

Agenda

Enterprise Asset Management

Customer Utility Board

Members:

Marc Williams - Chair
DOJ

Ryan Vogt - Vice-Chair
DHS

Christian Grorud
Oregon Marine Board

Teddy Leland
DLCD

Lori LeVeaux
ODFW

Fabiola Flores
Secretary of State

Gene Bentley
Real Estate

Virginia Carey
ODOT

Rick Willis
State Police

Jason Barber
Agriculture

David Moon
Oregon Judicial Dept

DAS Support Staff:

Barry Pack
Deputy Director

Shannon Ryan
EAM Administrator

Janet Savarro
DBS Administrator

John Fox
DBS Analyst

Debby Dyer
Administrative Support

Meeting Date: March 9, 2016

Time: 1:00-3:00 p.m.

Location: Somerville Building | 775 Court St. NE

ITEM	PRESENTER	TIME
Welcome		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Review of last meeting minutes Action items <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Surplus discussion – on agenda Caitlin to bring notes on Surplus target setting #2 – on agenda 	Marc Williams	1:00-1:05
CUB Satisfaction Survey		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clicker survey 	Ty Hendrix Caitlin Breitbach	1:05-1:15
SLA Performance Reports		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Maintenance Fleet & Parking Planning and Construction Mgmt Surplus Real Estate 	Randy Gengler Jeremy Miller Brian King Barry Jones Sven Anderson Eric Grindy	1:15-2:00
Surplus Discussion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caitlin to bring notes from the rationale used in setting target #2 SLA review Inventory threshold 	Sven Andersen	2:00-2:25
2017-19 Budget Update		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSOB Surcharge Policy Packages 	Shannon Ryan John Fox	2:25-2:50
Other Updates		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roundtable 		2:50-3:00

Next meeting:

April 13th, 2016
1:00-3:00 p.m.
775 Court St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

<p>impact on agency budgets because this is a steady and ongoing increase. It's not going to go down but will continue to increase as we continue to fund projects. It may level out at some point when we hit the maximum capacity around the mall area. This really is a proposal to get our arms around life safety and functionality of our critical core buildings in the Salem area.</p> <p>-Moving away from fix it as it breaks mentality, to trying to plan out for the repair and replacement of our capital assets. The feedback we're looking for is, does that make sense to you? Is this the right pace, because we could do it slower, over a 30 year plan instead of a 10 year plan and do less with a slower increase in rent prices.</p> <p>Some members expressed concern about the prices raising in all the CUB's and how that affects the budgets of the agencies. (Barry)</p> <p>How agencies generate the cash to cover the increase is up to the individual agencies. Generally speaking, rent is rent and it has to be put into the budget. The reason rent has stayed where it's at, is because we haven't been doing these kinds of reinvestments and now we're proposing to do it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fleet Vehicle Purchases – <u>see handout</u> – cash balance has never been this low before. Projecting replacement value. POP gives us capacity to spend \$1.5M on vehicles requested by agencies. • Staffing Needs – <u>see handout</u> - continue LD's that we have right now. 	
CUB Leadership	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair and Vice-Chair – still looking for replacements for these positions. Please contact Barry if interested. 	Ryan Vogt
Roundtable	
<p>Members appreciated seeing the POP's laid out and the building package as well.</p> <p>Need more clarity about decision points.</p>	All
Other Updates	
None	
<p>Next meeting: March 9, 2016 1:00-3:00 p.m. Somerville Building 775 Court St. NE Salem, Oregon 97301</p>	

