

California State Assembly



Informational Hearing Agenda

Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 6 on Public Safety

Assemblymember James Ramos, Chair

Monday, March 16, 2026
2:30 P.M. – State Capitol, Room 447

Items To Be Heard		
Item	Description	Page
0250	Judicial Branch	2
Issues	1. Judicial Branch Overview of Budget Priorities	2
	2. Proposition 36 Update	5
	3. Remote Court Proceedings	8
	4. Orange Central Justice Center Facility Modification Proposal and the LAO's Assessment and Recommendations related to Trial Court Construction Costs	10
0690	Office of Emergency Services	18
Issues	5. Victims Services Funding: VOCA Update, Overview of Trauma Recovery Centers, and Overview of Human Trafficking Programs	18
	6. Next Generation 9-1-1 Implementation Update	20
	7. Southern California Wildfire Recovery Update	22

Non-Presentation Items		
Item	Description	Page
0690	Office of Emergency Services	24
Issue	8. Various Budget Change Proposals	24

Public Comment will be taken in person after the completion of all panels and any discussion from the Members of the Subcommittee.

Items To Be Heard

0250 – Judicial Branch

Issue 1: Judicial Branch Overview of Budget Priorities

The Judicial Council will provide an overview of its 2026-2027 budget priorities.

Panel

- Michelle Curran, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California
- Honorable Patricia Kelly, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County and Chair of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee
- Kate Bieker, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Ventura County and Chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Budget Services Director, Judicial Council of California

Background

The following background is provided by the Legislative Analyst's Office:

The judicial branch is responsible for the interpretation of law, the protection of people's rights, the orderly settlement of all disputes, and the adjudication of accusations of legal violations. The branch consists of statewide courts (the Supreme Court and the Courts of Appeal), trial courts in each of the state's 58 counties, and state entities of the judicial branch (Judicial Council, Judicial Council Facility Program, and the Habeas Corpus Resource Center). The branch receives support from several funding sources including the state General Fund, civil filing fees, criminal penalties and fines, county maintenance-of-effort payments, and federal grants.

Governor's Proposal. The Governor's budget proposes \$5.3 billion (\$3.3 billion General Fund and \$2 billion other funds) to support the judicial branch and trial court operations.

Various Non-Capital Outlay Budget Proposals

1. Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal Court-Appointed Counsel Program. The Governor's Budget proposes \$11 million in General Fund ongoing to provide a \$25 per hour rate increase for appointed counsel in the Supreme Court Capital Court-Appointed Counsel (SCCCAC) and the Courts of Appeal Court-Appointed Counsel Programs. As part of the FY 2025–26 Budget Act, the Supreme Court Capital Court Appointed Counsel Program received a seven percent increase (\$434,000) for the Capital Court Appointed Counsel Project Office and a \$10 hourly rate increase (\$274,000) for the appointed counsel for capital appointments. Without a \$25 per hour rate increase in the capital appointment rate, the backlog for attracting counsel to accept appointments to capital cases will continue to increase with capital judgements.

2. Continuation of Courts of Appeal Workload. The Governor's Budget proposes 18.0 positions and \$5.2 million Appellate Court Trust Fund (ACTF) in FY 2026–27 and \$4.9 million General Fund in FY 2027–28 and ongoing to continue to address the courts' existing workload, reduce backlogs, and prevent case delays in appellate districts. The Legislature previously provided three-year limited term funding beginning in FY 2023–24, \$2.7 million in FY 2023–24, and \$2.3 million in FYs 2024–25 and 2025–26, from the ACTF. According to the Judicial Council, funding from the ACTF is a temporary solution as funds are limited and not a permanent source to support ongoing permanent resources. The current three-year limited term positions will expire on June 30, 2026.

The Courts of Appeal workload continues to increase specifically in areas such as pending appeals, fully briefed appeals, and notice of appeals. Appeals are processed in three phases. The first two phases include record preparation and the submission of the parties' briefs. Depending on case complexity, these phases can easily take a year or more. Because the rules and standards applicable to these first two phases are largely set by the Legislature and court rules, there is little the Courts of Appeal can do to hasten them. The third phase, however, is the decisional phase, and it begins when cases become fully briefed and are sent to the justices and attorneys (referred to as judicial staff) to research, analyze, discuss, and resolve. This phase presents the greatest opportunity to reduce appellate delays, and it is therefore the focus of this request. An excessive delay is one in which the decisional phase takes more than 12 months, which exceeds national standards, and should be shortened. The Judicial Council assumes that making the limited term resources permanent would reduce the decisional page to no more than nine months.

3. Incompetent to Stand Trial Procedures (SB 820). The Governor's Budget proposes \$4.25 million General Fund beginning in 2026-27 and continued through 2029-30 to support the trial courts with the implementation of new Incompetency to Stand Trial and involuntary medication order (IMO) procedures established by Chapter 330, Statutes of 2025 (SB 820). SB 820 creates an alternative process to allow involuntarily medication of individuals who are confined in county jail and have been found incompetent to stand trial (IST) after being charged with a misdemeanor. The bill provides for the ability to involuntarily medicate in an emergency situation, as defined, or where a court has found a defendant to be gravely disabled and without the capacity to refuse treatment without psychiatric medication. SB 820 creates a new workload for the courts which includes new hearing requirements, increased court-ordered psychiatric evaluations, managing involuntary medication orders, preparing findings based on psychiatric evaluations, and ensuring compliance with defendants' procedural rights.

According to the Judicial Council, IMO hearing costs are estimated at \$1.5 million based on an estimated 6,800 anticipated cases, of which there will be 5,320 psychiatric evaluations at a cost of \$1.6 million (\$300 per evaluation), court appointed evaluator testimony in 3,410 cases at a cost of \$853,000 (\$250 per testimony), and \$300,000 for 1,570 cases that require a 60 day review hearing. The total number of hearings is derived from courts reported IST filings in FY 2023–24 including a 10% growth in annual filings.

