

Office of Inspector General

Robert E. Clift, Inspector General 

Advisory Report No. 14P-1003

August 12, 2014

Maintenance Office Work Document Process Review

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this engagement was to conduct a review of the Office of Maintenance's Contract Management section (Maintenance Contract Management) work document process including the procedures and controls. Maintenance Contract Management is responsible for developing and maintaining policies, procedures, scopes of services, contract specifications and a variety of other contract administration tools and systems. The section also performs quality assurance reviews of districts to ensure compliance with policies and procedures.

Our review included the evaluation of policies, procedures and processes; interviews of Department of Transportation (department) staff; reviews of maintenance work document driven contracts and their associated work documents and contractor invoices; and reviews of the maintenance work document review portion of the Maintenance Office quality assurance reviews (QAR) conducted by Maintenance Contract Management staff.

Maintenance work document driven contracts are executed to provide certain maintenance activities described in the contract. Contractors are selected based on low bid. The department determines where and when the contractor provides services. Contract maintenance work documents, Form No. 375-020-05, are issued to the contractor detailing the location and work to be completed. The maintenance work document is initiated by department staff who completes the item number, location, work description and estimated work units on the form. The contractor fills in the actual work units¹ on the form and initials and dates for each item upon completion of each item.

For maintenance work document driven contracts, the department inspects the job site at a frequency necessitated by the type of activity being performed. Contract specifications determine the acceptable manner of performing the work. The department inspector verifies the contractor completed work when the document is submitted to the district. The department inspector initials and dates the maintenance

¹ Actual work units are work units completed as identified by the contractor.

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

work document for each item upon verifying the actual work units filled out by the contractor. These dates are the official dates of acceptance.

Finding number one is additional internal controls are needed to adequately protect the department from fraud, waste and abuse. There is a lack of centralized direction and sufficient procedures, which has led to inconsistent usage and information on maintenance work documents. We also found three different versions of the maintenance work document in use at various district maintenance yards/operations centers.

To strengthen internal controls, we recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance implement sufficient, detailed procedures to ensure the maintenance work document process is consistent, predictable and repeatable (CPR) statewide. The procedure should include: instructions for completing the maintenance work document; instructions for approving changes to items and quantities; and the current version of the maintenance work document form. **We also recommend** formalized training on completing maintenance work documents and processing of invoice payments.

Finding number two is the maintenance work document review portion of the Maintenance Office Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan is ineffective.

- There are no formal procedures for conducting the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR.
- The form used to conduct the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR does not contain signoffs or dates.
- Using the current methodology, a district can receive a QAR score indicating overall compliance when some contracts have highly non-compliant scores.

We recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance ensure:

- a formal procedure and consistent methodology is developed and implemented for use when conducting the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR. These procedures should include a standardized form for completion that includes signatures and dates by the reviewer. They should also include a method to follow-up on district corrective actions; and
- the methodology for calculating district overall compliance on the maintenance work documents include a requirement that none of the individual contracts have a non-compliant QAR score.

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION</u>	4
<u>RESULTS OF REVIEW</u>	5
Finding 1 – Internal Controls	6
Finding 2 – Quality Assurance Reviews	7
<u>APPENDIX</u>	
A. Purpose, Scope and Methodology	9
B. Summary Table of Maintenance Work Documents Reviewed	10
C. Management Response	11
<u>DISTRIBUTION, PROJECT TEAM AND STATEMENT OF ACCORDANCE</u>	13
<u>ATTACHMENT</u>	
1. Contract Maintenance Work Document Form 375-020-05	14
2. E4M84-R1 maintenance work document example	15
3. E4M84-R1 maintenance work document example #2	16
4. E3K77 maintenance work document example	17
5. E3K77 maintenance work document example #2	18
6. Maintenance work document QAR example	19
7. Maintenance work document QAR summary example	20

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

This engagement was conducted based on a complaint received and investigated by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Investigations Section. It was alleged a prime contractor on a maintenance contract fraudulently billed the department for the performance of routine maintenance work on a department contract. During the investigation, inadequacies in the controls for the contract monitoring process were identified and forwarded to the OIG Audit Section.

