

# Reorganization

## Option 1. One-Stop Permitting

Create One-Stop Permitting by co-locating Planning and Building, Public Works Land Use and Environmental Health to one location that focuses on the infrastructure and environmental needs of the county.

The One-Stop permitting concept was included in the following report:

- Blue Ribbon Task Force Recommendation dated July 2018. Page 32.

Currently, Environmental Health resides under the Public Health Branch of DHHS at 100 H Street, Eureka. Planning & Building is co-located with Public Works Land Use at 3015 H St. in Eureka.

The concept of Environmental Health, Planning & Building and Public Works Land Use continues to be of interest to the Board in creating a One-Stop Permitting location and is included in the Facilities Master Plan. The co-location of these departments/divisions would create a single department or location focused on all infrastructure and environmental permitting needs. Identifying an acceptable space for such a department/division has been a significant barrier, however in recent years Planning & Building has significantly reduced their staffing allocations, making this reorganization more feasible.

The co-location of Environmental Health with Planning and Building and Public Works Land Use would necessitate a relocation of all programs to form the One-Stop Permitting facility that could house all the current employees. Furthermore, preparing for the co-location would require a short-term investment in a swing space to allow for movement that would create opportunities for beginning design and construction plans as outlined in the Facilities Master Plan.

Should your Board choose this option you will also be creating opportunities that include but are not limited to:

- Relocating Environmental Health from a leased facility, and Planning and Building and Land Use from a county owned building to a newly identified swing space for One-Stop Permitting. This move will require the temporary lease of a building and would be an increased cost given programs would be moved from a county owned building.
- Estimated swing space lease payments for a co-located One-Stop Permitting facility are estimated at \$487,864 a year with a 5% escalation factor.
- The vacation of the Planning and Building and Land Use wing of 3015 H Street would allow for demolition of the vacant wing making it available for future planning for a campus complex as identified in the Facilities Master Plan.

- The movement of Environmental Health from 100 H Street could create an opportunity for the Public Defender to vacate its current county-owned building at 1001 4th Street and relocate to 100 H Street as swing space until its permanent location could be identified. This would be a General Fund increase to rental costs of approximately \$131,079 annually with a 3% escalation factor.
- With this movement the county owned Public Defender building and the newly purchased property at 1017 4th Street could be demolished and plans could begin for the design and construction of a new county owned building. Currently the 2020 Finance Plan has \$1,175,812 dedicated to a project at this location and the Deferred Maintenance Fund has \$1 million reserved for One-Stop Permitting.

**Cost Estimate:**

\$487,864 plus a 5% escalation annual lease

\$60,330 space needs study or this could be performed in house through Public Works.

**Survey:**

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 14 were in favor creating One-Stop Permitting by co-locating Planning and Building, Public Works Land Use and Environmental Health. Survey comments include:

- Yes, if it's cost-effective. This definitely makes sense logically, operationally.
- The concept alone of "one-stop permitting" certainly sounds efficient for customers/community members, which is good. However, based upon the limited information provided, this proposal appears to contemplate significant cost to Humboldt County with limited benefit(s) at this time. Under the present budget forecast, it is difficult to justify this proposal absent more information such as a detailed cost/benefit analysis. Lots of "temporary" & unknown which could also increase confusion for community members.
- Yes, in concept we've always been on board with this, however we should be avoiding any additional costs. So, while it would be ideal to have them all co-located, now may not be the time.
- Space Study was completed 5 years ago.
- I don't believe that cost savings would be realized for a very long time and at this time we need to conserve funding.

## Option 2. Centralized Information Technology (IT)

Separate Information Services (IS) from DHHS, Separate Child Support Services IT, District Attorney IT and Planning and Building IT staff and combine with County Information Technology (IT), making a centralized county IT Department.

The consolidation of DHHS IS and IT is not a new concept and was included in the following reports:

- WBCP (Wendy Brown Creative Partners) report dated Sept. 22, 2015. Page 37.
- Blue Ribbon Task Force Recommendation dated July 2018. Page 18.
- CPS HR Study dated Nov. 5, 2018. Pages 8 and 36-40.

Outside of IT, DHHS IS and Child Support Services, there are two departments (District Attorney and Planning and Building) that maintain some level of in-house IT support staff.

### **County IT**

County IT consists of 27.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) supporting county staff across 50 locations and is responsible for three primary functional teams as listed below:

**IT Technician Team-** Provide centralized network services to approximately 40 locations consisting of AT&T Switch Ethernet Wide Area Network (“WAN”) services, firewall, intrusion detection, web content filtering, internet services, and active directory infrastructure for all county departments. Additionally, this team provides telephony (AT&T VOIP), helpdesk, and general IT support services to most county departments. The IT Technician Team maintains the physical and virtual server infrastructure utilized by applications that County IT supports. This includes managing the hardware lifecycle, data backup and recovery, power infrastructure/battery backup, and monitoring system availability. Data back-up is performed through a self-store system that uses tapes to record data and cloud-based services.

**IT Applications Team-** Supports a wide array of applications, programs, and custom developed solutions used by all county departments. This includes supporting end users of these applications by resolving help desk tickets, interfacing with vendor provided support resources, as well as planning and performing software upgrade projects. The Webmaster is on this team and is responsible for website administration including the monitoring of the websites’ Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance, the review and analysis of third-party vendors linking software applications to the website and training for the county’s website editors and departmental Social Media content providers.

**IT Information Security Team-** Consists of three positions responsible for the monitoring of the county network for security breaches or intrusions including incident detection, response, recovery and implementing strategies to mitigate risks. This involves ensuring that security measures are integrated into the review of software applications and IT practices. Information Security is responsible for the county’s Information Security charter, policy and education of staff that ensures awareness of potential security threats, how to identify and respond to potential threats.

