

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
HAYWARD**

**Report Number 99-36
June 25, 1999**

Members, Committee on Audit

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Harold Goldwhite, Vice Chair
Eric C. Mitchell Dee Dee Myers
Joan Otomo-Corgel Frederick W. Pierce, IV
Ali Razi

Staff

University Auditor: Larry Mandel
Senior Director: Norman Buettner
Audit Manager: Janice Mirza

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose.....	1
Scope and Methodology.....	2
Background	2
Opinion.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

Maintenance Management Program.....	6
Program Development and Implementation.....	6
Program Administration.....	7
Preventive Maintenance	8
Custodial Services	9
Chargebacks and Non-Maintenance Work.....	11
Chargeback Controls	11
Non-General Fund Activities.....	12
Maintenance Materials and Equipment	14
Utilities Management.....	15

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	Personnel Contacted
APPENDIX B:	Campus Response
APPENDIX C:	Chancellor's Acceptance

ABBREVIATIONS

BSE	Building Service Engineers
CO	Chancellor's Office
CPDC	Capital Planning, Design & Construction (previously PPD)
CSU	California State University
CSUH	California State University, Hayward
DOFM	Department of Facilities Management
EO	Executive Order
MMS	Maintenance Management System
OMP	Operation and Maintenance of Plant
PM	Preventive Maintenance
SAM	State Administrative Manual
SUAM	State University Administrative Manual
WO	Work Order

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of policies and procedures related to the administration of the Operation and Maintenance of Plant (OMP) and to ensure that controls addressing current and future facility requirements are in place.

Within the overall audit objective, specific goals included determining whether:

- ▶ the administration and management of the OMP program and facilities planning functions provide clear lines of organizational authority and responsibility;
- ▶ budgeting procedures adequately address OMP funding, ensure that one-time funding allocations are used for their designated purpose, and include procedures to monitor budget versus actual expenses;
- ▶ a comprehensive program is in place that identifies all maintenance/repair requirements including preventive maintenance, facility repairs, deferred maintenance, custodial services, and grounds keeping;
- ▶ the maintenance/repair program includes productivity/performance standards, quality control and employee training to ensure that quality work is performed effectively and efficiently;
- ▶ administrative controls over the maintenance/repair program are adequate, and the maintenance management system includes work order scheduling, costing and control; backlog reports; and productivity tools;
- ▶ non-maintenance work is adequately controlled and fully charged back to the customer in accordance with CSU directives;
- ▶ all non-general fund operations and chargeable costs have been identified in accordance with CSU directives and are fully charged back to the operations;
- ▶ chargebacks are adequately controlled and properly valued;
- ▶ maintenance materials, supplies, and equipment are adequately controlled and properly accounted for;
- ▶ a utilities management program has been established in accordance with CSU policy; and
- ▶ the campus physical master plan is maintained in accordance with CSU policy.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This review emphasized but was not limited to compliance with state laws, Board of Trustee policies, and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters and directives. June 1998 to date was the primary period of review.

Our primary focus involved the internal administrative and accounting controls over the operation and maintenance of plant functions. Specifically, we reviewed and tested:

- ▶ □ budget allocation and monitoring procedures;
- ▶ □ identification of maintenance/repair requirements;
- ▶ □ work order processing and completion of preventive maintenance tasks;
- ▶ □ procedures for controlling custodial services and grounds keeping;
- ▶ □ procedures for controlling and processing chargebacks for non-maintenance work and costs associated with non-general fund operations;
- ▶ □ procedures for controlling and accounting for maintenance materials, supplies and equipment;
- ▶ □ implementation of a utilities management program; and
- ▶ □ maintenance of the campus physical master plan.

BACKGROUND

In response to the systemwide risk assessment conducted during 1996, which included input from officers representing the chancellor's office and each CSU campus, the Board of Trustees directed this review of Operation and Maintenance of Plant at its January 1999 meeting.

The Legislative Analyst's Report on the 1979/80 budget addressed the need to protect the substantial public investment represented by CSU facilities, and the Legislature subsequently directed the CSU to implement a preventive maintenance program on each campus. In December 1979, a CSU Task Force on Plant Maintenance was appointed to explore preventive maintenance needs for the system and concluded that the concept of preventive maintenance was too narrow in scope to accommodate the total maintenance needs of the CSU. Consequently, a concept of "Planned/Programmed Maintenance" was proposed, incorporating preventive maintenance as well as systematic planning and programming. The CSU Executive Council reviewed the task force report and approved the concept in March 1981.

