The Grand Jury reiterated the need for an adequate number of Project Managers and Inspectors; both with the requisite ability and authority to handle a $2.2 billion construction program.

The Grand Jury also acknowledged that the School Board has already created the position of chief inspector for its staff of UBC inspectors and is encouraged that the chief inspector has developed procedures for inspectors to follow.

The number of UBC Inspectors will grow based on a formula relating to the number of required inspections per project times the number of projects at a given time. The proposed organizational chart is included as a part of this presentation; specifics will be recommended to the School Board for approval in January 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>SBBC STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing Needs</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>(Pages 71-73)</em></td>
<td>1. The School Board must preserve the independence and insure the competence of its inspectors. Good contractors profit from a system where their work is fairly and knowledgeably inspected. Questionable contractors looking to cut corners will not be as successful if quality is demanded. &lt;br&gt;2. The staffing levels of inspectors, project managers, and the like must keep pace with the construction growth. Far from being “dead wood” administrative costs, these positions can protect the interests of the School Board and the taxpayers by insuring that construction proceeds on schedule.</td>
<td>1. Not only has the School Board established an independent UBC Inspector group; but it has also created a Senior Supervisor for Inspection and Code Compliance position which does not report to the Director of Facilities, Project Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Board Members’ Awareness and Understanding of Construction Issues</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>(Pages 73-75)</em></td>
<td>There were no Grand Jury Recommendations.</td>
<td>2. The number of UBC Inspectors will grow based on a formula relating to the number of required inspections per project times the number of projects at a given time. The proposed organizational chart is included as a part of this presentation; specifics will be recommended to the School Board for approval in January 1998.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. **Infighting**

For years, witnesses say, inspectors and project managers have been fiercely butting heads, each blaming the other for delays and wasted money. The inspectors claim PMs allow contractors to run roughshod, cutting corners, violating codes and getting change orders charged to the district. The PMs claim many inspectors are hyper-technical nitpickers, often misinterpreting code and unnecessarily holding up projects, ultimately costing taxpayers more money.

We don’t choose sides here nor do we need to. The fault clearly is with upper management. The problem according to witnesses has existed for years yet management has failed to resolve it. Despite years of accusations and recriminations by both sides, management with one glaring exception, has not fired anyone, disciplined anyone, reassigned anyone, offered additional training, or in any way proposed solutions. This is not the first time this issue has been brought to the attention of district officials. The 2002 Report had this to say about it.

“School inspectors are supposed to work independently of the Facilities Division. Their supervisor is the Building Official; his supervisor reports directly to the Superintendent and not to the Facilities Division.

We have received testimony that tremendous animosity exists between some members of the inspection team and the Facilities Department, these inspectors and their colleagues, and these inspectors and their supervisors.

---

1 In 2005 the District first reassigned then later fired Charlene Blackwood, at that time Senior Supervisor of Inspectors, for allegedly being insubordinate. She in turn filed suit claiming in essence the District was retaliating for blowing the whistle on numerous suspect practices at the Facilities Division. After years of litigation she received a settlement from the District which was widely publicized.

To the extent this was the District’s effort to resolve the animosity between the inspectors and the project managers; it apparently had little to no effect; the issues continued unabated according to witnesses.