

**Council Meeting: March 10, 2009****SUBJECT: Transmittal of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results Audit for Program 118 — Pavement Operations****REPORT IN BRIEF**

This report presents the audit of performance results reported during FY 2006/2007 by Public Works Program 118 — Pavement Operations. Findings and recommendations are presented in the attached report.

The purpose of this audit is to ensure budgetary and management decisions were based on valid and complete information. The program's performance reporting system was evaluated for: 1) reporting accuracy; 2) language transparency; 3) documentation/data integrity; and 4) the integration of reporting systems within workflow. The evaluation was performed through staff interviews, documentation review, and the recalculation of reported results.

**BACKGROUND**

Measuring program performance has been a key feature of Sunnyvale's management and budgeting system for more than two decades. Funding for City programs is not budgeted by line item, but rather by the efforts or tasks undertaken in each program. These tasks are called activities. In the budget structure, activities are grouped into service delivery plans, which are further grouped into programs. Each activity has a budgeted number of dollars and staff hours to perform the tasks. The activities also have a budgeted number of "products" that management is expected to produce with the given resources. Expenditures and product counts are used to calculate product cost, products per hour, and hours per product. Each program also has a series of performance measures which measure how well the services are performed. Service level and funding decisions are made based on these measures and Council priorities.

The accuracy review component of the audit verifies measure and product counts by reconciling the reported numbers to source documentation. Language is reviewed to ensure the measure reflects the actual intent and operating procedures being used. Data integrity and documentation are reviewed to verify reporting methods. Integration is reviewed to ensure workflow and tracking mechanisms are being used together in an efficient manner.

### **EXISTING POLICY**

The Fiscal Sub-element of the General Plan includes the following policies:

- Long Range Goal - VII: To ensure accuracy and policy consistency in City processes and reporting through regular financial and performance audits of programs.
- Internal Control - G.2.5: Performance audits will be conducted regularly on a schedule set by Council to verify that the performance data reported by each department is complete, valid, and accurate.

Per Council policy, performance results audits are performed on all operating programs over an eight year period. The audits presented in this report are part of the current audit plan's sixth year.

### **DISCUSSION**

Public Works Program 118 — Pavement Operations is responsible for maintenance of the City's streets. Major efforts include pavement maintenance and repair, traffic signs and markings, and street sweeping. The budget for this program in FY 2006/2007 was approximately \$4.1 million.

The performance results audit for Program 118 has uncovered a number of issues associated with recorded products. These issues appear most frequently in the service delivery plans (SDPs) associated with paving operations. The performance results recorded in the other SDPs — those associated with the Sign Shop, Street Sweeping, and general maintenance of the City's streetscape — do not appear to have the same issues.

In general, the issues found in this audit fall into two categories — procedural and systemic — and are shown below:

#### **Procedural Issues**

- Original recording of hours and products in the wrong activity/charge code.
- No substantiating information originally listed on the Daily Work Reports (DWR) to explain why certain products were/were not recorded.
- Limited checking of the DWRs prior to entry into the Unit Card, which is the summary document used to track the paving operations' products and serves as the data source for filling out journal vouchers for data entry into the City's financial system.
- Products are not consistently moved when hours are moved between operations and capital/special projects.

### Systemic Issues

- Infrastructure (“budget” structure) does not accurately reflect the actual work being done. (new activities needed; combining several existing activities; renaming of existing activities; deleting existing activities)
- Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) do not include clear description of all work actions being charged to each activity/charge code.
- SOPs do not cite the actual data sources used for tracking products.

It is important to note that the work for which Program 118 is responsible is being accomplished. One need only drive the streets of Sunnyvale or review the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to be aware that the City’s streets are being maintained. To support this claim, the auditor field checked the streets listed as having work accomplished during the same period as the audit covered. The auditor verified the work as accomplished. It is important to note that the City’s PCI is one of the highest in the Bay Area. Sunnyvale’s PCI in 2007 (the latest year available) is 77, which is 18<sup>th</sup> out of the 109 Bay Area jurisdictions. Our PCI also compares favorably with the regional average of 65.

The auditor’s main concern is that the paving operations work is not being quantified accurately or in the most efficient manner. This concern is substantiated because of the number of results that cannot be verified (NATV) and the high percentage of results that were inaccurately reported (65.7 percent). However, the lack of ability to verify the results does not mean the work for which Program 118 is responsible is not being accomplished. Rather, the major problem is the lack of data infrastructure available to program staff to allow them to efficiently track and report the results of their efforts.

With that contextual focus in the forefront, the findings and recommendations shown in the following pages deal mainly with how products are reported and the processes by which they are tracked. The findings are intended to provide information to Program 118 so it may fully identify the issues and work cooperatively to design and implement a more efficient system of reporting. The findings and recommendations presented here are the first step in establishing an automated product reporting system that more accurately captures the work already being accomplished by Program 118. The audit statistics for Program 118 are shown in the following table:

**Audit Statistics**  
**Results of FY 2006/2007 Performance**  
**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**

Number of Results Reported within $\pm 3\%$ & $\pm 5\%$	12	13.5%
Number of Results Not Reported within $\pm 3\%$ & $\pm 5\%$	65	73.0%
Number of Results Not Able to Verify (NATV)	12	13.5%
Total Number of Measures/Activities Reviewed	89	100.0%
Number of Results Not Audited	9	
Total Number of Measures/Activities in Program	98	
Number of SOPs Missing	1	
Number of Recommendations	30	

Of the total 98 reported results, 89 were tested during the course of this audit. Of that total, 12 were verified as accurate within the defined parameters, while 65 were identified as not being reported within the defined parameters. It is important to note that of the 65 not reported within the defined parameters, 25 were actually under reported, some by a significant amount. This under reporting again indicates that Program 118 is accomplishing the work for which it is responsible, but the results are not being recorded accurately.

The remaining category is “Not Able to Verify,” or NATV. Of the total results tested, 12 could not be verified (NATV). Sources for these results either did not exist or could not be correlated with the underlying documentation. Nine results were not audited because the defined product was either work hours, training-related or allocated. Work hours were not evaluated because there is no practical method to verify reported hours were actually worked. Training products were not audited because they are not a main operational function of the organization. Allocated costs are funds distributed to other programs to cover internal services. These costs were not audited because they are calculated by the financial system. The auditor makes 30 recommendations to Program 118, the majority of which are associated with procedural tracking and infrastructure/automation of systems. The program agrees with all 30 recommendations and states the recommendations will be implemented.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

Costs associated with preparation of these audit reports were included in the City of Sunnyvale’s operating budget in *Program 743 — Internal Audit*.

**PUBLIC CONTACT**

Public contact was made by posting the Council agenda on the City's official-notice bulletin board outside City Hall, in the Council Chambers lobby, in the Office of the City Clerk, at the Library, Senior Center, Community Center, and Department of Public Safety; posting the agenda and report on the City's Web site; and making the report available at the Library and the Office of the City Clerk.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. Receive the audit report and concur with management's acceptance of recommendations.
2. Receive the audit report and direct staff to hold a study session to discuss the audit findings and recommendations.
3. Receive the audit report and give alternative direction regarding specific recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends Alternative 1: Receive the audit report and concur with management's acceptance of recommendations.

Reviewed by:

Mary J. Bradley, Director of Finance  
Prepared by: Ann Durkes, Finance Department

Reviewed by:

Marvin Rose, Director of Public Works

Approved by:

Gary Luebbbers  
City Manager

**Attachments**

- A. City of Sunnyvale FY 2006/2007 Performance Results Audit, Department of Public Works, Program 118 — Pavement Operations

**City of Sunnyvale**  
**FY 2006/2007**  
**Performance Results Audit**



***Department of Public Works***

***Program 118***  
***Pavement Operations***

**January 2009**

---

**Auditor:** Ann Durkes  
City of Sunnyvale

**Field Work Start Date:** August 2008

---

## Table of Contents

Audit Objective .....	1
Program Background .....	1
Audit Scope .....	2
Summary .....	3
Audit Statistics .....	4
Summary of Findings .....	4
Audit Conclusion .....	8
APPENDIX 1 — Results Accuracy Table .....	9
APPENDIX 2 — Recommendation Table w/Departmental Response .....	13

**AUDIT OBJECTIVE**

The goal of a performance results audit is to ensure that budgetary and management decisions are based upon valid and complete performance information. This is accomplished by evaluating the following components of a program’s performance reporting system:

- **Accuracy:** Auditor count or calculations are within  $\pm 3.0$  percent for program measures and within  $\pm 5.0$  percent for activities’ product counts.
- **Language:** Measure/Product text accurately represents the numbers portrayed in the reported result.
- **Documentation/Data Integrity:** Documentation systems are complete and data accurately reflects a program’s operations. Each measure should have a Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) document describing data sources and calculation methodologies.
- **Integration:** Data collection systems are automated and integrated into the operational workflow of the organization whenever possible.

The evaluation is performed through staff interviews, documentation review, and by recalculating the reported results. The auditor considers the year-end report to the City Manager as final. Handwritten corrections in the year-end report are acceptable.