### **DHHS Information Services**

DHSS IS consisting of approximately 19.0 FTE supporting DHHS staff across 46 locations. DHHS IS is essentially a full-service IT department. DHHS IS is typically better funded and has in-depth knowledge of the information technology needs of DHHS. DHHS IS relies on County IT for centralized network services including AT&T Switch Ethernet Wide Area Network (“WAN”) services, firewall, intrusion detection, web content filtering, internet services, and active directory infrastructure. DHHS IS works closely with County IT to manage and maintain the countywide active directory infrastructure, but otherwise provides the full spectrum of information technology support services including hardware, software, telephony, development, and customer support to DHHS buildings and staff. DHHS IS receives significant funding from state and federal entities as well, which often allows DHHS IS to provide newer equipment and better technology than other county departments funded by the General Fund. Significant applications/systems supported by DHHS IS include telephony services (including multiple call centers and automated call distribution), multiple electronic health record systems, prescription drug control systems, and facilities management systems that are different from the county’s facilities management system.

### **Child Support Service (DCSS) IT**

DCSS IT, consisting of 2.0 FTE, is one of the county departments that has developed an in-house IT support function. DCSS IT supports both Humboldt and Trinity counties DCSS programs. DCSS IT supports all hardware, software, internal network (LAN), and customer support needs of approximately 38.0 FTE, many of which telework a portion of their time. DCSS IT relies on County IT for AT&T Switch Ethernet Wide Area Network (“WAN”) services, firewall, intrusion detection, web content filtering, internet services, and active directory infrastructure, but otherwise provide the full spectrum of information Technology support services to DCSS.

### **District Attorney IT**

District Attorney IT consisting of 1.0 FTE and is an IT Applications Analyst. This position is the same position title as County IT’s Applications Analyst. Although the title is the same the duties vary quite substantially, primarily in that the District Attorney IT position services one software application while the same position in County IT may be responsible for several software applications for multiple county departments.

### **Planning and Building IT**

Planning and Building IT consist of 1.0 FTE and is a Departmental Information Systems Supervisor. This positions services Planning and Building’s software application, Accela.

#### Prior Study Recommendation:

CPS HR Study recommendation IT-4 states that the county immediately unify its information technology resources under a single chain of command, that allows for deployment of positions in the departments they serve. The CPS HR Study also recommended that this change be made incrementally and with minimal disruption to existing staffing and assignments. The CPS HR Study went on to further say the rotation of job assignments between departments, where possible, should allow all employees access to the newest technology, as well as to the legacy systems that provide the backbone for mainstream county operations. Over time, this centralized unit should provide greater leadership for analysis and improvement of county information technology systems overall, maximize resources, and better service to county department operations.

#### Cost Estimates:

\$46,080 for class and comp study.

\$31,200 for a consultant's implementation plan.

#### Survey:

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 11 were in favor creating a centralized IT

Department. Survey comments included:

- I don't think I have enough understanding to "weigh in" one way or another. From my understanding of how DHHS operates, I don't think centralization would be beneficial, they need specialists to support their specific needs.
- The District Attorney's Office has a large number of highly time sensitive technologically driven mandates which require onsite, immediate action and prioritization. It would be extremely difficult to educate & train external IT staff of the functions and compliance requirements within the DA's Office. We function in an "emergency room" type setting, constantly reprioritizing based upon what comes our way by factors outside of our direct control. We recently hired and have devoted significant resources in specialized training and education of IT personnel. Specialized training and education pertains to statutory mandates, our unique case management system, dialogue amongst our internal electronic systems and those within local law enforcement agencies, state regulatory agencies, and our judicial system. Additionally, presentation of court cases during trial and other evidentiary hearings often requires hands on, immediate technical assistance. Furthermore, we utilize internal IT staff to assist in the preparation of electronic data, including video presentation, cellphone & other device extractions/reports for use in the courtroom. Mandated statistical reports are regularly

developed for compliance with multiple regulatory agencies, as well as grant application and compliance. Development of algorithms in order to compile statistical information regarding detailed demographics, contacts, case trajectories and outcomes will necessitate additional internal IT resource demands and likely necessitate contracting with additional experts in this specialized field. Therefore, relying solely on a centralized IT Department would drastically jeopardize the DA's Office functions and purpose in enforcing the law and enhancing public safety. We are grateful for our current IT position, as well as the current IT Department in their support of our duties and obligations. No such change should absent a thorough cost/benefit analysis study.

- No, this will need much further review. I am requesting a year to review internal cost for possible reduction. The number of complex state/program applications that require immediate attention has to be prioritized. DHHS has to be able to prioritize these applications for workflow or stoppage if a system is not working. We cannot take on more administrative cost or burden on our programs. We are saying no because we don't have enough data to make an informed decision, we don't have a cost/benefit analysis.
- Not comfortable telling other departments what to do as I don't know the reasoning they are not centralized. This should be a discussion between those departments and IT.
- Planning and Building does not have IT staff. Planning and Building has systems operators.

May 28, 2024, Department Head Meeting Feedback:

- In theory centralization of IT makes sense. More discussion with involved departments needs to occur. More information is needed.

### Option 3. Centralized Information Technology Security

Separate Information Technology Security from DHHS and combine with County IT's [Information Security](#).

DHHS IS and IT and Information Security is not a new concept and was included in the following reports:

- CPS HR Study dated Nov. 5, 2018. Pages 6 – 8.

Since the date of the above reports County IT has allocated three Information Security positions, two of which are currently filled, and one is in a job description analysis. They include:

- 2.0 FTE IT Security Analyst, both of which are filled positions.
- 1.0 FTE IT Security Officer, currently in a job description analysis.

