

RD 1.4

Cited Section 3.2.2

Overview of the Preventive Maintenance Program, Gordon Study, and Workload Standards.

The Budget Act of 1984 incorporated the following language regarding maintenance staffing for the CSU and UC systems.

“It is the intent of the Legislature that the maintenance staffing of the UC and CSU be based upon the same staffing standards for maintenance for similarly used equipment and space. It is the intent of the Legislature that the UC and CSU work with the Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst’s Office on the review and development of these standards.”

In September of 1984 representatives from the Dept. of Finance, Legislative analyst, CSU, and UC met to develop a coordinated plan for carrying out the required maintenance standards studies. It was decided to proceed with pilot studies at CSU and UC and to employ an outside consultant to develop workload budgeting standards. Clyde Gordon and Associates was selected.

The final report encompassing all of the CSU and UC campuses was submitted in 1987 and an update was done in 89-90.

The Gordon Study methodology attempted to incorporate in detail all of the facility installations that require maintenance and to develop standards and budgets for maintaining them -- from trees, to streetlights, to roofs, to square feet of floor to be cleaned all were analyzed and budgeted.

These discrete elements were then rolled up into larger maintenance elements that the Gordon study called “Workload Categories”

The Gordon Study also recommended that in addition to the normal operational costs, an amount be set budgeted for “replacements”. These would include replacements of OMP equipment up to \$200,000.

The roll-up of this massive study found that funding provided by the State to the University to maintain these elements was only half of what the Gordon study had recommended. Figuring in replacement costs, 85-86 funding was at 49% of standard and without replacement costs, at 62% of standard.

Based upon the Gordon study, in FY 88-89 the legislature did provide some additional funding to the University for maintenance, reducing the amount of underfunding reported in the 89-90 update to 57% with replacements and 72% without replacements.

By 1990 State budget difficulties precluded additional increases, and though the University has consistently pointed out its maintenance underfunding, there has been no movement toward funding at the Gordon Study standards.

An electronic version of the Gordon Report is available online at: (Link to follow)