

# PIERCE COUNTY AUDIT - AUGUST 2005

## REPORT BY ZUCKER SYSTEMS

### A. OVERVIEW

This report is based on a review of the August 1, 2005 Fast Forward report, the June 2005 Fast Forward Report, Establishing Project Managers draft policy, the Response to Zucker Monthly Reports and the draft policy for Project Managers.

### B. AUGUST 1, 2005 FAST FORWARD REPORT

#### 1. Building Division

It would be helpful to include a line on the charts showing the number of applications received by each date. The same is true for the other charts.

Reassigning the extra hire plans examiner to commercial reviews appears to be a good direction.

#### 2. Current Planning

Is the intent to have Parametrix handle the entire cases they are assigned?

#### 3. Development Engineering

Staff turnover can be a problem. It should be monitored to make certain the County does all it can to reduce staff turnover.

#### 4. Resource Management

Good progress is being made. Have alternative ways to handle insurance requirements been explored?

#### 5. Development Center

This report continues to use averages which we have commented on before. We are currently working for the City of Los Angeles and I will fax the kind of counter report they are using for planning. Note that in LA Planning Express Cases have 93% served in less than 30 minutes and 87% of Planning Case Filing in less than 87 minutes. Also I will fax the LA Building and Safety statistics showing 80% of walk in customers served within 15 minutes and 95% within 30 minutes. LA counter plan check times average 13 minutes wait. This section of the Fast Forward Report needs to be revised.

### C. JUNE 2005 FAST FORWARD, TWO PAGES

1. As shown on the front page, counter wait times continue to be a problem.
2. The Directors comments on the counter wait time issue is helpful. There are other things that can be done as follows:

- a. The audit suggested a new strategy for the counter but it appears that this is not being pursued.
- b. The indication that all customers want to know their applications are complete when they leave the counter does not match the customer input we received during the audit. There are other ways to handle this issue. One way would be to simply grandfather all permits at application without the completeness finding or make the finding within 30 days of submittal. Unless there is a major ordinance change pending, this can be a moot point in any case.
- c. The current system creates a certain duplication of staff work as outlined in the audit.
- d. We are pleased to see that the report indicates that the counter is now a high priority, but much more needs to be done.
- e. During my last presentation to the Audit Committee there was some discussion about moving ahead with two more counter positions. What happened to this idea?

## **D. RESPONSE TO ZUCKER MONTHLY REPORTS**

### **Advance Planning**

We continue to feel that staff should ask Council to delay a few advance planning projects, perhaps freeing one or two planners for three or four months.

### **Current Planning**

PALS should indicate their intent to review timeline performance standards in 2006.

### **Building Division**

PALS should indicate their intent to review timeline performance standards in 2006.

### **Development Center**

We continue to feel that more priority should be given to solving the counter issues.

### **PALS**

Reports should be sent to Zucker Systems at the same time they are sent to the oversight committee, as well as after committee approval.

What is the status of reducing the number of T&M categories and enforcing daily reporting for accuracy?

Reports on Public Works timelines have not yet been sent to Zucker Systems.

**E. DRAFT POLICY – ESTABLISHING PROJECT MANAGERS**

This draft policy is a good start on the concept. We do suggest that the Scope of Duties be expanded more in line with the audit. Of particular importance is the Project Manager having the responsibility to work on any conflicts between functions.