DHHS IS does not have any full-time security staff, although select DHHS IS staff may perform certain levels of security work.

**Prior Study Recommendation:**

CPS HR Study, pages 6 and 7 recommendation IT-1, stated the county-wide IT Security staff group must be consolidated and fully staffed to meet needs. Existing DHHS IS positions, even if outstationed, must directly report within a consolidated unit, and if preferable, the security unit lead could be named from one of the two existing DHHS personnel. This unit could report independently to the county executive, or alternately to the County IT division head.

Regardless, the development of a county-wide strategy for IT risk assessment and prevention must be completed, and the sharing of knowledge and responsibility for these functions must be within a single staff group. This is the only way to maintain and consistently deploy the resources necessary to protect the interest of the county.

- The County IT Director reports he could continue supervising the Information Security team but feels the Security Officer should report directly to the County Administrative Officer while the County IT Director would maintain day to day indirect supervision.
- There is value in the Security Officer reporting directly to the CAO as this ensures the CAO is better positioned to make informed decisions and strategic and tactical plans about the county's cybersecurity risks and needs. By reporting to the CAO, the Security Officer can align the county's cybersecurity strategy with the county's strategic framework. By aligning cybersecurity strategies with the county's strategic framework, the Security Officer can ensure that crucial projects are prioritized, and that cybersecurity is not considered an afterthought. One of the roles of the Security Officer is to create a security-focused culture. Reporting to the CAO can help to achieve this by aligning security objectives with county objectives. When employees see that security is a critical part of the county's strategy, they are more likely to adopt security principles.
- The County IT Director recommends that all security staff be located together.

The CPS HR Study further recommended, page 8 recommendation IT-4; the only immediate changes should be in the centralization of the System Security unit.

In approving this option your Board is approving the following:

- County-wide Information Technology Security be consolidated into one unit and be under the indirect supervision of the County IT Director.
- The Information Security Officer shall report to the County Administrative Officer.

**Cost Estimate:**

\$6,000 for class and comp study of DHHS IS.

\$2,880 for the completion of the IT Security Officer job description.

\$6,960 for a consultant's implementation plan.

**Survey:**

Of the 17 responses to this survey question 10 were in favor of creating a centralized IT Information Security division. Comments included:

- I don't know enough about this issue to cast an informed vote.
- Again, don't know why they are separate so can't knowledgably comment on this.
- Do not have enough background to provide an opinion.

**May 28, 2024, Department Head Meeting Feedback:**

- In theory centralization of IT Security makes sense. More discussion with involved departments needs to occur. More information is needed.

**Option 4. Combine Facilities with ADA**

Separate Facilities Management from Public Works and combine with the County Administrative Office, ADA Compliance Team.

This option would move the Facilities Management division of Public Works under the County Administrative Office. There is synergy in this movement as the ADA Compliance Team performs similar functions as Facilities Management's Capital Projects and is led by the Assistant County Administrative Officer/ADA Coordinator. Facilities Management is led by a Deputy Director.

The County Administrative Office has served as a liaison to Public Works, worked with the Deputy Director in the development of the Facilities Master Plan, performed ADA barrier remediation in county-owned and leased facilities, provided oversight of Facilities Management's funds and up until recently worked directly with the veterans' groups on stipend payments and other financial reimbursements.

In addition to the ADA Compliance Team, the County Administrative Office houses three other Internal Service Fund (ISF) programs including Purchasing, Communications, and Information Technology. This option would also contain a recommendation to convert the Building Maintenance Budget (1100162) to an Internal Service Fund. This would create a decrease in

General Fund allocations and an increase in ISF charges to departments. Departments should see enhanced services and a clear understanding of charges and service.

This option could be a temporary move for Facilities Management and provide for succession planning and leadership development opportunities until long-term solutions are identified, such as the creation of a department comprised of Facilities and ADA.

Facilities Management is comprised of three budget units.

#### **1100-162 Building Maintenance**

Building Maintenance oversees the maintenance and janitorial services provided at all county buildings and some leased facilities, and is focused on maintaining safe, healthy, and efficient facilities for the public and county staff. This budget unit also includes Real Property staff, who manage leases for county programs and manage the purchase, sale, and surplus of county-owned property.

#### **3562-170 Capital Projects**

This budget unit manages planning, design, and construction services for projects in county owned and leased facilities.

#### **1100-703 Veterans Buildings**

This budget unit was created to track facility maintenance costs for the five county-owned veterans buildings managed by the veteran groups in Arcata, Eureka, Ferndale, Fortuna and Garberville. This budget unit will monitor and analyze reporting requirements from the veterans contract agreements and disbursement of utility payments to the veteran groups for utility costs at the buildings.

The ADA Compliance team has one budget unit.

#### **3552-152 ADA Compliance Team**

The ADA Compliance budget unit enforces the county's compliance with Title II of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 (ADA.) ADA Compliance contains elements including accessibility to county programs, services, activities, facilities, roadways, website, county policies and procedures. The ADA Compliance budget unit investigates all ADA-related complaints, performs ADA barrier removal and coordinates with outside vendors on capital improvement projects for barrier removal.

The ADA Compliance Team has 4.0 FTE and are located in Room 112 of the Humboldt County Courthouse. The Facilities Management division has a total of 47.0 FTE. Building Maintenance

staff are located at 901 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Eureka and Custodial Staff are located at the Humboldt County Courthouse.

A cost to be considered with this option, although fairly minimal, would be the relocation of 2.0 FTE Real Property Agents, 2.0 FTE Construction Project Managers and 1.0 FTE Deputy Director of Facility Management.