Assembly Appropriations Analysis. The Assembly Appropriations analysis identified cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) of an unknown but likely significant amount, possibly in the low millions of dollars annually, to the courts to conduct additional hearings and

for medical evaluations and expert testimony. Judicial Council estimates costs of \$1.77 million to \$4.25 million annually ongoing to fulfill these responsibilities. Within that estimate, Judicial Council attributes approximately half of the costs to additional hearings that may not occur in conjunction with a competency hearing, and additional hearing time to consider involuntary medication orders. Judicial Council attributes the other half of the costs to psychiatric evaluations and for court-appointed evaluators' testimony at hearings. Judicial Council notes there is currently a shortage of psychiatric evaluators in many parts of the state and there may be delays in scheduling these hearings. Due to the shortage, courts are unable obtain required medical evaluations in a timely manner.

Issue 2: Proposition 36 Update

The Judicial Council will provide an overview of their report on Proposition 36 based on submitted data from county courts.

Panel

- Henry Ng, Department of Finance
- Mark Jimenez, Department of Finance
- Francine Byrne, Criminal Justice Services Director, Judicial Council of California
- Kate Bieker, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Ventura County and Chair of the Court Executives Advisory Committee
- Zlatko Theodorovic, Budget Services Director, Judicial Council of California
- Caitlin O'Neil, Legislative Analyst's Office

Background

The Judicial Branch has released its Proposition 36 data report which is posted on the Assembly Budget Committee's website. A total of 56 courts responded to the survey using information from their case management systems and other relevant sources of information. The data represents county level aggregate data and recognizes various challenges in data collection and tracking as counties have disparate systems, leading to inconsistent data availability.

Overview of Proposition 36

- **Creates Treatment-Mandated Felony.** Proposition 36 allows people who possess illegal drugs to be charged with a treatment-mandated felony instead of a misdemeanor if they: (1) possess certain drugs (such as heroin or cocaine); and (2) have two or more past drug convictions.
- **Requires Substance Abuse and Mental Health Evaluation of Defendants.** With consent of the defendant, Proposition 36 requires courts to order a substance abuse and mental health evaluation of the defendant conducted by a drug addiction expert.
- **Requires Assessment of Eligibility for Relevant Benefits.** Proposition 36 also requires courts to order that a case worker determine whether the defendant is eligible to receive Medi-Cal, Medicare, or any other relevant benefits.
- **Allows Drug Treatment, Mental Health Treatment, Job Training, or Any Other Conditions the Court Finds Appropriate.** Proposition 36 specifies that treatment may include drug treatment, mental health treatment, job training, and any other conditions related to treatment or a successful outcome for the defendant that the court finds appropriate.

- **Specifies BSCC May Allocate Monies from Proposition 47 savings (Safe Neighborhoods and Safe Schools “SNSF”) for Such Treatment Programs.** Proposition 36 specifies that BSCC may allocate funds from its share of the SNSF to local governments for treatment-mandated felony programs.
- **Most Treatment Historically a County Responsibility.** Proposition 36 allows for any treatment or conditions that courts find appropriate. Accordingly, the actual treatment provided under Proposition 36 will depend on decisions made by courts. However, much of the treatment that seems relevant is historically provided by counties. For example, counties are responsible for providing substance use disorder services for Medi-Cal enrollees.
- **State Not Required to Pay for Increased County Costs.** When ballot measures generate increased costs for local governments, the state is not required to cover them. The state could choose to provide additional funding, such as to help support the behavioral health system. Doing so, however, would likely come at the cost of other existing state programs, given the multiyear deficits the state is facing.

Resources to Support Proposition 36. The 2025-26 Budget included the following resources:

- \$50 million for grants to county behavioral health departments with an emphasis on addressing behavioral health capacity
- \$20 million to courts for increased workload and collaborative courts
- \$15 million for pre-trial services
- \$15 million for holistic defense
- \$30 million to CDCR for additional prison admissions

In addition, \$127 million in Proposition 47 grants were awarded in the Fall of 2025 to counties, of which 65% of the funding is specifically for substance use disorder and mental health treatment programs. The 2025 Budget Act also estimated approximately \$90 million in Prop 47 savings that will be awarded in 2026-27. The 2026-27 Governor’s Budget updated this estimate to \$81.3 million based on reductions to Proposition 47 as a result of the passage of Proposition 36.

Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO)

The LAO provides the following analysis related to Proposition 47 savings:

Administration’s Methodology for Estimating Proposition 47 Savings Inaccurately Assumes That All Components of Proposition 36 Undo Proposition 47. The administration did not provide detailed backup showing its methodology to incorporate the impact of Proposition 36 into its estimate of the savings attributable to Proposition 47. However, based on discussions, it is our understanding that the administration subtracted its *entire* estimated impact of Proposition 36 on the prison population from its baseline estimate of the impact of

Proposition 47 on the prison population. In other words, the administration's methodology assumes that *all* components of Proposition 36 have the effect of reducing the impact of Proposition 47. However, as previously discussed, only portions of Proposition 36 interact with Proposition 47. Accordingly, by overestimating the amount Proposition 36 affects Proposition 47, this assumption underestimates Proposition 47 savings.

Total Proposition 36 Prison Population Impact May Be Slightly Underestimated. As we discuss in a separate analysis of the administration's overall prison population projections, the impact of Proposition 36 on the prison population—which is incorporated into Proposition 47 savings estimate—may be slightly underestimated. This is largely because the administration only had six months of actual data on Proposition 36 when it made the projections, not a fundamental methodological problem. Accordingly, the accuracy of the estimate should improve in future rounds of projections, as more data becomes available. (For more information, please see “State Prison and Parole Population and Other Biannual Adjustments” in our publication *The 2026-27 Budget: California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*.)

