

**COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE**  
**Inter-Office Communication**

**Date:** April 4, 2002  
**To:** Karen M. Ordinans, Chairman, Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors  
**From:** Jerome J. Heer, Director of Audits  
**Subject:** Management Structure Review – Department of Public Works

At its January 2002 meeting, the County Board adopted resolution No. 02-79 which authorized and directed the Department of Administration to prepare a report that includes information regarding those departments that have been, or expect to be, hardest hit by a large number of retirements in 2002. Additionally, the resolution authorized and directed the Department of Audit to conduct a review of the organizational structure of County departments most affected by the large number of retirements and/or those departments that review for other reasons is deemed appropriate.

It was noted in the resolution that the “unexpected and significant number of retirements” could provide an opportunity for the County to realize longer term fiscal savings if vacant positions are combined with existing positions, particularly at the mid and upper management levels. It was also stressed that other strategies could be implemented to restructure departmental functions without sacrificing the quality of services or fiscal management and oversight of departmental programs.

The approach taken for the review of the Department of Public Works (DPW), and the other reviews that we will complete, involves the development and application of strategies and concepts to identify opportunities for savings and efficiency within the departments. We focused the review on organization units likely to yield the largest dollar savings due to the level of potential retirements and asked departmental administrators to collaborate in the review process. The concepts utilized in our reviews are centralization/decentralization, span of control, level of accountability, economy of scale, streamlining, consolidation, outsourcing, and elimination.

In conducting the review of DPW we examined organization charts, budgetary information, and strategic planning documents, compiled personnel and payroll data, and placed strong reliance on input from departmental administrators. We also reviewed the 3-tier budget reduction plan prepared by the previous County administration. While the County Board has stated a desire to give budgets a fresh look, this plan provided some foundation for our analysis. To complete the review in a timely manner, only limited audit analysis was employed in the process. While the views expressed in this report are those of the Department of Audit, we obtained a significant level of assistance from DPW.

**Department Of Public Works - Mission**

The Department of Public Works (DPW) provides essential services to plan, design, construct, manage, operate and preserve Milwaukee County’s natural resources, infrastructures and transportation systems. The Department performs this mission while maintaining and enhancing the economic, social and cultural vitality of all our citizens.

## Department Organization

As of January 2002, DPW was staffed with 731 employees within seven of the eight organizational units shown in **Table 1**, below. The eighth organizational unit within DPW, the Milwaukee County Transit/Paratransit System (org. 5600), is directly managed and operated by Milwaukee Transit Services, Inc. under contract with the County. This unit was not included as part of the review because it is not staffed with County employees.

<u>Division</u>	<u>Org. Code</u>	<u>Mgmt. Employees</u>	<u>Percent of Division Total</u>	<u>Non-Mgmt Employees</u>	<u>Percent of Division Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
Airport	5040	39	22.0%	138	78.0%	177
Transportation	5070	8	36.4%	14	63.6%	22
Arch. Eng. & Environ.	5080	24	38.1%	39	61.9%	63
Highway Maint.	5100	15	12.0%	110	88.0%	125
Fleet Management	5300	6	11.1%	48	88.9%	54
Transit Service Facilities	5600	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Management	5700	24	8.7%	252	91.3%	276
Administration	5800	7	50.0%	7	50.0%	14
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>123</b>	<b>16.8%</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>83.2%</b>	<b>731</b>

Source: Auditor prepared using data from the Genesys Payroll System – January 2002

As noted in **Table 1**, 123 (16.8%) of the 731 employees of the department are identified as being in managerial positions. Managerial positions are defined as those in the Executive Compensation Plan (ECP), elected officials who have managerial oversight, and those having key words such as director, manager, supervisor, coordinator, etc., in the title code descriptions of the position. Of the 123 employees identified as management, 46 (37.4%) are in the Executive Compensation Plan. Of these 46 employees, 19 are in engineering positions that command higher compensation due to the high level of professional expertise required, according to DPW.

A condensed organization chart depicting the management structure of the department is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

Following is a summary of issues that relate to the department as a whole, followed by information and opportunities for savings and efficiency more directly associated with individual divisions. The Airport and Highway Maintenance Divisions were not part of this review because the funding for these divisions is obtained primarily from State and Federal sources rather than County tax levy. The County Board's adoption of a 2002 budget amendment to provide funding for a comprehensive review of airport operations, which was to include an examination of its organization structure, is further reason the Airport Division

was excluded from this review. Also, due to the impact of the September 11<sup>th</sup> tragedy on airport operations, the comprehensive review has been postponed and this matter will be brought before the County Board this summer for direction on whether or not to proceed with it.

