



DATE: October 12, 2007

TO: NICK YOVINO, Director, Planning and Development
KEITH BERGTHOLD, Assistant Director, Planning and Development
JERRY BISHOP, Assistant Director, Planning and Development

THROUGH: RENENA SMITH, Budget Manager
Budget and Management Studies Division

FROM: BOB KOURY, Principal Internal Auditor
MARY VIANCOURT, Internal Auditor
BILL RICHARDS, Internal Auditor
Budget and Management Studies Division/Internal Audit

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP AUDIT - CODE ENFORCEMENT REQUEST FOR SERVICE
PROCESS AUDIT

Attached is the follow-up audit report with the current implementation status of the nine recommendations made in the Code Enforcement Request for Service Process Audit issued January 11, 2007. Internal Audit wishes to thank you and your staff for their cooperation and assistance in performing this follow-up audit, which was performed in accordance with AO 1-12 and Government Auditing Standards.

All nine recommendations were adequately implemented by the Department, and you and your staff should be commended for your efforts in this regard.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Bob Koury, Principal Internal Auditor, at 621-7072.

Attachment

cc: Alan Autry, Mayor
Council Members
Andrew T. Souza, City Manager
Jon Ruiz, Assistant City Manager
Bruce Rudd, Assistant City Manager
Craig Agabashian, Administrative Manager, Planning and Development
Matt Lopez, Manager, Code Enforcement Division
Karen Bradley, Assistant City Controller



Follow-up Audit Report 08-0006

**Planning and Development Department
Code Enforcement Division
Request For Service Process Audit**

October 12, 2007

**Submitted By
Bob Koury, Principal Internal Auditor**

**Performed By
Mary Viancourt, Internal Auditor
Bill Richards, Internal Auditor**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, MANAGEMENT RESPONSES, AND CURRENT STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding 1 - Code Enforcement Division	1
Finding 2 - City Council	6
Finding 3 - One Call Center	8
Finding 4 - City Manager's Office	11
Finding 5 - Mayor's Office	12
Additional Information - Other City Departments.....	13

Findings, Recommendations, Management Responses, And Current Status of Recommendations

Finding 1 – Code Enforcement Division

A. Policies and Procedures (P/Ps) for Code’s Intake Staff

Internal Audit requested a copy of Code’s Intake Staff’s P/Ps for review and to use throughout this audit for reference and compliance verification purposes. Internal Audit was informed the Intake staff does not have formal P/Ps. Therefore, Internal Audit could not assess compliance and/or consistency of Code employee’s receiving and inputting a reporting party’s information in the Harward Technical Enterprises (HTE) System.

B. Outside Telephone Calls

The Code Enforcement Division has four Intake employees whose main responsibility is to answer the telephones and enter new “Request(s)” and/or additional case information into the HTE System. The types of calls received are:

- New Request(s) for a high priority issue (overflowing sewer; open trench; car on jacks in front yard; etc.) that must be inspected within 24 hours and abated based upon circumstance and hazardousness of the condition.
- New Request(s) for service (tall grass/weeds; high fence; landscaping issue) that usually are inspected within three days.
- New Request(s) for Service that Code initially sends a Courtesy Notice to the property owner (chickens/roosters on City property zoned for residences; more than two yard sales a year; parking a vehicle(s) on unimproved surface (dirt or lawn). The property owner must resolve the Courtesy Notice violation within ten days and/or the reporting party must call back within twenty days to report the violation still exists before a case is opened.
- Telephone request for the status of a “Request(s)”.
- Telephone request to speak with a specific inspector.
- Telephone request with additional information about a prior service Request(s).
- Non-Code related calls requiring the services of other City Departments or other outside agency.

If there is a backlog of telephone calls in the queue and the phone line(s) rings back, other Code Enforcement staff (mainly clerical) will answer the telephone and take the reporting party’s “Request(s)”.