**PROGRAM BACKGROUND**

*Program 118 — Pavement Operations* is located within the Department of Public Works and its physical operation is housed at the Corporation Yard. The purpose of the program is to maintain the City’s streets. There are eight service delivery plans in this program. The chart shown below summarizes operating expenditures in Program 118 for FY 2002/2003 through FY 2006/2007.

<b>Program 118 — Pavement Operations</b>						
<b>Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results</b>						
<i>Actual Expenditures for Pavement Operations</i>						
<u>Source:</u> <i>Financial System, Access Query</i>						
		<b>FY 2002/2003</b>	<b>FY 2003/2004</b>	<b>FY 2004/2005</b>	<b>FY 2005/2006</b>	<b>FY 2006/2007</b>
SDP 1	Pavement Preventative Maintenance	\$1,668,009.99	\$1,814,488.85	\$1,979,127.66	\$2,156,929.60	\$2,262,393.93
SDP 2	Pavement Corrective Repairs	698,802.84	614,575.05	400,462.00	383,953.86	457,739.65
SDP 3	Traffic Signs	127,639.97	124,620.66	166,007.96	189,052.89	191,836.41
SDP 4	Traffic Markings	278,829.54	248,391.45	339,574.71	352,386.19	331,418.94
SDP 5*	Street Sweeping & Maintenance of Public Right-of-Way	0.00	0.00	378,173.71	391,712.37	381,522.59
SDP 6	Emergency Response	15,038.64	9,756.45	5,022.45	7,167.77	51,699.52
SDP 7	Service Response	53,698.19	20,582.35	100,513.17	149,131.31	141,773.77
SDP 8	Management & Support Services	538,898.81	515,964.79	547,398.83	566,150.53	320,136.01
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,380,917.98</b>	<b>\$3,348,379.60</b>	<b>\$3,916,280.49</b>	<b>\$4,196,484.52</b>	<b>\$4,138,520.82</b>

\* Prior to FY 2004/2005, SDP 5 was housed in Program 215 — Roadside & Median Right-of-Way Services. Beginning in FY 2004/2005, sweeping activities, as well as hazardous and emergency repairs and maintenance of City right-of-ways were moved to Prog 118 — Pavement Operations. The routine activities associated with maintenance of the right-of-ways were moved to Program 215 — Roadside & Median Right-of-Way Services.

The table shows that the majority of expenditures in Program 118 are made for pavement repairs and maintenance. In fact, 65.7 percent of the total operating expenditures is spent for pavement repair and maintenance, while 12.6 percent is spent on maintaining the traffic sign inventory; 13.9 percent is spent on keeping the streetscape and walkways free from hazardous debris and repairing fences, railings, etc.; and 7.8 percent is spent on management and support services.

### **AUDIT SCOPE**

The City of Sunnyvale uses performance-based budgeting — a method in which the General Plan's goals are directly supported and accomplished by specific programs. Performance-based budgeting quantifies both performance and expenditures; it also presents the interrelation between the two. This interrelation is called “performance results” and is the focus of this audit.

To quantify performance, each program's function is defined by a program performance statement. The program performance statement provides the purpose of the program and how this purpose will be achieved. Performance measures are the benchmarks and data points are the statistics which set the context for the benchmarks.

To quantify expenditures, each program is separated into service delivery plans (SDPs), which are separated further into activities [also referred to as organizational cost accounts (OCAs) or charge codes]. They are the “place” where all work hours, direct expenditures, and units of production (products) are charged.

The auditor reviewed the FY 2006/2007 performance results as reported for *Program 118 — Pavement Operations*. The program's reporting structure consists of 98 total results, including 16 performance measures, 15 data points, and 67 activities. Of the total 98 reported results, 89 were tested (15 measures, 13 data points, and 61 activities' products). Two of the program's activities, one measure, and two data points were not audited because the recommendation is to delete the activity. Four other activities were not audited because the products are either work hours, training-related, or allocated costs. Work hours were not evaluated because there is no practical method to verify reported hours were actually worked. Training products were not audited because they are not a main operational function of the organization. Allocated costs are funds distributed to other programs to cover internal services. These costs were not audited because they are calculated by the financial system.

---

## SUMMARY

The performance results audit for Program 118 has uncovered a number of issues associated with recorded products. These issues appear most frequently in the service delivery plans (SDPs) associated with paving operations. The performance results recorded in the other SDPs — those associated with the Sign Shop, Street Sweeping, and general maintenance of the City's streetscape — do not appear to have the same issues.

In general, the issues found in this audit fall into two categories — procedural and systemic — and are shown below:

### Procedural Issues

- Original recording of hours and products in the wrong activity/charge code.
- No substantiating information originally listed on the Daily Work Reports (DWR) to explain why certain products were/were not recorded.
- Limited checking of the DWRs prior to entry into the Unit Card, which is the summary document used to track the paving operations' products and serves as the data source for filling out journal vouchers for data entry into the City's financial system.
- Products are not consistently moved when hours are moved between operations and capital/special projects.

### Systemic Issues

- Infrastructure ("budget" structure) does not accurately reflect the actual work being done. (new activities needed; combining several existing activities; renaming of existing activities; deleting existing activities)
- SOPs do not include clear description of all work actions being charged to each activity/charge code.
- SOPs do not cite the actual data sources used for tracking products.

It is important to note that the work for which Program 118 is responsible is being accomplished. One need only drive the streets of Sunnyvale or review the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to be aware that the City's streets are being maintained. To support this claim, the auditor field checked the streets listed as having work accomplished during the same period as the audit covered. The auditor verified the work as accomplished. It is important to note that the City's PCI is one of the highest in the Bay Area.

The auditor's main concern is that the paving operations work is not being quantified accurately or in the most efficient manner. This concern is substantiated because of the number of results that cannot be verified (NATV) and the high percentage of results that were inaccurately reported (65.7 percent). However, the lack of ability to verify the results does not indicate that the work for which Program 118 is responsible is not being accomplished. Rather, the major problem is the lack of infrastructure available to program staff to allow them to efficiently track and report the results of their efforts.

With that contextual focus in the forefront, the findings and recommendations shown in the following pages deal mainly with how products are reported and the processes by which they are tracked. The findings are intended to provide information to Program 118 so it may fully identify the issues and work cooperatively to design and implement a more efficient system of reporting. The findings and recommendations presented here are the first step in establishing an automated product reporting system that more accurately reflects the work already being accomplished by Program 118. The audit statistics are shown below:

<b>AUDIT STATISTICS</b>		
Number of Results Reported within $\pm 3.0\%$ & $\pm 5.0\%$	12	13.48%
Number of Results Not Reported within $\pm 3.0\%$ & $\pm 5.0\%$	65	73.03%
Number of Results Not Able to Verify (NATV)	12	13.48%
Total Number of Measures/Activities Reviewed	<u>89</u>	100.00%
Number of Results Not Audited	9	
Total Number of Measures/Activities in the Program	<u><u>98</u></u>	
Number of SOPs Missing	1	
<i>Percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding.</i>		

Of the total 98 reported results, 89 were tested during the course of this audit. Of that total, 12 were verified as accurate within the defined parameters, while 65 were identified as not being reported within the defined parameters. It is important to note that of the 65 not reported within the defined parameters, 25 were under reported, some by a significant amount. This under reporting indicates that Program 118 is accomplishing the work for which it is responsible, but the results are not being recorded accurately.

The remaining category is “Not Able to Verify,” or NATV. Of the total results tested, 12 could not be verified (NATV). Sources for these results either did not exist or could not be correlated with the underlying documentation. The auditor makes 30 recommendations to Program 118, the majority of which are associated with procedural tracking and infrastructure/automation of systems. The full statistical summary is shown in Appendix 1. The detailed findings and recommendations are shown in Appendix 2.

