

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

SYSTEMWIDE

**Audit Report 12-37
February 21, 2013**

Members, Committee on Audit

Henry Mendoza, Chair
Lupe C. Garcia, Vice Chair
Rebecca D. Eisen Steven M. Glazer
William Hauck Hugo Morales

Staff

University Auditor: Larry Mandel
Senior Director: Michelle Schlack
Audit Manager: Ann Hough
Senior Auditors: Alexander Khan, Dane MacDonald, and Maureen Pasag

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	2
Background.....	2
Purpose.....	4
Scope and Methodology.....	5

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

General Environment.....	6
Facilities Maintenance Policy	6
Energy Conservation and Sustainability Policy	7

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	Personnel Contacted
APPENDIX B:	Management Response
APPENDIX C:	Chancellor's Acceptance

ABBREVIATIONS

BOT	Board of Trustees
CO	Chancellor's Office
CPDC	Capital Planning, Design and Construction
CMMS	Computerized Maintenance Management System
CSU	California State University
EO	Executive Order
FRRM	Facilities Renewal Cost Model Project
GC	Government Code
OUA	Office of the University Auditor
SAM	State Administrative Manual

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor (OUA) during the last quarter of 2011, the Board of Trustees at its January 2012 meeting directed that *Facilities Management* be reviewed. The OUA had previously reviewed *Operations and Maintenance of Plant* in 2000.

We visited the six campuses from March 12, 2012, through July 20, 2012, and audited the procedures in effect at the time. Campus-specific findings and recommendations have been discussed and reported individually.

Our study and evaluation revealed certain conditions that, in our opinion, could result in significant errors and irregularities if not corrected. Specifically, we found that systemwide policies in the areas of facilities management and energy were outdated. These conditions, along with other weaknesses, are described in the executive summary and body of this report. In our opinion, except for the effect of the weaknesses described above, the operational and administrative controls for facilities management activities in effect as of July 20, 2012, taken as a whole, were sufficient to meet the objectives stated in the “Purpose” section of this report.

As a result of changing conditions and the degree of compliance with procedures, the effectiveness of controls changes over time. Specific limitations that may hinder the effectiveness of an otherwise adequate system of controls include, but are not limited to, resource constraints, faulty judgments, unintentional errors, circumvention by collusion, and management overrides. Establishing controls that would prevent all these limitations would not be cost-effective; moreover, an audit may not always detect these limitations.

The following summary provides management with an overview of conditions requiring attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [] refer to page numbers in the report.

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT [6]

The facilities maintenance policy in Executive Order 847 was outdated, and the chancellor’s office was not always tracking or enforcing receipt of required reports from the campuses. Also, the systemwide policy addressing the Board of Trustees’ (BOT) energy conservation goals was outdated, and a required report was not submitted to the BOT on the date specified in the policy.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Legislative Analyst's Report on the 1979/80 budget addressed the need to protect the substantial public investment represented by California State University (CSU) facilities, and the Legislature subsequently directed the CSU to implement a preventive maintenance program on each campus. In December 1979, a CSU Task Force on Plant Maintenance was appointed to explore preventive maintenance needs for the system. It concluded that the concept of preventive maintenance was too narrow in scope to accommodate the total maintenance needs of the CSU. Consequently, the concept of "planned/programmed maintenance," which incorporated preventive maintenance and systematic planning and programming, was proposed. The CSU Executive Council reviewed the task force report and approved the concept in March 1981. Since then, the CSU has issued a sequence of directives and executive orders to reflect the system's commitment to ensuring that facilities-related assets are adequately maintained.

In 1999, the Office of the University Auditor conducted an audit of *Operations and Maintenance of Plant* at ten campuses and issued a systemwide report. The report included exceptions related to planned/programmed maintenance, work order administration, cost recovery, and chargebacks and required facilities condition reporting to the Office of the Chancellor (CO). Several of the recommendations from the resulting systemwide report were incorporated into Executive Order (EO) 757, issued September 1, 2000, and later into EO 847, *Policy Statement on Facility Maintenance*, issued January 10, 2003. The latter is the most recent dictate on the subject.

