GOVERNMENT & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Department of General Services

Reason for the Report

The Grand Jury investigates various departments of El Dorado County government to determine whether or not the Board of Supervisors (the Board):

- Adopts governance policies which identify clear levels of accountability;
- Selects qualified department directors to direct operations according to written departmental policies and procedures;
- Provides adequate oversight of department directors; and
- Provides adequate funding for the operation of specific departments.

The 2001/2002 Grand Jury conducted such an investigation of the Department of General Services (DGS) to determine whether the Board is fulfilling its above-described responsibilities and to evaluate problems that are apparent within DGS.

DGS serves a unique role in county government DGS provides to all county departments direct management of support services and resources that are critical to their operations, as well as dirct services to the public at large. DGS, with a staff of approximately 90 employees, is organized in six divisions: Facilities Services, Support Services (Central Stores and Purchasing), Communications & Transportation (Vehicle Fleet Services), Airports, Parks & Grounds, Fiscal and Administration Services, and Real Property Planning and Administration.

DGS has a broad range of responsibilities for management of resources and provision of services to other county departments and the public. These include cemeteries, airports, river rafting permits, radio and telephone communications, fleet vehicles, purchasing, property leasing, equipment leasing, printing, park development, recreation programs, real estate acquisitions, grounds maintenance, cable television franchise contracts, museums, etc.

The DGS Director has presented a plan for reorganization. This plan includes revising the job description and then filling the position of Assistant Director, realigning divisions, and reassigning responsibilities for division managers. The Director is also transferring division equipment, budget, and responsibilities to other departments. The purpose of this reorganization is to increase accountability for use of the division resources and operations. To her credit, the Director is pursuing improved organizational strategies addressing many of the findings contained in this report.

Findings

General Departmental Findings

F1: DGS occupies a unique position and function as a department because the services provided by DGS are critical to the operations of every other county department. In addition, DGS provides direct services to the public.

F2: DGS has had a significant and destabilizing turnover of department directors, amounting to nine directors, appointed and interim, within the last 10 years. One of them served on two separate occasions. This turnover has had an unsettling effect on DGS personnel and has affected the morale of employees negatively.

F3: DGS has experienced significant reorganizations following the appointment of each new department director.

F4: The DGS portion of the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan provides for the continuance of the position of Assistant Director. This position, however, has been vacant for more than 10 months. Managers from divisions within DGS have been called upon to perform the duties of Assistant Director on an interim basis.

F5: When the duties of the position of Assistant Director of DGS are assumed by an assigned employee who holds another management position in DGS, that employee is required to carry out the duties of two full-time positions for only a 5% pay differential.

F6: Divisions in DGS have operated for extended periods with interim managers or without assigned managers. The result has been under-filled or vacant positions, or positions filled by employees who have been assigned responsibilities and duties above and beyond their normal scope of duties. This frequently occurs without additional compensation. Job descriptions have been ignored.

F7: Over the past few years, various responsibilities have been transferred from other county departments to DGS. Examples include Vehicle Fleet Services (Fleet Services), Radio, and Airports, which were transferred from the Department of Transportation (DOT) to DGS, when administration personnel were transferred from DOT to DGS. In the example of Fleet Services, staffing was reduced 50%, from six employees at DOT to three employees at DGS, without a reduction in workload. This is significant because the DGS Fleet Services unit does not have adequate staff to cover absences and vacancies.

F8: Frequently, responsibilities for the performance of duties have been assigned based on individual personalities and abilities rather than structural efficiency.

F9: In February 2002, the current Director proposed another significant reorganization of the department into seven divisions, five of which would be headed by managers, one of which would be headed by a supervisor, and one of which would be headed by an Assistant Director. The Assistant Director would be assigned direct responsibility for Fleet Services and Special Districts.

F10: As part of the proposed DGS reorganization, Radio would be transferred to the Sheriff's Department, and Communications (telephone services) would be transferred to the Information Services Department, thereby eliminating that portion of the DGS division called Communications.

