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

Article 39. Yolo County

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

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. The court shall determine the nature and frequency of sessions held at additional court locations designated by the board of supervisors.

§ 76000 (amended). Added penalties
SEC. ____. Section 76000 of the Government Code is amended to read:
76000. (a)(1) Except as otherwise provided elsewhere in this section, in each county there shall be levied an additional penalty in the amount of seven dollars ($7) for every
ten dollars ($10), or part of ten dollars ($10), upon every fine, penalty, or forfeiture
imposed and collected by the courts for all criminal offenses, including all offenses
involving a violation of the Vehicle Code or any local ordinance adopted pursuant to the
Vehicle Code.

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

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

(A) Any restitution fine.

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

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

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

(b) In each authorized county, provided that the board of supervisors has adopted a
resolution stating that the implementation of this subdivision is necessary to the county
for the purposes authorized, with respect to each authorized fund established pursuant to
Section 76100 or 76101, for every parking offense where a parking penalty, fine, or
forfeiture is imposed, an added penalty of two dollars and fifty cents ($2.50) shall be
included in the total penalty, fine, or forfeiture. Except as provided in subdivision (c), for
each parking case collected in the courts of the county, the county treasurer shall place in
each authorized fund two dollars and fifty cents ($2.50). These moneys shall be taken
from fines and forfeitures deposited with the county treasurer prior to any division
pursuant to Section 1462.3 or 1463.009 of the Penal Code. The judges of the county shall
increase the bail schedule amounts as appropriate to reflect the added penalty provided
for by this section. In those cities, districts, or other issuing agencies which elect to accept
parking penalties, and otherwise process parking violations pursuant to Article 3
(commencing with Section 40200) of Chapter 1 of Division 17 of the Vehicle Code, that
city, district, or issuing agency shall observe the increased bail amounts as established by
the court reflecting the added penalty provided for by this section. Each agency which
elects to process parking violations shall pay to the county treasurer two dollars and fifty
cents ($2.50) for each fund for each parking penalty collected on each violation which is
not filed in court. Those payments to the county treasurer shall be made monthly, and the
county treasurer shall deposit all those sums in the authorized fund. No issuing agency
shall be required to contribute revenues to any fund in excess of those revenues generated
from the surcharges established in the resolution adopted pursuant to this chapter, except
as otherwise agreed upon by the local governmental entities involved.

(c) The county treasurer shall deposit one dollar ($1) of every two dollars and fifty
cents ($2.50) collected pursuant to subdivision (b) into the general fund of the county.
(d) The authority to impose the two-dollar-and-fifty-cent ($2.50) penalty authorized by subdivision (b) shall be reduced to one dollar ($1) as of the date of transfer of responsibility for facilities from the county to the Judicial Council pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 70321) of Chapter 5 of Part 5.7, except as money is needed to pay for construction provided for in Section 76100 and undertaken prior to the transfer of responsibility for facilities from the county to the Judicial Council.

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

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

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

§ 76223 (amended). Construction of court facilities in Merced County
SEC. _____. Section 76223 of the Government Code is amended to read:
76223. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following conditions pertain to
the construction of court facilities in Merced County by the County of Merced for any
construction pursuant to a written agreement entered into prior to January 1, 2004,
between the board of supervisors and the presiding judge of the superior court:
(a) Revenue received in Merced County from civil assessments for Failure to Appear,
pursuant to Section 1214.1 of the Penal Code, shall be available, in an annual amount not
to exceed the amount agreed upon by the board of supervisors and the presiding judge of
the superior court, for the purpose of augmenting other funds made available for
construction.
(b) The presiding judge of the superior court may agree to make available court funds,
up to a stated amount, other than funds received from the Trial Court Trust Fund or other
state sources, in the courthouse construction fund.
(c) The total amounts deposited under subdivision (a) may not exceed in any fiscal year
the amount payable on the construction costs less (1) any amounts paid by the courthouse
construction fund and (2) any other amounts paid from other sources except for any
amounts paid pursuant to subdivision (b).
(d) The total amounts deposited under subdivision (b) shall not exceed in any fiscal
year the amount payable on the construction costs less (1) any amounts paid by the
courthouse construction fund, (2) any amounts paid pursuant to subdivision (a) of this
section, and (3) any other amounts paid from other sources except for any amounts paid
pursuant to subdivision (b).
(e) If legislation is passed and becomes effective transferring the responsibility for
court facilities to the state, and the legislation permits the transfer of the bonded
indebtedness or other encumbrance on court facilities together with revenue sources for
payment of the bonded indebtedness or other encumbrance, the revenue sources
provided for by this section may also be transferred to the state.
(f) As used in this section, the costs of construction also includes the payment on the
bonded indebtedness or other encumbrance used to finance the construction.
Comment. Section 76223 is amended to reflect enactment of the Trial Court Facilities Act,
2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082. See in particular Section 70321 (transfer of court facilities from county
to Judicial Council) and Section 70325(a)(2) (county may transfer revenue sources to state,
whereupon state becomes responsible for making payments on bonded indebtedness).

