

Performance Audit

**PITTSBURGH MAYOR'S OFFICE**

Report by the  
Office of City Controller

**MICHAEL E. LAMB**  
**CITY CONTROLLER**

Douglas W. Anderson, Deputy Controller

Anabell Kinney, Management Auditor

Gloria Novak, Assistant Management Auditor

Ron Ieraci, Research Assistant

September 2009

September 16, 2009

To the Honorables: Mayor Luke Ravenstahl and  
Members of Pittsburgh City Council:

The Office of City Controller is pleased to present this Performance Audit of Department of the Mayor's Office, conducted pursuant to the Controller's powers under Section 404(c) of the Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the City of Pittsburgh and is elected every four years. The powers and duties of the Mayor are defined in the Home Rule Charter (HRC), Article 2, and in Title One, Article III, Chapter 113 of the Pittsburgh Code (PC). This audit assesses Mayoral Board, Authority and Commissions appointment compliance, the Mayor's 311 Response Line and PittMAPS, grant revenue from intergovernmental and non-governmental sources and intergovernmental cooperation in budget years 2007 and 2008.

## **Findings and Recommendations**

### Board, Authority and Commission (BAC) Appointments

There are three basic categories of BAC appointments: authorities and intergovernmental units, City-legislated units that do not require City Council approval of mayoral appointees and City-legislated units that do require City Council approval of mayoral appointees.

**Finding:** As of December 31, 2008, there was one intergovernmental board vacancy (Southwest Pennsylvania Commission) and one Pittsburgh Parking Authority board vacancy, neither one requiring City Council approval.

**Recommendation:** The Mayor's Office should fill its intergovernmental vacancies in a timely manner (within 60 days) and present the appointments to City Council by informing resolutions, even if the designees serve at the Mayor's pleasure. This would clarify the board member's status as a matter of public record.

**Finding:** Courts have held that where Home Rule Charter provisions conflict with the applicable State statute, the governing statute prevails. Local legislation cannot amend or supersede state law.

**Finding:** Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter sections referring to authority appointments that conflict with the applicable State statute are unenforceable.

**Finding:** The appointees that serve at the Mayor's pleasure are presumed to hold their post until resignation or removal by the Mayor.

**Recommendation:** The Mayor's Office should reappoint or replace Board and Commission members that serve at the Mayor's pleasure in a timely fashion (within 60 days) at the end of their term or when a vacancy occurs, and notify City Council of the action with an informing resolution as a matter of public record.

**Finding:** For board appointees requiring City Council affirmation, six (6) vacancies exist, fifteen (15) members are serving although their terms are expired (nine from the EORC), and two (2) appointees haven't been approved by City Council resolution.

**Recommendation:** The Mayor's Office should reappoint or replace Board and Commission members that require City Council's approval within sixty days after the end of their term or when a vacancy occurs.

**Finding:** The appointments that are enabled solely by City Code, required to have City Council approval, and have set term limits without "serve until a successor is seated" qualifier should be considered lapsed sixty-one days after the vacancy occurs if an appointment is not forwarded by the Mayor's Office to City Council.

**Recommendation:** In accordance with HRC Article 2, Section 222, the Mayor's Office should fill BAC vacancies that require City Council approval and have no "successor" clause for lapsed members within sixty days. If it does not, the vacancies could potentially be filled by nominees presented and approved by City Council.

**Finding:** Of the three commissions that have a formal process to appoint departmental designees, the CPC has three of six City spots vacant, and the HRC has one of two City positions vacant (filled by an ex-employee). The STC is fully staffed; its City representatives' terms ended December 31, 2008.

**Recommendation:** For the sake of continuity, the Mayor and City Council may wish to explore designating the City staff appointees by job title and making their appointments ex-officio rather than requiring a formal nomination and approval process.

**Finding:** The City website has the Board list linked on the home page under "Boards and Commissions." The link will lead the visitor to most of the information required under

Ordinance #35-2005, including an application form that can be completed and submitted online. The Mayor's staff keeps a statistical breakdown of the applicants.

### Mayor's 311 Response Line

The Mayor's 311 Response Line formally began on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2006. Its purpose is to serve as a one-call clearing house for all non-emergency calls requesting City services, making non-criminal complaints, or seeking information. The Response Line accepts e-mail and internet submissions, letters, and walk-in requests and is automated during non-working hours with a voice mail system

**Finding:** The Pittsburgh 311 Response Center generates many more service requests than comparable cities. Other municipal 311 call centers are more heavily utilized as information centers.

**Finding:** The 311 Response Center appears to be meeting the national benchmark of 1-2% missing/lost calls. Statistics for three months in 2007 were captured from a prior vendor, and indicated that 1% of the calls were actually lost (hang-ups as opposed to transfer to voice mail).

**Finding:** CIS could not provide the number of voice-mails and web-based (e-mail and form) submissions 311 received during the audit period; those figures are kept by the e-mail manager, a vendor.

**Recommendation:** The 311 Response Center and CIS should record the number of calls received, calls answered, voice mails, e-mails, and web submissions so the performance of the 311 Response Center can be accurately measured.

**Finding:** New 311 representatives are not provided with formal training or a manual of 311 procedures and policies, and there is no regular continuous education in place.

**Recommendation:** CIS and the 311 Coordinator should prepare a training and reference manual for the 311 representatives, and budget for periodic off-time training sessions for the staff members to update their skills.

**Finding:** If all non-emergency requests were directed to it, the 311 Response Center would be the City's primary non-emergency contact source and data provided to PittMAPS would be more powerful as a management and customer relations tool.

**Recommendation:** The City should direct all non-emergency service and informational calls to the 311 Response Center and promote and brand it as the City's one-stop request center.

**Finding:** It took 311 responders an average of nine seconds to pick up a call. This is well within national norms. The accepted benchmark is to respond to the majority of calls within twenty-to-thirty seconds

**Finding:** More consistency is required for Pittsburgh to meet national phone time standards. The length of time spent on the phone, gathering and entering information, was somewhat erratic, ranging from over four minutes/call in June to one minute/call in November with an average 2:30 minutes/call for all of 2008.

**Recommendation:** The Coordinator should continue to monitor the length of calls to ensure that service request processing remains within a ninety-second window.

**Finding:** The 311 Coordinator is sometimes required to assist the staff in entering the e-mail and other service requests. Because of backlogs, there are a high amount number of calls that are handled by voice mail rather than a representative

**Recommendation:** To capture as many original calls as possible, reduce the response time for voice mails generated by unanswered calls, and handle e-mail and web submissions requests, the Mayor should consider adding additional staff in accordance with need and budgetary constraints.

**Finding:** Web submissions for the City 311 site ask for name, address, neighborhood, and request. Other cities have designed pages that are both more user-friendly and easier to process for the staff. For example, Minneapolis and Fort Wayne both provide forms by service categories, while Knoxville provides a drop-down menu of common service requests.

**Recommendation:** CIS should design a web page submission form that can be fully completed by a citizen and submitted directly to the appropriate department by 311 representatives. This would considerably reduce the staff workload.

**Finding:** The 311 Response Line already contacts several outside agencies, such as the Water and Sewer Authority, City Source, Duquesne Light, and the Animal Rescue with service requests. The Response Line has the capability to expand services to include the County and other related municipalities, Authorities, and service agencies.

**Recommendation:** The City should explore expanding its 311 Response Line to represent additional municipal clients for a fee structure to be determined.

## Pittsburgh Management And Performance System (PittMAPS)

PittMAPS is a data collection and distribution system that provides City management with statistical information to measure departmental performance and determine response time to service requests. It replaced the CitiStats system.

**Finding:** PittMAPS is a useful management tool. It disburses departmental work data to both street-level supervisors and the Mayor's Office, and quarterly reports are prepared to satisfy Act 47 requirements. PittMAPS also provides an easily accessible, web-based platform for the public to examine City service performance.

**Finding:** In its current state, PittMAPS is limited in what it can provide until the City upgrades to a new software system. PittMAPS should then be fully integrated to both collect and disseminate data for the use of City managers and the public.

**Finding:** According to the Project Manager, PittMAPS does not collect data from all City departments.

**Recommendation:** PittMAPS should have a basic data template for every City department, office, and bureau included on its system.

**Finding:** PittMAPS list the collected data from the prior fiscal quarter on the City website, as per Act 47 requirements. However, one cannot review any prior year data to form a comparative basis of performance.

**Recommendation:** PittMAPS should provide an on-line archive of year-ending performance results.

## City Revenues From Grants

HRC Section 204 (i) (2) states that the Mayor should be "aggressively seeking funds for city programs from federal, state, and county sources." The Controller's Office identified \$23,120,739 in grant funds actually received by the City in 2008.

**Finding:** Grant procurement is not centralized, but left to the separate departments.

**Finding:** A material portion of the City budget is drawn from sources outside its own tax and fee revenue streams. Upgrades to programs or equipment often are dependent on drawing financial support from a dedicated grant fund.

**Finding:** There is no formal tracking system for grant awards. Without a verifiable audit trail of key due dates, expenditures, reimbursements, and deposits, it is very difficult to provide proper controls for the grant process. This is especially true of a decentralized system as used by the City.

**Recommendation:** The Mayor's Office should develop a system to track individual grant progress from paperwork submission through grant award and disbursement, either in-house through CIS or by purchasing an appropriate software package.