Facilities Services Division Findings

F11: The Project Management unit of the Facilities Services Division now consists of four staff positions: one Senior Architectural Project Manager, two Architectural Project Managers, and one Senior Engineering Technician. The Senior Project Manager position is new; the Board approved it in September 2001 with the adoption of the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan. This new position has not been filled. One Architectural Project Manager position has been vacant since November 2001. The Facilities Services Manager position is currently vacant. This leaves two employees to handle the project management workload until such time as qualified staff can be recruited and trained.

F12: Sixty-seven Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) were listed in the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan. Responsibility for 63 of those CIP projects was assigned to the Facilities Services Division.

F13: Of the 67 CIP projects named in the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan, 18 were New Facility Projects, 45 were Carryover Facility Projects, and 4 were New Parks Development Projects. Some carryover projects, including those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and those relating to life/health/safety issues, have been set forth in budget proposals since 1997 without being completed.

F14: Projects are not placed on the CIP list by priority, e.g., by the importance of ADA compliance and life/health/safety issues. The Grand Jury has been unable to determine what criteria are used to place projects on the New Facility Projects list or the Carryover Facility Projects list. Written policies or criteria do not exist within the Facilities Services Division for priority ranking of project requests.

F15: The Facilities Services Division purchased the software program MP2 for managing work orders, preventive maintenance, and facility planning over three years ago. As of November 26, 2001, $16,246 had been expended to pay the vendor for software, services, and support. That expenditure did not include county staff time spent in training and working on the MP2 program.

F16: Less than 30% of the capability of the MP2 program is used because of inadequate division staffing, limited training, and frequent staff turnover. Original data entered at the time of purchase has not been verified or maintained. Significant staff time will be required to update the existing MP2 database.

F17: MP2, as currently used, does not provide useful and reliable information for the Facilities Services Division and the new Maintenance Division, its proposed offshoot. More efficient operation and use of data in the MP2 program can be accomplished. That would result in major cost savings of thousands of dollars each year.

F18: Unlike the architectural, engineering and construction industries, the Facilities Services Division does not use computer-assisted drafting and design (CADD). The Division does not have designated hardware or software programs for CADD or trained staff able to perform CADD functions. The Division has made no effort to acquire this capability in order to achieve both prevailing standards of communication and efficiency and cost savings common in the referenced industries.

F19: Unbelievably, the County does not have an up-to-date Facilities Master Plan that addresses long range planning, acquisition of real property, disposal of real property, and leasing of facilities, even though a Master Plan has been a high priority of previous DGS directors.

F20: In adopting the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan (P. 59), the Board authorized a budget allocation in Department 15 (General Fund Other Operations) of approximately $250,000 for an "other capital projects/countywide capital facilities programming and financing plan." Notwithstanding the Board's adoption of this 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan in September 2001 and dissemination of a Request for Qualifications by the Facilities Services Division, a consultant has not signed a contract. It is unclear when, or if, this $250,000 allocation will result in a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan.

F21: In the absence of a Facilities Master Plan, the Board has not made, and cannot make, informed decisions in the area of capital improvement projects. As one example, the Board purchased the vacant Logan Building in Diamond Springs, then searched for appropriate uses for the building, and then planned to expend discretionary funds for tenant improvements in amounts exceeding the County's original purchase price, which itself was more than the appraised value of the property. The total expenditures may exceed $4.5 million.

F22: The Interim Chief Administrative Officer, in August 2001, prior to the adoption of the proposed 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan, represented to the Board that capital facility construction needs were "unquantified" and that the State was in a budget crisis. In spite of this, the Board adopted a budget in September 2001 allocating $7 million for a new Community Enhancement Fund (CEF). This Fund would be used to provide money for a myriad of constituent-requested projects and programs with little reference to department-requested New Facility Projects or Carryover Facility Projects.

F23: Criteria for CEF projects were not written or publicly discussed by the Board. The Board did not instruct constituents to consider existing CIP projects, some dating back to 1997, in preparing "wish lists" for CEF funds. Moreover, members of the Board selectively chose, and recommended approval of, new CEF projects in November 2001 for the 01/02 fiscal year without direct involvement from the DGS Director or the Facilities Services Division. It does not appear that the Board gave any consideration to current workloads and staffing problems in existing divisions of DGS that would be directly responsible for coordination with requesting parties, contract issuance, and project management.