The Transportation and Architecture, Engineering, and Environmental Services Divisions were reviewed because of the concentration of management positions in the divisions, the configuration of their respective management structures, and to some extent, the indirect tax levy that supports the Architecture, Engineering, and Environmental Services Division.

Because only three of the ten retirements that occurred in divisions reviewed, as of March 15, 2002, were in management (none were at the ECP level), few opportunities for savings and efficiency directly attributable to retirements were presented.

### **Opportunities for Savings/Efficiency at the Department Level**

A few issues were identified at the department level that may provide the opportunity to achieve savings or efficiency, if addressed. The first issue relates to the inconsistency in pay levels of the top department administrators. As illustrated in **Exhibit 2**, the pay level among the seven division administrators ranges from ECP Grade 16 to 19 and each of the administrators reports to one of two executives, the Director of Highway Engineering & Operations or the Deputy Director of Public Works. Ultimately these two executives, both at ECP Grade 19, report to the director of the department, who is compensated at ECP Grade 20.

1. *The opportunity to achieve savings or efficiency should be pursued through a detailed evaluation of the pay levels and reporting configuration of the top DPW administrators. In conducting the review, DPW can draw on the expertise of their internal human resources function as well as the Department of Human Resources. The salary survey conducted by the Department of Audit may also be useful in this undertaking.*

The procurement, human resources, and other processes in place for support functions centralized at the County level are cited by DPW administrators as time consuming and ineffective. The administrators attribute burdensome policies and procedures and insufficient technical expertise to meet the needs of the department as reasons for this ineffectiveness.

For instance, there are two different sets of Civil Service Rules, pre-1977 and post-1976, in effect at the County, according to DPW administrators. The applicability of a specific set of rules is dependant upon whether or not the post-1976 rules were negotiated into the particular collective bargaining unit contract.

A further example provided by DPW administrators of an area where improvement is warranted is the lengthy and time consuming four-step grievance process. Reducing the number of steps in the process would lead to efficiency across all affected departments.

2. *The opportunity to achieve savings and efficiency should be pursued through the creation of ongoing workgroups that would address Countywide service level issues and process improvement in those areas of the County responsible for centralized support functions.*

*Because process improvements brought about from these workgroups will directly impact departments' ability to achieve further savings and efficiency, timely creation of the workgroups is essential.*

## **Transportation Division (Org. 5070)**

The Transportation Division consists of the Transportation Planning Section and Transportation Engineering Section. The Transportation Planning Section provides multimodal transportation planning, development, grant administration and project and asset management. The Transportation Engineering Section is divided into four areas: (1) Highway Engineering, (2) Construction Management, (3) Bridge Engineering and (4) Traffic Engineering. The mission of the Transportation Engineering Section is to design and implement projects necessary to maintain and enhance the safety and efficiency of the County's highways, bridges, traffic control facilities, and transit systems. As of January 2002, the Division was staffed with 22 employees, eight (36.4%) of which are in management positions.

### **Impact of Anticipated Retirements**

Of the 22 employees in the Transportation Division, three are eligible for retirement in 2002, representing about 14% of the Division's staff. Of the three employees eligible to retire in 2002, all are management positions. It is estimated that amount of sick leave payout required in the Transportation Division will be minimal since there have been no retirements in the Division this year, as of March 15, 2002. If any retirements occur in the Division, DPW plans to fill the positions that become vacant.

### **Departmental Budget Repair Plan**

In response to the anticipated shared revenue reductions and the directive to develop a contingency plan to meet a 13.2% (\$5,015,069) tax levy reduction target for the entire department, no budget reductions have been slated for the Transportation Division since this department requires no direct tax levy.

### **Opportunities for Savings/Efficiency**

DPW administrators indicated that there are few opportunities for savings or efficiency within the Transportation Division due to the direction of the County's 5-year capital plan. The plan, which previously emphasized buildings projects, is shifting the budgetary focus to transportation infrastructure (i.e. rebuilding the freeway system, including the Marquette Interchange, bridges, etc.). In addition, the State Department of Transportation has downsized, expanding the County's roll in transportation projects. To respond to the growth in the transportation area, a management structure has been created in the Transportation Division that includes two Director positions.

