



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

PROJECT MANAGEMENT AUDIT

Exit Conference Date: January 27, 2005

Release Date: February 16, 2005

Report No. 05 – 15

CITY OF ORLANDO

OFFICE OF AUDIT AND EVALUATION

Beryl H Davis, CPA, CGFM  
Audit and Evaluation Director

George J. McGowan, CPA  
Audit and Evaluation Manager

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Memorandum.....   | 1  |
| Executive Summary .....   | 2  |
| Background .....  | 9  |
| Summary of Recommendations and Responses .....  | 10 |
| Issues and Recommendations .....  | 13 |
| Project Cost Control And Accounting .....   | 13 |
| Ensure Project Managers Are Accountable for Controlling Project Expenditures.....                 | 13 |
| Increase Controls over Selection, Tracking and Reporting of Continuing Service<br>Contracts ..... | 14 |
| Improve Controls over Invoice Approvals.....  | 16 |
| Determine Acceptable Range of Internal Service Charges.....                                       | 17 |
| Determine and Control Acceptable Employee Administrative Time.....                                | 19 |
| Lead Discussions to Improve Project Accounting System .....                                       | 20 |
| Project Budget Control .....  | 22 |
| Hold Project Managers Accountable for Preventing Group Budget Deficits.....                       | 22 |
| Immediately Notify Project Managers When Deficits Are Discovered.....                             | 24 |
| Develop and Enforce Project Closeout Procedures .....   | 25 |
| Host a “Summit” of Managers involved in Local Agency Program Projects.....                        | 26 |
| Efficiency And Cost Savings .....   | 29 |
| Fully Utilize In-house Design Team .....  | 29 |
| Develop Guidelines to Assist Project Managers in Effective Construction Delivery<br>Methods.....  | 31 |
| Project Documentation And Communications.....   | 32 |
| Standardize Project Files and Require Status Reports.....   | 32 |
| Improve Project Information on City Website .....   | 33 |
| Appendix A – Projects Selected for Review.....  | 36 |
| Appendix B – Budget Revision Request Analysis .....   | 37 |
| Appendix C – Substantial Completion Date Analysis .....   | 38 |



# CITY OF ORLANDO

---

## MEMORANDUM

To: Alan Oyler, Public Works Director

From: Beryl H. Davis, CPA, CGFM, Audit and Evaluation Director

Date: Exit Conference: January 27, 2005; Report Issued: February 16, 2005

Subject: Public Works Department Project Management Audit  
(Audit Report No. 05-15)

In accordance with our annual operations plan, the Office of Audit and Evaluation has performed an audit of the Project Management areas of the Public Works Department. Our objectives were to review and evaluate the effectiveness of various processes used to control the City's capital projects: project management and administration, project financial control and construction cost control.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, except that we did not perform tests of data gathered from computer-based resources. Our procedures included a review of project management procedures and detailed tests of selected budget revision transactions and construction payment transactions for fifteen capital projects. Therefore, the scope of our detailed testing included projects in every stage of a capital improvement project: conception, design, and construction.

It should be noted that during the course of this review, the Mayor approved a reorganization of the Project Management functions of Public Works into a Capital Improvement and Infrastructure Development Division. Until this reorganization occurs, the Project Management functions of the Public Works Department are located in three divisions: Engineering, Transportation Engineering and Wastewater. The scope of our review did not include a review of the current organization of the function, however, we concur that the consolidation of Project Management and Construction Management services into a single division will improve the management and financial administration of the City's capital projects. This report identifies several recommendations that can help to ensure that this improvement occurs.

We would like to express our appreciation to the employees of the Public Works Department who were consulted during this audit for their courtesy and cooperation.

BHD/am

c: Honorable Buddy Dyer, Mayor  
Jose I. Fernandez, Chief of Staff  
Joseph Robinson, Deputy Chief of Staff  
Richard L. Levey, AICP, Chief Administrative Officer  
Deborah D. Girard, Management, Budget and Accounting Director  
Kevin J. Edmonds, General Administration Department Director  
Thomas Connery, Capital Improvement and Infrastructure Development Division Manager  
Worth Busbee, Public Works Fiscal Manager

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### **Objective, Scope, and Methodology**

Page 13

The objectives of this audit were to assess the project management function's effectiveness in meeting its responsibilities and its efficiency in accomplishing its tasks. The scope of this audit equates to the activity dates of each of the fifteen projects selected for review (February 2000 to December 2004). We performed tests of these projects and held several discussions concerning procedures and practices with Project Managers, Fiscal Management staff and Public Works executives. We also interviewed several parties within and outside Orlando City government.

### **Ensure Project Managers Are Accountable for Controlling Project Expenditures**

Page 13

We selected five projects and tested four construction progress payments for each of these projects. We found that the payment routing form used by Public Works Fiscal Management to obtain approvals for the progress payment does not include the Project Manager, as it had in the past. Since the Project Manager is the individual chiefly responsible for the fiscal control of each construction project, this individual should be involved in the approval of construction invoices.

The Public Works Director should ensure that the Project Managers are held accountable for project fiscal control by requiring their signatures on each construction progress payment.

### **Increase Controls over Selection, Tracking and Reporting of Continuing Service Contracts**

Page 14

The Project Managers utilize various Continuing Service Contracts to obtain expertise for certain aspects of the City's construction projects. Under these contracts work orders are assigned to contractors for consulting, testing and other services. We reviewed payments made to selected contractors. We found that while each Project Manager is responsible for obtaining selected continuing services, no one is assigned to track and monitor the use of the contractors. Our testing showed that some contractors have never been used while

others have received the great majority of assignments in their service area. In addition, we found an instance where work assigned to a contractor was delayed for several months past the due date identified without amending the work order agreement with the contractor. The Public Works Director should institute greater control over the selection and use of contractors as well as reporting of compliance with Continuing Service Contract terms.

**Improve  
Controls Over  
Invoice  
Approvals**

Page 16

Our testing of selected construction, design and other invoices indicated a lack of control over the timely processing and proper authorization of project invoices. The Division Manager should institute controls to ensure that all required managers approve project invoices so that they are processed for payment within the guidelines identified in the Florida Prompt Payment Act.

**Determine  
Acceptable  
Range of Internal  
Service Charges**

Page 17

The cost of the time spent by Public Works employees who manage construction projects is charged to each project as an internal service charge. As we reviewed the Budget Revision Requests (BRRs) used to create and amend each project's budget, we found that there was no apparent pattern or order to the amount of project and construction management services that are charged to construction projects. We also learned that there are no guidelines or acceptable limits that have been created to control the project and construction management time spent on City construction projects.