**Summary of Findings**

In general, the findings contained in this audit fall into four categories. They are as follows:

1. Multiple and disjointed product recording and tracking systems are used throughout Program 118. Products are recorded on multiple spreadsheets and the procedures used to track and record products are not automated. In the most efficient procedures used, the information is “touched” multiple times, which introduces the possibility of human error at each “touch.”
2. In addition, the Daily Work Reports (DWRs) do not appear to be checked consistently for accuracy or corrected. It also appears that corrections are made while the data from the DWRs is being entered; however, corresponding notations, edits, or corrections are not shown on the DWRs. When this happens, the “trail” is lost and the Program has no way of knowing if the difference between the source document and the spreadsheet is entry error or a legitimate correction.
3. The automated database system that is being used, the Public Works’ Service Reports System, is being downloaded into a spreadsheet, then manipulated to generate the needed reports. The database system can and should be modified to generate the needed report, as well as calculate the needed data points. Making this change will actually automate the system and introduce a level of efficiency and accuracy to reporting the products.
4. The format of the DWRs is not conducive to efficient recording of work by line-staff. The DWR shown on the following page is an example of one filled out correctly. However, many additional notations and symbols were added to clearly convey the work accomplished, the charge code, the hours, and the associated units (Note the arrows, mark-outs, and units of measure written on the page)

CITY OF SUNNYVALE  
 PAVEMENT DIVISION  
 DAILY WORK REPORT

LEADER: <i>Arriaga</i>	DATE: <i>4-30-07</i>	DAY: <i>Monday</i>	WEATHER: <i>Clear Sunny</i>	START TIME: <i>6:30 AM</i>	FINISH TIME: <i>4:00 PM</i>
LOCATION: <i>VARIOUS LOCATIONS PER LIST</i>			<i>2008 SLURRY SEAL STREETS</i>		
EQUIPMENT: <i>646</i>	CREW: <i>17E ARRIAGA</i>	MARKING:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRINDING:	
	<i>160-WELLING</i>	SAWING:		SWEEPING:	
		PATCH:		WALKWAYS:	
		CRACKSEAL:		TRAINING:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		PETROMAT:		BARRICADES:	
		POST		SURVEY:	
		NOTIFY		SLURRY:	
		CHIP SEAL:		POST	
		POST		NOTIFY	
		NOTIFY			
TASK	HOURS	UNITS			
		SAWING			
		PATCHING			
<i>Task # 785400</i>	<i>160-WELLING → 1.0 hr. Comp.T.</i>	<i>CRACKSEAL</i>			
	<i>160-WELLING → 3.0 hrs.</i>	<i>PETROMAT MED. APPLTS.</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>118630 → 1.0 hr.</i>	<i>CHIPSEAL POT HOLES</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>118860 → 2.0 hrs.</i>	<i>TRAINING MEETING</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>118020 → 1.0 hrs.</i>	<i>MARKING</i>			<i>5 (Units)</i>
PAVEMENT DEPTH <i>6" &amp; 8" (116006)</i>	MATERIALS USED:	CRACKSEAL MATERIAL		DAILY VEHICLE INSPECTIONS DONE:	
INCHES:	TONS	BOXES		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>646</i> NO	
COMMENTS: <i>MARKING - 2008 SLURRY SEAL STREETS</i>					
<i>LOCATIONS → HARVARD, LUNSBROCK, KINTYRE, MANUARDIN, CARROW CT.</i>					
<i>FILLED UP 3 POT HOLES ON MARIA AV. @ ST. EL CAMINO REAL</i>					
TRAINING: DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION: <i>2.0 hrs. MEETING WITH TONY AND DAVE (LEADERS MEETING)</i>					

A suggested improvement to the circled section is presented below. The auditor believes that the new format for the section would reduce the long-hand alterations needed to record the work accomplished and its status. The new format also will enhance accuracy when filling out the DWR, checking it, and entering the data into the summary spreadsheet (Unit Card).



---

## **AUDIT CONCLUSION**

This audit presents the evaluations made of Program 118's performance results. The evaluations were made using four criteria: accuracy, language, documentation/data integrity, and integration into operational workflow. The allowable margins of error used to determine the accuracy status of reported results are  $\pm 3.0$  percent for program measures and  $\pm 5.0$  percent for activity product counts. Auditor calculations based on supporting documentation must be within the allowable error margins for the measure to be verified as accurate. Results are marked as NATV if supporting documentation is incomplete or the reported number cannot be verified.

It is important to note that the work for which Program 118 is responsible is being accomplished. The City's streets are being maintained and its PCI is one of the highest in the Bay Area. The main point resulting from this audit is that the paving operations work is not being quantified accurately or in the most efficient manner. This concern is substantiated because of the number of results that cannot be verified and the high percentage of results that were inaccurately reported. However, the lack of ability to verify the results does not indicate that the work for which Program 118 is responsible is not being accomplished. Rather, the major problem is the lack of infrastructure available to program staff to allow them to efficiently track and report the results of their efforts.

The findings and recommendations provided herein deal mainly with how products are reported and the processes by which they are tracked. The findings are intended to provide information to Program 118 so it may fully identify the issues and work cooperatively to design and implement a more efficient system of reporting. The findings and recommendations presented here are the first step in establishing an automated product reporting system that more accurately reflects the work already being accomplished by Program 118. The auditor makes 30 recommendations to address the findings discussed above. The audit statistics are shown in Appendix 1. A detailed list of findings, recommendations, and the Department of Public Works' responses is located in Appendix 2.

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 1 — Results Accuracy Table**

AUDIT STATISTICS		
Number of Results Reported within $\pm 3.0\%$ & $\pm 5.0\%$	12	13.48%
Number of Results Not Reported within $\pm 3.0\%$ & $\pm 5.0\%$	65	73.03%
Number of Results Not Able to Verify (NATV)	12	13.48%
Total Number of Measures/Activities Reviewed	89	100.00%
Number of Results Not Audited	9	
Total Number of Measures/Activities in the Program	98	
Number of SOPs Missing	1	

*Percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding.*

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within $\pm 3\%$	
							Y/N	+/-
1	Q	Customers are satisfied with the safety of City roadways (based on Citywide Survey).	Percent of Satisfied Customers	No	93.00 %	61.00 %	N	52.5 %
2	Q	City collector and residential streets are rated "good" or better with a PCI rating of over 70, based on Metropolitan Traffic Commission (MTC) Regional Standards.	Percent of Collector and Residential Streets Rated "Good" or Better	No	79.00 %	87.30 %	N	-9.5 %
			Miles of Collector and Residential Streets in the City	--	284.00	213.00	N	33.3 %
3	Q	City arterial streets are rated "good" or better with a PCI rating of over 70, based on Metropolitan Traffic Commission (MTC) Regional Standards.	Percent of Arterial Streets Rated "Good" or Better	No	69.00 %	91.10 %	N	-24.3 %
			Miles of Arterial Streets in the City	--	35.00	63.00	N	-44.4 %
4	Q	"No Parking" signs are posted before chip seal and slurry seal are applied to streets.	Percent of Signs Posted	No	100.00 %	NATV	--	--
			Number of Signs Posted	--	276.00	NATV	--	--
5	P	Annual pavement preventive maintenance activities (chip seal and slurry seal) are completed as scheduled.	Percent of Planned Maintenance Activities Completed	No	99.50 %	NATV	--	--
			1,000 Square Feet Chip and Slurry Seal	--	3,882.00	NATV	--	--
6	P	Annual major repairs (street reconstruction and asphalt overlay) are completed as scheduled.	Percent of Planned Repairs Completed	No	0.00 %	Not Audited	--	--
			1,000 Square Feet Reconstructed	--	0.00	Not Audited	--	--
7	P	Annual traffic sign reflectivity, inspection and maintenance are completed as scheduled.	1,000 Square Feet Overlaid	--	0.00	Not Audited	--	--
			Percent of Activities Completed	No	100.00 %	NATV	--	--
			Number of Signs Maintained	--	3,749.00	5,795.00	N	-35.3 %

Appendix 1 — Results Accuracy Table (continued)

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within ±3%		
							Y/N	+/-	
8	P	Annual arterial striping is completed as scheduled.	Percent of Striping Completed	No	73.00 %	NATV	--	--	
			1,000 Lineal Feet Striped	--	585.00	343.44	N	70.4 %	
9	P	Street sweeping requests/complaints are responded to within two (2) working days from notification.	Percent of Complaints Responded within Two (2) Days	No	100.00 %	100.00 %	Y	0.0 %	
			Number of Complaints	--	4.00	6.00	N	-33.3 %	
10	P	Hazardous debris calls are responded to within three (3) hours from notification.	Percent of Calls Responded to on Time	No	88.00 %	92.00 %	N	-4.3 %	
			Number of Emergency Debris Calls	--	175.00	137.00	N	-27.7 %	
11	P	Emergency graffiti obscenities are removed within one (1) working day from notification.	Percent of Graffiti Removed on Time	No	100.00 %	100.00 %	Y	0.0 %	
			Number of Emergency Graffiti Requests	--	4.00	4.00	Y	0.0 %	
12	CE	The cost to permanent-patch a square foot of City roadway will not exceed the planned cost.	Cost Per Square Foot	No	\$3.73	\$3.91	N	-4.6 %	
			Number of Square Feet	--	310,000.00	295,737.00	N	4.8 %	
13	CE	The cost to chip seal 1,000 square feet of City roadway will not exceed the planned cost.	Cost Per 1,000 Square Feet	No	\$326.00	NATV	--	-- %	
			Number of 1,000 Square Feet	--	1,436.00	NATV	--	-- %	
14	F	Actual total expenditures for Pavement Operations will not exceed planned program expenditures.	Total Program Expenditures	No	\$4,138,521.00	\$4,138,520.82	Y	0.0 %	
15	P	Non-hazardous debris calls are responded to within two (2) working days from notification.	Percent of Calls Responded to on Time	No	96.00 %	100.00 %	N	-4.0 %	
			Number of Non-emergency Debris Calls	--	116.00	206.00	N	-43.7 %	
16	P	Non-emergency graffiti are removed within two (2) working days from notification.	Percent of Graffiti Removed on Time	No	97.00 %	100.00 %	Y	-3.0 %	
			Number of Non-emergency Graffiti Requests	--	743.00	39.00	N	1805.1 %	
SDP	Activity	Charge Code	Charge Code Title	Product Title	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within ±5%	
1	1	118000	Crack Sealing - Use Asphaltic Material to Seal Surface Cracks In Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	529,750.00	526,355.00	Y	0.7 %
1	2	118010	Petromat Application - Apply Material to Streets to Reduce Water Penetration Into Base	A Thousand Square Feet	No	278.00	293.00	N	-5.1 %
1	3	118020	Marking of Damaged Pavement - Prior to Permanent Patching	A Project Location	No	275.00	244.00	N	12.7 %
1	4	118030	Sawing of Damaged Pavement - Prior to Permanent Patching	A Lineal Foot	No	48,671.00	56,266.00	N	-13.5 %
1	5	118040	Permanent Patching - Remove and Replace Damaged Pavement Prior to Resurfacing (Up to six (6) Inches)	A Square Foot	No	309,847.00	295,737.00	Y	4.8 %
1	6	118050	Slurry Seal - Application of Oil/Sand Mixture By Staff-Monitored Contractor to Extend Street Life	A Thousand Square Feet	No	2,446.00	NATV	--	--
1	7	118060	Double Chip Seal - Application of Oil/Gravel to Street By In-House Staff to Prepare for Slurry Seal	A Thousand Square Feet	No	1,436.00	NATV	--	--
1	8	118070	Provide Advance Notice - Notify Residents and Post "No Parking" Signs for Resurfacing Streets	A Project Location	No	276.00	317.00	N	-12.9 %