INTRODUCTION

In April 1981, Executive Order No.343, *Establishment of Planned/Programmed Maintenance*, was issued. It stated that “effective immediately, each campus shall initiate a Planned/Programmed Maintenance Management system that will provide systematic maintenance of State owned campus facilities, program future special maintenance and repair project requirements, identify deferred maintenance needs, and schedule replacement of Group I equipment.”

In 1983, the Office of the University Auditor reviewed *Plant Operations* at eight campuses and issued a systemwide report. The Board of Trustees subsequently accepted the systemwide report and addressed nine implementing actions in Trustees’ resolution RA 9-83-057. These actions were adopted in CSU directive BA 84-25, *Implementation of Trustees’ Resolution RA 9-83-057 (Plant Operations)*, dated July 25, 1984.

Throughout this report, we will refer to the program as operation and maintenance of plant (OMP). The titles of the departments assigned responsibility for managing CSU campus operation and maintenance of plant include, among others, physical plant and plant operations. At California State University, Hayward, the Department of Facilities Management (DOFM) manages the OMP program.

OPINION

We visited the California State University, Hayward campus from March 8, 1999, through April 9, 1998, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

In our opinion, the automated work order system was adequate to manage and account for the maintenance/repair program, and budget-monitoring procedures were effective. Areas needing improvement are mentioned in the executive summary below.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this section is to provide management with an overview of conditions requiring attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [] refer to page numbers in the report.

MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM [6]

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION [6]

The CSU maintenance management program had not been fully implemented by the campus. Full implementation of this program helps to ensure that all maintenance/repair requirements are identified and decreases the risk of system breakdowns and deterioration of facilities.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION [7]

Oversight of the work order program, productivity management and timekeeping was not adequate. Improving oversight over these areas helps to ensure that maintenance and repairs are performed on a timely basis and decreases the risk of system breakdowns.

PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE [8]

Controls over the preventive maintenance (PM) program did not ensure timely completion of PM tasks and coverage of newly acquired equipment and facilities. Ensuring that PM work is completed timely and all newly acquired equipment is included enhances PM scheduling and coverage of campus equipment and facilities.

CUSTODIAL SERVICES [9]

Oversight of custodial duties and responsibilities was in need of improvement. Strengthening oversight of these areas improves accountability over janitorial supplies and helps to ensure that custodial services are performed properly.

CHARGEBACKS AND NON-MAINTENANCE WORK [11]

CHARGEBACK CONTROLS [11]

Procedures regarding reimbursement (chargebacks) to the Department of Facilities Management (DOFM) for services rendered were unsatisfactory. Improving chargeback procedures increases the likelihood for timely and complete reimbursement to the DOFM for services rendered.

NON-GENERAL FUND ACTIVITIES [12]

Services provided to non-general fund activities were not always fully reimbursed to the campus. Strengthening chargeback procedures to non-general fund activities increases the likelihood for full and timely compensation to the Department of Facilities Management (DOFM) and increases the funds available for campus maintenance and repairs.

MAINTENANCE MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT [14]

Maintenance materials and supplies inventory procedures were not adequate. Strengthening inventory procedures will reduce the risk of lost or stolen assets and could result in lower overall inventory costs.

UTILITIES MANAGEMENT [15]

The campus utilities management program was in need of improvement. Improving this program will ensure that the general fund is fully compensated for utilities provided to self-support and external organizations and may result in increased energy efficiency.

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The CSU maintenance management program had not been fully implemented by the campus.

We noted that:

- ▶ A physical audit of each facility had not been performed since 1990.
- ▶ A comprehensive listing of unfunded deferred maintenance had not been prepared since 1996.
- ▶ The campus did not have a listing of Group I equipment programmed for replacement.

Executive Order #343, *Establishment of Planned/Programmed Maintenance*, dated April 29, 1988, states, in part, that each maintenance management system shall incorporate an annual physical audit of each facility to identify maintenance/repair program requirements, and current annual listings of unfunded deferred maintenance projects and Group I equipment programmed for replacement.

The associate vice president for facilities planning and operations stated that funds have not been available to perform facility audits, and he was not aware of the requirement for a listing of Group I equipment scheduled for replacement. The associate director for facilities management stated that staffing issues had prevented a current review of unfunded deferred maintenance issues and that the process has not been kept up since visits by Capital Planning, Design and Construction to review minor capital projects have been discontinued.

