

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PLANT

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
FULLERTON**

**Report Number 99-40
December 14, 1999**

Members, Committee on Audit

Stanley T. Wang, Chair
Harold Goldwhite, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg Neel I. Murarka
Dee Dee Myers Joan Otomo-Corgel
Frederick W. Pierce, IV Ali Razi

Staff

University Auditor: Larry Mandel
Audit Manager: Janice Mirza
Staff Auditor: Ellis Williams

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
Preventative Maintenance	6
Program Administration.....	7
Physical Audits	8
Quality Control.....	9
Chargebacks And Non-Maintenance Work.....	10
Chargeback Controls	10
Non-General Fund Activities.....	11
Maintenance Materials And Equipment	12
Maintenance Materials And Supplies Inventory.....	12
Small Hand Tools And Equipment	14
Utilities Management.....	15
Physical Master Plan	16

APPENDICES

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

ABBREVIATIONS

CPDC	Capital Planning, Design & Construction (previously PPD)
CSU	California State University
CSUF	California State University, Fullerton
FAMIS	Facilities Management Information System
MMS	Maintenance Management System
OMP	Operation and Maintenance of Plant
PM	Preventive Maintenance
SAM	State Administrative Manual
SUAM	State University Administrative Manual

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.

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, Fullerton, the Physical Plant Office manages the OMP program.

OPINION

We visited the California State University, Fullerton campus from June 14, 1999, through July 14, 1999, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

In our opinion, the administration and management of the OMP program provided clear lines of organizational responsibility, and budget-monitoring procedures were effective. Areas requiring improvement are referenced in the executive summary.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this section is to provide management with an overview of conditions requiring their 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]

PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE [6]

The Facilities Management Information System (FAMIS) preventative maintenance (PM) was not fully operational and did not provide adequate PM administrative reporting. A fully operational preventative maintenance program, which produces complete and accurate administrative reports, decreases the risk of system breakdowns and helps to ensure that maintenance and repairs are performed on a timely basis.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION [7]

Oversight over the work order program and preventive maintenance was not adequate. Improving oversight over these areas decreases the risk of system breakdowns and helps to ensure that maintenance and repairs are performed.

PHYSICAL AUDITS [8]

A complete physical audit of each campus facility had not been conducted since 1995. A complete physical audit decreases the risk of system breakdowns and deterioration of facilities and ensures that all maintenance/repair requirements are identified.

QUALITY CONTROL [9]

A comprehensive quality control program had not been fully implemented. Implementation of such a program decreases the risk of system breakdowns and deterioration of facilities and grounds and helps to ensure that work is performed in accordance with established standards.

CHARGEBACKS AND NON-MAINTENANCE WORK [10]

CHARGEBACK CONTROLS [10]

Procedures governing reimbursement (chargebacks) to physical plant for services rendered were not adequate. Improving chargeback procedures increases the likelihood for timely and complete reimbursement to physical plant for services rendered.

NON-GENERAL FUND ACTIVITIES [11]

Services provided to non-general fund activities had not been charged back in a timely manner. Prompt billing of services provided to non-general fund activities increases the likelihood of complete and timely reimbursement.

MAINTENANCE MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT [12]

MAINTENANCE MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES INVENTORY [12]

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

SMALL HAND TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT [14]

Accountability over small hand tools and equipment was not adequate. Proper accountability decreases the risk of lost or stolen assets.

UTILITIES MANAGEMENT [15]

The campus utilities management program was in need of improvement. A satisfactory utilities management program may result in increased energy efficiency.

PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN [16]

A thorough reevaluation of the campus physical master plan had not occurred since May 1993. Timely reviews of the campus physical master plan will ensure that facilities meet current and future needs.

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE

The Facilities Management Information System (FAMIS) preventative maintenance (PM) program was not fully operational and did not provide adequate PM administrative reporting.

PM work schedules and detailed work tasks had not been entered into FAMIS or verified for all crafts, and FAMIS did not provide adequate PM administrative reporting such as PM scheduling, backlog reports, and equipment PM history.

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.

CSU directive BA 84-25, *Implementation of Trustees' Resolution RA 9-83-057*, dated July 25, 1984, states that a work order system that reasonably accounts for all resources within plant operations will be implemented on each campus.

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 physical plant acting director stated that converting to the new system caused administrative reporting and scheduling problems.