Appendix 1 — Results Accuracy Table (continued)

SDP	Activity	Charge Code	Charge Code Title	Product Title	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +5%	
								Y/N	+/-
1	9	118080	Facilities Maintenance - Maintain Corp Yard Facilities and Make Minor Repairs to Equipment and Tools	An Activity	No	181.00	67.00	N	170.1 %
2	1	118120	Streets Reconstruction - Remove and Replace Full Depth of Asphalt On Streets (by Contractor)	A Thousand Square Feet	No	0.00	Not Audited	--	--
2	2	118130	Asphalt Overlay - Remove and Replace Top 1 1/2 to 2 Inches of Asphalt On Streets (by Contractor)	A Thousand Square Feet	No	0.00	Not Audited	--	--
2	3	118140	Pavement Management System Survey - To Assess Street Condition	A Street Surveyed	No	2,006.00	1,777.00	N	12.9 %
2	4	118150	Temporary Asphaltic Patching - Place Asphalt In Potholes or Low Areas On Temporary Basis	A Square Foot	No	1,047.00	720.00	N	45.4 %
2	5	118160	Remove Pavement by Grinding - To Prepare Street For Sealing (by City Staff)	A Square Foot	No	86,534.00	75,755.00	N	14.2 %
2	6	118170	Deep Lift Patching - Remove and Replace Asphalt In Damaged or Low Areas Where Depths Exceed Six (6) Inches	A Square Foot	No	43,818.00	41,615.00	N	5.3 %
2	7	118180	Pavement Equipment Repair and Servicing	A Repair Made	No	20.00	14.00	N	42.9 %
3	1	118220	Silk Screen Fabrication - Traffic Signs	A Sign Fabricated	No	183.00	268.00	N	-31.7 %
3	2	118230	Hand Fabrication - Traffic Signs	A Sign Fabricated	No	722.00	841.00	N	-14.2 %
3	3	118240	Traffic Sign/Pole - New Installations	A Sign/Pole Installed	No	161.00	206.00	N	-21.8 %
3	4	118250	Repair Damaged Traffic Sign/Pole	A Sign/Pole Repaired	No	1,388.00	1,500.00	N	-7.5 %
3	5	118260	Replace Traffic Sign/Pole	A Sign/Pole Replaced	No	868.00	940.00	N	-7.7 %
3	6	118270	Remove Traffic Sign/Pole	A Sign/Pole Removed	No	71.00	80.00	N	-11.3 %
3	7	118280	Maintain Traffic Sign Area of the Hazardous Material Facility at the Corporation Yard	An Occasion	No	7.00	8.00	N	-12.5 %
3	8	118290	Traffic Sign Annual Inspection for Condition and Reflectivity	A Sign Inspected	No	3,749.00	5,795.00	N	-35.3 %
4	1	118330	Traffic Line Striping of City Streets	A Thousand Lineal Feet	No	585.00	944.50	N	-38.1 %
4	2	118340	Pre-Marking/Cat Tracking Prior to Striping	A Location	No	172.00	223.00	N	-22.9 %
4	3	118350	Installation of Thermoplastic Crosswalks and Limit Bars	A Lineal Foot	No	9,489.00	12,241.00	N	-22.5 %
4	4	118360	Installation of Thermoplastic Street Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Installed	No	837.00	173.00	N	383.8 %
4	5	118370	Removal of Thermoplastic Crosswalks and Limit Bars	A Lineal Foot	No	9,908.00	10,430.00	Y	-5.0 %
4	6	118380	Removal of Thermoplastic Street Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Removed	No	85.00	93.00	N	-8.6 %
4	7	118390	Paint Crosswalks and Stop/Yield Limit Bars On Street Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	22,691.00	25,112.00	N	-9.6 %
4	8	118400	Paint Street Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Painted	No	1,661.00	1,000.00	N	66.1 %
4	9	118410	Removal of Painted Crosswalks and Limit Bars On Street Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	1,195.00	1,195.00	Y	0.0 %
4	10	118420	Removal of Painted Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Removed	No	4.00	9.00	N	-55.6 %
4	11	118430	Traffic Curb Painting - Red, Blue, Green, Etc.	A Lineal Foot	No	2,443.00	7,837.00	N	-68.8 %
4	12	118440	Install Ceramic and Reflective Transportation Markers	A Reflector Placed	No	3,774.00	4,880.00	N	-22.7 %
4	13	118450	Remove Traffic Markings On Street Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	0.00	0.00	Y	0.0 %
4	14	118460	City-Owned Parking Lot Pavement Maintenance	A Parking Lot Maintained	No	15.00	20.00	N	-25.0 %
4	15	118470	Sign Shop - Maintenance of Facilities	An Activity	No	15.00	14.00	N	7.1 %
4	16	118480	Sign Shop - Equipment Repair	A Repair Made	No	59.00	88.00	N	-33.0 %
5	1	118510	Curb Sweeping of City Streets - To Prevent Pollutants From Entering the Storm System and the Bay	A Mile Swept	No	9,569.00	14,768.00	N	-35.2 %
5	2	118520	Provide Temporary "No Parking" Signs - For Special Route Sweeping as Requested by Sweeper Operator or Residents	A Location Posted	No	12.00	7.00	N	71.4 %
5	3	118530	Weekly Sweep of City-Owned Parking Lots	A Lot Swept	No	875.00	NATV	--	--
5	4	118540	Heavy Leaf Drop Pick Up - To Assist Sweepers In Completing Scheduled Routes During Times We Experience Heavy Leaf Drop	A Cubic Yard	No	432.00	464.00	N	-6.9 %
5	5	118550	Haul Street Sweepings and Other Debris from the Corporation Yard's Sweeping Bin Area	A Cubic Yard	No	4,905.00	180.00	N	2,625.0 %

Appendix 1 — Results Accuracy Table (continued)

