



AUDIT FOLLOW-UP

AFU-0001-2002

Snohomish County
Performance Audit Division

Report – Audit Follow-up

Issued to:

PERFORMANCE AUDIT COMMITTEE

February 7, 2002

Issued By:

Performance Audit Division



Snohomish County

Date: February 7, 2002
To: Performance Audit Committee
Cc: Jim Krider, Sheriff Rick Bart
Peter Hahn, Randy Manley
From: Martin T. Standel
Subject: Audit Follow-up (AFU-0001-2002)

Auditor's Office
Performance Audit Division

Bob Terwilliger
County Auditor
Carolyn Ableman
Chief Deputy Auditor

M/S #505
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201-4059
(425) 388-3006
FAX (425) 259-2777

This report presents the results of our audit follow-up review (AFU-0001-2002). Per Snohomish County's Performance Audit Committee Policies (Policy 1.0), the Performance Audit Division is required to perform follow-up on all report recommendations.

Our approach was to request from appropriate Department or Division management a written response regarding their actions or proposed actions for each recommendation made in their report. We then assessed if their written response, by recommendation, was adequate or inadequate. Our assessment does not imply we audited their response, but only to review those responses for adequacy.

Our last audit follow-up review (AUF-0001-2000) was issued on January 30, 2001. At that time we did not receive managements responses from Real Estate/Property Transaction Systems (REP) project and from Corrections Overtime Audit. Subsequent to our issued report, we did receive their written responses. Their replies were adequate and no further action was deemed necessary.

Our last audit also identified one inadequate response to recommendation 2 of the SFG Integrated Financial Management System Review. Recommendation 2 stated, "The County should continue to pursue actions deemed necessary to fulfill the contract requirements specified to make the System complete and then formally accept the SFG Integrated Financial Management System to bring closure to the contract." While we understand, much has happened since our review; we to date still have not received an adequate response resolution.

Our review of the Department/Division written response on the following four new audits, (1) Police Felony Filings, (2) Sheriff Overtime, (3) Public Works Overtime and, (4) Telecommunications was deemed to be adequate with no further action necessary.

Table of Contents

Management Letter	i
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.	2
III. Findings.....	2
Attachment 1 - List of Audit Recommendations.....	4



I. Introduction

Per Snohomish County's Performance Audit Policies (Policy 1.0), the Performance Audit Division is required to perform follow-up reviews on all report recommendations. Policy 1.0 (Follow-up Audit Reports) states:

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards 6.12 and 6.13 (1994 Revision), the Performance Auditor will perform follow-up reviews on all report recommendations issued. This follow-up will be conducted no sooner than 6 months or no later than 1 year after the final report issue dated. Follow-up reports will be formal, submitted to the Performance Audit Committee, and will contain information on the status (action or inaction) of each recommendation made and reasons why implementation has not occurred.

Government Auditing Standards, page 68, (1994 Revision state in: **Chapter 6 – Field Work Standards for Performance Audits**

Audit Follow-up

6.12 Auditors should follow-up on significant findings and recommendations from previous audits that could affect the audit objectives. They should do this to determine whether timely and appropriate corrective actions have been taken by auditee officials. The audit report should disclose the status of uncorrected significant findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the audit objectives.

6.13 Much of the benefit from audit work is not in the findings reported or the recommendations made, but in their effective resolution. Auditee management is responsible for resolving audit findings and recommendations, and having a process to track their status can help it fulfill this responsibility. If management does not have such a process, auditors may wish to establish their own. Continued attention to significant findings and recommendations can help auditors assure that the benefits of their work are realized.”

Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, pages 65 – 68, from The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) states:

“Standard – 440 Following-up – Internal Auditors should follow-up to ascertain that appropriate actions is taken on reported audit findings.

Internal auditors should determine that corrective action was taken and is achieving the desired results, or that senior management or the board has assumed the risk of not taking corrective action on reported findings”.

II. Background

This is the second formal Division effort to comply with PAC Policy 1.0. While the timeframe for Sheriff Overtime does exceed one year, it has only been one year since our last follow-up report. During the past year the following four new audits became eligible for an audit follow-up.

