

CITY OF ATLANTA

CITY AUDITOR'S OFFICE

68 MITCHELL STREET SW, SUITE 12100 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-0312 (404) 330-6452 FAX: (404) 658-6077 AUDIT COMMITTEE

Fred Williams, CPA, Chair Donald T. Penovi, CPA, Vice Chair Marion Cameron, CPA C.O. Hollis, Jr., CPA, CIA

Ex-Officio: Mayor Kasim Reed

LESLIE WARD
City Auditor
Iward1 @atlantaga.gov

AMANDA NOBLE
Deputy City Auditor
anoble @atlantaga.gov

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Leslie Ward

DATE: July 23, 2013

SUBJECT: Implementation of Audit Recommendations

We undertook this audit to assess the extent to which city officials have taken timely, appropriate corrective action in response to audit findings and recommendations. The city charter requires my office to report on completed audits, major findings, management's corrective actions, and significant findings that have not been fully addressed.

We followed up on 28 recommendations made to the Atlanta Police Department, the Department of Public Works, Atlanta Municipal Court, the Department of Planning & Community Development, and the Department of Procurement in 12 audits:

- Oracle Implementation: ERP Target Process Blueprint (September 2005)
- Payroll Tax Compliance (April 2006)
- Oracle Implementation: HRMS, Financial and Procurement Applications Round 3 (July 2006)
- Hartsfield-Jackson Development Program (June 2007)
- Police Computer Aided Dispatch Data Reliability (April 2008)
- Police Department Sworn Staffing (July 2008)
- Office of Fleet Services (December 2008)
- Police Patrol Officer Availability (April 2009)
- Aviation Grants Management Federal Recovery Act (June 2010)
- Office of Code Compliance (June 2010)
- Municipal Court Operations (March 2011)
- Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts (April 2011)

The recommendations range from two to eight years old. Management agreed with 22 of the recommendations, partially agreed with one, and disagreed with one. Management provided no response for the remaining four recommendations.

We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Our audit methods included:

- obtaining management's assessment of whether each recommendation has been implemented, partially implemented, or not implemented
- reviewing managements' responses and data submissions to understand how management addressed each audit recommendation
- reviewing prior audit work relevant to particular recommendations
- reviewing city code and contractual documents

City staff implemented 14 and partially implemented 7 of the 28 recommendations we followed up in this report. City staff has not implemented the remaining seven recommendations. We are closing one unimplemented recommendation and two partially implemented recommendations made to the police department because the combination of different efforts addresses staffing concerns. We are issuing a new recommendation to the Department of Watershed Management related to utility street cuts.

Exhibit 1. Summary of Followed-up Recommendations

	Open	Close	Total
Implemented	0	14	14
Partially Implemented	5	2	7
Not Implemented	6	1	7
Total	11	17	28

Generally accepted government auditing standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The Audit Committee has reviewed this report and is releasing it in accordance with Article 2, Chapter 6 of the City Charter. We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation of city staff throughout the audit. The team for this project was Damien Berahzer and Christopher Armstead.

Cc:

Atlanta Police Department Recommendations

Police staff has implemented seven and partially implemented two of the ten recommendations we followed up in this report, including four recommendations we originally made to the commissioner of Planning & Community Development. Since we released the *Office of Code Compliance* audit, the function shifted from the Department of Planning & Community Development to the Atlanta Police Department's Community Service Division. We are closing the one unimplemented and two partially implemented recommendations because the department performs a different type of workload analysis to support deployment decisions.