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Operations				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	% of custodial inspections with a rating of 3 or better	95.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.7%	100.0%	
	# of custodial inspections with a rating of 3 or better		535	671	786	698	
	Total # of custodial inspections conducted		535	672	788	698	
2	% of emergency custodial incidents resolved in less than 1 hour	95.0%	92.9%	75.0%	100.0%	96.2%	
	# of emergency incidents resolved in less than 1 hour		13	6	17	25	
	Total # of emergency incidents resolved		14	8	17	26	
3	Average rating of satisfaction with custodial scheduled cleaning services (1-5)	3.9	4.03	3.78	3.72	3.83	
	Sum of the ratings given by survey respondents		238	227	171	207	
	# of building coordinator surveys received		59	60	46	54	
4	% of custodial actual hours worked vs. planned hours	95%	94.1%	97.1%	97.5%	99.4%	
	# of custodial hours actually worked		18,909	20,420	20,212	20,399	
	# of planned custodial hours		20,097	21,030	20,725	20,524	
5	% of landscape inspections with a rating of 3 or better	TBD	100.0%	No Data	100.0%	100.0%	
	# of landscape inspections with a passing rating of 3 or better		14		15	15	
	Total # of landscape inspections conducted		14		15	15	
6	% of landscaping safety items inspected with safety hazards detected	5.0%	0.0%	No Data	4.0%	5.0%	
	# of landscaping safety items inspected with a hazard detected		0		1	1	
	Total # of landscaping safety items inspected		20		25	20	

Comments for Performance Measures	
Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. Click on the measure on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.	
Measure	Comments
1. % of custodial inspections with a rating of 3 or better (in a 1-5 rating scale, with 5 being best)	General Comments
2. % of emergency custodial incidents resolved in less than an hour	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>There were 26 emergency requests this quarter, with 25 being resolved within an hour. One took 67 minutes to resolve. The average time for all 26 was 29.8 minutes.</p>
3. Average rating to question on quarterly building coordinators' survey, asking coordinators to rate their satisfaction with Operations' regular/scheduled cleaning services	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>There is no clear indicator why our rating is so low. Here are a few thoughts: 1) 1. With limited exception, many buildings have elicited only one or two respondents. One negative response out of one response is a dissatisfaction rating of 100%. This skews the ratings and even with positive building ratings, it brings the overall picture down drastically. 2) The usual outage per day is 8-10 custodians from a staff of 38. On average, each custodian takes 39 days of leave (out of 261 working days) a year, not including holidays. This means we are often filling in with "floaters" for the normal custodian. 3) Our floaters are primarily temps, who have not been fully trained in all buildings, which leads to missed tasks, lower productivity, and inconsistent service.</p> <p>It might be better to survey 25% of our buildings each quarter, and send the survey out to every person in the building to get a larger customer pool and more accurate review of the overall satisfaction.</p> <p>The Custodial Program has started creating a formal training program which will improve our floaters productivity and consistency. It is estimated to take one year to fully create and implement the training. I am also evaluating the need for additional custodians.</p>
4. % of actual custodial hours worked compared with what was billed	General Comments
5. % of landscape inspections with a rating of 3 or better (in a 1-5 rating scale, with 5 being best)	General Comments
6. % of landscaping safety items inspected with safety hazards detected	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>There was one inspection at the Commerce building indicating a tree health/collapse issue marked with a 2 (known hazard that we are aware of). Our new Landscape manager believes he marked the category incorrectly, since this was his first time using the new inspection program. There was no tree hazard at this site.</p>

Name of Program/ Division **DAS OPERATIONS**

Reporting period **Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)**

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description
1					None to report
2					
3					

