

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

499



**FROM:** Human Resources Department

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
July 6, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Non-Synchronized 4/10 and Telecommuting Alternative Work Arrangements

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** Receive and file this update on the utilization of Non-Synchronized 4/10 and Telecommuting Alternate Work Arrangements and allow an additional 12 months to measure and report back on the long term impact of the Alternative Work Arrangements.

**BACKGROUND:** On June 10, 2008, the Board adopted a recommendation to reaffirm Alternate Work Schedules Policy C-6 and Telecommuting Schedule Policy K-3. The Board encouraged Department Heads, based on the specific business needs of the department and the job requirements of their employees to broaden the use of non-synchronized 4/10 work schedules and/ or Telecommuting up to a maximum of three days per week. The Board also authorized Human Resources to develop training materials to broaden participation in these alternate work arrangements and to report back on progress.

(Continued)

*Barbara A. Oliver*  
Barbara A. Oliver Assistant Director for  
Ronald W. Komers  
Asst. County Executive Officer/Human Resources Dir.

<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$	In Current Year Budget:
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$	Budget Adjustment:
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$	For Fiscal Year:

<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b>	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:** APPROVE

BY: *Elizabeth J. Olson*  
Elizabeth J. Olson  
**County Executive Office Signature**

- Policy
- Policy
- Consent
- Consent

Dep't Recomm.:  
Per Exec. Ofc.:

Prev. Agn. Ref.: June 10, 2008 3.36 | District: | Agenda Number:

**3.65**

**BACKGROUND CONTINUED:**

The Board emphasized that County services and operation hours should not be adversely impacted by the increased use of alternative work arrangements. For that reason, Department Heads retain the prerogative to grant employees non-synchronized 4/10 work schedules and Telecommuting work arrangements based on the business needs of the department and job requirements of the employees.

It is understood that not all County operations will be able to accommodate alternate work arrangements, especially given the current economic environment.

4/10 work schedules, if implemented appropriately, serve the following purposes:

- Save employee personal vehicle expenses associated with the daily commute of reporting to their central office.
- Maximize County resources by reducing overhead costs; i.e. less draw on County resources; office space, desktop PC's, utility use, parking spaces, maintenance, gas, etc.
- Improve the air quality of the Inland Empire, and help the County meet its Emission Reduction Strategy (ERS) goals set forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) by reducing the number of miles commuted and varying travel times.

Telecommuting alternate work arrangements, if implemented appropriately, potentially serve the following purposes:

- Increase employee productivity
- Maximize County resources by reducing overhead costs; i.e. less draw on County resources; office space, desktop PC's, utility use, parking spaces, maintenance, gas, etc.
- ISave employee personal vehicle expenses associated with daily commute of reporting to their central office.

**Economic Environment:**

While the expanded use of alternate work arrangements was initially encouraged in part as a response to anticipated \$5 per gallon gas prices and the resulting economic hardship felt by employees, employees and the County now face unprecedented financial challenges associated with the current economic climate.

In the latter part of 2008 County departments shifted focus in order to manage the economic fallout. The current environment has demanded a curtailment of expenditures, immediate and planned budget cuts, and the implementation of the Maximum Fill Rate (MFR), among other measures. Perhaps more than ever before, County departments need to creatively maximize their resources in order to continue providing excellent service to the public. Alternate work arrangements when implemented prudently can be used as a cost saving tool by the County.

**Alternative Work Schedules:**

During the second half of the calendar year 2008, several County departments evaluated and implemented alternate work schedules according to their business needs and employee job requirements. Attachment "A" (pages 1-2), Comparative Work Schedule Data, provides department level comparative information between June 2008 and May 2009. The data reflects that during this period, participation in the non-synchronized 4/10 Work Schedule increased from 603 employees to 1,898 employees. In May 2008 only 3.23% of County employees participated in the 4/10 work schedule; that number increased to 10% by May 2009.

**Summary Statistics:**

Work Schedules	Number of Employees* <sup>1</sup> May 2008	Percent of Total May 2008	Number of Employees* May 2009	Percent of Total May 2009
5/40	5,190	27.7%	3,483	19%
9/80	8,817	47.19%	8,601	47%
4/10	603	3.23%	1,898	10%
Other** <sup>2</sup>	4,077	21.82%	4,307	23%
Total Regular Employees	18,688	100%	18,289	100%

This shift from a 5/40 work schedule to a 4/10 work schedule has a significant and measurable cost savings impact to employees, as well as resulting in a decreased number of commute days, reducing one commute day per week for each employee, or 52 commute days per year for each employee. According to the commute cost calculator provided on the website [www.commutesmart.info](http://www.commutesmart.info) (a partnership of transportation agencies of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties), each employee will save \$976 per year if the employee travels an average of 36 miles per day, pays \$2.81 per gallon for gas and has average vehicle wear and tear. This savings translates to 2.08% of pay if the employee earns an average of \$47,000 per year. For the 1,898 employees that have already transitioned to the 4/10 work schedule, the total number of commute days reduced per year is 91,104 for an estimated average annual cost savings of approximately \$1.8 million just in gasoline costs. This can also potentially reduce the stress on County employees when facing other issues related to budget constraints.

