AUG 31 RECD

COUNTY OF SONOMA
PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403-2829
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

GRAND JURY

August 17, 2004

The Honorable Allan Hardcastle
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
County of Sonoma, State of California

Honorable Judge Hardcastle:

Enclosed is my response to the 2003-04 Grand Jury's findings and recommendations pertaining to the Permit and Resource Management Department.

Sincerely,

Pete Parkinson, AICP
Director

cc: Board of Supervisors
Court Executive Officer
County Administrator
County Clerk

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
Response to the 2003-04 Grand Jury Report

Permit and Resource Management Division Compliance Review

Findings, Page 90

F3. As of April 5, 2004, PRMD had not fully implemented agreed to recommendations made by the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 grand jury.

Some of the agreed to recommendations from the 2000-2001 report not fully implemented were:

- R3. PRMD must have a formal written policy for ongoing training and cross-training.
- R4. Each Unit within PRMD must develop formal written procedures to implement and monitor PRMD policy for both training and cross-training
- R9. The various parts of the permit process must be integrated. Steps must be taken to ensure that a citizen gets complete and accurate information as to all procedures and permits that will be required before starting a project.

The agreed to recommendation from the 2001-2002 report not fully implemented was:

- R6. PRMD must continue to make progress in implementing the recommendations of the *Zucker Report*. The Board of Supervisors should closely monitor this progress to assure that future milestones are achieved.

Response: I partially agree with this finding. I agree that recommendations R3 and R4 from the 2000-01 Grand Jury Report have not been fully implemented. I disagree that recommendation R9 has not been implemented. PRMD is, by definition, an integrated permitting agency. Our front counter process and our permit application review processes are all focused on providing complete and accurate information to the public. Numerous forms and publications and information available on PRMD's website reinforce these processes. Nonetheless, given the complexity of PRMD's scope of responsibility and the ever-changing nature of regulations, there will always be room for improvement and PRMD is committed to this effort. I also disagree that recommendation R6 from the 2001-02 Grand Jury Report has not been implemented. As evidenced in the status reports submitted to the Board of Supervisors, most recently on August 17, 2004, PRMD has continued to make significant progress on implementing the recommendations of the *Zucker Report*.

Recommendations, Pages 90-91

R2. PRMD must complete implementation of the agreed upon recommendations in the 2000-2001 *Grand Jury Report*.

Response. Recommendations R3 and R4 from the 2000-2001 *Grand Jury Report* have not yet been implemented but will be implemented by October 31, 2004. PRMD may choose to implement these recommendations in a single policy and procedure document rather than separate procedures for each unit. As noted in the response to findings above, recommendation R9 has been implemented.

R3. PRMD must continue to make progress in implementing the recommendations of the *Zucker Report*. The Board of Supervisors should closely monitor this progress to assure that future milestones are achieved.

Response. This recommendation has been implemented. Please refer to the attached August 17, 2004 report to the Board of Supervisors. PRMD will continue to make progress on implementation of recommendations from the Zucker Report and on other process improvement efforts, but there is no mandate to implement every recommendation in the report. PRMD will provide future updates as directed by the Board.

R4. PRMD must provide a written timeline for implementing the agreed upon grand jury recommendations for approval by the Board of Supervisors by October 1, 2004.

Response. As noted above, recommendation R2 will be implemented by October 31, 2004. Recommendation R3 requires no further action unless so directed by the Board of Supervisors.

COUNTY OF SONOMA
AGENDA ITEM
SUMMARY REPORT

Clerk of the Board Use Only	
Meeting Date ___/___/___	Held Until ___/___/___
Agenda Item No: _____	Agenda Item No: _____

Department: Permit and Resource Management Department			( ) 4/5 Vote Required
Contact: Pete Parkinson	Phone: 565-1925	Board Date: August 17, 2004	Deadline for Board Action:

AGENDA SHORT TITLE:

Implementation of PRMD Operational Review Recommendations

REQUESTED BOARD ACTION:

Informational report on implementation of recommendations from Zucker Systems' "Operational Review of PRMD" approved by the Board in July 2001

CURRENT FISCAL YEAR FINANCIAL IMPACT

EXPENDITURES		ADD'L FUNDS REQUIRING BOARD APPROVAL	
Estimated Cost	$	**Contingencies** (Fund Name:)	$
Amount Budgeted	$	**Unanticipated Revenue** (Source:)	$
Other Avail Approp (Explain below)	$	**Other Transfer(s)** (Source:)	$
Additional Requested:	$	**Add'l Funds Requested:**	$

Explanation (if required):

Prior Board Action(s):

1/23/01: Board received final report from Zucker Systems and directed PRMD and County Administrator to return with recommended plan of action;
7/10/01: Board accepted PRMD's response to Zucker Report;
2/26/02: Board received first status report
1/14/03: Board received second status report

Alternatives - Results of Non-Approval:

Board could elect to change priorities or provide additional direction.

Background:

In 2000, the County Administrator contracted with Zucker Systems to prepare an "Operational Review" of the Permit and Resource Management Department (PRMD). The purpose of the review was to assess the extent to which the original goals of the 1994 County reorganization were achieved and to provide recommendations to improve PRMD's operations, particularly in the area of streamlined permit processing. The final report, containing a total of 271 recommendations in eight priority areas, was presented to the Board in January 2001. In July 2001, the Director of PRMD returned to the Board with an implementation plan, including a detailed response to 63 key recommendations within the eight priority areas. The Board considered the first status report on February 26, 2002 and a second status report on January 14, 2003.

Attachment A includes the original July 2001 response, the updates from 2002 and 2003 and the current status of the 63 key recommendations. Five recommendations are shown as "closed" and are not recommended for further action. PRMD has made significant progress on the rest, implementing 49 of the remaining 57 recommendations, many of which require ongoing effort. With one exception (road naming and addressing) the remaining 8 recommendations will be implemented shortly. Of the entire 271 recommendations contained in the Zucker Report, PRMD has implemented 163 and another 51 are in process (see Attachment B). An additional 18 recommendations have been reviewed and will not be implemented. Major highlights of PRMD's progress since the last status report include:

- We have implemented a new "Development Coordination Committee" (DCC) process for planning applications. The DCC provides a multi-disciplinary review of project applications very early in the process to identify key issues and resolve potential conflicts (this process was referred to as a "Project Review Meeting" in the Zucker Report)

- Substantial progress has been made on developing and publishing written policies and procedures. We have implemented an expedited process for review and approval of new policies and they are now available on PRMD's intranet site to provide a handy reference for staff. New policies and procedures are added constantly.

- PRMD has continued to place a strong emphasis on training and intra-departmental coordination. Since the Board approved modified office hours allowing PRMD to open at 10 a.m. on Wednesdays, the entire department devotes at least two hours each week to these activities. Key training areas have included new NPDES requirements, wetland issues, use of technology tools, safety and a variety of technical subjects. In addition, different sections of PRMD meet together on a regular basis to develop solutions to inter-divisional process issues.

Attachments:

A. July 2004 status report on eight key priority areas
B. Current status of all 271 Zucker Report recommendations

On File With Clerk:

n/a

CLERK OF THE BOARD USE ONLY

Board Action (If other than "Requested")	**Vote:**
_____	
_____	
_____	

Background: (Continued)

- Technology improvements have continued, including a newly redesigned PRMD website and a significant expansion of our GIS mapping products. The Board approved a "Technology Enhancement Fee" as part of the FY 04-05 fee schedule. Revenue from this fee will enable us to develop key technology enhancements including public internet access to permit status, online permitting for simple projects and increased electronic access to historical records.

- Permit Technician positions have been upgraded with the addition of the "Permit Technician II" level to recognize professional certifications or specialization in this important customer service function.

- Construction inspection for public improvements (streets and utilities) has been consolidated so that each inspector covers all facets of a project, rather than having separate inspectors for roads, sewers, etc. This has improved efficiency in this unit.

- A new "Special Projects Coordinator" position was added to handle the ongoing responsibilities associated with the Monte Rio wastewater project. This freed up staff resources in the Well & Septic Division to focus more effort on permit processing.

- A new Director's Advisory Group has been formed. This group of professionals who regularly use PRMD's services meets monthly with the Director to focus on process improvement and customer service issues. The Group has met four times and is currently addressing issues with well & septic services, building plancheck and drainage review.

Despite this progress, PRMD continues to experience a number of challenges. The most significant challenge is related to increasing workload and delivering our services in a timely fashion. We did not experience any significant reduction in workload during the "economic downturn" and activity has picked up considerably in the past six months. Although we are making extensive use of contract services and overtime, some review times are longer than we believe is acceptable. This challenge has been exacerbated by several key retirements and the "domino effect" of filling those vacancies internally. The increased workload also has other impacts as staff struggle to keep up with demands. The quality of reviews and responsiveness to customers sometimes suffers when workload is high. Reducing review times is a major concern of the Director's Advisory Group and the primary focus of many of PRMD's ongoing process improvement efforts.

Of the 63 "key recommendations" from the Zucker Report, the most elusive has been progress on revamping the County's approach to road naming and addressing. As the dimensions of this issue have become more defined, it is clear that the issue is primarily one of public safety rather than permit processing and development review. The most critical road naming and addressing problems already exist; they are not the result of new development. Accordingly, PRMD, the Department of Emergency Services and other emergency service providers agree that further progress on this issue will require initiative from the public safety sector rather than development services.

PRMD continues to embrace the overall themes of the Zucker Report recommendations: improving management, increased training, enhancing technology, improving internal coordination and improving the timeliness and responsiveness of our services. Our efforts in all of these areas will be ongoing and constantly adjusting to new demands and changing circumstances. In the near term, we will be focusing on several areas:

- Reducing processing times for various reviews, especially in the key areas of Well & Septic permits and Drainage Review. Both of these have become "critical path" processes for permitting activities.

Background (Continued)

- Implementation of technology enhancements using revenue from the new Technology Enhancement Fee, including online permitting, online access to permit tracking and status and electronic records management.
- Completion of the GIS zoning map.
- Hiring a new Building Division Manager for the Building Inspection and Plancheck Divisions.
- Increasing the number of code enforcement cases brought to hearing.
- Developing a process for drop-off applications to reduce waiting times for the public visiting the PRMD office.

STATUS OF ZUCKER REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRMD IMPROVEMENTS
July 2004

KEY PRIORITY AREA # 1 - Management and Supervisors

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:

"Managers and supervisors must manage. To do this they should:

- *Reduce the number of operational tasks they undertake.*
- *Delegate more work and decisions to staff.*
- *Participate in continuous management training through course work and a reading program.*
- *Establish an ongoing training program for their staff and initially target 2 ½% of staff time to training and then move toward a 5% goal.*
- *Update or develop needed policies and procedures.*
- *Develop a data source and monitor work volumes and timeliness on a weekly basis.*
- *Hold staff accountable and monitor progress."*

Recommendations: 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 88, 89.