Maintenance Contract Management is responsible for developing and maintaining policies, procedures, scopes of services, contract specifications and a variety of other contract administration tools and systems. The section also performs QARs of districts to ensure compliance with policies and procedures.

Maintenance work document driven contracts are executed to provide certain maintenance activities described in the contract. Contractors are selected based on low bid. The department determines where and when the contractor provides services. Contract maintenance work documents, Form No. 375-020-05 (see Attachment 1), are issued to the contractor detailing the location and work to be completed. The maintenance work document is initiated by department staff who completes the item number, location, work description and estimated work units on the form. The contractor fills in the actual work units on the form and initials and dates for each item upon completion of each item.

For maintenance work document driven contracts, the department inspects the job site at a frequency necessitated by the type of activity being performed. Contract specifications determine the acceptable manner of performing the work. The department inspector verifies the contractor completed work when the document is submitted to the district. The department inspector initials and dates the maintenance work document for each item upon verifying the actual work units filled out by the contractor. These dates are the official dates of acceptance.

Each maintenance yard/operations center maintains their own contracts, initiates work with the contractor by issuing a maintenance work document and has inspectors to inspect the contractor's work for accuracy and completeness.

After the maintenance work is approved and accepted by the department, the contractor invoices the department. Contractor payments are based on approved pay item quantities obtained from the maintenance work documents. However, contractors are not required to attach the associated maintenance work documents when they invoice the department. In order for department staff to verify invoiced items, they would need to locate the appropriate maintenance work documents and review the quantities

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

recorded as actual work performed to ensure the inspector's concurrence. The department processes the payment through Trns*port SiteManager.²

RESULTS OF REVIEW

We evaluated 422 maintenance work documents from a judgmental sample of 57 maintenance work document driven contracts³ for compliance with procedures.

The following table shows a breakdown of the 422 maintenance work documents reviewed at six maintenance yards/operation centers.

District	Maintenance yard/ operations center	Number of maintenance work documents reviewed
2	Lake City	167
2	Perry	34
3	Marianna	18
3	Midway	69
4	Ft. Pierce	39
4	West Palm	95
	Total	422

Of the 422 maintenance work documents reviewed, we attempted to determine department work unit or cost estimates differing from contractor actual work unit or cost. Since not all maintenance work documents contained total unit/cost estimates and actual unit/cost totals, we could only determine overages in estimates versus actuals for 137 of the 422 maintenance work documents. We found the following examples during our fieldwork:

- **Large differences between estimated versus actual work units or cost on maintenance work documents.** There were 137 maintenance work documents (32%) where either actual work units or actual dollars filled in by the contractor exceeded the estimates filled in by department staff. The total overage in the 137 maintenance work documents was 265,350 units and the total dollar overage was \$361,344.⁴ An example of these overages was tree removal/pruning and trimming:
 - For contract E4M84-R1 in District 4 Palm Beach Operations Center, for pruning and trimming palms, the work unit estimate was 600; however, the actual work units were 2,231. This, along with other changes, increased the

² A department system where periodic pay estimates can be generated based on completed work quantities.

³ Contract total of \$13,173,809

⁴ Overages in actual work units or actual dollar amounts could be due to a zero or blank estimate.

- maintenance work document amount from an estimate of \$18,000 to an actual of \$120,252 (see Attachment 2).
- For contract E4M84-R1 for trees, the actual work units exceeded the estimated work units. For example, one maintenance work document which had pruning and trimming 4" to 24" estimated work units at 100 and the actual work units were 250. This, along with other changes, increased the maintenance work document amount from \$11,087 to \$45,577 (see Attachment 3).
 - For contract E3K77 in District 3 Midway Operations Center, for tree removal, the actual work units exceeded estimated work units. One maintenance work document had tree removal for 13" to 24" estimated at 100 and the actual removal was 475 (see Attachment 4). Another maintenance work document had tree removal for 13" to 24" estimated at 100 and the actual removal was 300 (see Attachment 5).