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Maintenance				<div style="background-color: #90EE90; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">In compliance</div> <div style="background-color: #FF0000; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-top: 2px;">Out of Compliance</div> <div style="background-color: #D3D3D3; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-top: 2px;">No Data or Lack of Target</div>	
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)					
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	% of demand maintenance work orders with rework	5.0%	2.7%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	
	# of demand maintenance work orders closed that are flagged as rework		2	0	1	0	
	Total # of work orders closed		73	149	77	28	
2	% of non-emergency work orders that remain open after 10 business days	10.0%	8.6%	8.4%	9.3%	9.9%	
	# of non-emergency work orders closed after 10 business days		58	62	57	76	
	Total # of non-emergency work orders closed		675	736	612	764	
3	% of times a status reports is sent to the agency within 2 hours	97.0%	98.5%	98.3%	96.0%	98.0%	
	# of requests responded to within 2 hours		1,035	1,166	1,103	1,340	
	Total # of service requests created		1,051	1,186	1,149	1,368	
4	% of work orders closed after 30 days	5.0%	6.7%	5.0%	4.4%	6.0%	
	# of work orders closed after 30 days		45	41	27	48	
	Total # of work orders closed		675	820	611	805	
5	% of times keycards/ID badges are delivered within 2 business days of request being received	95.0%	No Data	No Data	91.5%	No Data	
	# of keycards/ID badges delivered within 2 business days				561		
	Total # of keycards/ID badges requested				613		
6A	Average # of business days to get a quote for security office projects	10	9.5	4.0	9.4	8.6	
	Total # of days to deliver quotes for security office projects		19	4	47	69	
	Total # of quotes delivered		2	1	5	8	
6B	Average # of business days to get a quote for all other projects	5	1.5	No Data	1.8	4.6	
	Total # of days to deliver quotes for all other projects		2		9	14	
	Total # of quotes delivered		1		5	3	

Comments for Performance Measures	
Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. Click on the measure on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.	
Measure	Comments
1. % of work orders for repairs that had already been performed in the previous 90 days	General Comments
2. % of non-emergency work orders that remain open after 10 business days	We are going to focus on closing work orders in a quicker more consistent manner. This percentage should show improvement in the near future through training of the employees.
3. % of times a status report is sent to the agency within 2 hrs.	General Comments
4. % of work orders that remain open after 30 days	This number reflects several projects that required us to order materials to complete the project. It also is a reflection of several hot cold HVAC calls that were left open over a period of time for testing purposes.
5. % of times keycards/ID badges are delivered within 2 business days of request being received	General Comments
6a. Average # of business days to get a quote for security office projects	General Comments
6b. Average # of business days to get a quote for all other projects	General Comments

Name of Program/ Division **DAS Maintenance**

Reporting period **Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)**

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description
1					None to report
2					
3					

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Fleet and Parking				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2014 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	Average repair cost per mile	Tracked as a monitoring metric: Cost per mile.	\$0.036	\$0.035	\$0.036	\$0.037	
	Sum of repair costs		1,215,690	1,322,378	1,321,776	1,357,679	
	Total # of miles travelled		34,160,428	37,641,861	36,893,278	36,800,046	
2	% of fleet beyond optimal replacement schedule	9.0%	12.8%	12.0%	14.2%	12.9%	
	Total # of vehicles beyond replacement schedule		456	433	520	464	
	Total # of vehicles		3554	3,606	3,673	3,603	
3	% of rental vehicle requests fulfilled with type of vehicle requested	95.0%	97.0%	97.7%	98.3%	97.7%	
	# of requests fulfilled with requested type		273	337	350	303	
	Total # of survey responses		274	345	356	310	
4	% of vehicles taken to the shop for rework repairs	4.0%	3.5%	3.8%	5.0%	4.5%	
	# of reported rework incidents		4	4	6	5	
	Total # of survey responses		135	106	121	110	
5	Average Customer Satisfaction rating of vendors performing maintenance and repair services (1-10)	8	8.78	8.68	8.59	8.53	
	Sum of customer satisfaction ratings		2,370	1,883	2,054	1,561	
	Total # of survey responses		270	217	239	183	
6	% of vehicles available for pick up from preventative maintenance services in less than 1 day	80%	87.5%	84.0%	80.0%	78.5%	
	# of reported PM vehicles ready for pick up in less than 1 day		161	131	140	95	
	Total # of survey responses		184	156	175	121	
7	% of vehicles available for pick up from repair services in less than 2 days	80%	60.2%	86.8%	78.4%	88.1%	
	# of reported RS vehicles ready for pick up in less than 2 days		119	92	91	96	
	Total # of survey responses		134	106	116	109	
8	% of times DAS customers are billed within the same month of a work order being finished or a vendor invoice is received	90%	90.0%	90.7%	94.0%	97.8%	
	# of invoices sent within the same month		4,309	4,343	5,082	4,900	
	Total # of invoices sent		4,788	4,786	5,408	5,011	