62.	The Executive Secretary confidential should have her responsibility for minutes and payroll transferred elsewhere. The Department Head should rely more on this position as a "right hand person." Additional functions might include expanded monitoring of Department Head directions and assignments. *(p. 114)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Completed November 2000
Responsibility:	Director
Status, January 2002:	*Completed.*

63.	The Department Head should not manage any internal committee. *(p. 114)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Completed November 2000
Responsibility:	Director
Status, January 2002:	*Completed.*

64.	The Department Head should not be solely responsible for any direct tasks. All such tasks should be delegated as appropriate. *(p. 114)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Ongoing
Responsibility:	Director
Status, January 2002:	*Completed.*

67.	PRMD should proceed with a simplified approach to preparing policy and procedure manuals *(p. 116)*.

We agree that the process of preparing department-wide and individual section policy and procedure manuals needs to be simplified and given a higher priority. A schedule for development of policies and procedures has been implemented which makes significant progress in this area, while balancing the need for thoughtful consideration to any potential changes in practice. A copy of the schedule is provided in Appendix 1.

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Initial 55 policies and procedures by June 2002
Responsibility:	Senior Management
Status, January 2002:	*Major progress has been made in the development and implementation of policy and procedure manuals. To date we have completed 17 with an additional 24 on track to be completed by the end of February 2002.* *We continue to strive to meet our goal of completing 55 policies and procedures by June 2002.*
Status, December 2002	*A total of 38 new policies and procedures have been completed and a number of others are in process. Work on Policy and Procedure Manuals has slowed while staff and managers are concentrating their efforts on the "Commitment to Excellence" project. Any process changes resulting from this project may also need to be incorporated into the Policy and Procedures Manuals. Development of Policy and Procedure Manuals and other written guidance documents will be an on going high priority for PRMD.*
Status, July 2004	**Completed. Development of new policies and procedures is ongoing and continuous. The process has been streamlined by bringing draft policies and procedures to the department's weekly managers meetings and establishing quick response periods for management review (usually one or two weeks). If no significant issues are raised, the policy is finalized and made available to staff on PRMD's intranet site.**

66.	Continuous training for managers and supervisors should be undertaken. *(p. 114)*
88.	PRMD should develop a comprehensive training strategy. The lead for this should come from the Administration Division with heavy involvement of all managers. Heavy emphasis should be on team building, overall mission of the Department, education on other division's functions, and policy consistency. An initial set aside of 2 1/2% of each employee's time should be targeted with a gradual increase to 5%. *(p. 134)*
89.	PRMD should request a budget increase for training in its 2001/2002 budget. *(p. 134)*

Continuous training for mangers, supervisors and staff will be a top priority for PRMD, particularly training required to remain current within fields of expertise. The department is taking the following steps to implement a training program:

(1) Conduct a needs assessment to determine specific training needs of staff and managers.
(2) Contract for in-house professional seminar services as identified from assessment. In-house training will save time and be more tailored to departmental needs. Utilize current managers to provide portions of staff training.
(3) Document employee training – registration, completion, monitoring for effectiveness, and determining any follow-up training needs.
(4) Set training goals and objectives and monitor attendance, progress, and time involved.
(5) Determine methods to set a higher value on continued training, i.e. performance evaluations, more responsibility and promotional opportunities, other incentives.
(6) Establish training as a priority through allocation of additional funds during the budget process.

The overall goal of this training program will be to provide employees with the necessary tools to effectively carry out their job responsibilities and to prepare them for promotional opportunities in the future. We want a work environment where staff understands the overall mission of the department and their individual roles in that mission, and where staff feels a part of a team effort to provide customer service. Through additional training efforts, we want to achieve overall consistency in the application of departmental policies and procedures.

The department recently executed a personal services contract to perform a training needs assessment of all staff and managers and to provide recommendations for a training program. That contract is on file with the Clerk of the Board. The needs analysis is currently underway, and results are expected in July 2001.

During preparation of the FY 01-02 requested budget, the department shifted internal priorities to provide additional resources for training within the 4% increase in net cost provided to all departments. Specifically, the current recommended budget more than doubles the current training budget to a total of $51,614.

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	FY 01-02 recommended budget includes $51,614. Additional training funds may be required dependent upon outcome of needs assessment
Timeline for implementation:	Needs assessment completed by July 2001. Review of recommendations and implementation of selected alternatives to begin shortly thereafter
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*These recommendations are currently in process. The needs assessment was completed in August 2001, and the first training track is in process. In November 2001, the Board approved a contract to implement a PRMD training and process mapping project. This program and contract with Arnie Dahlke is in full implementation. All PRMD staff is very excited and enthusiastic about working together as a team to implement many of the Zucker recommendations. Additionally, new ideas and problem solving methods have come from the teams that help both the staff and customer understand what is needed, why and how long processes may take. Staff is excited about streamlining processes and understanding how they can be made easier and more coordinated. The initial results have raised the spirits of the staff and produced glowing comments from customers. Letters*

and notes to the department acknowledge staff's increased helpfulness and understanding of the current process and continuing efforts to improve it.

With the Board approval of adequate training time for staff by allowing closure of the Department to the public at noon on Wednesdays for a 6 month period beginning December 12, a great deal of progress has begun to teach, learn, document and map the current process to assist in creating improved customer services, both internal and external. This includes meetings and training sessions with supervisors, managers and all staff. It is anticipated that several products will be completed by June 2002, which will lead to many positive changes to improving PRMD operations.

Status, December 2002:

This program, known as the "PRMD Commitment to Excellence" project, continues to be one of the department's top priorities. In June 2002 the Board approved an amendment to Dr. Dahlke's contract to continue the project with emphasis on process improvement. Ongoing training for managers and supervisors is also a key component of this program. The Board also extended the Wednesday afternoon closures through November 20, 2002. This time was invaluable for staff training and concentrating on process improvements. On December 17, the Board of Supervisors approved modified office hours for PRMD to provide ongoing opportunities for training and process improvement.

Status, July 2004

Training continues to be a high priority for PRMD and, along with process improvement, is the primary focus of the Wednesday morning periods when the office is closed to the public. Training is provided on a wide variety of topics including technical issues, familiarizing staff with the functions and responsibilities of other divisions and topical issues such as regulations regarding wetlands and streams and stormwater management. Over the next three months, PRMD will be developing a comprehensive policy on training, including systems for tracking and documenting staff training needs and accomplishments.

KEY PRIORITY AREA # 2 - Technology

Recommendations: 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80.

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:
"The County and PRMD should complete the technology upgrade that we understand has been funded including new computers, upgraded email, major portions of GIS and a new permitting system.

Consideration should be given to analyzing and pricing additional technology upgrades including:

- *The accounting and staff time monitoring system.*
- *Use of optical scanning for records.*
- *Telephone use of call monitoring and automated attendants.*
- *Use of the Internet and on-line permitting.*
- *Field computer for inspectors."*

December 2002 - Summary of General Technology Improvements

- *Implemented Thin Client computing technology. This technology can utilize thin client terminals that cost less than on third of the cost of traditional workstations and have twice the useful life.*
- *Upgraded one third of the Department's computers which were five years old or more to thin client terminals. Need to replace and additional 18 computers that will be more than five years old by the beginning of the next fiscal year.*
- *Replaced obsolete file servers with new faster and more stable servers.*
- *Completed implementation of PERMITS Plus permit processing and tracking software replacing the obsolete DOS-based system. This client server database product has an easy to use graphical user interface and is designed to allow faster and easier reporting.*
- *Replaced 5 printers that were seven years old and failing with new printers.*
- *Continued development of a superior GIS capability including an aggressive training program for GIS Staff. Virtually all comprehensive planning maps have been transferred to the GIS from old paper maps. All mapping and geographic data analysis activities are now being carried out in the geographic information system allowing more efficient utilization of geographic data. GIS data is being made available to the public on CD. Current products include Land Use and Open Space Maps. Pilot programs are being implemented to provide GIS generated maps and data to user's workstation.*
-

70.	A strategy should be developed to complete the GIS Zoning Map. Completion should be targeted for nine months. *(p. 124)*

Position allocation change:	1.0 Geographic Information Technician.
Additional estimated cost:	First year costs of $63,236, assuming a December 1st hire date. Costs include $22,075 of one-time expenses for workstation and equipment. Annualized cost of approximately $74,800. First year costs are anticipated to be from the General Fund, with subsequent years offset by fee revenues.
Timeline for implementation:	Beginning December 2001 with completion by July 2003.
Responsibility:	Project Responsibility: Deputy Director, Planning
Coordination Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*In August, the Board approved an additional Geographic Information Technician position, which was hired in October. The new position, along with existing staff, is currently working on GIS zoning maps.*
Status, December 2002	*PRMD's GIS Zoning data based on the Assessor's parcel layer is 90% complete. The current Zoning project is using a parcel layer that is generally accurate up to October 2001. A parcel layer which is generally accurate up to June 30, 2002 will be available by the*

end of September 2002. GIS staff will adjust our zoning data to that parcel layer. This will include overlay zones and combining districts. The data will then be reviewed for accuracy by planning staff which could require an additional six months depending on time and resources.

A procedure is in place to update the data as zoning and parcels change. The accuracy and reliability of all GIS projects county-wide are dependent on the existence of an accurate and up-to-date Assessor's parcel layer.

Status, July 2004

The first draft set of GIS zoning maps are complete and the updated parcel layer has been incorporated. Since these maps will be a source of critical information for a whole range of planning and real estate decisions, the maps must undergo quality control review prior to use. This process of map checking could be time consuming. We must also resolve issues related to certain overlay zones that are not based on parcel boundaries (such as the Biotic Resource overlay) to ensure these are accurately depicted on the maps. We estimate this process could take up to one year. When the QC process is complete, PRMD will present the GIS maps to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for formal adoption to ensure that there is only one official source of zoning information.