More employees may change to a non-synchronized 4/10 work schedule in 2009 because some departments are still carefully evaluating the impact of alternate work schedules. For example, in January 2009 DPSS started a 90 day pilot non-synchronized 4/10 work schedule project to examine and evaluate the impact of the program on customer service and staffing. The results are still being developed and will be reported at a later date.

Over the past twelve months, eight County departments have significantly increased the use of the non-synchronized 4/10 work schedule. Human Resources will work with these departments and report back to the Board in twelve months regarding the longer term impact of the 4/10 schedule on service levels.

**Synchronizing the 4/10 Schedule or Synchronized 9/80:**

With a synchronized 4/10 or 9/80 schedule for County employees there is a great potential savings in utility costs alone. According to a study conducted by Facilities Management (Attachment B), the following cost savings can be achieved if facilities are closed:

**Option #1: Synchronized 9/80 Schedule (One Day Closure Biweekly Pay Period)**

07-08 Annual Utility Costs	Annual Days of operation (5/40 Schedule)	Utility Cost Per Day	Total Non-Operational Days/ Yr.	Synchronized 9/80 Annual Utility Savings
\$8,300,206	248	\$33,468.57	24	\$803,245.71

<sup>1</sup> \*Data captured from recordkeeping (PeopleSoft) System

<sup>2</sup> \*\*Other work schedules include the 4/9, 3/12, 2/12, 7/12 and other Federally mandated schedules primarily used by RCRMC, Sherriff and Probation departments.

**Option #2: Synchronized 4/10 Schedule**

<b>07-08 Annual Utility Costs</b>	<b>Annual Days of operation (5/40 Schedule)</b>	<b>Utility Cost Per Day</b>	<b>Total Non-Operational Days/ Yr.</b>	<b>Synchronized 4/10 Annual Utility Savings</b>
\$8,300,206	248	\$33,468.57	48	\$1,606,491.43

**Telecommuting Arrangements:**

Telecommuting may require an initial budgetary investment by the departments. Departments typically need to successfully examine and resolve the following issues prior to authorizing a Telecommuting arrangement.

- Worksite safety and ergonomics
- Technology and equipment requirements
- Connectivity, and data security standards
- Productivity measurement and standards

**Telecommuting Training**

To meet these challenges, Human Resources has developed an array of tools to help departments implement telecommuting and to provide employees with more information about Telecommuting. The information is available on <http://www.thecenter.rc-hr.com>; the County of Riverside Human Resources' Center for Government Excellence website.

Listed below are examples of documents and video clips made available on the site:

- Telecommuting Training Video
- Telework Proposal Workbook (DRAFT)
- Telecommuting Guidelines
- Telework Home Office Self-Evaluation and Agreement
- Telework Security Standard
- Survey Example
- Getting Started for Employees
- Getting Started for Supervisors
- Who is eligible
- Q&A for County Employees

Human Resources estimates that there are less than 100 employees currently Telecommuting at the County. Some departments are in the process of evaluating the arrangement; for example, the Child Protective Services Division at DPSS started a 90 day telecommuting project involving 90 employees.

Riverside County Information Technology (RCIT) has also established a Telecommute Task Force to explore the technology issues and provide recommended solutions and guidelines to departments. In October of 2008, RCIT launched their department pilot program (Telecommuting/ Home Dispatch) and compiled a status report (Attachment C) identifying the successes as well as the issues associated with their program. Based on recent reports from RCIT, Fleet fuel and maintenance costs have decreased on average by 16%, Voice Technicians have been averaging 7.82 field hours per day (1.32 hours more than the average prior to Telework arrangements), there has been an increase in the amount of front facing customer time, there has been an increase in customer satisfaction, and a number of additional measureable improvements.

**Next Steps:**

Human Resources is committed to train and inform departments and employees in regards to Telecommuting. For that reason, staff time has been dedicated to create additional communication materials and conduct workshops in the first half of calendar year 2009.