Failure to fully implement the CSU maintenance management program increases the risk that all maintenance/repair requirements will not be identified and system breakdowns and deterioration of facilities will occur.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that, on an annual basis, the campus:

- a. perform a physical audit of each campus facility to identify maintenance/repair program requirements;
- b. prepare a current comprehensive listing of unfunded deferred maintenance; and
- c. prepare a listing of Group I equipment programmed for replacement.

Campus Response

The campus will perform a physical audit of campus facilities, prepare a listing of unfunded deferred maintenance, and prepare a listing of Group I equipment programmed for replacement. Anticipated Completion Date: July 31, 2000

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Oversight over the work order program, productivity management and timekeeping was not adequate.

We found that:

- ▶ An aging of open work orders (WO) for nine trade shops showed 260 WO's greater than 120 days old. The oldest was dated February 3, 1998. Further investigation showed that some WO's should be closed and others should be reclassified as special repairs, etc.
- ▶ A "Schedulable Project" report, which details projects requiring the coordination of more than one trade shop, was developed two months ago. However, procedures had not been developed to review and expedite the work. Many of the work orders on the report date back to 1998 and the Department of Facilities Management (DOFM) indicated that some may have been completed.
- ▶ Productivity reports were not currently available from the MMS system. The DOFM had recently requested that two reports be developed: PM Completion Analysis Report (CAR) and Scheduled vs. Actual Report.
- ▶ Supervisors were not always approving timesheets. A review of timesheets for the week of March 15, 1999 showed that 81% (61 of 75) did not contain supervisor approval.

CSU directive BA 84-25, *Implementation of Trustees' Resolution RA 9-83-057*, dated July 25, 1984, states that reasonably accurate time records should be maintained on building trades personnel so that productivity may be better managed.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal administrative control shall include an established system of practices to be followed in the performance of duties and functions as well as an effective system of internal review.

DOFM standing operating procedure SOP-WCC-006 requires that supervisors/managers turn in completed timesheets.

The associate director for facilities management stated that reports were not previously available to age outstanding work orders. He further stated that staffing issues had affected the review of open work orders and approved timesheets.

Less than adequate oversight over the work order program, productivity management and timekeeping increases the risk that maintenance and repairs will not be performed on a timely basis and system breakdowns will occur.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus:

- a. establish procedures to monitor the status and age of open work orders to expedite completion of the work;
- b. establish procedures to measure productivity; and
- c. establish procedures to ensure that timesheets are properly approved.

Campus Response

The campus will establish procedures to monitor work order progress, establish procedures to measure productivity, and ensure that timesheets are properly approved. Anticipated Completion Date: Feb. 28, 2000

PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

Controls over the preventive maintenance (PM) program did not ensure timely completion of PM tasks and coverage of newly-acquired equipment and facilities.

- ▶ A review of PM building service engineers (BSE) and refrigeration involving 614 tasks that occurred over a five-week period disclosed that;
 - (a) 26% (130 of 494) and 34% (41 of 120) of the scheduled PM tasks for BSE and the refrigeration shop, respectively, had not been completed;
 - (b) of the tasks completed, 57% and 24% were completed late for BSE and refrigeration, respectively, and;
 - (c) 51% and 62% were completed in less than the estimated hours for BSE and refrigeration, respectively.
- ▶ The Department of Facilities Management did not have a formalized process to ensure that all newly acquired facilities and equipment are added to the planned/programmed maintenance program.

Executive Order #343, *Establishment of Planned/Programmed Maintenance*, dated April 29, 1988, states that each management system shall incorporate a current, comprehensive schedule for all maintenance work to be accomplished in a timely manner.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal administrative control shall include an established system of practices to be followed in performance of duties and functions as well as an effective system of internal review.

The associate director for facilities management stated that the preventive maintenance schedule was originally established in 1984, and staffing issues prevented a thorough review of the program. He further stated that current plans include such a study.

By not ensuring that PM work is completed timely, and all newly acquired equipment and facilities are included, there is an increased risk of ineffective and inefficient PM scheduling and coverage for campus equipment and facilities.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus:

- a. strengthen procedures to ensure that preventive maintenance tasks, which have been assigned, are completed and performed in a timely manner;
- b. establish procedures to ensure that all newly acquired facilities and equipment are added to the planned/programmed maintenance program; and
- c. monitor estimated vs. actual PM hours and adjust where applicable.

