

County of Fresno
Board of Supervisors
RESPONSE TO THE
2016-17
FRESNO COUNTY GRAND JURY
FINAL REPORT No. 4



FACILITY SERVICES DIVISION

Please find below the Fresno County Board of Supervisors' response to the 2016-17 Grand Jury Final Report No. 4.

Findings:

- F8. Unresolved concerns regarding how supporting documentation must be supplied to the Auditor's office do not allow for complete rate study. This rate study review is required by county, state, and federal guidelines.**

F8: The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with the finding; the Internal Services Department (ISD) – Facility Services Division (FSD) has provided the supporting documentation to the Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office and collaboration continues to improve.

- F13. Failure to publish additional rates and charges on the MSF prohibits effective planning by user departments for anticipated projects.**

F13: The Board of Supervisors disagrees wholly with the finding; the Board of Supervisors approves the MSF (Master Schedule of Fees) rates, which include all necessary charges that have been reviewed and deemed appropriate.

- F14. FSD does not receive sufficient and regular allocations of deferred maintenance funds. Lack of deferred maintenance funds fails to protect the lifecycle of county property, which in turn impacts FSD's multi-year budget planning.**

F14: The Board of Supervisors disagrees partially with the finding; while funding outside of the approved rate structure may continue to be necessary, the rate structure should include a component for establishing replacement reserves for facilities and infrastructure systems in the future.

- F15. The turnover and absence of facility managers has led to difficulty with cohesiveness of operations, proper delivery of goods and services, and communication with user departments.**

F15: The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.

- F16. Circumventing FSD is not a widespread problem. When it does happen, failure to follow policy appears to lead to morale issues with FSD, along with potential liability to persons and property, and from the possible filing of union grievances.**

F16: The Board of Supervisors agrees with the finding.

Recommendations:

- R3. FSD must refer any unresolved concerns between FSD and the Auditor's office to the CAO and/or Board of Supervisors.**

R3: Recommendation has been implemented; ISD will continue to route unresolved issues to the appropriate venue.

R10. Adopt and include on the MSF all charges listed on the Facility Service Request (Work Order) Form by November 30, 2017.

R10: Recommendation will not be implemented; the Board of Supervisors approves the MSF rates, which include all necessary charges that have been reviewed and deemed appropriate.

R11. Create and propose to the Board of Supervisors a five-year plan for deferred maintenance budget allocation by September 30, 2018.

R11: Recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future; the implementation of the new facility management software program will allow for appropriate maintenance, renovations, and alteration planning.

R12. Evaluate the need for an assistant position to the Facility Manager to aid in retention of the Facility Manager.

R12: Recommendation will be implemented; ISD will consult with the Human Resources Department regarding the FSD organization.

R13. Provide additional training for elected officials and appointed department heads on existing county policy for use of FSD services. The CAO and/or Board of Supervisors should supplement the existing county policy to address any personnel circumventing FSD.

R13: Recommendation will be implemented; the review and revision, as necessary, of the existing County Administrative Office Management Directives is in progress. Once complete, the directives will be redistributed to all county departments.