



The Beverly Hills City Council Liaison / Audit and Finance Committee will conduct a Special Meeting, at the following time and place, and will address the agenda listed below:

CITY HALL
455 North Rexford Drive
4th Floor Conference Room A
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Monday, June 24, 2019
4:30 p.m.

AGENDA

- 1) Public Comment
 - a. Members of the public will be given the opportunity to directly address the Committee on any item listed on the agenda.

- 2) Results of the Annual Citywide Risk Assessment and Draft Annual Audit Work Plan for FY 2019/2020

- 3) Adjournment

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lourdes Sy-Rodriguez".

Lourdes Sy-Rodriguez, Assistant City Clerk

Posted: June 20, 2019

**A DETAILED LIAISON AGENDA PACKET IS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW IN THE
LIBRARY AND CITY CLERK'S OFFICE**



Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Beverly Hills will make reasonable efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities. If you require special assistance, please call (310) 285-1014 (voice) or (310) 285-6881 (TTY). Providing at least forty-eight (48) hours' advance notice will help to ensure availability of services. City Hall, including Conference Room 4A, is wheelchair accessible.



STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: June 24, 2019

To: City Council Audit and Finance Committee Liaisons

From: Eduardo Luna, City Auditor

Subject: Results of Annual Citywide Risk Assessment and Draft Annual Audit Work Plan for FY 2019/20.

Attachments:

1. Management Self-Assessment Questionnaire
2. FY 2019/20 Citywide Risk Assessment Model
3. FY 2019/20 Audit Suggestions

RECOMMENDATION

The City Auditor recommends that the City Council Audit and Finance Committee Liaisons review and provide direction on the Annual Audit Work Plan for FY 2019/20.

BACKGROUND

On December 20, 2018, the Audit Committee reviewed the staff report, Action Plan for Building the City of Beverly Hills Auditor's Office, which discussed developing a Citywide Risk Assessment model and proposing an Annual Audit Work Plan. The report recommended that the City Auditor develop an annual audit work plan for FY 2019-20. The Audit Committee concurred with the proposed plan and recommendations. On January 8, 2019, the staff report, Action Plan for Building the Beverly Hills Auditor's Office, was presented to the City Council, which concurred with the recommendations.

RISK ASSESSMENT MODEL

Government audit organizations typically publish annual audit work plans that communicate to the public, management, and policymakers proposed audits for the upcoming fiscal year. Audit work plans can be annual audit plans or multi-year audit work plans. It is a best practice to utilize a risk assessment model to identify, measure, and prioritize potential departments, programs, and activities to audit based on the level of risk to the City. The risk model can also incorporate City Council and management input.

Risk assessment is a process of systematically scoring (or rating) the relative impact of a variety of “risk factors,” which are typically fiscal in nature. Other factors that can be considered in the risk model include the potential vulnerability to fraud, management competency, and other risk factors that could impede the achievement of a department’s mission, goals, and objectives. Management completed a seven question self-assessment questionnaire that covered the following:

1. Extent of external public interface
2. Missional critical nature of operations
3. Extent of supporting internal operations
4. Consequences of negative media (reputational risk)
5. Potential loss of cash
6. Performance metrics
7. Regulatory impact on operations

The Management Questionnaire can be found in **Attachment 1**.

A key component of the risk assessment is the total risk score calculated for each auditable unit (list of the potential audits) in order of highest risk score to the lowest by tabulating the information gathered from the questionnaires and applying the weights assigned to the risk factors. See **Attachment 2** for the results of the Citywide Risk Assessment Model.

Current Audit Resources

For FY 2019/20, the Office of the City Auditor has received funding to hire two principal performance auditors. Job offers have been extended to two individuals, who will join the City by August 2019. As shown below, the Office of the City Auditor has 4,160 available audit hours to conduct performance audits, monitor outside audit engagements, and oversee the Trust & Innovation Portal. Specific outside engagements include overseeing consultants performing work on fire hydrant maintenance, Fiber to the Premises, and Police Department vehicle acquisition.