SDP	Activity	Charge Code	Charge Code Title	Product Title	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +5%	
								Y/N	+/-
5	6	118560	Clean and Maintain City-Owned Walkways - To Reduce Hazardous Conditions and Allow Safe Passage	A Location	No	149.00	153.00	Y	-2.6 %
5	7	118570	Clean and Maintain City Roadsides and Easements to Reduce Hazards to Pedestrians and Vehicles	An Occasion	No	25.00	21.00	N	19.0 %
5	8	118580	Repair Walkways, Guardrails, Barricades and Fences to Reduce Hazards and Allow Safe Passage	A Location	No	6.00	8.00	N	-25.0 %
5	9	118590	Minor Equipment Repair and Servicing - Including Daily Safety Inspections	A Repair Made	No	7.00	21.00	N	66.6 %
6	1	118630	Unscheduled Street Repairs - Due to Hazardous Condition	A Repair	No	40.00	18.00	N	122.2 %
6	2	118640	Temporary Traffic Controls - Unplanned Placing of Cones, Barricades, Etc.	An Occasion	No	12.00	7.00	N	71.4 %
6	3	118650	Unscheduled Street Sweeping - Per Request Within Two (2) Working Days of Notification	An Occasion	No	34.00	7.00	N	385.7 %
6	4	118660	Hazardous Debris Removal - Removal of Objects from Vehicle, Bike Lanes Within Three (3) Hours of Notification	An Occasion	No	175.00	7.00	N	2,400.0 %
6	5	118670	Walkways, Guardrails, Barricades and Fences - Unplanned Cleaning or Hazardous Conditions	A Repair	No	31.00	27.00	N	14.8 %
6	6	118680	Graffiti Abatement - Removal of Obscene/Racial Graffiti Within One (1) Working Day of Notification	A Location	No	4.00	4.00	Y	0.0 %
6	7	118690	Sign Repairs - Repair Traffic Signs/Poles that Present a Hazard Within Three (3) Hours of Notification	An Occasion	No	5.00	6.00	N	-16.7 %
7	1	118740	Provide Temporary Traffic Controls - Planned Events	An Occasion	No	198.00	274.00	N	-27.7 %
7	2	118750	Plan Checking - Staff Review of Plans for Developments and City Projects per Request	A Plan Checked	No	20.00	8.00	N	150.0 %
7	3	118760	Field Checking - On-Site Staff Surveys for Developments and City Projects per Request	An Occasion	No	163.00	205.00	N	-20.5 %
7	4	118770	Graffiti Abatement - Non-Emergency, Non-Obscene or Racial Contents Within Two (2) Work Days of Notification	An Occasion	No	743.00	877.00	N	-15.3 %
7	5	118780	Remove Debris from Streets - Non-Hazardous Within Two (2) Work Days of Notification	An Occasion	No	116.00	7.00	N	1557.1 %
7	6	118790	Remove Abandoned Shopping Carts as Debris - Non-Hazardous	An Occasion	No	251.00	38.00	N	560.5 %
8	1	118840	Management and Supervisory Services	A Work Hour	--	--	Not Audited	--	--
8	2	118850	Administrative Support - Including Clerical Staff Hours	A Work Hour	--	--	Not Audited	--	--
8	3	118860	Staff Training and Development - Including Tailgate Meetings, Certifications and Operations/Safety-Related Classes	A Training Completed	--	--	Not Audited	--	--
8	4	118870	Certification/Commercial Licenses Differential	A Certificate/License	Yes	0.00	NATV	--	--
98	99	118980	Program-Wide Allocation	None	--	--	Not Audited	--	--

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +3%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition		
							Y/N	+/-						
1	Q	Customers are satisfied with the safety of City roadways (based on Citywide Survey).	Percent of Satisfied Customers	No	93.00 %	61.00 %	N	52.5 %	1	The calculation methodology specified in the SOP was not followed.	1	Update SOP to reflect that the citizen survey is conducted by a third-party and data are provided as percentages. No calculations are required by program.	Agree. SOP to be updated.	
									2	Three categories, including "fair/average," were included in the reported performance result. Inclusion of this category is inconsistent with the underlying intent of the SOP.	2	Update SOP to reflect the reported result will be the summation of the percentage of responses shown in categories "excellent," "good," and "fair."	Agree. SOP to be updated. This measure has actually been split into two, one including just "excellent" and "good" responses, and the other to include "Fair" responses as well.	
2	Q	City collector and residential streets are rated "good" or better with a PCI rating of over 70, based on Metropolitan Traffic Commission (MTC) Regional Standards.	Percent of Collector and Residential Streets Rated "Good" or Better	No	79.00 %	87.30 %	N	-9.5 %	3	SOP for performance measures 2 states: "...collector and residential streets are rated 'good' or better with a PCI rating of 70+ ..." Performance measure 3 states: "... arterial streets are rated 'fair' or better with a PCI rating of 70+ ..."	3	Make the wording on the SOPs for both Performance Measures 2 and 3 consistent. A rating of 70+ should be either "good" or "fair" – not both when the only difference is the type of street.	Agree. SOP to be updated.	
									4	Master PCI Listing, a spreadsheet file, as submitted by the program, contains numerous formula errors.	4	Correct the formulas in the file so future reporting is more accurate.	Agree. Actual mileage to be verified and then consistently applied in all issues regarding length of streets maintained.	
									5	The wording of the performance measure and the wording on the SOP are inconsistent. As stated in the measure itself, the streets with a PCI of 70 are not included in the calculation; only those with a PCI "over 70" are included. The wording on the SOP is "70+"; again, those streets with a PCI of 70 are excluded.	5	Change the wording of the performance measure from "over 70" to "greater than or equal to 70" to conform to common standards. As stated in the measure itself, the streets with a PCI of 70 are not included in the calculation. Also change the wording on the SOP from "70+" to "greater than or equal to 70" for consistency, as well as to include those streets with a PCI of 70.	Agree. Performance measure and SOP to be reviewed, coordinated, and updated.	
3	Q	City arterial streets are rated "good" or better with a PCI rating of over 70, based on Metropolitan Traffic Commission (MTC) Regional Standards.	Percent of Arterial Streets Rated "Good" or Better	No	69.00 %	91.10 %	N	-24.3 %	Duplicate 3		Duplicate 3	Duplicate 3		
									Duplicate 4		Duplicate 4	Duplicate 4		
									Duplicate 5		Duplicate 5	Duplicate 5		
4	Q	"No Parking" signs are posted before chip seal and slurry seal are applied to streets.	Percent of Signs Posted	No	100.00 %	NATV	--	--	6	The SOP states the data source is "... a log kept by the Sr. PW Leader showing street names, number of signs to be posted, date of posting and staff who did the work ..." The data provided, a spreadsheet entitled "Slurry 2007, Revised 3-22-07" does not include the number of signs posted. In addition, no information was provided for posting for chip seal activities. This lack of information renders both Performance Measure 4 and the underlying data point "not able to verify" (NATV).	6	Combine all posting for all pavement repair activities (chip seal and slurry) into one spreadsheet. Add the columns to the spreadsheet for when the signs are picked up and by which crew. See Work Papers for suggested format.	Agree. Performance measure to be reviewed, and SOP to be updated to provide clear support for the precisely worded measure.	
									7	SOP does not specify how re-posting of signs is captured in the performance measure. For example, weather conditions dictate that the planned pavement repairs can not be made on the originally planned day. The street scheduled for repairs was posted the prior week, but now needs to be re-posted. Is the re-posting counted? If so, how?	7	Update SOP to include description of how re-posting of signs is accounted for in the performance measure.	Agree. SOP to be updated.	
5	P	Annual pavement preventive maintenance activities (chip seal and slurry seal) are completed as scheduled.	Percent of Planned Maintenance Activities Completed	No	99.50 %	NATV	--	--	8	The SOP states the data source is "... a log kept by the Sr. PW Leader showing street names, number of signs to be posted, date of posting and staff who did the work ..." The data provided, a spreadsheet entitled "2007 Summer Chip Seal and 2008 Slurry Seal Streets" does not include the original scheduled dates, thus no comparison may be made between the originally scheduled repair date and the date the repair actually took place. This lack of information renders Performance Measure 5 "not able to verify" (NATV).	8	Combine all posting for all pavement repair activities (chip seal and slurry) into one spreadsheet. Add the columns to the spreadsheet for the originally scheduled repair date and the actual repair date. See Work Papers for suggested format.	Agree. Performance measure to be reviewed, and SOP to be updated to provide clear support for the precisely worded measure.	