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
1	Police Computer Aided Dispatch Data Reliability April 2008 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: Immediately	The chief of police and chief information officer should work together to strengthen in-house expertise on their systems.	During the audit, we found the police department's expertise on the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system was limited and the department over relied on the contractor, Northrop Grumman, to provide information about the system. Since the audit, the Department of Information Technology staffed the police communications center with four full-time employees. Two of those employees rotate at the center to learn from Northrop Grumman.	Implemented
2	Police Department Sworn Staffing July 2008 No response Expected Implementation Date: June 2008	The chief of police should use the workload analysis to make staffing decisions as required by police standard operating procedures.	In the audit, we found the police department did not use the staffing model developed by its planning and research unit. The department's standard operating procedures required use of the staffing model. During follow-up, we found the police department analyzes workload to aid in staffing decisions. The analysis includes calls for service, two-officer calls, traffic accidents, proportion of crimes, and current staffing levels within the zones to determine appropriate levels of staffing.	Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
3	Police Department Sworn Staffing July 2008 No Response Expected Implementation Date: June 2008	The chief of police should update the personnel database on a regular basis to reflect actual officer locations, including officers on temporary assignments.	During the audit, we identified inconsistencies within the police department's personnel database, which made it difficult to track officer deployment. During follow-up, we compared the officers' schedules for each shift in two zones to the personnel lists provided by the department's police operations division. We noted no inconsistencies.	Implemented
4	Police Department Sworn Staffing July 2008 No Response Expected Implementation Date: Fiscal Year 2009	The chief of police should link budgeted cost centers to actual activities to identify where vacancies are and what areas may be underserved.	In the audit, we recommended that budgeted personnel strength be tied to organizational units. This action would allow the department to know where its vacancies exist and assess underserved functions. The police department still does not budget officers by zones. Department staff told us doing so would be cumbersome and hinder the department's ability to transfer officers from zone to zone on an as needed basis. Instead the department tracks officer vacancies by position. The department also analyzes workload and reassigns officers to zones based on need.	Not Implemented Closed The department tracks officer vacancies by position and reassigns officers to zones based on workload analysis.
5	Police Patrol Officer Availability April 2009 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: None Provided	The police department should regularly measure and report on blackout and uncommitted time, in each zone and for the department as a whole, and use these measures as tools to strategically deploy patrol resources.	In the audit, we introduced blackout and uncommitted times as measurements useful for supporting the deployment of resources. Since the audit the department measures and reports blackout time on a weekly basis for each zone and citywide. Zone commanders receive the reports and adjust resources accordingly. The police department does not measure uncommitted time.	Partially Implemented Closed Even though the department does not measure uncommitted times, they use blackout time along with workload analysis to support deployment decisions.

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
6	Police Patrol Officer Availability April 2009 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: None Provided	The police department should set a goal for the percentage of uncommitted time in each zone and consider uncommitted time as well as blackout in assigning resources.	In the audit, the police department lacked goals for the amount of time officers spend uncommitted. Our analysis showed uncommitted time varied from zone to zone. Currently, the department does not measure uncommitted time, but uses workload and blackout analysis to assign resources.	Partially Implemented Closed Even though the department does not measure uncommitted times, it measures blackout time analyzes workload to support deployment decisions.
7	Office of Code Compliance June 2010 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: : 1 st Quarter 2011	The commissioner should develop procedures on data collection and quality assurance to ensure data for assigning, prioritizing, tracking, and reporting on new complaints is complete and accurate.	During the audit, we found that the office lacked quality control measures leading to it publicly reporting data that overstated performance and misrepresented the makeup of complaints. Reports underestimated the time it took to complete first inspections, over counted the number of highly hazardous complaints, and over counted the number of complaints generated externally. Since the audit, the city has moved the office from the Department of Planning & Community Development to the Atlanta Police Department. The police department has standard operating procedures applicable to all staff members addressing quality assurance for recordkeeping, reporting and data entry. The department also evaluates inspectors and supervisors on their adherence to quality policies and procedures.	Implemented
8	Office of Code Compliance June 2010	The commissioner should develop measures and workload data that can be captured electronically in its normal work flows.	In the audit, we determined the Office of Code Compliance lacked workload and performance data to accurately assess its staffing needs.	Implemented
	Management Agreed		The Code Enforcement Section uses the	