Human Resources will partner with departments in which a significant number of employees (in excess of 15%) have recently adopted the non-synchronized 4/10 work schedule and those departments which have implemented a Telecommuting program and report back to the Board in twelve months regarding the long term impact on service levels of implementing the non-synchronized 4/10 work schedule and the telecommuting schedule.

Human Resources Center for Government Excellence will partner with departments to conduct Telecommuting workshops for management and employees. Human Resources will continue to develop communication materials to disseminate to employees and departments in order to promote awareness of alternate work arrangements.

County of Riverside  
Comparative Work Schedule Data

June 2008  
Work Schedules

January 2009  
Work Schedules

Comparison  
Work Schedules

Department Name	June 2008 Work Schedules			January 2009 Work Schedules			Comparison Work Schedules			Percent of Employees on 4/10			
	Filled Positions	5/40	9/80	4/10	9/80	Other	Filled	5/40	4/10		9/80	Other	
AUDITOR CONTROLLER	115	37	0	78	17	0	98	0	20	0	0	0%	
BOARD OF SUPV	62	37	0	25	35	0	22	0	(3)	0	0	0%	
CFD	5	2	0	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0%	
COMMUNITY HEALTH	1,498	443	7	1,047	370	105	1,035	0	(12)	98	(1)	6%	
COOP EXT	5	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
COUNTY COUNSEL	69	28	0	41	18	0	55	0	14	0	0	0%	
CSA 152 NP	22	9	1	12	11	1	11	0	(1)	0	0	0%	
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	795	370	21	382	356	18	437	26	(3)	55	4	0%	
DPSS	3,310	308	31	2,971	3,284	286	2,736	0	(235)	235	0	7%	
EDA	374	240	0	134	374	109	1	264	0	(131)	1	0%	
EXECUTIVE OFFICE	31	8	0	23	9	0	23	0	0	0	0	0%	
FACILITIES	519	339	0	180	150	0	386	0	(189)	0	206	0%	
HUMAN RESOURCES	426	90	1	335	37	13	341	0	(35)	12	6	3%	
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	188	94	1	93	64	15	120	0	(30)	14	27	7%	
LAFCO	5	1	0	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0%	
MENTAL HEALTH	960	547	13	396	543	14	404	4	(4)	1	8	0%	
OASIS	62	1	0	61	2	0	61	0	1	0	0	0%	
OFFICE ON AGING	69	28	0	41	68	0	46	0	(6)	0	5	0%	
PARKS	88	59	3	26	60	3	29	0	1	0	3	0%	
PROBATION	871	163	1	95	185	0	101	583	22	(1)	6	(19)	
PUBLIC DEFENDER	312	257	0	55	299	0	53	0	(13)	0	(2)	0%	
PURCHASING	142	85	0	57	140	47	93	0	(38)	0	36	0%	
RCA OPS	10	7	0	3	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	0%	
RCRMC	2,276	1,193	55	340	1,176	52	373	721	(17)	(3)	33	0%	
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS	36	13	0	23	12	0	23	0	(1)	0	0	0%	
SHERIFF	3,859	394	133	586	282	168	601	2,989	(112)	35	15	243	1%
VETERANS SVCS	13	4	0	9	2	0	10	0	(2)	0	1	0	0%
<b>Total Count</b>	<b>18,707</b>	<b>5,210</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>8,817</b>	<b>4,358</b>	<b>1,749</b>	<b>8,443</b>	<b>4,353</b>	<b>(852)</b>	<b>1,146</b>	<b>(374)</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>6.03%</b>

