

GOVERNMENT & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Final Reports - Introduction

The 2001/2002 El Dorado County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) issued a dated Final Report on January 23, 2002, recommending that the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors ("Board") strengthen the powers, duties and authorities of the position of the Chief Administrative Officer of the County of El Dorado (County).

In that Report, the Grand Jury noted that:

- It had observed a widespread lack of accountability in connection with the performance of the duties required of county employees.
- Some department heads, division heads and supervisors were attentive to the problem, while others were not.
- Lack of accountability for non-performance has a negative effect upon county efficiency.
- Many employees performed "above and beyond" the requirements of their positions.
- Outstanding performance was often unrecognized and uncompensated, although it was of substantial benefit to the County.
- Employees who do not meet performance standards cause considerable expense to the County.

The Grand Jury promised that it would continue to investigate and inquire into issues of accountability (and/or lack thereof) within county government, and that it would disseminate a more comprehensive Final Report on the subject at the end of its term.

This is the Government & Administration Committee's portion of that Report. It is divided into three separate segments, each of which is presented by a separate subcommittee of the Committee, as follows:

- Subcommittee on the Department of General Services;
- Subcommittee on Personnel; and
- Subcommittee on Government Structure.

The Subcommittee on Government Structure is presenting two separate reports. One is preliminary and addresses the way directives of the Board of Supervisors are (or are not) communicated to affected departments, employees and to the public. The other follows up on the Board's responses (or lack of response) to four "dated final reports" issued by the Grand Jury during the course of its term.

Scope of the Investigation

Members of the Grand Jury reviewed:

- The County's Charter (Charter);
- The County's Ordinance Code (Ordinance Code);
- Various Board Resolutions, specifically including (but not limited to) the Compensation Administration Resolution (No. 227-84), the Personnel Management Resolution (No. 228-84), the Employer-Employee Relations Resolution (No. 10-83) as amended (No. 112-86), and others;
- Agendas, agenda packets and conformed agendas (minutes) of various meetings of the Board;
- The Board's manual of policies and procedures;
- Various departmental manuals of policies and procedures;
- Numerous internal memoranda, both intra- and inter-departmental in nature;
- The County's Personnel Policy No. 3, Management Evaluation Program, adopted February 2, 1988 and revised December 1, 1989;
- Job descriptions for various positions within the County;
- The County's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the General, Professional, and Supervisory Bargaining Units of Public Employees Local Union No. 1 (Local No. 1), for the period from July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2003;
- The County's MOU with the Trades & Crafts Bargaining Unit of Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3 (Local #3, Trades & Crafts), for the period from November 21, 2000 through September 30, 2003;
- The County's MOU with the Probation Bargaining Unit of Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3 (Local #3, Probation), for the period from July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2004, plus the Letter of Understanding amendment thereto dated September 19, 1999, plus a further amendment thereto dated November 2000;
- The County's MOU with the Corrections Bargaining Unit of Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3 (Local #3, Corrections), for the period from January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2004;
- The County's MOU with the Deputy Sheriffs' Association Law Enforcement Unit (DSA, Law Enforcement), for the period from December 20, 2000 through December 31, 2007;
- The County's MOU with the DSA, Correctional Unit (DSA, Correctional), for the period from December 20, 2000 through December 31, 2007;
- The County's Salary and Benefits Resolution for Unrepresented Employees, as amended by Resolution 261-2000 on December 12, 2000;
- The 00/01 Grand Jury's Report on Employee Evaluations, and the Board's Response thereto;
- The County's 2001-2002 Proposed Budget and Workplan (Budget/Workplan);

- The 2001-2002 Budget for the County;
- The Board's Responses to the 01/02 Grand Jury's dated Final Reports of October 4, 2001, January 16, 2002 and January 23, 2002;
- The Sheriff's Response to the 01/02 Grand Jury's dated Final Report of October 10, 2001;
- The County's Purchasing Ordinance;
- The Reports of the Harvey M. Rose Accountancy Corporation, the Grand Jury's Consultant, on its reviews of the Child Protective Services division of the Department of Social Services and of the County's Budget Process; and
- Various redacted personnel files.

Members of the Committee and its subcommittees, and other members of the Grand Jury, interviewed numerous current and former county employees, including the Interim Chief Administrative Officer, the County Counsel, the Director and two former Assistant Directors of the Department of Human Resources, various other department heads, division heads, managers, supervisors, and clerical and field workers. They also interviewed several officers, directors, responsible employees and other members of Local No. 1 and of the DSA. Some of the most revealing information that the Grand Jury was able to obtain came from rank-and-file employees of the County.

Members of the Grand Jury also attended numerous regular meetings of the Board, and several Board "workshops," several countywide training sessions, and reviewed various newspaper articles pertaining to the issue of accountability.