**Finding:** The Mayor's Office did not fill vacant Grant Procurement and Compliance staff positions during the audit period.

**Recommendation:** The City should fill the vacant position of Grants Specialist to assist in its efforts.

### Intergovernmental Cooperation

The HRC states in Chapter 2, Section 204(i) that "The mayor shall have the following additional powers and duties...to promote intergovernmental relations generally and specifically by initiating as well as cooperating in working relationships with other governments, public and quasi-public agencies for the promotion of public services, economic development and cultural activities of mutual benefit to all concerned..."

The 2009 Act 47 intergovernmental recommendations lists only ten remaining objectives. Five are carry-over provisions from 2004. They include resolving differences in the City and County procurement codes, regionalizing City and County parks, sharing security costs for the City-County building, transferring pet licensing to the County, and entering an agility agreement with the County.

**Finding:** The unresolved recommendations from the original Act 47 Plan concern cooperative projects with Allegheny County. There are several working committees currently meeting on these issues. The City has also coordinated efforts with the School District and various authorities in projects like pooled purchasing.

**Recommendation:** The City and County should continue to take the lead in exploring more ways to share or functionally consolidate services that reduce costs and improve efficiency, and to include as many government entities as possible.

Community Development Block Grant Unspecified Local Option (ULO) Allocations

The Mayor distributes \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Unspecified Local Option (ULO) funding to local agencies and groups each budget year.

**Finding:** In a 2008 audit of City Council that included ULO spending, it was found that often the amount awarded was less than the City's expense to process the contract and monitor the project. Using rough calculations, the Controller's auditors recommended that no ULO awards be made that were under \$2,500 to provide a measure of cost-effectiveness to the process.

Consequently, it was determined that a floor of \$5,000 would provide a more cost effective minimum for CDBG grants. In 2007, the Mayor's Office awarded four contracts that were valued under \$5,000; in 2008, that number rose to six. Ten contracts, 9.6% of the 104 ULO awards granted during the audit period, were under \$5,000.

**Recommendation:** The Mayor's Office should set a minimum of \$5,000 for its CDBG-ULO grants (as should City Council).

Sincerely,

Michael E. Lamb  
City Controller

## INTRODUCTION

This performance audit of the Mayor's Office was conducted pursuant to section 404(c) of the Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter.

## OVERVIEW

The Mayor is the chief executive officer of the City of Pittsburgh and is elected every four years. The powers and duties of the Mayor are defined in the Home Rule Charter (HRC), Article 2, and in Title One, Article III, Chapter 113 of the Pittsburgh Code (PC). The primary duties of the Mayor's Office as defined in the HRC are:

- To provide leadership for the City;
- To execute and enforce the provisions of this charter, the ordinances and resolutions of the City and the laws of the Commonwealth;
- To inform council at least once a year concerning the finances and general conditions of the City;
- To provide council with information concerning the administration and conditions of the City as requested;
- To submit proposed legislation to any member of council for introduction;
- To make long and short range plans for the improvement of the economic, physical and social condition of the City and its neighborhoods;
- To supervise all city employees and officers except as otherwise provided by this charter;
- To promote intergovernmental relations generally and specifically by:
  - Initiating as well as cooperating in working relationships with other governments, public and quasi-public agencies for the promotion of public services, economic development and cultural activities of mutual benefit;
  - Aggressively seeking funds for city programs from federal, state and county sources;
- To ensure that each unit of government operates in a manner which provides every citizen full access to government and a like opportunity to render goods and services to the City; and
- To perform other duties and exercise other powers as stated in the charter or assigned by law, ordinance or resolution.
- The mayor delivers a state of the city message each year in public. The state of the city message may be delivered at the same time as the mayor's budget proposal to council or within three months thereafter.
- The operating and capital budgets are prepared by the mayor. The mayor will conduct public hearings to obtain the advice of other officials and citizens as part of the preparation of both budgets. The mayor shall, at least ten days in advance of public hearings, provide notice of the time and place of the hearings by publication in a newspaper circulated generally in the City. On the second Monday of the eleventh month of each fiscal year, the mayor will present both proposed budgets to council with a message explaining them. Council will adopt

- Council submits all proposed legislation to the mayor for approval prior to its effective date. The mayor must sign the legislation within ten days if approved. If not, the mayor returns it to council, stating objections. Council, at its next meeting, reconsiders any legislation disapproved by the mayor and may pass it in spite of the mayor's disapproval by a two-thirds vote of all the members. If the mayor fails to sign the legislation, it becomes law as of its effective date, ten days after submission to the mayor. The mayor may disapprove any item in the operating budget or capital budget, subject to reconsideration by council in the same manner as other legislation.
- The mayor appoints the heads of all major administrative units (directors) subject to approval of council. All directors hold office during the term for which the mayor is elected until removed and until their successors are appointed. If the mayor removes a director, the removal isn't effective until the mayor transmits reasons to council in writing.
- The mayor appoints the members of all boards, authorities, and commissions, subject to approval of council. The mayor may remove any member of a board or commission at will. A removal isn't effective until the mayor transmits reasons to council in writing.

### **MAYORAL STAFF POSITIONS**

The Mayor's Office was comprised of the following positions in 2008: Mayor, Mayor's Special Assistant, Mayor's Senior Administrator, Mayor's Senior Secretary, Chief of Staff, Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Operations, Operations Secretary, Manager of Communications, Policy Manager, Director of Public Affairs, Press Secretary, Assistant Press Secretary, Economic Development Coordinator, Secretary, Clerk/Typist 2, and interns as needed. The staff consisted of 16 full-time positions budgeted for \$990,760.

The staff had undergone some reorganization and consolidation of titles from 2007's budget, with a net loss of two job positions and a reduction in payroll of \$43,827.

During the audit period the Mayor's 311 Response Line personnel and the PittMAPS Project Manager were budgeted under the Department of Finance. The Youth Policy Coordinator and Secretary were included under Department of Public Safety (Bureau of Administration) budget. The Director, Coordinator, and Secretary of Neighborhood Initiatives, along with the Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator of Weed and Seed, were budgeted in the Department of City Planning.

The sections and positions mentioned in the preceding paragraph were considered by the auditors to be under the functional direction of the Mayor's Office.

## **OBJECTIVES**

1. To assess legal compliance with the Mayor's Board, Authority, and Commission appointment process.
2. To assess the resources available to the Mayor's 311 Response Line, the volume of cases it processes and resolution rate, and its interaction with PittMAPS and other City departments.
3. To assess the Pittsburgh Management And Performance System (PittMAPS) process and effectiveness as a management tool.
4. To assess the Mayor's CDBG Unspecified Local Option grant process.
5. To assess the amount of grant revenues attracted to the City through intergovernmental and non-governmental sources and the procedures used to obtain such grants.
6. To assess intergovernmental cooperation between the City and other municipal entities.
7. To make recommendations for improvement.

## **SCOPE**

The audit scope for examining the Mayor's Office covers the budget years of 2007-2008. The auditors examined and evaluated its programs for effectiveness, reasonableness, and timeliness, and examined and evaluated compliance with the provisions of applicable statutes, the City Code, and the Home Rule Charter by the Mayor's Office.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The auditors had an initial meeting with the Chief of Staff and the Assistant Finance Director to discuss the audit process and the tentative scope of the audit.

The auditors analyzed information gathered from the City of Pittsburgh's website, the City Code, the Home Rule Charter, the Act 47 Recovery Act, the City Budget documents of 2007-08, the City Controller's Trial Balance Reports of 2007-08, statistical reviews of the Mayor's 311 Response Line and PittMAPS, and ULO awards.

The auditors also examined other cities 311 performance and budgetary measures to compile a list of "best practices" benchmarks for the City's 311 operation.

The auditors performed testing of a random sampling of ULO invoices for accuracy and control.

Interviews were taken with the Assistant Finance Director (who was the auditors' point of contact person), the 311 Mayor's Action Line Coordinator, the PittMAPS Project Manager (who provided the auditors with a presentation), the Manager of Policy, an Assistant Solicitor, the Grant Officer, the Director of Neighborhood Initiatives, and the Director of City Planning.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Board, Authority, and Commission Appointments

The Mayor was responsible for appointing 269 members and directors to 43 different authorities, boards, commissions, and task forces (BAC), selected nine other members from City Council nominations, and sat ex-officio as a chair or member of nine other boards during the audit period.

Four BACs are inactive – the Budget, Revenue, and Assets Commission, the City Camera Review Committee, the Commission on Naming Public Properties, and the Economic Development Commission.

Table 1 - BAC Mayoral Appointees on page 12 provides a list of the organizations the Mayor appoints members to or sits on, the number of members the Mayor appoints to each, whether the appointees require City Council approval, and the number of sixty-day or longer vacancies found during the audit period.

There are three basic categories of BAC appointments: authorities and intergovernmental units, City-legislated units that do not require City Council approval of mayoral appointees, and City-legislated units that do require City Council approval of mayoral appointees.

Council notification of Mayoral appointments that do not require Council approval are made by an Appointment Informing Resolution, a non-voting resolution used to formally notify City Council of the Mayor's appointment. Appointments requiring Council approval are voted on through regular City resolution process.