**Cost Estimate:**

\$4,800 for class and comp study.

The cost of this option would also include the relocation of 2.0 FTE Real Property Agents, 2.0 FTE Construction Project Managers and 1.0 FTE Deputy Director. That cost is currently unknown as a location would need to be identified.

This option would create an ISF for Building Maintenance and therefore decrease General Fund allocations but would see an increase in ISF charges. General Fund allocations for Building Maintenance would be reallocated to departments to offset increased ISF charges.

**Survey:**

Of the 14 responses to this survey question 7 were in favor of consolidating Facilities Management with the ADA Compliance Team under the CAO. Comments included:

- Possibly, a good conversation for Public Works and the compliance team to develop possible synergy with projects.
- There is limited information to opine and a cost/benefit analysis study report may prove helpful. The ADA team has worked diligently for improvements that directly impacted my office in recent years. We are grateful. It seems that if Public Works had additional resources, they may be in a better situation to engage in (all) projects more efficiently. There may be cost savings as the resources needed to improve/maintain facilities are likely largely the same and redundancies should be reduced by having one team take on facility management & improvements.
- No. Public Works should have the responsibility of ADA, not the CAO.
- This is backwards. ADA should be moved to PW for all the reasons stated above.
- Projects are not getting completed with the current model in place. This is a major issue in the county and immediate attention is needed to fix this problem.
- ADA team should go to Public Works

May 28, 2024, Department Head Meeting Feedback:

- In theory Facilities Management with the ADA Compliance Team under the CAO makes sense. More discussion with involved departments needs to occur. More information is needed. Both departments (DHHS and Public Works) state the current process is working.

## Option 5. General Services Department

Separate Facilities Management Division and Fleet Services from Public Works and combine with a re-formed General Services Department; remove Purchasing, Information Technology (IT), Communication and ADA Compliance from the CAO Department and place into the newly formed General Services Department.

Until 2005, Humboldt County had in place an internal services department known variously as “Administrative Services” and “General Services”. This is quite common among counties in California, having a department which combines a variety of internal functions. Among the opportunities planned to be achieved by the dissolution of Humboldt County’s General Services Department in 2005 were:

- To allow the County Architect (a Public Works employee) to work more closely with Building Maintenance (a General Services function transferred to Public Works)
- Provide more support staffing to the CAO which was very small at the time.

Neither of these issues are a concern at the present time.

The services performed are charged to the using department. Motor Pool, Heavy Equipment, IT, Communications, ADA and Purchasing are all in separate ISFs. A new ISF for Buildings Maintenance (1100162) will need to be established. Please note Risk Management is an ISF and is not included in this reorganization.

Benefits of creating a General Services department would allow for increased attention and focus on customer service, cost recovery and process efficiencies. Some of these county-centric functions are currently part of larger departments. This means there is a possibility of losing sight of the vital role these functions play in the day-to-day operation of the county as they may be overshadowed by larger interests. By removing these functions and creating a General Services department, a new General Services Director would be able to work more effectively at process improvements and service enhancements. Additionally, this option with its current staffing, coupled with a new department head-level position for Director of General Services, could provide a level of succession planning within the new department that did not exist under the former department configuration prior to 2005.

On Feb. 9, 2016, the County Administrative Office proposed, with its mid-year report, that the Board consider the creation of a General Services Department. The Board directed staff to discuss proposed changes with affected department heads and to bring a recommendation back to the Board. On Aug. 23, 2016, staff recommended that your Board not pursue this reorganization effort due to feedback from staff and department heads involved at that time.

Below is a list of concerns regarding the creation of a General Services Department in 2016:

- Motor Pool and Facilities Management are supported by other Public Works staff members who, while working together, complete many vital and varied tasks for all county departments.
- The responsibility of Motor Pool and Facilities Management employees is to operate, create and maintain systems and this work type best fits within the Public Works Department.
- Motor Pool is grouped as part of Fleet Services and works in conjunction with the Public Works' Heavy Equipment unit.
- Heavy Equipment staffing is shared among Motor Pool with supervision provided by an Equipment Superintendent allocated to Heavy Equipment.
- Motor Pool and Facilities Management use the same cost accounting system (CAMS) outside of Finance Enterprise that maintains records of day-to-day operations. This program is currently used by and maintained by the Public Works Department. Separating out Motor Pool and Facilities Management from this cost accounting system would inhibit its ability to recover its costs or appropriately charge departments for the services provided.
- IT and Purchasing teams expressed concern about losing the broad perspective that working in the CAO affords them. By being exposed to a broader county picture is beneficial for long-term strategic planning for IT investments and process improvements for Purchasing.
- IT and Purchasing teams expressed if they were reassigned to the General Services Department, they would lose the support of the CAO and this support is necessary when performing their duties.
- The CAO is able to support and effectively advocate for resources necessary to provide technological improvements, any change in the way that IT operates could delay efforts to accommodate their ever-changing obligations for essential technical support.
- Pursuant to Government Code section 25500 et seq. the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors employs a Purchasing Agent. "The Purchasing Agent, who shall have powers and duties of County purchasing agent as prescribed by law, this Code and any other resolutions and orders of the Board of Supervisors, shall be the County Administrative

Officer or his/her designee" (Humboldt County Code section 245-1). The County Administrative Officer has designated the Purchasing Team to make and/or facilitate the purchases of goods and services required by county departments. This relationship with the CAO enables Purchasing to work with the Management and Budget Team on requests for proposals, departmental budget monitoring, process improvements and purchasing policy considerations. If your Board chooses to move Purchasing to a General Services department this mutually beneficial relationship will be hindered and will likely stall significant process improvements in the Purchasing system.