A PM system that is not fully operational increases the risk of ineffective and inefficient PM scheduling and coverage for campus equipment and facilities.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus complete the development and implementation of the FAMIS preventive maintenance program, including PM scheduling and administrative reporting.

Campus Response

We concur and will comply. Facilities Management is in the midst of transferring from a maintenance management system (MMS) to a facilities management system (FMS) known as FAMIS. FAMIS implementation is ongoing and, once in place, will be the core system in Facilities Management. The Work Management Module will be in place by October, 2000, and will handle the scheduling of preventive maintenance and administrative reporting.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Oversight over the work order program and preventive maintenance was not adequate.

We found that:

- A review of open work orders as of June 29, 1999, disclosed that 593 (49%) of 1,200 open maintenance work orders were over four months old and should have been closed.
- Physical plant management stated that very little preventive maintenance (PM) had been performed during 1998-99 and was not able to provide reliable data for the PM work that had been performed.

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 physical plant acting director stated that the work control staffing level combined with the conversion to FAMIS had affected work order closure and performance of PM.

Less than adequate oversight over work orders and preventive maintenance 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 work orders to ensure that completed work orders are promptly closed; and
- b. strengthen procedures to ensure that all preventive maintenance tasks are completed in a timely manner.

Campus Response

- a. We concur and will comply. We have always monitored the status and age of work orders and their closure, but will establish written procedures for same. These procedures will be in place by July 1, 2000. As stated above, the conversion to FAMIS has affected work order monitoring as does the low level of staffing in work control areas.

- b. We concur and will comply. We have always monitored the performance of preventive maintenance tasks, but will establish written procedures for monitoring their completion. These procedures will be in place by July 1, 2000. As stated above, the conversion to FAMIS has affected our ability to report on closure of PM tasks.

PHYSICAL AUDITS

A complete physical audit of each campus facility had not been conducted since 1995.

Executive Order #343, *Establishment of Planned/Programmed Maintenance*, dated April 29, 1988, requires that each maintenance management system shall incorporate an annual physical audit of each facility to identify maintenance/repair program requirements.

The physical plant acting director stated that, rather than performing formalized annual audits, he and his staff were performing informal reviews. He further stated that items requiring attention are discussed during the informal reviews.

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 3

We recommend that the campus perform an annual physical audit of each campus facility to identify maintenance/repair program requirements.

Campus Response

Annual physical audits as recommended are an outdated practice. Facility condition does not change that rapidly. Currently, the CSU system is implementing a complete physical audit program utilizing the consulting services of Pacific Partners, the same firm that recently created a similar program for the UC system. Fullerton is actively participating in this systemwide initiative. Even Pacific Partners does not recommend annual physical audits. At Fullerton, we take one of our major buildings each year and perform a complete physical audit on it along with other, less formal audits of other facilities. We believe this results in more detailed and useful information regarding the physical condition of our facilities.

We recommend that the CSU Auditor staff contact Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC) regarding the need to update CSU policy to reflect current practices.

QUALITY CONTROL

A comprehensive quality control program had not been fully implemented.

We found that:

- ▶ Routine documented quality control checks of service work orders and preventive maintenance were not performed.
- ▶ Custodial and grounds keeping inspections were not documented.

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 work control center supervisor stated that, except for major projects, inspections were performed on an informal basis or as time permitted.

A lack of fully implemented quality control procedures increases the risk that work will not be performed in accordance with established procedures and could result in system breakdowns and a deterioration of facilities and grounds.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus establish and implement a comprehensive formalized quality control program to ensure compliance with physical plant work standards.

Campus Response

We concur and are complying. Our Grounds Maintenance and Custodial Departments (the departments mentioned in the audit report) are now performing and documenting regular inspections. Our procedures in Landscape Services to conduct area inspections twice a year during April/May and again October/November. These inspections shall be carried out by the Landscape Services Manager or Lead Groundworkers. In Custodial Services, our procedures are that monitoring tasks will be conducted by Supervisors, Lead Custodians or the Manager of Building Services no less than three times per quarter. Both of these are internal procedures. Policies addressing same will be completed and put into place by July 1, 2000.

We have established an Administrative Services Manager position and will outline an implementation plan for inspection programs in other departments within Physical Plant by July 1, 2000.

Also, as part of an effort within the Administration division, Physical Plant is undertaking a comprehensive quality improvement program based on the Balanced Scorecard approach. Physical

Plant will focus on implementing APPA's Strategic Assessment Model. By July 1, 2000, we will outline how we intend to apply this model at Fullerton.