Support Services Division Findings

F24: With its adoption of the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan, the Board approved a reorganization of the Support Services Division and created a new Manager of Procurement and Contracts position. Support Services is now headed by that Manager, who has been delegated authority to act as the Purchasing Agent. Purchasing is now staffed by four full-time commodity buyers (one of whom is a Senior Buyer) and a Contract Analyst (Department Analyst) to write and process professional services contracts.

F25: The purpose of this reorganization and increase in staffing was to relieve departments from the time required to obtain informal quotations and process service agreements. Increased staffing was intended to re-institute centralized purchasing practices and capture detailed commodity utilization information to provide data for trend analysis. In turn, trend analysis results are supposed to support appropriate recommendations for revisions to the Purchasing Ordinance.

F26: Currently, limits for signature authority, purchase orders, and contracts without competitive bidding are being studied by the Manager of Procurement and Contracts in order to recommend appropriate changes for Board consideration.

F27: Board policy and county ordinance establish departmental signature authority up to $499.99 for direct or "over-the-counter" purchases of materials and supplies without formal purchase orders. The limit was increased from $99.99 to $499.99 in 1997 at the request of DGS. It has not been increased since 1997 in spite of increasing costs for materials and supplies. The $499.99 limit restricts the ability of the Facilities Services, Maintenance, Communications, and Radio units to respond quickly to requests for immediate repairs. As the County's buildings and equipment deteriorate from age and inadequate maintenance, and as inflation drives up costs, the $499.99 limit for "over-the-counter" purchases appears to be unrealistic.

F28: The County's purchase-order limit is currently $10,000 without competitive bids. This limit has not been adjusted for inflation and may be unrealistic given the amount of inflation that has occurred since the limit was set.

F29: The DGS Director is allowed to contract for services that do not exceed $10,000. The Purchasing Officer can require a department to seek competitive bids for contract work under $10,000. All contracts for services exceeding $10,000 must be bid competitively. This limit, also, has not been adjusted for inflation, and it may no longer be efficient for handling service contracts.

Communications and Fleet Services Findings

F30: The existing call accounting system, a software program used for cost analysis and billing telephone charges to each department, has been in operation since 1993. Periodic upgrades have been installed, but the original vendor is out of business and no longer supports this software. A new call accounting system software costing approximately $53,000 has been requested repeatedly, but those requests consistently have been rejected.

F31: The existing call accounting system software is exceedingly time-consuming to use for billing purposes, although it was considered "state of the art" at the time of purchase. Without vendor support, the time necessary to recover from software failures greatly impedes the ability of the Communications Division to perform interdepartmental telephone billing functions.

F32: Although no official reorganization plan had been adopted to transfer radio and telephone operations out of DGS, Communications was informed in midyear that the Information Services Department would assist it in budget preparation for FY 2002-2003. Likewise, Radio was informed in midyear that the Sheriff's Department would assist it in budget preparation for FY 2002-2003. This unofficial midyear plan has created a problem for the employees in these units because the lines of authority are no longer clearly defined. There is uncertainty about how these units will operate in different departments in the coming fiscal year.

F33: There are no apparent policies and guidelines in existence that deal with the preparation of budgets for Radio by the Sheriff's Department or for Telephones by the Information Services Department.

F34: Fleet Services is responsible for purchasing, maintaining, disposing of, and interdepartmental billing for all county-owned vehicles.

F35: There are presently over 550 county-owned and operated vehicles, approximately 100% more than existed five years ago. This has dramatically increased the workload of the entire staff in Fleet Services. The Board, in September 2001, approved a new position for a Fleet Services Technician in South Lake Tahoe.

F36: Technicians provide specialized installation and maintenance of lights, consoles, radios, computers, etc., in vehicles. Routine maintenance continues to be performed countywide by outside vendors.

F37: Fleet vehicles are fueled at a county-owned gas pump operated by DGS. Fuel can be pumped without providing accurate vehicle identification numbers and odometer readings, thereby distorting records for interdepartmental billings. As a result, certain departments are not billed for all mileage and vehicle use by employees of those departments. Consequently, budget preparations by those departments do not incorporate accurate cost projections.