We identified two findings which are described below.

Finding 1 – Internal Controls

Additional internal controls are needed to adequately protect the department from fraud, waste and abuse. There is a lack of centralized direction and sufficient procedures, which has led to inconsistent usage and information on maintenance work documents.

Procedure No. 375-020-002, Maintenance Contract Administration, Inspection and Reporting, Section 6 states that all contract maintenance work documents shall be issued by the department and shall identify the location, description and scope of work to be accomplished. During site visits, we determined there was a lack of guidance on preparing maintenance work documents. Also, maintenance work documents contained changes to items and quantities without indication of department approval.

We identified errors and inconsistencies in maintenance work documents, including (see Appendix B for summary table):

- 378 (90%) contained all of the dates accepted and inspector initials.
- 362 (86%) contained all of the dates completed and contractor initials.
- 360 (85%) contained actual work units completed as identified by the contractor.
- 357 (85%) contained estimated work units from department staff.
- 218 (52%) contained contractor initials for date received, as specified by the maintenance work document.

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

- 207 (49%) were the correct version of Form No. 375-020-05, revised in October 2010.

The primary reason for these errors and inconsistencies is a lack of guidance for changes or additions to maintenance work documents, resulting in inconsistent methodology throughout the districts. Procedure No. 375-020-002 does not provide guidance for changes or additions to maintenance work documents. Due to a lack of internal controls, such as lack of guidance and department approvals, the following risks exist:

- contractors could submit an invoice for work not completed;
- the state could pay for work not completed; and
- contractor's invoices for payment could exceed funds available on contract.

To strengthen internal controls, we recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance implement sufficient, detailed procedures to ensure the maintenance work document process is CPR statewide. The procedure should include: instructions for completing the maintenance work document; instructions for approving changes to items and quantities; and the current version of the maintenance work document form. **We also recommend** formalized training on completing maintenance work documents and processing of invoice payments.

Finding 2 – Quality Assurance Reviews

The maintenance work document review portion of the Maintenance Office Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan is ineffective.

The Office of Maintenance develops an annual Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan which includes conducting a QAR in each district office and one maintenance yard/operation center per district annually. In order to be compliant, a district or maintenance yard/operation center must receive at least an overall compliance indicator of 90%. Compliance is based on maintenance work documents being properly completed and containing appropriate signatures. Maintenance Contract Management staff perform the maintenance work document review portion of these QARs on the maintenance yards/operation centers.

We reviewed the maintenance work document portion of the following QARs:

District	Maintenance Yard/ Operation Center	Year QAR conducted	# contracts reviewed
2	Gainesville	2013	5
3	Marianna	2011	3
3	Midway	2013	3
4	Ft. Pierce	2011	4
4	West Palm	2013	2

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

We attempted to review the maintenance work document portion corresponding to our site visits. However, Lake City and Perry maintenance yards/operation centers have not had a QAR conducted recently.

- There are no formal procedures for conducting the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR.
- The form used to conduct the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR does not contain signoffs or dates (see Attachment 6).
- Using the current methodology, a district can receive a QAR score indicating overall compliance when some contracts have highly non-compliant scores. As shown in the table below, even though three of five contracts had scores below the 90% threshold currently used to determine compliance, the overall district score was determined to be in compliance (because of the high number of overall items tested on a single contract).

Contract	QAR Score	Percentage
E2P24-R0	19/21	90%
E2R63	8/31	26%
E2M89-R2	46/88	52%
E2L49-R2	108/124	87%
E2M56-R1	1061/1100	96%
Overall Total	1242/1364	91%

The risks associated with no formal procedures, no signoffs or dates and the scoring methodology is that districts may not have CPR QARs, there is no accountability for the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR and non-compliant contracts may have a higher dollar value than the compliant contracts.

We recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance ensure:

- a formal procedure and consistent methodology is developed and implemented for use when conducting the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR. These procedures should include a standardized form for completion that includes signatures and dates by the reviewer. They should also include a method to follow-up on district corrective actions; and
- the methodology for calculating district overall compliance on the maintenance work documents include a requirement that none of the individual contracts have a non-compliant QAR score.

APPENDIX A – Purpose, Scope and Methodology

The **purpose** of this engagement was to conduct a process review of the Contract Management section within the Office of Maintenance to include the procedures, processes and controls for maintenance work documents.

The **scope** of the advisory included all processes, procedures and documents pertaining to maintenance work documents for January 2011 through November 2013.

The **methodology** included:

- reviewing applicable statutes, policies and procedures;
- creating and distributing a questionnaire regarding processes;
- creating testing procedures for use at maintenance yards/operation centers;
- conducting site visits to evaluate maintenance work document processes and procedures within the department;
- reviewing maintenance work documents from a sample of maintenance work document driven contracts;
- reviewing contractor invoices related to those maintenance work documents;
- reviewing the maintenance work document portion of the QAR; and
- interviewing appropriate department staff.

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

APPENDIX B – Summary Table of Maintenance Work Documents Reviewed

The table below summarizes our review of maintenance work documents to determine if items were completed.

Maintenance Work Document Item	Was the listed item completed?				
	Yes	No	N/A ⁵	% Yes	% No
1. Estimated dollars provided by department staff	74	347	1	18%	82%
2. Actual dollars provided by contractor	102	319	1	24%	76%
3. Actual work units or dollars exceeded either estimated work units or dollars	137	227	58	32%	54%
4. Date received initialed by contractor	218	200	4	52%	47%
5. Most up-to-date maintenance work document form used	207	171	44	49%	41%
6. Estimated work units provided by department staff	357	64	1	85%	15%
7. Actual work units completed as identified by contractor	360	61	1	85%	14%
8. All dates completed and contractor initials	362	60	-	86%	14%
9. Department signoff on maintenance work document	362	52	8	86%	12%
10. All dates accepted and inspector initials	378	44	-	90%	10%
11. Contractor signoff on maintenance work document	395	19	8	94%	5%

⁵ Unable to determine

APPENDIX C – Management Response

The Office of Maintenance Director provided the following response on August 5, 2014.

FINDING 1 – INTERNAL CONTROLS:

Additional internal controls are needed to adequately protect the department from fraud, waste and abuse. There is a lack of centralized direction and sufficient procedures, which has led to inconsistent usage and information on maintenance work documents.

Office of Maintenance response: We concur with the finding.

To strengthen internal controls, we recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance implement sufficient, detailed procedures to ensure the maintenance work document process is CPR statewide. The procedure should include: instructions for completing the maintenance work document; instructions for approving changes to items and quantities; and the current version of the maintenance work document form.

Office of Maintenance response: We concur with the recommendation. We plan to implement in our existing procedure during the next scheduled review cycle, which is occurring right now. We also plan to concurrently revise, improve and update our current work document form. The target date for implementation is January 1, 2015.

We also recommend formalized training on completing maintenance work documents and processing of invoice payments.

Office of Maintenance response: We concur with the recommendation. We conceive of a GoTo Meeting type of training that can be done statewide without travel cost. We plan to commence hosting these trainings by October 1, 2014.

FINDING 2 – QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEWS:

The maintenance work document review portion of the Maintenance Office Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan is ineffective.

Office of Maintenance response: Although, we concur that the work document review of the Maintenance Office Quality Assurance Monitoring Plan is not as effective as it could be. We want to point out that it has been effective in dramatically improving District work document efforts over the last several years. Before we conceived of including this review in our QARs, this task had gone unchecked. Work documents today are far better than when we first made the effort to improve them several years ago. We do agree, however, that more improvement is needed and the QAR plan can be even more effective.

We recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance ensure a formal procedure and consistent methodology is developed and implemented for use when conducting the maintenance work document review portion of the QAR. These procedures should include a standardized form for completion that includes signatures and dates by the reviewer. They should also include a method to follow-up on district corrective actions.