In 2000, the CSU adopted the Facilities Renewal Resource Model Project (FRRM) with the long-term objective of securing adequate funding for deferred maintenance and renewal needs for CSU physical plants. FRRM implementation provided a standardized means for campuses to fulfill the requirement to prepare an annual five-year projection of deferred maintenance and capital renewal costs. It also provided the CO with information necessary for capital budgeting and planning.

Since the last audit and the adoption of FRRM, the CSU system has been confronted with funding appropriation challenges that have had a profound effect on facilities maintenance. The CSU support budget documentation for 2012/13 identifies a deferred maintenance need of \$470 million. However, this amount represents the highest priority projects out of an estimated \$1.6 billion in deferred maintenance and capital renewal backlog derived from the 2009/10 FRRM data. The model also concludes that absent investment of at least \$99 million per year to maintain the current backlog level, the need will grow to \$2.2 billion by 2016.

Meanwhile, appropriations for the CSU Capital Outlay budget have decreased significantly over the past several years, from \$410 million for 2007/08 to less than \$20 million in 2012/13. Between the fiscal years 2005/06 and 2008/09, the Trustees and the legislature provided for \$140 million within the budget for capital renewal projects, but that funding has since ceased. The Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan for 2012/13 reflects campus facility needs approaching \$6 billion. However, this number is artificially depressed by criteria, created to encourage campus prioritization, that limits the number of projects the campuses can request for funding. The CO's Capital Planning, Design and Construction (CPDC) office, in consultation with the Trustees, has been working on solutions for funding infrastructure renewal, seismic strengthening, and other capital priorities.

INTRODUCTION

The CSU codified its commitment to energy conservation and sustainability in February 1989 with the issuance of EO 538, *Policy Statement on Energy Conservation and Utilities Management for the California State University and Energy Consumption Reduction Goal for 1992/93 Compared to 1986/87*. This EO was superseded in August 2006 with EO 987, *Policy Statement on Energy Conservation, Sustainable Building Practices, and Physical Plant Management for the California State University*. This EO retained general operational provisions and sustainable building practices while adding the CSU Sustainable Measurement Checklist process. Since some of the deadlines for energy conservation goals outlined in the EO have expired, and other mandates within the EO have been deemed outdated, CPDC is considering options on how to update and issue new guidelines.

PURPOSE

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to facilities management and to determine the adequacy of controls over related processes to ensure compliance with relevant Trustee policy, Office of the Chancellor directives, and campus procedures.

Within the overall audit objective, specific goals included determining whether:

- ▶ Administration of facilities management is well defined and includes clear lines of organizational authority and responsibility and documented delegations of authority.
- ▶ Management has established policies and procedures for facilities maintenance and utilities management and has developed the means to monitor and measure compliance with applicable laws and CSU policies.
- ▶ Facilities management risks have been identified, assessed, and monitored.
- ▶ A comprehensive planned/programmed maintenance schedule that captures all preventive maintenance and repair requirements is in place.
- ▶ The campus has effectively identified facility deferred maintenance and capital renewal needs and is reporting the information to the CO annually.
- ▶ The campus has implemented an effective computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) to ensure proper administration of maintenance tasks, including scheduling, costs management reporting, and productivity tools to account for resource utilization.
- ▶ The campus is preparing and submitting biennial facilities assessments and equipment audits to the CO in an accurate and timely manner.
- ▶ The campus has implemented effective and efficient custodial and groundskeeping programs that include productivity and performance standards to ensure the work is performed in an effective and efficient manner.
- ▶ The campus has implemented controls to ensure proper capture, tracking, and collection of costs for non-maintenance and auxiliary-related work orders.
- ▶ The campus has implemented an effective utility tracking system to capture and report information pertinent to CSU goals for sustainability and energy conservation.
- ▶ Keys and other physical access devices are issued to authorized individuals, and access devices are properly secured and monitored.
- ▶ Systems and applications under facilities management administration are adequately controlled and secured, and access rights are granted on a need-to-know basis.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The proposed scope of the audit as presented in Attachment A, Audit Agenda Item 2 of the January 24 and 25, 2012, meeting of the Committee on Audit stated that *Facilities Management* includes custodial services; groundskeeping; facility repairs, preventive maintenance, and renovations; and utility distribution. Proposed audit scope would include, but was not limited to, review of cost allocations; deferred maintenance; building and grounds conditions; sustainable building practices; materials and equipment inventory; and work order scheduling and control systems.