- Police Felony Filings (LEJ06-0001-1999) was issued on May 1, 2001
- Sheriff Overtime (LEJ07-0002-1999) was issued on October 17, 2000
- Public Works Overtime (ID06-0001-1999) was issued on March 29, 2001
- Telecommunications (FCS-0001-2000) was issued on May 1, 2001

In addition, the two audits, which did not provide their written response in time to meet last years report, are:

- Real Estate/Property Transaction Systems (SC-REPT-1998) was issued on April 16, 1999
- Corrections Overtime (LEJ01-0001-1999) was issued on April 27, 2000

These six projects contained 36 individual recommendations. A complete listing of recommendations is included as Attachment 1.

III. Findings

The main purpose for “follow-up audits” is to provide management with feedback if necessary additional actions can be taken. The Performance Auditor role is to review ongoing operations for efficiencies and/or compliance with applicable criteria or laws; to assess departments’ procedures; and make appropriate recommendations, which may enhance operations or efficiencies.

The auditor’s role in follow-up audits, essentially classified as desk audits, is to compile written responses from effected Department/Division management, assess if the written responses, by recommendation, are adequate or not adequate, and relay those finding to the Performance Audit Committee.

It is management’s responsibility to decide if any appropriate action should be taken in response to reported audit findings. It is also their responsibility to assume the risk by not correcting a reported condition because of cost or other considerations.



Snohomish County
Performance Audit Division

All written responses appeared to be adequate and no further action is deemed necessary. Finally, please note that our assessment does not imply we audited their response, but only to review those responses for adequacy.



Attachment 1

Real Estate/Property Transaction System (REPT): April 16, 1999

Recommendation 1: We recommend that each department on an annual basis reconcile their books to Facilities Management's master list. Those differences, if identified, should be reviewed and corrected within the department and at Facilities Management.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the county develop and implement a central file system, which would contain a complete history for each specific property. The file system should have a unique identifier and be accessible through the county information systems.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that the county establish a property option purchase fund, which can be used to secure the ability to buy a specific property, and allow time for due diligence and or time necessary for council/executive approvals. This will allow the county to have first refusal and ample time for due diligence.

Recommendation 4: We recommend that Facilities Management take a more active role in assisting, reviewing and ensuring that each department is adhering to standard property acquisitions. These standard procedures should include file organization, checklists and reporting requirements to Property Management.

Recommendation 5: We recommend that the Snohomish County Executive and Council amend this county code (SCC 2.50.140) to include purchases so as to maintain the fairness doctrine and to assure Snohomish County citizens that county employees, appointed or elected officials do not use county information to benefit themselves financially. The county should prohibit the purchase or sale of any goods and or real property from its employees, appointed or elected officials.

Recommendation Parks 1, Airport 1, PDS 1, and PW 1: We recommend that files containing property transactions be organized along the lines of the departments acquisition checklist. The first page of the file could show the checklist with signed dates indicating completion of that requirement.

Recommendation PDS 2: We recommend that the "Delegation Signature Authority" for the Director of PDS and or the Director's Deputy be revised to include the ability to approve these short plat easements/road dedications as long as they do not conflict with SCC 13.70.010(2).



Attachment 1

Corrections Overtime: April 27, 2000

Recommendation No. 1: We recommend Corrections consider establishing a new formalized scheduling process, and expand current data gathering techniques. Correction managers could better manage the workload and Corrections staffing by collecting and analyzing more information. Through the use of a formal scheduling process, Corrections could expand their ability to monitor and measure staffing needs, patterns and requirements.

Recommendation No. 2: We recommend County and Corrections management in partnership review the workload needs for the Corrections Department. Then through the use of additional Corrections staffing and overtime data, they could improve scheduling practices and implement more cost-effective staff and overtime scheduling changes.

Recommendation No. 3: We recommend Corrections in conjunction with Local Union No. 763 continue their dialog and relationship that allows maximum overtime flexibility regarding the length of overtime performed.

Recommendation No. 4: We recommend Corrections in conjunction with Local Union No. 763 continue their dialog to modify Article V. 5.4.4 regarding overtime and extra work to allow more equal distribution of required overtime hours among all Corrections staff.