Although the ADA division of the CAO was not created at the time of the August 2016 agenda item, the ADA team shares a common concern. The ADA Coordinator and team should be housed in a department of authority to assist in carrying out the roles and responsibility of ensuring compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and county policy.

A County Executive Office (CEO) structure, as discussed in more detail below, would provide support to a newly formed Department of General Services and alleviate many of the concerns expressed above.

#### **Cost Estimate:**

\$32,400 for class and comp study may be needed to separate DHHS Facilities, Procurement, and Fleet Services staff and combine with County Facilities, Purchasing, and Fleet Services.

\$2,880 for the creation of a General Services Department Head job description.

\$25,200 for a consultant's implementation plan for the creation of a General Services Department.

Additional costs may include the relocation of staff should that be required at an undetermined cost. General Fund Contributions would decrease due to the creation of an ISF for Building Maintenance and departments will see an increase in ISF charges including the cost of a General Services Department Head.

#### **Survey:**

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 5 were in favor of creating a General Services Department as described above. Comments included:

- Not cost effective to create a new department and appoint a new department head.
- Sounds costly.
- No, the cost of having a new dept, requiring a new Department Head and increased ISF charges don't make sense. We do not have additional funding to do something like this.

Humboldt County had a General Services in the past and it was dissolved due to budget. Departments revenue cannot and should not be used for the entire County administration.

- This is going backwards to a system that got reorganized to what we have today because it didn't work then.
- I don't think creating another department is going to be a cost savings.
- Provided that the county is prepared to provide a GF allocation to the department that are impacted by increased in ISF charges after this transition.

## Option 6. Combine DHHS Procurement with County Purchasing

### [Separate DHHS Procurement from DHHS and combine with County Purchasing.](#)

By combining DHHS Procurement with County Purchasing this will create a centralization of duties. Centralizing functions of purchasing is important for a higher level of efficiencies through standardization. Purchasing would retain the responsibility of policy, procedures, and processes for acquisition. Through centralizing Purchasing functions while allowing departments to perform general purchasing duties and with additional staffing, County Purchasing will focus on increased oversight of procurement activities throughout the county. Cost savings will be realized through standardization of processes, increased efficiencies and process improvements lending itself to the enhanced buying power of the county.

#### **Cost Estimates:**

\$9,600 for class and comp study.

\$5,760 for a consultant's implementation plan.

#### **Survey:**

Of the 15 responses to this survey question 10 were in favor of combining DHHS Procurement with County Purchasing. Comments included:

- I think this consolidation and support could be beneficial to all concerned.
- Too little information available to opine on this. Likely DHHS has a lot of reporting requirements connected to funding and statutory compliance which would be extremely complicated for the County Purchasing to take on. Unclear how this would help anyone.
- No. Pending further review. We would still need staff to gather and process documents. This would need further review by a consultant.
- Yes. However, as a part of this transition, current Purchasing policies/processes should be streamlined (see previous answer) to help ensure minimizing staffing to perform work that could be performed at Department level by finance staff.

- These questions related to DHHS all sound like opportunities to increase efficiencies, but when they apply to another department and are not aspects of that department that my department interacts with, it feels like a shot in the dark to answer the questions.
- Not sure why it is separate thus can't comment on if putting together would be an improvement.
- Part of a bigger discussion about centralization. Even though our department is not DHHS we still have a staff person who spends substantial time on purchasing. This makes sense if it results in an overall reduction in staff, but our current centralized processes still require most of the work to be done by departments.

**May 28, 2024, Department Head Meeting Feedback:**

- In theory centralization of Purchasing makes sense. More discussion with involved departments needs to occur. More information is needed.

**Option 7. Combine DHHS Fleet Services with Public Works Fleet Services**

Separate DHHS Fleet Services from DHHS and combine with Public Works Fleet Services.

By combining DHHS Fleet Services with Public Works Fleet Services this will create a centralization of duties. Centralizing functions of fleet services is important for a higher level of efficiencies through standardization. Cost savings will be realized through standardization of processes, increased efficiencies, and process improvements.

**Cost Estimates:**

\$21,120 for class and comp study.

\$13,440 for a consultant's implementation plan.

**Survey:**

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 10 were in favor of combining DHHS Fleet Services with Public Works Fleet Services. Comments included:

- I think that DHHS fleet has specialist best equipped to administer their vehicles.
- Why? Would this help anything? Insufficient information. Presumably the vehicles utilized by DHHS are utilized daily basis and there may be grant/funding requirements that are (potentially) different from Public Works. Again, not enough information to opine = no.
- No, there is no benefit to doing that. County Motor Pool staff already track, monitor, and charge appropriate mileage to all appropriate programs based on the mileage logs provided by DHHS fleet staff. They also coordinate with DHHS staff for vehicle maintenance, identification, acquisition, and placement of replacement vehicles, and purchase new vehicles based on information provided by DHHS Fleet manager that is guided by program staff and the DHHS budget. DHHS Fleet Services includes the DHHS staff throughout several DHHS sites that provide vehicle reservation and key pick up of vehicles for program and administrative staff. The fleet itself cannot move locations from

DHHS sites as staff working out of those sites use those vehicles, which means the DHHS funded staff supporting the reservations and check out of those vehicles need to remain at those DHHS sites as well. Vehicles being located at several DHHS sites allows the ease of access and flexibility to DHHS staff and programs, simplifying their work as vehicles are a necessary part of DHHS program delivery throughout the county. The staff that manage the DHHS fleet at the different sites are supervised by DHHS administration except for the Automotive Service Technician that is located at the DHHS Plaza building. The Automotive Services Technician is supervised by County Motor Pool and paid for by DHHS through an interdepartmental memorandum of understanding.

