MOTION NO. 2445

A MOTION relating to the consolidation of certain functions and programs of the Departments of Public Works and Planning & Community Development.

WHEREAS, the County Council by action of Ordinance #2544 authorized a feasibility study regarding consolidation of certain functions and programs of the Department of Public Works and the Department of Planning and Community Development, and

WHEREAS, the County Council in cooperation with the County Executive has studied the feasibility of consolidating certain public facilities activities, and

WHEREAS, said study has indicated such a consolidation to be feasible, (study report appended hereto),

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

- l. The County Executive is hereby requested to complete the following studies recommended in the Public Facilities Consolidation Feasibility Study Report:
- A. An immediate review of Public Works CIP bidding procedures be conducted to determine the potential efficiences reulting from a more coordinated effort with the Office of Purchasing.
- B. A review of consolidating the craft functions in the various public facilities agencies occur.
- C. An examination of shifting the planning and Subdivision function from Public Works to the Building & Land Development Division be conducted.
- D. An examination of contracting out various maintenance activities currently performed by the various public facilities agencies be conducted.
- E. A long run study of consolidating maintenance activites and facilities be conducted.
- F. A long run study reviewing the consolidation of equipment and equipment maintenance be conducted.

15.

The County Executive is to complete the study items A through D above in time for consideration in the 1977 Budget and study items E and F in time for incorporation in the 1978 Budget. The Council Administrator in conjunction with the County Executive is instructed to initiate a detailed review of the potential realignment of CIP project management staff in-cluding design, engineering and contract management activities. Subject review is to include analysis of factors in other jurisdictions that operate a consolidated design and engineering function as well as other factors which will lead to a decision regarding the consolidation of these activities. Subject review shall be completed by June 30, 1976. PASSED this 26 th day of _____ Corel KING COUNTY COUNCIL KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON · 15 ATTEST:

TRACY J. OWEN, Dist. No. 1
ROBERT B. DUNN, Dist. No. 2
BILL REAMS, Dist. No. 3
BERNICE STERN, Dist. No. 4
RUBY CHOW, Dist. No. 5
MIKE LOWRY, Dist. No. 6
PAUL BARDEN, Dist. No. 7
BOB GREIVE, Dist. No. 8
DAVE MOONEY, Dist. No. 9



King County Council

Dave Mooney, Chairman
John L. Chambers, Council Administrator
Room 402, King County Courthouse
Seattle, Washington 98104
344-3467

April 9, 1976

To:

Tracy J. Owen, Chairman

Public Facilities & Utilities Committee

From:

Rol Malan, Team Leader

Public Facilities Consolidation Study Team

Subject:

Public Facilities Consolidation Feasibility Study Report

Attached is the study report from the Public Facilities Consolidation Feasibility Study. It was started in mid February and completed April 2, 1976. We are scheduled to explain its findings and recommendations at your April 12th committee meeting.

If you have any questions, please call me.

RM/kh

cc: All Councilmembers
Study Team members
John Chambers
Lloyd Hara
Jean DeSpain
Tom Ryan
Jack Lynch

PUBLIC FACILITIES STUDY REPORT

Background

In early January, 1976, the County Council directed that a special study be initiated to review the feasibility of organizationally consolidating public facilities functions. Council staff were assigned to plan and conduct this study. (An extract of the study plan subsequently approved by the Council is an appendix to this report.)

During the course of planning the review, the complexity of the public facilities area and the sensitivity of the interdepartmental relationships to be examined were acknowledged and Executive sanction of and commitment to the study was considered to be essential. On February 13, after some preliminary meetings with Department managers and the Executive to explain the nature and scope of the review, the Executive approved the project and committed staff resources to its accomplishment. Final planning of the review was completed and the study was initiated on February 17, 1976.

Study Objective and Scope

The study objective was "To managerially review the current functions of various public facilities agencies in King County Government in order to assess potential efficiencies through consolidation."

Study scope included:

- o Analysis of the functions of the Engineering Services Section in the Roads Division of Public Works.
- o Analysis of the functions of the Contracts & Standards Section in the Roads Division of Public Works.
- o Analysis of the functions of the Hydraulics Division of Public Works.
- o Analysis of the functions of the Roads Maintenance Section in the Roads Division of Public Works.
- o Analysis of the functions of the Parks Division in Planning and Community Development.
- o Analysis of the functions of the Architecture Division in Planning and Community Development.