Measure	Comments
1. Average repair cost per mile	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>Rising slightly but not a concern</p>
2. Fleet replacement status	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>drop due to influx of new vehicles. Will probably drop further for current qtr</p>
3. Daily rental vehicle fulfillment	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>consistently high. Raise target to 97%?</p>
4. Repair comeback rate	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>will need to research each incident to see if all are valid comebacks</p>
5. Rating of maintenance vendors	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>dropping slightly, not sure if it will be a continuing trend</p>
6. Downtime for preventative maintenance	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>will need to research each incident to see if all are valid. Past research showed several that were not.</p>
7. Downtime for repairs/breakdown	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>interesting swings in data from this one up and down. Not sure what causes that</p>
8. Billing timeliness	<p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <p>should monitor for a few more qtr's and see if target should be raised</p>

Name of Program/ Division	FLEET & PARKING
Date report is finalized	2/24/2016
Reporting Period	Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Planning and Construction Management			<div style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;">In compliance</div> <div style="background-color: #FF0000; padding: 2px;">Out of Compliance</div> <div style="background-color: #D3D3D3; padding: 2px;">No Data or Lack of Target</div>		
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)					
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	Average rating of quality of completed plans (1-5)	4.50	4.5	4.4	4.7	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		9	22	14		
	Total # of survey responses		2	5	3		
2	Average rating of quality of completed projects (1-5)	4.50	4	4.6	4.3	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		8	23	13		
	Total # of survey responses		2	5	3		
3	% of times a decision on a project is communicated back to the agency within 8 calendar days	100.0%	No Data	No Data	100%	86%	
	# of projects with a communicated decision within 8 days of request				13	12	
	Total # of projects with a communicated decision				13	14	
4	% of projects completed by the agreed upon date	90.0%	100%	70%	90.5%	100.0%	
	# of projects completed by the agreed upon date		2	16	19	2	
	# of projects completed		2	23	21	2	
5	Average rating of timely communication throughout project (1-5)	4.50	4.5	3.8	4.7	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question		9	19	14		
	Total # of survey responses		2	5	3		
6	% of times projects are completed within 10% of the initially agreed upon timeline	90.0%	No Data	No Data	90.5%	100.0%	
	# of projects that were completed within 10% of original timeframe				19	2	
	Total # of projects completed				21	2	
7	% of times projects are completed within 10% of the initially agreed upon budget	87%	No Data	No Data	66.7%	50.0%	
	# of projects completed within 10% of original budget				14	1	
	Total # of projects completed				21	2	

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
1. Average Rating of question "How well did the completed plans meet your needs?"	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Current quarter comments are delayed one quarter due to when surveys are deployed. No Qtr 1 comments received.</p>
2. Average rating of question "How well did the completed project meet your needs?"	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Current quarter comments are delayed one quarter due to when surveys are deployed. Qtr 1 comments: "The project turned out good and has really improved the space."</p>
3. % of times a decision on a project is communicated back to the agency within 8 calendar days	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>86% - In both instances, the person doing the contacting was out of the office on sick leave. Please see SLA for PA Request Q42015 attachment.</p>
4. % of projects completed by the agreed upon date	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Both the State Hospital Demo Planning and the DEQ/PHL Roof Assessment projects were completed on time.</p>
5. Timely communication throughout project	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>Current quarter comments are delayed one quarter due to when surveys are deployed. Qtr 1 comments: "Amanda was great to deal with, always friendly and helpful. She did a great job providing the drawings and coordinating the work." "<PCM was good at> keeping me in the loop."</p>
6. % of times P&CM meets the projects predicted hours	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>This comment box should reference whether PCM completed projects within 10% of initially agreed upon PM forecasted hours. DEQ/PHL Roof Assessment projected PM cost: \$3,000; actual: \$2,970. State Hospital N Campus Demo Planning: \$45,000; actual: \$45,356.</p>
7. % of times P&CM meets the projects predicted hours	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>This comment box should reference whether PCM completed projects within 10% of initially agreed upon budget. The State Hospital North Campus Demo Planning project came in 60% under budget because at the time the funds were assigned we did not know how much planning we could get done in the time frame. The remainder of some 6 year planning money was assigned to the project in case we could do more.</p>