Recommendation 1:

The Code Enforcement Manager or a designated employee should develop, implement, and distribute a Call Intake P/P Manual to appropriate staff to ensure consistent receipting and entering of a reporting party’s “Request(s)” information and to furnish a reference source for existing and future personnel. Subsequent to implementation of the P/P Manual, the Code

Enforcement Manager should share the P/P information with the Call Center and Council staffs to facilitate the receipt of accurate and detailed “Request(s)” information for Code investigation.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 1

Although Code’s current policy is not written; they are communicated to staff. A written Policy and Procedure for “call intake” is under way and will be created by affected staff and reviewed by Code’s Policy and Procedure Committee by March 30, 2007. Once these policies and procedures are completed they will be periodically reviewed by the Policy and Procedure Committee under their normal course of business. When the written documents are complete and have been approved they will be shared with all staff.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 1

A written policy and procedures for “call intake” was completed and approved by management. The policy was placed into the “L” drive providing accessibility to all Code Staff. The Policy is “Caller Intake” B-30 in the Table of Contents of Code Policies and Procedures.

C. Code’s Reporting Party’s Requirement

Code’s Intake Staff are not allowed to take or enter a “Request(s)” as an “Anonymous” reporting party. A reporting party (public citizen) who telephones Code Enforcement directly must provide their name, address, and telephone number. A reporting party may be reluctant or refuse to give this information for fear of retaliation. Code staff indicated this information is necessary for either an Intake employee and/or an Inspector to follow-up with the reporting party to obtain additional case information and or provide a status update.

Code staff also indicated the reporting party requirement is to prevent citizens from making frequent and/or frivolous or erroneous calls. Code staff indicated they have had some reporting parties attempt to retaliate against Code Enforcement after receiving a Citation or Warning by calling in large numbers of potential violations without clear descriptions or addresses of the violation.

D. City of Fresno’s Web Site for Residents

Code Enforcement also receives Citizens’ “Request(s)” via the City’s online web site. Internal Audit was informed and noted that “Report a Code Violation” was immediately followed by “Report a Crime” and “Report Graffiti” in the listing for residents. Code staff reported citizens appear to pick the first report listed – “Report a Code Violation” to report everything, not necessarily Code Violations.

Internal Audit spoke with an Information Services Supervisor about the confusion and problems caused by this current listing format. The Supervisor immediately moved the “Report a Code Violation” to the top of the web form list apart from the “Report a Crime” and “Report Graffiti” forms.

In addition, the Code web form requires the reporting party to provide their name, address, and telephone number to submit the Request(s) to prevent frequent erroneous reports. A reporting

party may be reluctant or refuse to give this information for fear of retaliation. The web form does not indicate that the Reporting Party's information is only given out upon Court Order.

Internal Audit queried 30 other California cities for an online "Report a Code Violation" form. Fourteen out of the 30 cities have an online form. Only seven out of the 14 other California cities require the requesting party's personal information.

The "Request(s)" received through the City's web site are accessed via e-mail by a Code employee. Information from the web e-mail is manually entered into the Code system. The number of Request(s) through the "Report a Code Violation" web site is not tracked separately by/for Code Management use.

Recommendation 2:

The Code Enforcement Manager should meet with the City Attorney's Office to discuss and develop a Confidentiality Statement to add to the "Report a Code Violation" web report. The statement should inform and ensure the reporting party of the City's duty to keep their information confidential but have sufficient information to perform their job to enhance the quality of life and customer service for citizens of Fresno.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 2

Implementation of this recommendation is in progress in order to create a statement regarding the extent of the confidentiality afforded to reporting parties; insuring the reliability and adequacy of information, and legal limitations of the reporting party's confidentiality. Upon receipt of a Confidentiality Statement from the City Attorney's office, Code will incorporate the information into a formal Policy and Procedure, to be implemented in February, 2007.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 2

The statement recommended by Audit has been placed onto Code's website on the Code Enforcement On-Line Complaint Reporting Form, as well as informing the citizen by telephone of their confidentiality.

E. Code Updates to Staff

The Planning and Development Director and/or the Code Enforcement Manager conducts meetings with the various Code staffing levels to report, discuss and/or inform the staff of changes and/or additions to the Codes. Internal Audit was informed by Code Management that meetings are conducted as follows:

- Management and Supervisors meetings are conducted weekly;
- Management, Supervisor and Senior Inspector meetings are held biweekly; and
- Staff meetings for the entire Division are held quarterly.

Internal Audit was informed by Intake and Clerical staffs that new or changes in codes or other information (e.g. POD containers) must filter down to the staff level by word of mouth. This prevents the Intake Staff from having current information at the time of speaking with reporting parties and/or other City Departments. This may result in informational inconsistencies between

Departments or inconsistent or lack of information entered into the HTE System that could impact the Inspectors.