F38: Administrative responsibility for Fleet Services was transferred in September 2001 from the Supervisor of the Communications and Fleet Services Division of DGS to the Manager of the Airports, Parks and Grounds Division. The most current reorganization proposal is to transfer responsibility for Fleet Services from the Manager of Airports, Parks and Grounds, which is now a vacant position, to the Assistant Director of DGS, which is also a vacant position. Line authority has not been clearly defined for making and reporting decisions, and the continuing changes have had an adverse effect on employee morale.

F39: The position of Fleet Services Supervisor has been vacant for more than six months. During this time the duties and responsibilities of Fleet Services Supervisor have been carried out by an employee who has not been given official supervisory authority or a pay differential.

F40: Because of inadequate staffing and inconsistent management, interdepartmental billings for use of fleet vehicles fell months behind schedule. Requests for administrative assistance and for substantial fiscal and clerical help were ignored or denied. As a result, interdepartmental billings were not completed for certain departments in the 2000-2001 fiscal year, resulting in incomplete data for preparation of budgets for the 2001-2002 fiscal year. In an effort to address these problems, in September 2001 the Board approved a new position, Fiscal Technician, for Fleet Services.

F41: For years, Fleet Services was housed in an old leaky trailer with damp, moldy interior wall spaces. Even though this condition was reported, the Department allowed this unhealthy work environment to continue to exist and did nothing to remedy the situation. Finally, action was taken in August 2001 by the new Interim Director of DGS. The new Manager of Airports, Parks, and Grounds was assigned responsibility for Fleet Services, and the old leaky trailer was replaced with a new trailer.

F42: The Fleet Services trailer location is isolated from other DGS offices. This has contributed to administrative problems, separation of employees from support systems, and inadequate oversight by management.

F43: Supervisory and management personnel at various levels of DGS have failed to address obvious conduct and performance issues. Some employees have performed well above required standards. Other employees have failed to meet standards for attendance and productivity. This has resulted in unfair workloads for some employees and a potential risk to the County of increases in workers compensation claims.

F44: In the recent past, critical vehicle registration documents were not processed properly or timely for fleet vehicles. Among other consequences, this lack of proper documentation jeopardized the safety of law enforcement officers using Fleet Services vehicles in undercover investigations. Extra Help employees could perform critical functions in Fleet Services. With limited staff and no backup, absences for vacations, sick leaves, family leaves, administrative leaves, and scheduled training result in tremendous workloads for the remaining employees.

F45: The "fleet rate" set by DGS for interdepartmental billing includes administrative costs. It is unclear why the "fleet rate" was higher when DOT administrative costs were a factor and why the "fleet rate" decreased after Fleet Services was transferred to DGS. The "fleet rate" is critical to develop accurate budget proposals for every county department.

Airports, Parks, and Grounds Division Findings

F46: The Airports Division is authorized to have one Airport Supervisor and two Airport Technicians to cover the Placerville and Georgetown Airports. The position of Airport Supervisor has been vacant for more than a year and currently is under-filled on a temporary basis by one of the Airport Technicians.

F47: Board Policy F-9, dated October 19, 1993, Subject: Airports-Portable Hangar Color, and Board Policy F-10, dated April 19, 1994, Subject: Minimum Standards for Commercial Aeronautical Activities for El Dorado County Airports, refer to the Department of Transportation (DOT) as responsible for airport operations. DGS is currently the responsible department and has been handling all matters related to county owned and operated airports for more than three years.

F48: Board Policies F-9 and F-10 refer to the Airport Commission as the recommending body to the Board for airport matters. The Airport Commission no longer exists; it has been replaced by two Airport Advisory Committees, one for the Placerville Airport and one for the Georgetown Airport.