Duties of the two directors, each responsible for one of the two sections (Planning and Engineering) within the Division, include oversight of 24 employees between them, a seemingly narrow span of control for positions at the director level of compensation (ECP Grade 18). However, given the growing level of activity and increasing responsibilities of the Division, this management structure configuration may be justified.

DPW administrators also provided additional rationale for the management structure in the Transportation Division, pointing out that the Division secures increased funding for the County by working directly with funding sources. This approach bypasses the costly option of using the State as an intermediary to obtain funding.

To some extent, the growth in transportation infrastructure projects will be met with use of staff from the Architecture, Engineering, and Environmental Services Division (A & E Division), who possess expertise in highway construction, according to DPW administrators.

In light of this information, the Transportation Division should be included in the evaluation of pay levels and reporting configuration of the top DPW administrators, suggested in Recommendation no. 1. In addition, with the provision of engineering services by the A & E Division to transportation projects, savings and efficiency may be attained through a restructuring of these two divisions.

3. *DPW administration should develop alternatives for restructuring the Transportation and Architectural, Engineering, and Environmental Service Divisions to best accommodate the growth in transportation infrastructure projects and to take advantage of any opportunities for savings and efficiencies that may result.*

### **Architectural, Engineering and Environmental Services Division (Org. 5080)**

This Division is comprised of six sections: (1) Architectural, which provides technical services in building maintenance, remodeling, additions and new construction for various County departments. (2) Airport Engineering, which provides program and cost estimates for capital improvement, major maintenance and passenger facilities charge projects for General Mitchell International and Lawrence J. Timmerman Airports. (3) Construction Management, which provides construction of facilities and systems in compliance with construction documents on the prescribed schedule and for the contracted amount for a cost-effective fee. (4) Civil Engineering and Site Development, which provides civil engineering and land surveying technical services on public works projects for various County departments. (5) Environmental Services, which provides technical and managerial services concerning environmental issues of all County departments. (6) Support Services, which provides County facilities records management, County facilities assessment, administration of the DPW cost and scheduling system used for project management and administration of the Geographic Information system. As of January 2002, the Division was staffed with 63 employees, 24 (38.1%) of which are in management positions.

#### **Impact of Anticipated Retirements**

Of the 63 employees in the Division, 17 have or will become eligible for retirement in 2002 representing approximately 27% of its staff. A total of nine of the 17 individuals eligible to retire in 2002 are employed in management positions. It is estimated that amount of sick leave payout required in the Division will be minimal since there have been no retirements this year as of March 15, 2002.

According to the Director of the Division, all vacancies that occur would be filled unless the level of capital projects is scaled back. The director expressed that the Division's functions are highly specialized and that the managers are actively involved in project management in addition to their administrative responsibilities. The director also stated that staffing is maintained at the workload "mid-line," which is a strategic approach taken to effectively deal with fluctuations in project activity. Consequently, unless capital projects are to be permanently decreased by a significant amount, succession planning should be integrated into its overall strategic plan to ensure a continuum of qualified and experienced staff to maintain the Division's core competencies.

### **Departmental Budget Repair Plan**

In response to the anticipated shared revenue reductions and directive to develop a contingency plan to meet a 13.2% (\$5,015,069) tax levy reduction target for the entire department, DPW slated a \$63,000 reduction in the Architectural, Engineering and Environmental Services Division. To achieve its targeted reduction, the Division would have reduced Franklin landfill expenditures by \$63,000 in Tier 1. Since the full amount of the Division's reduction is achieved in Tier 1, no further reductions are noted for Tiers 2 - 3.

Also, because the Division's operating costs are allocated to capital projects, no direct tax levy funding is required to support the Division. Consequently, DPW's budget repair plan for the Division did not address its management structure nor did it include a reduction in the number of management positions. A reduction in staffing would only be contemplated with a sustained reduction in capital projects, according to DPW administrators.

### **Opportunities for Savings/Efficiency**

See the suggestion made in Recommendation no. 3.

## **Fleet Management Division (Org. 5300)**

The Fleet Management Division provides a broad array of services to the County and its customers, including developing vehicle replacement programs; developing and designing vehicle specifications; managing the County fuel System; assigning vehicles and equipment to users based on needs and requirements. In addition, responsibilities include managing and developing vehicle and equipment disposal through periodic auctions, managing and maintaining all automotive equipment owned by the County; and authorizing and acquiring all vehicles and equipment in the Fleet Equipment Acquisition Capital Budget. As of January 2002, the Division was staffed with 54 employees, six (11.1%) of which are in management positions.