Subsequent to this audit, Internal Audit was informed Code Management distributes minutes of the meetings to all Code staff either electronically or hard copy and posts a copy on the Code Community Bulletin Boards.

Recommendation 3:

The Code Enforcement Manager should assess whether the current methods of disseminating information to all Code staff is the most effective means. In addition, Code Management should consider writing and issuing a Directive, Policy/Procedure or Other Document stating Code staff is responsible to obtain and read all information disseminated by Code Management as part of their job performance.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 3

These issues have been presented to the Policy and Procedure Committee for recommendation and disposition. Code Enforcement will write a directive for individual staff ownership of all Policies and Procedures; which include industry updates, meeting minutes, etc. by March 30, 2007. The Policy and Procedure Committee will also write a policy for dissemination of information which includes annual training to review the policies and updates and will be included in all new employee orientation and training. This will include keeping information available for all staff in a binder in the Code Manager's office; including industry bulletins and Director Classification listings for land use/zoning.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 3

A directive for individual staff to review all Policies and Procedures, as well as all electronic and disseminated information was developed and placed into Code Policies and Procedures in the "L" drive for accessibility by all staff. This includes informing all staff that information pertaining to Director's directives is in a binder at the Code Manager's Office or at the Senior Secretary's desk. The Policy is "Responding to Electronic Email" B-31 in the Code Policy and Procedures.

F. Tracking the Origin of a Reporting Party's "Request(s)"

Currently, there are approximately 18 reporting Origination Codes in HTE. Internal Audit noted that two Origination Codes (Proactive and Service Request) are mainly used. The Proactive (PA) Origination Code is to track violations noted by Code Inspectors while in the field inspecting another "Request(s)". The Service Request (SR) Origination Code is a conglomerate of "Request(s)" from the reporting party directly to Code Enforcement; the Call Center; the "Report a Code Violation" from the web; and Other City Departments. During Calendar Years 2001-06, approximately 41% of the total Request(s) recorded in HTE were under the SR Origination Code. The need to separately track reporting sources or origins would allow management to identify and/or make decisions affecting work processes that are more proactive versus reactive.

Code's HTE employee indicated the setting up of new Origination Codes for "Request(s)" can be done and that Code Management would need to approve any new Origination Codes and communicate the information to all staff responsible for the input of the Origination Codes.

G. Reconciliation of HTE Data

Internal Audit was unable to determine approximately how many "Requests" are received directly by the Code Enforcement staff - excluding all other sources. The reasons are:

- Code Management stated that the limitations of the HTE System prevents Code Management from accessing valuable report information and/or necessary or useful information from being entered into HTE by the various staff who have access and use HTE. (Internal Audit did not test the limitations of the HTE System because that was outside the scope of this audit).
- Internal Audit requested and received two HTE Reports - "Caseload Status by Council District" and the "Number of Cases by Origination Code" for each calendar year from 2001 to present. Testing performed by Internal Audit showed the total cases by Council District did not match for these two Reports. Subsequent to the audit, Internal Audit was informed old and outdated reports (currently not used due to the expense to revise the report program) still exist in HTE. The reports can be retrieved and disseminated.
- Per investigation by Internal Audit, Code staff has not attempted to reconcile source information in HTE with other "Requests" source data.

Recommendation 4:

The Code Enforcement Manager or designated staff member(s) should review their current list of Origination Codes for areas that provide a "Request(s)". The list should be modified and/or a new Code(s) should be created for a location(s) not currently identified (e.g. City Manager's Office, One Call Center, and Other Departments). Tracking and reporting "Request(s)" by Origination Code will aid management in identifying and ensuring all "Request(s)" are being received by Code Enforcement to possibly determine future operational changes and the most efficient use of resources.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 4

Origination codes have been reviewed and new ones have been added to provide pertinent statistical information. Staff will continue to analyze and revise the origination codes as future needs occur. Origination codes in HTE have also been completed for Call Center requests and will be updated as needed.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 4

Origination codes for areas that provide a "Request(s)" were reviewed and revised. Origination codes in H.T.E. have also been completed for Call Center Requests.

Finding 2 – City Council

A. Citizen Reporting

Citizens may interact with their Council Member rather than a City Department because the citizen has a rapport with their elected representative; believes their Council Member should handle District issues; or as a last resort, calls their Council Member to request assistance to get a potential violation corrected. Council Members receive “Request(s)” via telephone, letter, e-mail, or in person at district meetings or at a social event. Each Council District staff has their own methodology of initially logging “Request(s)” (telephone logbooks, legal pads, an Access or Excel database) and retaining the information for the term of the Council Member.