F49: Subsequently, the Board revised Policy I-3, September 16, 1999, Subject: El Dorado Airport Commission, to create two Airport Advisory Committees -- the Placerville Airport Advisory Committee and the Georgetown Airport Advisory Committee. This revised policy abolished the Airport Commission, but did not indicate which department has primary jurisdiction over airport matters. The original Policy I-3 indicated that DOT had primary jurisdiction. Primary jurisdiction, however, is now with DGS, but no written document has established this fact.

F50: Administrators of Fleet Services and Airports must interface with federal and state transportation agencies regarding policies and operating requirements. These units in

DGS clearly have management issues and reporting responsibilities that are aligned with federal and state transportation matters.

Fiscal and Administrative Services Findings

F51: According to the 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan, DGS is responsible for work plans and budgets set forth in five separate funds: Fund 10 is the DGS General Fund Budget for general operations; Fund 12 is for Special Districts (County Service Areas #2, #3, #5, and #9); Fund 13, the Accumulated Capital Outlay (ACO) Fund, sets forth the County's capital improvement projects for facilities and parks; Fund 31, the Airports Enterprise Fund, provides separate budgets for the Placerville and Georgetown airports; and Fund 32 is the vehicle Fleet Management Internal Service Fund.

F52: The Fiscal Administration Manager (FAM) is responsible for the operations of the Fiscal and Administration Services Division of DGS and for the work plans and budget preparations for the five Funds.

F53: Considerable money was spent for overtime during February and March to prepare DGS budget requests for submission to the CAO's budget analyst in early April 2001. The process, however, extended into May, and the FAM and DGS Director (then interim) were required to make major revisions with insufficient notice to complete revisions without additional overtime. Communication with division managers during this process was insufficient to keep them informed of critical budget requests, which were deleted from the final proposal by the FAM and the CAO's budget analyst.

F54: The CAO presented the DGS budget to the Board for approval without including substantial details on the full scope of budget needs for each division. The Board was not informed as to the nature or priority of requests deleted from the final DGS budget. It appears that the CAO’s budget analyst is too far removed from the operational requirements of DGS divisions, project design, and construction management to make critical budget recommendations. For example, at one time the construction of a toilet facility in a county park was approved, but, unbelievably, the septic system required for the toilet facility was deleted from the budget.

F55: Some capital facilities projects for the county are identified in the budget of Department 15 (General Fund Other Operations), which is composed of discretionary county revenues and expenditures, rather than in the DGS budget for Fund 13 (Accumulated Capital Outlay projects). Examples of those discretionary projects set aside in the Department 15 Fixed Asset budget include the South Lake Tahoe Juvenile Hall ($4.5 million) and the “capital facilities programming and financing plan” ($250,000).

F56: It is not clear why the Department 15 budgeted item of $250,000 for a "capital facilities programming and financing plan" did not appear in the narrative for the

DGS 2001-2002 Budget/Workplan. DGS has divisions of Real Property Planning and Administration and of Facilities Services, both of which should be (but have not been) fully informed and involved in the creation and execution of this "plan," referred to in previous Findings as "Facilities Master Plan."

Real Property Planning and Administration Division Findings

F57: The Real Property Planning & Administration (RPPA) Division of DGS has authorized positions for a Manager, Administrative Secretary, Senior Administrative Analyst, and Administrative Technician. There is one additional position of Storekeeper for Records Management, which is filled by two "extra help" employees, each working one half time, or .5 full time equivalent (FTE).

F58: RPPA is responsible for purchasing, leasing, and disposing of county facilities, analyzing space needs, contacting realtors and property owners, coordinating department moves, managing county cemeteries, negotiating cable television franchises, and monitoring property leases in the Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor.

F59: In addition to the above listed duties, RPPA provides storage for all permanent county records and documents in the basement of the main library building and the lower floor of county-owned Building C. Record storage and retrieval requests are processed daily. Records disposal is accomplished on a schedule determined by county ordinances and departmental regulations. The Grand Jury's inspection of the records storage areas was conducted without notice. Storage areas appeared to be organized, clean, and adequate. The present library building and Building C, however, were not designed to provide permanent, safe storage for county records in the event of a manmade or natural disaster.

F60: In 2001, RPPA prepared and published an excellent manual to assist county departments in planning, organizing and completing department or division moves from one facility to another, or reconfiguring existing space.

