



## 2008-2009 SANTA CLARA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

# DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION/FACILITIES AND FLEET A BROKEN RELATIONSHIP IN NEED OF REPAIR

### Issue

Where are the breakdowns in the system through which the Facilities and Fleet Department (FAF) meets the demands of the Department of Correction (DOC) to maintain the health, safety and security of the Elmwood Correctional Facility and the Main Jail? Is there basis for the long-standing dissatisfaction felt by the DOC toward FAF?

### Background

Facilities and Fleet (FAF) is a county agency charged with constructing, maintaining, repairing, and improving buildings and vehicles for all Santa Clara County agencies. It also covers building and vehicle leases, property management and capital projects. The Facilities section often contracts with outside vendors to assist in providing service in these main areas:

- Preventive maintenance (scheduled),
- Corrective maintenance (unscheduled, as needed),
- Custodial and grounds (janitorial, landscaping),
- Major projects (tenant improvements).

Each of the above functions operates under a separate manager. Each manager has two or more supervisors working under him, handling such areas as plumbing, air conditioning, electrical issues and architecture. One supervisor can have a crew of ten, or fifty, depending on the area of coverage.

The Department of Correction is composed of the Elmwood Complex in Milpitas (including the Correctional Center for Women) and the Main Jail in San Jose. (DOC also operates the Brokaw Road Day Reporting Center in San Jose, but it is not served by FAF.) These facilities generate over 66% of FAF's county business. DOC needs are primarily preventive and corrective maintenance. DOC Operations is the department in charge of maintaining the Elmwood and Main Jail facilities. Operations is under the command of the DOC Support Services Division Commander who is stationed at the Main Jail, and the Correctional Support Services Manager, who divides his time between the Main Jail and Elmwood. This report will focus primarily on Elmwood, as it experiences the majority of requests and has its own unique problems.

There are nine assigned DOC Operations personnel (called Custody Support Assistants, or “CSAs”) at Elmwood. This staff performs minor repairs, escorts outside vendor/contractors (hired by FAF to complete various repairs and maintenance) and supervises groups of inmates who are involved in rehabilitative skill development within the facilities. To keep the jails functioning in a safe, secure manner, Operations must work closely with both FAF and the DOC Custody division.

DOC Custody, under the command of the Elmwood Captain, is the division in charge of inmate security. Operations is a separate entity over which the Elmwood Captain has no control even though he is ultimately responsible for the secure and safe functioning of Elmwood. The Elmwood Captain, the Support Services Division Commander, and the Captain of the Main Jail all report to the Chief of Correction.

The major sources of daily interaction between DOC and FAF involve either scheduled routine maintenance or unplanned corrective maintenance. In addition, there are ongoing projects such as barracks renovations, perimeter security, and facility improvements.

## **Procedure**

When DOC personnel notice a problem, i.e. broken equipment, clogged plumbing, graffiti, etc., s/he submits a service request by phone or computer to the Office Specialist (OS; there is one at Elmwood, and one at the Main Jail). Inmates may also report problems to the barracks officer, who in turn makes the request to the OS. The OS sends the service request to the FAF Monitoring Automation Center (MAC) on Berger Drive via computer. There are approximately twenty service requests generated per day, with forty forwarded to FAF each Monday because of the weekend backlog. (These service requests are in addition to the scheduled preventive maintenance orders and major project work that is ongoing.)

The Building Operations Monitor Systems Operator at FAF receives and confirms the service request, and re-enters it into the FAF “MAXIMO” computer software system. The clerk prioritizes the request based on the “severity of the damage it can do and the disruption to the client’s operations”:

- Priority 1 – Health and Safety – Immediate response
- Priority 2 – Mission Critical – 24-hour Response
- Priority 3 – Painting, etc – 48-hour Response
- Priority 4 – Tenant request, non-urgent – ten-day Response
- Priority 5 – 30-day Response

MAXIMO then routes the work order to one of the four divisions (Corrective Maintenance; Custodial and Grounds, etc).

The appropriate supervisor in FAF meets with workers upon their arrival at Berger Drive at 6 or 7 a.m., prints the work order and assigns it to the appropriate trade. Those workers assigned to Elmwood also report to Berger Drive to meet with their supervisors, but their work orders are faxed to FAF's Elmwood maintenance shop, where they will be picked up. New orders are faxed to Elmwood throughout the day.

Upon the completion of their day's work, the workers return their county vehicles to Berger Drive, and record the number of hours they have spent on their work orders. The hours are entered into the MAXIMO system. These updated work orders and jobs that have been completed are processed and entered into the MAXIMO system to show their latest status.