The Council Districts reported the following code violations are most often reported:

- Abandoned/Inoperable Vehicles
- Barking Dogs
- Grass/Weeds
- Illegal Dumping
- Junk/Debris on a Property

B. Council District’s Reporting System

The Council Districts use a system called Request For Service (RFS) that was developed specifically for Council. The purpose for developing the RFS was to allow Council to request assistance from City staff indirectly in order to prevent any conflict with the City Charter. This system was implemented between 1999 and 2001. The system allows each Council District to track any “Request(s)”, not just Code “Request(s)”, for their District only.

The reporting party contacting Council may give their personal information or request anonymity. If the reporting party requests anonymity, the Council staff will list their own name as the reporting party.

For the calendar year 2006, there were 3,785 cases logged into RFS for Code Enforcement by the seven Council Districts. The types of violations reported were as follows:

Types of Violation	# Reported	Percentage
Illegal Parking: 72 Hour Ordinance, For-sale, Inoperable, etc	1,758	46%
Graffiti Issues	636	17%
Lot, Yard, OCU: Cleanup, Hazard, etc.	593	16%
Miscellaneous – See Descriptions	475	13%
Other “Request(s)” Descriptions	323	8%
TOTAL	3,785	100%

Council “Request(s)” are received by the Code Enforcement staff in the form of an e-mail. A designated Code employee must manually type the information from each e-mail into the HTE System.

A designated Code employee will enter a message into the Comment Section of RFS to acknowledge: a) When the “Request(s)” was received; b) When the “Request(s)” was entered into HTE; and c) When Code resolved the case. A Code employee can also enter a message to the Council staff such as insufficient information in the Comment Section.

C. Reconciliation of Council’s RFS System Data to Code’s HTE System

Internal Audit selected a random sample of 100 out of 3,785 RFS cases from January through October 2006 to review and reconcile with Code’s HTE System. The results are as follows:

Reconcile RFS to HTE	Results	Percentage
No record in HTE	5	5%
RFS reconciled with HTE	59	59%
Invalid address	16	16%
Invalid complaint	13	13%
Graffiti Case to PD	7	7%
Total	100	100%

D. Other Systems Available to Council Staff

Council staff has Read-Only access to Code’s HTE System to obtain updates on particular code violation cases. Most Council staff use the HTE System for information such as: a) Whether the case is open or closed; b) Other violations at the same address; c) Updates on Code staff inspections and actions taken on specific “Request(s)” received by the District. Three Council Offices reported not using HTE.

Each Council District also has access to Front Counter and I-View to look up whether: a) The complaint is in City and in their district; b) How the area is zoned; c) School districts; d) Property Lines; e) Who owns the property; f) Land use; and g) Major intersections, etc. Some Districts reported not being able to minimize I-View while attempting to use other programs.

Recommendation 5:

The Code Enforcement Manager or designated employee should better coordinate and document HTE training to the City Councils’ staffs. The Read-Only access training should allow each Council’s staff improved utilization of resources provided (HTE) to obtain informational case updates versus calling Code Enforcement for an update.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 5

Code Enforcement staff have been coordinating and training City Council staff regarding use and benefits of the HTE case management system. Although training is currently in place, tracking the training for Council staff will be added to the Division’s current staff tracking system for improved documentation of these efforts. Code staff continues to encourage and emphasize the benefits of HTE training for all Council staff. In addition to current weekly meetings with

Council staff, Code management staff will meet with Council staff in a regularly scheduled monthly meeting to discuss issues of concern in individual Council Districts.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 5

In order for City Council staff to enhance their staff by utilizing resources available to them, Code scheduled H.T.E. training for City Council Staff. Regular scheduled meetings have been scheduled to address various issues in the individual Council Districts.

E. Council “Sweeps”

Council Districts perform sweeps in their Districts to identify code or other issues that need to be addressed by a City Department. Most Districts perform their sweeps on Friday. Some Districts perform more sweeps (e.g. weekly) and identify more issues (e.g. hundreds) than other Districts. As a result, the Council Districts collectively are restricted to inputting a maximum of 50 Code Violations per week.