- Yes. However, Departments owning and operating their own fleets should be evaluated as well to find the most cost effective and efficient solution here.
- This is a discussion that should be had between DHHS and DPW.
- I don't know what DHHS Fleet services does. Do they manage vehicles that are assigned to DHHS and those vehicles would become fleet vehicles? If they remain DHHS vehicles it seems like they would be best able to manage them. I don't think fleet services are as well managed as they used to be. There seems to be conflicting direction regarding fleet size.

May 28, 2024, Department Head Meeting Feedback:

- Public Works states it would be heavy left on Motor Pool to take on the scheduling and tracking of DHHS vehicles and that currently both DHHS and Public Works agree there is a symbiotic relationship that works well.

## Option 8. Combine DHHS Employee Service with the Department of Human Resources

Separate DHHS Employee Services (ES)/Payroll staff functions from DHHS and combine with the Department of Human Resources (HR) creating a centralized Human Resource Department. Centralization with delegation of Human Resources was a concept included in the following report:

- CPS HR Study dated Nov. 5, 2018. Pages 43 – 64 and page 102.

The payroll functions performed through DHHS is not the same functions that County Payroll performs, rather more of a time-keeping function. An analysis of the DHHS Payroll function may determine that the separation of these positions/functions is not a fit for the centralization of HR services.

As identified in the Blue-Ribbon Task Force Recommendation Report, on Jan. 9, 2018, the Board of Supervisors approved an agreement with Cooperative Personnel Services (CPS) to conduct a study looking at the centralization of certain services including Human Resources.

With the consolidation of DHHS ES/Payroll staff and functions many of the recommendations in the Blue-Ribbon Task Force report will be carried out. Human Resources will play a large role in the implementation of new software such as Time and Attendance, Employee Online and Laser Fiche workflow for onboarding and offboarding employees.

The county would benefit from centralized Human Resource function. This centralized department could focus on developing further HR and Risk expertise through professional development opportunities that benefit the county with the most current strategies. This centralization would streamline and standardize processes and procedures with focused efforts on improving workflows and identifying and resolving current gaps created by a lack of resources. With consolidated resources staff can be cross-trained and knowledgeable in various functional workflows, allowing staffing resources to be shifted, as needed and thereby enhancing services to county departments.

The recommendation to consolidate DHHS ES/Payroll staff/functions is an opportunity to leverage the advantages listed above and to improve consistency and standardization across the organization.

#### **Costs Estimates:**

\$23,280 for a class and comp study.

\$14,640 for a consultant's implementation plan.

Departments may not see a significant changes to their Cost Allocation charges based on this change. Departments should see cost savings in process improvements and increased efficiencies, streamlined processes, workflows, and defined procedures.

#### **Survey:**

Of the 17 responses to this survey question 9 were in favor with 5 no votes and 3 comments for combining DHHS Employee Services/Payroll functions with the Department of Human Resources. Comments included:

- This again is a subject based on those two departments. They should meet and provide the recommendations.
- Need more information.
- Maybe but I think some of the functions might belong in payroll not all of it is HR. It does seem like it is currently redundant and inefficient.

#### **Option 9. Consolidate PIO and Legislative Functions**

Separate, after review and analysis of positions, staff that perform major public information (PIO) and legislative functions and combine those positions with the CAO.

The consolidation of major PIO and legislative is not a new concept and was included in the following reports:

- WBCP (Wendy Brown) report, dated Sept. 22, 2015. Pages 38.

- Blue Ribbon Task Force Recommendation dated July 2018. Page 26.

Additionally, at the Feb. 9, 2016, meeting the Board of Supervisors voted to place the major public information and legislative functions of DHHS under the County Administrative Office. For unknown reasons, to date this reorganization has not been implemented.

In addition, duties and positions performing public information and legislative functions have increased in other departments. This necessitates the change in this option to include a review and analysis of positions that perform the PIO or Legislative functions as a major part of their duties, to effectively consider if consolidation would be beneficial.

**Prior Study Recommendation:**

The WBCP (Wendy Brown) report presented to the Board Sept. 22, 2015, provided in recommendation VI. F. 5., page 38, Legislative Analyst/Public Information, that consideration be given to the appropriate reporting relationship for DHHS Legislative Analyst and Public Information staff, and the roles and responsibilities of these positions should be reviewed. Legislative Analysts and Public Information staff are typically located in the Board of Supervisors and/or the CAO's office. These positions typically communicate on behalf of the CAO and/or the Board of Supervisors. In larger counties, additional staff may be assigned to, or co-located with a major county department; however, they work closely with the Board of Supervisors and CAO. Also, identified in the organizational assessment report prepared by WBCP, DHHS has more robust functions for public information and legislative tracking than would customarily be found within an individual department in an organization the size of Humboldt County. However, in the current structure of the county's PIO and legislative functions within DHHS and other departments, there is not coordinated efforts. For legislative and PIO functions this is a concern in that departments may be working in conflict with county policy, Strategic Framework or identified goals.

Currently coordinated efforts mentioned above have seen much improvement and is occurring with communication to other departments though the CAO office.

There are five dedicated public information staff and two legislative staff within DHHS. Given the size of the department, it makes sense to have a full-time public information position. The Sheriff's Office, for instance, also maintains a public information function. However, an examination of "the appropriate reporting relationship" for the remaining staff - as recommended by the organizational assessment - indicates that these functions should be transferred to the CAO.

The seven current DHHS staff members are in six different position classifications, some of which exist only with the Merit System Services classification structure and have not been adopted as county position classifications. Thus, a classification study would need to be conducted by Human Resources in order for those staff to be transferred from DHHS into another department. In addition, the functions are currently funded through Social Services, so a study of budgetary transfers will be required.