Based on the organization’s budget and staffing, in general, one principal performance auditor can perform two to four performance audits per year. Direct project hours can range from 400 to 800 hours per project depending on audit objective and scope. Most audits would require about 400 hours to complete. If audits have a broad scope and involve multiple departments, audits may take 600 to 800 hours to complete.

Available Audit Hours to Conduct and Oversee Audits

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total Annual Hours per Principal Auditor | 2,080 |
| -600 Hours = Vacation, Sick, Holiday, Administrative, CPE, Other | |
| -140 Hours = Auditors on board August 2019 | |
| Total Available Hours per Principal Auditor (x2) | 1,340 |
| Total Available Hours for City Auditor | 1,480 |
| Total Audit Hours | 4,160 |

Given current audit resources, my recommendation is to undertake four performance audits. Additional audit activity will include overseeing three outside audits, investigating fraud-related complaints, and researching suggestions for improving City government.

| Audits | Hours |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| Performance Audit 1 | 550 |
| Performance Audit 2 | 550 |
| Performance Audit 3 | 625 |
| Performance Audit 4 | 625 |
| Outsourced Audits (Oversight) | |
| Fire Hydrant Maintenance | 150 |
| Fiber to the Premises Pro-Forma | 200 |
| BH Police Vehicle Procurement | 200 |
| Trust & Innovation Portal | |
| Fraud Related Complaints | 760 |
| Research Suggestions | 500 |
| Total | 4,160 |

Selection of FY 2019/20 Performance Audits

Based on the risk assessment model, the actual selection of potential audits can be based on risk scores, City Council and management input, and auditor judgement. A typical work plan can include a combination of low to high risk audits, and specific City Council and management requests. **Attachment 3** has a list of suggested audits from the City Council, City Treasurer, and management.

Next Steps

Once the City Council reviews and approves the annual audit work plan, the plan should only be modified under limited circumstances and in consultation with the City Council. Criteria for modifying the annual audit work plan mid-year could include the following circumstances:

1. Health and safety of residents and employees is threatened.
2. Significant fiscal impact to the City's general fund or enterprise funds.
3. Personal integrity of City officials and employees is questioned.

Management Self-Assessment Questionnaire

1. To what extent does your activity group interface with the external public?

Description: Assess how frequently your activity group works/interacts directly with the public or City residents. Little to no interaction is not a negative indicator, but rather an indicator that your activity group serves internal customers - internal customer interaction is addressed in question 3.

- a. None.
- b. Rarely or infrequently.
- c. Monthly to quarterly level of interface.
- d. Weekly level of interface.
- e. Continual interface with the external public several times daily or more.

2. To what extent is your activity group considered to be "mission critical" for the department to achieve its goals and objectives?

Description: Ascertain the significance that your activity group plays in your department's overall mission relative to other activity groups. Little to no contribution is not a negative indicator, but rather an indicator that your activity group may provide services and be focused on other internal customers.

- a. No contribution towards the department's goals I objectives.
- b. Minimal contribution towards attaining the department's goals and objectives.
- c. Moderate contribution towards attaining the department's goals and objectives.
- d. Significant contribution towards attaining the department's goals and objectives.
- e. The success of the department's goals and objectives is fully dependent on this activity group.

3. To what extent does your activity group support internal operations or are considered critical to achieving the objectives of other entity's/department's mission/goals?

Description: Determine the level of support and role your department plays in helping other departments achieve their overall mission. This question identifies the interconnectedness that one activity group has with other internal operations.

- a. No support provided to other operations I departments.
- b. Infrequent (i.e. annual) support provided to other operations I departments.
- c. Periodic (i.e. monthly) support provided to other operations I departments.
- d. Regular (i.e. weekly) support provided to other operations I departments.
- e. Ongoing support provided to other operations I departments every day

Attachment 1

4. To what extent would failure to achieve your activity group's mission or goals lead to public displeasure or negative media coverage?

Description: Assess how the activity group's level of visibility to the public, public interest in the group's activities, interest of the media, or other public safety related factors would lead to an increased potential loss or embarrassment if the activity group did not perform its critical mission or goals. This could also be called the newspaper test - how much negative press or public disapproval would a failure cause?