Work orders on which no hours have been charged for over three months are deleted by one of the FAF Managers based on his " experience and common sense."

If FAF determines it cannot perform the needed task unassisted, it contracts with the outside vendor of its choice to help. Outside vendors must be escorted by CSAs around Elmwood and the Main Jail. FAF crews are not usually required to be escorted.

Out of FAF's budget for DOC, 80% is funded by the county and 20% is reimbursable through billings to DOC, which in many cases are not itemized.

## **Discussion**

DOC is FAF's biggest customer, yet DOC has felt underserved and ignored. DOC complains that it cannot select the priority of its own request; is not told when requested repairs or routine maintenance will occur; the status of jobs underway; or when a job has been completed. Methods to obtain this information are flawed. There is considerable influx of FAF vehicles and workers at Elmwood every day, yet DOC staff are frustrated that needed repairs remain undone while so many workers are present on site.

There is no clear or consistent assignment of a direct liaison between Ops and FAF, this despite the statement by FAF that it has a designated DOC Facilities Manager employed by DOC who undergoes training every two years, and is available to liaise between DOC Operations and FAF (*County Building Maintenance: High Cost, Poor Customer Communication*, Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury Report 2007-2008). When questioned on the identity of this person, DOC staff responded with, "We don't have one," and "What are you talking about?"

### **FAF Traffic at Elmwood**

FAF maintains a two-story structure at Elmwood which it claims is stocked with parts, tools and equipment needed at Elmwood. DOC is not permitted access. There are approximately 70 entries and exits recorded daily at the East Gate, the main trade entrance, and approximately 30 unrecorded entries and exits at the West Gate. DOC has questioned the large number of East Gate entries and exits by FAF for "parts" if this structure is in fact stocked for Elmwood.

DOC staff disputes the actual work hours claimed by FAF workers. FAF installed a card reader at the East Gate in January 2009 to track the entry and exit of its workers, in part to answer the charges that superfluous, idle FAF personnel are present at Elmwood and that there are excessive comings and goings unrelated to Elmwood work.

DOC staff states, "The problem is, FAF workers are hiding in the break room reading the paper. The good thing is, I know they're in there reading the paper so I can grab them to do things." Others ask FAF, "Could you do me a favor?" and describe themselves as "begging and cajoling" to get long-needed repairs done.

### **FAF Challenges at Elmwood**

FAF has felt challenged to provide timely repairs and maintenance because its workers cannot freely move through the secure facility, and can encounter delays by the presence of inmates in work areas. FAF claims the large presence of their workers at DOC sites is due to the volume of both routine and corrective maintenance needs, such as the continual breakage and vandalism that is a hallmark of jail populations. It has stated that DOC's needs are addressed in a timely manner, and that job status can easily be determined by either logging onto the FAF website or calling the FAF MAC room. FAF states it has a designated Facilities Manager at DOC who acts as liaison. This person is "available" to convey any and all issues from DOC staff to FAF.

### **Conclusion**

While certain procedural changes can and should be made, FAF and DOC can take better advantage of existing avenues to facilitate a cohesive working relationship. A major problem is lack of communication between the two parties. Regularly scheduled meetings among top administration would provide a consistent and efficient mechanism to share concerns and complaints between DOC and FAF. Staff in both agencies must know their concerns and problems are heard and acted upon.

The lack of notification of when maintenance will occur is an ongoing issue. If notice is not given, inmates are likely to be in work areas. When questioned as to why they do not give notice of scheduled work, FAF's Preventive Maintenance Manager replied with reference to county buildings in general. He did not feel the need to contact clients if he believed his work would not interfere with the clients' operations.

This may be appropriate for most county agencies, but DOC is a special needs agency and should be treated as such. Additional notification of scheduled work is indicated.

DOC has used the FAF website to check work status. Their limited knowledge of the site has prevented them from accessing the most accurate, updated information. FAF could have been far more forthcoming in informing DOC Operations that it actually has had far more access to updates, if only they had the proper training.

FAF reports customer satisfaction “at 99%.” The agency that represents 66% of FAF business is clearly not satisfied, per this investigation. Formal feedback avenues cited by FAF following last year’s Grand Jury Report (*County Building Maintenance: High Cost, Poor Customer Communication*, June 5, 2008), as yet do not exist, and are clearly needed.

At the same time, DOC has not been consistent or organized in tracking recurring problems and demanding answers from top FAF administration. “Too expensive,” “too many,” and “too slow” need to be replaced with documented, quantifiable complaints that can be addressed. Photographing a damaged bathroom was one staff member’s last resort. Complaints would be more credible if documented by all staff, whenever noticed, and conveyed to the DOC Assistant Operations Manager and Facilities Manager who can consolidate the issues and present them at scheduled meetings.