Recommendation No. 5: We recommend Corrections continue and expand the hiring of part-time Corrections Officers for their own Department, and continue discussion with the union to foster this process.

Recommendation No. 6: We recommend additional Corrections Officers be hired, in addition to the 11 slated for 2000. While our baseline staffing model suggests this number should approximate 10 additional FTE's, we feel the department should verify our analysis prior to any action using data from the expanded scheduling process.

Recommendation No. 7: We recommend employees and supervisors fill out completely and sign timesheets and Overtime/Extra Pay Authorizations. Our review showed that up to 39 percent of employees and 5 percent of supervisors did not sign employee timesheets. Our review also showed on several occasions, overtime forms were not filled out or signed by the supervisor.



Attachment 1

SFG - Integrated Financial Management System Review: April 27, 2000

Overall Status of System Implementation

1. Expedite project completion; move quickly toward decisions to secure an acceptable RDBMS software so custom or ad hoc reporting can be achieved, and complete those components which require that software to function.

Status of Contract Compliance/Issues and Problems

2. The County should continue to pursue actions deemed necessary to fulfill the contract requirements specified to make the System complete and then formally accept the SFG Integrated Financial Management System to bring closure to the contract.

Implementation Progress and Issues

3. Develop or enhance SFG training programs to ensure users and their designated backups are well trained and help prepare them for future system advances including when a new RDBMS component is secured and becomes operational. Continue to periodically survey users to determine where training is needed and better respond to user needs.

4. Continue to address the internal control issues identified by the State Auditor in management letters and findings reports.

5. For large-scale, countywide, computer-based project implementation, assign a dedicated, experienced, and formally trained DIS project manager as standard policy and practice.

6. Address project management shortcomings as identified by Colin Bottem and his Committee in his report to the County Council in response to Budget Item 8. Consider revising the appropriate County Code, which addresses these issues (SCC) 2.350.030, to reflect new policies and practices relative to project management, and finalize a statement of authority and responsibility for the Department of Information Services relative to the management of computer networks, systems, development activities and implementation activities.

7. Decisions on all future major planned projects, involving computer systems or not, should be supported by a comprehensive cost/benefit analysis covering all traditional areas such as technical feasibility, and all costs whether they be contractor or internal costs. Furthermore, such feasibility studies should include an assessment



Attachment 1

of risks the County faces if the project is pursued and/or implemented; contain alternatives and risk abatement plans; and all should be included in final recommendations to the Council.

8. The County should authorize development of a formal Project Management policy, practice, and procedures manual. This manual should assist future project managers and staff assigned in performing prescribed tasks according to a pre-approved process.

A. Additional Support

9. Ensure system training is on going and comprehensive, and training budgets are adequate for trainers and users to achieve this.

10. If not already done, DIS should formalize and document their current, formal user response process; this process should contain a timeframe for responses and a method to keep concerned parties updated regarding final problem resolution.

Note: We recognize DIS established an end-user response process that appears acceptable. DIS management is actively involved in dispute resolution between the County and SFG and takes an active role in attempting to resolve user concerns. SFG does have a Web page it weekly updates with technical information and there is a Northwest SFG User Group, which convenes to assist in solving problems

B. Other Issues: Not related to specific project objectives

11. Consider developing a formal “systems newsletter,” or some similar communication vehicle to keep county employees, system administrators, and system managers even better informed. Focus on positive accomplishments and future plans for improvements, additional training, enhancements, etc.

Sheriff's Office Overtime: October 17, 2000

Our recommendations fall within the areas of communication, information data collection, improved management internal control process, and deputy scheduling. To fully implement these recommendations, the Department's may need to reallocate resources to better manage, collect and disseminate information.