§ 76225 (repealed). Reimbursement of court construction funds in Merced County if
transfers do not occur on time
SEC. _____. Section 76225 of the Government Code is repealed.
76225. If Merced County has not executed the transfer of its responsibilities and titles
for the New Downtown Merced Courthouse, New Courts Building (Departments 1 to 3,
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>$22,509,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>11,974,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>11,222,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>9,234,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>198,858,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) (A) This paragraph sets forth the amount of the revenue maintenance of effort payment as modified by the reductions in Sections 68085.2 and 68085.7, including, if applicable, any adjustment made pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 68085.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>$7,529,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>58,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>261,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>797,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>298,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>394,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>3,136,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>120,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>732,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>3,536,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>293,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>933,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>1,075,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>610,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>5,247,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>759,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>133,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>379,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>47,023,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>1,025,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>2,010,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>131,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>441,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>1,600,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc</td>
<td>103,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>409,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>2,662,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>710,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,197,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>15,603,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>835,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumas</td>
<td>154,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>7,108,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1,829,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>270,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>3,325,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13,501,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>3,123,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>2,158,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>1,754,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>2,527,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>3,117,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1,495,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>574,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>41,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td>482,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>1,931,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>1,439,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>1,079,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>644,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>627,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>102,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>1,345,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuolumne</td>
<td>277,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>2,283,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>464,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>273,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

(c) Except for those counties with a population of 70,000, or less, on January 1, 1996, the amount a county is required to remit pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) shall be adjusted by the amount equal to any adjustment resulting from the procedures in subdivisions (c) and (d) of Section 77201 as that section read on June 30, 1998, to the extent a county filed an appeal with the Controller with respect to the findings made by the Department of Finance. This subdivision shall not be construed to establish a new appeal process beyond what was provided by Section 77201, as that section read on June 30, 1998.

(d) Any change in statute or rule of court that either reduces the bail schedule or redirects or reduces a county’s portion of fee, fine, and forfeiture revenue to an amount...
that is less than (1) the fees, fines, and forfeitures retained by that county, and (2) the
county’s portion of fines and forfeitures transmitted to the state in the 1994–95 fiscal
year, shall reduce that county’s remittance specified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) by
an equal amount. Nothing in this subdivision is intended to limit judicial sentencing
discretion.
(e) Nothing in this section is intended to relieve a county of the responsibility to
provide necessary and suitable court facilities pursuant to Section 68073 70311.
(f) Nothing in this section is intended to relieve a county of the responsibility for
justice-related expenses not included in Section 77003 which are otherwise required of
the county by law, including, but not limited to, indigent defense representation and
investigation, and payment of juvenile justice charges.
Comment. Section 77201.3 is amended to reflect the renumbering of former Section 68073
(see 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 1082, § 3). This is not a substantive change.

§ 77650 (repealed). Task Force on Court Facilities
SEC. ____. Section 77650 of the Government Code is repealed.
77650. The Task Force on Court Facilities is hereby established in state government
and charged with identifying the needs related to trial and appellate court facilities, and
options and recommendations for funding court facility maintenance, improvements, and
expansion, including the specific responsibilities of each entity of government.
Comment. Section 77650 is repealed as obsolete. The Task Force on Court Facilities
completed its assigned work and submitted its final report to the Legislature in 2001. Soon
afterwards, the Legislature enacted the Trial Court Facilities Act, which endorsed and
implemented the key recommendations of the Task Force on Court Facilities. See 2002 Cal. Stat.
ch. 1082.