County of Riverside  
Comparative Work Schedule Data

January 2009  
Work Schedules

May-09  
Work Schedules

Comparison  
Work Schedules

Department Name	January 2009 Work Schedules			May-09 Work Schedules			Comparison Work Schedules			Percent of Employees on 4/10	Percent of Employees on 4/10	Percent of Employees on 4/10									
	Filled Positions	5/40	9/80	Other	Filled Positions	5/40	9/80	Other	Filled				5/40	9/80	Other						
AUDITOR CONTROLLER	115	17	0	98	0	0	0	0	105	9	1	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	1%	1%
BOARD OF SUPV	57	35	0	22	0	0	0	0	57	34	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
CFD	5	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
COMMUNITY HEALTH	1,510	370	105	1,035	0	0	0	0	1,381	214	106	1,061	0	0	0	0	0	0	8%	8%	8%
COOP EXT	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
COUNTY COUNSEL	73	18	0	55	0	0	0	0	69	3	0	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
CSA 152 NP	23	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	22	9	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	5%	5%	5%
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	837	356	18	437	26	0	0	0	823	343	19	436	25	0	0	0	0	0	2%	2%	2%
DPSS	3,284	282	266	2,736	0	0	0	0	3,165	167	382	2,616	0	0	0	0	0	0	8%	8%	8%
EDA	374	109	1	264	0	0	0	0	377	50	0	326	1	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
EXECUTIVE OFFICE	32	9	0	23	0	0	0	0	32	9	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
FACILITIES	536	150	0	386	0	0	0	0	514	142	0	372	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
HUMAN RESOURCES	391	37	13	341	0	0	0	0	365	35	2	328	0	0	0	0	0	0	3%	1%	1%
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	199	64	15	120	0	0	0	0	194	11	15	167	1	0	0	0	0	0	8%	8%	8%
LAFCO	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
MENTAL HEALTH	965	543	14	404	4	0	0	0	920	459	10	446	5	0	0	0	0	0	1%	1%	1%
OASIS	63	2	0	61	0	0	0	0	60	2	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
OFFICE ON AGING	68	22	0	46	0	0	0	0	68	8	0	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
PARKS	92	60	3	29	0	0	0	0	89	61	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	3%	3%	3%
PROBATION	879	185	0	101	593	0	0	0	849	169	0	93	587	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
PUBLIC DEFENDER	299	246	0	53	0	0	0	0	291	237	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
PURCHASING	140	47	0	93	0	0	0	0	131	38	0	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
RCA OPS	10	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
RCRMC	2,322	1,176	52	373	721	0	0	0	2,306	1,151	58	353	744	0	0	0	0	0	2%	3%	3%
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS	35	12	0	23	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
SHERIFF	4,040	282	168	601	2,969	0	0	0	4,013	205	292	592	2,924	154	124	124	65	65	4%	7%	7%
VETERANS SVCS	12	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	12	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total Count</b>	<b>18,903</b>	<b>4,358</b>	<b>1,749</b>	<b>8,443</b>	<b>4,353</b>	<b>4,353</b>	<b>4,353</b>	<b>4,307</b>	<b>18,289</b>	<b>3,483</b>	<b>1,898</b>	<b>8,601</b>	<b>4,307</b>	<b>(418)</b>	<b>(875)</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>(46)</b>	<b>10.38%</b>	<b>10.38%</b>	<b>6.03%</b>

## County of Riverside Facilities Management

### Utility Cost Avoidance Analysis: Synchronized 9/80 vs. 4/10 Schedules

Due to the current State/County budget circumstances, all County departments are being required to reduce their respective expenses. The BOS is requiring each department to provide recommendation and strategies to achieve desired goals. The following analysis illustrates two potential annual cost savings options for utilities in the County's "Owned" and "Leased" facilities.

#### Option #1: Synchronized 9/80 Work Schedule

The projected annual cost savings could be achieved by implementing a "synchronized 9/80" work schedule for most County departments in owned and leased facilities. A "synchronized 9/80" work schedule would essentially "shutdown" most County facilities two (2) additional days per month or a total of 24 days per year.

#### Option #2: 4/10 Work Schedule

The projected annual cost savings could be achieved by implementing a "4/10" work schedule for most County departments in owned and leased facilities. A "4/10" work schedule would essentially "shutdown" most County facilities four (4) additional days per month or a total of 48 days per year.

The following facilities/sites would not participate in such a strategy due to their obvious responsibilities and function(s) within Riverside County:

#### Excluded Sites:

Southwest Justice Detention Center (MU1301)	Southwest Justice Center Central Plant (MU1305)
Southwest Juvenile Detention Center (MU1311)	Robert Presley Detention Center (RV914)
Riverside "Old Jail" (RV902)	Mental Health Treatment--County Farm (RV919)
Mental Health Treatment--Indio (RV718)	Jurupa Valley Sheriff Station (RX5007)
Cabazon Sheriff Station (CB3101)	Indio Sheriff Station (IN710)
Indio Coroner Facility (IN728)	Perris Coroner Facility (PR808)
Indio Detention Center (IN 702)	Hemet Sheriff Station (HM611)
Palm Desert Sheriff Station (PD2202)	Lake Elsinore Sheriff Station (LE504)
Larson Justice Center (IN723)	Historic Courthouse (RV901)
Hall of Justice Bldg. (RV903)	*Criminal Justice Bldg. (RV904)
Juvenile Court (RV916)	*Academy of Justice (RX5006)
District Attorney Bldg. (RV996)	Family Law Bldg. (RV1000)
Federal Court Bldg. (RV1003)	Blythe Sheriff & Detention Center (BL301)
Riverside Public Defender (RV1017)	Riverside 911 Comm Center (RV908)
Bankruptcy Court (RV1001)	Perris Sheriff Station (PR810)
Indio Courts (IN701, 703-707)	Hemet Courts (HM601)
Blythe Courts (BL320)	Riverside Animal Shelter (RV995)
Coachella Valley Animal Shelter (TP4502)	Blythe Animal Shelter (BL305)
*Corona Courts & Family Health Clinic (CR403)	*Indio Family Health Clinic (IN717)
*Mecca Family Health Clinic (ME2004)	*Palm Springs Family Health Clinic (PG1104)
*Perris Family Health Clinic (PR811)	*Riverside Family Health Clinic (RV927)
*Rubidoux Family Health Clinic (RX5000)	**Riverside County Regional Medical Center