The Public Works Director should direct staff to study historical data to identify acceptable ranges of internal service charges by construction category and service type and this information should be used to both budget for a project's internal service charges and act as performance measures for the individual Project Managers. As an additional control, Project Managers should complete a form that explains the amounts budgeted for internal services and this form should become an attachment to the BRR.

**Determine and Control Acceptable Employee Administrative Time**  
Page 19

We selected one month's report of internal service charges for construction projects for a detailed review. We found that the system to compile the information for this report is very effective. The employees who work on projects identify the number of hours worked in the electronic time and attendance system (Kronos). A system report is used to prepare the monthly internal service charge journal voucher. While reviewing this information we noted that the employees can also charge their time to two administrative codes.

Our review of one month showed that some employees had charged a good deal of time to these administrative codes and we inquired about the controls in place to limit employees "unproductive" time. We found that no such standards exist; we also found that supervisory employees do not use the online time and attendance system to determine whether employees are remaining productive. The Public Works Director should require supervisors and managers to review online time reporting information each week to monitor the amount of time charged to administrative duties. An acceptable percentage of administrative time for each employee group should be determined and reports developed to manage and limit administrative time to an acceptable level.

**Lead Discussions to Improve Project Accounting System**  
Page 20

When the City converted to its accounting system, JD Edwards OneWorld, the employees involved in the conversion accepted the system's limitations regarding project accounting. These limitations cause some inefficiencies and a continued reliance on manual accounting records. As the City converts from the current accounting system to a new product due to the acquisition of JD Edwards by PeopleSoft, an opportunity to readdress some accounting methods is presenting itself. We believe that the Public Works Fiscal Manager should lead discussions to correct the current limitations of the JDE OneWorld system in its processing of project accounting transactions in order to eliminate the need for a manual record keeping system and the annual budget close out.

**Hold Project Managers Accountable for Preventing Group Budget Deficits**

Page 22

An important fiscal control over construction projects is the budget created for these projects. This budget is the responsibility of the Project Manager. We examined the budget revisions made for the fifteen projects selected for review. We also reviewed expenditures made after the substantial completion date for four projects. This testing revealed many cases where projects overspent their allotted group level budgets. We found 24% of BRRs were prepared because of deficits in a project's budgetary group (see Appendix B). These findings indicate a reactive rather than predictive method of controlling project expenditures.

The Division Manager should institute effective internal controls and other tools to prevent the group budget deficits that occur. The Public Works Director should hold Project Managers accountable when group budget deficits occur and discipline individuals when patterns of large dollar amount deficit conditions occur.

**Immediately Notify Project Managers When Deficits Are Discovered**

Page 24

During our review of internal charges for project and construction management services we noted that one project could not be charged for these internal services because there was not sufficient budget in the internal service budgetary group. Fiscal Management staff indicated that they wait until the next month to try to make the charge again. Rather than using this practice, we recommend that Public Works Fiscal Management notify the affected Project Manager that immediate action is needed to rectify the budget deficit.

**Develop and Enforce Project Closeout Procedures**

Page 25

We discussed with Project Managers and Public Works Fiscal Management staff our review of payments made after substantial completion and concluded that some additional guidance is needed by the Project Managers in the area of project "closeout." In addition, we found several instances of projects being closed out by transferring remaining funding to other projects rather than returning these funds to their source. Not having written and understood procedures for Project

Managers to follow after substantial completion is reached allows many projects to remain “open” for many months after this date and become a funding mechanism for other projects in need of additional budget. The Division Manager should write guidelines for the tasks that need to be completed within an acceptable number of months after substantial completion, including a requirement that any remaining project funds be returned to their source. Project Managers should also increase the frequency of their progress reports after the substantial completion date is reached so that management is informed regarding efforts to reach completion.

**Host a  
“Summit” of  
Managers  
Involved in Local  
Agency Program  
Projects**

Page 26

Several City construction projects are funded through a grant program of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) known as the Local Agency Program (LAP). This program allows the State to transfer federal and state roadway funds to City projects that affect the regional transportation network. It was learned that some difficulties have been experienced in the management of the program. The one key matter of confusion is that Project Managers believe fiscal management should be responsible for grant-related matters, while the Fiscal Manager believes the Project Managers should be responsible for these matters. Furthering these difficulties is the fact that there are no written guidelines or procedures for the many action steps that are required to occur during a LAP project’s lifecycle. As a result, reimbursements are prepared well after grant-related expenditures are made, production delays occur on projects, and funding is put at risk as a result.

We should note that the City’s relationship with FDOT is sound, but there should be an effort to rectify these continuing and manageable difficulties to ensure strong support from FDOT. In order to make improvements, the Division Manager should organize a “summit” of the parties interested in the proper management and administration of LAP funded transportation improvement projects. This group, which should include Transportation Engineering, Transportation Planning and City

grants management representation, can identify all necessary steps in the administration of this grant program and the parties responsible for these processes. In order to make this most effective, the Division Manager should name one individual with primary responsibility for managing LAP grant activities and ensure that all procedural steps are assigned to specific individuals with appropriate deadlines determined.

**Fully Utilize  
In-house Design  
Team**  
Page 29

The Public Works Department has a team of construction project designers. We inquired about the use of this resource and learned that there are no standards for utilizing this staff, and that the decision to utilize their talents is not driven by any identified procedures or considerations. As a result, the talent and economic value of using the in-house design staff may not be fully realized.

We also believe the expertise of the in-house design staff can be used to identify cost-savings on City construction projects. This can be accomplished through a process of “value engineering.” Value engineering is reviewing a construction project’s design to identify simplified construction methods, substitute more economical materials, or suggest other methods to decrease cost while maintaining a project’s aesthetics and quality.

In order to maximize the value of our in-house design staff, the Division Manager should devise a logical, considered system that indicates what types of construction projects would benefit from using the in-house design team versus a contracted design firm. In addition, Project Managers should utilize the in-house design section as “value engineers” on selected projects to ensure the City is being economical in its project designs.

**Develop  
Guidelines to  
Assist Project  
Managers in  
Effective  
Construction**

In discussions with Project Managers, we learned that no guidelines exist for assisting them with some of the important decisions they make during a project’s life cycle. One of these key decisions is the determination of the best construction delivery method for a capital project. Several factors need to be

**Delivery Methods**

Page 31

considered when making this determination, yet no reference resources are available to the Project Managers to assist in this decision process. A Project Manager suggested that some guidelines were important to help them make these decisions in an efficient and consistent way. We recommend that the Division Manager develop such guidelines to assist Project Managers to make and document the more important decisions in the management of the City's capital projects.

**Standardize  
Project Files and  
Require Status  
Reports**

Page 32

We reviewed the project files for fifteen construction projects and found that there is no standardized method for organizing project files. We also learned that no "progress report" for each project is prepared on a regular basis (see Appendix C). Our study of the Project Management industry showed that such reports are necessary to keep a record of project details for use by interested parties. We recommend that Project Managers meet to determine a uniform method of filing their project records and documentation and create a Progress Status Report form that can be efficiently completed on a regular basis.