71.	The County should develop a strategy to complete a street and addressing data-base as well as building outlines as a GIS layer. *(p. 124)*

Position allocation change:	To be determined
Additional estimated cost:	To be determined
Timeline for implementation:	November 2001: Road naming and addressing policy to Board November 2001: Work plan and schedule to Board
Responsibility:	Project Responsibility: Customer Services Manager
Coordination Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*Building outlines are part of ISD contract with Merrick in connection with the aerial-ortho photos. Street naming and addressing will be added after a system is reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors.*
Status, December 2002	*Building footprints have been derived from the orthophotos by the photography vendor. ISD's GIS section is coordinating this work with the vendor. The vendor is also working with ISD to correct the existing street layer to the orthophotography. Quality control of this work is approximately 50% complete. The computer aided dispatch system is scheduled to go live at the end of January 2003, according to the Information Systems Department.*

Status, July 2004	**The street and addressing database is complete and in use by the new dispatch system. Parcel boundaries must be rectified before the building footprints can be used, and that work underway at ISD and is expected to be complete by fall 2004.**

72.	The County should proceed with installation of a new permit system including the features outlined above. *(p. 126)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable.
Timeline for implementation:	Additional features to be added as funding and time allow
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*On schedule for an April 2002 implementation.*
Status, December 2002:	*Complete*

73.	Interim temporary staff or consultants should be added to PRMD as necessary to help with the permit system installation. *(p. 126)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Implementation consultant contract began February 2001
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer.
Status, January 2002:	*An extra-help Information Technology Analyst has been hired.*
Status, December 2002:	*Complete*

74.	Use of the permitting system within PRMD should be made mandatory. *(page 126)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Completed
Responsibility:	All Managers and Supervisors
Status, January 2002:	*As stated in recommendation #72 above, the department's information systems team worked with Accela to develop a customized training program for staff on the use of the new Permits Plus system. This training started in October 2001 and is continuing. As of this writing, 90% of all staff are trained and ready to use the new Permits Plus system upon implementation in April. A great deal of time and effort has and will continue to be dedicated to this project. As new staff is hired and new products are added, training will be on going and is mandatory for all staff. While we are utilizing basically one person to do all of the training at this time, we have trained "unit experts" that will be available to assist current and new staff in training and using the systems as is appropriate for their particular*

function.

Status, December 2002: *Complete*

75.	The County should support a new cost accounting system for PRMD. *(p. 127)*

Position allocation change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable
Timeline for implementation: Implementation: July 2002
Responsibility: Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002: *The TEAMs system has been installed in the accounting division and they are in the process of evaluating it. Implementation of this program will be explored after Permits Plus is functional.*

Status, December 2002: *The County of Sonoma is in process of preparing an RFP for selecting a vendor to install a County-wide time and attendance system. Contract discussions with vendors are scheduled to begin in February 2003.*

In September 2002, GFOA representatives met with PRMD accounting staff to assess the department's time reporting and cost accounting needs. GFOA will present PRMD's issues to prospective vendors to evaluate the feasibility of tailoring a system to meet PRMD's reporting requirements.

PRMD currently uses a spreadsheet database (Excel) to accumulate their cost accounting data. The spreadsheet system consists of the prior cost accounting system project code series that was transferred to the Excel format. The accounting staff manipulate cost data using data base functions to provide a variety of reports that are used for billing external customers, and internal reporting.

Status, July 2004 **A vendor for the new time and attendance system has been selected and implementation is now underway. As noted in the December 2002 update, PRMD's cost accounting needs were considered when selecting the new system and we expect it to enhance our cost accounting capabilities and make for more efficient timekeeping by staff. The County Information Systems Department recently provided PRMD with an updated copy of the TEAMS cost accounting system for further evaluation. PRMD and other County departments currently using TEAMS are exploring development of an interface between the new time and attendance project and TEAMS for cost accounting purposes.**

76.	PRMD's E-mail system should be upgraded. *(p. 127)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Completed May 2001
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer.
Status, January 2002:	*Complete.*

77.	Examine the options of linking the cash register to the new permitting system. *(p. 127)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	To be determined
Timeline for implementation:	FY 02-03 budget cycle
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*Once Permits Plus is up and running in April 2002, the Department Information Systems division will explore this option.*
Status, December 2002:	*No action has been taken on this item. We will develop a scope of work for this project by assessing needs with the accounting section and discussing hardware options with the Permits Plus vendor. Since the current system is not creating problems this is not a high priority. Completion date for the scope of work is 6/1/2003.*
Status, July 2004	**Closed. It was determined that this interface would have to be custom designed by the Permits Plus vendor and would not be a significant improvement to the current system. The cost is not justified given more cost-effective projects, such as online permitting.**

79.	PRMD should develop a full web strategy including projected time lines. The first step of placing documents on the site should be targeted for completion in six months. *(p. 128)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	January 2003
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*The following documents are available on the internet: FAQ, Fees, General Plan, General Plan Update, Zoning Ordinance, Appointments* *The following documents are available on the Intranet: Policies and Procedures Manual, Fees, Employee Forms, PCAS codes, Org Chart, Phone/Pager list, GroupWise information.*
Status, December 2002:	*Complete. A strategy for developing a PRMD web presence has been created and content items identified and prioritized. An extensive area has been developed for the 2002 General Plan including meeting calendars, minutes, time lines and the text of existing plan. Other areas include Fees, FAQs, Zoning Ordinance and a "What's New" area for announcements. Other data*

soon to be added include technical bulletins for construction, overview of services and boards and commissions areas. Also an organization chart with staff phone numbers will be made available on the site, which responds also to Zucker recommendation #84.

80.	Once sufficient information is on the web site, an information kiosk or computer displaying the same information should be placed in PRMD's lobby. *(p. 128)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	To be determined
Timeline for implementation:	FY 02-03
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*This is targeted for Summer or Fall of 2002. Terminals will be placed in the lobby of PRMD where customers will have access to the Internet.*
Status, December 2002	*We will pursue a two step approach to this issue. The first is to define the types and costs of hardware and software needed to provide a secure internet connection in our lobby for the public. We will meet with ISD network personnel to obtain this information. The second is to identify information we can provide to the public on a standalone computer. We will complete a proposal for this project and present it to the PRMD's Information Systems Working Group in early 2003.*
Status, July 2004	**The quickest and best way to make this information available to the public in our lobby is to set up a computer with access to the PRMD website. ISD must set up a proxy server to control what can be accessed from this internet connection. ISD has acquired and is currently configuring the proxy server. Our goal is to have a public station pilot underway during summer 2004.**

KEY PRIORITY AREA # 3 - Permit Center

Recommendations: 59, 90, 91, 114, 120, 121, 126, 135.

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:

"The report includes numerous recommendations impacting the permit center. The recommendations should be implemented as a total package. Key items include:

- *Appointing a Customer Services System manager.*
- *Giving process and administrative authority, but not substance authority to the Customer Service System manager.*
- *Staffing the Planning and Well and Septic cubicles on a more permanent basis.*
- *Over time, upgrading the qualifications and responsibilities of the Permit Specialists."*

59.	The Customer Service Section should be headed by a manager. Should this not be approved the Section should report to one of the Deputy Directors. *(p. 113)*

Position allocation change:	1.0 PRMD Manager
Additional estimated cost:	First year costs of $87,275, assuming October 1st hire date. Costs include $8,442 of one-time expenses for computer and equipment. Annualized costs of approximately $105,200. First year costs are anticipated to be from the General Fund, with subsequent years offset by fee revenues.
Timeline for implementation:	October 1, 2001, or as soon thereafter as possible.
Responsibility:	Director
Status, January 2002:	*Completed. The new Manager was hired in December 2001.*

90.	The Customer Service Manager should have secondary supervision responsibility for the File Counter/Self Help and the Cashiers in relation to the flow of permits and customer service activities. *(p. 135)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Director does not agree with this recommendation.
Responsibility:	Not applicable
Status, January 2002:	*Closed. As stated in the previous report to the Board, recommendation will not be implemented.*

91.	The Customer Service Manager should have administrative and process authority over cubicle employees. *(p. 136)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Director does not agree with this recommendation.
Responsibility:	Not applicable
Status, January 2002:	*Closed. As stated in the previous report to the Board, this recommendation will not be implemented.*

114.	The Permit Specialist Position should be upgraded to handle additional functions. *(p. 145)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Unknown at this time. Dependent upon level of changes in duties and responsibilities.
Timeline for implementation:	January 2003
Responsibility:	Customer Service Manager
Status, January 2002:	*Although this is a high priority, it requires review of job descriptions and anticipated state requirements that should be clearer within the next year. This recommendation is scheduled for consideration in FY 2002-2003.*
Status, December 2002	*The Customer Service Manager and Department Analyst have met with H.R. to discuss reclassification of the*

permit specialists to include Permit Specialist I and II. The higher level would require ICBO certification. Since Debra Watts' transition to the Customer Service Division, all permit specialists have completed at least one ICBO course for front counter technicians and two of the four have passed the ICBO certification exam.

Status, July 2004 **Completed.**

120.	Planning should identify another person who will be assigned 22 hours per week to the Planning cubicle. This person could be a planning technician. This is considered a new position, which will also share planner phone responsibility. *(p. 147)*

Position allocation change: 1.0 Planner III

Additional estimated cost: First year costs of $56,085, assuming November 1 hire date. Costs include $8,442 of one-time expenses for computer and equipment. Annualized costs approximately $83,700. First year and subsequent years' costs offset by fee revenues.

Timeline for implementation: Hire date: December 2001 hire date
Implementation date: January 2002

Responsibility: Deputy Director, Planning

Status, January 2002: *The Board approved an additional position for the FY 01-02 budget. This recommendation this will not be fully implemented until approximately April 2002 due to current vacancies. However, the Planning cubicle is backed up at all times and the Planner phone is fully covered.*

Status, December 2002: *Complete. The new Planner III position was filled in February 2002 and other vacancies were filled. Two planners are now responsible for primary cubicle duty except during lunch hours. All the other planners and planning technician in the Project Review Division handle lunch cubicle duty and backup on the cubicle. However, the new Planner III allocated to half-time cubicle duty will not handle phone duty, but rather will process some Project Review applications. The Comprehensive Planning Division planners have been relieved of backup cubicle duty, thus making more time available to them to complete Comprehensive Planning Division Work Program tasks.*

121.	Planners from Project Review should be assigned as planner of the day backup in eight-hour blocks of time, thus limiting the piecemeal impact of the assignment. *(p. 147)*

Position allocation change: See recommendation #120 above

Additional estimated cost: See recommendation #120 above

Timeline for implementation: March 2002

Responsibility: Project Review Division Manager

Status, January 2002: *Depends on filling position from Recommendation #120. Implementation is scheduled for April 2002.*

Status, December 2002: *This recommendation has not been implemented yet due to a number of staffing changes and need for training. Further, most planners seem to prefer smaller segments of time, rather than having one full day of backup cubicle duty. We may reconsider implementation of this recommendation or implement it for a trial period to see whether planners find such a schedule beneficial to productivity.*

Status, July 2004: **This recommendation has been implemented in modified form. The Zoning cubicle at the front customer service area is now staffed primarily by two senior planners. Other planners provide backup during lunch breaks and during busy periods in efforts to move customers through the customer service area more quickly. Due to current staffing, backup planners now work one four-hour block of time per week, which has limited interruptions and increased the team's productivity and customer service.**

126.	An analysis should be conducted regarding the number of customers needing well and septic from 7:30-9:00 a.m. If there is normal demand during this period, the cubicle should be staffed. *(p. 149)*

Position allocation change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable.
Timeline for implementation: Director does not agree with this recommendation.
Responsibility: Not applicable
Status, January 2002: *Closed. As stated in the previous report to the Board, the recommendation will not be implemented.*

135.	The County should rapidly resolve its approach to addressing and street naming. Once the approach is determined, appropriate staffing should be authorized. *(p. 162)*

Position allocation change: To be determined
Additional estimated cost: To be determined
Timeline for implementation: September 2001: Road naming and addressing policy to Board November 2001: Work plan and schedule to Board
Responsibility: Coordination Responsibility: Director
Implementation Responsibility: Customer Services Manager
Status, January 2002: *Recommendations regarding clarification of the existing policy will be presented to the Board by the end of February 2002. Further recommendations for improvement and will be presented to the Board for further action by mid-June 2002.*

Status, December 2002: *The road naming and addressing working group, which includes County Counsel; County Administrator; Sheriff's Office; DES; GIS, and PRMD, have been meeting weekly for the last six weeks. A Board workshop*

will be scheduled for early 2003, to discuss policy options for resolving this issue.