Office of Maintenance response: An alternative correction will be taken. A documented process is already in place for conducting our QARs which does not solely address work documents, but addresses every aspect of maintenance QARs. We have already implemented a standard form (but not with a Form number) used to conduct QARs of work documents, but we plan to improve this form as recommended before October 1, 2014.

We recommend the Director of Office of Maintenance ensure the methodology for calculating district overall compliance on the maintenance work documents include a requirement that none of the individual contracts have a non-compliant QAR score.

Office of Maintenance response: We concur with the recommendation. We will change our criteria to say “Each contract must achieve 90%...” rather than the current “All contracts combined must achieve 90%...” As our QAR plan was just recently revised, we will implement these changes at the next scheduled update before July 1, 2015.

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

DISTRIBUTION, PROJECT TEAM AND STATEMENT OF ACCORDANCE

Action Official Distribution:

Tim Lattner, P.E., Director, Office of Maintenance
Michael Sprayberry, P.E., State Administrator for Maintenance Contracting

Information Distribution:

Ananth Prasad, P.E., Secretary
Jim Boxold, Chief of Staff
Brian Blanchard, P.E., Assistant Secretary of Engineering and Operations
Tom Byron, P.E., Chief Engineer

Project Team:

Engagement was conducted by Amy Furney, Audit Team Leader
Kevin Doar, Auditor
Under the supervision of:
Joseph W. Gilboy, Audit Manager; and
Kristofer B. Sullivan, Director of Audit
Approved by: Robert E. Clift, Inspector General

Statement of Accordance

*The mission of the department is
to provide a safe transportation system that ensures the mobility of people and goods,
enhances economic prosperity, and preserves the quality of our environment and communities.*

*The mission of the Office of Inspector General is
to promote integrity, accountability and process improvement in the Department of
Transportation by providing objective fact-based assessments to the DOT team.*

This work product was prepared pursuant to Section 20.055, Florida Statutes, in accordance with the applicable Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspectors General as published by the Association of Inspectors General and the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing as published by the Institute of Internal Auditors, Inc.

This report is intended for the use of the agency to which it was disseminated and may contain information that is exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Do not release without prior coordination with the Office of Inspector General.

Please address inquiries regarding this report to the department's Office of Inspector General at (850) 410-5800.

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

ATTACHMENT 2 – E4M84-R1 maintenance work document example

Maintenance work document with changes that increased amount from \$18,000 to \$120,252.20.

Page 1 of 1
 WORK ACTIVITY Removal Non-Desirable Trees & Brush
 CONTRACT NUMBER E4M84-R1
 JOB NUMBER 1st Trim Palms (A) (B)

DATE ISSUED 2/14/2013
 DATE RECEIVED 2/14/2013
 DATE WORK BEGAN 2/20/13
 UNIT DESCRIPTION EA/AC

ITEM NO.	LOCATION	WORK DESCRIPTION	**DATE COMPLETED	WORK UNITS	
			**DATE ACCEPTED	EST	ACTUAL
E580332 20		LESS THAN 4" TREE REMOVAL	3/14/13	0	74
E580332 21		4"-12" TREE REMOVAL	3/14/13	0	35
E580332 22		13"-24" TREE REMOVAL	3/14/13	0	2
E580332 23		25"-36" TREE REMOVAL			
E580332 24		37"-48" TREE REMOVAL			
0110 2 1		CLEARING & GRUBBING	3/14/13	0	.6
E580336-14		PRUNING AND TRIMMING (PALMS)	3/14/13	800	223
E580336		PRUNING AND TRIMMING (LESS THAN 4")	3/14/13	0	122
E580336-1		PRUNING AND TRIMMING (4" TO 24")	3/14/13	0	413
E580 336-2		TRIMMING 24"-48"	3/14/13	0	36
UNITS ACCOMPLISHED:			TOTAL	18,000.00	\$120,252.20
PRIMARY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INTERSTATE <input type="checkbox"/> TOLL <input type="checkbox"/>					
REMARKS: This is for trimming palms along I-95 northbound and southbound outside of the MOA areas. Partial Payment for WO #1: (A)					

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

ATTACHMENT 3 – E4M84-R1 maintenance work document example #2

Maintenance work document with changes that increased amount from \$11,087.50 to \$45,577.20.

