



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

COURT FACILITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/cfac.htm
cfac@jud.ca.gov

COURT FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S INDEPENDENT OUTSIDE OVERSIGHT CONSULTANT SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

December 12, 2018

12:15 PM – 1:15 PM

Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Chair
Mr. Stephen Nash
Hon. Gary R. Orozco
Hon. David Edwin Power (Ret.)
Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.

Advisory Body Members Absent: None

Others Present: Mr. Mike Courtney, Director, Facilities Services
Mr. Chris Magnusson, Supervisor, Judicial Council Facilities Services
Mr. Jagandeep Singh, Principal Manager, Facilities Services

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m., introductions were made, and roll was taken.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Pegasus Audit Implementation Status and Next Steps

Summary: The subcommittee reviewed a draft report on *Pegasus Audit Implementation Status and Next Steps* pertaining to the management of California's courthouse capital program. This report captured Judicial Council Facilities Services' current responses to all 137 audit recommendations and its request to close the audit.

Mr. Mike Courtney presented this item consistent with materials that were posted online for public viewing in advance of the meeting and available at www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cfac-20181212-iooc-materials.pdf. He indicated the following:

- At the time of his (Mr. Courtney's) employment in summer 2016, the Judicial Council's Executive Office directed an evaluation of the progress made with implementing Pegasus' audit recommendations. In summer 2018, the evaluation was reviewed by the Judicial

Council Audit Services. This evaluation became the basis for the draft report presented to the subcommittee. The Judicial Council's Executive Office has directed that a report containing the audit recommendations ultimately be reviewed by the Judicial Council for closure.

- As shown in the table on page 6 of the draft report, most Pegasus audit recommendations have been implemented except for 10 *Not Accepted*, 3 *In Progress*, and 2 *Obsolete*. Consistent with the report, Mr. Courtney described the 10 *Not Accepted* recommendations and their rationale.
- The *Recommendations by Categories*, under Section 3.1 on page 10 of the draft report, mostly pertain to policies and procedures.
- In 2015, the *Status of 20 Summary Issues*, under Section 3.2 on page 11 of the draft report, was prepared by Judicial Council Audit Services. It captured Audit Services' review of the implementation of the Pegasus audit recommendations by the former Judicial Branch Capital Program Office.
- The following subcommittee-directed revisions would be made to the draft report to prepare it for Court Facilities Advisory Committee review:
 - Move Line 44 from Section 3.1 - Areas of Disagreement to the *In Progress* category;
 - Delete the *Status of 20 Summary Issues* under Section 3.2, since it pertains to a past internal review of the former Judicial Branch Capital Program Office's performance; and
 - Add language to clarify the infeasibility of certain *Not Accepted* recommendations, such as Lines 17, 93, 97, and 98.

Action: The subcommittee voted unanimously on the following motion:

1. With the adjustments to the draft report as directed, the final disposition of all 137 audit recommendations be submitted to the Court Facilities Advisory Committee for confirmation and Judicial Council for final approval.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.