

# **SAN DIEGO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES: REDIRECTING THE FACILITIES OPERATIONS DIVISION**

## **SUMMARY**

The Department of General Services provides support services to all San Diego County departments and is organized into three groups: Facilities Management, Fleet Management, and Document Services. Within the Facilities Management Group there are four divisions: Project Management and Facilities Operations, Real Estate Services, Fleet Management and Document Services.<sup>1</sup>

The 2002-2003 San Diego County Grand Jury received three complaints related to the Facilities Operations Division within the Project Management and Facilities Operations. These complaints focused on the improper use of job order contracts, excessive overtime, an inefficient computerized maintenance management system, preventative maintenance data and how it altered production percentages and affected “Quality First” bonuses, personnel hiring practices and discontent in the Division, and improper use of General Services credit cards.

A new Director had been appointed to the Department of General Services and personnel and operational changes had been instituted within the Facilities Operations Division and the Project Management and Facilities Operations management prior to the start of the Grand Jury investigation. The Grand Jury discovered a history of personnel problems within the Division. Within the past two years, the complaints had been investigated by County audits and General Services Department investigations. Appropriate corrective action had been instituted.

## **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The Grand Jury inquired into:

- Complaints directed toward the Facilities Operations Division.
- Staff performance in the Department of General Services, the Project Management and Facilities Operations (PM&FO), and the Facilities Operations Division.

---

<sup>1</sup>According to a July 2002 Department of General Services Organizational Chart.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

In the beginning of August, the Grand Jury learned that there was a new Director of the Department of General Services. One of his priorities was to improve customer service. The Grand Jury interviewed and met with various personnel from the Department of General Services, the PM&FO, and the Facilities Operations Division. The Grand Jury visited out-lying sites of the Facilities Operations Division – Northeast (Vista, San Pasqual), South Bay, Downtown – and interviewed 30 Division management personnel and employees. The Grand Jury observed, during individual interviews, an unexpected improvement in job satisfaction among the Facilities Operations personnel.

The Facilities Operations Division is divided into 13 “zones”. These “zones” include: Northeast, Northeast Detention, East County Regional Center, Honor Camps, East Mesa George Bailey, South Bay Regional Center, Downtown, Downtown Hall of Justice, Courts and Law Library, and South Central. Prior to the Grand Jury investigation most of the Facilities Operations personnel were located at the main facility in Kearny Mesa and served these “zones” from that location.

## **PROCEDURES EMPLOYED**

The 2002-2003 San Diego County Grand Jury:

- Interviewed Department of General Services employees.
- Interviewed County and Department of General Services management staff.
- Inquired about maintenance, repair, and support provided by the Facilities Operations Division personnel.
- Conducted random visits to various County buildings serviced by Facilities Operations Division staff.
- Toured the San Pasqual Academy in order to obtain information regarding reconstruction and funding expenditures.
- Reviewed the 2001-2002 San Diego County Grand Jury report titled, “County General Services, Support of Detention Facilities” and the 1999-2000 San Diego County Grand Jury report titled, “Detention Facilities of San Diego County”.

## **FACTS AND FINDINGS**

In July 2002, the Department of General Services, in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Sheriff’s Department agreed to shift control of some Facilities

Operations staff. One such reassignment involved shifting personnel on-site to various Sheriff and Probation Department detention/jail facilities where these staff members were under the direction and control of the Sheriff or Probation officer in charge of each facility.

The 2002-2003 San Diego County Grand Jury finds that:

- A. The Director of the Department of General Services and Department management personnel have addressed, corrected, and instituted new procedures to overcome the problems outlined in the complaints.
- B. As a result of the Memorandum of Agreement with the Sheriff, the Facilities Operations Division management personnel have made significant changes to improve the conditions outlined in the complaints.
- C. The Facilities Operations Division employees, interviewed by the Grand Jury, are willing and able to perform job assignments and are satisfied with their general working conditions.
- D. The County departments, investigated by the Grand Jury, are satisfied with the new direction, which the General Services Department management has undertaken, and the Facilities Operations Division employees generally provide timely and supportive maintenance to the County departments served by the MOA with the Sheriff.
- E. The recommendations in the 2001-2002 San Diego County Grand Jury report titled, "County General Services, Support of Detention Facilities" and the 1999-2000 San Diego County Grand Jury report titled, "Detention Facilities of San Diego County" have been addressed and improvements have been made.

## **COMMENDATIONS**

The Facilities Operations Division of the Department of General Services is commended for striving to create a department focused on customer service.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The 2002-2003 San Diego County Grand Jury Recommends that the San Diego County Board of Supervisors:**

- 03-69:** Continue to monitor the San Diego County Department of General Services to ensure that Facilities Operations Division staff perform their duties in an efficient, timely and professional manner, and that the County departments served by the Memorandum of Agreement continue to be satisfied with such efforts.

## REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

The California Penal Code §933(c) requires any public agency which the Grand Jury has reviewed, and about which it has issued a final report, to comment to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the agency. Such comment shall be made *no later than 90 days* after the Grand Jury publishes its report (filed with the Clerk of the Court); except that in the case of a report containing findings and recommendations pertaining to a department or agency headed by an elected County official (e.g. District Attorney, Sheriff, etc.), such comment shall be made *within 60 days* to the Presiding Judge with an information copy sent to the Board of Supervisors.

Furthermore, California Penal Code §933.05(a), (b), (c), details, as follows, the manner in which such comment(s) are to be made:

- (a) As to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following:
  - (1) The respondent agrees with the finding
  - (2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefor.
- (b) As to each grand jury recommendation, the responding person or entity shall report one of the following actions:
  - (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
  - (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
  - (3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
  - (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefor.
- (c) If a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority. The response of the

elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.

Comments to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court in compliance with the Penal Code §933.05 are required by the date indicated from:

<b><u>RESPONDING AGENCY</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>
<b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS</b>	<b>03-69</b>	<b>09/25/03</b>

**Filed: June 27, 2003**