Recommendation

Direct Administration to Correct Its Proposition 47 Savings Estimate Methodology in the May Revision. We recommend that the Legislature direct the administration in spring budget hearings to correct its methodology for estimating the savings attributable to Proposition 47 in the May Revision. We recognize that any estimates will be subject to significant uncertainty due to the limited amount of actual data since the enactment of Proposition 36. However, the problem we identify with the administration's methodology results in a structural underestimate of the savings, regardless of the data that are available. We will continue to monitor Proposition 36 implementation and the prison population and make recommendations as needed based on the updated information available at the May Revision, including the administration's revised estimates.

Staff Recommendation: This is an informational item.

Issue 3: Remote Court Proceedings

The Judicial Council will provide an overview of remote court proceedings.

Panel

- Jessica Devencenzi, Policy and Research Director, Judicial Council of California
- Honorable Patricia Kelly, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Santa Barbara County and Chair of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee
- Honorable Rodney Cortez, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of San Bernardino County
- Drew Soderborg, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Mark Jimenez, Department of Finance
- Henry Ng, Department of Finance

Background

The 2024 Budget Act included trailer bill that: (1) extended the existing policy for remote court hearings until January 1, 2027 to allow courts to continue using remote hearings in specified civil and criminal hearings; (2) required the adoption and implementation of minimum technology standards for remote participation in criminal proceedings by July 1, 2025; (3) required the court executive officer of each superior court to certify that each court conducting remote hearings meets the minimum technology requirements specified in subdivision (o) of Section 367.76 in the Code of Civil Procedure, subdivision (j) of Section 977 of the Penal Code, or subdivision (n) of Section 679.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code; and (4) included various changes related to court decorum for remote participants, identification of remote participants, and the physical location of court reporters.

The Judicial Council provided the following information (the information below does not include provisions which permit a defendant to appear through counsel):

Remote technology may be used in the following proceedings subject to notice and other requirements as specified in the authorizing statutes (*Penal Code sections 977, 977.3, and 1043.5, Code of Civil Procedure sections 367.75 and 367.76, and Welfare and Institutions Code section 679.5*).

- All misdemeanor proceedings except jury or court trials or when charged with a domestic violence offense or DUI, as specified.
- All felony proceedings except trials and sentencing. A court may allow waiver of the defendant's presence for noncritical portions of felony trials where no testimonial evidence is taken.
- Postconviction relief proceedings and as otherwise provided by law.
- All civil cases (such as unlawful detainer actions, family law proceedings, requests for restraining orders).
- Juvenile dependency proceedings and Juvenile justice proceedings brought pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code sections 601 or 602.

- Civil commitment proceedings which are defined to include the following:
 - Judicial commitments, except for delinquency proceedings;
 - Involuntary treatment and conservatorships of gravely disabled persons, including Murphy conservatorships;
 - Contempt proceedings;
 - Mentally disordered offender proceedings;
 - Commitment proceedings under Penal Code section 1026 et seq.;
 - Competency proceedings;
 - Placement and revocation proceedings; and
 - Involuntary medication and treatment hearings.

Staff Recommendation: This is an informational item at this time but the Subcommittee anticipates trailer bill at a later date.

Issue 4: Orange Central Justice Center Facility Modification Proposal and the LAO's Assessment and Recommendations related to Trial Court Construction Costs

The Judicial Council will provide an overview of the Orange Central Justice Center Facility Modification Proposal.

Panel

- Zlatko Theodorovic, Budget Services Director, Judicial Council of California
- Tamer Ahmed, Facilities Services Director, Judicial Council of California
- Drew Soderborg, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Mark Jimenez, Department of Finance
- Henry Ng, Department of Finance

Governor's Proposal

The Governor's Budget proposes \$36 million General Fund and \$3.6 million one-time State Court Facilities Fund (SCFCF) reimbursement authority in 2026-27 and \$35 million General Fund and \$3.5 million one-time SCFCF reimbursement authority in 2027–28 for the state-owned Central Justice Center in Orange County (CJC).

As it is a shared-use facility between the Judicial Council and County of Orange, both parties are responsible for their respective shares of the total project cost based on their occupancy percentages. The Judicial Council is the managing party for the project and is responsible for overseeing its implementation, including billing the County for its portion of the costs. Current resources within the statewide Facility Modification Program are insufficient to cover the costs due to the size, scope, and complexity of the project.

According to the Judicial Council, this project has encountered delays due to an understated scope of work, unforeseen conditions within the area of improvement, and the deteriorated condition of the facility. The facility has been found to contain far more asbestos-containing materials than anticipated. The project's construction began in 2023 and is currently 25 percent complete.

Staff Note. The total cost of this project when it was initially proposed was \$70.2 million with \$64.1 million covered by General Fund and the remaining to be covered by the county. The Governor's proposal seeks an additional \$71 million, more than doubling the cost of the original project. Considering that only 25 percent of construction has been completed, there is a significant likelihood that additional costs may be identified. The Subcommittee may wish to inquire as to what foreseeable conditions and errors were made and what project management controls have since been put in place to control costs and reduce/eliminate further delays.

Various Proposals	Capital	Outlay	Budget
----------------------	---------	--------	--------

1. San Luis Obispo County: New San Luis Obispo Courthouse. The Governor's Budget proposes \$320,265,000 Lease Revenue Bond Authority for the Design-Build phase of the New San Luis Obispo Courthouse in San Luis Obispo County. The project will provide construction of a new, 12-courtroom courthouse. The project includes solar and secure parking for judicial officers. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 2.5 acres. Total project costs are estimated at \$357,287,000, including Acquisition (\$29,169,000), Performance Criteria (\$7,853,000), and Design-Build (\$320,265,000). The design-build amount includes \$267,225,000 for the construction contract, \$8,017,000 for contingency, \$9,410,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$35,613,000 for other project costs. Acquisition began in July 2022 and will conclude in September 2026. Performance Criteria is scheduled to begin in September 2026 and will be approved in August 2027. Design-Build is scheduled to begin in September 2027 and will be completed in August 2031.