**Improve  
Project  
Information on  
City Website**

Page 33

One of the important tasks in the Project Management field is keeping the client, and in the case of government projects, the public, well informed on the status and progress of a project. We reviewed the information on City construction projects on the Public Works Department webpage and observed that the information is a list of key dates, contacts, consultants and a brief overview of the project to date. While the information is lengthy, we believe that the presentation of the information could be improved. For this reason, we recommend that the Division Manager, with assistance from the City's Web Development Coordinator, revise its websites for each construction project by simplifying the information, making it more succinct, presentable and useful to the general public. In addition, the Division Manager should hold the Project Managers accountable for the accuracy and timeliness of the information presented on each project website.

## **BACKGROUND**

In general terms, the City of Orlando manages its capital improvement projects by using City employees in four disciplines: Project Management, Construction Management, Project Design and Fiscal Management. For many years, the employees working in the first three disciplines were assigned to the former Project/Construction Management Bureau of the Public Works Department. In 2003, Mayor Dyer's Transition Team issued its report that recommended that this bureau be disbanded and the affected employees reassigned to three existing Public Works Department Divisions (Engineering, Transportation Engineering and Wastewater), according to the types of capital projects managed by these individuals.

This reorganization did not affect the Fiscal Management section of the Public Works Director's office. This section is responsible for processing all project-related invoices and progress payments. It also prepares the monthly internal charges that bill each project for the hours each Project Manager, Construction Manager and Construction Inspector spends in support and management of the project. Perhaps most importantly, the Fiscal Management section tracks the payments made for each project and keeps the only inception-to-date record of all project-related financial transactions, including maintaining a record of each project's construction "retainage" account. Retainage is the amount of each construction progress payment that is retained by the City in order to ensure that the construction contractor completes the project to the City's standards.

During the course of this audit, the Public Works Director presented to the Mayor a plan for a further reorganization of the Project and Construction Management functions of the three affected Public Works Divisions. The Mayor has approved the creation of a Capital Improvement and Infrastructure Development Division that will include all four of the project management disciplines (Project Management, Construction Management, Project Design and Fiscal Management) under a single Division Manager who will report to the Public Works Director. Throughout this report, when the term "Division Manager" is used in a recommendation, it refers to the Capital Improvement and Infrastructure Development Division Manager.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES**

| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  | <b>RESPONSES</b> |
|---|------------------|
| 1. The Public Works Director should ensure that the Project Managers are the individuals accountable for project fiscal control by requiring their signature on each construction progress payment.   | Concur           |
| 2. The Public Works Director should institute greater control over the selection and use of Continuing Service Contractors and the reporting of compliance with contract terms.   | Concur           |
| 3. The Division Manager should institute controls to ensure that project invoices are approved by all required parties in a manner that allows the payments to be processed within the time required by the Florida Prompt Payment Act.                                       | Concur           |
| 4. The Public Works Director should direct staff to study historical data to identify acceptable ranges of internal service charges and this information should be used to both budget for internal service charges and act as performance measures for the Project Managers. | Concur           |
| 5. Project Managers should complete a form that shows the calculations used to determine the amounts budgeted for internal services and this form should be used as an attachment to the electronic Budget Revision Request when adjustments to the budget are made.          | Concur           |
| 6. The Public Works Director should require supervisors and managers to review online time reporting information each week to monitor the amount of time charged to administrative duties.  | Concur           |
| 7. The Division Manager should summarize administrative time worked by each employee group and report this information to the Public Works Director to ensure employees limit their administrative time to an acceptable level.   | Concur           |
| 8. The Public Works Fiscal Manager should lead discussions with key City staff to improve the project accounting system to eliminate the need for manual record keeping and the annual budget close out process.  | Concur           |

| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>   | <b>RESPONSES</b> |
|--|------------------|
| 9. The Division Manager should institute effective internal controls and other tools to prevent the number of group budget deficits that occur.  | Concur           |
| 10. The Public Works Director should hold Project Managers accountable for group budget deficits and discipline individuals when patterns of large dollar amount deficit conditions occur.   | Concur           |
| 11. Public Works Fiscal Management, when it becomes aware of any deficit condition in a project, should notify the affected Project Manager that action is needed to rectify the budget deficit.   | Concur           |
| 12. The Division Manager should write guidelines for the tasks that need to be completed within an acceptable number of months after substantial completion, including a requirement that any remaining project funds be returned to their source.   | Concur           |
| 13. Project Managers should increase the frequency of their progress reports after the substantial completion date is reached so that management is informed regarding what actions are being taken to bring the project to final completion.  | Concur           |
| 14. The Division Manager should organize a “summit” of the parties interested in the proper management and administration of Local Agency Program projects and this group should convene to identify all necessary steps in the administration of this grant program.  | Concur           |
| 15. The Division Manager should, in coordination with the Transportation Engineering Division Manager, name an individual with primary responsibility for managing the department’s Local Agency Program process and ensuring that all procedural steps are assigned to specific individuals with appropriate deadlines. | Concur           |
| 16. The Division Manager should devise a logical, considered system that indicates what types of construction projects should be studied to determine whether the City would benefit from using the in-house design team versus a contracted design firm.  | Concur           |

| <b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>   | <b>RESPONSES</b> |
|--|------------------|
| 17. Project Managers should utilize the in-house design section as “value engineers” on selected projects to ensure the City is being economical in its project designs.   | Concur           |
| 18. The Division Manager should develop guidelines for use by the Project Managers to determine the most effective construction delivery methods for a project and document the factors considered in this decision.   | Concur           |
| 19. Project Managers should meet to determine a uniform method of filing their project records and documentation, including updating the current “Project File Index” to refine it to meet their project management needs.   | Concur           |
| 20. Project Managers should create a Progress Status Report form that can be efficiently completed on a regular basis to document the progress of each construction project.   | Concur           |
| 21. The Division Manager, with assistance from the City’s Web Development Coordinator, should revise the website that shows information on current projects by simplifying the information, making it more succinct, presentable and useful to the general public. | Concur           |
| 22. The Division Manager should hold the Project Managers accountable for: 1) the accuracy of the information presented on the website for each project and 2) the timeliness of the information presented.  | Concur           |

## ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Objectives** The objectives of this audit were to assess the project management function's effectiveness in meeting its responsibilities and its efficiency in accomplishing its tasks. This included a review and evaluation of the effectiveness of management and administrative processes involved in project management and a determination of the effectiveness of project financial management control processes.

**Scope** The scope of this audit equates to the activity dates of each of the fifteen projects selected for review. The fifteen projects were selected based on several factors, including project cost, current phase of the contract (design, construction, completion), project manager and division. As a result, the time period covered by this review is February 2000 to December 2004 for the fifteen projects identified in Appendix A.

