

From: Fred Stetson
To: Invitations
Subject: SEC Comment form
Date: Thursday, July 19, 2012 9:14:33 AM

Please see my attached comments. I am unable to attach a file to my email for an unknown reason, hence the copy paste below. Thank you!

Fred W. Stetson

-----Begin Comment Form Copy-----

It is important to remember that the premise for SB 1732 was the condition and state of the judiciary facilities brought on significantly by county financial capacity to provide the level of effort to sustain/improve building conditions. The problem has been transferred to the state by our legislature and exasperated by County Facility Payments (CFP) that are clearly far below industry standards. Your job now is to determine how you want the facilities maintained and improved. The term for equal access includes building upgrade efforts to allow for persons with disabilities, as mandated by law.

My position allowed me to start a new team/organization that would provide world class support to our courts. My passion has not diminished since leaving the AOC for health reasons, and I may not be able to see the final outcome, it is important to me to speak to you. I found this format the only conceivable means to urge you to not allow the program to be dissected to individual court management, as it will return us to the same level as county management, with the exception of more personnel in literally all 58 courts, and the Supreme and Appellate courts. In my experience stateside and abroad, outsourcing facility management will provide a savings from internal staff growth that would (in my estimate) exceed 400 trades and support staff, to include the necessity to create a dedicated purchasing and contract management structure. I understand a comparison study is underway finally. This is a much needed study.

My comments are not substantiated at this moment, as it is now the responsibility of others. There is a lot of fervor about the cost of maintaining a building. YES, it is expensive, especially when you are trying to improve the safety and reliability of our courts. Using a DGS model will cost the taxpayers of California far more in just direct costs. The indirect costs for benefits will tip the costing factors.

My apologies for my writing, as I am trying as hard as I can to point the conversation back to the original task force condition surveys of all 58 courts. You will be shocked by the findings. I implemented a solution for the judiciary to have open and industry-based data to assist in measuring and managing the

Facility Conditions. Look at the condition indexes, and you'll see a a definitive pattern for how discrepancies from county/court operations would be. The larger courts have better condition indexes than most smaller courts...it doesn't take a brain surgeon to know that the existing courthouses need to be returned to safe, reliable and affordable maintenance management.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinions...the only recommendation I can make is for the council to look at how we can incorporate partial building modernization projects as indentified in the original task force surveys and are not programmed within the capital program. Existing buildings must be the priority, in concert with new building requirements. It is going to take years to bring the condition indexes to industry standards. I created a matrix for everyone to understand what expectations for service would likely be based on funding, condtion indexes, level of effort, etc.. Mr. Burt Hirschfeld should be able to provide you with this matrix. It has been adopted by many of my peers, including by the Department of Corrections; Mr. Fred Cordano, Director of Facilities, who is a former DGS director.