Campus Response

The campus will strengthen procedures to monitor preventive maintenance progress, ensure that newly acquired facilities and equipment are added to the list, and review scheduled preventive maintenance hours for appropriateness. Anticipated Completion Date: Feb. 28, 2000

CUSTODIAL SERVICES

Oversight of custodial duties and responsibilities was in need of improvement.

We noted that:

- ▶ Monthly custodial inspections were not always performed. For January and February 1999, inspection sheets were not completed for 41% (9 of 22) and 55% (12 of 22) of custodians, respectively.

- ▶ Custodians were no longer required to complete custodial department station sheets acknowledging completion of their assigned areas.
- ▶ Employee receipt of the Rules and Procedures for the Custodial Services Department had not been acknowledged since 1996.
- ▶ Custodial department procedures include monthly work inspections for each custodian and annual distribution of department rules and procedures, including custodian acknowledgement of receipt. However, these procedures were not included in the department's written rules and procedures.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal administrative control shall include an established system of practices to be followed in performance of duties and functions.

SAM §3535 states that each state agency must develop internal policies and procedures for effective materials management within each organizational unit that maintains continuing inventories of expendable goods.

The manager of custodial services stated that he assumed that these items were being done. He further stated that compliance was affected by staffing levels. Steps were taken to correct some of the above items prior to the end of the audit.

Without strengthening oversight of custodial duties and responsibilities, there is an increased risk that custodial services will not be performed properly and janitorial supplies may be lost or stolen.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus:

- a. strengthen procedures to ensure that all custodial inspections are performed and employees receive copies of custodial department rules on an annual basis;
- b. reestablish the use of custodial department station sheets to document completion of all assigned cleaning areas; and
- c. update the department written rules and procedures to include all current procedures.

Campus Response

The campus will establish procedures to ensure that custodial inspections are performed, custodial department station sheets are used to document completion of assigned cleaning areas, and updated custodial department rules are distributed to employees annually. Anticipated Completion Date: Feb. 28, 2000

CHARGEBACKS AND NON-MAINTENANCE WORK

CHARGEBACK CONTROLS

Procedures regarding reimbursement (chargebacks) to the Department of Facilities Management (DOFM) for services rendered were unsatisfactory.

We noted that:

- ▶ Procedures had not been established to ensure that all chargebacks are billed.
 - A review of chargeback billings for December 1998 through March 1999 showed 14 chargebacks reflected at \$0.00. Further investigation showed that these chargebacks should have been billed at a total of \$2,521,85. Subsequent to our discussions with management, these chargebacks were billed back to the departments at the appropriate rates.
 - A review of 30 chargeback work orders showed that eight involved facilities reservations for off-campus events; none of which was included on monthly billing lists. Five other work orders had the following problems: two were billed at incorrect amounts; one was closed but not billed; and one was not billed, although it had been completed in January.
- ▶ Because current procedures do not include verification that credit is received for chargebacks invoiced by accounting and events processed through facilities reservations, the DOFM is not able to verify that credit is received for all chargebacks.
- ▶ Procedures had not been established to ensure that actual labor rates are used. Labor rates currently used for chargebacks were updated using actual rates as of June 30, 1998 and modified for expected labor rate increases. However, these labor rates were not subsequently adjusted when the expected rate increases were finalized. In addition, labor rates in the system were not routinely changed for changes in job classification.
- ▶ There was no supporting documentation to substantiate the 25% overhead rate used for chargebacks. In addition, the rate currently used for benefits was incorrect.
- ▶ Overhead was being charged on the labor, but not the materials portion of chargebacks.

CSU directive BA 84-25, *Implementation of Trustees' Resolution RA 9-83-057*, dated July 25, 1984, states that each campus will develop a chargeback system, and campus policy and procedures must ensure the return of all costs to the plant operations budget. Additionally, the policy should include reimbursement for overhead that would normally be calculated as a percentage of total costs.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal accounting and administrative control shall include a system of record keeping procedures adequate to provide effective accounting control over assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenditures.

The associate director for facilities management stated that a more detailed review of chargebacks is needed, and some of the issues are related to staffing transitions. The budget analyst/administrative supervisor stated that she needs more detail from accounting to perform a complete verification of credit to the DOFM.

By not improving chargeback procedures, there is an increased risk of untimely and incomplete reimbursement to the DOFM for services rendered.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus:

- a. establish procedures to ensure that all chargeback work is billed and verify that credit has been received;
- b. substantiate the validity of the overhead rate and apply that rate to total work order cost; and
- c. establish procedures to ensure that current labor and benefit rates are used for chargebacks.

Campus Response

Procedures will be developed to ensure that chargeback work is billed and credit received, chargeback rates are reviewed for appropriateness, and that current labor and benefit rates are used for chargebacks. Anticipated Completion Date: Feb. 28, 2000

NON-GENERAL FUND ACTIVITIES

Services provided to non-general fund activities were not always fully reimbursed to the campus.

We found that:

- ▶ Maintenance services provided to the University Union (UU) only included material and equipment charges, not building service engineer labor. In addition, the UU was not being charged for trash removal.
- ▶ The American Language program (ALP) was not being charged for preventive maintenance work.
- ▶ Chargeback rates for activities through Facilities Reservations were based on flat rates. However, procedures had not been established to periodically review the flat rates and adjust them based on current material costs, labor rates and the estimated time of the tasks.

CSU directive BA 84-25, *Implementation of Trustees' Resolution RA 9-83-057*, dated July 25, 1984, states that each campus will develop a chargeback system, and campus policy and procedures must ensure the return of all costs to the plant operations budget.

CSU directive BA 83-30, *Policy on Chargeable Services to Self-Supporting Operations*, dated December 28, 1983, states that funds provided from the general fund may be used to provide support for ancillary operations that are not funded through the general fund if there is recovery of the cost of such support. In the absence of specific CSU policy, recovery for the cost of support shall include the incremental costs of providing the support. If trade-offs are appropriate, they shall be clearly documented, valued in accordance with supportable cost studies, and otherwise not in conflict with state, system or campus regulations. Support provided shall be in accordance with appropriate written agreements that include the basis and rationale for the valuation.

SAM §8752 states that state policy is for departments to recover full costs whenever goods or services are provided to others.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal accounting and administrative control shall a system of record keeping procedures adequate to provide effective accounting control over assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenditures.

The director of facilities management stated that the above practices had been in place when he joined the department. The assistant controller stated that the University Union is considered a campus building and previously included a cafeteria instead of outside food vendors. The vice president for administration and business affairs stated that a thorough review of non-general fund activities would be appropriate.

Failure to fully implement chargeback procedures to non-general fund activities reduces the likelihood for complete and timely compensation to the Department of Facilities Management (DOFM) and reduces the amount of funds available for campus maintenance and repairs.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus review all services performed by the DOFM for non-general fund activities and strengthen procedures to ensure full reimbursement.

Campus Response

The campus will review services performed by the DOFM for non-general fund activities and strengthen procedures to ensure full reimbursement. Anticipated Completion Date: Feb. 28, 2000

MAINTENANCE MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

Maintenance materials and supplies inventory procedures were not adequate.

We noted that:

- ▶ □ Each trade shop maintained some inventory items in their work areas. Some of these items were recorded in the perpetual inventory system, while others were not.
- ▶ □ A proper segregation of duties was not maintained over maintenance materials both centrally and in the trade shop storage areas. The storekeeper was solely responsible for ordering, receiving, inventory custody, issuing materials and the physical inventory process. In addition, trade shop employees had direct access to the supplies maintained in their areas, some of which were on the inventory, while others were not.
- ▶ □ A physical inventory, including reconciliation to perpetual records, had not taken place since June 1997, and the DOFM had not developed formalized policies and procedures for effective materials management.
- ▶ □ There were no procedures in place for the return to stock of unused materials. We observed that used materials were accumulated in the trade shops.

SAM §3535 states that state agencies must maintain unit stock records and conduct physical inventories if they operate warehouses with gross floor space exceeding 4,000 sq. ft., average annual inventory investment in expendable goods exceeding \$50,000, annual issues of expendable goods exceeding \$100,000 or expendable goods inventory consisting of 400 or more stock items. In addition, each state agency must develop internal policies and procedures for effective materials management within each organizational unit that maintains continuing inventories of expendable goods.

CSU directive BA 84-25, *Implementation of Trustees' Resolution RA 9-83-057*, dated July 25, 1984, states that internal controls over the purchase, storage and use of plant operations department materials be developed and implemented at the campuses.

SAM §20003 states that a satisfactory system of internal accounting and administrative control shall include segregation of duties appropriate for proper safeguarding of state agency assets and a system of record keeping procedures adequate to provide effective accounting control over assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenditures.

The engineering manager stated that there is no space available to keep all the items together. The associate director for facilities management stated that more controls are needed, but space and staffing issues exist. The vice president for administration and business affairs stated that he did not want the costs to outweigh the benefits.

Lack of sufficient inventory controls increases the risk of lost or stolen assets and leads to higher overall inventory costs.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the campus:

- a. evaluate the DOFM central stores program and establish procedures to ensure adequate physical security and proper segregation of duties over all items maintained in inventory;
- b. develop formalized internal polices and procedures for effective materials management; and
- c. establish procedures to ensure that a physical inventory, including reconciliation to perpetual records, is performed on an annual basis.

Campus Response

Materials management policies and procedures will be developed to ensure adequate physical security and segregation of duties over central stores inventory items and the physical inventory will be reconciled to the perpetual records. Anticipated Completion Date: July 31, 2000

UTILITIES MANAGEMENT

The campus utilities management program was in need of improvement.

We noted that:

- ▶ The campus has not had an Energy/Utilities Manager since September 1997.
- ▶ Utilities had not been charged back to non-general fund activities since May 1998.
- ▶ The campus did not have a campus-wide five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan.
- ▶ The campus had not submitted a monthly Energy Consumption Report to CPDC since October 1997.

Executive Order #538, *Policy Statement on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management for the CSU and Energy Consumption Reduction Goal for 1992/93 Compared to 1986/87*, dated February 1, 1989, states that:

- ▶ □ each CSU campus will designate an Energy/Utilities Manager with the responsibility and the authority for carrying out Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Programs;
- ▶ □ all CSU campuses will implement a utilities chargeback system to recover the cost of utilities provided to self-supporting and external organizations;
- ▶ □ each CSU campus will develop, implement and update a campus-wide five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan;
- ▶ □ on a monthly basis, the CSU will monitor energy usage on all campuses and the headquarters buildings (Capital Planning, Design and Construction requires the submission of monthly Energy Consumption Reports and uses these reports to update a systemwide energy consumption database); and

SAM §8776.3 requires invoices to be prepared as soon as possible after recognition of a claim.

The associate director of facilities management stated that the energy/utilities manager position had been frozen from October 1997 to June 1998, and recruitment for this position is currently being conducted. He further stated that staffing issues, including the lack of an energy/utilities manager, had prevented completion of utility chargebacks and the energy consumption report. The associate vice president for facilities planning and operations stated that he believed that the campus utilities deregulation plan fulfilled the requirement for a campus-wide five-year energy conservation and utilities management plan.

A less than satisfactory campus utilities management program reduces the likelihood that the general fund will be fully compensated for utilities provided to self-supporting and external organizations and may result in decreased energy efficiency.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the campus:

- a. ensure the duties of the energy/utilities manager are delegated to an alternate employee until such time as the position is filled;
- b. charge utilities back to non-general fund activities on a monthly basis;
- c. charge the non-general fund activities for the utility charges accrued since May 1998;
- d. develop and implement a campus-wide five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan; and
- e. submit Energy Consumption Reports to CPDC.

Campus Response

The position of energy/utilities manager has been filled. Chargebacks for non-general fund work will be charged. A five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan will be developed and implemented. Energy Consumption Reports will be submitted to CPDC. Anticipated Completion Date: Feb. 28, 2000

APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Norma S. Rees	President
John Abbey	Assistant Controller
Dave Cowden	Engineering Manager, Facilities Management
Kris Erway	Budget Officer
Dan Franke	Work Control Supervisor, Facilities Management
Randy Gale	Grounds Manager, Facilities Management
Mary Hootman	Manager, General Accounting and Financial Reporting
Neal Hoss	Controller
Durga Krishnamoorti	System Analyst, Facilities Management
Georgia Lang	Storekeeper, Facilities Management
Mirasol Mercado	Budget Analyst/Administrative Supervisor, Facilities Management
Dick Metz	Vice President, Administration and Business Affairs
Milton Owens	Custodial Manager, Facilities Management
Jordan Rich	Associate Director, Facilities Management
Randy Porter	Associate Vice President, Facilities Planning and Operations
Ricardo Sanchez	Director, Facilities Management