**Methodology** We performed tests of fifteen active capital projects managed by project management employees as listed on the City's website. We held several discussions of current procedures and practices with Project Managers, fiscal management staff and Public Works Department managers and executives. We interviewed several parties within and outside Orlando City government.

### PROJECT COST CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING

**Ensure Project Managers Are Accountable for Controlling Project Expenditures** During our review, we selected five current projects and reviewed four construction progress payments for each of these projects. We found that the payment routing form used by Public Works Fiscal Management to obtain and indicate the approval of the progress payment does not include the Project Manager. In the past, the Project Manager was required to sign this routing form to show his or her approval of the construction progress payment. While discussing this matter it was learned that this practice ended some time ago.

As a result of this practice, the Project Manager is not made aware of the progress payment and, therefore, may not be fully aware of the extent of the payments made on the construction

phase of the project under his or her management. This is curious since several individuals have told us that they consider the Project Manager to be the individual most responsible for the fiscal control of the City's capital projects.

We believe that the Project Manager should be involved in the construction payment approval process as the manager should be the primary party responsible for the fiscal control of the City's construction projects. It is very important for the Project Managers to be aware of the progress of the construction of their assigned projects and one way is to have them involved in the review of progress payments. The Public Works Director should ensure that the Project Managers are accountable for project fiscal control by requiring them to sign to indicate approval for construction progress payments.

**Recommendation 1.**

We recommend that the Public Works Director ensure that the Project Managers are the individuals accountable for project fiscal control by requiring their signature on each construction progress payment.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Increase Controls over Selection, Tracking and Reporting of Continuing Service Contracts**

The City has a number of Continuing Service Contracts for certain recurring services performed for the Public Works Department. These services include Architectural Services, Civil Engineering, Soils Testing, Survey Services and others. Each Project Manager is responsible for administering an assigned number of these contracts and leading the effort to renew existing contracts or open the services to the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) process. While reviewing this area, we inquired into efforts made to track the payments made to contractors under these agreements and whether it is appropriate to rotate work to all contractors retained to perform a certain service. We found that Project Managers do not take any action to track the use of each contractor.

We reviewed the payments made to the City's continuing service

contractors by reviewing the information on payments available in the JD Edwards accounting system. This review revealed that some contractors for certain services are utilized more often than others. During our detailed testing of payments made for Continuing Service Contracts we found one case where a contractor that was authorized to perform work did not perform this work until many months after the authorized date. As a result, the contractor was paid for work that did not meet the accepted conditions of the work order and the timeframe outlined in the work agreement presented to City Council. While the Project Manager indicated that the contractor was granted verbal extensions because the project experienced several delays, we feel that a tracking system could have discovered this delay and stimulate efforts to amend the agreement in question.

When we further inquired into the possibility of Project Managers increasing their duties in this area, we were informed that, in their opinion, the Project Managers do not have adequate administrative support or enough time of their own to add a comprehensive management or administrative process for tracking the use of the Continuing Service Contracts. While this may be the case, it is important for all contracts of the City to be managed and information gathered on the effectiveness of the contract, the effectiveness of the contractor, and the adherence to contract terms. In addition, if contractors are replying to our RFQs, being interviewed and asked to review and sign a contract with the City but do not receive work assignments, we will have cost both the City and contractor the resources dedicated to the RFQ and contractor selection process.

The Public Works Director should institute a process to track and periodically analyze the use of Continuing Service Contractors. This analysis should include the creation of appropriate management reports to inform managers of the recent engagements of the contractors, the quality of their work, and their adherence to contract terms.

**Recommendation 2.** We recommend that the Public Works Director institute greater control over the selection and use of Continuing Service Contractors and the reporting of compliance with contract terms.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Improve Controls  
over Invoice  
Approvals**

The payments made for construction projects should be approved by the required managers in a timely manner. This is important for two reasons: 1) to remain in accordance with the terms of our agreements with contractors and 2) to adhere to the provisions of the Florida Prompt Payment Act, which states that payments are required within 25 days of the date the invoice is stamped as received by the City. Our testing of selected construction, design and other invoices indicated a lack of control over payment timeliness and proper payment authorization by the individuals involved in managing this process.

During this testing, we selected five projects and reviewed four construction or design invoices (depending on the phase of the contract) for each project. We also selected a total of 25 invoices from 6 projects for other continuing services (soils testing, consulting, etc.). We found 2 of the 4 payments made to the Conway Road Improvement project's design consultant were not approved by the Project Manager in a timely manner and resulted in payments made more than 25 days after the date the invoice was received by the City. We found that 2 of the 4 payments made to the construction contactor for the Mercy Drive Improvements project did not have the proper approvals.

For the other continuing service invoices, we found that 2 of the 3 selected for the Conway Road project did not have the proper approvals and 2 of the 6 invoices selected for the Mercy Drive project did not have the proper approvals.

It is very important for all required managers (Construction Manager, Division Manager and Public Works Director) each

sign the pay requests to indicate their approval. It is equally important for these approvals to be made in a timely manner since the invoices are not entered into the City's Accounts Payable system until the Project Manager indicates approval. We recommend that the Division Manager be responsible for ensuring that the proper individuals approve project payments in a timely manner to end any delays in payment processing.

**Recommendation 3.**

We recommend that the Division Manager institute controls to ensure that project invoices are approved by all required parties in a manner that allows the payments to be processed within the time required by the Florida Prompt Payment Act.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Determine  
Acceptable Range  
of Internal  
Service Charges**

During our audit, we reviewed the project and construction management cost reimbursement process and reviewed Budget Revision Requests (BRRs) for the projects we selected for review. These tests indicated that there was no apparent pattern or order to the amount of project and construction management services that are charged to construction projects. In addition, discussions with the Project Managers noted that there are no guidelines or acceptable limits that have been created to control the amount of project and construction management charges that are made to City construction projects.

We learned that Project Managers budget for these internal charges by using their judgment and do not base their budget requests on any historical information or internal guidance. For example, no information has been gathered or compiled that shows the average number of contact hours for managers and inspectors on construction projects per project type, length, scale or construction method. This information is available in historical records but has not been manipulated to determine if patterns exist which could help Project Managers effectively budget for these service costs and attempt to keep service costs within an acceptable range. We found one case where a Project Manager developed an internal form that was used to document

the number of hours needed for each internal service and further documentation of the need for each line item requested in the project budgets.