Status, July 2004:

Although PRMD is responsible for assigning new addresses and road names, the working group agreed that it would be most appropriate for emergency responders (primarily the Department of Emergency Services and local fire chiefs) to develop specific recommendations for prioritizing road naming and addressing problems for action.

KEY PRIORITY AREA #4 - Technical Support Division

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:

"The Technical Support Division should be renamed Engineering Services and reorganized into three sections, one Survey and Land Use, one Engineering, and one Construction Inspection. Our report includes a variety of recommendations that would help to integrate the functions."

Recommendations: 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254

Note: Recommendations 245 and 246 are included in this response, although not originally included in the January 21, 2001 list of 52 recommendations within the eight key priority areas. However, both are essential to the other recommendations included within Key Priority Area #4.

245.	Convert a half-time clerical position to one full-time clerk-typist position in the Operations Division to assume plan check and related duties. *(p. 241)*

The Board of Supervisors approved PRMD's request to implement this recommendation in March 2001. The position was filled on April 7, 2001.

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Completed April 7, 2001
Responsibility:	Field Operations Manager
Status, January 2002:	*Completed April 2001.*

246.	Add one clerical staff to be shared equally by Inspection and Well and Septic for filing and relief duties. *(p. 242)*

Position Allocation Change:	1.0 Clerk Typist II.
Additional estimated cost:	First year costs of $35,174, assuming December 1st hire date. Costs include $8,442 of one-time expenses for computer and equipment. Annualized costs approximately $47,200. First year costs are anticipated to be from a combination of eliminating extra help ($10,591), eliminating agency extra help ($10,000), and General Fund ($14,583). In subsequent years, costs will be offset by fee revenues.
Timeline for implementation:	December 1, 2001.
Responsibility:	Field Operations Manager
Status, January 2002:	*Completed December 2001.*

247.	Change the name of Technical Support Division to "Engineering Services". *(p. 242)*
248.	Change the title of the Division Manager Technical Support to Engineering Services Manager. *(p. 242)*

249.	The Technical Support division should be reorganized as shown in Figure 22. *(p. 242)*
250.	Create an Engineering section to include personnel consolidated from the current Drainage and Sanitation and Encroachment sections. Retain the current Survey and Land Use Section. *(p. 247)*

Position Allocation Change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable
Timeline for implementation: December 2001.
Responsibility: Deputy Director, Engineering and Construction
Status, January 2002: *These four items should be completed by February or March of 2002 with the hiring of staff listed in recommendations 252, 253 & 254 below. After meeting with the CAO, the new "Engineering Services" Division organizational structure has been slightly modified in regards to reporting lines for Building Inspection and Plan Check (see Attachment D and recommendations 252, 253 & 254 below).*

Status, December 2002 *#247 Completed. The name was changed to "Engineering Division".*

#248 Completed.

#249 Completed.

#250 Completed.

251.	Transfer inspection responsibilities for inspections of sewer and water lateral piping on private property to the Building Inspectors. *(p. 247)*

Position allocation change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable
Timeline for implementation: Director does not agree with this recommendation.
Responsibility: Not applicable
Status, January 2002: *Closed. As stated in the previous report to the Board, this recommendation will not be implemented.*

252.	Transfer the three inspection positions into one consolidated construction inspection section and re-title positions to Inspector. Have main line construction inspection and all rights of way inspected by these inspectors. *(p. 247)*
253.	Add a position titled Construction Inspection Supervisor to function as a working supervisor. *(p. 247)*
254.	Add a position titled Senior Civil Engineer to supervise a new Engineering Section. *(p. 247)*

Position Allocation Change:
1.0 Senior Civil Engineer
1.0 Clerk Typist II (see recommendation #246)
2.0 Engineering Tech IV
(2.0) Building Inspector III

Additional estimated cost: Senior Civil Engineer: First year costs of $82,366, assuming November 1st hire date. Costs include $8,442

of one-time expenses for computer and equipment. Annualized costs approximately $114,100. First year costs are anticipated to be from deferred revenue account, with subsequent years offset by fee revenues.

Clerk Typist II: (see recommendation #246)
2.0 Engineering Tech IV, offset by deletion of 2.0 Building Inspector III: First year costs of $5,762, assuming November 1st hire date. Annualized costs approximately $8,500. First year costs are anticipated to be from the deferred revenue account, with subsequent years offset by fee revenues.

Timeline for implementation: July 2001: Reorganization request submitted to CAO
September/October 2001: Completion of Human Resources review and Board review and approval
December 2001: Hire of final position

Responsibility: Deputy Director, Engineering and Construction

Status, January 2002: *#252. Consolidation of the construction inspection section will occur when the Senior Civil Engineer is hired to provide front line supervision and support for this change. This position is currently being recruited.*

#253. As indicated previously and shown on Attachment D, PRMD and CAO are proposing that Building Inspection report directly to the Deputy Director, Engineering Services. Human Resources is currently completing the necessary steps (including Civil Service Commission review of classification specifications and salary negotiations with appropriate union representatives)

#254. Board of Supervisors approved new position, which is currently open continuously until filled.

Status, December 2002: *#252: Consolidation of the Construction Inspection Section is currently being phased in. Workload is being more evenly distributed among the three inspectors. At this time, inspectors are sharing encroachment permit inspection duties. Analysis of this phase will help determine the viability of distributing the workload on an area basis with each inspector responsible for encroachments, water and sewer mainline inspections and subdivision inspections.*

#253: Completed. The classification actions were completed and the Board of Supervisors approved the addition of one position "Building Inspection Supervisor" and an additional one (for a total of two) PRMD Manager (Building Inspection). Currently, a recruitment for the manager position is underway. Once that position is filled, there will be an immediate promotional recruitment for both Building Inspection Supervisor positions. At this time, we have a current list

for Building Inspector II and will underfill the supervisor positions until they can be filled permanently.

#254: Completed. Recruitment for the position of Senior Civil Engineer for the Engineering Division has finally been successful. This position has been filled and the successful candidate began work in early October of this year.

Status, July 2004:

#252: Completed. With the successful recruitment and hiring of the new Engineering Technician to take over plan check duties in the Land Development Section, recommendation #252 has been fully implemented. Construction and sanitation inspections have been consolidated into one function of "construction inspection" that inspects all work in the public right-of-way and private roads. Each inspector is assigned a geographic area of the county and there is no overlap of personnel. The change has had a positive effect on training and morale and appears to be working very well. The Survey and Land Development Supervisor has taken over supervisory duties for this section, freeing the Division Manager for other tasks. A new position of Construction Inspection Supervisor has not been added as it will be necessary to review the operational improvement and workload assessment of the structure currently in use and make recommendations as to the need for a new supervisor position at a later date.

KEY PRIORITY AREA # 5 - Project Review

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:

"The Project Review Division should be reorganized to reduce the managers' span of control. Planners should become true project managers working within a series of revised processes that are detailed in our report. A new Planner IV should be added to this Division to assist with planner supervision."

Recommendations: 141, 142, 155, 156, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170, 171, 174, 175

Note: Recommendations #141, 142, 155, 156, 163, 164, 165, 167, and 168 are included in this response, although not originally included in the January 21, 2001 list of 52 recommendations within the eight key priority areas. However, these recommendations are essential to the other recommendations included within Key Priority Area #5.

141.	Management in the Project Review Section should change their priorities to include the necessary time to establish written guidelines, procedures and policies. *(p. 168)*
170.	PRMD should review the proposed Alternatives for reorganization of the Project Review Section and implement one of them. *(p. 196)*

Position allocation change:	2.0 Supervising Planner (or equivalent).
Additional estimated cost:	First year costs of $112,098, assuming January 1st hire date. Costs include $16,884 of one-time expenses for computer and equipment. Annualized costs approximately $193,600. First year and subsequent year costs are offset by fee revenues.
Timeline for implementation:	July 2001: Reorganization request submitted to CAO September/October 2001: Completion of Human Resources review and submission to Civil Service Commission November 2001: Board review and approval January 2002: Anticipated hire of positions
Responsibility:	Implementation: Project Review Division Manager
Oversight:	Deputy Director, Planning
Status, January 2002:	*Reorganization request has been submitted to CAO and additional Supervising Planner positions were approved in the 2001/02 Final Budget. The classification study for these new positions is nearing completion by Human Resources. We now project final Board approval of the class specification by March, with anticipated hire of positions by the end of May 2002. This will delay the implementation of several other Project Review recommendations correspondingly.*
Status, December 2002:	*Completed. Two new positions were allocated in the 2001/2002 budget and the Human Resources Department completed a classification study. Two Supervising Planners were hired on June 11, 2002.*

142.	PRMD should identify and list all the recommended procedure changes within this report and submit the list to County Counsel and the consultants preparing the new ordinances in order that they may be incorporated into the new documents. *(p. 168)*
155.	Project Review should develop a checklist(s) of what is required for an application to be complete for submittal. (Different checklists may be necessary for different types of applications.) The checklist(s) should be available to applicants at the front counter along with other pertinent information. When the application is submitted, the staff reviewing the application would use the list, checking off each item on the list. The checked list would then be signed by the staff person and attached to the application prior to accepting it. *(p. 180)*
156.	Until Recommendation 155 is fully implemented eliminating the problem of incomplete files, the planning technician should keep the file and pursue obtaining the necessary information where the file is so incomplete that referrals cannot be sent. If referrals are sent, the file should be kept on the assigned planner's desk. As an option, consideration could be given to returning the file to the applicant and only accepting complete applications. *(p. 180)*
164.	Planners should field check projects early in the process. If possible, this field inspection should be done before PRM. Pictures of the site should be taken and made available at the meeting to assist with the discussion. *(p. 185)*
165.	The Planning Division should reaffirm their commitment of performing environmental review and project analysis concurrently. *(p. 186)*
167.	Project Review should establish a Hearing Calendar, which shows all hearings, projects that have scheduled hearing and the assigned planner. *(p. 189)*

