DEPARTMENT: Public Works
By: Michael D. Edwards
Director of Public Works

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION: (Policy Item: Yes__ No X)

Approve the proposed reorganization of the Public Works Department Engineering Division. For discussion purposes, refer to my memo to the Board of April 27, 1995 (Attachment #1) regarding proposed personnel actions. Attachment 2 shows the proposed Engineering Division organizational structure and Attachments 3 and 4 are the existing organizational structures for the Engineering Division and the entire Public Works Department.

The Personnel Department has a concurrent item before the Board for approval of new class specifications for the Junior Civil Engineer and Associate Civil Engineer, as well as revised class specifications for the Senior Civil Engineer position. If approved, this division reorganization will provide greater engineering services capabilities as well as a better-defined career path for employees.

Funds are available in the Transportation Planning, Roads and C.I.P. budgets.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

Refer to Attachment #1.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Do not approve. The benefits of this reorganization could not be realized. This would possibly place the current Transportation Planner position in jeopardy if the transportation planning function is transferred to the Planning Department and a new employee.

COSTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(X) Not Applicable</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted current FY</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total anticipated costs</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required additional funding</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal transfers</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) 4/5th Vote Required</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanticipated revenues</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for contingencies</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Reserve Contingencies, if approved</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMO

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Michael D. Edwards, Director

Subject: Recommendations for Elimination of Two Positions and Addition of Two Engineering Positions within the Public Works Department

This memo is to provide the backup, history and recommendations for two proposed personnel actions to reorganize the Engineering Division. This item corresponds with a related item from the Personnel Department to approve the class specifications and related actions.

1. Eliminate the position of Transportation Planner and create a new position of Junior Civil Engineer. My intention, if the Board approves this action, is to promote Gwendolyn Foster, currently the County's Transportation Planner, to this new position.

2. Delete one of the Engineering Technician II positions (currently three positions allocated) and create a second Junior Civil Engineer position. A draft class specification is attached for your review. My intention is to promote Bret Giannetta, presently one of three engineering technicians and the only one with a civil engineering degree.

You will recall that I proposed these changes during the FY 94/95 budget hearings. The Board declined to take action on this request but directed me to bring them forward as part of a comprehensive presentation on the Engineering Division organization to include the Assistant Public Works Director, Associate Engineer and Junior Engineer. The presentation was to include the issues of mandate compliance for safety and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). (The Board may wish to refer to Page 4 of the 1994-95 Budget Wrap-up memo from the CAO dated 9-26-94.) This proposed action addresses that directive.

The positions could not be dealt with as part of the previous reclassification requests because they were not on the same career path.
The first Junior Engineer position (Gwen Foster) will be funded about 1/2 from the Transportation Planning budget and 1/2 from road and capital improvement projects. This is consistent with the recent reorganization of the Planning Department. The position would consult part-time on transportation planning projects to the Planning Director who soon will be acting as the Executive Director of the LTC. (The Planning Director will oversee all County transportation planning efforts.) He/she would also be directly involved in CIP and road projects working under the Senior Civil Engineer's supervision. If State transportation planning subvention funding is deleted (as is proposed in the Governor's proposed budget), the workload would be shifted to fulltime in C.I.P. and road projects. I recommend that this position be allocated in the Roads budget, where the other engineering positions are allocated, with non-road project charges paid on a reimbursement basis. Gwen has recently successfully completed the only remaining requirement of the draft class specification, by fulfilling the requirements for graduation with a B.S. degree in civil engineering (from Fresno State).

The other Junior Engineer position (Bret Giannetta) would be allocated and funded as the technician position is now; i.e., it would also be paid by the Road Fund and the Road Fund would be reimbursed for non-road project costs. Bret already has his civil engineering degree and is currently under-utilized as an engineering technician. This position would also work under the Senior Civil Engineer's direction.

Both positions would work in team and individual settings, depending on the task at hand.

The total additional costs on an annual basis, including benefits, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Gwendolyn Foster</th>
<th>Bret Giannetta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Transport. Planner</td>
<td>Engr. Technician II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Position</td>
<td>Junior Civil Engr.</td>
<td>Junior Civil Engr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Range/Step</td>
<td>157/5</td>
<td>157/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Range/Step</td>
<td>195/3</td>
<td>195/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Annual Cost</td>
<td>$41,582</td>
<td>$35,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Annual Cost</td>
<td>$45,557</td>
<td>$41,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$3,975</td>
<td>$5,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The additional costs for these upgrades are easily achievable by savings in the road and capital improvement projects that will not require us to hire outside consultants to complete. There will be no negative impact to the General Fund as a result of this proposal.

This change allows Public Works to do more actual engineering in-house than previously. This, in turn, reduces the amount of outside consulting engineering necessary. On most projects, staff can perform these services more efficiently and economically than consultants. The funds set aside for capital projects are thereby stretched further and projects are delivered quicker.

This also allows for a reasonable job class series for Public Works engineering. The result is a more motivated and professional team performing capital project design and other engineering services. A reasonable growth opportunity is provided for the entry-level engineer or technician.

A comparison of salary ranges in the Engineering Division is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Public Works Director (deleted)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Civil Engineer</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Coordinator</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Surveyor</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Civil Engineer</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Civil Engineer</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineering Technician (deleted)</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technician III</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technician II</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technician I</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Director / Water Agency Engineer. Also during the 94/95 budget hearings, I requested that the Assistant Public Works Director position be recreated and filled, but that request was denied. This request was tied closely to other budget proposals for funding of safety and ADA compliance mandates, which were also denied. Follow-up discussion with the Board resulted in the suggestion that the County create a separate, short-term engineering position to be funded by the County Water Agency working primarily on Water Agency-funded projects. Since most of the Water Agency funds are now committed and staff or consulting engineers are already at work
on some of those projects, most of which are on a fast-track, it does not make sense to go forward with such a position. With the recommended reorganization, design of any new Water Agency-funded projects and oversight of the consultant engineering efforts can be handled by the Public Works engineering staff. I do not recommend a separate Water Agency position at this time. Regardless, I still feel that this department cannot function for the greatest public benefit, even in times of budget constraints, without an Assistant Director. I would like to keep this open for discussion with the Board and perhaps propose it again in the 95/96 budget.

Thank you for your consideration of the above-described recommendations. I'm very proud of the team we have put together at Public Works, with Board support, and see a strong, professional Engineering Division as a key part of our future mutual successes for the County.

cc: Lisa Edelheit, SEIU
    Gwen Foster
    Bret Giannetta
    Dave Tucker
Proposed Organization
Public Works – Engineering Division

Sr. Civil Engineer
Dave Tucker

Junior Civil Engineer
Gwen Foster
Traffic Tech.
Roy Briese

Junior Civil Engineer
Bret Giannetta

Special Proj.
Coordinator
Bruce Atkinson
Eng. Tech. II
Brian Atkinson
Eng. Tech. II
Judye Mangan

Assoc. Survey
Charlie Pratt
MEMORANDUM

To: Nancy Kyle, Personnel
From: Michael D. Edwards, Director
Date: April 27, 1995
Re: Proposed Reorganization for Engineering Division

Per our previous discussions, attached is our draft Board Agenda item for the Engineering Division reorganization. Would you please review this with Mike and/or Jeff for any input they may have; also, in conjunction with your item on the class specifications.

Please give me a call if you have any questions.

sm

Enclosures: As noted

5/1/95
1. Jeff
2. Mike
3. njk

Attached is a copy of Mike Edward's concurrent Board agenda item requesting approval of his reorganization. Pages 2 and 3 of his attached memo address budgetary considerations.

njk

(The final Personnel agenda package is enclosed).