Our study and evaluation were conducted in accordance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors and included the audit tests we considered necessary in determining whether operational and administrative controls are in place and operative. This review emphasized, but was not limited to, compliance with Board of Trustee policies and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. The audit focused on procedures in effect from January 1, 2010, through January 1, 2012.

We focused primarily on the internal administrative and operations controls over facilities management activities. Specifically, we reviewed and tested:

- ▶ The campus framework for facilities management, including the required implementation of a CMMS and a utility tracking system.
- ▶ Methods by which the campus identifies, prioritizes, and monitors routine, preventive, and special maintenance projects.
- ▶ The capabilities and management utilization of a CMMS to capture and monitor task progress and to track resource allocations and costs.
- ▶ Methods by which the campus identifies and quantifies deferred maintenance backlog, and the escalation of the information to the proper management level, including the CO.
- ▶ Methods for capturing and recovering costs of services provided to non-state and auxiliary organizations.
- ▶ The campus strategic energy resource plan and its correlation to systemwide goals for energy conservation and sustainability.
- ▶ Compliance with specific energy conservation policies.
- ▶ Devices and technology used to control physical access to campus facilities.

During the course of the audit, we visited six campuses: Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Maritime Academy, Pomona, Sacramento, and San José. We interviewed campus personnel and audited procedures in effect at the time of the audit.

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

FACILITIES MAINTENANCE POLICY

The facilities maintenance policy in Executive Order (EO) 847 was outdated, and the chancellor's office (CO) was not always tracking or enforcing receipt of required reports from the campuses.

We noted that EO 847, *Policy Statement on Facility Maintenance*, delegates to each president the authority to implement the Board of Trustees (BOT) policy and defines maintenance expectations and reporting requirements to assure efficient and effective use of available maintenance funding. We further noted that:

- ▶ The policy had not been updated since 2003.
- ▶ The policy did not adequately address emerging issues regarding deferred maintenance. Though the policy indicated that the long-term objective is to eliminate deferred maintenance, the economic environment has changed significantly since the policy's most recent update, and nearly every campus now has a significant backlog of deferred maintenance. The policy did require campuses to submit annual reports to the CO on any backlog, but it did not provide further guidance on related best practices, such as use of appropriate performance indicators, risk assessment, prioritization, elevation of high-risk issues to the proper CO authorities, guidelines on when to close a high-risk facility, and alternative funding sources for remediation.
- ▶ The policy did not provide adequate guidance on best practices for cost recovery.
- ▶ The CO was not tracking receipt of or reviewing two biennial reports that the policy requires campuses to submit.

State Administrative Manual (SAM) §20050 states that one symptom of a deficient internal control system is policy and procedural or operational manuals that are either not currently maintained or are non-existent.

EO 847, *Policy Statement on Facility Maintenance*, dated January 10, 2003, states that it is the responsibility of the university president to ensure that appropriate resources are directed toward meeting the requirement of proper operations and maintenance of the campus physical plant, and that the long term objective is to eliminate deferred maintenance. The EO further states that that campus general fund operations accounts shall be reimbursed for actual costs, both direct and indirect, associated with requested non-maintenance services provided by the facilities department. In addition, the EO states that the campuses are required to submit to the chancellor's office two biennial reports: one that identifies maintenance and repair requirements in the scheduled maintenance program, and one that provides a listing and specific information on fixed maintained equipment.

Government Code (GC) §13403 states that internal accounting and administrative controls are the methods through which state entity heads can give reasonable assurance that measures to safeguard

assets, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency, and encourage adherence to prescribe managerial policies are being followed.

The chief of plant, energy, and utilities stated that the policy had not been updated due to other projects that were deemed higher priority for an under-resourced staff. He further stated that the issue of deferred maintenance backlog was being tracked and reported to the BOT on a regular basis. The physical plant program manager stated that receipt of the biennial reports was not tracked because it was determined that the information in the reports was redundant with information obtained through other, more closely tracked reporting mechanisms. He further stated that CO management had discussed the standardization of cost recovery methods, but it was their belief that the authority to determine a cost recovery method was at the campus president level.