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +3%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition
							Y/N	+/-				
			1,000 Square Feet Chip and Slurry Seal	--	3,882.00	NATV	--	--	9 The data point is rendered NATV. The square footage of slurry seal and chip seal that are accomplished during a given fiscal year are recorded in Activity 118050 — Slurry Seal and Activity 118060 — Double Chip Seal. No supporting documentation was provided by the Program to verify the products recorded in the MBO or the Unit Card. The auditor renders Activity 118050 and Activity 118060 and all associated performance measures NATV. For Activity 118050, no verification of square footage was provided and invoices to Granite Rock Construction, the contractor, do not show any work accomplished except the Mary Avenue Rehabilitation Project (#826020). Products (1,000 square feet) would not have been recorded for a project. Further, the amount shown on the "master Chipseal Summer 2007 worksheet 122806.xls" shows Total 2008 Slurry Seal Footage equal to 2,329,500 2008 is not the year being audited.  For Activity 118060, the program provided a spreadsheet entitled, "Master Chip Seal Summer 2007 worksheet 122806.xls" which shows 1,608.3 thousand square feet chip sealed. However, 1,436.0 thousand square feet was recorded on the Unit Card and the MBO.	9 Ensure the data source defined in the SOP, the log of streets sealed, which is maintained by the Sr. Leader, is accurately filled out and the Daily Work Reports and invoices received by the contractor(s) accurately reflect all work being accomplished via contract.	Agree. The performance measure and activity descriptions will be coordinated, and the SOP updated to match actual steps taken, consistent with the needs of this performance measure.	
6	P	Annual major repairs (street reconstruction and asphalt overlay) are completed as scheduled.	Percent of Planned Repairs Completed	No	0.00 %	Not Audited	--	--	10 The work being tracked by this performance measure is accomplished through the Capital Budget. It is not part of the Operational Budget, thus no products are recorded.	10 Delete Performance Measure 6.	Agree. This performance measure will be reviewed and proposed for deletion if there is no reason to track information of this nature in this program.	
			1,000 Square Feet Reconstructed	--	0.00	Not Audited	--	--				
			1,000 Square Feet Overlaid	--	0.00	Not Audited	--	--				
7	P	Annual traffic sign reflectivity, inspection and maintenance are completed as scheduled.	Percent of Activities Completed	No	100.00 %	NATV	--	--	11 The SOP states the data source is "... the log of street signs inspected during each year, maintained by the Sr. Leader ..." The data provided, a document entitled "2006-2007 Area Check & Sign Maintenance Schedule," does not include the original scheduled inspection dates, thus no comparison may be made between the originally scheduled inspection date and the date the inspection actually took place. This lack of information renders Performance Measure 7 "not able to verify" (NATV).	11 Modify the "Area Check & Sign Maintenance Schedule" to include the scheduled inspection date. An alternative would be to reword the performance measure to reflect a given percentage of the City's signage inventory is inspected annually.	Agree. Performance measure and SOP will be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect actual practice in a reportable format.	
			Number of Signs Maintained	--	3,749.00	5,795.00	N	-35.3 %	12 Activity 118290 — Traffic Sign Annual Inspection for Condition and Reflectivity is the underlying foundation for this performance measure's data point. Multiple products recorded on multiple data sources. See Work Papers for details.	12 Ensure the data source defined in the SOP, the log of street signs inspected, which is maintained by the Sr. Leader, is accurately filled out and the Daily Work Reports accurately reflect all inspections being conducted.	Agree. Work methods and SOP to be reviewed, with retraining as necessary to assure conformance to written procedures.	
8	P	Annual arterial striping is completed as scheduled.	Percent of Striping Completed	No	73.00 %	NATV	--	--	13 The SOP states the data source is "... the log of striping done during each year, maintained by the Sr. Leader ..." The data provided, a document showing the completion dates for both residential and arterial striping, painting of legends, maintenance of thermoplastic markings, and marking of the City's streets does not include the original scheduled inspection dates, thus no comparison may be made between the originally scheduled inspection date and the date the inspection actually took place. This lack of information renders Performance Measure 8 "not able to verify" (NATV).	13 Modify the log to include the scheduled inspection date. An alternative would be to reword the performance measure to reflect a given percentage of the City's signage inventory is inspected annually.	Agree. Performance measure and SOP to be reviewed, coordinated and updated.	
			1,000 Lineal Feet Striped	--	585.00	343.44	N	70.4 %	14 Activity 118330 — Traffic Line Striping of City Streets is the underlying foundation for this performance measure's data point. However, the activity also includes striping accomplished on residential and connector streets; these products were excluded from the auditor's calculations. Multiple products were recorded on multiple data sources. See Work Papers for details.	14 Ensure the data source defined in the SOP, the log of striping, etc., which is maintained by the Sr. Leader, is accurately filled out and the Daily Work Reports detail the activity being recorded, i.e. striping for residential & connectors, striping for arterials, thermoplastic application, painting legends, etc.	Agree. Work methods and SOP to be reviewed, with retraining as necessary to assure conformance to written procedures.	

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +3%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition
							Y/N	+/-				
9	P	Street sweeping requests/complaints are responded to within two (2) working days from notification.	Percent of Complaints Responded within Two (2) Days	No	100.00 %	100.00 %	Y	0.0 %	15 During FY 2006/2007, 585 service requests were logged in the Public Works' Service Reports System. Of that total only 6, or 1.1 percent, were related to street sweeping requests/complaints. Further, the SOP states that the annual average number of complaints related to sweeping is 15, or 2.6 percent.	15 It is neither cost effective nor feasible to separately report such a small segment of the program's work. Performance Measures 9, 10, 11, 15, and 16 are similar in this way so all five are addressed with this recommendation. The auditor recommends deleting these individual performance measures and replacing them with an over-arching performance measure that reflects responsiveness to public requests and complaints. The Public Works' Service Reports System would remain as the data source for the new performance measure. The categories, or types of work, should correspond to the existing categories and existing target response times. For those categories without target response times, appropriate targets should be established. The auditor suggests the following:  New Performance Measure — Requests/Complaints received through the Public Works' Service Reports System are addressed within the established acceptable response time.  <b>New Performance Measure —</b> Requests/Complaints received through the Public Works' Service Reports System are addressed within the established acceptable response time.  Categories/Work Type Target Response Times Debris Emergency within 3 hours of notification Debris Non-emergency within 2 working days of notification Graffiti Emergency within 1 working day of notification Graffiti Non-emergency within 2 working days of notification Sewer — Other To be established Sign Hazard To be established Sign Non-hazard To be established Sign Shop Misc. To be established Street Lights To be established Street Pavement Hazard To be established Street Pavement Non-hazard To be established Street-Sweep-Sign-Paint-Other To be established Sweeping within 2 working days of notification  Data Point 1: Percent of requests/complaints responded to within the established acceptable response time.  Data Point 2: Total number of requests/complaints	Agree. Performance measures and SOPs to be reviewed and updated as necessary to accurately provide a measurable result of customer calls on these services, as appropriate.	
			Number of Complaints	--	4.00	6.00	N	-33.3 %	16 The Public Works' Service Request System data appears to be downloaded into a spreadsheet and manually manipulated in order to determine the relevant products.	16 Modify the Public Works' Service Request System to include an automated calculation of the time elapsed between when the request/complaint is received (already exists in system) and when the response is completed (already exists in system). Also, design an automated report within the system that produces the needed product information in tabular form, as well as an automated report that populates the products onto an electronic Journal Voucher form. This form would then be transmitted electronically (via e-mail) to the Finance Department for entry into the City's Financial System. Using this, or a similar procedure will enhance reporting accuracy because the information is entered manually only once. Reducing the number of times the data is "touched" or manipulated will reduce the probability of data entry/keystroke errors.	Agree. This type information can be gotten from a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) which the Public Works Department has been trying to obtain for years. Changes to the Service Request System might be available, in the near term, through the Information Technology Department.	
									17 The SOP states the data source is "... the log ... maintained by the Sr. Leader ..." The data source is the Public Works' Service Reports System.	17 If the measure is not deleted, update the SOP to reflect the correct data source.	Agree. This measure to be deleted and combined, as suggested, or the SOP will be review and updated, as appropriate.	
10	P	Hazardous debris calls are responded to within three (3) hours from notification.	Percent of Calls Responded to on Time	No	88.00 %	92.00 %	N	-4.3 %	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15	

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +3%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition
							Y/N	+/-				
			Number of Emergency Debris Calls	--	175.00	137.00	N	-27.7%	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16	
11	P	Emergency graffiti obscenities are removed within one (1) working day from notification.	Percent of Graffiti Removed on Time	No	100.00 %	100.00 %	Y	0.0 %	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15	
			Number of Emergency Graffiti Requests	--	4.00	4.00	Y	0.0 %	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16	
12	CE	The cost to permanent-patch a square foot of City roadway will not exceed the planned cost.	Cost Per Square Foot	No	\$3.73	\$3.91	N	-4.6 %	18 The performance measure reflects the cost effectiveness of only a minute portion of the work being accomplished by the program.	18 The auditor recommends establishing additional performance measures that reflect the other segments of primary work carried out by this program. The additional performance measures should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost per square foot to prepare pavement for repair by slurry seal only, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Posting "no parking" signs</li> <li>Marking pavement for failures</li> <li>Sawing &amp; patching OR milling &amp; deep patching OR milling &amp; shallow patching</li> <li>Crack sealing</li> </ul> </li> <li>The cost per square foot to apply slurry seal only.</li> <li>The cost per square foot for completion/follow-up activities, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sweeping</li> <li>Striping</li> <li>Traffic markings (crosswalks, legends, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>The cost per square foot to prepare pavement for repair by combined chip seal and slurry, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Posting "no parking" signs</li> <li>Marking pavement for failures</li> <li>Sawing &amp; patching OR milling &amp; deep patching OR milling &amp; shallow patching</li> <li>Crack sealing</li> </ul> </li> <li>The cost per square foot to apply the combination of chip seal and slurry seal.</li> <li>The cost per square foot for completion/follow-up activities, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sweeping</li> <li>Striping</li> <li>Traffic markings (crosswalks, legends, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Agree that this measure represents the cost effectiveness of only a portion of the Program. Public Works will work with Finance and OCM, as appropriate, to determine the precise requirements and create the necessary performance measures and SOPs.	
			Number of Square Feet	--	310,000.00	295,737.00	N	4.8 %	19 The SOP does not accurately reflect the measure. The data source is incorrectly stated, the language relating to how the target is calculated does not reflect the target; the criteria ranges for "exceeds," "met," and "not met" is too large relative to the magnitude of the cost.	19 Redo the SOP to include the following information, by section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2e. Add: "The underlying data source for information entered into the City's Financial System is the Pavement Division's Daily Work Reports."</li> <li>2f. Delete the word "actual" and replace with "planned." Add language that defines the costs included. i.e. Does the target cost include preparatory work or only the cost of labor and materials used to accomplish only the patch?</li> <li>2g. Suggest changing the target range for meeting the performance level from +10.0 percent to +5.0 percent. The current level results in a 20.0 percent range, which is too large. A 10.0 percent range is more appropriate and coincides with standard contingencies used for contracting pavement work and materials.</li> <li>3b. Correct the data source to be the Daily Work Reports.</li> <li>3c. Correct the wording of how the data point is calculated. Delete "scheduled to be" and replace with "actually." Delete the last word in the first sentence ("number").</li> </ul>	Agree. Performance measure and SOP to be reviewed, coordinated and updated, with details of accuracy to be determined within an appropriate range.	
13	CE	The cost to chip seal 1,000 square feet of City roadway will not exceed the planned cost.	Cost Per 1,000 Square Feet	No	\$326.00	NATV	--	-- %	20 Activity 118060 — Double Chip Seal – Application of Oil/Gravel to Street by In-house Staff is the underlying foundation for this performance measure's data point. The auditor renders this performance measure and the underlying activity's products as "not able to verify" (NATV). See Work Papers for details.	20 Ensure the Daily Work Reports are accurately filled out and entered into the unit card.	Agree. The SOP will be verified, and necessary training will be provided to assure accurate recording of necessary information.	