### Authority and Intergovernmental Board and Commission Appointments

Authorities are independent agencies of the Commonwealth that are organized for limited purposes. Authorities provide services to single or joint municipalities. The most commonly used enabling statute is the Municipal Authorities Act of 1945. Other authorities operate under more specific enabling statutes such as the Parking Authority Law of 1947.

Authority boards may consist of five members or any greater number set forth in the authority's articles of incorporation. Authority appointment powers are set forth in the applicable statute.

Intergovernmental boards and commissions are organized to serve multiple municipalities. Appointment powers to boards and commissions are set forth in the organization by-laws or articles of incorporation.

None of the appointment processes specify a formal notification procedure or an exact replacement time for vacancies. However, most enabling statutes and by-laws suggest that a 60-day window to fill a board vacancy is appropriate.

The status of Mayoral authority and intergovernmental board appointees as of December 31, 2008, was:

- Allegheny County Sanitary Authority (3 seats/CC approval): Filled.
- Allegheny League of Municipalities (3 seats/at-will): Filled.
- Allegheny Regional Asset District (2 seats/at-will): Filled.
- Carnegie Library (5 seats/at-will): Filled.
- City/County Disability Task Force (6 seats/at-will): Filled.
- Equipment Leasing Authority (3 seats/at-will): Filled.
- Housing Authority, City of Pittsburgh (7 seats, 2/at-will, 3 /CC approval): Filled.
- Pittsburgh/Allegheny County Thermal (1 seat/at-will): Filled.
- Pittsburgh Parking Authority (5 seats/at-will): There is one (1) vacancy.
- Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Authority (7 seats/CC approval): Filled.
- Southwest Pennsylvania Commission (3 seats/at-will): There is one (1) vacancy.
- Sports & Exhibition Authority (3 seats/1 at-will, 2- CC approval?): Filled.
- Stadium Authority (5 seats/at-will): Filled. It took one year to replace the Council Member on the Stadium Authority board.
- Urban Redevelopment Authority (5 seats/at-will): Filled.
- Vacant Property Review Board (2 seats/at-will): URA?

Municipal Authorities Act Board members appointed at the Mayor's pleasure are assumed to continue in their board position, even if the original term date has lapsed, until specifically removed by the Mayor; other authorities contain a successor clause that holds members in place until a successor is appointed.

**Finding:** During the audit period, all mayoral authority and intergovernmental board appointments that required City Council approval received it.

**Finding:** As of December 31, 2008, there was one intergovernmental board vacancy (Southwest Pennsylvania Commission) and one Pittsburgh Parking Authority board vacancy, neither one requiring City Council approval

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 1:**

The Mayor's Office should fill its intergovernmental vacancies in a timely manner (within 60 days) and present the appointments to City Council by informing resolutions, even if the designees serve at the Mayor's pleasure. This would clarify the board member's status as a matter of public record.

## City Home Rule Charter and State Statute Conflicts

Section 2, Articles 219, 220, and 221, and in part, Article 222 of the Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter (HRC) place legal parameters on the Mayor's authority appointments. These include Council approval of all selections, a "one-authority-board-per-member" limitation, written notice of removal, and Council appointment powers.

Neither State law nor authority by-laws place a limit on individual City Council member representation on authority boards, as the HRC does, or allow City Council a role in the selection of appointees, other than approval in some cases.

**Finding:** Courts have held that where Home Rule Charter provisions conflict with the applicable State statute, the governing statute prevails. Local legislation cannot amend or supersede state law.

**Finding:** Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter sections referring to authority appointments that conflict with the applicable State statute are unenforceable.

**Finding:** No member of Council was serving on two authority boards during 2007-08, although it should be noted that one Council Member holds two board positions as of July, 2009.

## Municipal Authorities Act Appointments

The Allegheny County Sanitary Authority (ALCOSAN), the Equipment Leasing Authority (ELA), and the Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Authority (PWSA) were organized under the Municipal Authorities Act of 1945 and have somewhat different appointment provisions. Section 5610(a) of the Act states that the appointment power is vested in "...the governing body of the municipality...". The Act provides no definition of "governing body."

There has been some debate as to whether that wording leaves the appointment power in the hands of the Mayor or City Council. There has been no judicial guidance for the phrase "governing body" for purposes of the Municipal Authorities Act.

The ELA Articles of Incorporation include an appointment process approved by City Council that calls for three mayoral and two council appointments. ALCOSAN, in Ordinance 37 of 1988, only specifies that its board include "...three members to be appointed by the City." The PWSA was enabled by Resolution 36 of 1984, and its' Articles of Incorporation did not change the Municipal Authorities Act appointment procedure.

**Finding:** ALCOSAN and the PWSA have had the board appointments made by the Mayor and approved by City Council as a matter of past practice, which would appear to satisfy the spirit of the law.

## City Board & Commission Appointments Made At The Mayor's Pleasure

The City has several Boards and Commissions enabled by local legislation. One group consists of members that serve at the Mayor's pleasure and do not require City Council approval to take their seat according to City Code. These appointments are presented to City Council through an Appointment Informing Resolution.

There are four boards that are solely enabled by City legislation that do not require City Council approval for board members appointed by the Mayor, and two other seats are held by the Mayor or his designee ex-officio, or "by right of office". The Mayor also serves ex-officio as a member of the Municipal Pension, Fire Pension, and Police Pension boards.

None of the appointments appear to have disqualifying flaws because of a lack of notification, as the members are assumed to serve at the Mayor's pleasure, and continue in their position until the Mayor chooses to replace them or they resign.

The status of the at-will Board and Commission Mayoral appointees as of December 31, 2008, is:

- Board of Standards & Appeals (5 members): Filled. Selected to serve for a limited term, the members hold their seats until a successor is selected to replace them and do not require City Council approval: Filled.
- Citizen's Police Review Board (3 seats by Mayor): Filled.
- Disruptive Properties Appeal Board – (3 seats): Filled.
- Personnel Appeals Board (1 designee): The Personnel Appeals Board has not met recently. The members are named by the Mayor, Controller, and City Council when the board is called upon for a hearing.
- Pittsburgh Cable Communications Advisory Board (2 seats): Filled.
- Task Force on Intergovernmental Cooperation (1 designee): Filled.

**Finding:** There are no vacancies. These appointees serve at the Mayor's pleasure, and are presumed to hold their post until resignation or removal by the Mayor.

### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 2:**

The Mayor's Office should reappoint or replace Board and Commission members that serve at the Mayor's pleasure in a timely fashion (within 60 days) at the end of their term or when a vacancy occurs, and notify City Council of the action with an informing resolution to both clarify the board member's status and as a matter of public record.

## City Board & Commission Appointments By The Mayor That Require City Council Approval

A second, larger group of City Board and Commission appointees consists of members who are appointed by the Mayor and require City Council approval before taking their seat, in accordance with the City Code.

The status of the Board and Commission Mayoral appointees that require City Council approval as of December 31, 2008, is:

- Art Commission (8 seats): One (1) vacancy for a sculptor.
- City Planning Commission (9 seats): One (1) member's term expired on 1/2/2008, and she is currently listed as serving on commission.
- City Public Safety Camera Review Committee (3 seats): Authorized by City Code Section 680.02; not yet set up for operation.
- Civil Service Commission (3 seats): Filled.
- Clean Pittsburgh Commission (15 seats): Three (3) spots are vacant. Members serve until a successor is named.
- Commission on Human Relations (15 seats): Filled.
- Comprehensive Municipal Pension Board (4 seats; amended to 2 by City Council Bill # 2008-0255): Filled.
- Equal Opportunity Review Commission (11 seats): Nine (9) members' terms have expired, and all are currently listed as serving on the commission.
- Ethics Hearing Board (2 seats): Filled.
- Historic Review Commission (7 seats): Filled.
- Propel Pittsburgh (25 seats): Filled. The Mayor chairs the group.
- Shade Tree Commission (15 seats): One (1) vacancy exists, two (2) members do not have resolutions of approval from City Council. City Council members are ex-officio members of the board.
- Water Exoneration Board (1 seat): One (1) vacancy exists.
- Youth Commission (15 seats): Three (3) members' terms expired 9/30/2008, and all are currently listed as serving on the commission.
- Youth Council (31 seats): Six (6) seats are vacant as of 2009.
- Zoning Board of Adjustment (3 seats): Two (2) members have terms that have expired, and both are listed as serving on the board.

**Finding:** Six (6) vacancies exist, fifteen (15) members are serving although their terms are expired (nine from the EORC), and two (2) appointees haven't been approved by City Council resolution.

### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 3:**

The Mayor's Office should reappoint or replace Board and Commission members that require City Council's approval within sixty days after the end of their term or when a vacancy occurs.

## Sixty Day Vacancy Window

HRC Section 222 states that “Should the Mayor fail to nominate a person to fill any vacancy, however created, on any authority, board or commission within sixty days after an office becomes vacant, Council may fill the vacancy unless prohibited by law.”

As noted in the HRC Commentaries, “...prolonged vacancies can be harmful...” and is the presumed reason that HRC Article 2, Section 222, allows for City Council to fill a City Board or Commission vacancy if the Mayor doesn’t act within 60 days of a vacancy, unless otherwise prohibited.

In the case of authorities and intergovernmental boards, the appointment process, as written in the various State Authority Acts and incorporation papers, generally gives the Mayor power to appoint board members without a specific time frame for replacement, or alternate appointment remedies.

Because State law supersedes Home Rule Charter provisions and other local law, boards that are enabled outside of the City Code appear to be exempt from the sixty-day timetable.