CHARGEBACKS AND NON-MAINTENANCE WORK

CHARGEBACK CONTROLS

Procedures governing reimbursement (chargebacks) to physical plant for services rendered were not adequate.

We found that:

- ▶ Labor rates had not been adjusted for 1998/99 salary increases.
- ▶ The rate used for staff benefits was not current.
- ▶ Supporting documentation could not be provided to substantiate the 15% overhead rate.

CSU systemwide 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.

CSU systemwide directive BP 86-69, *Staff Benefits – Billing Rates for Services of General Fund Employees*, dated September 29, 1986, states that campuses will be responsible for the derivation of benefit rates applicable to the campus and compliance with SAM §8740.

SAM §8740 establishes the formula for determining hourly rates including staff benefits for the billing of services of employees paid on a monthly basis.

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 physical plant acting director stated that the benefit and overhead rates were established years ago and have not been reviewed since that time. The work order control supervisor indicated that labor rates for chargebacks were not current because the former budget coordinator did not input all data, such as cost of living salary increases, into the FAMIS.

Inadequate controls over chargebacks increase the risks of inaccurate, incomplete, and untimely reimbursements to physical plant for services rendered and decrease funds available for campus maintenance and repairs.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus:

- a. establish procedures to ensure that current labor and benefit rates are used for chargebacks; and
- b. substantiate the validity of the 15% overhead rate.

Campus Response

- a. We concur and have complied. We have procedures in place which call for the use of current labor and benefit rates in chargebacks.
- b. Overhead rates on other CSU campuses range from 0% to 98%. Lacking specific systemwide guidance as to what should be included in overhead charges, Fullerton has selected 15% as an internally equitable overhead rate. We will conduct an internal study relative to overhead rates, and will complete it by July 1, 2000. As a part of that study, Willie Hagan, Vice President for Administration, will discuss this issue with CABO.

NON-GENERAL FUND ACTIVITIES

Services provided to non-general fund activities had not been charged back in a timely manner.

The Commons (bookstore and cafeteria) had not been invoiced for maintenance services and materials since fiscal 1997/98, and the Arboretum had not been invoiced since December 1998. Services and materials provided to the Commons during fiscal 1998/99 totaled \$27,135. Records were not available to determine unbilled Arboretum charges.

CSU systemwide 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 systemwide 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.

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

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

The physical plant acting director stated that the staff member who was responsible for billing had been relieved of her duties and had not been replaced.

Failure to promptly invoice non-general fund activities for services rendered by physical plant reduces the likelihood for complete and timely reimbursement and the amount of working capital available for maintenance and repairs.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus establish procedures to ensure that services rendered to non-general fund activities are billed in a timely manner.

Campus Response

We concur and have complied. The staff position responsible for billings has now been filled. Billings are now up to date.

MAINTENANCE MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

MAINTENANCE MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES INVENTORY

Maintenance materials and supplies inventory procedures were not adequate.

We found that:

- ▶ No comprehensive written/computerized record of physical plant materials and supplies inventory existed. As a result, physical plant inventory was not being recorded on the campus balance sheet.
- ▶ A complete physical inventory, including reconciliation to perpetual records, had not been performed since 1996.
- ▶ Formalized policies and procedures had not been developed for effective materials management.
- ▶ A proper separation of duties was not maintained within the material control center. Each of the three staff performed the same functions including ordering and receiving of supplies, inventory control, and issuing materials and equipment.

SAM §3535 requires state agencies to 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.

SAM §8080 requires an adequate separation of duties so that no one person orders and receives supplies, maintains control over the inventory and issues materials and equipment.

CSU systemwide 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 must 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 material coordinator stated that the conversion to the new system and a loss of staff positions contributed to these deficiencies. He further stated that staff size made it difficult to maintain an adequate separation of duties.

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. develop a comprehensive record of physical plant materials and supplies inventory;
- b. establish procedures to ensure that a physical inventory, including reconciliation to perpetual records, is performed on an annual basis;
- c. maintain a proper separation of duties over all items maintained in inventory; and
- d. evaluate the physical plant central stores program and develop formalized internal policies and procedures for effective materials management.

Campus Response

- a. We concur and have complied. Physical Plant has a comprehensive record in our new FMS system.
- b. We concur and will comply. Written procedures will be established by July 1, 2000, and annual physical inventories will be conducted as staffing is available.

