

---

## OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET ANALYST REPORT

---

**Date Issued:** September 30, 2010

**IBA Report Number:** 10-72 REV

**City Council Docket Date:** TBD

**Item Number:** TBD

---

# Response to Grand Jury Report Titled “Efficiency in Government: Managed Competition, Outsourcing, Reengineering and Reverse Auction within San Diego County”

## OVERVIEW

On June 3, 2010 the San Diego County Grand Jury issued a report to the Mayor and City Council entitled “Efficiency in Government: Managed Competition, Outsourcing, Reengineering and Reverse Auction within San Diego County.” The Grand Jury report provides a snapshot of the state of managed competition and Business Process Reengineering programs in the City of San Diego.

The Grand Jury report included seven findings and two recommendations directed to the Mayor and the City Council. Both the Mayor and the City Council are required to provide comments to the Presiding Judge of the San Diego Superior Court on each of the findings and recommendations within ninety days. Due to the demands of the legislative calendar, the Presiding Judge granted an extension to the date for the Mayoral and City Council response to November 1, 2010. This report presents the City Council’s response as recommended by the IBA.

Prior to developing response recommendations for the City Council, the IBA reviewed the Mayor’s response and discussed the Grand Jury’s findings/recommendations with the Business Office. For each finding and recommendation, the City Council may 1) join the Mayor’s response; 2) respond with a modification to the Mayor’s response; or 3) respond independently of the Mayor.

In responding to each Grand Jury finding, the City is required to either 1) agree with the finding or 2) disagree wholly or partially with the finding. Responses to Grand Jury

recommendations must indicate that the recommendation 1) has been implemented; 2) has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future; 3) requires further analysis; or 4) will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Explanations for responses are requested when applicable.

The table below provides a summary of the IBA’s recommendations.

Findings:	01, 02, 03, 05, 06, 07	<i>Join the Mayor’s Response</i>
Findings:	04	<i>Respond with a Modification to the Mayor’s Response</i>
Recommendations:	10-99	<i>Respond with a Modification to the Mayor’s Response</i>
Recommendations:	10-100	<i>Join the Mayor’s Response</i>

This item was presented to the Rules Committee on September 22, 2010. The Rules Committee voted 5-0 to accept the IBA’s recommendations with amendments and move the item to the full council. The IBA’s recommended responses have been updated to reflect the Rules Committee action, in addition to September 27, 2010 City Council adoption of the Managed Competition Guide (strike-out, underlining is used to reflect these changes). The full text of the Mayor’s responses, and the IBA’s modified recommended responses on behalf of the City Council, can be found in Attachment 1 to this report.

**[SIGNED]**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Brittany Coppage  
 Research Analyst

**[SIGNED]**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 APPROVED: Andrea Tevlin  
 Independent Budget Analyst

Attachments:

- 1) Recommended City Council Responses to Findings and Recommendations in San Diego County Grand Jury Report entitled, “Efficiency in Government: Managed Competition, Outsourcing, Reengineering and Reverse Auction within San Diego County”
- 2) San Diego County Grand Jury Report entitled “Efficiency in Government: Managed Competition, Outsourcing, Reengineering and Reverse Auction within San Diego County”