In our analysis of fifteen projects, we found that those in the construction stage had charges for project management services between 0.47 and 6.29% of the total project cost; and charges for construction management services (including inspector services) between 2.02 and 5.65% of total project cost. It should be noted that these projects were from several different construction disciplines (building, roadway, wastewater, stormwater, etc.) and further analysis of a larger number of projects could indicate patterns that could be used to develop a range of acceptable internal charges. In fact, we believe that these guidelines could become performance measures for Project Managers to adhere to and periodically report to management.

The Public Works Department should gather and analyze its internal service charges to determine the acceptable range of charges for each of its construction disciplines. These guidelines would assist Project Managers in the budgeting for these service charges as well as become performance measures that could indicate which disciplines need increased attention to lower internal charges to acceptable levels. We suggest that the use of a form acceptable to all Project Managers that shows the acceptable range of charges for internal services would both increase the information available to the Project Manager in their development of project budgets and document for the project file how each line item of the project budget was determined.

**Recommendation 4.** We recommend that the Public Works Director direct staff to study historical data to identify acceptable ranges of internal service charges and that this information be used to both budget for a project's internal service charges and act as performance measures for the Project Managers.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 5.**

We recommend that Project Managers complete a form that shows the calculations used to determine the amounts budgeted for internal services and that this form be used as an attachment to the electronic Budget Revision Request when adjustments to the budget are made.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Determine and Control Acceptable Employee Administrative Time**

We reviewed a selected month's internal charges for project management and construction management services and noted that the Public Works Fiscal Management section has an effective method, using the Kronos time and attendance system for employees to indicate on their electronic time records which projects they are working on during the workday. A summary report for each month is used to prepare the charges for these internal services to the indicated projects.

We noted during this review that these employees also "charge" time to codes that are not related to specific construction projects. These codes, Projadmin and Projavail, are used to indicate time spent on administrative duties and time available for assignment to construction projects. Our review of the selected month showed that certain individuals had charged comparably more time to the administrative code than others, and that one Construction Manager charged 40% of his hours in the month to the time available code (Projavail).

As a result of this testing, it appears that some of the time spent by Project Managers, Construction Managers and Construction Inspectors is not charged directly to projects. This is understandable as some of these individuals are responsible for administrative matters. It is also understandable that some individuals will be between projects at times. However, we believe that the use of these two administrative codes should be tracked and limited to an acceptable level both by individual and by group (i.e., Project Manager, Construction Manager, and Construction Inspector).

We inquired about the cause for the idle condition and were informed that it was unknown but that the Public Works Fiscal Manager discusses these instances with the Public Works Director each month. We believe that this management effort should not be limited to once per month after charges are made. Instead, the Public Works Director should require supervisors and managers to analyze charges made to the Projadmin and Projavail codes on a weekly basis by reviewing the online Kronos system. In addition, a performance measure of the acceptable level of administrative activity of each group should be devised and appropriate reports created to allow management to determine whether its employees and groups are keeping within established limits.

**Recommendation 6.** We recommend that the Public Works Director require supervisors and managers to review online time reporting information each week to control the amount of time charged to administrative duties.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 7.** We recommend that the Division Manager summarize time worked by each employee group and report this information to the Public Works Director to ensure employees limit their administrative time to an acceptable level.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Lead Discussions  
to Improve  
Project  
Accounting  
System**

When the City converted from the OMIS Accounting System to the JD Edwards OneWorld system, project accounting (effectively the accounting for expenditures that cross fiscal years) was configured in a way that requires Management Budget and Accounting (MBA) to “close out” each project at the end of the fiscal year and re-establish each project at the beginning of the next fiscal year. During discussion of this issue, we also learned that, as a result of this configuration, the JD Edwards system does not gather project payment information in such a way as to allow queries of the system to show project

information on an inception-to-date basis. We were informed that at the meetings held several years ago during the system upgrade from OMIS to OneWorld, it was decided by the working group that the job costing module of the new application, while compatible for project accounting and useful for carrying over projects budgets from year-to-year, was not completely effective and would be a time-consuming and costly effort to undertake. Therefore, certain concessions were made to allow an alternative method of accounting for project costs and an effort to institute innovations in project accounting were not undertaken at that time.

The first issue noted above causes the MBA budget section to process a great number of budgetary transactions in the system each year to “close out” project budgets and then after the new fiscal year begins to re-establish these project budgets. This causes additional work for MBA but also causes project budgetary information to be inaccurate for a period of time at the start of every fiscal year while the reestablishment process takes place. In effect, the Project Managers cannot rely on the information in the OneWorld system to show accurate budget to actual information. The second issue causes the Public Works Fiscal Management section to continue a long-standing process where it creates project notebooks that track the inception-to-date costs for each project. While this practice has been beneficial to several interested parties, including Audit and Evaluation, it remains an inefficient manual system in an age of integrated and electronic accounting management systems.

The City now has an opportunity to readdress the above issues as it upgrades from the JDE OneWorld application to the PeopleSoft application. PeopleSoft recently acquired JD Edwards and is converting its users to the new product. We believe that there may be benefits from studying the project accounting capabilities of the new application. Project Managers, the Public Works Fiscal Manager, Budget Manager and the Technology Management Division Application Administrator should meet to discuss whether the PeopleSoft application can be utilized to end the current problems and

limitations of the OneWorld system’s accounting for projects.

It should be noted that it is possible that PeopleSoft will eventually be acquired by Oracle over the next few years. If this causes another software change upgrade, efforts should be made to configure the Oracle system to address the weaknesses identified above.

**Recommendation 8.**

We recommend that the Public Works Fiscal Manager lead discussions with key City staff to improve the project accounting system to eliminate the need for manual record keeping and the annual budget close out process.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**PROJECT BUDGET CONTROL**

**Hold Project Managers Accountable for Preventing Group Budget Deficits**

An important fiscal control over construction projects is the budget created for these projects. This budget is the responsibility of the Project Manager. While they consult with many parties (client divisions and departments, MBA, Public Works Fiscal Management) before finalizing the budget for a project, it is primarily the responsibility of the Project Managers.

To test the control over project budgets, we examined the budget revisions made for the fifteen projects selected for review. We also reviewed the expenditures made after the substantial completion date of the four projects that had reached that milestone.

This testing revealed many cases where projects overspent their allotted group level budgets. For the fifteen projects, we examined 87 individual budget revision requests (BRRs) and found that 21 (or 24%) were made because of deficits in a project’s budgetary group (See Appendix B). While we found that many of these revisions were made when deficits were relatively minor, there were 2 instances where the deficits were over \$100,000 prior to a BRR being prepared and approved. In

addition, for the four projects that have reached substantial completion, one showed Internal Service charges totaling \$347K but authorized budget for this group of \$306K. It should be made clear that this overspending does not indicate that the entire project was at any time over budget, but it does indicate that project budgets are not being adequately controlled at the group level, as required by MBA.