WORK ACTIVITY Removal Non-Desirable Trees & Brush
 CONTRACT NUMBER E4M84-R1
 JOB NUMBER 3i - Tree Removal, Trim Palms/Trees
 UNIT DESCRIPTION EA/AC

DATE RECEIVED 6/18/2013
 DATE WORK BEGAN 6/24/13

ITEM NO.	LOCATION	WORK DESCRIPTION	**DATE COMPLETED	WORK UNITS	
			**DATE ACCEPTED	EST	ACTUAL
E580332 20		LESS THAN 4" TREE REMOVAL	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)	5	52 ✓
E580332 21		4"-12" TREE REMOVAL	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)	5	78 ✓
E580332 22		13"-24" TREE REMOVAL	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)	5	30 ✓
E580332 23		25"-36" TREE REMOVAL			
E580332 24		37"-48" TREE REMOVAL			
0110 2 1		CLEARING & GRUBBING	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)		18 ✓
E580336-14		PRUNING AND TRIMMING (PALMS)		10	
E580336		PRUNING AND TRIMMING (LESS THAN 4")	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)	10	13 ✓
E580336-1		PRUNING AND TRIMMING (4" TO 24")	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)	100	250 ✓
<u>E580336-2</u>		<u>Pruning & Trimming 7 24"</u>	7/2/13 P Accepted 7/2/13 (JW)		99 ✓
UNITS ACCOMPLISHED:			TOTAL	\$11,087.50	45,577.20 ✓
PRIMARY _____ INTERSTATE X _____ TOLL _____					
REMARKS: This is for trimming trees on I-95 NB & SB between Broward County Line and Palmetto Park Road. There are also some small Australian Pines for removal between Palm Beach Lakes and Blue Heron (mainly near SR 710 Overpass) and some miscellaneous dead trees (Broward to Martin). Please contact Tony to get the locations of the dead trees and small pines.					

E4M84-R1

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

ATTACHMENT 4 – E3K77 maintenance work document example

Maintenance work document with tree removal for 13" to 24" estimated at 100 and the actual removal was 475.

Page 1 of 1
 WORK ACTIVITY 492
 CONTRACT NUMBER E3K77
 JOB NUMBER 42215117231

DATE ISSUED 10/1/2012
 *DATE RECEIVED 10/1/2012
 DATE WORK BEGAN 10/1/2012
 UNIT DESCRIPTION Tree timing and Removal

ITEM NO.	LOCATION	WORK DESCRIPTION	**DATE COMPLETED	WORK UNITS		
			**DATE ACCEPTED	EST	ACTUAL	
E580332 21	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (4' to 12")	10/26/12	20	109	
			10/31/12		109	
E580332 22	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (13" to 24")	10/26/12	100	475	
			10/31/12		475	
E580332 23	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (25" to 36")	10/26/12	100	0	
E580332 24	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (37" to 48")	10/26/12	0	0	
E580332 25	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (> 48")	10/26/12	0	0	
E580334 1	Leon & Gadsden	Stump Grinding (4" to 24")	10/26/12	220	320	
			10/31/12		320	
E580334 2	Leon & Gadsden	Stump Grinding (25" to 48")	10/26/12	67	2	
			10/31/12		2	
E580334 3	Leon & Gadsden	Stump Grinding (> 48")	10/26/12	0	0	
E580336 1	Leon & Gadsden	Pruning and Trimming (4" to 24")	10/26/12	50	0	
E580336 2	Leon & Gadsden	Pruning and Trimming (> 24")	10/26/12	15	0	
UNITS ACCOMPLISHED				TOTAL		
PRIMARY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INTERSTATE _____ TOLL _____						
REMARKS: Work units are estimated. FDOT personnel will specify what trees are to be trimmed or removed. Start work no later than Friday, 10/5/2012.						