Most of the boards and commissions enabled by City Code also appear to be exempt from the sixty day timetable. The members either serve at the Mayor’s pleasure or the term length is indefinite, due to language that specifically preserves the members’ status quo until a successor is appointed, approved, and seated.

However, several boards and commissions (City Planning Commission, Comprehensive Municipal Pension Board, Economic Opportunity Review Commission, Propel Pittsburgh, Shade Tree Commission, Water Exoneration Board, Youth Commission, Youth Council, and Zoning Board of Adjustment) have a finite term, no “serve until a successor is seated” language, and require City Council approval.

If the Mayor doesn’t appoint a new board member within sixty days of the term’s expiration date, then that seat would become vacant, in accordance with the HRC.

**Finding:** The appointments that are enabled solely by City Code, required to have City Council approval, and have set term limits without “serve until a successor is seated” qualifier should be considered lapsed sixty-one days after the vacancy occurs if an appointment is not forwarded by the Mayor’s Office to City Council.

### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 4:**

In accordance with HRC Article 2, Section 222, the Mayor’s Office should fill BAC vacancies that require City Council approval and have no “successor” clause for lapsed members within sixty days. If it does not, the vacancies could potentially be filled by nominees presented and approved by City Council.

**Table 1 – Mayor’s BAC Appointments**

<b>Boards, Authorities, Commissions with Mayoral Appointees:</b>					
<i>BAC Category</i>	<i>Mayor Appoints</i>	<i>12/31/2008 Vacant</i>	<i>Enabling Law</i>	<i>Council OK</i>	<i>Term</i>
<b>Authorities:</b>					
All. Co. Sanitary (ALCOSAN)	3	0	Muni Auth Act	yes	5 years
Equipment Leasing (ELA)	3	0	Muni Auth Act	no	5 years
Housing (HACP)	7	0	Housing Law	5-yes	until successor
Parking (PPA)	5	1	Parking Auth Act	no	until successor
Sports & Exhibition (SEA)	3	0	S&E Auth Act	no	until successor
Stadium (1)	5	1	S&E Auth Act	no	until successor
Urban Redevelopment (URA)	5	0	URA Law	no	until successor
Water & Sewer (PWSA)	7	0	Muni Auth Act	yes	5 years
<b>Boards:</b>					
Board of Appeals	7	0	PC 1002.02 - B	no	at-will
Citizen's Police Review Board	3	0	PC 662.04	no	until successor
City Public Safety Camera Review Comm.	3	*	PC 680.02	yes	not cited
Comprehensive Municipal Pension Board (2)	3	0	PC 176.02, .03	yes	4 years
Disruptive Property Appeal Board	3	0	PC 670A.01	yes	at will
Ethics Hearing Board	2	0	PC 197.09	yes	until successor
Fire Pension Board	0	*	Fire Act	n/a	mayors term
Municipal Pension Board	0	*	Pension Act	n/a	mayors term
Personnel Appeals Board	1	0	PC 180.04c	no	same as mayor
Police Pension Board	0	*	Police Act	n/a	mayors term
Water Exoneration Board	1	1	PC 303.01	yes	2 years
Zoning Board of Adjustment	3	2 expired	PC 923.02.A	yes	3 years
<b>Commissions:</b>					
Art Commission	8	0	PC 175.01	yes	until successor
Budget, Revenue, Asset Commission	5	*	PC 172	yes	until successor
City Planning Commission	9	1 expired	PC 923.01.A	yes	6 years
Civil Service Commission	3	0	CSA 2-23432	yes	until successor
Clean Pittsburgh Commission	15	3	PC 179A.02	yes	until successor
Commission on Human Relations	15	0	HRC 216	yes	until successor
Commission on Naming Public Properties	10	*	PC 173.01	yes	until successor
Economic Development Commission	11	*	PC 177	yes	5 years
Equal Opportunity Review Commission	11	9 expired	PC 177A.03	yes	2 & 4 years
Historic Review Commission	7	0	PC 1101.07	yes	until successor
Propel Pittsburgh	26	1	PC 178B.01	yes	3 years
Shade Tree Commission	15	2 not approved	PC 487.04	yes	4 years
Southwest Pennsylvania Commission (1)	3	1	IGA	no	same as mayor
Youth Commission	15	3 expired	PC 178A	yes	4 years
Youth Council	31	6	PC 178.A.05-06	yes	1 year
<b>Others:</b>					
Allegheny League of Municipalities	3	0	All. Co. IGA	no	until successor
Allegheny Regional Asset District (RAD)	2	0	ARAD	no	until successor
Carnegie Library	5	0	1890 agreement	no	same as mayor
City-County Task Force on Disabilities	6	0	All. Co. IGA	no	same as mayor
Pgh-Allegheny Co. Thermal Heat	1	0	non-profit agree	no	3 years
Pgh. Cable Comm. Advisory Committee	2	0	PC 425.07	no	same as mayor
Vacant Property Review Committee	1	0	PC 104	no	not cited
Intergovernmental Cooperation Task Force	1	0	Res 2008-0139	no	not cited
<b>Totals</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>14</b>			
(1) Vacancy filled in 2009					
(2) Board appointment procedure amended in April, 2008					

## City Department Designees

Some BAC appointments are legislatively mandated to be appointed from specifically designated City departments, to draw on the expertise of the staff. These boards and commissions are the Cable Advisory Board (CAB), Clean Pittsburgh Commission (CPC), Historic Review Commission (HRC), Shade Tree Commission (STC), and Water Exoneration Board (WEB).

Of these, the CAB and WEB City staff appointments are ex officio and need no formal appointment or approval. The other three, CPC, HRC, and the STC, designate the departments from which the representative designees are appointed by the Mayor and approved by City Council.

**Finding:** Of the three commissions that have a formal process to appoint departmental designees, the CPC has three of six City spots vacant, and the HRC has one of two City positions vacant (filled by an ex-employee). The STC is fully staffed; its City representatives' terms ended December 31, 2008.

### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 5:**

For the sake of continuity, the Mayor and City Council may wish to explore designating the City staff appointees by job title and making their appointments ex-officio by amendment rather than appointing them through a formal nomination and approval process.

### **Ordinance #35-2005 “Fair Representation”**

Ordinance #35 of 2005 expresses and makes enforceable the will of City Council to open the BAC appointment process so that potential appointees match the demographics of the City population. It requires the Mayor, through CIS, to set up a website that will:

- Supply a hyperlink to Ordinance #35-2005 and an application for BAC board consideration,
- Provide an alphabetic BAC list,
- Show the enabling legislation and governing documents,
- Give board member information – name, date of appointment and its expiration,
- Include a list of current vacancies and those coming vacant in the next 60 days.

The Ordinance also requires the Mayor's Office to build and keep a database of BAC appointees and applicants, providing the age, sex, and zip code of each individual. It allows for the collection of optional information regarding race, sexual orientation, and disabilities.

**Finding:** The City website (<http://www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us>) has the BAC list linked on the home page under “Boards and Commissions.” The link will lead the visitor to most of the information required under Ordinance #35-2005, including an application form that can be completed and submitted online.

**Finding:** The computer list of applicants who applied on-line for City BAC positions is kept by the Mayor’s staff. The database was started in 2006, with demographic breakdowns and current BAC board members included.

According to the Mayor’s BAC database, in 2007 there were 164 applicants, of whom 21 were selected (13%) for appointment, and in 2008, there were 82 applicants, of whom 31 were chosen (38%) for appointment. During the audit period, there were 246 applicants, of whom 52 were awarded BAC appointments (21%).

The breakdown of appointments by race and gender are shown on Table 2:

**Table 2 – Mayor’s Appointments By Race/Gender**

<b>Class</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>White</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>Minority</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>White Male</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>Minority Male</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>White Female</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Minority Female</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Total Appointments</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>

*(Source: Mayor’s Office. The table includes all BAC appointments made by Mayor Ravenstahl through June 24, 2009.)*

Mayor’s 311 Response Line

The Mayor’s 311 Response Line formally began on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2006. Its purpose is to serve as a one-call clearing house for all non-emergency calls requesting City services, making non-criminal complaints, or seeking information. The Response Line is staffed by operators from 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM during the week and is automated during non-working hours with a voice mail system. It also accepts e-mail and internet submissions, letters, and walk-in requests.

There is an internet form available for filing a request or complaint on the City’s website home page, which provides a link to the form. The staff also processes requests from the Mayor’s Office, City Council, and various City departments. The 311 staff also directs requests to non-City service providers, such as City authorities, City Source, Duquesne Light, the Animal Rescue League, and various social agencies.

Every contact is given a case tracking number, routed to the proper City department or outside agency for action, and the status of the call as it works its way through the system can be followed. The complaints and responses are entered and kept on a 311 Oracle-based data file.

The 311 Center is located on the first floor of the City-County Building, Department of Finance. The Center is staffed by a Coordinator, 3 Representatives, and 2 Representatives As-Needed with a salaried budget of \$152,466 in 2008. It was staffed by a Coordinator and 3 Representatives with a salaried budget of \$112,175 in 2007.

The 311 staff was included with the Department of Finance during the audit period, and is now a part of CIS. From 2005 and before, the Mayor's Service Center managers were budgeted as part of the Mayor's Office.