### **Impact of Anticipated Retirements**

Of the 54 employees in the Fleet Management Division, seven have or will become eligible for retirement in 2002 representing approximately 13% of the Division's staff. Of the seven employees eligible to retire in 2002, one is in a non-represented management position. It is estimated that the amount of sick leave payout required of the Division will be minimal since only two individuals have retired as of March 15, 2002, one of which was a management employee. The sick leave payout for these two retirements will be met with budgeted personal services costs and by leaving one additional represented position unfilled for the balance of 2002.

However, factors such as the potential for a significant number of retirements expected within a few years, on top of the already high level of vacancies (currently 12 positions), presents management with an opportunity to reassess the direction of the Division.

### **Departmental Budget Repair Plan**

In response to the anticipated shared revenue reductions and directive to develop a contingency plan to meet a 13.2% (\$5,015,069) tax levy reduction target for the entire department, DPW slated a \$123,000 reduction in the Fleet Management Division. To achieve its targeted reduction, Fleet Management Division expenditures for parts and fuel were to be reduced by \$123,000 in Tier 1. Since the full amount of the Division's reduction is achieved in Tier 1, no further reductions are noted for Tiers 2 - 3.

Vehicle service volume has decreased with recent retirements and the existing vacancies. Consequently, DPW has no plans to eliminate any of the positions in the Division.

### **Opportunities for Savings/Efficiency**

With the vacancy of one of the three service supervisor positions at the central service facilities due to a recent retirement, the Fleet Management Division's management structure was streamlined by removing one layer of reporting within its chain of command. Previously, two of the service supervisors reported to the third service supervisor, who in turn reported to the Fleet Services Coordinator. Under the revised management structure, the third service supervisor position was realigned to the same reporting level as the other two supervisors positions, all now reporting to the coordinator.

As noted earlier, the Division is currently operating with 12 vacancies and expects a significant number of retirements within a few years. In addition to the impact on the volume of repair orders completed, a decreased workforce level results in lower service facility utilization. This was confirmed during a walk-through of the central service facility in which we noted a number of vehicles parked in service bays that lacked technicians to complete the needed repairs. Consequently, with fewer repairs being completed, user departments experience longer turnaround times and are assessed higher service rates which are increased so that fixed costs associated with the service facilities are fully allocated.

Efficient operation of the Fleet Management Division requires that DPW administration increase utilization of existing facilities. To meet this objective, service activity would need to be increased. This would be accomplished through a combination of filling vacant service technician positions and taking in more work. Work volume could be increased through a combination of completion of more work from internal sources and contracting to perform work for surrounding municipalities, principally the City of Milwaukee, according to DPW administrators.

The level of work performed for internal users could also be increased through the transfer of the equipment repair shop functions of the Parks Department to DPW. Parks operates its equipment repair shop at 68th and State Street. To some extent, this operation parallels functions performed at the Fleet Management Division. Although it is recognized that Parks may be able to run its repair operation at a lower cost, consolidation of this function within the Fleet Management Division may lead to Countywide savings with an overall reduction of labor, equipment and facilities costs between the two departments.

4. *The opportunity to achieve cost savings through the consolidation of the Parks Department equipment repair shop functions with those of the Fleet Management Division of DPW should be pursued through the collaboration of administrators from both departments.*
5. *DPW management should determine the potential savings and efficiency that could be achieved through serving as a vehicle and equipment service center for surrounding municipalities. If this endeavor would prove favorable to the County, a proposal should be developed and submitted to the County Board for review and approval.*

According to DPW management, the level of auto bodywork performed has decreased significantly over the years to the point to where only minor auto bodywork is done by the Division. All major bodywork, including painting is done through a partnership with a private auto body shop. In light of these circumstances, DPW plans to eliminate the auto body function by 2003 through attrition.

6. *DPW management should pursue the opportunity to outsource the remaining auto body shop functions prior to 2003 if the space is needed to accommodate the consolidation of the Parks equipment repair shop at the Fleet Management Division.*

DPW administrators also indicated that savings and efficiency could be achieved through centralization of functions within the Fleet Management Division. For example, vehicle and equipment utilization levels could be increased through the downsizing of the countywide vehicle and equipment inventory and proper coordination of the use of all remaining vehicles and equipment by the division.