168.	The Project Review Manager should review the Hearing Calendar weekly and make adjustments as appropriate in order to assure even planner caseloads whenever possible. *(p. 189)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	July 2002
Responsibility:	Implementation: Project Review Division Manager
Oversight:	Deputy Director, Planning
Status, January 2002:	*#142: has been completed.*
	#155: has been partially implemented with the completion of a new checklist for Use Permit applications, the most common planning application. Other checklists are under development, to be completed by July 2002.
	#156: has been implemented by instituting a policy of accepting only complete applications. Standards for complete applications have been established and direction provided to staff on this matter.
	#165: has been implemented.
	#164, #167 and #168: will be completed later in conjunction with implementation of #170.
Status, December 2002:	*#164: has been implemented.*
	#167 and #168: have not yet been implemented due to the need for the Project Review Manager to train the two new Supervising Planners and to handle some of the duties of the Deputy Director of Planning. Furthermore, due to the departure of the Project Review Manager, it may be several months before it can be implemented. A new Deputy Director has recently been hired and the Project Review Manager position just been filled by promoting one of the Supervising Planners. July 2003 is a realistic date for implementation of these recommendations.
Status, July 2004:	**#167 and 168: These two recommendations have been implemented. Master calendars are prepared on a bi-weekly basis for Planning Commission, PRAC, Design Review Committee and the Board of Zoning Adjustments. The Planning Manager sets agendas on a weekly basis for the Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Adjustments. The Planning Manager reviews the master calendars on a regular basis to assess the case load of individual planners when assigning files. We have also developed a report in the permit tracking system to better assess the workload of each planner.**

158.	The Project Review Manager should analyze the previous caseload history to determine areas of high and low activity. She should then identify backup planners for each area, thus allowing for more even caseloads among the planners when necessary and the cross training of planners in multiple areas of expertise. *(p. 182)*

Position allocation change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable
Timeline for implementation: January 2002
Responsibility: Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002: *As noted in the July 10 report, this recommendation has already been partially implemented. Backup staff has been identified in some areas and additional staff has been assigned projects in areas where the caseload is heavy (such as the Sonoma Valley area). Additional steps can be undertaken following implementation of the reorganization of the Project Review division (Recommendation #170). Due to anticipated delays in filling the Supervising Planner positions and a recent resignation in the Project Review Division, the timeline for full implementation of this recommendation will likely be May 2002.*

Status, December 2002: *Completed. Two geographical teams have been created (north and south) each directed by a Supervising Planner. This allows each team to develop expertise within the team area. Typically, the highest volume geographical areas of those that require special expertise are the Sonoma Valley, the Coastal area, Bennett Valley Design Review and the processing of Administrative Certificates of Compliance. We now have at least four planners processing files in the Sonoma Valley, two planners processing files in the Coastal area, two planners trained to handle Bennett Valley Design Review and two planners handling ACCs.*

171.	A comprehensive project manager approach to project review should be implemented.
163.	PRMD should establish a new Project Review Meeting procedure for all applications that require public hearings. Any department, agency or PRMD intradepartmental sections that now respond to and/or condition projects should attend the meetings. If a representative is unable to attend the meeting, the project manager must receive written comments the day before the meeting. *(p. 185)*

Position allocation change: See recommendation #170 above
Cost: See recommendation #170 above
Timeline for implementation: Full implementation by December 2002
Responsibility: Implementation: Project Review Division Manager
Oversight: Deputy Director, Planning
Status, January 2002: *Although implementation of recommendation #170 (Reorganization of Project Review) is expected to be delayed, full implementation of recommendations #171 and 163 should be completed by December 2002. As*

noted in the July 10 report, Project Review planners already perform many of the functions of a "project manager."

Status, December 2002:

Full implementation of these recommendations has been delayed due to retirement of the Project Review Manager and ongoing difficulty in filling that position. Nonetheless, Project Review Planners continue to perform most functions of a "Project Manager" and staff's work under the "Commitment to Excellence" project is already resulting in process improvements that will accomplish some objectives of the "Project Review Meeting" envisioned under Recommendation #163. With the new Project Review Manager on board, a full evaluation of the "Project Review Meeting" concept will be undertaken. Beginning in January, the Project Review Staff will begin using an informal "Technical Review Advisory Committee" to provide an inter-disciplinary review of new applications early in the process to identify major issues and possible conflicts.

Status, July 2004:

Planners have been serving as the comprehensive project manager for planning projects. A project planner is assigned to a project from the initial application and entitlement/public hearing process through to completion of the construction and monitoring phase. Project planners have been working with the applicant and staff from other divisions and departments to resolve problems and coordinate the various stages of project development. This comprehensive approach to project management has improved customer service and allows the project planner to assist customers with every step in the development review and construction process. Recommendation #163 has been implemented in the form of the new "Development Coordination Committee" (renamed from the *Technical Review Advisory Committee* mentioned in the December 2002 update). This process provides an early review of major planning projects to identify critical issues as early as possible in the process.

174.	Review the caseload and additional time requirements of being a project manager as well as other recommendations in this report to determine if there is a need for additional staff in the Project Review Section during the FY 01/02 budget cycle and again in FY 02/03. If there are significant changes in either or both of these items indicated, then an additional or reduction of planner staffing should be identified for the FY ½ and FY 02/03. *(p. 199)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Completed for FY 01-02 budget process To be reviewed on an ongoing basis

Responsibility:	Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002:	*Will also be reviewed again as part of FY 02/03 budget process.*
Status, December 2002:	*Completed. Staffing needs were evaluated for the 02/03 budget and no additional positions were found necessary. This will be reviewed again as part of the FY 03/04 budget process.*

175.	The following changes in Project Review staffing should be implemented: • Hire one new person to staff the planner cubicle *(per Recommendation 120)* • Implement the reorganization of Project Review by creating the new position(s) and/or promoting staff *(per Recommendation 170)* • Monitor the workload of the project planners and make appropriate adjustments in the FY 01-02 budget *(p. 199)*.

Position allocation change:	See recommendations #120 and 170
Additional estimated cost:	See recommendations #120 and 170
Timeline for implementation:	See recommendations #120, 170, and 174
Responsibility:	Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002:	*This recommendation is simply a repetition of recommendations #120, 170 & 174. Please see the responses in earlier sections of this report.*
Status, December 2002:	*Completed.*

KEY PRIORITY AREA # 6 - Telephones/Pagers

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:

"Changes in procedures, policies and enforcement concerning phones and pagers should be completed. The report includes a variety of suggestions such as:

- *Have the planning information phone answered from 7:30 to 4:00, provide more back-up staffing, increase the monitoring of phone activity, consider use of call sequencing and automated attendant features.*
- *Have all phone calls returned by the end of the day.*
- *Require pagers to be answered within five minutes*
- *Establish a progressive discipline approach to phone and pager problems."*

Recommendations: 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87.

81.	PRMD incoming lines should remain at five lines and be staffed accordingly *(p. 129)*.

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Current operation
Responsibility:	Customer Services Supervisor
Status, January 2002:	*Completed.*

82.	PRMD should aggressively work with the county's telephone experts to correct any PRMD

	telephone problems. *(p. 129)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Undetermined at this time. Dependent upon recommended equipment and service needs
Timeline for implementation:	Ongoing
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*PRMD continues to work with Communications to resolve issues. Full implementation will not take place until all IS projects are completed and space reconfiguration is completed. Incremental changes are or have been completed, such as the installation of a repeater within the building to enhance pager response. Additionally, we have tested various cell phones and pagers in the field. Final determination on the most appropriate system(s) will depend upon the most feasible and available technology. This should be accomplished by October 2002.*
Status, December 2002	*Completed. There has been a significant reduction in the number of complaints from employees regarding the phone system. A new voice mail system was put in place in 2000, and employees received training on the features. Also the department has developed a telephone policy effective January 28, 2002, which addresses issues such as time lines for returning calls, voice mail messages and keeping a written record of voice mails. Caller ID phones have been assigned where appropriate when they are available.*

83.	PRMD should examine in detail the potential application of call sequencing and automated attendant equipment. *(p. 130)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Undetermined at this time. Dependent upon recommended equipment and service needs
Timeline for implementation:	October 2001
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*See 82 above. The ASO will continue to work on a telephone system that will fit our various needs. The current process mapping project with our consultant will include exploration of possible technical remedies also. We have received sample system information from other counties that is being investigated. Additionally, the new Telephone policy review has identified several possible areas and options for the use of attendant equipment to assist the customer and reduce staff time to answer repeated simple questions. It is estimated that investigation of one or more systems will be completed by the end of September 2002.*
Status, December 2002	*Completed. The Department has had little interest in having an automated attendant. The preference has been*

to have a live person answer each call. The option the department is pursuing is to have assigned staff available in each section to answer phone calls when other staff may not be available, but there are staffing and coverage issues to be resolved. The use of call-sequencing equipment would be most useful on the planner phone where several callers are regularly queued up. However, the additional expense (estimated at $15,000 to $20,000 in the Zucker Report) does not appear to be warranted at this time.

84.	PRMD should clarify its policy re-distributing employee phone lists. We prefer a system where most phone numbers are readily available to customers and have worked with numerous organizations where this did not create problems. *(p. 130)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Minimal cost in staff time and supplies
Timeline for implementation:	September 2001
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*Completed.*

85.	PRMD should ask for Board of Supervisors' clarification regarding phone calls from non-applicants and citizens protesting an action. *(p. 209)*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Dependent upon option selected
Timeline for implementation:	December 2001
Responsibility:	Deputy Director, Planning
Status, January 2002:	*Completed, with #84.*

86.	Consider a new phone standard requiring all calls to be returned by the end of the day. *(p. 131).*

Position allocation change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Increased costs may be encountered with new phone technology (see recommendations #82 and 83)
Timeline for implementation:	Determination of telephone system changes: October 2001.
Responsibility:	Administrative Services Officer
Status, January 2002:	*Completed.*

87.	Issues surrounding the planner phone should be resolved. *(p. 133)*

Position Allocation Change:	See recommendation #120
Additional estimated cost:	See recommendation #120. Additional increased costs may be encountered with new telephone technology (see recommendations #82 and 83)
Timeline for implementation:	Full implementation March 2002 (after hiring and training of additional Planner III)
Responsibility:	Director; Deputy Director of Planning
Status, January 2002:	*See recommendation #120 regarding additional Planner III position. Improved and more consistent coverage is*

already in place and will be addressed more fully by June 2002 with the hiring of staff to fill the positions approved by the Board.

Status, December 2002:

Completed. Additional Project Review staff have been hired and trained and planning cubicle coverage fully assigned to Project Review Division as of August 2002. Comprehensive planners are no longer providing primary or backup cubicle coverage. Comprehensive planners are now fully trained on planner phones. Planner phone hours have been extended in the afternoons to assure that all calls in queue as of 4:00pm are answered before the planner leaves phone duty. Calls are being periodically monitored by Division Manager through reports provided by Communications division.

Recent reports show that while call volume remains high, average caller wait time is down slightly and the number of abandoned calls is down by 27% compared to data gathered for the Zucker Report. PRMD's telephone operators report fewer customer complaints about the planner phone, but some callers would still like to see extended phone hours.