2. Nevada County: New Nevada City Courthouse. The Governor's Budget proposes \$1,491,000 for the Performance Criteria phase of the new Nevada City Courthouse. The project includes the construction of a new, six-courtroom courthouse of approximately 77,000 SF in the city of Nevada City. The project includes solar and secure parking for judicial officers and surface parking spaces. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 5.0 acres. Total project costs are estimated at \$206,775,000, including Study (\$972,000), Acquisition (\$8,729,000), Performance Criteria (\$1,491,000), and Design-Build (\$195,583,000). The design-build amount includes \$158,577,000 for the construction contract, \$4,757,000 for contingency, \$8,008,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$24,241,000 for other project costs. Acquisition began in July 2023 and will conclude in June 2026. Performance Criteria is scheduled to begin in July 2026 and will be approved in June 2027. Design-Build is scheduled to begin in July 2027 and will be completed in April 2031.

3. Plumas County: New Quincy Courthouse. The Governor's Budget proposes \$2,276,000 for the Performance Criteria phase of the new Quincy Courthouse. The project includes the construction of a new, two-courtroom courthouse of approximately 23,000 square feet in the town of Quincy. The project includes solar and secure parking for judicial officers and surface parking spaces. The project will require acquisition of a site of approximately 1.9 acres. Total project costs are estimated at \$76,261,000, including Acquisition (\$4,387,000), Performance Criteria (\$2,276,000), and Design-Build (\$69,598,000). The design-build amount includes \$55,866,000 for the construction contract, \$1,676,000 for contingency, \$2,764,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$9,292,000 for other project costs. Acquisition began in July 2022 and will conclude in June 2026. Performance Criteria is scheduled to begin in July 2026 and will be approved in June 2027. Design-Build is scheduled to begin in July 2027 and will be completed in September 2030.

4. Kings, San Joaquin, and Sutter Counties One New Shelled Courtroom for One New Judgeship in Each County. The Budget Act of 2022 included funding for 23 additional superior court judgeships and to address increased security needs placed on counties due to the additional judgeships. The Governor's Budget requests funding for a courtroom and

support spaces for 3 of those 23 new judgeships. Space needs for the remaining new judgeships were factored into a separate budget change proposal that was approved, and those projects are moving forward.

1. San Joaquin County: One New Shelled Courthouse for One New Judgeship. \$394,000 for Working Drawings and \$6,026,000 for Construction. The project includes the design and construction of a courtroom and support space of approximately 1,900 SF in currently vacant and unfinished space. The courtroom will replicate existing courtrooms within the courthouse. Total project costs are estimated at \$7,328,000 including Preliminary Plans (\$245,000), Working Drawings (\$1,057,000), and Construction (\$6,026,000). The construction amount includes \$4,882,000 for the construction contract, \$342,000 for contingency, \$122,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$680,000 for other project costs. The Preliminary Plans began in January 2023 and were completed in September 2023. Working Drawings began in September 2023 and will be approved in January 2027. Construction is scheduled to begin in May 2027 and will be completed in March 2028.
2. Kings County: One New Shelled Courthouse for One New Judgeship. \$7,618,000 for Construction. The project includes the design and construction of a courtroom and support space of approximately 6,250 SF in currently vacant and unfinished space. The courtroom will replicate existing courtrooms within the courthouse. Total project costs are estimated at \$8,526,000 including Preliminary Plans (\$245,000), Working Drawings (\$663,000), and Construction (\$7,618,000). The construction amount includes \$6,229,000 for the construction contract, \$436,000 for contingency, \$155,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$798,000 for other project costs. The Preliminary Plans began in January 2023 and were completed in September 2023. Working Drawings began in September 2023 and will be approved in June 2026. Construction is scheduled to begin in November 2026 and will be completed in September 2027.
3. Sutter County: One New Shelled Courthouse for One New Judgeship. \$6,521,000 for Construction. The project includes the design and construction of a courtroom and support space of approximately 2,500 square feet in currently vacant and unfinished space. The courtroom will replicate existing courtrooms within the courthouse. Total project costs are estimated at \$7,429,000 including Preliminary Plans (\$245,000), Working Drawings (\$663,000), and Construction (\$6,521,000). The construction amount includes \$5,301,000 for the construction contract, \$371,000 for contingency, \$132,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$717,000 for other project costs. The Preliminary Plans began in January 2023 and were completed in September 2023. Working Drawings began in September 2023 and will be approved in June 2026. Construction is scheduled to begin in November 2026 and will be completed in September 2027.

5. Solano County New Solano Hall of Justice (Fairfield) – Performance Criteria Reappropriation. The Governor’s Budget proposes \$5,159,000 for reappropriation of the Performance Criteria phase of the New Solano Hall of Justice project. The project includes the construction of a new 12-courtroom courthouse of approximately 141,000 square feet in the city

of Fairfield. The project includes solar and secure parking for judicial officers and surface parking spaces. The project requires acquisition of a site of approximately 2.9 acres. Total project costs are estimated at \$338,432,000, including Acquisition (\$16,494,000), Performance Criteria (\$5,159,000), and Design-Build (\$316,779,000). The design-build amount includes \$259,031,000 for the construction contract, \$7,771,000 for contingency, \$12,509,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$37,468,000 for other project costs. The Acquisition began in July 2022 and will be completed in December 2026. The Performance Criteria is scheduled to begin in December 2026 and will be approved in April 2027. Design-Build is scheduled to begin in April 2027 and will be completed in December 2030.

