TO: HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL

ATTENTION: FINANCE COMMITTEE

FROM: CITY MANAGER DEPARTMENT: PUBLIC WORKS

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2007 CMR:150:07

SUBJECT: TRANSMITTAL OF THE STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS (STREET MAINTENANCE AUDIT CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 7, 2006)

This is an informational report and no Council action is required.

BACKGROUND
At the November 7, 2006 Finance Committee meeting several questions were raised regarding the status of the Street Maintenance Audit (See Attachment A). This report presents staff’s response to the questions.

DISCUSSION
A number of street audit recommendations were in process and have now been completed. Staff’s answers to the questions raised are noted below:

1) Are 100 percent of all permits being issued by the Director, per recommendation number 7 on page 62?
   No, the Director does not issue permits for utility street cuts but is instead notified of every utility cut performed through a quarterly report. Staff has significantly improved coordination by developing a street work tracking system that integrates data from street work permits and utility work orders. This tracks all emergency and private development-related street cuts in the public right-of-way and provides a description and reason for the street cut performed. Utility and Public Works staff coordinate street paving and utility work by meeting monthly and using the City’s Graphical Information System (GIS) to view all projects within the next 5 years.

2) Is the Director being noticed or getting justification of emergency street cuts on the next day?
   The Utility Department tracks emergency cuts on a daily basis and submits a quarterly report of these cuts to Public Works for review. The Utilities Department with Information Technology Support, has implemented a street work tracking system for emergency street cuts which tracks work orders in SAP and identifies emergency street cut information on a regular basis. Staff believes the most efficient way to
administer tracking of emergency street cuts is on a quarterly basis. Please refer to Attachment B, staff comments to audit recommendation number 7, page 62.

3) Are quarterly reports being generated on these emergency cuts?
   Yes, quarterly reports on emergency cuts are being submitted to the Public Works Director and staff.

4) What has the Director done with the emergency cut reports?
   The Assistant Public Works Director uses the reports to ensure routine utility maintenance work is not being categorized as emergency work thereby avoiding coordination with Public Works. Routine utility maintenance is coordinated to the extent possible with the City’s capital improvement projects and discussed during the monthly coordination meetings.

5) Has the Director validated the cuts are caused by emergencies?
   Yes, the Assistant Public Works Director receives and validates the quarterly reports.

6) How many emergency cuts have there been?
   There were 21 emergency cuts from July to November 2006 as identified in the quarterly report for this period.

7) Is the City looking/accessing GIS to see if permits are being issued?
   Utility work orders from SAP and street work permits are now linked to GIS. The City displays current work orders entered in SAP and open street work permits issued in the Accela database. This information can be refreshed as often as is required from these data sources. This integration accomplishes the GIS-related recommendations and will support improved coordination of all projects impacting city streets.

8) What is the status of comparing the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Street Saver with the City’s Pavement Maintenance Management System (PMMS)?
   The City received grant funding to compare MTC’s Street Saver program with the City’s PMMS. This comparison will include a street condition survey developed by MTC, comparing the MTC system’s pavement condition scores with the City’s PMMS. In addition, the project will do a pilot study analyzing various budget scenarios addressing street maintenance backlog. Staff anticipates entering into a consultant contract this spring to assist staff in the comparison of the City’s pavement network with other agencies within the Bay Area.

9) Is there a reluctance to convert to MTC’s Street Saver and if so why?
   Yes. The City has integrated the PMMS into the City’s GIS which allows staff to access pavement data on any view displayed. This improves project coordination and tracking of street cut fees. By comparison, MTC’s Street Saver is proprietary and has only limited GIS integration capabilities which can not be modified. However, based on a scoping meeting between staff and MTC consultants, it was determined that the best features of both systems can be incorporated by normalizing the PMMS and Street Saver data.
outputs. In this manner, the City’s street conditions can be directly compared to others in the Bay Area and none of the City’s advanced PMMS-GIS integration will be lost.

10) When will the standard specifications be completed?
   The City’s updated standard drawings and specifications have been approved by all City departments and will become available to the public in Spring 2007.

11) What is the process for implementing the standard specifications?
   In accordance with the City Resolution 7161, the City Engineer can make revisions, changes or modifications to the standard drawings and specifications as deemed necessary. Staff will prepare an informational report to Council this spring summarizing revisions incorporated into the new specifications.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Excerpt of Finance Committee meeting notes dated November 7, 2006
Attachment B: Excerpt of the Report on the Status of Audit Recommendations (Issued 11/7/06) pages 60 to 68"
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