We recommend the Department improve its understanding of staffing levels or needs by precinct and watch. This understanding needs to consider deputy training, vacation, and sick time needs. We recommend the Sheriff's Office establish and articulate Department overtime standards and criteria. In that regard, we recommend



Attachment 1

they be more consistent and explicit as to what criterion is acceptable and not acceptable. We recommend the Department explore all avenues, which improves internal and external communication, and which minimizes overtime use. We recommend they consider reevaluating their current resources allocation between Commissioned Officers and support staff so better management tools and reporting might be provided. Lastly we recommend the Department review internal controls and management reporting so they have reasonable assurances that overtime funds are expended efficiently and consistently with Department/County policies.

A. SCHEDULING PROCESS

Expenditures for overtime in the Snohomish County's Sheriffs Office between 1996 - 2000 are projected to increase over 196 percent. Our review indicates that while there are several primary causes for this growth, including the facts high incidences of overtime are essential to "police work" and largely necessary, they do not necessarily explain completely the causes for overtime's growth rate.

Over the past years, the Sheriff's commissioned and non-commissioned staff has expanded to meet increasing service needs requested by the County's growing unincorporated population. However, the combinations of increased population, density and calls for service have grown even more dramatically.

In 1996, the Sheriff's Office had a total of 245 FTE's of which 175 were Commissioned Officers. The Adopted 2000 budget identifies 303 FTE's of which 225 are Commissioned Officers. This represents a 24 percent growth in total FTE's.

In 1996, calls for service were 171,644, and our projection for 2000 is 245,391. This represents a growth of 43 percent.

In 1996, unincorporated population stood at 272,310, and our projection for 2000 is 298,677. This represents a growth of 10 percent.

There are more people living in a decreasing unincorporated area causing population density to increase. Over the same period, the County's total population has grown from 538,100, to a 2000 projection of 598,907. This represents a growth of 11 percent.

Our analysis and the Department's own records show overtime hours required to meet minimum patrol staffing will range between a minimum of 7 percent (4,507 hours) and a maximum of 23 percent (14,808 hours). This translates to an FTE shortage of 3 - 8 patrol deputies. The cost to support this staffing shortage when associated only to overtime premium (amount over straight time) would range between \$54,000 -\$177,000 per year.



Attachment 1

While the Department has begun to develop several new and additional approaches to manage their overtime, the Department currently lacks detailed overtime budgets, detailed management reporting and an analytical process to estimate overtime usage and its subsequent comparison to actuals.

The Corona Model, which shows resource requirements for specific input service goals, does not provide adequate information to determine how limited resources should be allocated. In addition, improvements are needed in the overtime authorization process. Absent of controls, and the inability to schedule for maximum efficiency impairs management's control process.

Recommendation 1: We recommend the Department consider establishing a formal scheduling process using resources and skills necessary to provide management the tools necessary to meet service demands with minimal overtime needs. At a minimum, this unit should have the tools necessary to identify actual service goal outputs to compare against the Corona's agreed upon input drivers.

Recommendation 2: We recommend patrol deputy FTE count be increased to minimize the premium overtime pay attributed to manpower shortages if, after the addition of the 5 FTE approved in the adopted 2000 budget, manpower shortages still exist. (Consideration should include training and equipment costs).

B. OVERTIME STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) governs when, where and how overtime must be paid. As stated in 29C.F.R. , §785.11 – “Employees who, with the knowledge or acquiescence of their employer, continue to work after their shift is over, albeit voluntarily, are engaged in compensable working time. The reason for the work is immaterial; as long as the employer “suffers or permits” employees to work on its behalf, proper compensation must be paid.”

However, FLSA also states in 29C.F.R. , §785.13 **Duty of Management** “In all such cases it is the duty of management to exercise its control and see that the work is not performed if it does not want it performed. It cannot sit back and accept the benefits without compensating for them. The mere promulgation of a rule against such work is not enough. Management has the power to enforce the rule and must make every effort to do so”.

We project that for 2000, the Sheriff's Office will incur overtime expense of over \$2.3 million. We developed the **broad categories** of discretionary and non-discretionary. Using the discretionary category only, we project savings of between 5 and 20 percent if more formalized overtime standards and criteria are developed and articulated.



Attachment 1

Savings in Discretionary Overtime:	5%	10%	15%	20%
Potential Savings	\$67,473	\$134,945	\$202,418	\$269,891

Recommendation 3: We recommend the Sheriff’s Office develop formalized standards and criteria pertaining to overtime usage and to articulate standards more explicit and consistently as to what is appropriate and inappropriate overtime use.