Staff assigned to this project were:

- o Rol Malan, Manager of Management Audits, Council Staff (Auditor's Section), Full Time, Team Leader.
- o Cheryle Broom, Legislative Management Auditor, Council Staff (Auditor's Section), Full Time.
- o Don Arrowsmith, Senior Legislative Management Auditor, Council Staff (Auditor's Section), Part Time.
- o Brian Smith, Junior Legislative Management Auditor, Council Staff (Auditor's Section), Part Time.
- o Tom Bertek, Chief Plat Inspector, Department of Public Works, Full Time.
- o George Wyse, Special Consultant to Department of Planning and Community Development, Full Time.
- o Greg Lux, Manager of Parks Maintenance Section, Part Time.
- o Bob Jacobs, Manager of Parks CIP Program, Part Time.
- o Dick Gemperle, Manager, Division of Architecture, Part Time.
- o Craig Donald, Budget Analyst III, Program Budget Division, Department of Budget & Program Development, Part Time.
- o Tom Ahlers, Budget Analyst III, Program Budget Division, Department of Budget & Program Development, Part Time.

Study Approach

Two subteams were formed; one reviewed appropriate Public Works operations, and the other reviewed relevant Community Development operations. Data gathering consisted of record examination, interviews and group meetings. Weekly team meetings were held to review group findings and to analyze similarities and dissimilarities as related to agency functions.

Once data was gathered, the team developed criteria to be used in the examination of findings and development of recommendations. These criteria are:

- o Consolidation may be feasible and potentially cost effective if:
 - 1. A duplication of work activities in the various public facilities operations are identified.

- 2. Similar equipment exists for use in each public facilities agency.
- 3. A potential for improved service delivery could be identified.
- o Consolidation might be beneficial if management and control accountability problems are identified and could be resolved through an organization change.
- o Consolidation might be advisable if future work trends point to a need for organization change.

Recommendations and Findings

Legal Considerations

Legal feasibility of consolidation was reviewed by study team staff. Staff legal findings are:

- o Any consolidation action must be approved by the Council.
- o An ER & R fund must be separately established for Roads, but it (the fund) can rent equipment to other agencies.
- o Organizationally there must be a County Road Engineer, who is licensed and has certain responsibilities identified by law.

These findings have not been reviewed with the Prosecutor. Should further action be initiated as a result of this study, appropriate legal counsel should become involved.

Community & Governmental Input

Local community groups and other local governments of similar size throughout the country were surveyed for input on their opinions, and in the case of the governments, for their experiences regarding organizational structure. The responses received were inconclusive. Certain other municipalities, such as Dade County, Florida, Multnomah County and San Diego County have organizational structures which appear to be unique and may have merit and thus might be more fully explored.

Suggestions for Immediate Review

1. Management of the Bidding Process

CIP bidding practices used by Parks and Public Works are dissimilar. Parks utilizes the Office of Purchasing to a larger extent than does Public Works. It is suggested that a review of the potential efficiencies and improved control which may result from Purchasing

management of Public Works bidding be undertaken immediately.

Short Run Study Projects

The following studies should be initiated at once so their findings may be incorporated into the 1977 budget. They are studies which if properly staffed, can be accomplished by late June for consideration in the budget process. No priorities have been assigned to the work to be done; Council direction is requested.

1. Review consolidation of the craft functions in the public facilities agencies.

Craft functions are identified as carpentry, plumbing, electrical and painting. Similar craft functions are performed and controlled by several separate County organizations. During the course of the study it was determined that utilization of craft skills may be suboptimized. (Full time utilization of craft skills may not occur.) Additionally, the seasonality of public facilities work and the geographic locations where craft work is to be performed have significant impacts upon scheduling of craft resources.

These factors have led the team to recommend a more quantified analysis of consolidating craft skills to assess optimum utilization of this resource.

2. Review shifting the platting and subdivision process from the Public Works Department to the Building & Land Development Division in the Department of Planning and Community Development.

Principal considerations leading to this recommendation are that the Council desires a one-stop permit process; the platting function is not directly related to engineering and roads functions and the present platting and permit practices may lend themselves to increased efficiency through organizational change.