\* Facility has potential to close

\*\*Facilities Management does not pay utility bills for RCRM.

Since these facilities would not participate in the two proposed scenarios, their respective utility cost/data will be subtracted from the total costs for all Owned Facilities. The remaining cost/data will be reflected in the Riverside County Owned Facilities and the Riverside County Leased Facilities cost/data charts.

### Utility Cost Avoidance Analysis

Facility Type		FY 07-08 Annual Utilities Total
Total County Owned Facilities		\$ 11,738,101
Total Excluded Sites	-	\$ 7,660,823
Total County Owned Facilities Eligible for Closing	=	\$ 4,077,278
Total County Leased Facilities		\$ 4,222,928
<b>Total Costs for All Eligible Facilities</b>		<b>\$ 8,300,206</b>

#### Option #1: Synchronized 9/80 Schedule

Facility Type Eligible for Closing	07-08 Annual Utility Costs	Annual Days of Operation	Utility Cost Per Day	X	Total Non- Operational Days/Yr.	=	Synchronized 9/80 Annual Utility Savings
Owned	\$ 4,077,278	248	\$ 16,440.64	X	24	=	\$ 394,575.29
Leased	\$ 4,222,928	248	\$ 17,027.93	X	24	=	\$ 408,670.42
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,300,206</b>		<b>\$ 33,468.57</b>				<b>\$ 803,245.71</b>

#### Option #2: 4/10 Schedule

Facility Type Eligible for Closing	07-08 Annual Utility Costs	Annual Days of Operation	Utility Cost Per Day	X	Total Non- Operational Days/Yr.	=	4/10 Schedule Annual Utility Savings
Owned	\$ 4,077,278	248	\$ 16,440.64	X	48	=	\$ 789,150.58
Leased	\$ 4,222,928	248	\$ 17,027.93	X	48	=	\$ 817,340.85
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,300,206</b>		<b>\$ 33,468.57</b>				<b>\$ 1,606,491.43</b>

Attachment C

# RCIT Telephone Mobility Pilot

May 4, 2009



## Background

- In the past, RCIT Voice Technician staff reported to a central place of work to retrieve their respective work assignments, associated inventory and county vehicle before dispatching out to the customer work sites. Each Technician was assigned an average of 6.5 hours of Service Request time per day.
- In October 2008, Voice Technicians began obtaining service requests remotely and reporting directly to the worksite from their homes, as well as reporting directly home instead of the central office at the conclusion of the work day. By adopting the new business model, each Technician has been assigned a daily average of 8 hours of Service Request time.
- **GOAL:** To gain valuable front facing customer time and increase our maintenance tasks/responsibilities.

## Voice Communications ~ By the Numbers

- Average Monthly Service Requests/Trouble Tickets = 900
- Approximately 80% of these are dispatchable tickets
- Employees: 12
- Number of facilities: Approximately 440
- Number of Telephone Systems: 180 PBX's + 130 Key Systems
- Number of telephones: 33,000+

## Business Objective

- Gain 1.5 hours of productivity per Technician
- Increase the amount of front facing customer time
- Increase the number of service requests completed daily
- Improve the average customer turnaround times on Moves, Adds, Changes and Repairs
- Increase in Customer Satisfaction

## Accomplishments To Date

- Averaging 7.82 field hours per Technician per day.
- Increased the amount of front facing customer time
- Increased the amount of resources assigned to maintenance tasks
- Increased the turnaround times on Customer Moves, Adds, Changes and Repairs
- Customers satisfaction has improved during the Pilot program
- Staff have a greater sense of pride for their respective area's and the customers they service