- c. We concur and have complied. Shipping and Receiving now receives what is ordered by the Material Control Center.
- d. We concur and will comply by outline an implementation plan for the evaluation of the program and for policy and procedure development by July 1, 2000.

SMALL HAND TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT

Accountability over small hand tools and equipment was not adequate.

Although the material control center was the designated control point for small hand tools and equipment, trade areas often purchased items and did not inform the material control center of the purchases. In addition, the material control center check out procedures did not include follow-up procedures to ensure the timely return of small hand tools and equipment.

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

The material coordinator stated that enforcement in this area is difficult because campus employees do not routinely inform him of purchases and follow his verbal instructions to return equipment to the material control center. He further stated that he does not have the staff to properly follow-up.

Inadequate accountability over small hand tools and equipment increases the risk of lost or stolen state property.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the campus establish a comprehensive and uniform control system for small hand tools and equipment.

Campus Response

We concur and will comply. We will develop an appropriate control system for these items by July 1, 2000. In addition, this is an area where systemwide guidelines would be helpful. Discussions are currently taking place in CPDC regarding the establishment of appropriate levels of control for these items. We will comply with those guidelines within a reasonable time frame following their establishment.

UTILITIES MANAGEMENT

The campus utilities management program was in need of improvement.

We found that:

- The campus utilities management program procedures were not formally documented and did not include the control requirements described in Executive Order No. 538 to properly monitor energy usage.
- The campus did not have a campus-wide five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan.

Executive Order No. 538, *Policy Statement on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management for the California State University and Energy Consumption Reduction Goal*, effective February 1, 1989, provided formal control requirements to monitor energy usage including the development, implementation, and updating of a campus-wide five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan.

The physical plant acting director stated that the loss of the chief engineer required the energy/utilities manager to assume additional responsibilities. He further stated that, due to a loss of staff, the utilities management program has not been given a high priority.

A less than satisfactory utilities management program may result in decreased energy efficiency.

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the campus:

- a. adopt formalized utility management program procedures; and
- b. develop and implement a campus-wide five-year Energy Conservation and Utilities Management Plan.

Campus Response

- a. We concur and will comply. Physical Plant will develop a set of utility management procedures for campus review by July 1, 2000.
- b. We concur and have complied. In 1990, Fullerton developed an aggressive master plan for providing utilities for our future and increasing our energy efficiency. By 1996, we had completed over \$17 million of improvements which affected every aspect of our heating, cooling, lighting, and electrical systems. As a result, by the late 1990s, we had reduced our per square foot utility costs by 40%, and were the most efficient and progressive campus in the CSU in terms of our utility

management. We will develop a campus-wide five-year energy conservation plan and utility management plan by July 1, 2000.

PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN

A thorough reevaluation of the campus physical master plan had not occurred since May 1993.

PPD SUAM Section II §9009 states that periodically, but not less often than every three years, each campus shall accomplish a thorough reevaluation of all parts of the physical master plan and shall submit a written summary report of the reevaluation to Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC).

The associate vice president of facilities management stated that since the campus is almost at “build out status” not much is being done to change the physical master plan. He further stated that the physical master plan is reviewed each year as part of the campus five-year capital plan.

Failure to complete timely reviews of the campus physical master plan increases the risk that facilities will not meet current and future needs.

Recommendation 10

We recommend that the campus obtain clarification from CPDC regarding the periodic physical master plan reevaluation requirement and comply as instructed.

Campus Response

We have complied. We have obtained the recommended clarification from CPDC. Their clarification is included as a draft revision of SUAM, and we comply with the proposed revision. We are told that the proposed changes will be formally published by the first week in April, 2000.

APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Milton Gordon	President
Jay Bond	Associate Vice President, Facilities Management
Welson Badal	Systems Analyst
Jim Corbett	Manager, Central Plant/Utilities
Brian Christie	Manager, Building Maintenance
Steven Dugas	Manager, Landscape Services
Linda Erickson	Director, Budget & Revenue Management
Flora Farzad	Accounting Officer
Holly Hall	Director, Logistical Services
Terry Jarmon	Property Coordinator
Joan Joyce	Administrative Analyst Specialist
Tom Ritchey	Manager, Building Services
Tom Shigenaka	Material Coordinator
Willem van der Pol	Acting Director, Physical Plant
Melinda White	Supervisor, Work Order Control
Deborah Wiedeman	Budget Analyst