Name of Program/ Division

Planning and Construction Management

Reporting Period

Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Q3 2015
(Jul-Sep)

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description

SLA Quarterly Performance Report

Name of Program/ Division	DAS Real Estate Services	In compliance
Reporting Period	Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Out of Compliance
		No Data or Lack of Target

Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2015 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2014 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2014 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	Lease rate vs. average market rate for Salem CBD	100.0%	No Data	No Data	No Data	73.7%	
	Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.					\$1.29	
	Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.					\$1.75	
	Lease rate vs. average market rate for Salem Metro		No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.						
	Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.						
	Lease rate vs. average market rate Portland CBD		No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.						
	Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.						
	Lease rate vs. average market rate in Portland Metro		No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.						
	Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.						
	Lease rate vs. average market rate for Medford		No Data	No Data	No Data	96.3%	
	Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.					\$1.54	
	Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.					\$1.60	
	Lease rate vs. average market rate for Bend		No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.							
Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.							
Lease rate vs. average market rate Eugene	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data			
Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.							
Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.							
Lease rate vs. average market rate for Roseburg	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data			
Weighted average cost per Sq. Ft.							
Weighted average market rate per Sq. Ft.							
2	% of lease contracts with rates below or at the applicable geographic market rates	TBD	No Data	66.1%	No Data	77.3%	
	Total # of leases signed with rates at or under market rates			39		17	
	Total # of leases signed			59		22	
5	# of critical lease dates missed	0	0	4	0	17	
	Total # of critical lease dates					28	
6	% of private lease portfolio contracts on 5-year or longer lease terms	TBD	No Data	23.7%	No Data	28.9%	
	# of contracts in the private lease portfolio with leases of 5 years or more			14		44	
	Total # of contracts in the private lease portfolio			59		152	
7	Average rating of the quality of completed projects	100.0%	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	Sum of the ratings to specific question						
	Total # of survey responses						

Comments for Performance Measures

Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. **Click on the measure** on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.

Measure	Comments
1. Lease rate vs. average market rate for the applicable geographic regions	<p align="center">General Comments</p>
2. % of lease contracts with rates below or at the applicable geographic market rates	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>We are hoping to move towards a yearly report-out on measure 1 and 2 - because they have such a low dataset once we have gone through the leases and weeded out the ones that are not applicable. There were only 3 leases that fit the parameters this quarter.</p>
5. # of critical lease dates missed	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>one of the main dates missed in our department in regards to Agency related critical dates is the (1.) LRI response date. This date is considered "Missed" after their 30 day period to get us information back after we have requested it on their direction on a leased space. On average this quarter, the agencies have taken 122 days to respond. Other critical dates would be (2.) a lease expiring without being under contract without a signed agreement (Lease expiration), as well as the notification period of our (3.) intent to lease the space (Generally 90-120 notification)</p>
6. % of lease portfolio contracts on 5-year or longer lease terms	<p align="center">General Comments</p> <p>There were not many leases greater or equal to five (5) years in length. However, if we were to include the four (4) year leases in this measure, we would have thirteen (13) out of the twenty-eight (28) leases, which would be 46% of the closed transaction for the quarter.</p>
7. Average rating of quality of completed projects	<p align="center">General Comments</p>