The CAO has a public information specialist whose primary responsibilities are county compliance with the California Public Records Act (PRA), and disaster communications, serving as the Joint Information Center (JIC) Manager when the function is activated. The position's day-to-day activities are to provide oversight of departmental public information postings to the county website, social media and the creation of flyers and documents intended for the public and/or county employees' use. In the time not used for PRA compliance, this public information specialist ensures postings and documents are in line with the Board of Supervisors Strategic Framework and is well versed in the ADA, ensuring compliance of documents and postings. The CAO PIO also ensures ADA compliance for critical press conference and other public information activities. Additionally, the CAO has additional staff to support, as needed, the compliance with the ADA including the County IT Webmaster who is ADA Certified and the county's ADA Coordinator. Additionally, the CAO has a Deputy County Administrative Officer dedicated to legislative work for the county and supervises the PIO function, serving as the Lead PIO in emergencies. This position works directly with the county's legislative consultants, departments and the Board on the county's Legislative Platform.

**Cost Estimate:**

\$12,000 for class and comp study may be needed to separate DHHS PIO and Legislative major functions from other staff to consolidate with the CAO.

\$5,520 for class and comp study for major PIO and Legislative functions in other departments to consolidate with the CAO.

\$11,040 for a consultant's implementation plan.

Additional costs may include the relocation of some staff and legislation software, should that be required. Those costs are unknown at this time.

DHHS may see a cost savings in a reduction in staffing costs, however other departments may see an increase in cost allocation charges.

Cost savings may be realized with the expanded staffing presence for departments that will help with advocacy to avoid unfunded mandates or provide channels for county funding opportunities.

Efficiencies would be realized through streamlined and more accessible reporting on active/pertinent legislation for other departments and facilitating faster connections with state and federal officials on pressing topics.

#### **Survey:**

Of the 14 responses to this survey question 10 were in favor consolidating major PIO and Legislative Functions under the CAO. Comments included:

- Maybe could be helpful for some departments- opt in?
- No. Further analysis is needed. We question efficiency and cost savings. How would that save money when our PIO and Leg staff are paid for by DHHS and not CGF? Because they solely do DHHS related work, having them under a different org structure would complicate communication and create inefficiencies.
- Yes. However, consideration should also be given to the fact that staff at the Department level still need to be involved with the functions of professional PIO and/or Legislative staff due to the specificity/specialty of knowledge housed within specific Departments related to their specific professional field.
- I thought this is how it works.
- Not sure where are these positions? If they are not in the General Fund what would be the reason to add them to the General Fund as an additional cost? If they are in the General Fund then yes.
- Only public information request. The Sheriff's Office would still need a designated PIO function. WE currently have two PIS allocations because this work is so immense. the County should take on all PRA functions under one roof - and charged A87 cost plan.

## **10. CEO Model**

Change the Board and CAO reporting structure for appointed Department Heads by changing the county's reporting structure to that of a CEO model.

The CEO concept was first introduced in the following reports:

- WBCP (Wendy Brown) report, dated Sept. 22, 2015. Page 45.
- Blue Ribbon Task Force Recommendation dated July 2018. Page 21.

These reports, while only specifically referencing the relationship between the Board, the DHHS Director and the CAO, suggest that the Board should be the appointing authority but that the day-to-day operations should be "administratively" supervised by the CAO.

In county government, both the CAO and CEO models represent different approaches to organizational structure and leadership within counties.

Under the current CAO model, Department Heads are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and report directly to the Board with the exception of elected officials.

A CAO model typically focuses on administrative functions such as budgeting, finance and operations management. This specialization can lead to more efficient and effective management of county resources. There is consistency in administrative leadership that lends itself to stability in governance and long-term planning. With the CAO focusing on administrative functions, there is a clear division of responsibilities between administrative management and elected officials, reducing potential conflicts of interest.

Under a CEO model, department heads are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and report directly to the CEO, with the exception of elected officials.

A CEO model typically consolidates both administrative and executive functions under a single leadership position, providing a clear and unified direction for county government. Having a single executive responsible for both administrative and policy decisions can lead to quicker and more decisive action, particularly during times of crisis, while also relieving the Board from day-to-day decisions of running a department. A CEO model can provide insulation for the Board of Supervisors in personnel matters which may pose conflicts or result in lawsuits or depositions. The CEO may have the authority to make organizational changes without approval from Board. A CEO model may lend itself to streamlined administrative decision-making, insulated from political bias while minimizing the duplication of efforts.

Both CAO and CEO models provide direction, coordination and administration of county functions and activities; advises the Board of Supervisors on significant policy issues; conducts community outreach and communication strategies; performs administrative studies of county operations, procedures, and department budget requests; develops collaborative working relationships with the state and local government entities; prepares the county budget; and works with the Board of Supervisors and departments to execute the county's strategic plan and pursue goals of the Legislative Platform.

The primary difference is in the CEO model, the CEO oversees the county's Department Heads and their respective departments.

**Costs Estimates:**

\$10,080 for a class and comp study of the CEO position and key staff

**Survey:**

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 10 were in favor of a CEO model. Comments included:

- No. Communication is stream-lined by Board members reaching out directly to Dept Heads and vice versa and would be greatly impacted if there is a CEO communicating for them, resulting in misinformation and misrepresentation. A CEO would not be able to know the answer to every question or how each Dept runs, resulting in Dept Heads having to be looped in anyway. It's actually more transparent for Dept Heads to report to the Board who are accountable to their constituents than to a CEO who is not.
- Would've clicked maybe if it was an option here.

