



# CITY OF ORLANDO

---

## Office of Audit Services and Management Support

### MEMORANDUM

To: Frank Billingsley, Economic Development Director

From: Beryl H. Davis, CPA, CGFM, Director  
Office of Audit Services and Management Support

Re: Follow-Up of Audit of the Permitting Services Division Special Project (Report No. 07-06)

Date: January 26, 2007

Attached is a summary of the status of recommendations as determined from our follow-up review of the "Permitting Services Division Special Project" (*Report No. 06-10*), issued April 17, 2006. Our review procedures consisted of staff inquiries and a review of the status of the recommendations provided by management. Our follow-up was made in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, except that we did not perform substantial tests of evidence supporting the replies from the officials responsible for resolving audit findings and recommendations.

**Two of the eight recommendations in the original report are implemented. Two are partially implemented, one is planned for implementation and one is not implemented. Two recommendations are no longer applicable.** The recommendation not implemented regards the development of a performance goal for the inspection "rollovers" of the Division. We continue to believe that determining performance standards for this area would improve the customer service of the Division.

Every year, we perform an annual follow-up on all city-wide recommendations that have not been fully implemented. Report recommendations #4, 5, 7 and 8 will be reviewed again during this annual process.

We wish to thank the officials and personnel of the Economic Development Department and Permitting Division for their cooperation and response to the follow-up request.

Maryann Bonk, Performance Optimization Manager, performed this follow-up review.

BHD/am

#### Attachment

c: Honorable Buddy Dyer, Mayor  
Cheryl J. Henry, Chief of Staff  
Byron W. Brooks, Chief Administrative Officer  
Rebecca W. Sutton, Chief Financial Officer  
Brooke D. Rimmer-Bonnett, Deputy Director, Economic Development Department  
Timothy L. Johnson, Permitting Division Manager

**REPLY AND IMPLEMENTATION SUMMARY  
FOLLOW-UP REVIEW OF AUDIT OF PERMITTING SERVICES DIVISION SPECIAL PROJECT**

#	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	CURRENT STATUS	IMPLEMENTATION DATE	AUDITEE COMMENTS
1.	The Permitting Services Division should increase its number of inspectors by <b>six</b> to reduce backlogs, meet customer demands and increase customer satisfaction.	Concur	Implemented	December 2006	Permitting Services agrees and will begin implementation. Permitting received 8 new positions. At this time 5 are filled, 3 “in-process.”
2.	The Permitting Services Division should analyze economic development activity, with assistance from City Planning, to forecast future customer demand for permitting services.	Concur	Implemented	Draft of the forecast chart submitted to CAO/and EDV Director in December	Permitting Services agrees and is developing a comparison diagram to track and forecast the anticipated permitting volume.
3.	The Permitting Services Division should determine performance standards for the average number of inspections that should be performed each day by its inspectors.	Concur	No Longer Applicable		Permitting Services disagrees with determining and setting an average number. There is no uniform method of measuring inspection times and length of inspections. Audit Services and Management Support (ASMS) concurs and suggests Permitting continue to review aggregate productivity on an annual basis.
4.	The Permitting Services Division should identify an acceptable level of “rollovers” and include this as a performance goal in its annual Business Plan.	Concur	Not Implemented	No Action	Permitting Services agrees with limiting the number of “rollovers”. However there is not an acceptable level for performance measurement.
5.	The Permitting Services Division should use the forecasts and performance standards to evaluate staffing levels and report to the Director its projected staffing needs.	Concur	Partially Implemented	On-going	Forecasting charts are being developed to determine the volume, which will be used to evaluate the staffing needs.

**REPLY AND IMPLEMENTATION SUMMARY**  
**FOLLOW-UP REVIEW OF AUDIT OF PERMITTING SERVICES DIVISION SPECIAL PROJECT**

#	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSE	CURRENT STATUS	IMPLEMENTATION DATE	AUDITEE COMMENTS
6.	The Permitting Services Division should review the current re-inspection fee to determine whether raising it will decrease the number of re-inspections.	Concur	No Longer Applicable	No Action	Permitting Services disagrees – raising the fee would discourage but is not the true source of excessive re-inspections. Last increase in fee was 2002 and there is concern that another increase so soon will not be well received by those affected. ASMS concurs. The City fee is \$50 and the County fee is \$30. A further increase is not warranted and alternative methods are needed to review re-inspections to determine their cause and develop possible solutions.
7.	The Permitting Services Division should discuss with Fleet Management what options exist for assigning a vehicle to act as a “spare” vehicle for its inspectors.	Concur	Planned for Implementation	On-going	Permitting Services agrees and will discuss with the Fleet Services Division.
8.	The Permitting Services Division should determine and report the benefits and efficiencies of its take home vehicle “pilot” program.	Concur	Partially Implemented	On-going	Permitting Services has completed the pilot program and is formatting data for further review – A policy has been compiled for review.