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

			Number of 1,000 Square Feet	--	1,436.00	NATV	--	--	%	Duplicate 18	Duplicate 18	Duplicate 18
										Duplicate 19	Duplicate 19	Duplicate 19
14	F	Actual total expenditures for Pavement Operations will not exceed planned program expenditures.	Total Program Expenditures	No	\$4,138,521.00	\$4,138,520.82	Y	0.0	%	-- None.	-- None.	N/A
15	P	Non-hazardous debris calls are responded to within two (2) working days from notification.	Percent of Calls Responded to on Time	No	96.00	100.00	N	-4.0	%	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15
			Number of Non-emergency Debris Calls	--	116.00	206.00	N	-43.7	%	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16
										Duplicate 17	Duplicate 17	Duplicate 17

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

Meas#	Type	Measure	Data Point	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +3%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition	
							Y/N	+/-					
16	P	Non-emergency graffiti are removed within two (2) working days from notification.	Percent of Graffiti Removed on Time	No	97.00 %	100.00 %	Y	-3.0 %	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15	Duplicate 15		
			Number of Non-emergency Graffiti Requests	--	743.00	39.00	N	1805.1 %	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16	Duplicate 16		
									Duplicate 17	Duplicate 17	Duplicate 17		
SDP	Activity	Charge Code	Charge Code Title	Product Title	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +5%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition
1	1	118000	Crack Sealing - Use Asphaltic Material to Seal Surface Cracks In Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	529,750.00	526,355.00	Y	0.7 %	21 The SOP does not accurately reflect the activity's products.	21 Redo the SOP to include the following information, by section:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1e. Auditor suggest deleting all words in the title following the "—" to fully encompass all that is being charged to this activity.</li> <li>2. Add a full listing of preparatory work needed to accomplish crack sealing.</li> <li>4. Correct the data source to include the Daily Work Reports and the Unit Card.</li> </ul>	Agree. This activity and SOP to be reviewed, coordinated and updated to reflect actual practice, and provide helpful results, as appropriate.	
1	2	118010	Petromat Application - Apply Material to Streets to Reduce Water Penetration Into Base	A Thousand Square Feet	No	278.00	293.00	N	-5.1 %	-- None.	-- None.	N/A	
1	3	118020	Marking of Damaged Pavement - Prior to Permanent Patching	A Project Location	No	275.00	244.00	N	12.7 %	22 The SOP does not accurately reflect the activity's data sources.	22 Edit the SOP to include the correct data sources. Section 4 of the SOP currently reads:  "The Sr. PW Leader will record products for this activity on monthly product cards. The cards will be based on a log maintained by the Sr. Leader showing daily activities performed by staff and time involved in each activity."  The auditor suggests the following wording to reflect the actual way the data is being captured and recorded:  "The Sr. PW Leader will record products for this activity on monthly product cards journal vouchers and submitted to the Finance Department for entry into the Financial System. The cards JVs will be based on a log maintained daily work reports filled out by field staff/crew leaders. The daily work reports will be checked and entered into the Unit Card Summary on a weekly basis by the Sr. Leader. The daily work reports will showing daily activities performed, by staff and time involved in each activity, and associated products or an explanation of why no products were recorded. Example: Work not completed in 1 day."	Agree. This activity and SOP to be reviewed, coordinated and updated to reflect actual practice, proper data sources, and provide helpful results, as appropriate.	
1	4	118030	Sawing of Damaged Pavement - Prior to Permanent Patching	A Lineal Foot	No	48,671.00	56,266.00	N	-13.5 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
1	5	118040	Permanent Patching - Remove and Replace Damaged Pavement Prior to Resurfacing (Up to six (6) Inches)	A Square Foot	No	309,847.00	295,737.00	Y	4.8 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
1	6	118050	Slurry Seal - Application of Oil/Sand Mixture By Staff-Monitored Contractor to Extend Street Life	A Thousand Square Feet	No	2,446.00	NATV	--	--	Duplicate 9	Duplicate 9	Duplicate 9	
1	7	118060	Double Chip Seal - Application of Oil/Gravel to Street By In-House Staff to Prepare for Slurry Seal	A Thousand Square Feet	No	1,436.00	NATV	--	--	Duplicate 9	Duplicate 9	Duplicate 9	
1	8	118070	Provide Advance Notice - Notify Residents and Post "No Parking" Signs for Resurfacing Streets	A Project Location	No	276.00	317.00	N	-12.9 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
									23 Products recorded both when sign posting is first placed and when signs are picked up. Inconsistencies related to when products are recorded may decrease accuracy.	23 Add language to the SOP indicating that the products will be recorded either when the signs are posted or when they are picked up.	Agree. The activity and the SOP will be reviewed and revised, as appropriate, to properly record units and track work performed.		

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

	24	<p>The SOP specifically states:</p> <p>"This activity keeps track of advanced notification of maintenance to be performed on city streets to residents and businesses in the areas involved. This particular work includes posting 'No Parking' signs on the streets where maintenance will be performed and delivering notices to residents and businesses a minimum of 48 hours prior to the start of maintenance. These duties will be performed by the Sr. PW Leader, Technical Support Specialist, PW Leaders, Equipment Operators and Sr. Utility and Utility Workers during regular work hours."</p> <p>No mention of retrieving the signs is noted in the SOP; however, hours are charged to this activity for picking up the signs after the work is concluded</p>	24	<p>Add language to the SOP indicating that all hours associated with posting and picking up signage for notification are charged to this activity. Suggest changing only the second sentence to read:</p> <p>"... This particular work includes both posting and retrieving 'No Parking' signs on the streets where maintenance will be performed, delivering notices to residents, and businesses a minimum of 48 hours prior to the start of maintenance. ..."</p>	<p>Agree. The activity and the SOP will be reviewed and revised, as appropriate, to properly record units and track work performed.</p>
--	----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