- a. No risk of loss or embarrassment.
- b. Low risk of loss or embarrassment.
- c. Moderate risk of loss or embarrassment.
- d. Significant risk of loss or embarrassment.
- e. Very high risk of loss or embarrassment.

5. To what extent is there potential loss due to the cash or cash convertible nature of your activity group's transactions?

Description: Assess the risk associated with cash or cash-convertible assets. Be sure to factor in the amount of cash collected as compared to business transacted by other means (credit card, electronic funds transfer, invoice, journal entry, etc.), as well as risks associated with the volume, type and nature of existing assets that are susceptible to theft such as equipment, supplies and inventories.

- a. None.
- b. Minimal amount of cash transactions or assets are difficult to convert to cash.
- c. Moderate amount of cash transactions or assets can be converted to cash with some difficulty.
- d. Nature of operations is primarily cash or assets are easily converted to cash.
- e. Fully cash or cash equivalent operations.

6. To what extent does your activity group track activity performance metrics?

Description: Determine the extent to which your activity group captures, assesses, and responds to performance measurement data.

- a. We continuously capture performance metrics on key operations, assess achievement of goals and trends in the information, and adjust operations to improve upon our performance in all key areas.
- b. We track performance information in all key operations, assess and use data to improve operations, but we do not engage this process in a continuous, fluid manner.
- c. We track performance information in all our key operations and may assess data to some extent, but we do not use data to improve performance in all key areas.
- d. We collect some performance information, but the information does not account for all our key operations or we do not assess the data.
- e. We do not track performance measures or metrics.

Attachment 1

7. To what extent do regulations affect or have impact on operations?

Description: Assess how government regulations (federal, state, or local) impact your activity group operations and the exposure to sanctions and potential penalties for noncompliance. Please be sure to factor in the complexity, volume, and change in regulations, including ordinances, municipal codes, administrative regulations, MOUs, federal and state laws and regulations, contract conditions, and grant provisions that pertain to your department.

- a. None.
- b. Few regulations and little risk of noncompliance.
- c. Risk of either substantial regulations or significant penalties.
- d. Complex, voluminous, or frequently changing regulations with significant penalties.
- e. Heavily regulated with serious consequences for noncompliance.