## Option 11. Department of Emergency Services

Separate the Office of Emergency Services from the Sheriff's Office and create an Office of Emergency Services (OES) Department.

The Humboldt County Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services is the primary local coordination agency for emergencies and disasters affecting residents, public infrastructure and government operations in the county. The Humboldt County Sheriff's OES coordinates and participates in emergency planning, response, and recovery under the direction of the Sheriff and in collaboration with local, state, and federal partners. Per Humboldt County Code §2210-6, the Sheriff is the designated Director of Emergency Services for the Humboldt Operational Area.

A Local Emergency affecting the County of Humboldt may be proclaimed by the Board of Supervisors or the Sheriff (or their designee) when hazardous conditions cause significant damages or pose an imminent threat to people, property, and/or the environment. Proclaiming a Local Emergency can provide the county a pathway to additional resources.

The Office of Emergency Services under the Sheriff's Office facilitates a unified command structure during emergencies, enhancing coordination between law enforcement and emergency management. The integration with law enforcement agencies can provide access to additional resources and personnel during crises. Collaboration with law enforcement agencies can leverage others' experience in public safety and crisis management. Staffing in OES are civilian positions that are subject to thorough background checks that delay the onboarding process.

As the Sheriff is an elected position under the direction of a new Sheriff, OES may not receive the same level of priority as other duties within the Sheriff's Office and may not receive the same level resources needed to effectively run the division.

As a standalone department OES would have more autonomy in relation to emergency management, including disaster preparedness, response, and recovery. Operating independently may allow for more flexibility in decision-making and resource allocation during emergencies.

Should your Board elect to create a Grant Coordinator position (as discussed in the below Option 11), this position could assist in leveraging further grant opportunities and could offer grant management solutions that would assist with some of the concerns raised in this response. Additionally, the division may opt to work with a grants consultant to assist in the development of grants combined with the purchase and implementation of grant management software at the county level would provide needed assistance with the management of awarded grants.

As a department outside of the Sheriff's Office, OES may face some challenges in sharing resources and coordinating with other agencies during the event of an emergency and communication and collaboration between OES and other law enforcement agencies may be hindered. Furthermore, if OES were to be a department of its own, it would require a department head, with the associated salary costs. Given the county's current fiscal environment, this may not be prudent at this time.

A CEO structure would provide support to a newly formed department and the CEO reporting relationship would provide a barrier between the department and elected officials.

#### **Costs Estimates:**

Staffing costs for a Department of Emergency Service is estimated to require additional annual General Fund contributions ranging from \$105,000 to as much as \$711,000 depending on staffing levels and other associated funding. Currently the General Fund contribution for the Office of Emergency Services is \$259,854. Office of Emergency Services currently have 4.0 FTE. Eventually there may be costs associated with relocating the program from the courthouse basement to a more accessible location for partner agencies and the public.

#### **Survey:**

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 3 were in favor of creating a Department of Emergency Services. Comments included:

- Will be expensive to create new DH, department.
- Expensive and risky (to the public).
- No. It would increase costs to have an additional Dept Head. The Sheriff also has the responsibility in a disaster and has close communication with CALOES and whoever is in county OES.
- Responding to emergencies is a core function of SO and does not need to be recreated/duplicated elsewhere.
- I do not think creating another department is a cost that should be considered at this time. Much of the OES disaster claiming is done through Public Works.

- Doesn't make sense. This is not a cost-effective proposal and not necessary.

## Option 12. Grant Coordinator

### [Create a Grant Coordinator position in the County Administrative Office.](#)

Following direction from the Board for staff to investigate options to create a function to help the community and county increase grant funding opportunities, the County Administrative Office contracted with the California Center for Rural Policy (CCRP) at Cal Poly Humboldt to conduct a study on needs and logistics, which was completed in January 2024. Excerpts from the CCRP recommendations are below. There was consensus during the CCRP meeting with department heads and is mentioned in the report that the need is not for a grant writer but rather a Grant Coordinator. The Grant Coordinator would exist to assist county departments and outside agencies with creating and maintaining a strategic plan for grants, efficiently identifying grant opportunities, grant tracking and reporting and maintaining software to that end, ensuring compliance with county policy, providing a centralized point for administrative issues that impact multiple departments like developing and maintaining federally recognized indirect cost rates that would exceed the 10% de minimis allowed without it and maintaining the county's award registration with federal government, and more as defined in the attached CCRP report.

#### [Cost Estimate:](#)

\$141,000 is estimated for salary and benefits for the Grant Coordinator position.

Additional cost may include grant management software that range between \$45,000 and \$110,000 annually. Cost for contracted services to assist department in the actual writing of grants and lobbying for funding may enhance opportunities for more departments to apply for grants. Annual costs for such a service range from \$50,000 to more than \$250,000, depending on the number of projects and level of service desired. Any professional service would be managed by a Grant Coordinator to ensure services align with county-wide strategic plans and priorities.

#### [Survey:](#)

Of the 16 responses to this survey question 8 were in favor of creating a Grant Coordinator position. Comments included:

- Maybe- opt in- some depts can use the help, some are well-equipped.
- Assistance in applying for grants and complying with grants (report production, data gathering/analysis) could be very helpful. Appreciate input from CAO's regarding grant opportunities that we currently receive. Not sure what is contemplated here as the "much more."
- No. It is unclear what this would mean or solve in DHHS and seems redundant. We have several staff that are responsible for grant writing, monitoring/managing in DHHS

programs. Many are state or federal grants that are recurring annually that fund our program staff and work.

- Maybe.
- This would be redundant and a waste of money. We all know what grants are out there and what we can apply for with what we have.