C. COMMUNICATIONS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL

Our review divided overtime into two broad, discretionary and non-discretionary categories; discretionary was 57 percent and non-discretionary was 43 percent. Exclusive of manpower shortages, court time is the largest component within the non-discretionary category. Better communication between the courts and the department may result in reduction of court time by the deputies. The Department also tries to schedule training to best fit the needs of the Department and its deputies. However, improved polices and confirmation follow-up may also reduce overtime.

We project that improved communications with the courts and Corrections, and better internal scheduling with confirmation should result in savings of non-discretionary overtime between 5 and 10 percent.

Savings in Non-Discretionary Overtime:	5%	6%	8%	10%
Potential Savings	\$50,243	\$60,292	\$80,389	\$100,487

Recommendation 4: We recommend effort and resources be allocated to design, improve and implement better communication processes between the Sheriff’s Office, Courts, and Corrections, along with better internal scheduling and confirmation processes; all with the intent to minimize overtime needs.

Recommendation 5: We recommend the Sheriff’s Office enter in discussion with the Finance Department to formally breakout Holiday costs from the overtime cost category. This will allow a truer picture of actual overtime costs associated with providing police services.

D. RESOURCE ALLOCATION - COMMISSIONED & SUPPORT

Staffing levels within the support functions appear to be disproportionately low considering the growth in Commissioned Officers. Commissioned Officers have been added at a ratio of 6 to 1.



Attachment 1

Since 1996, the Sheriff's Office will have added 50 Commissioned Officers and only 8 support staff. However, the ratio of support staff to Commissioned Officers will increase from 2.5 in 1996 to 2.9 during 2000 with the addition of three personnel.

Performance measurements and criteria encourage accountability by providing information regarding resource use. These measurements are most effective when they are useful, relevant, and current. A more representative overview of department efficiency should include such a group of related measurements. Performance measurements as they relate to management, generally translate to increased internal reporting and allow management to implement better internal controls.

Recommendation 6: We recommend the Department review their support staff function requirements and staffing needs in light of an expanding Commissioned Officer base and consider increasing resources to better serve management's increased information needs.

E. INTERNAL CONTROLS AND MANAGEMENT REPORTING

We also performed a standard internal control test for employee and supervisor signatures on employee overtime request forms. We used statistical sampling to test 1998 – 1999 forms and scheduled out 100 percent of forms from January 2000. Based on our sample (1998 – 1999), we projected "Additional Compensation Requests" were not signed by a first-level supervisor 19 percent of the time. However, 93 percent were signed at a higher level and our scheduling out of January 2000 forms showed a not-signed rate of 11 percent. The form as it currently exists, has space for the employee and three levels of supervisors to sign.

Recommendation 7: We recommend the number of Signature Approval lines be reduced from the current four to two. The only lines needed are one for the Employee and another for the employee's Manager/Supervisor to approve.

Public Works Overtime: March 29, 2001

The following recommendations are based on PW management suggestions and observations during fieldwork and analysis. If implemented, the recommendations might save or avoid approximately \$129,500 - \$234,000 per year in additional overtime and salary and benefit costs.

A. OVERTIME POLICY

While some Public Works department managers provided overtime guidance, Public Works overall or its Divisions (other than Solid Waste), have not provided specific



Attachment 1

written overtime policy of when overtime should be used. Traditionally, increased management control or “interest” in an area reduces costs from 5 – 10 percent which could mean a yearly reduction of \$74,500 - \$149,000 of PW’s controllable overtime (\$1,494.865).

Recommendation No 1. We recommend Public Works provide each employee formal, written departmental overtime policy spelling out when overtime should be used and approval authority.