| Number | Department | Division | Organizational Code | FTE | FTE Score | FTE Weight 4 | Expenditure Expenditures | Expenditure Score | Expenditure Weight 8 | Revenue Revenues | Revenue Score | Revenue Weight 8 | External | | Mission Critical | MC Weight 10 | Support Internal Operations | SIO Weight 10 | Failure to achieve result in negative media | | Potential loss cash | PLC Weight 7 | Performance Metrics | PM Weight 4 | Regulation impact | RI Weight 6 | SCORE |
|--------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | Public Interface | EPI Weight 25 | | | | | NM Weight 15 | NM Weight 15 | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Police | Special Operations Division | 26 | 84.07 | 9 | 36 | \$ 17,844,567 | 9 | 72 | \$ 7,340,000 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 795 |
| 2 | Community Development | Development Services | 46 | 34.9 | 7 | 28 | \$ 8,219,254 | 9 | 72 | \$ 16,038,642 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 135 | 5 | 35 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 54 | 773 |
| 3 | Police | Operations Division | 25 | 103.6 | 9 | 36 | \$ 26,595,630 | 9 | 72 | \$ 1,121,100 | 5 | 40 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 763 |
| 4 | Fire | Emergency Medical Services | 34 | 45.54 | 7 | 28 | \$ 16,510,672 | 9 | 72 | \$ 3,095,150 | 7 | 56 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 751 |
| 5 | Public Works | Water Supply & Distribution | 60 | 36.46 | 7 | 28 | \$ 20,108,282 | 9 | 72 | \$ 37,004,589 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 747 |
| 6 | Police | Administrative Services | 24 | 37 | 7 | 28 | \$ 7,418,051 | 9 | 72 | \$ 150,050 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 739 |
| 7 | Fire | Emergency Response Services | 33 | 34.16 | 5 | 20 | \$ 12,555,211 | 9 | 72 | \$ 38,061 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 731 |
| 8 | Policy & Management | City Council & Administrative Support | 1 | 13.46 | 5 | 20 | \$ 2,641,544 | 7 | 56 | \$ 321,717 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 54 | 727 |
| 9 | Community Development | Planning | 37 | 15.65 | 5 | 20 | \$ 3,128,524 | 7 | 56 | \$ 1,594,223 | 5 | 40 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 135 | 5 | 35 | 7 | 28 | 7 | 42 | 721 |
| 10 | Police | Administration/Office of the Chief | 21 | 25.62 | 7 | 28 | \$ 6,697,472 | 9 | 72 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 9 | 54 | 718 |
| 11 | Public Works | Facilities Services | 59 | 14.39 | 5 | 20 | \$ 5,374,668 | 9 | 72 | \$ 4,194,388 | 7 | 56 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 709 |
| 12 | Fire | Community Risk Reduction | 32 | 10.27 | 3 | 12 | \$ 3,228,125 | 7 | 56 | \$ 1,181,792 | 5 | 40 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 703 |
| 13 | Community Development | Transportation Planning | 125 | 7.4 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,768,050 | 5 | 40 | \$ 3,032,649 | 7 | 56 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 42 | 703 |
| 14 | Public Works | Off Street Parking Operations | 72 | 78.65 | 9 | 36 | \$ 1,651,913 | 5 | 40 | \$ 23,368,443 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 105 | 9 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 699 |
| 15 | Finance | Management & Budget Division | 8 | 20.12 | 5 | 20 | \$ 3,379,487 | 7 | 56 | \$ 88,800 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 5 | 35 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 697 |
| 16 | Public Works | Solid Waste | 52 | 21.49 | 5 | 20 | \$ 10,725,806 | 9 | 72 | \$ 15,440,500 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 685 |
| 17 | Public Works | PW Administration | 50 | 13.29 | 5 | 20 | \$ 2,304,353 | 5 | 40 | \$ 68,628 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 5 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 42 | 681 |
| 18 | Fire | Fire Administration | 31 | 9.05 | 3 | 12 | \$ 2,045,269 | 5 | 40 | \$ 475,123 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 671 |
| 19 | Community Services | Recreation | 67 | 80.84 | 9 | 36 | \$ 8,601,792 | 8 | 64 | \$ 9,640,447 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 3 | 30 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 657 |
| 20 | Community Development | Community Preservation Services | 146 | 9.7 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,667,746 | 5 | 40 | \$ 448,157 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 7 | 28 | 5 | 30 | 655 |
| 21 | Community Services | Library | 77 | 72.42 | 9 | 36 | \$ 7,072,313 | 9 | 72 | \$ 481,050 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 7 | 49 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 651 |
| 22 | Policy & Management | Community Filming & Event Permits | 40 | 2 | 3 | 12 | \$ 281,813 | 3 | 24 | \$ 548,713 | 5 | 40 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 105 | 5 | 35 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 643 |
| 23 | Public Works | Park Operations | 69 | 22.35 | 5 | 20 | \$ 3,723,684 | 7 | 56 | \$ 12,482 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 641 |
| 24 | Public Works | Civil Engineering | 124 | 18.11 | 5 | 20 | \$ 3,749,973 | 7 | 56 | \$ 5,019,135 | 9 | 72 | 7 | 175 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 640 |
| 25 | Human Resources | Risk Management | 6 | 5.57 | 3 | 12 | \$ 13,594,178 | 9 | 72 | \$ 246,000 | 3 | 24 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 639 |
| 26 | Community Services | Human Services | 88 | 3.9 | 3 | 12 | \$ 14,351,315 | 9 | 72 | \$ 235,637 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 629 |
| 27 | Policy & Management | Communications & Marketing | 83 | 4.16 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,115,109 | 5 | 40 | \$ 219,719 | 3 | 24 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 42 | 621 |