This practice indicates a reactive budgetary control practice rather than a proactive process. In our opinion, it indicates a lack of concern on the part of Project Managers, who are primarily responsible for project fiscal control. The cause of this condition is the lack of control practices that help Project Managers to predict and manage possible future budgetary deficits. We noted that some Project Managers utilize ad-hoc systems to keep track of project budgets and associated expenditures.

It should be noted that MBA prepares and distributes a Project Overdraft Report on a periodic basis that shows deficit conditions for City project group budgets. The December 2004 report shows 13 instances of repeated group budget deficits in projects. Again, these deficits indicate a lack of fiscal control by the Project Managers.

In order to alleviate these conditions, it may be necessary for the Public Works Director to require individual Project Managers to be accountable by using the Project Overdraft Report as a management tool to indicate which Project Managers are not vigorously controlling project budgets. Management should consider under what conditions it should take corrective action up to and including formal discipline of the Project Managers.

In order for Project Managers to be more proactive with regards to project budgets, they need to collectively determine the practices, procedures and tools they need to help ensure that possible future group budget deficits are identified in advance. This additional fiscal control could lead to fewer BRRs and, therefore, would save time for Project Managers, budget

personnel and the Budget Review Committee. In our previous report on Budget Development, Monitoring and Change Processes, MBA asserted that projects are expected to stay within group level budgets. As noted, overdraft reports still indicate that projects are exceeding group budgets and that improvements to budgetary control are needed.

We recommend that the Project Managers be held more strictly accountable for the number of deficit situations that occur on their projects. A system of control practices should be undertaken that limits the number of deficit situations.

**Recommendation 9.** We recommend that the Division Manager institute effective internal controls and other tools to prevent the number of group budget deficits that occur.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 10.** We recommend that the Public Works Director hold Project Managers accountable for group budget deficits and discipline individuals when patterns of large dollar amount deficit conditions occur.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Immediately  
Notify Project  
Managers When  
Deficits Are  
Discovered**

During our review of one month's internal charges for internal services we noted that one project could not be charged for these internal services because there was not sufficient budget in the internal service budgetary group to pay for these charges. We asked Public Works Fiscal Management how these conditions are rectified when they arise. Staff indicated that they wait until the next month to try to make the charge and the budget is usually corrected by that time to allow the charge to take place.

As a result of this practice, the budget deficit for the internal services budgetary group may remain for a month if the Project Manager does not correct it for other reasons. Rather than the current practice, we suggest that when any budget deficit

condition is brought to the attention of fiscal management staff, it should be reported to the responsible Project Manager for immediate rectification.

**Recommendation 11.**

We recommend that Public Works Fiscal Management, when it becomes aware of any deficit condition in a project, notify the affected Project Manager that action is needed to rectify the budget deficit.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Develop and Enforce Project Closeout Procedures**

During our review of payments made after substantial completion and after discussion with Project Managers and Public Works Fiscal Management staff, we concluded that some additional guidance is needed by the Project Managers in the area of project “closeout.”

Our testing of BRRs, summarized above, also indicated a need for such guidance. For example, we found several instances of projects being closed out by transferring remaining funding to other projects rather than returning these funds to their source. We were also informed that not having written and understood procedures for Project Managers to follow after substantial completion is reached allows many projects to remain “open” for many months after this date. We believe this causes some completed projects to become potential funding sources for other projects.

At present, there is no control process in place to require the Project Manager to take action to finalize a project and close it out within an acceptable timeframe. Open projects take up “space” in the City’s accounting system, increase the number of pages required for comprehensive reports of active projects and contribute to delays in project closeout. While there are legitimate reasons for keeping some projects open, mainly those with problems with the contractor or unacceptable conditions, most projects can and should be closed out within an acceptable

number of months after substantial completion.

One action that could be taken to increase awareness of projects that have reached substantial completion and efforts being made to close out the project is to require Project Managers to increase the frequency of project progress reports once substantial completion is reached. In this way, the Division Manager and the project's client are aware of any delays and actions being taken to alleviate these delays. We believe that Project Managers should be held to a standard number of months to close out projects and that acceptable project close out procedures, including a requirement to return excess funding to its source, should be written to give Project Managers appropriate guidance on the necessary post-substantial completion tasks and requirements.

**Recommendation 12.**

We recommend that the Division Manager write guidelines for the tasks that need to be completed within an acceptable number of months after substantial completion, including a requirement that any remaining project funds be returned to their source.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 13.**

We recommend that Project Managers increase the frequency of their progress reports after the substantial completion date is reached so that management is informed regarding what actions are being taken to bring the project to final completion.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Host a "Summit"  
of Managers  
involved in Local  
Agency Program  
Projects**

Several City construction projects are funded through a grant program of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) known as the Local Agency Program (LAP). This program allows the State to transfer federal and state roadway funds to City projects that affect the regional transportation network. During discussions with several individuals, including the Public Works Fiscal Manager and a Project Manager most

knowledgeable about the LAP process, it was learned that some difficulties have been experienced in the management of the program. The one key matter of confusion is that the Project Manager believes that fiscal management should be responsible for grant-related matters, while the Fiscal Manager believes that the Project Managers should be responsible for these matters.

Furthering these difficulties is the fact that there are no written guidelines or procedures for the many action steps that are required to occur during a LAP project's lifecycle. As a result, reimbursements are prepared well after our grant-related expenditures are made, production delays occur on projects, and funding is put at risk as a result. These circumstances require the individuals involved to scramble to ensure that we report difficulties to FDOT representatives and establish firm plans for meeting their requirements.

The apparent reason for this condition is that City management has not firmly expressed who is the accountable party for managing the LAP grant processes. With shared responsibility comes confusion and uncoordinated efforts. The importance of the LAP program funding to the City's transportation system cannot be overstated. These funds are essential to funding some of the more important roadway improvement projects in the City. Any inefficiencies or ineffectiveness in administering these grants is certainly noticed by local FDOT representatives. It was reported to OAE that these officials become less inclined to assist the City when certain conditions, such as delays that cause funding to move from one State fiscal year to the next, occur. We believe that a "summit" of interested parties: Project Managers, the Division Manager, the Public Works Fiscal Manager, the Transportation Engineering Division Manager, and the Public Works, Economic Development and General Administration Directors (or their representatives), along with the City's grant coordinators should gather to document the steps needed to properly manage the LAP funded projects and that these steps be assigned to responsible parties. At the present time, the City's grant coordinators are meeting to devise the necessary policies and procedures for grants management

and coordination. Audit and Evaluation was involved in these initial meetings and did not observe any individuals who are currently responsible for managing LAP projects in attendance at these meetings. We feel that the City's grant coordination staff in the General Administration Department should be consulted to determine what tools and practices could help Public Works to more efficiently and effectively manage the LAP grant program.