§ 77651 (repealed). Composition of task force
SEC. ____. Section 77651 of the Government Code is repealed.
77651. The task force shall be composed of 18 members, appointed as follows:
(a) Six members appointed by the Chief Justice who shall be from urban, suburban, and
rural courts. Four representatives may be either trial court judges or trial court
administrators. One representative shall be a justice of the courts of appeal:
(b) Six members appointed by the Governor from a list of nominees submitted by the
California State Association of Counties, who represent urban, suburban, and rural
counties. Four representatives may be either county supervisors or county administrators.
One representative shall be a person with court security responsibility.
(c) Two members appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, one of whom shall
represent the State Bar or an associated attorney organization, neither of whom would be
eligible for appointment under subdivision (a) or (b).
(d) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, one of whom shall
represent the State Bar or an associated attorney organization, neither of whom would be
eligible for appointment under subdivision (a) or (b).
(e) The Director of General Services and the Director of Finance:
(f) The Chief Justice shall designate one of these representatives as the chairperson of the task force.

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

§ 77652 (repealed). Staff support for task force and guidelines for procedures and practices
SEC. ____. Section 77652 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

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

§ 77653 (repealed). Duties of task force
SEC. ____. Section 77653 of the Government Code is repealed.

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

(a) Document the state of existing court facilities;

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

(c) Document the funding mechanisms currently available for maintenance, operation, construction, and renovation of court facilities;

(d) Examine existing standards for court facility construction;

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

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

(g) Review and provide recommendations on concepts regarding security; operational flexibility; alternative dispute resolution; meeting space; special needs of children, families, victims, and disabled persons; technology; the dignity of the participants; and any other special needs of court facilities.

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

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

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

§ 77654 (repealed). Timeline for task force
SEC. ____. Section 77654 of the Government Code is repealed.
77654. (a) The task force shall be appointed on or before October 1, 1997.
(b) The task force shall meet and establish its operating procedures on or before September 1, 1998, and submit its plan for the entire review of court facilities by October 1, 1998, to the Judicial Council, Legislature, and Governor.
(c) The task force shall review all available court facility standards and make preliminary determinations of acceptable standards for construction, renovation, and remodeling of court facilities, and shall report those preliminary determinations to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and the Governor in an interim report on or before July 1, 1999.
(d) The task force shall complete a survey of all trial and appellate court facilities in the state and report its findings to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and the Governor in a second interim report on or before January 1, 2001. The report shall document all of the following:
(1) The state of existing court facilities.
(2) The need for new or modified court facilities.
(3) The currently available funding options for constructing or renovating court facilities.
(4) The impact which creating additional judgeships has upon court facility and other justice system facility needs.
(5) The effects which trial court coordination and consolidation have upon court and justice system facilities.
(6) Administrative and operational changes which can reduce or mitigate the need for added court or justice system facilities.
(7) Recommendations for specific funding responsibilities among the entities of government—including full state responsibility, full county responsibility, or shared responsibility.
(8) A proposed transition plan if responsibility is to be changed.
(9) Recommendations regarding funding sources for court facilities and funding mechanisms to support court facilities.
(e) The interim reports shall be circulated for comment to the counties, the judiciary, the Legislature, and the Governor. The task force may also circulate these reports to users of the court facilities.
(f) The task force shall submit a final report to the Judicial Council, the Legislature, and the Governor on or before July 1, 2001. The report shall include all elements of the interim reports incorporating any changes recommended by the task force in response to comments received.
(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period from July 1, 1997 to December 31, 2002, inclusive, the board of supervisors of each county shall be responsible for providing suitable and necessary facilities for judicial officers and court support staff for judicial positions created prior to July 1, 1996, to the extent required by Section 68073. The board of supervisors of each county shall also be responsible for providing suitable and necessary facilities for judicial officers and court support staff for judgeships authorized by statutes chaptered in 1996 to the extent required by Section 68073, provided that the board of supervisors agrees that new facilities are either not required or that the county is willing to provide funding for court facilities. Unless a court and a county otherwise mutually agree, the state shall assume responsibility for suitable and necessary facilities for judicial officers and support staff for any judgeships authorized during the period from January 1, 1998, to December 31, 2002, inclusive.

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

§ 77655 (amended). Inadmissibility of task force findings
SEC. ____. Section 77655 of the Government Code is amended to read:

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

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

UNCODIFIED

Uncodified (added). Savings clause — rights and benefits
SEC. ____. If a right, privilege, duty, authority, or status, including but not limited to, a qualification for office, salary range, or employment benefit, is based on a provision of law repealed by this act, and if a statute, order, rule of court, memorandum of understanding, or other legally effective instrument provides that the right, duty, authority, or status continues for a period beyond the effective date of the repeal, that provision of law continues in effect for that purpose, notwithstanding its repeal by this act.