| 28 | Information Technology | Information Technology | 15 | 23.33 | 5 | 20 | \$ 7,225,298 | 9 | 72 | \$ 299,200 | 5 | 40 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 610 |
| 29 | Public Works | Street Maintenance | 76 | 20.55 | 5 | 20 | \$ 2,012,862 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 610 |
| 30 | Public Works | Urban Forest | 56 | 3.1 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,683,898 | 5 | 40 | \$ 12,000 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 606 |
| 31 | Public Works | Customer Service | 95 | 6.48 | 3 | 12 | \$ 8,677,011 | 9 | 72 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 603 |
| 32 | Community Development | Rent Stabilization | 147 | 6.02 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,057,747 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 595 |
| 33 | Human Resources | Human Resources | 4 | 14.1 | 5 | 20 | \$ 3,139,532 | 7 | 56 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 5 | 30 | 594 |
| 34 | Fire | Fire Community Programs | 35 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | \$ 65,192 | 3 | 24 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 135 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 575 |
| 35 | Policy & Management | Real Estate & Property Management | 122 | 2.61 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,614,880 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 573 |
| 36 | Public Works | Parking Meters | 74 | 7.53 | 3 | 12 | \$ 3,917,351 | 7 | 56 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 9 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 569 |
| 37 | Community Services | Park Rangers | 68 | 16.36 | 3 | 12 | \$ 2,083,631 | 5 | 40 | \$ 150,000 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 70 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 567 |
| 38 | Community Services | CS Administrative Support | 79 | 9.24 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,353,651 | 5 | 40 | \$ 5,000 | 3 | 24 | 9 | 225 | 7 | 70 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 561 |
| 39 | Policy & Management | Emergency Management | 41 | 2.78 | 3 | 12 | \$ 669,590 | 3 | 24 | \$ 74,450 | 3 | 24 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 54 | 537 |
| 40 | Information Technology | Cable TV | 9 | 9.7 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,102,486 | 5 | 40 | \$ 722,000 | 5 | 40 | 7 | 175 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 532 |
| 41 | Policy & Management | Economic Sustainability | 11 | 1.11 | 3 | 12 | \$ 312,471 | 3 | 24 | \$ 16,903 | 3 | 24 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 531 |
| 42 | Finance | Finance Administration | 3 | 5.5 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,409,131 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 514 |
| 43 | Finance | General Accounting | 16 | 14.04 | 5 | 20 | \$ 2,366,845 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 42 | 512 |
| 44 | City Attorney | Legal Services | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$ 3,631,068 | 7 | 56 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 9 | 225 | 9 | 90 | 3 | 30 | 3 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 42 | 500 |
| 45 | Public Works | Wastewater Disposal Services | 54 | 10.49 | 3 | 12 | \$ 4,961,828 | 7 | 56 | \$ 13,253,000 | 9 | 72 | 3 | 75 | 7 | 70 | 3 | 30 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 42 | 483 |
| 46 | Community Development | CD Administration | 36 | 1.25 | 3 | 12 | \$ 617,970 | 5 | 40 | \$ 868,484 | 5 | 40 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 477 |
| 47 | Public Works | Project Administration | 123 | 4.7 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,079,180 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 42 | 476 |
| 48 | Public Works | Fleet Services | 85 | 11.2 | 5 | 20 | \$ 829,321 | 5 | 40 | \$ 442,606 | 3 | 24 | 3 | 75 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 42 | 471 |
| 49 | Policy & Management | Tourism & Marketing | 13 | | | 0 | \$ - | | 0 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 7 | 175 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | 7 | 105 | 3 | 21 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 471 |
| 50 | City Clerk | City Clerk Administration | 14 | 2.3 | 3 | 12 | \$ 448,616 | 3 | 24 | \$ 690 | 3 | 24 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 445 |
| 51 | City Clerk | Municipal Elections | 91 | 1.25 | 3 | 12 | \$ 350,253 | 3 | 24 | \$ 412 | 3 | 24 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 445 |
| 52 | City Clerk | Public Records Request | 94 | 0.7 | 3 | 12 | \$ 115,335 | 3 | 24 | \$ 754 | 3 | 24 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 445 |
| 53 | City Clerk | Public Meetings & Outreach | 92 | 1 | 3 | 12 | \$ 296,873 | 3 | 24 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 421 |
| 54 | City Clerk | Records Management | 93 | 0.75 | 3 | 12 | \$ 145,820 | 3 | 24 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 35 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 421 |
| 55 | Finance | Purchasing | 17 | 2.5 | 3 | 12 | \$ 419,259 | 3 | 24 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 7 | 70 | 9 | 90 | 7 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 30 | 418 |
| 56 | Public Works | Stormwater Utility | 55 | 14.79 | 5 | 20 | \$ 2,262,989 | 5 | 40 | \$ 1,791,300 | 5 | 40 | 3 | 75 | 7 | 70 | 3 | 30 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 401 |
| 57 | Information Technology | Reprographics/ Graphics | 71 | 7.77 | 3 | 12 | \$ 1,817,384 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 5 | 50 | 9 | 90 | 3 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 392 |
| 58 | Public Works | Central Stores | 100 | 4.2 | 3 | 12 | \$ 2,116,475 | 5 | 40 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Attachment 3