KEY PRIORITY AREA # 7 - Timelines

Summary Recommendations:

"PRMD should confirm and/or establish clear timelines for all of its permit activities. Standby consultants should be used when timelines cannot be met. These consultants should be given orientation and trained in County procedures to perform work in the expected manner. Given the current market conditions impacting the availability of consultants, the Board of Supervisors past policy to use local consultants should be rescinded."

Recommendations: 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 207, 208.

157.	The Pre-Planner Review procedure should be changed to meet the goals outlined in Table 18. Changes to the existing procedures in order to meet the above timeline *(see p. 181 of the Report)* should include: - Gathering the applications from the front counter twice daily. - Give the Project Review Manager the Sierra Summary Sheet and/or contents of submittal package for each project before the file is assembled or reviewed for completeness. - The Project Review Manager or another assigned staff person quickly reviews the Sierra Summary Sheet and/or contents of submittal package, and assigns cases within one day of receipt. - The preparation and sending of referrals should be given priority over other less essential clerical assignments. *(p. 181)*

Position Allocation Change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable
Timeline for implementation: Partial implementation: June 2001

	Full implementation: Estimated for July 2002, depending upon implementation of recommendations #155 and 156
Responsibility:	Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002:	*Additional improvements have been made to reduce the time from application to file assignment to two days, per the recommendation. Full implementation will occur by the July 2002 target date.*
Status, December 2002	*We have continued to make improvements to reduce the time from application to file assignment but this has largely been affected by the workload of the Planning Technician, Clerk Typist II, and Project Review Manager involved in this process. Several changes are occurring at this time in that a new Planning Technician started October 1, and the duty of file assignment has been delegated (at least temporarily) from the Project Review Manager to the two Supervising Planners. In addition, our Process Improvement Program has provided us with the opportunity to review and refine this process. Our goal was to reduce the clerical duties completed by the Planning Technician, reduce the number of times that a project changes hands and reduce the time of processing. We were able to identify efficiencies and re-assignments of the CT II's workload so she has more time to take on tasks associated with file processing. We have drafted and will soon implement a new system that is much like recommendation 157. This new division of tasks and change is the process will be phased in over the next few months.*
Status, July 2004:	**We have implemented new procedures for file assignment reducing the time from 12 days to 5 to 7 days for assigning files to planners and sending out referrals. File assignments are now handled by the Supervising Planner on a daily basis, which significantly reduced the delay in getting the files to planners and improving the Planners responsiveness in reviewing the files for completeness.**

159.	Within 30 days of determining that the application is complete, the following environmental procedures should occur: ☐ Initial environmental review should be completed. ☐ Letters requesting additional environmental information, if any should be mailed. ☐ Review and comments regarding any submitted environmental documents should be completed. *(p. 182)*

Position Allocation Change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Partial implementation: June 2001 Full implementation: Estimated for July 2002, depending upon implementation of recommendations #155 and 156

Responsibility:	Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002:	*As noted in the July 10 report, full implementation of this ambitious goal will depend on implementation of several other key recommendations, including the reorganization of the Project Review Division (recommendation #170) and improving application completeness (recommendation #156). Ongoing progress is occurring. However, due to delay in hiring for new positions, full implementation may take beyond the original July 2002 target date.*
Status, December 2002:	*Progress continues to be made. Full implementation will be a high priority for the new Project Review Manager. Due to recruitment difficulties for this position, timing of implementation is uncertain.*
Status, July 2004:	**We have significantly improved our review of new planning applications within the initial 30-day period, including a determination of application "completeness." A letter is sent to the applicant indicating any items necessary to complete the application, or additional information needed to complete the environmental review.**

160.	PRMD's intradepartmental divisions should meet a 10-working day response for referral review. *(p. 184)*

Position Allocation Change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	August 2001
Responsibility:	Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002:	*Complete. Procedures are in place, including a system for tracking referrals so that late referrals can be identified and followed up. This recommendation will require ongoing monitoring.*

161.	If PRMD is having problems with other departments complying with the State mandated timelines, the Director should request the assistance from the CAO to resolve this matter. *(p. 184)*

Position Allocation Change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Ongoing
Responsibility:	Director; Deputy Director, Planning
Status, January 2002:	*This is an ongoing activity. The CAO met with the Directors of PRMD and DTPW to address and clarify the respective responsibilities of the two departments in relation to project referrals.*
Status, December 2002:	*Completed. Ongoing activity.*

162.	The project manager should take a proactive approach with external agencies such as CalTrans, the Fire Departments, and Fish and Game if they do not respond in a timely manner. This includes: ▯ Identify and meet with the responsible person(s) and their supervisors in order to determine the correct procedural system for obtaining timely responses and to explain PRMD's system. ▯ Repeatedly contact the responding individual reminding him/her of deadlines. ▯ Indicating in writing that they have not responded in a time for their concerns if any or special condition if any to be included as part of the approval process. *(p. 184)*

Position Allocation Change: Not applicable
Additional estimated cost: Not applicable
Timeline for implementation: October 2001
Responsibility: Project Review Division Manager
Status, January 2002: *Completed. As noted in the July 10, 2001 report, PRMD Project Review staff already work with external agencies on a regular basis to seek timely input. A meeting to discuss streamlining of reviews by DFG has occurred, including a follow up memo to DFG on the matter. A coordination meeting with Project Review staff and the State Permit Assistance Center staff was held in early October. A memo providing direction to staff on outside agency referrals has been distributed to staff. We continue to use the State Permit Assistance Center when problems with State and even Federal agencies exceed reasonable time frames. We have met and continue to work closely with other county departments, including involvement of the CAO when necessary. Although not perfect, progress has been made with most agencies in accommodating turn around times. We will continue to monitor the actions of each agency to ensure the most efficient processing times can be reached (See #160 above).*

207.	Establish a goal and complete plan checks in Engineering, Building, and Well and Septic with turn around times shown in Table 24. *(p. 224)*

Position Allocation Change: As recommended in key priority area 4
Additional estimated cost: As recommended in key priority area 4
Timeline for implementation: July 2002
Responsibility: Deputy Director; Engineering and Construction
Status, January 2002: *Currently, we are meeting the Board of Supervisors established goals for residential and commercial building plan checks, which range from 1 to 7 weeks depending upon the type of plan check (attachment E is a copy of plan check times included in the original report). Meeting the goals suggested by the Zucker Report would require the assistance of contract help or additional staff even though we anticipate being fully staffed at our current allocation level by the end of April 2002. It is our recommendation that we stay with the Board established goals.*

For the Well & Septic section, current goals have not been met. Workload issues are currently being reviewed. It has been difficult to find sufficient contract help. This is a very specialized field and there is not a large pool of consultants to draw from.

Engineering Section goals will be by the new Engineering Division Manager by April 2002. With the hiring of a new Senior Civil Engineer, which will perform the first line supervision of the Drainage, Encroachment and Sanitation sections, the goals will be review and refined as appropriate.

Status, December 2002:

We are continuing to meet the Board established goals for plancheck turn-around times. Although we have used contract help as suggested by the Zucker Report, staff time needed to administer contract help has increased. In part, this is due to the need to double check contract work to insure code compliance. As of August of this year, the plancheck section is fully staffed for the first time since 1997. We have decreased our dependency on contract help and utilizing contract help during peak periods of activity or on projects with a high degree of complexity. Contract help will only be used on an as needed basis in order to meet and maintain Board established goals.

For the Well & Septic Section, PRMD's current goals are still not being met. A workload analysis has been completed indicating a need for additional staff. The Board approved one additional position in October and recruitment will be completed in early 2003. If approved, it may be possible to recruit additional staff in early 2003. This is a very specialized field and we have had difficulties in the past filling vacancies and supplementing with consultant help has been difficult because there is not a large pool of consultants to draw from.

Due to the necessity for the Engineering Division Manager to allocate a substantial portion of her time to the NPDES program, development of goals for turn-around times in the Engineering Division have been postponed. Now that the new Senior Civil Engineer has been hired, goals will be reviewed, established and refined as appropriate.

Status, July 2004:

The recommended targets for plan checks remain a goal for this Department. We are currently using extra-help and limited contract services to keep up with workload in building plan check. An additional REHS was added to the Well & Septic Section in early 2003, which provided some temporary relief.

However, subsequent vacancies have hampered further progress. Until recently, the Well & Septic Section was operating with 2 vacancies, which was having a significant impact on timelines. One of these vacancies has been filled and recruitment is underway for the other. We have made some progress with respect to turn-around times in Subdivision Improvement Plan Check. When Zucker submitted their report, the first check on Improvement Plans was running about 10 to 12 weeks and it is now at 8 to 10 weeks. Improving all plan check turn-around times continues to be a high priority for PRMD.

208.	Complete contracts with a team of qualified consultants to handle work that staff can not handle within the established turn around times. *(p. 224)*

Position Allocation Change:	Not applicable
Additional estimated cost:	Not applicable
Timeline for implementation:	Ongoing
Responsibility:	Director; Engineering and Construction Deputy Director
Status, January 2002:	*Consultants have been contracted to the greatest extent possible for building plan check, building inspection, and drainage review. As referenced in recommendation 207, consultants for Well & Septic have not been successful due to conflict of interest constraints. Temporary help has been hired for the Encroachment, Sanitation and Land Use sections and reduction of turn-around times has begun to occur.*
Status, December 2002:	*Completed. Consultants are continuing to be utilized for building inspection, building plancheck and drainage review. However, consultants are far more costly than regular staff. In addition, as referenced in the update for recommendation 207, there have been some adverse effects associated with the use of this consultant help. Since we are now fully staffed in building plancheck and will soon have the reorganization of the building inspection section completed, we will be able to reduce our dependency on contract help and only use it during times of peak activity or special projects. Difficulties remain with hiring qualified consultants without conflict of interest constraints for Well & Septic work. An additional Engineering Technician position has been allocated to the Survey and Land Use Section to accommodate the heavy workload and improve turn-around times in the subdivision plancheck process. This position was filled in early November. Temporary help is still needed to augment the Encroachment and Sanitation Sections due to heavy workloads.*

KEY PRIORITY AREA 8 - Staffing

Zucker Report Summary Recommendations:

"As an approach to staffing we suggest:

1st Step — *PRMD managers first look through PRMD to determine if needed positions could be added by deleting from another function, hiring consultants, or in the case of supervising positions, promoting existing staff.*

2nd Step — *If this is not possible, we believe the Board should add the positions with the following provision:*

Assuming permit activity remains the same or is reduced, within three years PRMD should reduce their staffing count to 133 by deleting some positions as they become vacant."