B. MANAGEMENT COORDINATION

Discussions with division managers clarified their individual concern for overtime control and varied methods they used for that control. While managers at all levels noted discussing overtime issues and controls routinely in staff and division meetings, several managers suggested increased manager coordination and cooperation might improve overtime controls and work flow understanding. Unique division overtime tools generally did not “crossflow” to other Public Works managers to help “spur” other overtime control ideas. While some unique control tools are not applicable to other divisions, improvements in overtime control are important since delays in one division (planning, permitting, repair, and etc.) often drives overtime in others, and better controls can lead to reduced overtime costs.

Recommendation No 2. We recommend Public Works managers formally meet as required (biyearly, quarterly, etc.) to discuss overtime impacts within and between divisions, and share overtime controls methods (policies, procedures, reports, etc.) and workload plans that drive overtime.

C. OVERTIME CATEGORIES & REPORTING

During audit fieldwork, it was discovered overtime was generally controlled as a single overtime category. Emergency work is generally captured under specific job codes and some overtime related to that can be analyzed. However, while holiday and weekend overtime (Solid Waste), mandatory work preparation overtime (lead responsibilities in Road Maintenance), and job completion overtime (Fleet Management and Public Works general requirements) could be unique overtime reporting categories, they and others are not clearly delineated and easily analyzed using Public Work’s financial system. This makes it difficult for Public Works managers to analyze what type of overtime staff is performing, determine if it is required, and even better control it.

Further, several managers noted that even if they had varied overtime categories, the existing report generation software of the SFG financial system make it difficult to



Attachment 1

produce overtime control reports. They noted developing the reports was time consuming and the process was not as flexible as wanted.

Recommendation No 3. We recommend Public Works more thoroughly categorize and capture types of overtime (holiday, emergency, training, etc.) so data can be subsequently analyzed to aid overtime control.

Recommendation No 4. We recommend Public Works coordinate with DIS to expedite the SFG financial system report generation software replacement in Public Works and plan for the required personnel training necessary to operate it.

D. OVERTIME DUE TO MANPOWER SHORTAGES

In Fleet Management (FM) and Solid Waste overtime is significant. While managers noted much of that overtime is based on the “nature of the job,” some they felt was due to FTE shortages based on authorized personnel and personnel hiring challenges. FM asked for increased FTE in 2000 of two mechanics, but one was approved. Further, the manager noted difficulties in hiring replacement mechanics tended to “drive” overtime by existing staff to meet job requirements. Fleet Management’s 2000 overtime was \$105,035.

Of the \$105,035 overtime cost in 2000, \$34,977 was the premium pay portion (the “half” of time and a half paid for overtime) spent. The remaining \$70,058 appears to be enough money to pay for an additional full-time employee’s salary and benefits, and the \$34,977 in premium pay might be able to be saved. Additional overtime analysis and anticipated work demands may indicate another approved FTE might be less expensive than the overtime hours now used.

Solid Waste’s (SW) overtime for 1999 showed that seven percent of it was required for training purposes. Management noted overtime had to be used for training since there were not enough FTE to effectively fill the required shifts on regular time while personnel were trained. There was a similar situation in 2000 and the overtime expenditure was \$470,642, or 146 percent of the \$352,586 budgeted. The County increased SW’s FTE for 2001 by 10.5 FTE and those personnel should reduce SW overtime expenditures.

Recommendation No 5. If work and overtime analysis demonstrates overtime cost or avoidance savings will pay for another FTE, we recommend Fleet Management submit a request for an additional FTE authorization.



Attachment 1

E. HIRING PRACTICES

While performing this overtime review, several managers noted they could save money, without increasing overtime, if they could leave full time employee (FTE) positions vacant until they are needed. For instance, Roads Maintenance expends tremendous overtime and hires a large number of temporary employees to meet the Summer construction schedule, but in “wet” weather, evolving environmental concerns are limiting when and where certain work can be done. The manager noted a less critical FTE position(s) might be able to be left vacant until better weather and work demands drove requirements to fill the position(s).

Road Maintenance road worker 2 full time employees at step 5 earn \$18.30 an hour. (The pay scale is from levels 1 – 6.) Hence, if a road worker 2, step 5, left RM after the primary construction season, the County could save approximately \$3,800 in salary and benefits each month that position was not filled until needed. With RM’s yearly personnel turnover rates, an estimated \$20,000 - \$50,000 yearly might be saved. Some savings might also be possible in Solid Waste.