6. Fresno County New Fresno Courthouse – Performance Criteria Reappropriation. The Governor’s Budget proposes \$18,145,000 for Reappropriation of the Performance Criteria phase of the new Fresno Courthouse project. The project includes the construction of a new 36-courtroom courthouse of approximately 413,000 SF in the city of Fresno. The project includes solar and secure parking for judicial officers; parking for staff and public is not included in the project. Parking needs will be assessed during the acquisition phase site selection and California Environmental Quality Act process. It requires acquisition of a site of approximately 2.1 acres. Total project costs are estimated at \$964,591,000 including Acquisition (\$21,158,000), Performance Criteria (\$18,145,000), and Design-Build (\$925,288,000). The design-build amount includes \$778,720,000 for the construction contract, \$23,361,000 for contingency, \$36,110,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$87,097,000 for other project costs. Acquisition began in July 2022 and will conclude in April 2027. Performance Criteria is scheduled to begin in April 2027 and will be approved in September 2027. Design-Build is scheduled to begin in September 2027 and will be completed in November 2031.

7. Los Angeles County: Spring Street Courthouse – Chatsworth Buildout. The Governor’s Budget proposes \$6,276,000 General Fund for the Preliminary Plans and Working Drawings phases to build out six courtrooms, support space, and upgraded holding facilities at the Chatsworth Courthouse for relocating six courtrooms and associated operations from the Spring Street Courthouse in the county of Los Angeles. This funding request is necessary due to the federal government’s planned divestment of the Spring Street building, which the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is leasing in the Civic Center area of downtown Los Angeles. Total project costs are estimated at \$41,123,000, including Preliminary Plans (\$2,052,000), Working Drawings (\$4,224,000), and Construction (\$34,847,000). The construction amount includes \$27,876,000 for the construction contract, \$1,951,000 for contingency, \$697,000 for architectural and engineering services, and \$4,323,000 for other project costs. The Preliminary Plans phase is scheduled to begin in July 2026 and will be completed in October 2026. The Working Drawings phase is scheduled to begin in October 2026 and will be approved in June 2027. Construction is scheduled to begin in June 2027 and will be completed in November 2028.

8. Los Angeles Spring Street Courtrooms Relocation. The Governor’s Budget proposes \$4.6 million one-time General Fund in 2026–27 to relocate 17 courtrooms and associated operations from the Spring Street Courthouse in Los Angeles County to other existing courthouses within the county. In early 2025, the Judicial Council was informed by the U.S. General Services Administration that the federal government is divesting from the building that is currently housing the Spring Street Courthouse in downtown Los Angeles and that the lease

for the superior court, which expires on December 31, 2028, will not be extended. This request proposes to relocate 17 of the courthouse's 24 courtrooms and associated operations across six court districts in nine existing courthouses. Of the remaining seven courtrooms, a FY 2026–27 Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposal will be submitted for only six that require relocation to the Chatsworth Courthouse. Facility Modification work includes electrical and data ports, carpet replacement, paint, repairing floor finishes, modifications to elevators, signages, HVAC system modifications, lighting upgrades and fixtures, furniture, and court department and judicial officer and staff relocation.

Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)

The LAO provides the following assessment and recommendations:

No Concerns With Requested Amounts... As discussed in our January budget publication, [The 2026-27 Budget: Overview of the Governor's Budget](#), the state faces serious multiyear deficits that will need to be addressed. This means the state lacks the necessary revenues to sustain current expenditure levels. As such, any proposals that require new General Fund support require greater scrutiny and must meet a higher bar for approval as it would reduce General Fund spending elsewhere. Such a higher bar can include spending to address critical infrastructure issues. We find that the identified projects meet this higher threshold as they seek to address critical health, safety, and other facility needs in buildings frequented by the public. Additionally, the costs and scopes of these identified projects generally seem reasonable. The existing construction projects were largely selected based on the judicial branch's 2019 ranked list of facility project needs and require funding to continue moving forward. The projects related to the relocation of the Los Angeles Spring Street courthouses are also necessary as the landlord is terminating the state's lease of space. Without this funding to build or modify space to relocate the courtrooms into existing courthouses, service levels would be impacted. Finally, the Orange CJC project is already in progress and addresses key safety issues in a building with large numbers of people visiting on a daily basis.

...But CJC Proposal Raises Questions About Appropriate Oversight. While the CJC project is necessary, the project's cost has more than doubled. Specifically, prior budgets included \$64.1 million for this project, which was estimated to cost a total of \$70.2 million, with the county covering the remaining balance. The judicial branch estimates that an additional \$71 million will now be necessary to complete the project due to various factors that were unidentified at the start of the project, including unanticipated asbestos remediation and the need to address new issues identified by the Office of the State Fire Marshall (OFM). However, construction is currently only 25 percent complete and discussions with the OFM continue. This means that additional issues could be identified that drive further cost increases. The sizeable increase in funding raises questions on whether sufficient oversight was in place to appropriately assess the scope of work and costs *before* the project began. Sufficient oversight would ensure the Legislature has the information it needs as it weighs court facility projects against its other priorities. This is particularly important in tough budget times with scarce General Fund resources.

Total Costs of Court Facility Projects Continue to Increase... As noted above, the judicial branch’s 2019 assessment estimated a total of \$13.2 billion would be needed to address 80 projects. Of this amount, about \$6.1 billion was associated with 17 projects in Los Angeles County. In April 2024, the Los Angeles Superior Court completed a reassessment of its facilities needs based on its operations. The estimated costs of these 17 projects increased to around \$14 billion. Similarly, while most of the remaining projects on the 2019 list have not been reassessed, the costs of projects in other parts of the state are likely increasing. For example, the 2019 assessment estimated the new Fresno Courthouse project would cost \$483 million. This project is currently in the middle of pre-construction activities, which has resulted in an updated cost estimate of \$965 million—double the original estimate. In combination, as shown in Figure 3, it makes it likely that at least \$21 billion could be needed to complete the list of 80 projects. These costs will likely continue to increase over time due to inflation and various other factors.