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

ATTACHMENT 5 – E3K77 maintenance work document example #2

Maintenance work document with tree removal for 13" to 24" estimated at 100 and the actual removal was 300.

Page 1 of 1
 WORK ACTIVITY 492
 CONTRACT NUMBER E3K77
 JOB NUMBER 42215117231

DATE ISSUED 8/30/2012
 *DATE RECEIVED 8/30/2012
 DATE WORK BEGAN 9/4/12

UNIT DESCRIPTION Tree trimming and Removal

ITEM NO.	LOCATION	WORK DESCRIPTION	**DATE COMPLETED	WORK UNITS		
			**DATE ACCEPTED	EST	ACTUAL	
E580332 21	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (4" to 12")	9-28-12	20	188	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		188	
E580332 22	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (13" to 24")	9-28-12	100	300	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		300	
E580332 23	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (25" to 36")	9-28-12	100	2	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		2	
E580332 24	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (37" to 48")	9-28-12	0	0	(P)
E580332 25	Leon & Gadsden	Tree Removal (> 48")	9-28-12	0	1	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		1	
E580334 1	Leon & Gadsden	Stump Grinding (4" to 24")	9-28-12	220	223	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		223	
E580334 2	Leon & Gadsden	Stump Grinding (25" to 48")	9-28-12	67	2	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		2	
E580334 3	Leon & Gadsden	Stump Grinding (> 48")	9-28-12	0	0	(P)
E580336 1	Leon & Gadsden	Pruning and Trimming (4" to 24")	9-28-12	50	1	(P)
			10/2/12 ML		1	
E580336 2	Leon & Gadsden	Pruning and Trimming (> 24")	9-28-12	15	0	(P)
UNITS ACCOMPLISHED:						
PRIMARY _____ INTERSTATE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TOLL _____				TOTAL		
REMARKS: Work units are estimated. FDOT personnel will specify what trees are to be trimmed or removed. Start work no later than Wednesday, September 5, 2012.						

**Office of Inspector General
Florida Department of Transportation**

ATTACHMENT 6 – Maintenance work document QAR example

Form used to conduct maintenance work document QAR.

Contract: _____ Page ____ of ____

Work Doc #	# of Items	Dates				Initials			Comments
		Issued (Y/N)	Received (Y/N)	Completed (#)	Accepted (#)	Received (Y/N)	Completed (#)	Accepted (#)	
	1	Y	Y	1	1	N	1	1	
	2	Y	Y	2	2	N	2	2	
	2	Y	Y	2	2	N	2	2	
	2	Y	Y	2	2	Y	2	2	
	2	Y	Y	2	2	N	2	2	
	2	Y	Y	2	2	Y	2	2	-LD's - good note
	2	Y	Y	2	2	Y	2	2	
	2	Y	Y	2	2	Y	2	2	-LD's - good note
	15	8/8	8/8	15/15	14/15	4/8	15/15	15/15	
					15/15				
					"All work"				
Subtotals (page)									
Totals Per Contract									

80 | 84 possible

95%

ATTACHMENT 7 – Maintenance work document QAR summary example

Summary report of QAR completed in 2013.

Gainesville Maintenance Cost Center 291

Inspections of Work Directed Contracts are properly documented

90% of issued work orders have been properly completed and contain appropriate signatures

Five Contracts were reviewed.

- A The posted and approved version of the work document is not being used.
 - B The method used to identify pay items specific to multiple locations identified on the form is confusing. *documenting & recording work units completed accepted*
 - C Dates and initials are not required for items or locations not included on the document. *is not consistent*
- ~~3 of the 5 contracts reviewed did not consistently meet requirements.~~
- 1 The overall calculation of all pay items reviewed resulted in 91% compliance.

However, concerns were identified

Finding