This is not meant to diminish in any way the problems with maintenance and repair experienced by DOC. The Main Jail and Elmwood house a volatile and destructive population. Damage, whether intentional or from wear and tear, constitutes a threat to secure and safe operation that, by law, must be dealt with as expeditiously as possible. Many Elmwood buildings are over thirty years old, and are placed across 62+ acres. At present, the entire facility is monitored for damage by a lone Safety Officer.

Onsite work supervision, whether provided by FAF or DOC, by regular patrol or spot check, is needed. Enhanced communication of procedure and regulations between FAF and DOC, both at the top level and among line staff, and awareness of job progress and oversight of job quality by DOC and FAF, are the *minimum* that must occur if the relationship is to transform from adversarial to collaborative.

## Findings and Recommendations

### Finding 1

- 1a. FAF is invited but rarely attends the monthly meetings held by the Elmwood Captain at Elmwood, where Operations and Custody issues are discussed. Effective exchange of issues and concerns does not occur among all responsible agencies.
- 1b. The DOC Support Services Division Commander meets monthly with the FAF Executive Manager of Building Operations at Berger Drive. Problems expressed by staff do not appear to reach these individuals.
- 1c. Corrective Maintenance meetings are held every Thursday at 1 pm. on Berger Drive. They are attended by FAF Managers and the supervisors who answer to them. One or two high-ranking DOC Operations staff usually attend. Custody attends only when they have a problem. There is no agenda and no minutes are kept. These are informal meetings to air problems and give status reports on major projects.
- 1d. FAF states they have an appointed Facilities Manager at DOC. However, DOC staff state they do not know of any "Facilities Manager."

### Recommendation 1

DOC and FAF should schedule weekly meetings with mandatory attendance by DOC Operations Managers and FAF Maintenance Managers to discuss common problems and concerns, and to share project plans and updates. There should be a formal agenda and published minutes available to all staff of both facilities, including Custody administration.

The DOC Facilities Manager should be formally identified and his responsibilities as liaison made explicit to all staff by the Support Services Division Commander.

FAF should implement the formal customer feedback mechanism cited in its reply to the 2008 *County Building Maintenance* Report.

### Finding 2

DOC is limited to setting all service requests as "Priority Three" or below, though they phone in emergency Priority One and Two requests for immediate help. Work orders are prioritized by the MAXIMO Building Operations Monitor Systems Operator and responded to according to the urgency of the problem, defined as the "severity of the damage it can do and the disruption to the client's operations":

- Priority 1 – Health and Safety – Immediate Response
- Priority 2 – Mission Critical – 24-hour Response
- Priority 3 – Painting, etc – 48-hour Response
- Priority 4 – Tenant request, non-urgent – ten-day Response
- Priority 5 – 30-day Response

Priority Three response time is typically over one week. DOC states that problems such as a malfunctioning security camera may be assigned the same priority as a painting job.

## **Recommendation 2**

The ability of DOC to set priority should be revisited during the mandatory meetings between FAF and DOC.

## **Finding 3**

The Elmwood Office Specialist's primary job is to submit service requests to FAF. Other DOC personnel submit them as well, sometimes resulting in the same request being sent in multiple times, and duplicate work orders.

## **Recommendation 3**

DOC should assign one Office Specialist and one designated back-up to enter all service requests to avoid duplicates.

It should be noted DOC is already working on this problem.

## **Finding 4**

DOC is not given advance notice of when jobs will begin, but require such notice if inmates must be moved.

## **Recommendation 4**

DOC service requests should indicate if inmates will need to be moved to allow FAF access.

It should be noted that Custody administration has put itself on-call to be available any time for inmate moving to assist FAF in accessing areas.

## **Finding 5**

- 5a.** There are approximately 100 entries and exits per day by FAF personnel at Elmwood, 30 of which are not electronically recorded, and 70 of which are recorded by card swipe.
- 5b.** With an average of 20 corrective maintenance service requests per day, DOC is unable to reconcile the large number of workers with the number of jobs, and the large numbers of entries and exits. DOC questions the need for so many FAF staff at Elmwood.
- 5c.** DOC does not know which jobs are being done on any particular day.
- 5d.** DOC is not informed of job progress. This is problematic when jobs involve more than one trade. Trades do not communicate and work stops until DOC realizes the first part of a job is done and it is time to schedule the next trade.
- 5e.** DOC is not given notice of job completion and must personally check job areas for job status, which is time-consuming in a 62+ acre facility.

## **Recommendation 5**

- 5a.** FAF should track entries by work order number. This will identify any superfluous personnel at Elmwood,
- 5b.** FAF should add an additional card reader at the West entrance off Thompson St.
- 5c.** FAF should simultaneously fax duplicates of daily work orders to the OS desk. DOC would be able to spot-check work in progress, precluding the need to contact FAF.
- 5d.** See Finding 5d and 5e.
- 5e.** See Finding 5d and 5e.

## **Finding 6**

DOC has been unable to electronically monitor work status.

## **Recommendation 6**

FAF should provide DOC with training on how to access and utilize MAXIMO capabilities as they relate to DOC concerns.

## **Finding 7**

- 7a.** There is little or no supervision of FAF staff and DOC notices “idle” FAF staff.
- 7b.** DOC Operations staff does not inspect or approve completed jobs done by either FAF or outside vendors/contractors. FAF workers sign off on their own jobs.
- 7c.** The DOC Correctional Support Services Manager is not readily available at Elmwood. Custody personnel must liaise with FAF on big jobs, though Operations is not their responsibility.
- 7d.** The DOC Assistant Operations Manager, though stationed at Elmwood, does not frequently leave the shop area to monitor the overall state of the facility, and to oversee and coordinate the efforts of Ops and FAF. This task is left to other Operations and Custody personnel who are then forced to neglect their specified duties.

## **Recommendation 7**

DOC should direct the DOC Correctional Support Services Manager to spend sufficient time at Elmwood to effectively supervise and monitor ongoing work. He should be accessible to his Ops staff so issues can be conveyed to FAF during meetings.

DOC should ensure that the appropriate DOC personnel conduct spot visits to work areas and regular patrols of Elmwood with the Safety Officer, and be available to liaise with FAF on major projects.

## **Finding 8**

FAF deletes work orders that are not addressed within three months from the system without always first notifying the client.

## **Recommendation 8**

FAF needs to check with DOC before deleting or closing inactive work orders, even though the deletions may seem to be “common sense” decisions.

## **Finding 9**

On average, there are four outside vendors/contractors working at Elmwood per day. They must be escorted by CSAs. If they arrive unexpectedly, CSAs may be on other assignments, and the vendors must wait until CSAs are available, wasting time and money.

## **Recommendation 9**

FAF should inform DOC as far in advance as possible to arrange for escorts when multiple vendors are scheduled. FAF should advise DOC of where vendors are to work, and be prepared to escort the vendors if necessary.

## **Finding 10**

FAF work is frequently delayed when inmates are in areas FAF needs to access.

## **Recommendation 10**

FAF should make every effort to let DOC know when FAF needs access to inmate occupied areas. It should be noted that Custody administration has put itself on-call to be available any time for inmate moving to assist FAF in accessing areas, *and* that FAF plans to assign one of its long-time Elmwood workers as onsite supervisor for the entire facility.

## **Finding 11**

DOC receives a non-itemized bill from FAF for accumulated corrective maintenance charges. In FY 2008, this bill totaled \$3.364M.

## **Recommendation 11**

FAF should provide to DOC an itemized quarterly statement so that the charges can be reconciled with the services provided to ensure accurate accounting.

## **Finding 12**

Several DOC personnel enter service requests to FAF (through the FAF web site or by e-mail). This at times results in duplicate requests, resulting in duplicate work orders. The duplicates show up on MAXIMO as incomplete jobs, requiring review several months later.

## **Recommendation 12**

It should be noted DOC is already working on designating only one individual to enter all requests.

### **Finding 13**

FAF supervisors work at Berger Drive. They make brief and infrequent visits to Elmwood. As a result, FAF is unable to verify the hours their workers spend on the job.

### **Recommendation 13**

FAF should designate a supervisor for Elmwood. It should be noted that FAF plans to assign one of their long-time Elmwood workers as onsite supervisor for the facility.

### **Finding 14**

FAF has not implemented the formal customer feedback process cited in its response to the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report *County Building Maintenance: High Cost, Poor Customer Communication*.

### **Recommendation 14**

FAF should implement the formal customer feedback process cited in its response to the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report *County Building Maintenance: High Cost, Poor Customer Communication*.

### **Finding 15**

FAF Building Operations last received a county management audit in 1991 when it was known as GSA.

### **Recommendation 15**

The County Board of Supervisors should order a management audit on FAF.

This report was **PASSED** and **ADOPTED** with a concurrence of at least 12 grand jurors on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2009.

---

Don Kawashima  
Foreperson

---

June Nishimoto  
Foreperson pro tem