FY 2019/20 Audit Requests

- Outside support groups
- Fiber to the premises
- Water treatment plant remediation
- Real estate management in light of past issues
- Citywide Fleet Review
 - a. Servicing of vehicles
 - b. Take home vehicles
 - c. Gas policy
 - d. Funding (charges versus actual replacement costs, cash balance of fund is steadily building)
 - e. Number of vehicles / mileage. More pool vehicles?
 - f. Leasing versus buying
- Setting citywide standards for:
 - Appropriate use of public funds/purchases by departments
 - Including events, trainings, team building, meals, shirts, items with City logo, etc.
- Review of recruitment process from start to finish
 - Considering automation, electronic personnel actions, best practices, identify bottlenecks and ways to speed up the process
- Review of citywide risk management
 - Assess current process and movement toward centralizing the vendor insurance verification function
- Grants Management
 - Very decentralized process currently.
- Look at what we could do to improve the Billing process for the Community Risk Reduction (old Fire Prevention Bureau) fire inspections.
- How can we improve the Special Event process citywide?
- Review/consideration of centralized invoicing
- Review/consideration of centralized billing

Attachment 3

- A few years ago, there was interest expressed by the Council for auditing the newspapers (Weekly/Courier) and this is being proposed as an item for review.
- Review of entire procurement process and length of time it takes from vendor quotes/selection, through agreements/reviews/signatures, obtaining insurance and review, through requisition entry/approval and purchase order creation. This is a lengthy process and would be worth breaking down to see if there are opportunities for improvement and to determine bottlenecks and causes for delay.
 1. Opportunities for electronic automation of contract processing.
 2. Consider centralized purchasing with centralized buyers citywide.
 3. Review of blanket purchase order process.
- Review of agreements with CVB, RDC, Chamber regarding funding activities and municipal code compliance.
- Review of Friends of groups to determine agreements and terms needed moving forward.
- Review JPA with school district.
- Review of fiscal policies (Finance Department).
- Review of farmer's market cash collections.
- The JPA - and what the schools are really doing with the money. And alternatives - how to give to the school to obtain better value from the \$10+ mill we give them annually (e.g., specific budget? Performance goals?). And what controls are appropriate on how/what they spending on.
- I believe the City has an MOU with the CVB that required us to allocate a fixed portion of the TOT to them. Look at what value the City is receiving from this support of the CVB and the Chamber. What controls are appropriate on the spending, if any?

Public Safety Overtime

- For example, what limitations are appropriate on overtime? Could/should lower salaried safety people be mandated to perform for some of the overtime? Should we have a policy to that effect - lowest salaried person gets overtime (e.g., except if a senior officer is needed for the assignment)?
- I have heard anecdotally that if an officer/fireman wants to 'switch shifts' (e.g., to have a longer time off, or to take off for family occasions), often the person taking over does so on overtime, not regular time - which would not have been the case if there was no 'shift shifting.'

Attachment 3

- Minor point, but when we provide safety personnel to events (*e.g.*, Golden Globes), we charge the event for the time. But are we picking up the overtime? I know we pick up pension, but pensions are substantially underfunded - so the 'charge' should probably be double what we charge.
- Another component to look at with the fire overtime is the mutual aid we provide for fighting wildfires throughout the State. We should see that impact on fire OT and how and when we are reimbursed for that.
- Comparative Pay Study—Private vs. Public salaries