SDP	Activity	Charge Code	Charge Code Title	Product Title	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +5%		Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition
								Y/N	+/-				
										25 The SOP does not specify if reposting of signs/notifications are counted as a product. Some repostings are counted; some are not.	25 Add language to the SOP indicating that all postings and repostings are counted as separate products. The underlying reasoning for including repostings is because comparable resources are required to both post and repost a given location.	Agree. The activity and the SOP will be reviewed and revised, as appropriate, to properly record units and track work performed.	
1	9	118080	Facilities Maintenance - Maintain Corp Yard Facilities and Make Minor Repairs to Equipment and Tools	An Activity	No	181.00	67.00	N	170.1 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
2	1	118120	Streets Reconstruction - Remove and Replace Full Depth of Asphalt On Streets (by Contractor)	A Thousand Square Feet	No	0.00	Not Audited	--	--	26 The work being tracked by this performance measure is accomplished through the Capital Budget. It is not part of the Operational Budget, thus no products are recorded.	26 Delete Activity 118120.	Agree. This activity to be reviewed for appropriateness and deleted if there is no operational value.	
2	2	118130	Asphalt Overlay - Remove and Replace Top 1 1/2 to 2 Inches of Asphalt On Streets (by Contractor)	A Thousand Square Feet	No	0.00	Not Audited	--	--	27 The work being tracked by this performance measure is accomplished through the Capital Budget. It is not part of the Operational Budget, thus no products are recorded.	27 Delete Activity 118130.	Agree. This activity to be reviewed for appropriateness and deleted if there is no operational value.	
2	3	118140	Pavement Management System Survey - To Assess Street Condition	A Street Surveyed	No	2,006.00	1,777.00	N	12.9 %	28 The defined product is "a street surveyed." However, the survey is conducted by sections, as per the MTC guidelines for the PCI.	28 Change the defined product to "a section surveyed" and update the SOP to reflect the change.	Agree. Product definition and SOP to be reviewed and revised as appropriate to reflect actual practice and responsiveness to the description.	
2	4	118150	Temporary Asphaltic Patching - Place Asphalt In Potholes or Low Areas On Temporary Basis	A Square Foot	No	1,047.00	720.00	N	45.4 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
2	5	118160	Remove Pavement by Grinding - To Prepare Street For Sealing (by City Staff)	A Square Foot	No	86,534.00	75,755.00	N	14.2 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
2	6	118170	Deep Lift Patching - Remove and Replace Asphalt In Damaged or Low Areas Where Depths Exceed Six (6) Inches	A Square Foot	No	43,818.00	41,615.00	N	5.3 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
2	7	118180	Pavement Equipment Repair and Servicing	A Repair Made	No	20.00	14.00	N	42.9 %	29 This activity is redundant. It is a subset of <i>Activity 118080 — Facilities Maintenance – Maintain Corp Yard Facilities and Make Minor Repairs to Equipment and Tools</i> , which is intended to track actions relating to maintaining the Corporation Yard, equipment, tools, and vehicles.	29 Delete Activity 118180 and record all products in Activity 118080 where all other repairs and servicing of equipment, including pavement equipment is being recorded currently.	Agree. This activity to be reviewed for appropriateness and deleted if there is no operational value.	
3	1	118220	Silk Screen Fabrication - Traffic Signs	A Sign Fabricated	No	183.00	268.00	N	-31.7 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	2	118230	Hand Fabrication - Traffic Signs	A Sign Fabricated	No	722.00	841.00	N	-14.2 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	3	118240	Traffic Sign/Pole - New Installations	A Sign/Pole Installed	No	161.00	206.00	N	-21.8 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	4	118250	Repair Damaged Traffic Sign/Pole	A Sign/Pole Repaired	No	1,388.00	1,500.00	N	-7.5 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	5	118260	Replace Traffic Sign/Pole	A Sign/Pole Replaced	No	868.00	940.00	N	-7.7 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	6	118270	Remove Traffic Sign/Pole	A Sign/Pole Removed	No	71.00	80.00	N	-11.3 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	7	118280	Maintain Traffic Sign Area of the Hazardous Material Facility at the Corporation Yard	An Occasion	No	7.00	8.00	N	-12.5 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
3	8	118290	Traffic Sign Annual Inspection for Condition and Reflectivity	A Sign Inspected	No	3,749.00	5,795.00	N	-35.3 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	1	118330	Traffic Line Striping of City Streets	A Thousand Lineal Feet	No	585.00	944.50	N	-38.1 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	2	118340	Pre-Marking/Cat Tracking Prior to Striping	A Location	No	172.00	223.00	N	-22.9 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	3	118350	Installation of Thermoplastic Crosswalks and Limit Bars	A Lineal Foot	No	9,489.00	12,241.00	N	-22.5 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	4	118360	Installation of Thermoplastic Street Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Installed	No	837.00	173.00	N	383.8 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	5	118370	Removal of Thermoplastic Crosswalks and Limit Bars	A Lineal Foot	No	9,908.00	10,430.00	Y	-5.0 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	6	118380	Removal of Thermoplastic Street Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Removed	No	85.00	93.00	N	-8.6 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	7	118390	Paint Crosswalks and Stop/Yield Limit Bars On Street Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	22,691.00	25,112.00	N	-9.6 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	8	118400	Paint Street Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Painted	No	1,661.00	1,000.00	N	66.1 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	9	118410	Removal of Painted Crosswalks and Limit Bars On Street Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	1,195.00	1,195.00	Y	0.0 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	10	118420	Removal of Painted Legends On Street Pavement	A Legend Removed	No	4.00	9.00	N	-55.6 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	11	118430	Traffic Curb Painting - Red, Blue, Green, Etc.	A Lineal Foot	No	2,443.00	7,837.00	N	-68.8 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	12	118440	Install Ceramic and Reflective Transportation Markers	A Reflector Placed	No	3,774.00	4,880.00	N	-22.7 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	13	118450	Remove Traffic Markings On Street Pavement	A Lineal Foot	No	0.00	0.00	Y	0.0 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	14	118460	City-Owned Parking Lot Pavement Maintenance	A Parking Lot Maintained	No	15.00	20.00	N	-25.0 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	15	118470	Sign Shop - Maintenance of Facilities	An Activity	No	15.00	14.00	N	7.1 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
4	16	118480	Sign Shop - Equipment Repair	A Repair Made	No	59.00	88.00	N	-33.0 %	Duplicate 29	Duplicate 29	Duplicate 29	
5	1	118510	Curb Sweeping of City Streets - To Prevent Pollutants From Entering the Storm System and the Bay	A Mile Swept	No	9,569.00	14,768.00	N	-35.2 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	2	118520	Provide Temporary "No Parking" Signs - For Special Route Sweeping as Requested by Sweeper Operator or Residents	A Location Posted	No	12.00	7.00	N	71.4 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	3	118530	Weekly Sweep of City-Owned Parking Lots	A Lot Swept	No	875.00	NATV	--	--	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	4	118540	Heavy Leaf Drop Pick Up - To Assist Sweepers In Completing Scheduled Routes During Times We Experience Heavy Leaf Drop	A Cubic Yard	No	432.00	464.00	N	-6.9 %	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	

**Program 118 — Pavement Operations**  
**Audit of FY 2006/2007 Performance Results**  
**Appendix 2 — Recommendation Table with Departmental Response**

SDP	Activity	Charge Code	Charge Code Title	Product Title	SOP Missing	Reported Result	Auditor Calculation	Accurate within +5%	Findings	Recommendations	Department Response	Disposition
								Y/N +/-				
5	5	118550	Haul Street Sweepings and Other Debris from the Corporation Yard's Sweeping Bin Area	A Cubic Yard	No	4,905.00	180.00	N 2,625.0%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	6	118560	Clean and Maintain City-Owned Walkways - To Reduce Hazardous Conditions and Allow Safe Passage	A Location	No	149.00	153.00	Y -2.6%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	7	118570	Clean and Maintain City Roadsides and Easements to Reduce Hazards to Pedestrians and Vehicles	An Occasion	No	25.00	21.00	N 19.0%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	8	118580	Repair Walkways, Guardrails, Barricades and Fences to Reduce Hazards and Allow Safe Passage	A Location	No	6.00	8.00	N -25.0%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
5	9	118590	Minor Equipment Repair and Servicing - Including Daily Safety Inspections	A Repair Made	No	7.00	21.00	N 66.6%	Duplicate 29	Duplicate 29	Duplicate 29	
6	1	118630	Unscheduled Street Repairs - Due to Hazardous Condition	A Repair	No	40.00	18.00	N 122.2%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
6	2	118640	Temporary Traffic Controls - Unplanned Placing of Cones, Barricades, Etc.	An Occasion	No	12.00	7.00	N 71.4%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
6	3	118650	Unscheduled Street Sweeping - Per Request Within Two (2) Working Days of Notification	An Occasion	No	34.00	7.00	N 385.7%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
6	4	118660	Hazardous Debris Removal - Removal of Objects from Vehicle, Bike Lanes Within Three (3) Hours of Notification	An Occasion	No	175.00	7.00	N 2,400.0%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
6	5	118670	Walkways, Guardrails, Barricades and Fences - Unplanned Cleaning or Hazardous Conditions	A Repair	No	31.00	27.00	N 14.8%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
6	6	118680	Graffiti Abatement - Removal of Obscene/Racial Graffiti Within One (1) Working Day of Notification	A Location	No	4.00	4.00	Y 0.0%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
6	7	118690	Sign Repairs - Repair Traffic Signs/Poles that Present a Hazard Within Three (3) Hours of Notification	An Occasion	No	5.00	6.00	N -16.7%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
7	1	118740	Provide Temporary Traffic Controls - Planned Events	An Occasion	No	198.00	274.00	N -27.7%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
7	2	118750	Plan Checking - Staff Review of Plans for Developments and City Projects per Request	A Plan Checked	No	20.00	8.00	N 150.0%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
7	3	118760	Field Checking - On-Site Staff Surveys for Developments and City Projects per Request	An Occasion	No	163.00	205.00	N -20.5%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
7	4	118770	Graffiti Abatement - Non-Emergency, Non-Obscene or Racial Contents Within Two (2) Work Days of Notification	An Occasion	No	743.00	877.00	N -15.3%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
7	5	118780	Remove Debris from Streets - Non-Hazardous Within Two (2) Work Days of Notification	An Occasion	No	116.00	7.00	N 1557.1%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
7	6	118790	Remove Abandoned Shopping Carts as Debris - Non-Hazardous	An Occasion	No	251.00	38.00	N 560.5%	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	Duplicate 22	
8	1	118840	Management and Supervisory Services	A Work Hour	--	--	Not Audited	--	--	--	N/A	
8	2	118850	Administrative Support—Including Clerical Staff Hours	A Work Hour	--	--	Not Audited	--	--	--	N/A	
8	3	118860	Staff Training and Development—Including Tailgate Meetings, Certifications and Operations/Safety Related Classes	A Training Completed	--	--	Not Audited	--	--	--	N/A	
8	4	118870	Certification/Commercial Licenses Differential	A Certificate/License	Yes	0.00	NATV	--	--	30 No SOP.	30 Prepare and submit an SOP.	Agree. SOP to be prepared to measure this activity.
98	99	118980	Program Wide Allocation	None	--	--	Not Audited	--	--	--	N/A	