Figure 3
**Status of Trial Court Construction Projects
 Beginning in 2019-20^a**

Priority Group	Number of Projects	Estimated Project Costs (in Billions)	Number Initiated
Immediate Need	17	\$2.0	12
Critical Need	26	10.6	—
High Need	17	4.7	—
Medium Need	10	3.5	—
Low Need	10	0.2	—
Totals	80	\$21.0	12

^aReflects data from 2019 facility assessment, adjusted to include updated data from 2024 reassessment of Los Angeles facilities.

...And Pace of New Construction Projects Is Slow... As shown in Figure 3, the state has only initiated 12 (or 15 percent) of the construction projects identified in 2019. Additionally, the state’s current plan is to initiate one new project a year. Absent any changes, this means the last immediate need project would be initiated in 2030-31. Continuing at this pace means that it would take decades to fully address the list. During this time, it is likely that the condition of the facilities on the list will worsen and additional facilities could be added to the list.

...Raising Questions About Long-Term Plan for Addressing Court Facility Needs... The slow pace in initiating construction projects, as well as the increasing costs, raises questions about the long-term plan for fully addressing court facility needs. Delays in initiating projects means that the facilities on the list could worsen to the point where the state has no option but to replace them immediately. This could result in significant, unexpected costs occurring simultaneously. For example, if multiple courthouse projects—including some large, multistory courthouses—needed to be started at the same time, it could require hundreds of

millions of dollars in General Fund annually to pay for pre-construction costs or debt service. Under such a circumstance, the judicial branch and the state's capacity to appropriately conduct oversight of such projects could be strained. At the same time, the condition of other facilities could worsen resulting in the need for new construction, facility modification, or deferred maintenance projects. As General Fund is a major source of supporting these costs, it would be prudent to have a long-term plan or strategy to address these needs while balancing other state General Fund priorities.

...And Whether More Funds Should Be Dedicated to Facility Modification Projects. Given the current plan of starting one new construction each year, it could be reasonable to consider whether the state should concurrently or alternatively prioritize facility modification projects to extend and/or improve the usability of existing facilities. This could prevent facility conditions from worsening—thereby delaying the need for a new replacement courthouse or full-scale renovation. It could also enable the state to more slowly build new courthouses and avoid a surge of unpredictable facility costs. Finally, such an approach could distribute the monies across more facilities throughout the state—thereby increasing the number of people benefiting from improved facilities.

Recommendations

Consider How Much General Fund to Dedicate to Court Facilities. Given the magnitude of the judicial branch's facility needs and deficits facing the state General Fund, it is not possible for the state to fully address such needs in the short run. Accordingly, we recommend the Legislature instead consider how much General Fund it would like to dedicate annually to address court facility needs. A stable commitment of funding would allow the state and judicial branch to make short- and long-term plans to maximize use of these funds. For example, this would allow the judicial branch to make choices between new construction or facility modification projects. The specific amount would depend on its other General Fund priorities. This is because increased and consistent facility funding would come at the expense of other General Fund priorities given the multiyear deficits facing the state. If it is comfortable with the level of funding proposed for facilities in 2026-27, we recommend it approve the Governor's proposals. If the Legislature would like to dedicate a different level of funding, it could work with the judicial branch to prioritize how to use whatever level of funding the Legislature deems appropriate.

Direct Judicial Branch to Report on Long-Term Plan for Facilities Based on Legislative Direction. We recommend the Legislature direct the judicial branch to report by January 2028 on a long-term plan for addressing facility needs based on the Legislature's direction on the amount of annual General Fund that would be prioritized for court facilities. This plan should include an assessment of how the funding should be divided between new construction and facility modification projects to maximize the amount of time existing facilities may be safely used. It could also consider innovative ways to use the funding to finance new construction or facility modification projects. To enhance the plan, the Legislature could also consider whether it should provide funding for the judicial branch to reassess the total estimated costs of the construction project list—excluding Los Angeles facilities which were reassessed in 2024. We estimate this could cost several million dollars—or slightly more—depending on what the Legislature asks for the reassessment to include. Such a reassessment could also include

direction to reconsider existing operations—such as the impact of increased remote proceedings—and whether existing projects should move up or down in the prioritization list. As costs seem to be significantly increasing, having more recent information could provide the Legislature with more accurate information on how much the full list of construction projects will cost as well as which projects are the most pressing.

Consider Additional Oversight of Facility Modification Projects Receiving One-Time Funding. We recommend the Legislature consider increasing oversight of facility modification projects receiving one-time General Fund support. As noted above, these project costs typically would use a significant portion of the judicial branch’s discretionary funding if they were not funded separately. The doubling of the Orange CJC project from initial estimates, with the potential for even more future costs as the project is only 25 percent complete, raises questions about whether state oversight of such larger or more complex projects is sufficient. It is possible that the Orange CJC project faces unique factors based on the specifics of its existing condition that will not be an issue in other facility modification projects. However, if the state prioritizes more General Fund for facility modification projects, it becomes critical to ensure appropriate oversight is in place to ensure the Legislature has sufficient information. At a minimum, this information should include an accurate assessment of the existing condition of a facility, the scope of the project, and the costs to complete it. One way to accomplish this would be for the Legislature to require that such projects undergo review in the budget process by DOF in a manner similar to new courthouse facility capital outlay projects. This would mean that similar construction expertise is applied by DOF in its assessment and monitoring of these larger facility modification projects. This could help ensure the Legislature receives accurate and complete data to inform its decision-making and that state funds are used cost-effectively.

Staff Recommendation: Hold Open.

0690 – Office of Emergency Services

Issue 5: Victims Services Funding: VOCA Update, Overview of Trauma Recovery Centers, and Overview of Human Trafficking Programs

The Office of Emergency Services (OES) will provide an overview of Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) funding, followed by a discussion on Trauma Recovery Centers and the Human Trafficking Victim Assistance Program.