Recommendations: 68

68.	The Board of Supervisors and PRMD should agree on a staffing strategy and fill the positions indicated in this report. *(p. 122)*

For staffing required as a consequence of workload, PRMD will continue to monitor workload statistics and, as appropriate, will work with the County Administrator to seek approval for additions or reductions to staffing. For staffing required as a consequence of organizational structure, the department's recommendations in this response will provide much needed structural changes to the organization to ensure an appropriate level of staff supervision, as well as assure managers sufficient time to write policies and procedures to improve consistency.

Position allocation change:	See recommendations #70, 59, 114, 246, 254, and 170
Additional estimated cost:	See recommendations #70, 59, 114, 246, 254, and 170
Timeline for implementation:	See recommendations #70, 59, 114, 246, 254, and 170
Responsibility:	Allocation Approval: Board of Supervisors
Implementation:	Director and Managers
Status, January 2002:	*Partially completed with further review by the CAO and PRMD to be done during budget processes or as needed and agreed upon. The addition of staff numbers and classifications has and will continue to be accomplished as deemed necessary by the CAO, Board of Supervisors and PRMD. The Zucker Report laid the groundwork for a thorough organizational review. Additional review will take place at least annually.*
Status, December 2002:	*The initial staffing additions have been completed. Staffing needs will continue to be evaluated on an ongoing basis.*
Status, July 2004:	**Completed and ongoing. During the FY 02-03 budget year, an additional REHS position was added to address workload demands in the Well & Septic Division. In FY 03-04, a new position of "Special District Project Coordinator" was created to provide oversight for construction of the Monte Rio sewer project.**

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
1	Prepare implementation plan.	20	Director			X	
2	Review Exit Survey with employees.	61	Division Mgrs				X
3	Discuss negative scores with employees.	73	Director		X		
4	Address employee issues.	73	Division Mgrs		X		
5	Large nameplates for Commissioners.	76	ASO		X		
6	Staff introductions and nameplates.	76	Planning Deputy		X		
7	Commission to limit early questions.	76	Planning Commission		X		
8	Full size graphics for Planning Agency members.	76	Planning Deputy		X		
9	Technical documents to Planning Agency members.	77	Planning Deputy		X		
10	Discuss staff reports problems with Planning Agency.	77	Planning Deputy		X		
11	Design Review Committee meeting at conference table.	79	Design Review Committee		X		
12	Provide easels at Design Review Committee.	80	Project Rev Mgr		X		
13	Nameplates for Design Committee Review members.	80	ASO		X		
14	Notify neighbors regarding non-Administrative design reviews.	80	Project Rev Mgr		X		
15	Design Review members to be non-County employees.	80	Planning Deputy				X
16	Consider Bd of Supervisors appointment Design Review Committee members.	81	Planning Deputy				X
17	Compensate Design Review Committee members	81	Planning Deputy				X
18	Train Design Review members.	81	Project Rev Mgr				X
19	Complete Airport Master Plan.	84	Comp Plan Mgr		X		
20	Meet with Development Services Advisory Panel regarding concerns.	88	Director		X		
21	Review DSAP structure.	88	Director		X		
22	Flag identified landmarks.	90	Comp Plan Mgr			***	~~X~~
23	Determine HD descriptions for Landmarks sites.	90	Landmarks Commission			***	~~X~~
24	Develop policy regarding non-designated historic resources.	91	Comp Plan Mgr				X
25	Landmarks Commission to be represented at Planning Commission or Board of Zoning Adjustments	91	Landmarks Commission				X
26	Joint meetings of Landmarks Commission and Design Review Committee.	91	Planning Deputy				X
27	Detailed work program for Landmarks Commission.	92	Comp Plan Mgr			***	~~X~~
28	Compensate Landmarks Commission.	92	Director		NR		~~X~~
29	Landmark Commission to attend training sessions.	92	Planning Deputy				X
30	Discussion Landmark Commission purpose and work program.	92	Comp Plan Mgr / Landmarks Commission				X
31	Redefine Environmental Review Committee (ERC).	95	Planning Deputy			X	
32	Send documents to ERC when appropriate.	96	Planning Deputy			X	
33	After time, re-evaluate ERC.	96	Planning Deputy				X
34	Train ERC members.	97	Envir. Rev. Mgr			X	
35	Eliminate Project Review and Advisory Committee.	101	Department Head			X	
36	Staff to recommend subdivision conditions.	102	Project Rev Mgr				X
37	Require photographs for project submittal.	102	Project Rev Mgr				X

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
38	Direct communication to employees via email.	103	Director		X		
39	Computerized list of all staff assignments	104	ASO		* * *		~~X~~
40	Managers to increase communication to employees.	104	All Managers		X		
41	Conduct employee survey.	104	ASO		X		
42	Develop e-mail list of customers.	104	All Managers		X		
43	Develop e-mail strategy.	104	Director			X	
44	Expand PRMD Information.	105	ASO		* * *		~~X~~
45	Obtain sufficient business cards for all employees.	105	ASO		X		
46	Customers to leave PRMD with business card.	105	Director		X		
47	Place business card holders at all cubicles.	105	ASO		X		
48	Use mail surveys for customer feedback.	106	ASO				X
49	Repeat focus groups in two years.	106	ASO				X
50	Use sample shoppers.	106	ASO				X
51	Managers to make random phone calls.	107	All Managers				X
52	Review and simplify fees.	108	ASO			X	
53	Revise forms process and committee.	109	Director		X		
54	Modify handout format.	109	ASO		X		
55	Communicate vacancies and promotion opportunities.	110	ASO		X		
56	Use peer review panel in hiring.	110	ASO		NR		~~X~~
57	Review approach to employee discipline.	111	Director		X		
58	Analyze stress leave issues.	111	Director		X		
59	Head Customer Service Section with manager.	113	Director	11	X		
60	Pre-application to report to Customer Service manager.	114	Director		X		
61	Resolve Administrative Services Officer permanency need.	114	Director		X		
62	Change Executive Secretary Confidential functions.	114	Director	1	X		
63	Department Head not to manage internal committees.	114	Director	1	X		
64	Department Head not solely responsible for direct tasks.	114	Director	2	X		
65	Clarify mandatory employee tasks.	114	Director		X		
66	Train managers and supervisors.	114	ASO	2	X		
67	Simplified approach to policy and procedure manuals.	116	All Managers	3	* * *	~~X~~	
68	Add agreed to staffing positions.	122	Board of Supv.	37	X		
69	Resolve conflicts-staff meetings and permit center.	122	Director		X		
70	Complete GIS Zoning Map.	124	Planning Deputy	5		X	
71	Complete street addressing database.	124	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.	6		X	
72	Install new permit system.	126	ASO	6	X		
73	Interim staff to help install permit system.	126	ASO	7	X		
74	Mandatory use of permitting system.	126	All Managers	7	X		
75	Support new cost accounting System.	127	ASO	8		X	
76	Upgrade email system.	127	ASO	8	X		
77	Tie cash register to permitting system.	127	ASO	9	NR		~~X~~
78	Integrate postage meter and scale.	128	ASO				X
79	Develop and implement WEB strategy.	128	ASO	9	X		
80	Add computer information display to lobby.	128	ASO	10		X	
81	Keep incoming telephone lines at five.	129	N/A	27	X		

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
82	Correct telephone problems.	129	ASO	27	X		
83	Examine call sequencing and automated attendant.	130	ASO	27	X		
84	Clarify phone list issues.	130	ASO	28	X		
85	Clarify Board policy regarding phone calls.	131	Planning Deputy	28	X		
86	Return phone calls by end of day.	131	ASO	29	X		
87	Resolve planner phone issues.	133	Planning Deputy	30	X		
88	Develop training strategy.	134	ASO	2	X		
89	Increase training budget.	134	ASO	2	X		
90	Customer Service Manager to secondarily supervise cashiers.	135	N/A	11	X		
91	Customer Service Manager to secondarily supervise cubicle employees.	136	N/A	12	X		
92	Locate staff needed at customers' service area close to the area.	137	Director		X		
93	Remove"8-5:00 office hours" from Permit Center sign.	137	ASO		X		
94	Enlarge sign and bell at survey counter and rename.	138	ASO		NR		~~X~~
95	Improve reading material in waiting area.	138	ASO		X		
96	Add soda/coffee machine.	138	ASO		NR		~~X~~
97	Add electronic reader board to customer area.	139	ASO		NR		~~X~~
98	Remove and update flow chart.	139	Eng. Deputy			X	
99	Revise waterfall.	139	ASO		X		
100	Customer Service Section to maintain waterfall.	139	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
101	Keep handouts up-to-date.	139	All Managers		* * *	~~X~~	
102	New cashier sign.	140	ASO		X		
103	Customer Service Section responsible for customer comment system.	140	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
104	Consult with employees regarding changes to customer service area.	140	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
105	Monitor receptionist wait times.	141	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
106	Training manual for receptionist functions.	142	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		* * *	~~X~~	
107	Training for receptionists.	142	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
108	Prepare handouts regarding directing customers.	142	ASO				X
109	Call in cubicle back up after 10 minutes.	143	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
110	Use computer check out system.	143	Director		* * *	~~X~~	
111	Enforce paging time policy.	144	Director		X		
112	Report paging problems to management.	144	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
113	Locate house phone near receptionist.	144	ASO		X		
114	Upgrade Permit Specialists positions.	145	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.	12	* * *		~~X~~
115	Training manual for Permit Specialists.	145	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		* * *	~~X~~	
116	Training program for Permit Specialists.	145	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
117	Add printers to Permit Specialist cubicles.	145	ASO		X		
118	Experiment with methods to greet customers.	145	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
119	Customer return directly to Permit Specialists.	146	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.			X	
120	Identify additional person for Planning Cubicle.	147	Planning Deputy	13	X		
121	Planner back up in eight hour blocks of time.	147	Project Rev Mgr	13	NR	~~X~~	
122	No Comprehensive Planners at Planning Cubicle.	147	Planning Deputy		X		
123	Establish an appointment system.	148	Planning Deputy		X		