According to research, the original Response Line concept dates back to the 1950's and Mayor David Lawrence, who began it as the City Complaint Center. In 1977, Mayor Pete Flaherty renamed it the Mayor's Service Center and brought it to its present location. Mayor Tom Murphy closed it on January 1, 2005, and replaced it with an automated phone answering menu as a cost-cutting measure.

Mayor Luke Ravenstahl revived the concept and began the Mayor's 311 Response Line in late 2006.

311 Call Centers that provide a substantial statistical collection component are a key cog of the emerging technology of e-government. According to "Government Technology" magazine, only 65 cities provided the service during the audit period, even though the 311 number was available for use by municipalities beginning in 1997.

**Finding:** The 311 Center not only provides citizens with a one-stop center for non-emergency service and information requests, but is also a major generator of performance statistics for the PittMAPS project and City management, allowing for data-driven analysis and decision-making in City government.

### 311 Call Activity

In 2007 and 2008, on average, the 311 Response Center received 51,411 calls per year and answered 41,560 calls which resulted in 43,049 service requests. (Because some calls are informational and other calls have multiple service requests, the number of calls and requests will not match).

The activity during the audit period is shown on Tables 3-A and 3-B: Pittsburgh 311 Call Center Activity – 2007 & 2008, on the following page.

**Table 3-A - Pittsburgh 311 Call Center Activity (2007)**

<b>City of Pittsburgh 311 Activity - 2007</b>							
<i>month</i>	<i>all calls</i>	<i>answered</i>	<i>dropped calls</i>	<i>dropped rate</i>	<i>calls per day</i>	<i>days open</i>	<i>service requests</i>
January Total:	4015	3366	649	16.16%	191	21	1781
February Total:	5607	4983	624	11.13%	280	20	3135
March Total:	5329	4384	945	17.73%	242	22	3424
April Total:	5010	4321	689	13.75%	251	20	3148
May Total:	5650	4974	676	11.96%	257	22	3824
June Total:	5042	4324	718	14.24%	240	21	4193
July Total:	3912	3021	891	22.78%	186	21	4064
August Total:	4171	3071	1100	26.37%	181	23	4280
September Total:	3637	2969	668	18.37%	191	19	3474
October Total:	4063	3324	739	18.19%	177	23	3571
November Total:	3421	2866	555	16.22%	180	19	2324
December Total:	3550	2840	710	20.00%	178	20	2291
<b>2007 Total</b>	<b>53,407</b>	<b>44,443</b>	<b>8964</b>	<b>16.78%</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>39,509</b>

*Call statistics provided Mayor's 311 Response Center*

**Table 3-B - Pittsburgh 311 Call Center Activity (2008)**

<b>City of Pittsburgh 311 Activity - 2008</b>							
<i>month</i>	<i>all calls</i>	<i>answered</i>	<i>dropped calls</i>	<i>dropped rate</i>	<i>calls per day</i>	<i>days open</i>	<i>service requests</i>
January Total:	4133	3538	595	14.40%	197	21	2927
February Total:	5891	4904	987	16.75%	281	21	4728
March Total:	4814	3994	820	17.03%	253	19	4389
April Total:	5498	4705	793	14.42%	250	22	4586
May Total:	4210	3280	930	22.09%	191	22	4091
June Total:	4453	3182	1271	28.54%	212	21	4934
July Total:	3465	2391	1074	31.00%	158	22	5014
August Total:	3427	2597	830	24.22%	163	21	4254
September Total:	3531	2629	902	25.55%	168	21	4163
October Total:	3713	3173	540	14.54%	161	23	3022
November Total:	2862	2366	496	17.33%	159	18	2182
December Total:	3418	1997	1421	41.57%	155	22	2299
<b>2008 Totals</b>	<b>49,415</b>	<b>38,756</b>	<b>10,659</b>	<b>21.57%</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>46,589</b>

*Call statistics provided by 311 Mayor's Response Center*

**Finding:** The Pittsburgh 311 Response Center generates many more service requests than comparable cities (Table 4, p. 18). Other municipal 311 call centers are more heavily utilized as information centers, with 75% of the calls being answered by the receptionist and requiring no further action.

Pittsburgh also has a high rate of dropped (unanswered) calls. Because the 311 Center does not keep track of the number of calls that go to voicemail during busy and

off-work periods, it has no way of knowing how many calls are being transferred and how many are “lost” (hang-ups). (If an operator is not available, the system tells the caller how many others are ahead of them and gives an option of waiting for a live receptionist or going to voice mail. If the center is closed, calls are automatically forwarded to voicemail).

The number of transferred and lost calls are key statistics in determining the effectiveness of 311 as a one-call stop for citizens both in processing requests and in customer satisfaction.

**Finding:** The 311 Response Center appears to be meeting the national benchmark of 1-2% missing/lost calls. Statistics for three months in 2007 were captured from a prior vendor, and indicated that 1% of the calls were actually lost (hang-ups as opposed to transfer to voice mail).

**Finding:** The 311 Response Center has available the number of phone calls made and answered, but not the number of voice mails. Its system keeps a tally of the service requests rather than individual contacts. CIS could not provide the number of web-based (e-mail and form) submissions 311 received during the audit period; those figures are kept by the e-mail manager, a vendor.

#### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 6:**

The 311 Response Center and CIS should have a counter or hit service to record the number of calls received, calls answered, voice mails, e-mails, and web submissions so the performance of the 311 Response Center can be accurately measured.

#### **311 Response Center Training**

Because of its small staff size and turnover, the 311 Response Center does not offer formal training to its representatives but utilizes on-the-job training. New staff members start by entering non-call requests from web sources, and then begin phone duty under the training of a veteran representative. There is no City 311 policy and procedure manual.

Training updates are provided to the staff via e-mail from the Coordinator, who also works “hands-on” with the staff to answer questions, resolve problems, and improve work skills.

**Finding:** New 311 representatives aren’t provided with formal training or a manual of 311 procedures and policies, and older representatives do not have regular continuous education.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 7:**

CIS and the 311 Coordinator should prepare a training and reference manual for the 311 representatives, and budget for periodic off-time training sessions for the staff members to update their skills.

311 Call Volume

The Mayor’s Response Center was called 53,407 times in 2007 and 49,415 times in 2008 (See Table 3: “Calls and Service Requests for Selected Cities”). This is a quite low number compared to calls received by other 311 Call Centers. However, the percentage of calls involving a service rather than informational request is much higher than those of the other selected 311 Call Centers.

**Table 4 - Calls and Service Requests for Selected Cities**

City	2007 Population	Calls 2008	Work Orders 2008	W.O. %	Calls 2007	Work Orders 2007	W.O. %
Columbus OH	747,755	261,811	n/a	n/a	283,777	n/a	n/a
Minneapolis MN	377,392	436,284	84,203	19%	443,384	106,412	24%
Pittsburgh PA	311,218	49,415	46,589	94%	53,407	39,509	74%
Columbus GA	187,046	173,220	24,067	14%	172,705	23,829	14%
Knoxville TN	183,546	253,127	33,000	13%	206,194	32,784	16%
Hampton VA	146,439	285,000	60,000	24%	242,138	61,114	25%

\* Population taken from 2007 Census Bureau figures.  
 \* Call & Work Order figures taken from respective 2009 Budget documents/311 Performance Reports.  
 \* Pittsburgh figures provided by 311 Response Center database.

The large number of work orders generated may partially explain the higher-than-average length of call noted on Table 5 - 311 Length of Call, on page 19.

**Finding:** The lack of call volume also highlights the City’s dual approach to handling service calls. In the public phone directory, complaint and request calls to the Bureau of Building Inspection are directed to call 311. For issues regarding Public Safety or Public Works, the phone directory and City web site both list departmental numbers to contact, rather than calling the 311 Response Center.

In the phone directory, Public Works has at least eight numbers dedicated to different problem areas listed to contact, while Public Safety lists contact numbers for non-emergency calls to Police, Fire, and EMS, along with the Police Zone Headquarter phone numbers.

A third party agency such as the 311 Response Center that tracks a request from start to completion and enters the results on a data base is the best guarantee of complete and unbiased data being provided to City management.

Calls received by the 311 Center are reported to the appropriate department within minutes, and e-mail and other submissions are generally forwarded by the next working day. A process to allow the 311 Center to contact Building Inspectors in the field with real-time service requests is expected to be shortly in place.

**Finding:** If all non-emergency requests were directed to it, the 311 Response Center would be the City’s primary non-emergency contact source and data provided to PittMAPS would be more powerful as a management and customer relations tool.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 8:**

The City should make a concerted effort to direct all non-emergency service and informational calls to the 311 Response Center, and to promote and brand it as the City’s one-stop request center.

311 Call Response Times:

The average response time to answer a call, collect, and enter the required information, was two minutes and thirty seconds in 2008, as shown on Table 4 - 311 Average Call Length. (There are slight differences between the 311 and PittMAPS call totals.)