F61: Administration of cable television franchise contracts with five different cable companies was assigned to RPPA without a commensurate increase in staff and resources. RPPA does not have sufficient staff or expertise to address all the issues that must be resolved if the County is to collect higher revenues from franchise contracts. Communication with the responsible people in each company is difficult because of constantly changing ownership resulting from mergers and acquisitions in the telecommunications industry. Franchise contracts have been difficult to track and renegotiate. One company is seriously delinquent in paying franchise fees to the County, and collection of these delinquent fees has not been accomplished.

F62: Management of county-owned and county-operated cemeteries has required increased staff time and record keeping. RPPA personnel are required to respond frequently, often on very short notice, to the public, concerned citizens, and mortuaries in order to provide services and monitor compliance with state laws and county ordinances. They are required to be present at all interments in county cemeteries. Management of historic pioneer cemeteries has become a matter of public debate and concern.

F63: The Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor (SPTC) is an abandoned railroad right-of-way that was deeded to El Dorado County. There are 537 parcels in the SPTC. The County is the lessor for 77 of these parcels. RPPA requested an initial budget allocation of approximately $30,000 for Professional and Special Services. This money would be used for parcel appraisals in order to establish realistic values and lease rates. The Department has not been able to negotiate lease renewal contracts at realistic rates that are advantageous to the County. RPPA has begun eight parcel appraisals with the initial $24,000 in approved funding. Additional appraisals will be completed for future lease agreements as these leases are renewed.

Recommendations

R1: The Board should contract with a professional management consulting firm for a comprehensive management audit of DGS to determine if the department is organized in a manner which enables it to perform its assigned responsibilities and functions efficiently and effectively with current resources and personnel. Among other management issues, this study should address and explain reasons for frequent vacancies and high turnover of Directors, Assistant Directors, Managers, and Supervisors in DGS.

R2: The Board should consider consolidating the physical offices of all DGS divisions at one site to improve administrative oversight, accountability, communication, operational efficiency, and working conditions.

R3: The Board should adopt general policies and identify specific procedures for the transfer of functions and responsibilities within departments and from one department to another.

R4: The Board should immediately institute intensive manager and supervisor training programs for DGS personnel. The Department should require such training before those employees complete probation as managers and supervisors.

R5: The Board should direct the Human Resources Department (HRD) and the DGS Director to remove unnecessary requirements for post-secondary degrees from job descriptions for DGS division managers when the jobs do not require certification, registration, or licensing.

R6: The Board should authorize the DGS Director to hire contract employees as "Extra Help" to work on construction projects which are short term and seasonal.

R7: The DGS Director, with the assistance of the HRD, should recruit and hire staff for the Project Management unit who are proficient in CADD. The Director should budget for upgraded computer hardware and software to facilitate and expedite the design and construction management of facilities projects.

R8: The DGS Director should request, and the Board should make appropriate budget allocations for, staff and training to enable the Facilities Services Division and the proposed Maintenance Division to use the MP2 program consistently for repair orders, maintenance orders, and facilities planning.

R9: The DGS Director, the CAO, and the Board should undertake a comprehensive review of outside contract services available to expedite design, engineering, construction and repair of county facilities. The Board should determine the economy of abolishing the Facilities Services Division and contracting all design and construction management to private enterprise. Privatization of functions of the Facilities Services Division should be considered for the following reasons:

- Volume of work;
- Current vacant positions;
- Inability of current managers and staff to perform work in a timely manner;
- Difficulty in recruiting and training qualified project design and management staff;
- Antiquated manual construction project design and drafting methods; and
- Staff turnover.

R10: The Board, with full participation of DGS administrative and management personnel, should proceed immediately to create a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan (the Plan) to guide this Board and future Boards in planning, acquiring, and disposing of real property and to assure more efficient and economical operation of all county buildings and facilities. The Plan must identify all currently owned and leased properties, determine the condition of current facilities, evaluate maintenance and repair requirements, estimate capital outlay costs for future growth, establish priority for acquisitions based on department needs, and recommend adequate budgets for continuing maintenance and repairs for long term planning.