Further examples of savings and efficiency would be the funneling of vehicle and equipment purchases and leasing through the Fleet Management Division as the clearinghouse for these activities. Under this centralized structure, proper analysis could be used in making lease or buy, retain or dispose decisions and there would be assurance that all purchases meet technical specifications.

7. *The opportunity to achieve savings and efficiency through centralization of functions in the Fleet Management Division should be pursued by DPW administration. The viability of this alternative should be determined through the development of a cost-benefit analysis prepared by DPW. If centralization appears viable, a proposal should then be submitted to the County Board for review and approval.*

## **Facilities Management Division (Org. 5700)**

The Facilities Management Division (FMD) provides services and performs functions in two principal areas: maintenance operations and property management. The Maintenance Operations Section is responsible for buildings, grounds and mechanical systems for all facilities. The Management Services Section is responsible for property management and lease administration functions for all land and buildings. As of January 2002, the division was staffed with 276 employees, 24 (8.7%) of which are in management positions.

### **Impact of Anticipated Retirements**

Of the 276 Facilities Management Division employees, 59 will be eligible for retirement in 2002 representing about 21% of the Division's staff. Of the 59 individuals eligible to retire in 2002, 10 are management employees. It is estimated that amount of sick leave payout required of division will be minimal in 2002 since eight individuals have retired as of March 15 (2 management, 6 non-management). The sick leave payout for these retirements will be met with budgeted personal services costs and by leaving currently vacant positions unfilled.

### **Departmental Budget Repair Plan**

In response to the anticipated shared revenue reductions and directive to develop a contingency plan to meet a 13.2% (\$5,015,069) tax levy reduction target for the entire department, DPW slated a \$1,100,000 (commodities \$300,000, other service expenditures \$300,000, major maintenance \$500,000) budget reduction in the FMD in Tier 1. Expenditures would have been reduced by an additional \$369,155 (personal services \$119,155, major maintenance \$250,000) in Tier 2 and \$694,584 (personal services) in Tier 3.

Combining all three tiers, the DPW plan called for the Facilities Management Division to reduce personal services by \$813,739, major maintenance by \$750,000 and supplies by \$300,000. DPW provided general comments regarding services that would be reduced, such as housekeeping, security, and grounds maintenance, leading to the elimination of 25

positions within the Division. However, specifics were not developed as to the number of management positions that would be eliminated nor was there any indication that the management structure would be affected, due to the short period of time given to complete the plan.

### **Opportunities for Savings/Efficiency**

The Facilities Management Division is responsible for certain utility services; electric distribution, storm sewer, potable water, and roadways, at the County Grounds. According to DPW administrators, these functions require that the division employ individuals that possess specialized trade skills and, at least for the electric distribution function, State utility licensing is required of the County.

As County government's presence continues to shrink at the County grounds, the need for the County to maintain the utility infrastructure has significantly diminished. To address this issue, DPW in collaboration with the Department of Administration (DOA) had received authorization to enter into discussions with the City of Wauwatosa to pursue the transfer of a number of these functions.

8. *With the goal of transitioning County government out of the responsibility for maintaining utility operations at the County grounds, DPW in conjunction with DOA should obtain the necessary approval to finalize negotiations with the City of Wauwatosa to transfer these functions to the municipality.*

FMD is responsible for security at the buildings assigned to DPW. DPW management believes that security is a function that is better fit within the core mission of the Sheriff's Department, where security is administered for the Parks Department. According to DPW, discussions have taken place with the Sheriff's Department in this regard. As part of the discussions, it was suggested a "cadet" position could be created for assignments such as building security, parking duties for baseball games at Miller Park, etc.

While it is recognized that creation of a cadet level position by the Sheriff's Department may not translate into savings to DPW, the Sheriff's Department could benefit by using cadets on assignments that do not require the use of the higher paid deputy level positions. It is further understood that there may be a number of labor relations issues that would have to be resolved with affected collective bargaining units before this alternative could be implemented.

A potential cost savings alternative to this would be to contract with security companies to provide building security functions, a common cost savings practice followed in the private sector.

9. *DPW should explore the opportunity for savings through the outsourcing of building security to private companies. Coincident with this analysis, the Sheriff's Department should quantify the potential savings and impediments associated with the creation of a cadet level position, that among other duties would be responsible for building security for DPW and other areas in the County in which it would prove beneficial. Ultimately, a determination should be made as to which alternative, or combination of alternatives, would be most beneficial to the County.*

DPW has been successful in achieving savings and efficiency through the merging of several specialized custodial and maintenance positions into one general position that is established with a formal career ladder. This accomplishment provides FMD with the ability to assign any one individual in the general position to a range of duties that were previously carried out

within the narrow ranges of several different positions. These janitorial and maintenance functions are examples of other services that are frequently outsourced to companies in the private sector to reduce costs.