Panel

- Eric Swanson, Deputy Director, Finance and Logistics Administration, Cal OES
- Ricki Hammett, Assistant Director, Grants Management, Cal OES
- Sarah Metz, Psy.D, Director of Trauma Recovery Services-National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers
- Leigh LaChapelle, Director of Survivor Advocacy for the Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking (Cast)
- Cher Gonzalez, Esq., Gonzalez Government Consulting, Representing Cast
- Heather Gonzalez, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Drew Soderborg, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Sara Swan, Department of Finance
- Zachary Voss, Department of Finance.

Background

Victims of Crime Act (VOCA). The mission of the Cal OES Victim Services Program is to provide financial assistance and support to victim service providers to ensure all victims of crime in California receive the services they need by: (1) creating programs that are trauma-informed and victim centered; (2) providing timely technical assistance to grant subrecipients; and, (3) ensuring California complies with all federal grant requirements.

Not all but many of the awarded victim services grants are funded with federal VOCA funds which have been steadily declining over recent years. VOCA funding has been declining due to a decrease in the amount of money collected from fines and penalties imposed on federal offenders. As federal prosecution and penalties decrease, so does the amount of VOCA funding available for states. In the past two recent state budgets, the state had to appropriate roughly \$100 million General Fund per year to backfill lost federal VOCA funding to maintain victim services at about the same level as the previous year.

Trauma Recovery Centers (TRCs). The National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers has provided a handout for the Subcommittee which is also available on the Assembly Budget Committee's website. TRCs are funded through the State Restitution Fund, Prop 47 savings, and other various other sources. The 2022 Budget Act included \$27 million one-time General Fund to support TRCs statewide and to establish satellite offices in rural and underserved rural

areas in Northern and Central California. California currently has 20 TRCs in the state that serve approximately 9,000 crime survivors annually.

Human Trafficking Victim Assistance Program. Victims/survivors of human trafficking need specialized intensive services to recover and rebuild their lives. The Human Trafficking Victim Assistance Program (HTVAP) was created in the 2015 Budget Act to fund human trafficking victim services, as described in Government Code Sections 8590.6-8590.7. The purpose of the HTVAP is to help human trafficking victims/survivors (sex trafficking and labor trafficking) recover from the trauma they experienced and assist them with reintegrating into society through comprehensive safety and supportive services. To receive HTVAP funding, human trafficking victim service organizations must provide comprehensive services to victims/survivors of human trafficking and their children, as well as provide progress reports to Cal OES on a quarterly basis. The HTVAP requires the following services to victims/survivors of human trafficking and their children:

- Twenty-four Hour Crisis Line
- Emergency Shelter
- Temporary Housing and Housing Assistance
- Legal Assistance such as filing T-Visas, obtaining restraining or protective orders against traffickers, and record expungement.
- Emergency Food/Clothing
- Transportation
- Emergency Financial Assistance
- Psychological Support/Individual Counseling
- Referrals to Local Community Services

Staff Recommendation. This is an informational item.

Issue 6: Next Generation 9-1-1 Implementation Update

The Office of Emergency Services (OES) will provide an update on its implementation of the Next Generation 9-1-1 project, identifying the challenges it has faced which have resulted in significant delays.

Panels**First Panel**

- Steve Yarbrough, Deputy Director of Public Safety Communications, Cal OES
- Eric Swanson, Deputy Director, Finance and Logistics Administration, Cal OES
- Heather Gonzalez, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Drew Soderborg, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Sara Swan, Department of Finance
- Zachary Voss, Department of Finance

Second Panel

- Don Ferguson, CEO, NGA 911
- Barbara Winn, Chief Growth Officer, NGA 911
- Daniel Munsey, Fire Chief/Fire Warden, San Bernardino County Fire Protection District

Background

Next Generation 9-1-1 (NextGen 911). NextGen 911 refers to an Internet Protocol (IP)-based, two-way communications system that will enable real-time transmission of emergency-related voice, text, data, photos, and video between the public and Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), based on standards set by the National Emergency Number Association. PSAPs are better known as 911 call centers, or dispatch centers. There are approximately 440 PSAPs in California.

In 2014, the Legislature directed Cal OES to develop a plan and timeline of target dates for testing, implementing, and operating a NextGen 911 emergency communications system, including text to 911 service throughout the state. The goal is for NextGen 911 to build upon and ultimately replace the existing legacy 911 network that was built on aging circuit switch technology (copper network) and was developed prior to modern cell phones and advanced communications networks.

The 2018 Budget Act provided Cal OES with the funding and resources to initiate the development of the NextGen 911 project. At that time, the five-year (2018-19 to 2022-23) request for the project was \$131.8 million with an ongoing annual increase cost of \$39.7 million. The project is funded with State Emergency Telephone Number Account (SETNA) revenue which is a monthly customer surcharge on voice communications services (landlines and cell phones).

In November 2025, after a significant project delay and with over \$455 million already spent, Cal OES released a revised NextGen 911 transition plan, totally revamping the project. Moving away from a design of four regional NextGen 911 networks with one statewide backup system operator, the new plan is to have a single network provider operate the state's NextGen 911 system.

Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)

On February 27, 2026, the Legislative Analyst's Office provided the Legislature with an analysis of the Cal OES NextGen 911 project, focusing on the proposed revised transition plan and identifying key questions to consider with some recommendations:

Available Information Leaves Key Questions Unanswered. While OES has provided high-level descriptions of its plans, it has not presented critical details to the Legislature, leaving key questions unanswered, including the following:

- **What Is the Nature and Scope of the Problem?** For example, have the regional networks experienced systematic technical failures or are the problems a reflection of management and coordination challenges?
- **Will New Plan Solve the Problem?** What evidence is there showing that the transition to a statewide approach will solve the problems identified by OES?
- **What Other Options Were Considered?** Does the state need to transition to a statewide approach to solve these problems, or can they be solved within the regional approach as it currently exists? What other options have been explored?
- **How Do the Options Compare?** How do different options compare on parameters such as cost, effectiveness of addressing the problems encountered to date, and length of time to decommissioning of the legacy 911 system?