Once informational meetings are held it is very important for the responsibilities of all involved staff to be memorialized in a policy manual or other document to begin to design control systems that will ensure such policies are followed and enforced. In addition, it may be most important for one individual to be named as the overall responsible party who will be held accountable if any adverse conditions arise in LAP funded projects.

**Recommendation 14.** We recommend that the Division Manager organize a "summit" of the parties interested in the proper management and administration of Local Agency Program funded transportation improvement projects and that this group convene to identify all necessary steps in the administration of this grant program.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 15.** We recommend that the Division Manager, in coordination with the Transportation Engineering Division Manager, name an individual with primary responsibility for managing the department's Local Agency Program process and who is responsible for ensuring that all procedural steps are assigned to specific individuals with appropriate deadlines.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

## **EFFICIENCY AND COST SAVINGS**

### **Fully Utilize In-house Design Team**

The Public Works Department has a team of construction project designers that are used to design some projects in-house rather than hiring an outside engineering contractor. We inquired about the use of this resource and learned that there are no standards for utilizing this staff, and that the decision to utilize their talents is not driven by any identified procedures or considerations. As a result, the talent and economic value of using the in-house design staff may not be fully realized.

During our review, we also learned of one area where the expertise of the in-house design staff may lead to cost-savings on City construction projects. This opportunity is termed “value engineering.” Value engineering is “an analysis of the functions of a ... building, facility, ... directed at improving performance, reliability, quality, safety, and life cycle costs.” Some refer to value engineering as reviewing a project’s design to simplify construction methods, substitute more economical materials, or suggest other methods to decrease cost while maintaining a project’s aesthetics and quality. Some individuals we spoke with believe that the City may not be doing all it can to determine whether cost savings may be available in the design of projects prior to accepting the project design and proceeding to the construction phase of a project.

For example, there is no one (other than the assigned Project Manager) who is dedicated to evaluating proposed designs for elements that are “nice to haves” but could be changed or altered in some way to obtain savings while still meeting the needs of the client. At present, there is no incentive for Project Managers, design staff or others to point out these items to management to determine whether savings should be sought. We assert that Public Works should take the role of a reasoned approach to a project, meeting the clients needs at the most competitive and economic price for the City. Utilizing the expertise of the internal design team to act as the City’s value engineers and give feedback to executive management and clients on how project designs could be altered to realize cost savings would increase the value of the services provided by

Public Works and save the City valuable construction funds.

Therefore, as a first step, we believe that procedures and/or a checklist should be created that identifies the items, facts, or circumstances that should be considered by Project Managers in their determination of whether to utilize the talents of City staff as the most economical and practical method for completely designing an upcoming City construction project. In order to effectively consider all aspects of this decision, the City should have procedures that guide the decision maker through all items that should be measured and considered to determine and compare the value the City would receive from an in-house design and one prepared by a design contractor.

Secondly, the Project Manager should be required to involve the design staff when projects utilize contracted design firms. The design team should be involved both throughout project design and include formal and written recommendation for cost-saving alternatives and other “value engineering” services. The Project Manager should consider these recommendations, and decisions to act on these recommendations should become part of a project’s file documentation. When savings are realized these circumstances should be reported to the Public Works Director.

**Recommendation 16.**

We recommend that the Division Manager devise a logical, considered system that indicates what types of construction projects should be studied to determine whether the City would benefit from using the in-house design team versus a contracted design firm.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 17.**

We recommend that Project Managers utilize the in-house design section as “value engineers” on selected projects to ensure the City is being economical in its project designs.

**Response**

We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Develop  
Guidelines to  
Assist Project  
Managers in  
Effective  
Construction  
Delivery Methods**

During this review, we held discussions with each Project Manager on the processes and practices used to manage a capital project for City government. We were told that no formal processes and practices are maintained or followed by the Project Managers. One example of an important decision process required of a Project Manager is the determination of the best construction delivery method for a project. We noted that the City uses three main construction delivery methods: “hard bid”, Construction Manager at Risk, and Design Build. We were told that each of these methods has its strengths and weaknesses. During the initial phases of a project, the Project Manager, in consultation with the Public Works Director and other knowledgeable technical staff, determines the correct construction delivery method for a project. We were told that this determination depends on several factors, including the type of capital project, the availability and reliability of construction contractors in our area, the size and scope of the project, and other factors. We inquired about the documentation of this determination and were told that none is required.

One Project Manager believed that this decision process is one of several decisions important enough to require a more formal consideration of all the factors necessary to determine the most effective construction delivery method. We concur with this assessment and believe that a more formal consideration process would result in an efficiencies and consistency. We suggest that the Division Manager document guidelines for factors to be considered and steps necessary to make each important decision in a project’s life cycle, including the most appropriate construction delivery method. These decision processes should also be documented in each project file.

**Recommendation 18.**

We recommend that the Division Manager develop guidelines for use by the Project Managers to determine the most effective construction delivery methods for a project and document the factors considered in this decision.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

## **PROJECT DOCUMENTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS**

### **Standardize Project Files and Require Status Reports**

We performed a detailed review of the project information managed by the Project Managers. We noted two major findings in this area.

First, there is no uniform and consistent method used by the Project Managers to organize the great amount of information that becomes a project file record. Many of the Project Managers utilize a "Project File Index" that was once used by the previous Project/Construction Management Bureau and store the project folders in a centralized file room. But all Project Managers do not use these practices. Therefore, there is no consistent sequence of project documents and information and no set of guidelines for managing project information.

Second, we found that there is no procedure that requires the Project Managers to periodically document project progress. Our review of project management standard practices and discussions with project managers at OUC and Orange County indicated that the use of progress reports is an important communication tool that both documents project conditions as of a point in time and informs Public Works and client management regarding the project in progress. Since the project files do not contain progress information in a standard format on a regular schedule, it is difficult to determine whether projects are on time and on-budget at any point in their history. We believe that these items are the most important considerations by which the Project Managers should be held accountable.

We should note that the Project Managers have not received direction on what items are important to include in project files, as noted above. This includes any need for periodic project progress reports. A website is used to show some important project information, which is discussed in the next section of

this report, but this information is incomplete (see Appendix C).

It is most important for the City to have a complete record of its construction projects for many reasons. First, if any legal action occurs because of a project, this information will be crucial to use as defense against claims and charges. Second, the client needs to be kept informed of the progress of the project in order to monitor and give feedback to the Project Managers. Third, having the Project Managers take time to memorialize project conditions at a point in time alerts management to the difficulties the project is facing and how to best utilize staff to address these difficulties. We contend that short, but detailed, progress reports can be efficiently created for each construction project managed by the City.

