

April 30, 2002

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: David E. Janssen
Chief Administrative Officer

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE PROJECT: CLARIFICATION

Your Board had previously directed my office to investigate the reporting of the \$2.0 billion backlog in County facility maintenance needs contained in Governing Magazine's article on the Government Performance Project (GPP). As you know, our survey response identified a maintenance backlog of \$215.9 million. The supporting documentation submitted with our response and the followup staff interviews conducted by a Governing reporter confirmed the backlog of \$215.9 million. Subsequent discussions with GPP management and staff have failed to produce any clarification on this issue.

The discrepancy between the reported and actual maintenance backlog levels was highlighted in our written response to the GPP evaluation. This response concluded that a significant amount of information provided by my staff was not considered in the grading process and that the grade assigned to the County's Capital Program was inconsistent with the published evaluation criteria and was not indicative of the County's performance in this area. A copy of our response to the GPP has been attached for your information.

I am available to discuss this further with you at your convenience.

DEJ:SRH
SNY:DJT:mda

Attachment

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel

Gppmotionresponse

Each Supervisor
May 1, 2002
Page 2

LOS ANGELES COUNTY POSITIVES THAT WERE NEGATIVES IN COUNTIES WITH HIGHER GRADES

1. Much citizen input into capital decision making
 - Contra Costa County (B-): Capital improvement plan covers only two years with minimal citizen input
2. Cost and funding of facilities projects well tracked; scope creep less a problem than in past
 - Sacramento County (C-): “Galloping scope creep” in facilities management

LOS ANGELES COUNTY NEGATIVES THAT WERE NEGATIVES IN COUNTIES WITH HIGHER GRADES

1. **Inadequate maintenance funding for roads and County spending on maintenance is minimal**
 - Alameda County (B-): Funding shortages prevented attention to major maintenance in past decade.
 - Contra Costa County (B-): Maintenance routinely underfunded, leading to large backlog; insufficient attention paid to costs of future maintenance when facilities are built.
 - Riverside County (C-): Maintenance funding still short for both facilities and roads, although increasing; minimal effort to calculate future maintenance cost of new road projects
 - Sacramento County (C-): \$120 million in deferred roadway maintenance
 - San Bernardino County (C-): Transportation funding runs substantially short of needs; only 46% of roads in good condition, with 17.3% in poor condition; maintenance approach generally reactive rather than proactive
2. **No formal criteria to assess priorities**
 - Alameda County (B-): No long-term facility planning until this year
 - Riverside County (C-): Departmental rivalries and politics play major role in project selection
 - Sacramento County (C-): Project selection can be overly political; limited capital planning for facilities

3. Facility condition assessments far too infrequent

- Sacramento County (C-): Just beginning to do condition assessments on facilities
- Contra Costa County (B-): Condition assessments on facilities are “catch as catch can”

4. Capital Improvement Plan goes out only one year

- Alameda County (B-): No long-term facility planning until this year; no automated inventory-management system
- Contra Costa County (B-): Capital improvement plan covers only two years, with minimal citizen input
- Riverside County (C-): Capital improvement plan desperately needs updating
- Sacramento County (C-): County currently lacks comprehensive facilities plan, although one is being developed
- San Bernardino County (C-): Decentralized asset management creates information gaps; no long-term plan for facilities