Name of Program/ Division

DAS Real Estate Services

Reporting Period

Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Q2 2014 (Apr-Jun)					
Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	No Data	Affected Customer (s)	Description
			No Data		

SLA Quarterly Performance Report							
Name of Program/ Division		DAS Surplus				In compliance	
Reporting Period		Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)				Out of Compliance	
						No Data or Lack of Target	
Measure #	Performance Measure	Target	3 Previous Quarters			Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)	Trend
			Q1 2014 (Jan-Mar)	Q2 2015 (Apr-Jun)	Q3 2015 (Jul-Sep)	Current	
1	% of disposed vehicles reimbursed that went through the disposition process in less than 70 days	80.0%	89.7%	91.7%	93.8%	95.6%	
	# of disposed vehicles reimbursed within 70 days		183	200	151	197	
	Total # of disposed vehicles reimbursed		204	218	161	206	
2	% of accountable surplus property items located during inventory	97.0%	94.3%	96.2%	92.6%	95.5%	
	Total # of accountable surplus items found during inventory		659	678	760	579	
	Total # of accountable surplus items		699	705	821	606	
3	% of compliance with agreed upon collection schedule	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	# of collections made by the agreed upon collection schedule		35	33	39	25	
	# of collections made		35	33	39	25	
4	% of hard-drives selected for audit scrubbed by e-waste vendor to verify full erasure of data	100.0%	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	
	# of hard-drives analyzed that had been successfully wiped						
	# of hard-drives analyzed						
5	% of customers with items on the "Want List" that are contacted every 45 days	90.0%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	
	Total # of customers on the want list contacted every 45 days		111	147	169	232	
	Total # of customers on the want list that are contacted		111	147	169	232	

Comments for Performance Measures	
Instructions: Enter comments in the box below the heading for "General Comments" for the specific performance measure you wish to enter comments about. Click on the measure on the left to return to the worksheet to which you wish to go back.	
Measure	Comments
1. Timeliness of end-to-end vehicle disposition process	<div style="background-color: #0070C0; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 2px;">General Comments</div> 196 of 206 vehicles processed in less than 70 days. The average is 42 days.
2. Accuracy of inventory reports	<div style="background-color: #0070C0; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 2px;">General Comments</div> 579 of 606 were accounted for in this inventory. The 27 items were miscellaneous office and furniture.
3. Compliance with agreed surplus property collection/pick-up schedule	<div style="background-color: #0070C0; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 2px;">General Comments</div> 25 of 25 property pick-ups were collected as scheduled
4. IT asset data scrubbing audits	<div style="background-color: #0070C0; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 2px;">General Comments</div> On hold
5. Timely communication to customers about items on Federal Surplus "Want List"	<div style="background-color: #0070C0; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 2px;">General Comments</div> Email Want List reminders were sent out on 11/6/2015 and 12/18/2015

Name of Program/ Division **SURPLUS PROPERTY**

Reporting period **Q4 2015 (Oct-Dec)**

Report on Formal complaints received in the previous quarter

Formal complaints raised by customers using the designated email or alternative electronic means cited on SLA during the last quarter

Complaint #	Date received	Complaint Type	Complainant (Agency and, if applicable, Dept.)	Affected Customer (s)	Description
1					None to report
2					
3					

Department of Administrative Services
 2017-19 Biennium: Proposed Policy Option Packages
 February 26, 2016