R11: The Board and the CAO, with the assistance of DGS staff, should adopt policies, which establish criteria to prioritize all Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), including New Facility Projects, Carryover Facility Projects, and New Parks Development Projects.

R12: The CIP should be placed on a proposed list by the DGS director, CAO's Office, and Risk Management in order of priority, based on ADA compliance requirements, life/health/safety issues, and other established criteria.

R13: Assuming the Board is willing to delegate authority to the CAO based on the reasons set forth in the Grand Jury's Report on the CAO/CEO dated January 23, 2002, the CAO should determine, and explain to the Board, the reasons why each CIP project was not contracted or completed before recommending re-authorization of that project in the following fiscal year.

R14: If CIP projects are not contracted or completed within the fiscal year, the Board should re-authorize each specific project for the following fiscal year only after determining to its satisfaction the reasons why projects were not contracted or completed as planned.

R15: The Board and the DGS Director should review the current ordinances on bidding requirements for service contracts. The Board should consider revising policies and ordinances for such contracts to increase the limit from $10,000 to $15,000. County ordinances requiring bids for New Facility Projects, Carryover Projects, and New Park Development Projects costing less than $15,000 appear to be out-of-date and do not reflect increased costs resulting from inflation.

R16: The Board should increase the present $499.99 limit of signature authorization for materials and supplies to $999.99 to expedite work by DGS personnel on installation, repair, and maintenance projects.

R17: The Board should take appropriate action to approve and acquire new call accounting system software. This is a matter of urgency because the Communications Division cannot obtain software support for the original call accounting system.

R18: The Board should take appropriate action to transfer Fleet Services and Airports from DGS back to DOT.

R19: A complete review and analysis of the formula used to establish the vehicle "fleet rate" in DGS should be undertaken by the DGS Director, the CAO, and the Board to determine why the overhead costs in the DOT formula and the overhead costs in the DGS formula are different. The Board should receive a full explanation of the reasons for any change in the "fleet rate" which would result from transferring Fleet Services from DGS to DOT.

R20: The DGS Director should immediately order the installation of a system that will require the identification of the county employee, the vehicle, and the vehicle's mileage before pumping fuel at the county fuel pump. Employees who attempt to bypass these identification requirements should be identified by the system, reported to the appropriate department, and disciplined.

R21: If the Board does not adopt the recommendation to transfer Fleet Services back to DOT, the DGS Director, the CAO, and the Board should consider providing budget support, training, and authorizing positions for "Extra Help" in DGS.

R22: The DGS Director, the CAO, and the Board, with the assistance of HRD, should initiate a thorough analysis of the compensation schedule for the authorized position of Airports Supervisor.

R23: The Board should revise policies and adopt ordinances, which clearly state which department -- DGS or DOT -- is responsible for and has primary jurisdiction over Airports.

R24: The Board should recognize and take appropriate action to remedy the County's lack of expertise in the area of cable television franchise fee negotiations and collection of fees.

R25 The Board should authorize immediately the full budget allocation which was requested by the RPPA to contract for property appraisals in the Sacramento Placerville Transportation Corridor.

R26: The DGS Director, with the assistance of the CAO's office, should be allowed to present the Department's entire budget request to the Board, including detailed justifications for expenditures, to assist the Board in understanding the unique and critical functions of DGS.

R27: The Board should establish a new method of budget preparation for DGS, which allows for full and open discussion of budget needs and requirements by the DGS Director, division managers and supervisors, the Fiscal and Administrative Manager, the CAO's budget analyst, and Board members. This new method must allow adequate time for input directly to the Board from supervisors and managers on recommendations.

R28: The Board must establish new priorities in budget allocations for DGS staff recruitment, training, retention, and critical functions.

R29: The DGS Director should identify, and the Board should authorize the transfer of, personnel and responsibilities before permitting budget proposals to be developed outside of DGS for divisions and units within DGS.

Responses Required For Findings

F1 through F63	El Dorado County Board of Supervisors. Director of the Department of General Services

Responses Required For Recommendations

R1 through R29	El Dorado County Board of Supervisors. Director of the Department of General Services