Recommendation 6:

The Code Enforcement Manager and/or designated employee should continue to meet with each Council’s Representatives to discuss and reach a compromise on sweeps performed in each District. The coordination of sweeps or the performance of sweeps by Code Enforcement only will prevent conflicting/duplicate scheduling and excessive reporting of “Request(s)” to Code Enforcement that over burdens the Code staff.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 6

Code staff meets weekly and schedules meetings to coordinate efforts. Code continues to coordinate the scheduling and conducting of area sweeps in order to avoid duplicated efforts. In addition to current weekly meetings with Council staff, Code management staff will meet with Council staff in a regularly scheduled monthly meeting to discuss issues of concern in individual Council Districts.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 6

Code staff meets with City Council staff to address “focused area enforcement” in their respective districts, as well as schedule future focused area enforcement activities so as to avoid duplications.

Finding 3 - One Call Center

A. Implementation of the Call Center

City Management implemented the One Call Center in February 2006 to give citizens one number to call to get assistance and/or answers to any and all of their questions. The concept was to prevent citizens from being transferred from department to department; having to repeat

information multiple times which is frustrating, and therefore resorting to their Council Member, the Mayor, or City Manager.

At the time of the audit, the Call Center was staffed with a supervisor and five employees. From the beginning of February until the middle of October 2006, there were approximately 20,000 calls logged in the HEAT System by the Call Center staff. Of the 20,000 calls, approximately 894 were designated as potential Code violation calls. The majority of the cases were for the following categories:

Major Categories of Calls	# of Call Received	Percentage
Codes	196	22%
Complaints	116	13%
Information	107	12%
Vehicles	80	9%
Other	395	44%
Total	894	100%

B. Call Center’s Policies and Procedures

Internal Audit requested a copy of the Call Center’s Policy and Procedure Manual. At the time of this audit, the Call Center did not have a formal, written Policy and Procedure Manual. Internal Audit was informed that every call received by the Call Center is logged into their HEAT System (manufactured by Front Range). Internal Audit interviewed and observed Call Center staff receiving and inputting calls into HEAT.

C. Other Systems Available to the Call Center Staff

Each Call Center staff member has access to Code’s HTE System (read-only access) to look-up information about an open case. The staff also uses Front Counter and I-View for information about the potential violator’s location and whether the City has jurisdiction.

D. Telephone Calls From Within City Departments

Code Enforcement receives telephone calls from other City Departments, mainly the One Call Center (Call Center). The Intake employee receives the reporting party’s information from a Call Center employee versus directly from the reporting party to enter into the HTE System. Both the Call Center and Code Enforcement staff are logging the reporting party’s information into separate systems, which is a duplication of effort and inefficient. In addition, the Call Center staff may not obtain all necessary and pertinent information for Code personnel to perform their duties.

If all Code lines are busy when a Call Center employee telephones Code, the Call Center’s calls are automatically routed to the beginning of Code’s queue. The automatic rerouting of the Call Center’s call to first in the queue delays citizens’ calls who directly called Code Enforcement. Code staff indicated they receive calls from City Departments (including the Call Center) that do not pertain to Code and have to transfer the calls to the appropriate Department/Division.

E. Responsiveness to Citizen Calls

Internal Audit observed information elicited from callers and inputted into the HEAT System. The Call Center does allow “Anonymous” reporting in an attempt to assist reporting parties.

Internal Audit observed several methodologies used by Call Center staff to obtain and transfer the reporting party’s information to Code Enforcement, as follows:

- The Call Center staff obtains and enters information into the HEAT System from the reporting party, disconnects the reporting party, and calls Code Enforcement to provide the reporting party’s information to a Code Intake employee or staff member who answers the telephone for their entry into Code’s HTE System.
- The Call Center staff obtains and enters information in the HEAT System from the reporting party, keeps the reporting party on the line and transfers the reporting party to Code Enforcement after informing or not informing Code of the reporting party’s information for Code’s entry into the HTE System.
- The Call Center staff obtains and enters information from the reporting party into the HEAT System, keeps the reporting party on the line, transfers the reporting party to Code Enforcement after informing or not informing Code of the reporting party’s information for entry into Code’s HTE System, and e-mails the Call Center Ticket information to the Code Intake employee.