3. Examine the efficiencies associated with contracting out additional maintenance functions such as building maintenance, signing, stripping, etc.

The rationale supporting this suggestion is that: the practice of maintenance by outside contractors is already precedent in King County; work is occasionally being performed below job classification and there is a potential for cost savings. Differential pay scales must be analyzed carefully.

Long Run Study Projects

Planning for the following long run projects should start soon with actual study initiation beginning in late fall of 1976 so that study results may be included in the 1978 budget proposals. These studies have potentially significant impact to County operations and require extensive additional data gathering and analysis. They are:

1. Determine if consolidation of maintenance activities and facilities would be cost effective.

Maintenance activities on public facilities are performed throughout King County by three separate agencies: Hydraulics & Roads Divisions of Public Works and the Parks Division. (Juvenile Court and Facilities Management were excluded from this study). These agencies maintain separate facilities from which maintenance activities are scheduled. In many cases, the skills used in maintenance work are quite similar even though the project is different. The agencies separately perform similar maintenance activities in the same geographic vicinity.

Scope of the proposed study would include:

- o Analysis of geographic maintenance needs of public facilities.
- o Analysis of maintenance facility capability as it applies to various public facility agency needs.
- o Analysis of maintenance area boundaries presently established by organizational unit as they effect service delivery.
- o Analysis of maintenance area boundaries in comparison with the varying service needs of various planning districts and local community desires.
- 2. Review consolidation of equipment and equipment maintenance.

Findings from the feasibility study include:

- o Similar equipment maintenance skills and work activities occur in the various groups performing maintenance work on equipment.
- o Similar types of equipment are maintained by Roads, Parks and the Motor Pool. The observation is, however, that Public Works tends to have a greater proportion of light equipment.
- o Parks and Public Works have overlapping geographic divisions in King County in which equipment maintenance is performed.
- o Potential exists for increased equipment utilization by consolidating.

o Consolidation of stores and inventory management could result in increased efficiency.

The scope of the proposed study would include:

- o Analysis of equipment utilization County-wide.
- o Examination of geographic location of maintenance facilities.
- o Analysis of various forms of securing equipment usage. Included in this analysis would be comparisons of purchase to lease to rental of equipment. Analysis of equipment capitalization needs would also be considered.
- o Consideration of renting both the equipment and operator for the equipment.
- Analysis of inventory practices and management control over inventories of equipment and parts.
- o Analysis of the equipment needs of various public facilities agencies including scheduling of equipment for various tasks.
- o Analysis of the compatibility and future needs of accounting methods used to support equipment maintenance (to include a review of the effect of the new County financial system).
- 3. Review realignment of design, engineering and project management of CIP project staff.

Findings from the feasibility study are:

- o Hydraulics, Roads and Parks/Division of Architecture are all variously involved in similar design, engineering and CIP project management activities. Although the types of projects are in some ways dissimilar, there are certain similar skills required to perform design, engineering and project management tasks.
- o Public Works and Division of Architecture are both involved in environmental planning and assessment of environmental impact. Both contract work to outside contractors and administer those contracts. Both employ survey crews.
- o Public Works generally designs and engineers its own projects, while the Division of Architecture generally contracts this work out. Both agencies use dissimilar accounting systems for costing time and materials. (Both have to go through the Design Commission for design approval).

o Contracts & Standards Division of the Public Works agency appears to have a cyclical work load, and there may be efficiencies associated with consolidating the activities of that group with the Engineering Services group in Public Works.

Scope of the proposed study should include:

- o Analysis of the amount and types of work needed for future County capital projects. (For example, the HCD block grant contains several projects which are unlike many of the present projects in work).
- o The technical and professional skills needed to satisfy future needs should be assessed.
- o Analysis of various management configurations which might be used to efficiently manage County CIP projects. (For example, ad hoc project management team, and technical staff would return to their agency after their work is completed).
- o Analysis of contractual arrangements.
- o Analysis of accounting requirements including required procedures and reporting mandates.
- o Analysis of the continuity between long range planning work performed in the County CIP, design and engineering activities.