Failure to maintain clear and complete policies perpetuates inconsistencies in interpretation and compliance. Inconsistent application of cost recovery methodologies increases the risk that the campus operating funds will not be fully compensated for maintenance and other support provided to auxiliary enterprises and other campus areas. Inconsistent enforcement of reporting requirements on facilities conditions increases the risk that systemwide planning and analysis of deferred maintenance and capital renewal requirements will be hampered or flawed due to lack of relevant data.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the CO:

- a. Review and update EO 847 to reflect current conditions and objectives, including deferred maintenance backlogs and cost recovery methodologies.
- b. Ensure that required campus reports are received and reviewed as appropriate.

Management Response

- a. We agree, and we will draft a new EO that will direct campuses to use the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM) for physical plant policies and procedures by August 2013.
- b. The Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning Design and Construction (CPDC) department will oversee campus participation in the annual Facilities Replacement and Renewal Model (FRRM) data collection process for deferred maintenance backlogs and renewal forecasts. Policies and procedures for using the FRRM will be written into the ICSUAM for physical plant by August 2013.

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY POLICY

The systemwide policy addressing BOT energy conservation goals was outdated, and a required report was not submitted to the BOT on the date specified in the policy.

We noted that EO 987, *Policy Statement on Energy Conservation, Sustainable Building Practices, and Physical Plant Management for the California State University*, is the fourth in a succession of executive orders issued since 1989 that delegates to each president the implementation of the CSU BOT policy on conservation, sustainable building practices, and physical plant management. It reflects the most recent changes to the original policy adopted by the BOT in 1978 and reaffirms the need to conserve energy in order to achieve goals updated in 2001 and reevaluated in 2005. However, two of the deadlines for the stated goals had expired, specifically:

- ▶ Reduce energy consumption by 15 percent by fiscal year 2009/2010, using fiscal year 2003/2004 as the baseline.
- ▶ Procure 20 percent of electricity needs from renewable sources by 2010, subject to the constraints of program needs and standard budget parameters.

We also found that the results of energy conservation efforts and progress toward achieving the stated goals were not reported to the BOT at its July 2011 meeting, as required in the policy.

EO 987, *Policy Statement on Energy Conservation, Sustainable Building Practices, and Physical Plant Management for the California State University*, dated August 2, 2006, states that each campus is responsible for reducing energy consumption, and that a BOT goal of a 15 percent overall systemwide reduction would be evaluated at the end of fiscal year 2009/10, and reported to the trustees in July 2011. The policy also states that the CSU will endeavor to meet or exceed a goal of procuring 20 percent of its electricity needs from renewable sources by 2010, subject to the constraints of program needs and standard budget parameters.

GC §13403 states that internal accounting and administrative controls are the methods through which state entity heads can give reasonable assurance that measures to safeguard assets, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency, and encourage adherence to prescribe managerial policies are being followed.

The chief of plant, energy, and utilities stated that management had been tracking the progress toward the stated goals and that draft updates to the energy policy had been prepared, but that submission to the BOT was deferred due to resource constraints resulting from CSU budget reductions and emerging changes in technology and objectives that would affect the final policy.

Failure to maintain clear and complete policies perpetuates inconsistencies in interpretation and compliance, and delayed status updates to the BOT on energy conservation progress increases the risk that data necessary to meet long-term goals will be compromised.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the CO:

- a. Review and update EO 987 to reflect necessary changes to policy goals.
- b. Ensure that the BOT receives scheduled progress reports on energy conservation efforts.

Management Response

- a. We agree, and we will draft a new EO that will direct campuses to use the ICSUAM for energy efficiency and sustainability policies procedures and goals by August 2013.
- b. The Office of the Chancellor, CPDC department will oversee campus participation with energy efficiency programs and sustainability initiatives goals. CPDC will report systemwide progress to programs and goals to the Board of Trustees in accordance with the revised procedures referenced in Management Response 2a. Revisions to the energy efficiency policy in ICSUAM will be completed by August 2013.

APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
<u>Office of the Chancellor</u>	
Benjamin F. Quillian	Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Shawn Holland	Physical Plant Program Manager
Wesley Morgan	Energy Program Manager (at time of review)
Leonard Pettis	Chief of Plant, Energy and Utilities
Elvyra San Juan	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction
<u>California State University, Bakersfield</u>	
Horace Mitchell	President
Laurie Davis	Administrative Analyst Specialist
Felix Garcera	Director, Facilities Operations
Wendy Gerhold	Administrative Support Assistant
Patrick Jacobs	Assistant Vice President, Facilities Planning Development and Operations
Michael Neal	Vice President, Business and Administrative Services
Julie Smith	Director, Safety and Risk Management
Shirley Stevens	Work Control Coordinator
Tom Velasquez	Facilities Manager
Douglas Wade	Assistant Vice President, Fiscal Services
<u>California State University, Channel Islands</u>	
Richard R. Rush	President
Raudel Banuelos	Director of Facility Services
Tim Berndston	Manager of Logistical Services
Tom Brown	Interim Director of Operations
Dave Chakraborty	Associate Vice President, Operations, Planning and Construction
Terrie Cilley	Administrative Services Supervisor
Wesley Cooper	Assistant Director of Operations
Caroline Doll	Director of Special Projects, Finance and Administration
Loren Fleming	Locksmith
Anna Pavin	Associate Vice President, Human Resources
Ysabel Trinidad	Vice President of Finance and Administration
<u>California Maritime Academy</u>	
Thomas A. Cropper	President
William B. Eisenhardt	President (At time of review)
William Brown	Director, Facilities Management
Kristen Cunningham	Facilities Administration Coordinator, Facilities Management
Vineeta Dhillon	Director, Purchasing and Risk Management
Susan Foft	Accounting Manager, Fiscal Services
Kurtis Lohide	Vice President, Administration and Finance
Steve Mastro	Associate Vice President, Finance Services, Fiscal Services
Ken Toet	Controller, Fiscal Services

APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

J. Michael Ortiz	President
Edwin Barnes	Vice President, Administrative Affairs/Chief Financial Officer
Eric Bellman	Manager, System Administrator
Kathy Harper	Assistant to the Associate Vice President
Don Johnson	Manager, Building and Mechanical Services
Darwin Labordo	Associate Vice President/Associate Chief Financial Officer
George Lwin	Manager, Energy Services
Walter Marquez	Administrator-In-Charge, Facilities Planning and Management
Mark Miller	Director, Facilities Management and Capital Projects
Lorraine Rodriguez	Senior Buyer
Jane Self	Director, Payroll Services
Mooris Taylor	LEED AP Senior Project Manager
Joice Xiong	Director of Internal Audit

California State University, Sacramento

Alexander Gonzalez	President
Bena Arao	Director, Administrative Services
Kendal Chaney-Buttleman	University Controller
Michael Clemson	Associate Energy Program Analyst
Darnell Cooper	Accountant II
Edna Flores	Administrative Analyst
Leticia Guerrero	Payroll Supervisor
Linda Hafar	Senior Director, Sustainability and Plant Operations
Yavette Hayward	Senior Management Auditor
Justine Heartt	Associate Vice President, Financial Services
Ali Izadian	Associate Vice President, Facilities Services
David Kesty	Lead Auto Mechanic
Ming-Tung "Mike" Lee	Vice President, Administration and Business Affairs/ Chief Financial Officer
Mark Leisz	Senior Zone Manager
Joe Manzella	Supervising Electrician
Nathaniel Martin	Energy Coordinator
Joey Martinez	Recycling Coordinator
Susan McGuire	Budget Analyst
Kaye Milburn	Director, Auditing Services
Daryn Ockey	Director, Facility Operations
George Paine III	Customer Service
Greg Paul	Administrative Analyst
Len Pettis	Chief, Plant Energy and Utilities
Victor Takahashi	Director, Facilities Planning and Construction Services

San José State University

Mohammad Qayoumi	President
Adam Bayer	Director, Utilities, Maintenance and Operations
Shawn Bibb	Vice President, Administration and Finance
Christopher Brown	Associate Vice President, Facilities Development and Operations
David Buchmann	Lead Locksmith
Catherine Chen	Financial Budget Analyst

APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

San José State University (cont.)