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
124	Planners to look up addresses and parcel numbers.	148	Planning Deputy		NR		~~X~~
125	Well and Septic to answer questions.	149	Bldg. Div. Mgr.		X		
126	Review staffing of Well and Septic Cubicle.	149	N/A	15	X		
127	Include cashiers in Customer Service staff meeting.	151	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
128	Cashier and cubicle staff to meet to resolve issues.	151	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
129	Allow fees by credit card.	151	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		***		
130	Self-service permit system.	152	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.				X
131	After-hours drop box.	152	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.			***	~~X~~
132	Obtain customer data.	156	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.				X
133	Change over-the -counter process.	158	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.			X	
134	Alternative plan checks process.	160	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.			X	
135	Resolve approach to addressing and street naming.	162	Director	15		X	
136	Train two staff for pre-application.	164	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.				X
137	Pre-application participants to write comments.	164	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
138	Assigned planner to attend pre-application.	164	Project Rev Mgr				X
139	Review pre-application logistics.	165	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.				X
140	Staff site visit before pre-application.	165	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.			X	
141	Develop guidelines, procedures and policies.	168	Project Rev Mgr	21	X		
142	Submit procedural changes to County Counsel.	168	Project Rev Mgr	23	X		
143	Update General Plan, Zoning and Assessor Maps.	169	ASO			X	
144	Duplicate copies of all resource maps.	169	ASO			X	
145	Survey to do Administrative Certificate of Compliance.	173	Deputy Directors		NR		~~X~~
146	Approve Certificate of Modifications administratively.	173	Planning Deputy			X	
147	Appeals of Administrative Design Review to Design Review Committee.	173	Planning Deputy			X	
148	Allow some Zoning Revision files to be administratively approved.	174	Project Rev Mgr			X	
149	Approve Lot Line Adjustments administratively.	174	Planning Deputy			X	
150	Allow some Subdivision Revision to file administratively.	175	Project Rev Mgr			X	
151	Approve Minor Subdivisions administratively.	175	Planning Deputy			X	
152	Approval Level II Use Permit administratively.	176	Planning Deputy			X	
153	Allow Use Permit revisions to file administratively.	176	Project Rev Mgr			X	
154	Approve some variations administratively.	177	Planning Deputy		X		
155	Develop checklist for application completeness.	180	Project Rev Mgr	23	X		
156	Pursue application completeness.	180	Project Rev Mgr	23	X		
157	Set process timelines.	181	Project Rev Mgr	32	***	~~X~~	
158	Analyze caseload history regarding staff activity.	182	Project Rev Mgr	24	X		
159	Complete initial environmental review in 30 days after complete file.	182	Project Rev Mgr	33	***		~~X~~
160	PRMD sections to meet 10-day response times.	184	Project Rev Mgr	33	X		
161	CAO to assist with other departments.	184	Planning Deputy	34	X		
162	Use proactive approach to external agencies.	184	Project Rev Mgr	34	X		

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
163	Establish Project Review Meetings.	185	Project Rev Mgr	25	* * *		
164	Field check projects early in the process.	185	N/A	23	X		
165	Environmental review and project analysis concurrently.	186	Project Rev Mgr	23	X		
166	Property owner to post property.	189	Project Rev Mgr				X
167	Establish a hearing calendar weekly.	189	Project Rev Mgr	23	* * *		~~X~~
168	Review hearing calendar weekly.	189	Project Rev Mgr	23	* * *		~~X~~
169	Number report "macros",	190	Project Rev Mgr		X		
170	Reorganize Project Review Section.	194	Project Rev Mgr	21	X		
171	Use project managers.	196	Project Rev Mgr	25	* * *	~~X~~	
172	Planner to enter Sierra data.	196	Project Rev Mgr		X		
173	Augment Project Review staffing re backlog.	198	Planning Deputy		X		
174	Identify planner staff needs.	199	Project Rev Mgr	26	X		
175	Add planning staff.	199	Project Rev Mgr	26	X		
176	Environmental Review to remain in PRMD.	201	Director		X		
177	Consider moving Parks Environmental Review to PRMD.	201	Director		NR		~~X~~
178	Modify environmental process for public projects.	204	Envir. Rev. Mgr				X
179	Complete negative declarations in 3 months.	204	Envir. Rev. Mgr				X
180	Report project status to client departments.	205	Envir. Rev. Mgr		X		
181	Develop exempt list for public projects.	205	Envir. Rev. Mgr				X
182	Provide environmental resources to Project Review sections.	207	Envir. Rev. Mgr		* * *	~~X~~	
183	Provide environmental specialist.	208	Envir. Rev. Mgr		X		
184	Identify costs for environmental changes.	208	Envir. Rev. Mgr		* * *		~~X~~
185	Repeal Ordinance 3836R.	209	Envir. Rev. Mgr		NR		~~X~~
186	Complete productivity study for Environmental Section.	209	Director				X
187	Monitor comprehensive planning work products.	210	Comp Plan Mgr		X		
188	Project review planner to make General Plan consistency findings.	212	Project Rev Mgr		X		
189	Training program regarding General Plan.	212	Comp Plan Mgr				X
190	Consider moving Landmark responsibility to Project Review.	213	Director		NR		~~X~~
191	Full-time planners for Zoning Ordinance and General Plan.	213	Comp Plan Mgr		X		
192	Review comprehensive planning work program.	214	Board of Supvs.		X		
193	Engineering Deputy and Operation Manager to have code training.	217	Director		* * *	~~X~~	
194	Change designation of Chief Building Official.	218	Director		* * *	~~X~~	
195	Review Information Bulletin.	218	Eng. Deputy		X		
196	Distribute new Information Bulletins.	219	Eng. Deputy		X		
197	Create Information Bulletin Manual.	219	Eng. Deputy		X		
198	Enforce uniformly.	219	Eng. Deputy			X	
199	Train contractors in code.	219	Eng. Deputy			X	
200	Lead time of 60 days on ordinance or policy changes.	219	Eng. Deputy			X	
201	Put code interpretations in writing.	220	Eng. Deputy			X	
202	Weekly code training for plan checkers and inspectors.	221	Eng. Deputy		X		
203	Weekly engineering training.	221	Eng. Div. Mgr.			X	
204	Implement supervisor quality control system.	221	Eng. Deputy				X
205	Increase Sierra computer training.	221	ASO		X		
206	Review employee complaint procedure.	222	Director		X		

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
207	Establish plan check turnaround time.	224	Eng. Deputy	35		X	
208	Use consultants to meet time deadlines.	224	Eng. Deputy	36	X		
209	Field personnel to leave daily schedules with receptionist.	224	Eng. Deputy		X		
210	Expand over-the-counter plan checks.	224	Plan Check Supv				X
211	Issue majority of encroachment permits over the counter.	225	Eng. Div. Mgr.		NR		~~X~~
212	Change name of Operations Division to Building and Safety Division.	225	Director		NR	~~X~~	
213	Replace plan checker with licensed professional engineer.	226	Director			X	
214	Provide more detailed plan checks.	226	Bldg. Div. Mgr.			X	
215	Change job specifications for Plan Checkers.	227	ASO		X		
216	Plan Checkers to ride with inspectors.	227	Bldg. Div. Mgr.		X		
217	Plan check and inspection supervisors to meet regularly.	227	Bldg. Div. Mgr.		X		
218	Plan review training for Plan Checkers.	228	Bldg. Div. Mgr.			X	
219	Obtain plan check software.	228	ASO			X	
220	Use plan check correction lists.	228	Plan Check Supv		X		
221	Discontinue peer review plan checks.	229	Eng. Deputy		NR	~~X~~	
222	Standby structural engineers for plan checks.	229	Bldg. Div. Mgr.		X		
223	Change title "Construction Inspector" to "Building Inspector".	230	Director		X		
224	Inspector III's to become more specialized.	230	Const Inspt Supv			X	
225	Formalize special Inspector program.	231	Const Inspt Supv		X		
226	Implement outsource program.	232	Bldg. Div. Mgr.		X		
227	Allow inspectors to take vehicles home at night.	233	Director				X
228	Assign site review to district inspectors.	233	Bldg. Div. Mgr.				X
229	Maintain central permit files in inspector area.	234	Bldg. Div. Mgr.				X
230	Use computer to document inspection approvals.	234	Const Inspt Supv		X		
231	Hand held computers for field inspectors.	234	Eng. Deputy				X
232	Consolidate permit data into new permitting system.	235	ASO		X		
233	Building inspectors to do reports for code enforcement.	235	Const Inspt Supv		X		
234	Complete ISO Audit.	236	Bldg. Div. Mgr.			X	
235	Geo technical engineer or geologist to review grading plans.	237	Eng. Deputy		X		
236	Develop a new "Construction Permit".	237	Eng. Deputy				X
237	Create comprehensive grading ordinance.	237	Eng. Deputy			X	
238	Well and Septic to meet with other sections.	238	Well & Septic Mgr.		X		
239	Well and Septic to use standard procedures.	238	Well & Septic Mgr.		* * *	~~X~~	
240	Enter Sierra data daily.	238	Well & Septic Mgr.		X		
241	Check Well and Septic for full coverage.	239	Well & Septic Mgr.		X		
242	Collect invoices for Well and Septic monitoring.	239	Well & Septic Mgr.		X		
243	Amend Well and Septic Ordinance for 3 year permits.	239	Well & Septic Mgr.		X		
244	Well and Septic to sign job cards.	240	Well & Septic Mgr.		* * *		~~X~~
245	Add clerk typist to Operations Division.	241	Eng. Deputy	16	X		
246	Add one clerk to be shared-Inspection and Well and Septic.	242	Eng. Deputy	16	X		

Attachment B
Zucker Recommendations - Current Status as of July 2004

No.	Recommendation	Zucker Report Page	Responsibility	Current Status			
				Response Page	Completed	In Process	Later Consideration
247	Change name of Technical Support Division to Engineering Services.	242	Eng. Deputy	17	X		
248	Change title of "Division Manager Technical Support".	242	Eng. Deputy	17	X		
249	Reorganize Technical Support Division.	242	Eng. Deputy	17	X		
250	Consolidate functions.	247	Eng. Deputy	17	X		
251	Transfer sewer and water lateral piping to Building Inspection.	247	N/A	20	X		
252	Transfer three inspectors.	247	Eng. Deputy	17	***	~~X~~	
253	Add Construction Inspection Supervisor.	247	Eng. Deputy	17	X		
254	Add Senior Civil Engineer.	247	Eng. Deputy	18	X		
255	Process engineering submittals in a timely manner.	248	Eng. Div. Mgr.			X	
256	Establish time lines with Public Works.	248	Eng. Div. Mgr./ASO			X	
257	Subdivision conditions to be written by PRMD.	248	Eng. Div. Mgr.		NR		~~X~~
258	Team-building between PRMD and Public Works.	248	Eng. Deputy			X	
259	Confer with Public Works on major projects.	249	Eng. Div. Mgr.		***	~~X~~	
260	Implement data collection system.	255	Eng. Deputy			X	
261	Analyze code enforcement cases and staffing.	260	Code Enf Mgr		X		
262	Monitor technology staff needs.	262	ASO		***	~~X~~	
263	Move to optical scanning system.	263	ASO			***	~~X~~
264	Complete records retention schedule.	263	ASO		X		
265	Enforce filing system rules.	263	ASO			X	
266	Train File Counter employees.	264	ASO		X		
267	Meeting between File Counter and Customer Service.	264	Cust. Srvc. Mgr.		X		
268	Examine customer pulling microfilm cards.	264	ASO		NR		~~X~~
269	Repair or replace microfilm viewers.	264	ASO			***	~~X~~
270	Redesign file counter.	264	ASO		NR		~~X~~
271	Administrative Division to handle administrative policies.	265	ASO		X		
				Total	183	52	37

NR = Not Recommended
X = Status Quo
~~X~~ = Previous Status
*** = New Status