Solid Waste managers noted summer yard and construction waste increases the amount of garbage they must handle for several months, but other times of the year there is generally less. Here managers noted allowing them more discretion on when to fill FTE positions might also save monies.

Currently, managers stated if they request FTE positions be left vacant for any period, they feel they will lose those positions (use or lose syndrome). We realize the difficulty in balancing the demand and availability of staff and the uncertainty of turnover rates. However, with the cyclic nature of PW job requirements, FTE are critical during periods of high workload demand.

Recommendation No 6. We recommend Public Works be given the authority to hire authorized FTE personnel when best needed to fill their work demands and not lose those positions if they suggest a hiring delay.

Telecommunications: May 1, 2001

Overall Telephone Services performs their assigned tasks efficiently and professionally. However, through better dissemination of current telephone procedures and use policy, the County could have saved \$20 thousand dollars over the year of our review. Our recommendations include communication policies and procedures, departmental management controls, and IS expanded communication with our primary telecommunications provider (Verizon).



Attachment 1

Recommendation 1: In order to limit excess charges for telephone credit card improper use, we recommend Telephone Services develop and provide current procedures to all telephone calling card holders. At a minimum, those procedures should include explicit directions regarding proper access.

Recommendation 2: We recommend Telephone Services develop training materials for Human Resources to be given to new Snohomish County employees regarding proper telephone equipment use.

Training materials should at least include areas where unnecessary costs can be eliminated such as using the Internet to look up numbers or addresses, and proper use of operators and director assistance.

Recommendation 3: We recommend Telephone Services periodically (routinely as needed) ask Verizon's assistance to specifically reduce the costs of equipment lines not being used, unnecessary telecommunication features (800 lines, etc), best available discounts, and etc.

In addition, we request Telephone Services review Public Work's single-line, monthly Internet charge.

Recommendations 4: We recommend Telephone Services consider periodic distribution of departmental telephone bills to all County Department managers.

Police Felony Filings: May 1, 2001

Our recommendations concern two major areas. The first deals with data collection parameters for the County's proposed Integrated Law & Justice Database currently under discussion. A second recommendation deals with management tools, related criteria, and their effective use.

A. DATA COLLECTION

Each Department within the County's Law & Justice function collects specific data needed for their individual management and reporting requirements. Unfortunately, all Law & Justice data needed by County Departments are not maintained in a single database. This results in management being unable to fully identify and analyze all elements necessary for more efficient operations, and costs savings for the County and its citizens.

With proper security and design, integrated databases can store data needed by all users. With Law & Justice privacy requirements, certain information would require



Attachment 1

unique identifiers for individual Department input and control, but much of the input could be shared. In such a system, any Department could input, store, access and analyze its own key data using their unique security identifier, but unsecured data input would be available to all Law & Justice agencies, and joint, unsecured data could be input one time and all would benefit. Importantly, greater available joint data (now held in individual databases) would allow Departments an opportunity to access, correlate, and analyze it for operational efficiencies, and data input costs could be reduced.

Recommendation 1: We recommend, with proper security procedures, the proposed Law & Justice integrated system be designed to track all data elements deemed appropriate by Department management.

B. MANAGEMENT TOOLS

When managing, understanding of and motivating support to achieve critical work requirements is crucial to success. A primary motivating tool is setting goals and measuring group performance against them. When people work in groups, there are two distinct and critical issues involved. The first issue is the task and problems associated with getting the job done, and the second is the group dynamics process. It is management's challenge to enhance the group's worth and morale through goal setting and measurement of critical work requirements, and then improving them. Setting critical work requirement goals and determining criteria for successful goal accomplishment may require significant management time, but are necessary for organizational improvements. Without goals and criteria, there is limited organizational direction, motivation, and advancement.

Such information should allow management within the Prosecutor's Office to better understand their own processes and used to measure the Departments progress in achieving their goals.

Recommendation 2: We recommend the Prosecutor's Office consider developing management goals and criteria guidelines for caseload management after the information addressed in Recommendation 1 above becomes available.