FINAL VERSION FOR ARB PRICE LIST

Approved (Y)es or (N)o	SCR	Division	Program	Title (44 Characters)	Description	Personal Services	Services & Supplies	Capital Outlay	Debt Service	Special Payments	Total	Positions	FTE	Assessment	Charge for Service	OH Transfer	GF	Additional Comments	
CONTINUATION OF SERVICES OR LIMITED DURATIONS																			
Y	060	EAM	Planning and Construction Management	EAM Staffing	Requests position authority only to continue four limited duration positions needed for completing a growing queue of deferred maintenance and renovation projects for DAS and other agencies.	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4.00	-	-	-	-	- These LD positions can be administratively requested during 17-19 budget execution	
Y	060	EAM	Operations & Maintenance	Permanent Staffing Request	Requests to convert three limited duration positions to permanent to continue providing adequate service levels to our agency customers.	384,601	(384,601)	-	-	-	-	3	3.00	-	-	-	-	- LDs established administratively in 13-15 biennium approved to be offset by S&S	
Y	060	EAM	Real Estate Services	Permanent Staffing Request	Requests to convert two limited duration positions to permanent to continue advancing recent enterprise-wide change initiatives migrating the enterprise to more efficient work environments and providing adequate service levels to our agency customers.	279,575	(279,575)	-	-	-	-	2	2.00	-	-	-	-	- LDs established administratively in 13-15 biennium approved to be offset by S&S	
TOTAL CONTINUATION OF SERVICES OR LIMITED DURATIONS						664,176	(664,176)	-	-	-	-	9	9.00	-	-	-	-		
CAPITAL PROJECTS																			
Y	060	EAM	Rent Program	Capital Investments	Increase monthly uniform rent rate from \$1.37 to \$1.55 to fund capital investment program below. Increases S&S limitation to pay cost of issuing \$70 million in Article XI-Q bonds (phase 1 planning and construction costs).	-	1,102,657	-	-	-	1,102,657	-	-	-	6,969,175	-	-	-	
Y	088	EAM	Capital Improvements	Capital Improvements	Capital improvement projects financed with Capital Project Fund (ORS 276.005) monies.	-	-	4,347,021	-	-	4,347,021	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Y	089	EAM	Capital Construction	Capital Construction	Capital construction projects financed with Capital Project Fund (ORS 276.005) monies.	-	-	23,190,719	-	-	23,190,719	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Y	089	EAM	Capital Construction	Capital Investments	Construction of a new 260,000 sq. ft. state office building in Salem and renovation of the Portland State Office Building. Also establishes a \$5.0 million dedicated revolving fund within the Capital Project Fund to assist with agency implementation of enterprise workplace strategy.	-	-	182,146,000	-	-	182,146,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Y	094	EAM	Debt Service	Debt Service	Limitation to pay 2017-19 debt service costs for \$70 million in Article XI-Q bonds (phase 1 planning and construction costs).	-	-	-	2,909,135	-	2,909,135	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS						-	1,102,657	209,683,740	2,909,135	-	213,695,532	-	-	-	6,969,175	-	-	-	
NEW ASKS																			
Y	060	EAM	Planning and Construction Management	EAM Staffing	Requests two permanent positions needed for completing a growing queue of deferred maintenance and renovation projects for DAS and other agencies.	399,168	47,737	-	-	-	446,905	2	2.00	-	446,905	-	-	-	
Y	060	EAM	Real Estate Services	EAM Staffing	Requests one permanent position needed for advancing recent enterprise-wide change initiatives migrating the enterprise to more efficient work environments and providing adequate service levels to our agency customers.	176,305	23,870	-	-	-	200,175	1	1.00	-	200,175	-	-	-	
Y	060	EAM	Fleet Services	Agency Vehicle Requests	Establish funding primarily dedicated to meet agency requests for the new additional vehicles they need to accomplish their missions.	-	-	1,500,000	-	-	1,500,000	-	-	-	1,100,000	-	-	-	
TOTAL NEW ASKS						575,473	71,607	1,500,000	-	-	2,147,080	3	3.00	-	1,747,080	-	-	-	
OTHER NEEDS																			
TOTAL OTHER						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL POPS						1,239,649	510,088	211,183,740	2,909,135	-	215,842,612	12	12.00	-	8,716,255	-	-	-	-