F. Reconciliation of Call Center Data to Code’s HTE System

Internal Audit obtained a sample of 137 HEAT Tickets for the period March through September 2006 to review and reconcile to Code’s HTE System. The results were as follows:

Reconciliation of Call Center HEAT Tickets to the HTE System	Reconciliation Results	Percentage
Reconciled with HTE System	44	32%
No specific address, APN number, or HTE Case number to use for verification.	35	26%
Description – Request to speak to Code personnel	19	14%
Description – Requesting specific Code Violation information	16	12%
Violator’s address did not match any addresses in HTE	12	9%
Violator’s address matched a prior HTE case.	5	4%
Violator’s address matched a prior non-related HTE case.	3	2%
Duplicate of another HEAT Ticket	1	<1%
Code personnel Voided case for HEAT Ticket	1	<1%
Violator’s information added to former non-related HTE case	1	<1%
TOTAL	137	100%

Based on the above information/findings related to the One Call Center, and more specifically due to the lack of a formalized policy and procedures manual and the several different methodologies used by Call Center staff in handling calls, Internal Audit could not fully conclude that all calls received by the Call Center are being logged into HEAT, especially Code related calls.

Recommendation 7:

The Code Enforcement and Call Center Managers should periodically meet to discuss the most effective and efficient means for the Call Center staff to forward telephone calls or a reporting parties information to Code (E-mail, Telephone or Both). The e-mail provides a record of where the call originated, exactly what the caller stated, and/or what was requested of the caller.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 7

Code will schedule regular meeting dates, rather than impromptu meetings, to improve coordination regarding this effort. Code will initially meet with Call Center staff in order to develop and review the process and to resolve issues of “dropped,” “referred,” or “invalid” calls. Email and phone requests coming through the Center should be tracked by the original receiver of the request. On a quarterly basis, Code will invite One Call Center’s management to Code’s bi-weekly Senior Meetings or weekly Management Meetings to resolve any issues in a timely manner.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 7

Regularly scheduled meetings with Call Center Management have been scheduled in order to improve communications and to avoid and issues of “dropped”, “referred”, or “invalid” calls. Call Center Management Team has attended Code Enforcement’s Management Team meetings to address various issues.

Finding 4 – City Manager’s Office

The City Manager’s Office receives citizens’ “Request(s)” calls by telephone; by chance meeting in the Lobby of City Hall; by a citizen’s meeting with an Assistant City Manager; or “Request(s)” forwarded from the Mayor’s Office. The City Manager’s Office will submit a “Request(s)” from an “Anonymous Constituent” if the reporting party request anonymity.

The City Manager’s Office does not use a formal tracking system. The major types of calls received by the City Manager’s Office are:

- Vehicles abandoned on the streets
- Neighbor disputes
- Health hazard such as slum landlord, living conditions a hazardous health issue.
- Business Tax Licenses, especially if the legitimacy of the business is questionable.

Recommendation 8:

Code Enforcement, ISD and the City Manager's Office should work jointly to implement a formal tracking system (such as RFS with Read-Only access by the City Manager's Office) to formally track all citizens "Requests" received through the City Manager's Office. The purpose of the formal tracking system is to ensure an accurate and efficient process to communicate "Requests" to Code Enforcement and to ensure citizens' "Requests" have been properly and timely resolved. In addition, the formal tracking system will provide data to the City Manager on the number, location and types of "Requests" received by and through the City Manager's Office.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 8

Code has initiated the steps necessary for ISD and the City Manager's Office to implement and train in the RFS system. Code has contacted ISD to insure the RFS is available to the City Manager's office and will coordinate RFS training.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 8

Code's staff coordinated the RFS training for the City Manager's Office by ISD. The training was completed.

Finding 5 – Mayor's Office

The Mayor's office receives citizens' "Request(s)" in the following formats:

- a) E-mails, which are forwarded to the City Manager's Office and the Code Enforcement Manager;
- b) Telephone calls, which are initially recorded on a legal pad. Then a staff member creates an e-mail with the caller's information, which is sent to the City Manager's Office and sometimes to the Code Enforcement Manager;
- c) Letters, which are attached to a cover Memo from the Mayor's Office and sent to the City Manager's Office and the Director of Planning and Development and sometimes to the Code Enforcement Manager.
- d) A written citizen's personal request to speak with the Mayor during his Open Door Day. If the Mayor's staff is unable to handle the citizen's "Request(s)" prior to the meeting or the citizen requests to speak with the Mayor then the appropriate Department (e.g. Code) will be requested to attend the meeting to answer the citizen's question(s) and/or take the "Request(s)". If the specific Departmental member is not present, then a member of the Mayor's staff in attendance will record the citizen's "Request(s)" and e-mail the City Manager's Office and the Director of Planning and Development and sometimes the Code Enforcement Manager.