Recommendations. We recommend that the Legislature direct OES to pause implementation of the statewide approach until it can provide answers to the key questions. If this is not possible by May Revision, the Legislature could consider halting the project to allow an independent third-party to evaluate the state's options. We also recommend requiring ongoing monthly project updates and quarterly fiscal reports. Finally, we recommend the Legislature consider implementing a new governance structure to provide greater ongoing oversight of the 911 system.

Staff Recommendation. Hold Open.

Issue 7: Southern California Wildfire Recovery Update

The Office of Emergency Services (OES) will provide an update on the 2025 Southern California Wildfire recovery efforts and the extent of federal reimbursements for these costs. And the Department of Finance will provide a general update on the use and availability of funds pursuant to Section 90 of the Budget Act of 2025.

Panel

- Robyn Fennig, Deputy Director, Recovery, Cal OES
- Eli Owen, Assistant Director, Recovery Operations, Cal OES
- Eric Swanson, Deputy Director, Finance and Logistics Administration, Cal OES
- Sara Swan, Department of Finance
- Zachary Voss, Department of Finance
- Heather Gonzalez, Legislative Analyst's Office
- Drew Soderborg, Legislative Analyst's Office

Background

On January 7, 2025, Governor Gavin Newsom proclaimed a State of Emergency in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties and directed Cal OES to take charge of the response to the fires, bring in firefighting resources (mutual aid) from other parts of California, the federal government, other states and foreign countries. The two largest fires were the Palisades Fire and the Eaton Fire.

The Palisades Fire began in the Santa Monica Mountains of Los Angeles County on January 7, 2025, and quickly expanded to the Pacific Palisades, Topanga and Malibu. It burned over 23,000 acres and was ultimately contained after 24 days. The Eaton Fire also began on January 7, 2025. The fire began in Eaton Canyon in the San Gabriel Mountains and primarily impacted the unincorporated City of Altadena and portions of the City of Pasadena. The Eaton Fire burned over 14,000 acres and destroyed over 9,000 structures.

The negative economic impact to California's economy is in the tens of billions of dollars, including billions in lost revenue to local, state and federal governments. California is determining the financial costs in responding to and cleaning up these wildfires. Before his departure, former President Joe Biden announced that the federal government would cover 100% of the costs for California's initial response to, and cleanup of, the Southern California wildfires for the first 180 days.

Recovery Efforts.

As Southern California continues its recovery, the Legislative Members have raised several issues and concerns:

- After a wildfire disaster, there are three options for who conducts soil clean up: the federal government, the state, or the local government. Who ultimately decides which of these three entities will conduct the cleanup?
- Cal OES has noted in discussion that the federal government has had a policy since 2020 that the federal government will only scrape the top 6 inches of soil post fire and will not conduct any further soil testing. Where is that policy written?
- If the state undertakes additional soil testing to verify the soil is remediated, what happens if the tests come back positive and there are remaining unsafe contaminants in the soil? Will the state pay for any additional soil remediation?
- Cal EPA came out with its Residential Soil Evaluation Guidance for the 2025 Los Angeles Wildfires. Are there any codified statewide standards on how to remediate soil post-wildland urban interface (the zone of transition between unoccupied land and human development) fire?
- Does Control Section 90.00(b) of the Budget Act of 2025 allow for the use of funds for environmental testing and other actions to protect public health? Would these funds be eligible to support additional soil testing and remediation efforts?

Staff Recommendation. This is an informational item.

NON-PRESENTATION ITEMS

The Subcommittee does not plan to have a presentation of the items at this time in this section of the agenda, but the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office are available to answer questions from the Members. Public Comment may be provided on these items.

0690 – Office of Emergency Services

Issue 8: Various Budget Change Proposals

1. California Cybersecurity Integration Center: Artificial Intelligence (AB 979). The Governor's Budget proposes \$717,000 General Fund in 2026-27 and \$463,000 in 2027-28 to create the California Artificial Intelligence (AI) Cybersecurity Collaboration Playbook pursuant to Government Code Section 8586.5.

Prior to January 1, 2027, Cal OES, in consultation with the Office of Information Security and with Government Operations Agency, is required to develop a California AI Cybersecurity Collaboration Playbook to facilitate information sharing across cyber and AI communities, strengthening cyber defenses against emerging threats.

2. Accessibility to Emergency Information and Services: Evacuations: Pets (AB 478). The Governor's Budget proposes \$668,000 General Fund and three positions in 2026-27 and ongoing to support cities and counties updating Emergency Operations Plans with procedures for the rescue, reunification, and temporary holding of household pets during and after evacuations.

3. Artificial Intelligence Models: Large Developers (SB 53). The Governor's Budget proposes \$618,000 General Fund and two positions in 2026-27 and ongoing to establish a mechanism to be used by a frontier developer or the public to report critical safety incidents and a mechanism to confidentially submit summaries of assessments of potential catastrophic risk resulting from use of frontier models, in order to implement Chapter 138, Statutes of 2025 (SB 53).

4. Provisional Language Authorizing Augmentations for Emergency Management Assistance Compact Reimbursements. The Governor's Budget proposes provisional language authorizing augmentation within the Budget Act for Emergency Management Assistance Compact reimbursements from other states due to a disaster.

This agenda and other publications are available on the Assembly Budget Committee's website at: [Sub 6 Hearing Agendas | California State Assembly](#). You may contact the Committee at (916) 319-2099. This agenda was prepared by Jennifer Kim and Bernie Orozco.