**Table 5 - 311 Average Call Length/Pick-Up Time (2008)**

<b>311 Calls - Time On Line 2008</b>				
<b>2008</b>	<b>Calls Taken</b>	<b>Call Time Hr-Min</b>	<b>Per Call Min-Sec</b>	<b>Wait For Pick-Up</b>
January	3457	155:14	2:42	0:09
February	4779	191:32	2:24	0:09
March	3867	198:07	3:04	0:09
April	4587	225:29	2:57	0:10
May	3110	196:46	3:48	0:09
June	2905	207:38	4:18	0:09
July	2219	110:50	3:00	0:09
August	2540	73:39	1:45	0:09
September	2627	67:40	1:32	0:09
October	3371	66:07	1:17	0:12
November	2366	39:47	1:00	0:10
December	1955	54:14	1:40	0:09
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,783</b>	<b>1587:03</b>	<b>2:30</b>	<b>0:09</b>
<i>Source: 2008 PittMAPS Report            "311 Mayor's Service Center"            (Not Kept in 2007)</i>				

**Finding:** It took 311 responders an average of nine seconds to pick up a call. This is well within national norms. The accepted benchmark is to respond to the majority of calls within twenty-to-thirty seconds.

It is common practice for 311 and customer relation center representatives to use a prepared script to refer to in answering a service request. The City 311 Coordinator said that a script was once used by the phone staff, but it was determined that the representatives preferred the flexibility of responding to calls without a script.

Nationally, 311 Call Centers have a goal of handling a customer call from pick-up to hang-up in a minute to ninety second time span. During the first seven months of 2008, Pittsburgh's 311 response time was considerably longer than that, but from August until the end of the year, the times improved to near, if not better, than national best practice benchmarks. The January-to-July average call time was 3:06; from August-to-December, it was 1:24, as shown by Table 5 on the preceding page.

**Finding:** The 311 City Response Line representatives answer the phone in a timely manner. More consistency is required for Pittsburgh to meet national phone time standards. The length of time spent on the phone, gathering and entering information, was somewhat erratic, ranging from over four minutes/call in June to one minute/call in November with an average 2:30 minutes/call for all of 2008.

#### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 9:**

The Coordinator should continue to monitor the length of calls to ensure that service request processing remains within a ninety-second window from start to finish.

#### **311 Electronic and Manual Service Requests**

Service requests made other than by phone (e-mail, voice mail, letters, etc.) are more time consuming to enter because needed information is sometimes omitted and staff follow-up is required to complete the request and provide a tracking number to the service requester. A backlog of requests, waiting to be processed and forwarded to the proper department or agency for resolution, often occurs.

Several hours are dedicated to entering the previous day's non-phone requests on the Oracle system. To keep 311 agents available for phone duty, the Coordinator processes the majority of non-phone requests alone or with the assistance of a representative temporarily taken off of phone duty.

**Finding:** Pittsburgh's 311 Response Center operates with somewhat less staffing resources compared to other cities, as shown by Table 6 - 311 Staffing In Comparable Cities on the following page.

**Table 6 – 311 Staffing In Comparable Cities**

<b>311 Staffing</b>					
<b>City</b>	<b>2007 Population</b>	<b>2008 F/T Staff</b>	<b>Cost 2008</b>	<b>2007 F/T Staff</b>	<b>Cost 2007</b>
Columbus OH	747,755	24	\$ 1,510,239	26	\$ 1,717,962
Minneapolis MN	377,392	34	\$ 3,314,419	34	\$ 3,130,117
Pittsburgh PA	311,218	4	\$ 152,466	4	\$ 112,075
Columbus GA	187,046	8	\$ 333,041	8	\$ 283,926
Knoxville TN	183,546	6	\$ 359,180	6	\$ 317,350
Hampton VA	146,439	13	\$ 593,818	13	\$ 568,818

\* Population taken from 2007 Census Bureau figures.  
 \* Cost and Staff figures taken from respective 2007-08 Budget documents.

**Finding:** The 311 Coordinator is sometimes required to assist the staff in entering the e-mail and other service requests. Because of backlogs, there are a high amount of dropped and unanswered calls that are handled by voice mail rather than a representative. (It should be noted that the vast majority of calls are not dropped from the 311 system, but sent to voice mail for action.)

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 10:**

To capture as many original calls as possible, reduce the response time for voice mails generated by unanswered calls, and handle e-mail and web submissions requests, the Mayor should consider adding additional staff in accordance with need and budgetary constraints.

**Finding:** Web submissions for the City 311 site ask for name, address, neighborhood, and request. Other cities have designed pages that are both more user-friendly and easier to process for the staff. Minneapolis and Fort Wayne both provide forms by service categories, while Knoxville provides a drop-down menu of common service requests.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 11:**

The 311 Coordinator and a liaison from CIS should design a web page submission form that can be fully completed by a citizen and submitted directly to the appropriate department by 311 representatives. This would considerably reduce the time spent on “double entry” submissions that have to be reworked by the 311 staff before they can be forwarded to the appropriate department for action.

## 311 Expansion

Analogous to the 911 Emergency Center operated by the County, the 311 Response Line lends itself to consolidation. The current Act 47 amended report states: "...the City could expand 311 to cover other governments' services."

A 311 consolidation would also provide CIS with a starting point towards taking the lead in forming a Shared Service Organization with other agencies.

**Finding:** The 311 Response Line already contacts several outside agencies, such as the Water and Sewer Authority, City Source, Duquesne Light, and the Animal Rescue, for service requests. It has the capability to expand services to include the County and other related municipalities, Authorities, and service agencies.

### **RECOMMENDATION NO. 12:**

The City should explore expanding its 311 Response Line to represent additional service clients for a fee structure to be determined.

## Pittsburgh Management And Performance System (PittMAPS)

PittMAPS is a data collection and distribution system that provides management with statistical information to measure departmental performance and determine response time to service requests. It replaced the CitiStats system used by the prior administration.

The Project Manager for PittMAPS began in May, 2007, by holding "Work Out Sessions" with departmental stakeholders. The Project Manger simplified the report format using input from user departments about which data fields to include.

Data collected by City departments and the 311 Response Line (and limited data from City agencies and authorities), is manipulated by date range and category into various reports. These reports are distributed to City management, from the Mayor's Office to field supervisors. PittMAPS also has data sets posted on the City web site.

A departmental master report is generated monthly. Other more specific reports are prepared as required. The PittMAPS Manager also serves as an analyst of the information collected, acts as an ad hoc consultant to the departments and offers recommendations to other City managers as suggested by the data.

The PittMAPS system is still a work in progress. Reports are saved by month in Excel files because there is no main database capability. The Manager does not believe PittMAPS will reach its full capabilities until the City upgrades its government finance accounting software package.

**Finding:** PittMAPS is a useful management tool. It disburses departmental work data to both street-level supervisors and the Mayor’s Office, making it available to those performing the work and those who are supervising it. Also, certain quarterly reports are prepared to satisfy Act 47 requirements. PittMAPS provides an easily accessible, web-based platform for the public to examine City service performance.

**Finding:** In its current state, PittMAPS is limited in what it can provide until the City upgrades to a new software system. PittMAPS should then be fully integrated to both collect and disseminate data for the use of City managers and the public.

**Finding:** According to the Project Manager, PittMAPS does not collect data from all City departments.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 13:**

PittMAPS should have a basic data template for every City department, office, and bureau included on its system.

**Finding:** PittMAPS list the collected data from the prior fiscal quarter on the City website, as per Act 47 requirements. However, you cannot check on any prior year data to form a comparative basis of performance.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 14:**

PittMAPS should provide an on-line archive of year-ending performance results.

City Revenues From Grants

HRC Section 204 (i) (2) states that the Mayor should be “aggressively seeking funds for city programs from federal, state, and county sources.”

The position of Director of Grants and Development was filled in 2007, but not in 2008. Likewise, the position of Grants Specialist, under the Department of City Planning’s budget, was filled in 2007 but left vacant in 2008. It should be noted that a Grants Officer was hired in early 2009.

**Finding:** Grant procurement is not centralized, but left to the separate departments.

**Finding:** A material portion of the City budget is drawn from sources outside its own tax and fee revenue streams. Upgrades to programs or equipment often are dependent on drawing financial support from a dedicated grant fund.

**Table 7 – City Grant Revenues 2008 & 2007**

<b>Grants - 2008 &amp; 2007</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>
Capital Projects (Matching Funds)	\$ 6,495,226	\$ 2,097,421
Grants TF	\$ 5,113,534	\$ 407,118
State Grant - Regional Events	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 6,045,000
Senior Citizens Program	\$ 1,062,147	\$ 676,617
PEMA & Homeland Security	\$ 774,584	\$ 94,965
Public Safety Training	\$ 695,100	\$ 100,407
HOPWA	\$ 675,729	\$ 576,240
Emergency Shelters	\$ 597,855	\$ 795,828
Weed And Seed	\$ 586,633	\$ 454,915
Commonwealth Recycling Grant	\$ 535,911	\$ 360,065
Special Summer Food Service	\$ 458,107	\$ 666,250
Local Law Enforcement (LLEBG)	\$ 332,454	\$ -
Auto Theft	\$ 285,913	\$ 168,087
Shade Tree Commission	\$ 147,381	\$ 119,380
WC Commutations	\$ 114,048	\$ 675
HUD Fair Housing	\$ 89,490	\$ 30,580
Highway Safety	\$ 85,578	\$ 135,052
EEOC	\$ 36,286	\$ 24,750
Drug Abuse Resistance	\$ 23,167	\$ 5,840
Mayor's Youth Initiative	\$ 11,596	\$ -
State Emergency Shelter	\$ -	\$ 161,737
Grants (now part of Grants TF)	\$ -	\$ 80,100
Public Works	\$ -	\$ 41,967
Criminal Intelligence	\$ -	\$ 24,728
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,120,739</b>	<b>\$ 13,067,722</b>
<b>Source: City Controller's Trial Balance Report, 2008 &amp; 2007</b>		

Many of the individual grants that the City receives are accounted for in the Grants Trust Fund (GTF). During the audit period, thirty six (36) different grants from State, Federal and foundation sources were in the GTF. The following Table 8 - Grant Trust Fund Awards shows the grants and their value (the amount will not match Table 7 which shows actual revenues received to date from the grants, while Table 8 shows the total amount of the grant available over its life.)