*10. DPW should explore the opportunity for further savings and efficiency through the outsourcing of building janitorial functions to private companies.*

## **Administration Division (Org. 5800)**

The Administration Division is responsible for the management of the Department of Public Works administrative functions, including establishment and implementation of department policy and procedure, personnel administration, accounting and budgeting and general public information services. As of January 2002, the division was staffed with 14 employees, 7 (50%) of which are in management positions.

### **Impact of Anticipated Retirements**

Of the 14 employees in the Administration Division, six are, or will become eligible, for retirement in 2002, representing about 43% of the division's staff. Of the six employees eligible to retire in 2002, two are management positions. It is estimated that the amount of sick leave payout required of the division will be minimal since there have been no retirements this year, as of March 15, 2002.

### **Departmental Budget Repair Plan**

In response to the anticipated shared revenue reductions and directive to develop a contingency plan to meet a 13.2% (\$5,015,069) tax levy reduction target for the entire department, DPW slated a \$78,247 reduction in the Administration Division. To achieve its targeted reduction, one vacant position will be kept unfilled, with an estimated savings of \$29,663, and Home Owners Protection Plan revenue would be increased by \$48,584 in Tier 2. Since the full amount of the division's reduction is achieved in Tier 2, no further reductions are noted for Tiers 1 and 3.

### **Opportunities for Savings/Efficiency**

DPW management indicated that if any vacancies occur within the Administration Division they would attempt to fill them. The management also stated that if any realignment were to take place within this division, they would advocate that more of the administrative functions currently performed centrally at the County would be taken on by the division so that they would be carried out with greater efficiency.

In our review of the management structure of this division, we noted that six of the 14 positions in the division are in the ECP. Of these six positions, four include the word "director" in the title. Furthermore, as shown in **Exhibit 3**, there is a narrow span of control for four of the six positions, including one position with no direct reports and another with only two direct reports. According to DPW administrators, one of the positions with the word director in the title has been reevaluated to a lower pay level. However, as explained by DPW, the incumbent in this position will remain at the ECP pay level while in the position.

Given the configuration of the Division's management structure, conducting the evaluation of pay levels and reporting configuration of the top DPW administrators suggested in Recommendation No. 1, should prove helpful. Also, due to the multiple layers of management within the reporting hierarchy of the Division and the narrow span of control

associated with some ECP positions, there appears to be potential for savings/efficiency through restructuring of the Division.

According to DPW administrators, the opportunity for savings and efficiency is limited because processes established at the County level drive administrative functions performed in the division. DPW administrators contend, and we agree, that to achieve the greatest level of savings and efficiency within DPW, as well as other departments across the County, requires streamlining of centralized processes as noted in Recommendation No. 2. For instance, DPW administrators believe that savings and efficiency could be accomplished through the transfer of control over capital budgeting from DOA to DPW.

In addition, DPW informed us that a number of efficiency measures have been incorporated into the Administration Division over time. For example, the Human Resources Coordinator who serves as the grievance hearing officer for the department, also serves in this capacity for the Housing and Human Development Division and the General Assistance – Medical Program within the County Health Related Programs Division of DOA.

*11. Management should pursue opportunities for savings by restructuring the Administration Division with fewer layers in its reporting hierarchy and a broadened span of control for management. The restructuring could include the elimination of positions and/or lowering their compensation level.*

Our review of the Department of Public Works is the first in a series of department organization structure reviews. We have started reviews in the other departments and will release them as soon as they are completed.

If you have any questions, we are available to respond.

Jerome J. Heer  
Director of Audits

JJH/PAG/kjw

Attachments

cc: County Board of Supervisors  
Supervisor Lynne D. De Bruin, Chairperson, Committee on Finance & Audit  
Supervisor James G. White, Chairman, Committee on Transportation,  
Public Works & Transit  
Supervisor Joe L. Davis, Sr., Chairman, Transportation and Public Works  
Budget Reduction Work Group  
Janine P. Geske, County Executive  
David Novak, Director, Department of Public Works  
Terry D. Kocourek, Acting Director, Department of Administration  
Rob Henken, Director of Research, County Board Staff  
Lauri J. Henning, Chief Committee Clerk, County Board Staff