The Mayor's Office does not have a formal system or use the RFS System to track citizen "Request(s)". The major code issues reported to the Mayor are:

- Weeds
- Illegal Dumping in Alleys
- Abandoned/Inoperable vehicles
- Citizen doesn't know who to go to
- Citizen has tried other avenues and the problem has not been resolved

Recommendation 9:

Code Enforcement, ISD and the Mayor's Office should work jointly to implement a formal tracking system (such as RFS with Read-Only access by the Mayor's Office) to formally track all citizens "Requests" received through the Mayor's Office. The purpose of the formal tracking system is to ensure an accurate and efficient process to communicate "Requests" to Code Enforcement and to ensure citizens' "Requests" have been properly and timely resolved. In addition, the formal tracking system will provide data to the Mayor on the number, location and types of "Requests" received by and through the Mayor's Office.

Prior Management Response to Recommendation 9

Code has initiated the steps necessary for ISD and the Mayor's Office to implement and train in the RFS system. Code has contacted ISD to insure the RFS is available to the Mayor's office and will coordinate RFS training. A person from the Mayor's staff will be invited to the monthly coordination meeting along with Council assistants.

Current Management Response/Status of Recommendation 9

Code initiated the steps necessary for ISD and the Mayor's Office to implement and training in the RFS system. However, at the request of the Mayor's Office, it was referred back to the City Manager's Office. The CMO received training on RFS – see status of Recommendation 8.

Additional Information – Other City Departments

A number of other City Departments' employees may identify a code violation during the course of their duties. For example:

1. Fire Department

The Prevention Division personnel may identify code violations during fire and life safety inspections. The code violations are reported to a designated employee in Code Enforcement. That employee will e-mail the Prevention Division employee which inspector has been assigned the case.

2. Police Department

Problem Oriented Policing (POP) Officers may identify building code violations. POP Officers will send an e-mail, make a telephone call or, if the violation is emergent, the POP Officer will make a radio call requesting Code Enforcement ASAP. Code Enforcement areas are set-up the same as the POP areas. Therefore, Code Enforcement management has indicated Code personnel may have routine contact with the POP Officers in their area, which assists with the identification and monitoring of potential Code violations.

3. Parking Services Division

The Parking Services Division receives calls from the public about cars parked on lawns. Parking refers these calls to Code. The Parking Controllers may notice potential Code violations during the course of their duties and will call Code to report the violation.

4. Sewer Maintenance Division

The Sewer Maintenance Division receives Code or Code/Risk related calls. The Sewer Maintenance Division calls Code to report the call and maintains a log of the calls reported to Code or Code/Risk. Internal Audit attempted to reconcile the 23 reported Sewer cases with Code’s HTE System. The results were:

Reconciliation of Sewer to HTE	Reconciliation Results	Percentage
Case not found in HTE	10	44%
Case entered into HTE for exact date	4	17%
Duplicate case reported by Sewer	4	17%
Not valid address	2	9%
Other non-related cases	2	9%
Case in HTE but date not exact	1	4%
TOTAL	23	100%

5. Streets Division

Calls received by the Streets Division that relate to potential code violations are transferred to Code Enforcement. In some instances (e.g. illegal dumping in an alley), the Street Division personnel may abate the situation and then call Code Enforcement to report the address and violation.

6. Wastewater Management Division

Personnel from Wastewater Management infrequently may see a Code issue in the course of their duties. Wastewater personnel call the main Code Enforcement number to report a potential Code violation.

7. Non-related Code Calls

Code Enforcement receives numerous calls for non Code related information and/or problems. The Code staff will either transfer these calls to the appropriate Agency or City Department, or work with the Reporting Party and the appropriate City Department to effect a resolution (if feasible). These types of calls impact the workload of the Intake/Clerical staff.

The above items are primarily for informational purposes only – no audit recommendations considered necessary.

Prior Management Comments Regarding the Above Additional Information

Code will work with other City Departments, such as Fire and PD, to implement a tracking system such as Code’s online tracking system.