

The Board of Supervisors justifiably recognized that there were and are problems of a functional and structural nature present within the Department of Transportation. In their effort to address those deficiencies the Board directed the Director of Transportation to conduct a study and bring before them a proposal that would lead to a reduction in cost and improve efficiencies within the Department. While the Board's direction was of sound intent I believe the execution leaves a great deal to be desired.

Over the past 20+ years the Department of Transportation has been the subject of nearly constant reorganization. If past efforts had proven fruitful there would have been no reason to continuously repeat this exercise. Unfortunately, since all previous efforts failed to result in the savings and other improvements the Board was seeking they found themselves trapped in a revolving door. By not using the same methodologies that proved in the past to lead to unsatisfactory results this Board can break this cycle.

Past reorganizing efforts have usually been conducted under the auspices of the Director of Transportation. By utilizing internal resources the Director cannot compile an objective recommendation regarding the organizational structure of the Department. Simply put, the Director and those involved in conducting the study personally have too much at stake with their future wellbeing riding on the outcome. Further, the Director must rely largely on the recommendations of upper management in developing ^{A FINAL} ~~the~~ recommendation.

The issue here is that most of the current upper management has been part of the DOT management team for the past 20 years and are directly responsible for present conditions within the Department. The only position during this period that has seen significant change is that of Director. Sometimes the position has been filled from sources outside the County and sometimes it has been filled from existing ranks through promotional opportunity. Unfortunately, regardless of the Director's line of ascension, his efforts and policies have always been constrained by the long established culture promoted and protected by the existing hierarchy. It's human nature to resist change and the management in DOT is no exception to that rule.

The foregoing presentation can lead to only one conclusion; the results of any study conducted by the stakeholders upon whom the study will have direct impact, is at best suspect. It may also be concluded that the results are likely to prove less than satisfactory and will necessitate another study in the near future. Thus resulting in and contributing to the revolving door syndrome.

The only way to insure that a study of functional and structural deficiencies within the Department of Transportation is conducted in an unbiased manner and results in a recommendation that is in the best interest of the County is to have that study conducted by a third party who has no personal interest in the outcome.

While there is definitely a cost associated with retention of a consultant, I believe there is strong potential for a study conducted by a consultant to result in greater savings than the \$3,086,269 indicated in the Department of Transportation study. If the study has the potential to result in savings of this magnitude the Board can't afford not to get it right.

While I am philosophically strongly opposed to using consultants to accomplish tasks that County employees can perform better, in this case I would argue that County employees are too personally involved to complete the task in a manner that reflects the best interest of the County and its taxpayers.

Therefore, I urge that the Board reject the proposal being presented by the Department of Transportation and direct that a consultant with proven qualifications and no ties or obligations to this County, to the Department of Transportation or to any person employed by this County be retained to conduct the study and return to the Board with a recommendation that all can agree is above reproach.

To insure that the final study is completely protected from undue influence I further recommend that the Board direct the CAO's office to take lead responsibility for the study, provide oversight and be the primary contact point for the consultant.