During the audit period, \$5.5 million of the \$10.1 million in grant money available in the GTF, 55% of the total awarded, was spent and reimbursed to the City.

**Table 8 – Grant Trust Fund Awards 2008 & 2007**

<b>Grant</b>	<b>Grantor</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Year</b>
Police on Patrol; Illegal Gaming Grant	State	\$ 181,129.08	2008
Artwork Conservation	King Mellon	\$ 300,000.00	2008
Solar America Cities	DOE	\$ 200,000.00	2008
Creation of An Energy Consortium	DCED	\$ 70,000.00	2008
Sector Planning	DCED	\$ 200,000.00	2008
Assistance to Firefighters Grant (Truck)	FEMA	\$ 958,400.00	2008
Assistance to Firefighters Grant (Facilities)	FEMA	\$ 716,760.00	2008
Training Equipment	DCED	\$ 30,000.00	2008
Tree Vitalize	DCNR	\$ 250,000.00	2008
Workforce Diversity	PADOH	\$ 149,206.72	2008
Cultural District Infrastructure Improvements	Cultural Trust	\$ 500,000.00	2008
City BID Program - Benches	DCED	\$ 625,000.00	2008
Training - EMS	PAASP	\$ 34,239.48	2008
Development of a Comprehensive Art Plan	Colcom	\$ 45,000.00	2008
Purchase/Training Canine Dog	DCED	\$ 10,000.00	2008
Cooperative Agreement/Carnegie Library	PA DoEd	\$ 500,000.00	2008
CCPP - Parks Study	DNCR	\$ 56,000.00	2007
WRCP - Parks Study	DNCR	\$ 30,975.00	2007
Pittsburgh Foundation - Parks Study	Pitt	\$ 27,534.00	2007
Waste Hauler Retrofit Pilot Grant	MARAMA	\$ 127,200.00	2007
Port Security Grant	DHS	\$2,587,513.00	2007
Firefighters Assistance Grant	DHS	\$ 340,244.00	2007
Motor Carrier Safety Program Grant	USDOT	\$ 232,124.00	2007
Bike Pedestrian Coordinator Funding	King Mellon	\$ 125,000.00	2007
PGH Downtown Partnership Traffic Grant	PDP	\$ 33,000.00	2007
Route 28 - Three Rivers Herritage Trail	State	\$1,000,000.00	2007
Beechview Weed & Seed	DCED	\$ 10,000.00	2007
Cat Eyes Byrne Grant	DOJ	\$ 98,723.00	2007
Beechview Weed & Seed	DCED	\$ 50,000.00	2007
Biodiesel Tanks and Fuel	DCED	\$ 303,675.00	2007
Efficiency in Government Grant	Heinz	\$ 50,000.00	2007
Public Art and Civic Design	Heinz	\$ 132,000.00	2007
Phase I Hazard Mitigation Plan	Heinz	\$ 40,000.00	2007
Phase II Hazard Mitigation Plan	Heinz	\$ 125,000.00	2007
Pension Summit	Heinz	\$ 7,000.00	2007
Casino Public Meeting Grant	Heinz	\$ 10,000.00	2007
<b>Total Amount</b>		<b>\$10,155,723.28</b>	
<i>Source: Mayor's Grant Office</i>			

Additionally, as shown by Table 9 – Trust Funds Supported By Grants on the following page, there are several smaller projects that are financially grant-driven.

**Table 9 – Trust Funds Supported By Grants**

<b>GRANT TRUST FUNDS</b>	<b>12/31/2008 BALANCE</b>
Alternate Vehicle Fuel Usage	\$12,034.83
Animal Fighting Reward	\$1,000.00
Community Based Organizations	\$7,358.27
Community Oriented Policing	\$11,467.42
Culture of Integrity Initiative	\$660.62
Disaster Assistance	\$26,219.13
Domestic Violence	\$6,249.01
Energy Conservation	\$96.81
Green Initiative	\$100,000.00
Minority Business Training	\$825.35
Mounted Police	\$900.46
Problem Solving Partnership	\$109,206.39
SW Regional Planning	\$5,050.19
Underage Drinking Prevention	\$4,950.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$286,018.48</b>

*(Figures taken from the Controller’s Trial Balance of 2008 and presented in accordance to GAAP)*

**Finding:** There is no formal tracking system for grant awards. Without a verifiable audit trail of expenditures, reimbursements, and deposits, it is very difficult to provide proper controls for the grant process. This is especially true of a decentralized system such as employed by the City.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 15:**

The Mayor’s Office should develop a system to track individual grant progress from paperwork submission and key due dates through grant award and disbursement, either in-house through CIS or by purchasing an appropriate software package.

**Finding:** The Mayor’s Office did not fill vacant Grant Procurement and Compliance staff positions during the audit period. With the City’s Capital Budget being operated on a “pay as you go” basis to conserve bond funds, grants covering both capital projects and assets such as vehicles should be maximized.

Also, a fully staffed grants office could track grants that have been awarded and those being applied for, and would provide a resource for procurement, technical assistance, and training for the departments seeking grants. It should be noted that a Grants Officer was hired by the City in 2009.

## **RECOMMENDATION NO. 16:**

The City should fill the vacant position of Grants Specialist to assist in its efforts to procure grant money.

### Intergovernmental Cooperation

The HRC states in Chapter 2, Section 204 (i) that “The mayor shall have the following additional powers and duties...to promote intergovernmental relations generally and specifically by initiating as well as cooperating in working relationships with other governments, public and quasi-public agencies for the promotion of public services, economic development and cultural activities of mutual benefit to all concerned...”

Also, City Council Resolution #139-2008, established the “Task Force for Intergovernmental Cooperation,” calling for a three member body to examine “opportunities for operational efficiencies between the City of Pittsburgh, the Pittsburgh Public Schools, City Authorities and Allegheny County.”

Task Force membership consists of the Mayor, City Controller, and a City Council Member (or their designee), and it has met several times. While many of its actions are informal, it did help in the formation of CONNECT (Congress of Neighboring Communities), a consortium of Pittsburgh and adjoining communities that are examining transportation, public safety, and infrastructure cooperation issues.

Additionally, the Act 47 Recovery Plan of May 26, 2004, noted that “...intergovernmental cooperation – (the) joint provision of services, provision of services by one entity for another, and joint purchasing efforts...represent an important strategy for achieving economies in public service delivery...” and recommended over two dozen initiatives for the City to consider.

Examples of intergovernmental cooperation the City participates in are:

- Regional representation through the Southwest PA Commission and Allegheny League of Municipalities;
- County-wide sales-tax sharing to support regional destinations through the Regional Asset District;
- County-wide representation as part of the Allegheny County Sanitation Authority, Sports and Entertainment Authority, and Stadium Authority;
- The merging of 911 and City ID with the county;
- The City’s Magistrate Court system shifting to state control and Traffic Court adjudication given to the Parking Authority;
- Joint purchasing agreements with Allegheny County for telecom services and commodities;
- City metered mail is sent through the County mail room;

- Joint purchasing agreements with a group of governmental entities for utilities;
- Tax collection for the School District and the Three Taxing Bodies;
- Piggybacking of government contracts;
- Public safety cooperative agreements, such as cross-jurisdictional task forces, support agreements with other municipalities, and Homeland Security/Emergency agreements;
- Public works agreements to swap road clearing routes for efficiency;
- Residential trash collection for Wilkinsburg and the Housing Authority communities; telecasting the Allegheny County Council meetings.

Act 47 Intergovernmental Cooperation Recommendations

The Act 47 recommendations of 2004 listed 29 specific intergovernmental projects for the administration to explore. Many, such as 911 consolidation, facilitation of joint purchasing with the County, reverse auctions, school guard reimbursement, joint sharing of elevator services and costs in the City-County Building, and shared services with local municipalities, along with several others, were adopted.

The most recent draft version of the 2009 Act 47 recommendations, to be implemented later this year, lists only ten remaining objectives. Five are carry-over provisions from 2004. They include resolving differences in the City and County procurement codes, regionalizing City and County parks, sharing security costs for the City-County building, transferring pet licensing to the County, and entering an agility agreement with the County.

**Finding:** The unresolved recommendations from the original Act 47 Plan concern cooperative projects with Allegheny County. There are several working committees currently meeting on these issues.

The City has also coordinated efforts with the School District and various authorities in projects like pooled purchasing.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 17 :**

The City and County should continue to take the lead in exploring more ways to share or functionally consolidate services that reduce costs and improve efficiency, and to expand its efforts to include as many government entities as possible.

Community Development Block Grant Unspecified Local Option (ULO) Allocations

The Mayor distributes \$800,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Unspecified Local Option (ULO) funding to local agencies and groups each budget year, as does City Council.