**Recommendation 19.** We recommend that Project Managers meet to determine a uniform method of filing their project records and documentation, including updating the current “Project File Index” to refine it to meet their project management needs.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 20.** We recommend that Project Managers create a Progress Status Report form that can be efficiently completed on a regular basis to document the progress of each construction project.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

**Improve Project Information on City Website**

Information regarding the active construction projects of the City is included on the City’s Internet website. However, our review showed that this information, while lengthy, is not organized in the most effective manner. The information is presented in a long listing of key dates, contact names and telephone numbers and a brief summary of current project status. Although a standardized form is used to present this information, our review of this information for fifteen current projects showed that many of the items are not consistently completed. In addition, no explanation is given for the lack of

information presented.

The information, while voluminous, is not organized in a fashion that is “user-friendly” or effective in reporting the status of a project at a point in time. The information as currently shown on the project websites seems more suited for internal use rather than as an effective method to inform the general public.

In addition, we found that some of the information included on the websites in question is not complete and is outdated. We obtained a listing of all City projects from the JD Edwards accounting system and reviewed them to determine which projects have had recent charges for project and construction management services. We found several projects where this was the case, but did not find the projects listed on the City’s website listing all current projects.

We also briefly reviewed the information presented for the fifteen projects selected for review to determine if it is accurate. We found some inaccuracies and some project information that had not been updated recently. As of the date of our review, the information for three projects was not updated in over 2 ½ months.

In order to improve its effectiveness, the Project Management Internet website should be redesigned with the following goals in mind: simplicity, consistency, importance and functionality. Links could be included to email the assigned Project Manager for additional information rather than listing all information for the public to sort through to get to the information most vital to them. If detailed information is important for internal use, the existing project information websites should be moved to the City’s Intranet site for exclusive use by City employees.

Project Managers should be required to update the website information on a regular basis and be accountable for the accuracy of the information presented for their assigned projects.

**Recommendation 21.** We recommend that the Division Manager, with assistance from the City’s Web Development Coordinator, revise the website that shows information on current projects by simplifying the information, making it more succinct, presentable and useful to the general public.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

**Recommendation 22.** We recommend that the Division Manager hold the Project Managers accountable for: 1) the accuracy of the information presented on the website for each project and 2) the timeliness of the information presented.

**Response** We concur. We will implement within 12 months.

---

## APPENDIX A – PROJECTS SELECTED FOR REVIEW

| <u>Project Name</u>                                | <u>Project Cost to Date</u><br><u>(As of Dec. 14, 2004,</u><br><u>rounded)</u> |
|--|--|
| Beverly Shores Neighborhood Sewer Improvement      | \$4,506,000  |
| Clear Lake Park                                    | 1,080,000  |
| College Park Community Center                      | 94,000   |
| Conserv I Flow Diversion                           | 1,021,000  |
| Conway Road Widening Improvement                   | 854,000  |
| Eagles Nest Cornerstone Park                       | 6,720,000  |
| Iron Bridge Deep Bed Filter                        | 2,776,000  |
| Iron Bridge Odor Control                           | 2,548,000  |
| Jefferson Street Parking Garage                    | 417,000  |
| Lake Breeze Drive Roundabout                       | 267,000  |
| Little Lake Fairview Restoration                   | 68,000   |
| Mercy Drive Improvements                           | 4,958,000  |
| Orange Ave. and Pineloch Intersection Improvements | 673,000  |
| Parramore Heritage Stormwater Management Facility  | 5,380,000  |
| Water Conserv II Rib Site 2                        | 3,238,000  |

## APPENDIX B – BUDGET REVISION REQUEST ANALYSIS

| <u>Project Name</u>                                | <u>Number of<br/>Budget Revisions<br/>Reviewed</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Budget Deficits<br/>Corrected</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|--|--|--|-------------------|
| Beverly Shores Neighborhood Sewer Improvement      | 6  | 1  | 17%               |
| Clear Lake Park                                    | 9  | 6  | 67%               |
| College Park Community Center                      | 2  | 0  | 0%                |
| Conserv I Flow Diversion                           | 7  | 2  | 29%               |
| Conway Road Widening Improvement                   | 1  | 0  | 0%                |
| Eagles Nest Cornerstone Park                       | 15   | 4  | 27%               |
| Iron Bridge Deep Bed Filter                        | 6  | 0  | 0%                |
| Iron Bridge Odor Control                           | 4  | 1  | 25%               |
| Jefferson Street Parking Garage                    | 3  | 0  | 0%                |
| Lake Breeze Drive Roundabout                       | 7  | 2  | 29%               |
| Little Lake Fairview Restoration                   | 4  | 0  | 0%                |
| Mercy Drive Improvements                           | 4  | 1  | 25%               |
| Orange Ave. and Pineloch Intersection Improvements | 3  | 2  | 67%               |
| Parramore Heritage Stormwater Management Facility  | 11   | 0  | 0%                |
| Water Conserv II Rib Site 2                        | 5  | 2  | 40%               |
| <b>TOTALS</b>                                      | <b>87</b>  | <b>21</b>  | <b>24%</b>        |

## APPENDIX C – SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION DATE ANALYSIS

| <u>Project Name</u>                                | <u>Estimated Substantial Completion Date</u> | <u>Actual Substantial Completion Date</u> | <u>Comments</u>  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Beverly Shores Neighborhood Sewer Improvement      | 6/7/04                                       | Not Listed                                | Website states that substantial completion reached but no date is listed |
| Clear Lake Park                                    | 4/26/04                                      | Not Listed                                | Website notes that project is “slightly behind” schedule                 |
| College Park Community Center                      | TBA  | TBA                                       | Construction Phase just beginning  |
| Conserv I Flow Diversion                           | TBA  | TBA                                       | Obtaining easements and permits  |
| Conway Road Widening Improvement                   | TBA  | TBA                                       | Design Phase continuing  |
| Eagles Nest Cornerstone Park                       | 2/16/04                                      | 2/27/04                                   |  |
| Iron Bridge Deep Bed Filter                        | 8/4/05                                       | N/A                                       | Construction Phase continuing  |
| Iron Bridge Odor Control                           | 11/2/03                                      | 4/5/04                                    |  |
| Jefferson Street Parking Garage                    | TBA  | TBA                                       | Design phase completed   |
| Lake Breeze Drive Roundabout                       | 2/16/04                                      | 6/24/04                                   |  |
| Little Lake Fairview Restoration                   | TBA  | TBA                                       | Project in pre-design phase  |
| Mercy Drive Improvements                           | 5/16/04                                      | Not listed                                | Project completed but no date is listed                                  |
| Orange Ave. and Pineloch Intersection Improvements | 10/28/04                                     | Not listed                                | Website shows work continuing on 11/30/04.                               |
| Parramore Heritage Stormwater Management Facility  | 4/15/04                                      | 5/19/04                                   |  |
| Water Conserv II Rib Site 2                        | 6/12/04                                      | 9/24/04                                   |  |