Michelle Chen	Budget Analyst
Donna Duval	Customer Service and Logistics Lead
Marna Genes	Budget Planning and Financial Management Director
John Gorvad	Auto Shop Supervisor
Jared Isaacson	Energy Analyst
Josee Larochelle	Associate Vice President, Finance
Betty Luna	Director, Facility Services
Chris Nordby	Associate Director, Utility Operations
Ninh Pham-Hi	Director, Internal Control
Jose Rios	Work Control Lead/Technology Systems Specialist
John Skyberg	Associate Director, Maintenance Operations and Repairs
Cynthia Soto	Administrative Services Coordinator
Elena Stoian	Business Services Lead
May Xie	Projects Account Analyst



Business and Finance
401 Golden Shore, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

www.calstate.edu

Benjamin F. Quillian
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

562-951-4600
Fax 562-951-4971
bquillian@calstate.edu

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 7, 2013

TO: Larry Mandel
University Auditor

FROM: Benjamin F. Quillian *BFW*
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: Audit Report Number 12-37
Facilities Management, Systemwide

RECEIVED
UNIVERSITY AUDITOR

MAY - 9 2013

THE CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Per your request, the prior response has been revised to incorporate additional information. The revised response is attached and was previewed by Auditor Ann Hough in order to ensure the response addressed the noted concerns. CPDC has met with campus Directors of Facilities Operations as part of the process to update the Executive Orders on Facilities Management and on Energy Conservation, Sustainability and Physical Plant Management Practices and make progress on this audit action item.

Cc: Elvyra F. San Juan, Assistant Vice Chancellor
Len Pettis, chief of Plant, Energy and Utilities
Shawn Holland, Physical Plant Program Manager

CSU Campuses
Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

SYSTEMWIDE

Audit Report 12-37

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

FACILITIES MAINTENANCE POLICY

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the CO:

- a. Review and update EO 847 to reflect current conditions and objectives, including deferred maintenance backlogs and cost recovery methodologies.
- b. Ensure that required campus reports are received and reviewed as appropriate.

Management Response

- a. We agree and we will draft a new EO that will direct campuses to use the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM) for Physical Plant policies and procedures, by August 2013.
- b. The Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning Design and Construction (CPDC) department will oversee campus participation in the annual Facilities Replacement and Renewal Model (FRRM) data collection process for deferred maintenance backlogs and renewal forecasts. Policies and procedures for using the FRRM will be written into the ICSUAM for Physical Plant, by August 2013.

ENERGY CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY POLICY

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the CO:

- a. Review and update EO 987 to reflect necessary changes to policy goals.
- b. Ensure that the BOT receives scheduled progress reports on energy conservation efforts.

Management Response

- a. We agree and we will draft a new EO that will direct campuses to use the ICSUAM for energy efficiency and sustainability policies procedures and goals, by August 2013.

- b. The Office of the Chancellor, CPDC department will oversee campus participation with energy efficiency programs and sustainability initiatives goals. CPDC will report systemwide progress to programs and goals to the Board of Trustees in accordance with the revised procedures referenced in Management Response 2a. Revisions to the energy efficiency policy in ICSUAM will be completed by August 2013.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

CHANNEL ISLANDS

May 23, 2013

CHICO

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

MEMORANDUM

EAST BAY

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel
University Auditor

FRESNO

FULLERTON

FROM: Timothy P. White
Chancellor



HUMBOLDT

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report 12-37 on *Facilities Management*, Systemwide

LONG BEACH

LOS ANGELES

In response to your memorandum of May 23, 2013, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on *Facilities Management*, Systemwide.

MARITIME ACADEMY

MONTEREY BAY

TPW/amd

NORTHBRIDGE

POMONA

SACRAMENTO

SAN BERNARDINO

SAN DIEGO

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSÉ

SAN LUIS OBISPO

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS