DCH Technology Consulting

Independent Consulting in Audiovisual, Control, and Smart Technology Integration

Courtroom Audiovisual Planning and Design

A Practical Guide for Courts and Project Teams

Prepared by: Douglas Hoag

Douglas Hoag
Email: douglas.hoag@dchtc.com
Phone: (970) 313-3062

DCH TECHNOLOGY CONSULTING
© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction: Coordinating Courtroom Modernization	1
2	Defining Courtroom Audiovisual Requirements	1
2.1	Participant Communication Needs	1
2.2	Communication, Presentation, and Control	1
2.3	Project Conditions and Responsibilities	2
3	Translating Workflows into Audiovisual Design	2
3.1	Audio Coverage and Distribution	2
3.2	Display Legibility and Camera Views	3
3.3	Architectural Integration and Service Access	3
3.3.1	Counsel Tables	3
3.3.2	Dais and Courtroom Millwork	3
3.3.3	Jury Display Locations	3
3.3.4	Gallery Display Locations	4
3.3.5	Media Spaces and Broadcast Connections	4
3.3.6	Equipment Connections and Service Access	4
3.4	Control Workflows and Automation	4
3.5	Annotation and Exhibit Capture	5
3.6	Jury Deliberation Rooms and Exhibit Review	5
3.7	Verifying Courtroom Workflows	5
4	AV Design and Consulting Engagements	6
5	Discussing Your Courtroom Project	6

© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

1 Introduction: Coordinating Courtroom Modernization

Courtroom technology planning should begin with how the court conducts proceedings. Whether upgrading an existing courtroom or developing a new justice facility, the design should support intelligible speech, legible exhibits, clear views of participants, and the court's control over presentation and recording.

For architects and project teams, these operational needs inform room layout, furniture, sightlines, acoustics, lighting, and infrastructure. Early coordination with court personnel, IT staff, and other responsible organizations helps establish compatible systems, clear scopes of work, and practical support arrangements.

For court and county leadership, this planning establishes a practical basis for budgeting, phasing improvements, and limiting disruption to proceedings.

This guide explains how courtroom workflows translate into AV requirements and coordinated design decisions. Its goal is a courtroom that supports the intended proceedings, is straightforward for staff to operate, and can be maintained with the court's available resources.

2 Defining Courtroom Audiovisual Requirements

The AV consultant translates court procedures and user needs into requirements for audio, video, presentation, and control systems. These requirements are developed with court personnel and coordinated with the architect, IT staff, and others responsible for the courtroom's systems.

2.1 Participant Communication Needs

Courtroom AV requirements should be developed with the people who conduct, manage, and support proceedings. The judge and clerk may have different responsibilities for operating the system, managing remote participation, and controlling presentation. Court reporters and recording staff need audio and system interfaces suited to the court's method of creating a record. These responsibilities should be established with court personnel during planning.

Counsel need practical ways to present and review exhibits while remaining visible and audible to the court. Witnesses need to hear questions, review material presented to them, and communicate clearly with both local and remote participants. Jurors need intelligible speech and legible exhibits while maintaining a clear view of the witness and other relevant participants.

The gallery should also be considered in courtroom AV planning. Observers need to hear the proceedings, and the court should establish what exhibits or other visual content will be presented to public seating. These requirements should inform audio coverage, display locations, and the controls governing distribution to the gallery.

Planning should also address interpreters, remote participants, and people using assistive listening or captioning. Their requirements should be considered alongside the primary courtroom workflows. The project team should identify what each participant needs to hear and see, where they will participate, and what assistance or system access they require.

2.2 Communication, Presentation, and Control

The court's procedures should establish how information moves through a proceeding. For exhibit presentation, this includes connecting a source, reviewing material before release, distributing it to authorized destinations, and stopping or changing the presentation. The requirements should identify who performs each action and how the system communicates its current status.

Bench conferences, confidential attorney-client consultations, and interpretation require defined communication paths. For each workflow, the court should identify the intended listeners and determine how courtroom loudspeakers, remote connections, court reporting or recording systems, and authorized public or media feeds are handled. These decisions establish the required routing and control functions.

Local and remote presentation sources should be considered together. Material shared directly through a conferencing platform may follow a different path from content routed through the courtroom AV system. Planning

DCH TECHNOLOGY CONSULTING
© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

should identify those paths and establish how authorized staff control distribution, interrupt sharing, and return the courtroom to its normal operating state.

2.3 Project Conditions and Responsibilities

Existing equipment, infrastructure, room conditions, and support arrangements should be evaluated against the court's intended workflows. That review establishes what can be retained, adapted, or replaced and identifies conditions that may affect scope, cost, and schedule. For new facilities, court standards, established technology platforms, and available support resources should inform the proposed approach.

The court and project team should establish priorities before selecting equipment. Planning should distinguish the capabilities needed for the intended proceedings from improvements that can be considered in a later phase. Where work will be phased, each stage should result in a usable, supportable system, with future connections and dependencies identified.

Work in occupied facilities should account for courtroom availability and continuity of proceedings. Equipment replacement, infrastructure work, system verification, and staff training should be coordinated with the court's schedule. Temporary operating arrangements and the transition from existing systems should be addressed before installation begins.

Responsibilities for equipment, network services, integration, software licensing, training, and ongoing support should be assigned among court administration, county or state organizations, IT staff, and technology providers. The boundaries between their scopes should be clear. Project budgeting should account for installation and infrastructure requirements alongside recurring costs, maintenance resources, and future equipment replacement.

3 Translating Workflows into Audiovisual Design

Courtroom workflows establish the basis for AV equipment locations, signal distribution, and system controls. The consultant develops these requirements alongside the architectural and engineering team, identifying where room conditions, furniture, lighting, acoustics, or infrastructure affect system performance.

3.1 Audio Coverage and Distribution

Microphone selection and placement should reflect the designated speaking positions and how those positions are used. Planning should account for seated and standing speech, movement during witness examination, and the distance between participants and their microphones. Microphones should remain usable without obstructing exhibits, work surfaces, or views of participants. Their mounting and cable connections should be coordinated with furniture and millwork.

Loudspeaker coverage should support intelligible speech at the intended listening positions. Room finishes, reverberation, and background noise should be reviewed with the architectural, acoustical, and building systems teams. The design should establish where speech reinforcement is needed and how loudspeaker placement and level will support those areas.

Conferencing, court reporting or recording, assistive listening, and authorized media feeds may require different combinations of audio sources. The design should identify which local microphones, remote participants, and presentation sources reach each destination, including any need for separate microphone channels. Audio restrictions associated with bench conferences or confidential consultations should be coordinated across these outputs.

Interpretation workflows should identify the interpreter's listening feed, the recipients of interpreted speech, and any separate communication paths required by the court. These requirements apply to both in-room and remote interpretation. Assistive listening feeds should likewise be defined around the proceedings and content the listener needs to follow. The resulting audio paths should be documented and tested under the intended operating conditions.

© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

3.2 Display Legibility and Camera Views

Display planning should begin with the material participants need to read and the positions from which they will view it. The AV consultant evaluates image size, viewing distance, viewing angle, and the detail within representative exhibits. Documents, photographs, diagrams, and video may place different demands on the display arrangement. Where captioning is required, its placement and readability should be evaluated alongside the presentation of exhibits and remote participants.

Camera coverage should be developed around the people and activities that remote participants need to see. The project team should identify the required views of the judge, counsel, witness, and other designated positions, accounting for seated and standing use. Camera framing, lighting, and potential obstructions should be reviewed together. Where sign-language interpretation is required, camera and display arrangements should support clear communication between the interpreter and the participant using the service.

These viewing requirements should inform the display locations, monitor mounts, recessed troughs, and other architectural provisions described in Section 3.3.

3.3 Architectural Integration and Service Access

AV equipment and connections should be integrated with the courtroom's architectural character and coordinated with the people responsible for its furniture, millwork, and infrastructure. Equipment locations, mounting provisions, and service access should be established while those elements are being designed and selected.

3.3.1 Counsel Tables

Counsel tables should accommodate securely mounted equipment while preserving usable work surfaces and clear views of participants. Coordinate underside mounting space, floor boxes, and cable routes with table framing, seating, and circulation, preserving knee space and chair movement. Appropriate brackets or compact enclosures can be more practical than an under-table rack.

At counsel tables., low-profile, angled display mounts can support comfortable viewing while keeping participants' faces visible. Coordinate display size and position with courtroom sightlines and camera views.

3.3.2 Dais and Courtroom Millwork

At the judge's bench, clerk's station, and witness stand, establish equipment mounting surfaces, connection points, and enclosure locations before millwork fabrication. Coordinate plywood backing or another suitable substrate, its attachment, and equipment fasteners with the millwork designer. Small enclosures or dedicated compartments can organize devices and cabling discreetly.

Recessed monitor troughs can lower displays to preserve views of the judge, clerk, and witness. Coordinate trough dimensions and monitor angles for comfortable viewing, courtroom sightlines, and camera coverage, with access for connections and monitor removal.

3.3.3 Jury Display Locations

Evaluate jury displays from each juror's seated position. Displays integrated into the jury box or recessed into adjacent walls should make exhibits legible while preserving views of courtroom participants. Where the court prefers ceiling-mounted displays, evaluate mounting height and viewing angle for comfortable use and clear sightlines.

Mobile monitor carts can supplement fixed displays when detailed exhibits require closer viewing. Identify operating positions that staff can use without obstructing circulation or views of the proceedings.

© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

3.3.4 Gallery Display Locations

Evaluate gallery displays from public seating, accounting for viewing distance, image size, and obstructions from occupants or furnishings. The arrangement should make court-authorized content legible while preserving direct views of courtroom participants.

Ceiling-mounted displays and mobile monitor carts may serve these seats. Coordinate display positions and mounting heights with viewing angles, aisles, accessible seating, and courtroom circulation.

3.3.5 Media Spaces and Broadcast Connections

Media infrastructure should give news organizations a defined connection to approved courtroom content while preserving the court's control over distribution. Coordinate camera positions, press connections, and permanent pathways with court personnel, facilities staff, and media representatives to reduce temporary cabling and disruption.

Press panels may distribute approved audio, exhibits, individual camera views, or a selected program feed. Incoming media camera feeds can pass through the courtroom system for monitoring and controlled distribution. Access to images and permission to operate courtroom cameras should be established separately.

A separate media workroom can receive a shared courtroom feed at a defined handoff, with a designated media organization responsible for distribution to other organizations. Establish responsibility for supplying and operating downstream equipment. This supports recording and commentary outside the courtroom while retaining the court's control over the originating feed.

Where broadcast vehicles are anticipated, coordinate exterior connections with vehicle locations, building access, and power. All media destinations should remain subject to the distribution and interruption controls described in Section 3.4.

3.3.6 Equipment Connections and Service Access

Across courtroom furniture and equipment locations, coordinate mounting support, ventilation, cable pathways, and service access with the architectural details. Technicians should be able to reach connectors and remove individual devices without dismantling surrounding millwork. Access panels, enclosure openings, and cable slack should support that work.

Labeled connector plates should define the interface between permanent building wiring and furniture-mounted equipment, allowing disconnection and future furniture replacement with limited disturbance to permanent wiring. Labels should identify functions or destinations and match the system documentation.

For ceiling-mounted displays, coordinate structural support and maintenance access. For mobile carts serving the jury or gallery, establish power and signal connections, cable management, and storage so staff can deploy them without obstructing aisles or accessible routes.

3.4 Control Workflows and Automation

System controls should translate documented workflows into straightforward tasks for the judge, clerk, and other authorized operators. A single button or guided sequence can coordinate routing, displays, and audio, with clear indications of the selected source, intended recipients, and sharing status.

Automation should preserve the court's decisions about when material is reviewed, released, restricted, or stopped. Distribution to counsel, witnesses, the jury, gallery, remote participants, recording systems, and media should follow the agreed workflows.

Where court procedures require media recording or transmission to use a controlled courtroom output, incoming media camera signals should pass through the court's routing and interruption functions before reaching the designated recording or streaming equipment. The judge or another authorized operator should be able to monitor incoming images and confirm the released signal, with source preview clearly distinguished from active distribution.

A readily accessible control should interrupt designated media audio and video feeds while preserving court functions needed to continue proceedings. The interruption should cover all approved media outputs and downstream connections, with restoration requiring deliberate operator action.

© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

Remote sharing requires the same attention to distribution paths. Operating sequences and testing should address both content distributed directly by the conferencing platform and signals controlled through the courtroom AV system.

3.5 Annotation and Exhibit Capture

Annotation can allow witnesses, counsel, and other authorized participants to identify locations, trace movements, or highlight details on displayed exhibits. Planning should establish which positions require touch displays or other annotation devices and whether participants will annotate individually or simultaneously. Device placement should support comfortable use while preserving courtroom sightlines and camera views.

Distinct annotation colors can help participants follow contributions from different positions. Color assignments should be consistent and legible against representative exhibits, with an additional means of identifying the contributor where needed. The operating workflow should establish who can enable annotation, assign an active participant, clear markings, and release the annotated image to designated displays and connected systems.

The court should determine whether annotated images need to be captured and retained. Where capture is required, the workflow should preserve the original exhibit separately and identify the annotated version, its associated exhibit, and the responsible participant or position. Saving, naming, storage, and retrieval should follow the court's established exhibit procedures. Operators should receive confirmation that a capture has completed before clearing markings or advancing to another exhibit.

3.6 Jury Deliberation Rooms and Exhibit Review

Jury deliberation rooms should support review of authorized exhibits under the court's procedures. The presiding judge's direction should establish whether jurors review electronic material in the deliberation room or return to the courtroom, and who controls playback. Where electronic review is excluded, record that decision in the project requirements.

A deliberation room dedicated to one courtroom can receive approved material through a controlled connection to that courtroom's AV system. Alternatively, a local playback system can make selected exhibits available without an active connection to the courtroom. Either approach should restrict access to the material authorized for the particular case. Changes to courtroom presentation sources should not automatically change the content available to the deliberating jury.

Where deliberation rooms serve multiple courtrooms, the control system can support an exclusive room-assignment workflow. Authorized court staff should be able to identify an available room, assign it to the appropriate courtroom and case, and enable the permitted content paths. Controls should prevent conflicting assignments and distribution from other courtrooms. The active assignment should remain clear to staff until an authorized operator releases the room.

Display size, viewing positions, audio playback, and operating controls should support joint review by the jury. Planning should establish whether playback is managed by court staff or by jurors using limited controls, such as selecting an authorized exhibit, pausing, or replaying material. Instructions and technical support procedures should reflect that operating arrangement.

The presentation system should protect the privacy of deliberations and should not capture, record, or transmit jury discussions. Before a room is reassigned, the operating sequence should end the previous routing and remove access to the prior case's material without affecting the court's retained records. System verification should demonstrate correct assignment, exclusion of unrelated sources, authorized playback, release, and reassignment.

3.7 Verifying Courtroom Workflows

System verification should demonstrate documented workflows using representative participants, exhibits, and operating conditions. Check speech at intended listening positions, display legibility from required seats, camera views, and the actual feeds received by remote participants and connected systems.

Operational checks should cover exhibit review and release, source changes, confidential audio restrictions, interpretation, assistive listening, and interruption of distribution. Test remote sharing through both the conferencing platform and courtroom controls. Where included, verify media interruption at downstream recording

© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.

and streaming connections. Check annotation control, capture, and removal of prior markings, along with deliberation-room assignment, exclusion of unrelated sources, removal of prior case access, and reassignment.

Court personnel should participate and practice returning the system to normal operation. Training and instructions should reflect assigned responsibilities, common problems, and support procedures. Document findings for correction and follow-up through system verification, punch review, and acceptance support.

4 AV Design and Consulting Engagements

DCH Technology Consulting supports courtroom projects from initial planning through design, construction, and acceptance. Engagements can cover the complete AV scope or a defined stage, coordinated with the court's needs, delivery method, and project team.

An initial planning engagement can review existing conditions, document workflows, identify operational gaps, and establish priorities. Depending on scope, deliverables may include a coordinated requirements summary, prioritized improvements, phasing recommendations, and preliminary AV budget guidance with stated assumptions. These findings support funding decisions and subsequent design.

A full design engagement develops those requirements into coordinated system designs, drawings, and specifications. Collaboration with the architect, engineering team, IT staff, and court personnel integrates AV with furniture, infrastructure, and operating responsibilities. Support can continue through procurement, construction coordination, system verification, punch review, and acceptance.

Focused engagements can address design review, coordination issues, or verification against documented requirements. A consultant involved in initial planning may return under a separate scope to assess the delivered systems.

5 Discussing Your Courtroom Project

Whether you are planning a new justice facility, upgrading an existing courtroom, or evaluating installed systems, DCH Technology Consulting welcomes a conversation about your project. Your operational priorities, project stage, and existing team responsibilities provide a starting point for defining the appropriate AV design and consulting support.

Douglas Hoag
Principal Consultant, DCH Technology Consulting
douglas.hoag@dchtc.com | (970) 313-3062 | www.dchtc.com

© 2026 DCH Technology Consulting.
All rights reserved.