SUMMARY

In summary, the public facilities study completed by the team has shown that consolidation of functions in the public facilities service delivery area is feasible. Certain activities appear to be more amenable to consolidation than others and the study team therefore recommends the following actions:

- o An immediate review be undertaken of the potential efficiencies and improved control associated with Public Works increasing its use of the Purchasing Office in bidding CIP projects.
- o Three short run studies be initiated to:
 - Review consolidation of the crafts functions in the public facilities agencies.
 - 2. Review shifting the Platting and Subdivision process from Public Works to the Building Division.
 - 3. Examine the efficiencies associated with contracting out additional maintenance functions.

- o Three long run studies be initiated to:
 - 1. Examine geographic consolidation of maintenance activities and facilities.
 - 2. Review the potential efficiencies associated with consolidating equipment management and equipment maintenance.
 - 3. Study the benefits associated with realigning design, engineering and project management activities in the various public facilities agencies.

It is further suggested that these studies (with the exception of the study on realigning design, engineering and project management) deal principally with administrative matters and therefore are reasonably the responsibility of the Executive and should be performed by the Executive Branch. The team's recommendation for study completion is mid to late June 1976 for the short run studies so results may be implemented by 1977, and completion of the long run studies by June of 1977 for implementation in 1978.

The design, engineering and project management study has potentially significant policy implications and should be continued as a joint study effort with the Legislative Branch retaining project leadership. Planning for this effort should start immediately and might include the involvement of an outside consulting firm with knowledge of this subject on a national basis.

PUBLIC FACILITIES CONSOLIDATION STUDY PLAN EXTRACT SUB-GOALS OF PHASE I

I. Legal Review

A. Objective - To review all state, county and administrative laws, ordinances and motions which affect the possibility of consolidating public facilities activities.

II. Input

A. Objective - To solicit and receive input from groups outside King County government on the subject of consolidating public facilities activities.

III. Construction Activities

- A. Objective Review all activities and functions associated with County construction of public facilities.
 - *Subobjective 1 Comprehensively examine the design and engineering functions in various County agencies.
 - *Subobjective 2 Comprehensively examine the real property acquisition practices used by various County agencies.
 - *Subobjective 3 Review the nature of construction management activities in various County agencies.
 - *Subobjective 4 Review the nature of construction functions performed by various County agencies.
 - *Subobjective 5 Determine, from a general perspective the difficulties associated with consolidation presented by environmental factors.

IV. Maintenance Activities

- A. Objective To review all activities and functions associated with directly maintaining County Public Facilities
 - *Subobjective 1 Determine the nature of maintenance functions performed.
 - *Subobjective 2 Determine the labor, equipment, materials and facilities presently utilized to perform maintenance activities.
 - *Subobjective 3 Review management activities involved in performing the above maintenance operations.
 - *Subobjective 4 Summarize the maintenance activities by like and unlike functions
 - *Subobjective 5 Review special considerations to physical consolidation.

STUDYFACILITIES CONSOLIDATION Public Works Sub-Group PUBLIC 9 2 6 1

| PHASE T - SHR_OBJECTTWES | Febr | February | , - c | 03 04 0 | 76 26 36 | March | | 0. 0. 1. 7. 7. | | , (|
|---|------|----------|---------------------------------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| | 2 | 2 | | 5 | 2 20 27 | t C 7 1 | 0 0 | 2 | 77 57 47 57 79 | 67 |
| CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Comprehensively examine the design and engineering functions. | | | | 4 | | | | | | |
| Examine the real property acquisition practices in each agency. | | | | 7 | | | | | | |
| 3. Review nature of construction management activities. | | | | | 1 1 , | 4 | | | | |
| 4. Review nature of construction functions performed by various County agencies. | | | • | | • | 11111 | | | | |
| 5. Determine difficulties presented by environmental factors regarding potential consolidation. | | | | | | | / / / / | | | |
| MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES 1. Determine nature of maintenance functions newformed | | • | | | | | | / / / / | | |
| 2. Determine labor, equipment and materials used to perform maintenance activities. | | | | | · . | | | 1 / | 11 | |
| 3. Review management activities involved in performing maintenance activities. | | • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | • | | | | 111 | |
| 4. Summarize maintenance activities by like and unlike functions. | | | | | | | | | , , | |
| 5. Review special consider- ations to physical consoli- dation. | | | | * ; | | | | | , | |
| Summarize and prepare recommendations. | | | | | | | | | | |