The process begins in City Planning, which sends an application in August to every non-profit organization that had expressed interest in seeking a City grant for the upcoming year. The Planning Director estimates that approximately 200 applications are received annually from interested groups.

The returned applications for ULO funding are reviewed by Planning for CDBG eligibility. Eligible groups and their requests are entered onto a spreadsheet which is sent to both City Council and the Mayor's Office.

The Mayor's Office uses an awards process based on the objectives and potential outcomes as proposed on the CDBG application. The successful awardees' grants are included in the following year's Capital Budget.

The awards are funded through the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and must be in a CDBG eligible neighborhood or spent on an organization that provides an eligible service such as a food bank, senior or adult daycare center, battered spouses shelter or children's home. HUD must approve all CDBG contracts.

Once approved by HUD, usually in the late spring or early summer, the CDBG budget has to be approved by City Council and then the contracts are drawn up, signed, and processed. The contracts, like the budget, must be approved by HUD, so often the organizations may not have a working agreement with the City until the early fall.

The grant funds are not fronted to the organizations. The groups must present an invoice to Planning, which then reimburses the expenditure from the CDBG Revolving Fund. (The Revolving Fund was originally funded by Capital Bond money, and is replenished by the HUD repayments, which has a turnaround time of a work week .

The result is that many projects don't begin to draw down on their contracts for a period of a year to eighteen months. There is still \$109,411.64 that hasn't been used from 2007 grants, and there is \$488,629.05 remaining, more than 60% of the total awarded funding, for 2008 grants.

**Finding:** The auditors were satisfied with the control procedures in place for payment. The contracts describing the project scope and consequent invoicing are also examined and approved by both City Planning and HUD, and are considered for payment only for services already provided by the vendor.

In 2008, forty seven (47) groups were provided ULO funding. The major awardees were: Greater Pittsburgh Community Food Bank (\$125,000); Pittsburgh Community Services (\$120,000); Western Pennsylvania Conservancy (\$100,000); Women's Center & Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh (\$60,000); Pittsburgh Action Against Rape (\$60,000); Center for Victims of Violent Crime (\$60,000); and Urban League (\$20,000).

Fifty seven (57) groups received funding in 2007. The major recipients were: Greater Pittsburgh Community Food Bank (\$125,000); Western Pennsylvania Conservancy (\$100,000); Naomi's Place (\$100,000); Center for Victims of Violent Crime (\$60,000); Pittsburgh Action Against Rape (\$60,000); Women's Center & Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh; and Pittsburgh Community Redevelopment Group (\$20,000).

Table 10 - Mayor's CDBG/ ULO Grants 2008 & 2007, shows the individual grants awarded during the audit period.

**Table 10 - Mayor's CDBG – ULO Grants In 2008 & 2007**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>2008 Grant</b>	<b>2007 Grant</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>2008 Grant</b>	<b>2007 Grant</b>
Afro-American Music Institute	10000	0	Lawrenceville United	5000	10000
Allentown CDC	0	5000	Manchester CC	0	5000
Amani CDC	0	5000	Marion Manor	0	5000
Arlington Meals on Wheels	2500	2500	Mt. Washington CDC	5000	10000
At The Root	5000	0	Naomi's Place	0	10000
Beltzhoover CDC	0	10000	National Council of Jewish Women	0	5000
Better Block Development	10000	10000	Northside Leadership Conference	10000	0
Bloomfield Business Association	5000	0	Oakland BID	5000	0
Bloomfield CC	5000	10000	Oakland Planning & Devel.	5000	10000
Brashear Association	5000	5000	Onala Club	0	5000
Brighton Hgts. Meals on Wheels	2500	2500	Operation Better Block	5000	0
Brightwood CC	10000	5000	Pittsburgh Action Against Rape	60000	60000
Catholic Charities	0	10000	Pittsburgh Assoc. for the Deaf	0	5000
Center for Victims of Violent Crime	60000	60000	PCRG	20000	20000
Central Northside NC	5000	5000	Pittsburgh Community Services	120000	0
Centre Avenue YMCA	5000	5000	Pittsburgh Mediation Center	10000	0
East Allegheny CC	2000	0	Polish Hill CA	10000	10000
East Northside Action Comm.	0	10000	Rosedale Block Cluster	10000	10000
Elder-Ado	10000	10000	Saint Clair AA	1500	0
Elizabeth Seton Center	0	10000	Senior Friends	2500	2500
Elliott-West End AA	0	5000	Sheraden CC	0	5000
Fineview CC	5000	5000	SIDS Alliance	0	5000
Friendship Development Corp.	0	10000	South Side LDC	0	10000
Greater Pgh. Food Bank	125000	125000	Southside AA	5000	5000
Greenfield Org.	5000	10000	South Side Saber's Youth Football	0	5000
Hazelwood Initiative	5000	10000	Tree of Hope	10000	10000
Hazelwood YMCA	5000	5000	Troy Hill CC	10000	20000
Homewood-Brushton AA	10000	10000	Urban League - Hunger Program	20000	0
Homewood YMCA	5000	5000	West End-Elliott CC	0	5000
I W Abel	0	5000	West Pittsburgh Partnership	5000	0
Jewish Association on Aging	0	10000	West Pittsburgh Youth Football	0	5000
Jewish Community Center	0	10000	Western PA Conservancy	100000	100000
Kingsley Association	6500	10000	Windgap-Chartiers AA	5000	5000
L'Ville - B'Field Meals on Wheels	2500	2500	Womens Center & Shelter	60000	60000
Lawrenceville Corporation	10000	10000	<b>Total</b>	<b>800000</b>	<b>800000</b>

**Finding:** In a 2008 audit of City Council that included ULO spending, it was found that many times, the amount awarded was less than the City's expense to process the contract and monitor the project. Using rough calculations, the Controller's auditors recommended that no ULO awards be made that were under \$2,500 to provide a measure of cost-effectiveness to the process.

Consequently, it was determined that a floor of \$5,000 would provide a more cost effective minimum for CDBG grants.

In 2007, the Mayor's Office awarded four contracts that were valued under \$5,000; in 2008, that number rose to six. Ten contracts, 9.6% of the 104 ULO awards granted during the audit period, were under \$5,000.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 18:**

The Mayor's Office should set a minimum of \$5,000 for its CDBG-ULO grants (as should City Council).

TO: Anabelle Kinney  
Ron Ieraci

FROM: Cathy Qureshi  
Gabe Mazefsky

CC: Yarone Zober

SUBJECT: Response to Mayor's Office Audit

=====

Please accept this communication as a response to your audit of the Mayor's Office. We are pleased to respond to the six areas that you included to be reviewed, as follows:

**Boards and Commissions**

Many of the findings within the Boards and Commission section are out of date as the audit period was through December of 2008. While we differ slightly on the universe of boards that could be included in a review of city Boards, Authorities and Commissions, currently all but a few of available board positions are filled.

Case law and legal opinions crossing four separate administrations and dating back to January 25, 1988 indicate that there is no legal obligation to make appointments to authority boards within a given timeframe. Further, there is no obligation to provide the appointment for the public record. Nonetheless, the Administration has and will continue to provide notice of authority board appointments for the public record.

All officials with the ability to appoint to codified city boards and commissions should make a good faith effort to adhere to all appointing guidelines.

**311 and PittMAPS**

311 should continue to work toward Best Practice goals and outcomes and do so in a manner consistent with an austere budget.

*Interplay between Mayor's 311 Response Line and PittMAPS*

As a one-call clearing house for all non-emergency calls requesting City services, the 311 Center not only continues to support citizens, but also is an integrated source of operational information influencing data-driven decision-making in City government (PittMAPS).

The PittMAPS business intelligence tool directly connected to the 311 technology, and the Mayor's insistence to make data useful for sector supervisors to manage smarter, enables Pittsburgh's desire for 2-way accountability. The Mayor got both the 311 volume

increase from the public as well as a more responsive and smarter government, with increased efficiency and productivity, by applying technology to achieve performance management outcomes.

In April, the City initiated an intergovernmental agency (PWSA, ACHD, and City) enterprise wide (BBI, DPW, DCP, 311, GIS, Police) Web-based Permitting and Business Licensing \$1.3 million project to go live in September 2010 with a single database for non-emergency activities unique to each address (or lot and parcel) in the City. This will bring a unified visual geographical mapping and work-in-process status of all 311 service requests permitting applications, code enforcement, and business licenses.

### **Grants**

The City of Pittsburgh's grants management is administered through the Finance Department. This has been facilitated by the hiring of a Grants Officer in 2009. The Grants Officer systematically and strategically implements grants management protocols and procedures to address compliance issues related to City wide grants management. A formal system for tracking and grants is currently being developed. This will enable the central compliance operations while allowing departments the flexibility of managing their own grants. There are several Grant Specialists for each department who are responsible for each department's grants management, coordinating procurement of grants, and communication with the Grants Officer on status of proposals and awarded grants. Additionally, the hiring of the Grants Officer coincides with the implementation the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Stimulus) whereby the analysis of regulations, reporting requirements, documenting information, coordination of proposals, and oversight of tracking is being managed by that position.

### **Intergovernmental Cooperation**

The City agrees that it should continue the efforts to share and or consolidate services that reduce costs and improve efficiency.

### **CDBG-ULO**

The City agrees that the process is thorough and comprehensive and maintains necessary controls.