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
	Expected Implementation Date: 1 st Quarter 2011		Accela software to support its permitting function. The office identified 17 workload and performance metrics to include as part of the city's 311 implementation; the data exists in the system for 12 of metrics.	
9	Office of Code Compliance June 2010 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: 1st Quarter 2011	The commissioner should organize the file room for historical cases and any paper files created for new cases.	In the audit, the Office of Code Compliance had misplaced 21 of 35 files we requested. In addition, we noted the file room for historical cases was in disarray. Since the audit, the city has moved the office from the Department of Planning and Community Development to the Atlanta Police Department. During this follow-up, the office provided documentation for the six cases we selected. In addition, we examined the files room and noted historical cases were filed in order of street name.	Implemented
10	Office of Code Compliance June 2010 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: 1st Quarter 2011	The commissioner should develop job expectations for inspectors and supervisors that require inspectors to enter inspection results promptly and accurately.	During the audit, we discovered inspectors omitted or delayed the entry of inspection data into Accela, which impaired data reliability. Since the audit, the city has moved the office from the Department of Planning and Community Development to the Atlanta Police Department. The police department has standard operating procedures applicable to all staff members addressing quality assurance for recordkeeping, reporting and data entry. Additionally, the department developed performance evaluations for inspectors and supervisors.	Implemented

Department of Public Works Recommendations

The Department of Public Works staff implemented three and partially implemented three of the seven recommendations we followed up in this report. The Department of Public Works is unable to fully implement one recommendation without the cooperation of the Department of Watershed Management. We are issuing a new recommendation to watershed management to properly distribute accountability. Public Works staff acknowledged not implementing one of the recommendations.

		City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: January 2012	The commissioner of public works should consolidate the permitting function to help coordinate regulatory activity.	In the audit, we found a fragmented permitting structure and inspection responsibilities complicated tracking and record-keeping. In addition, separate permit application processes for franchised utilities and other qualified contractors resulted in the department keeping records in different locations and in different formats. Two sections within the department issued permits for utility street cuts. Public Works consolidated all aspects of the permitting function for franchise utility companies and qualified contractors under the Transportation Engineering Section.	Implemented
Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: May 2011	The commissioner of public works should develop detailed policies and procedures that explain the permitting, inspection and recordkeeping requirements for excavation in the public right-of-way. The procedures should: -clarify employees' responsibilities for processing permits -clarify permit requirements to ensure that street cut activity is permitted -provide standard guidelines for conducting preliminary, interim, post-closure and warranty inspections	During the audit, we determined a lack of written policies and procedures contributed to difficulties with tracking and recordkeeping of utility streets cuts. The department developed policies and procedures, which address: -permit requirements to ensure that street cut activity is permitted -standard guidelines for conducting preliminary, interim, post-closure and warranty inspections -a process for complete and easily	Partially Implemented
	Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: January 2012 Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation	Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: January 2012 The commissioner of public works should develop detailed policies and procedures that explain the permitting, inspection and recordkeeping requirements for excavation in the public right-of-way. The procedures should: Management Agreed Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: May 2011 Consolidate the permitting function to help coordinate regulatory activity. The commissioner of public works should develop detailed policies and procedures that explain the permitting, inspection and recordkeeping requirements for excavation in the public right-of-way. The procedures should: -clarify employees' responsibilities for processing permits -clarify permit requirements to ensure that street cut activity is permitted -provide standard guidelines for conducting preliminary, interim, post-closure and	Consolidate the permitting function to help coordinate regulatory activity. April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: January 2012 Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 The commissioner of public works should develop detailed policies and procedures that explain the permitting, inspection and record-keeping. The public right-of-way. The procedures should: April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: May 2011 Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 The commissioner of public works should develop detailed policies and procedures that explain the permitting, inspection and record-keeping requirements for excavation in the public right-of-way. The procedures should: -clarify permits Expected Implementation Date: May 2011 Expected Implementation Date: May 2011 Consolidate the permitting function to help coordinate regulatory activity. Department dependent to different formats. Two sections within the department issued permits for utility street cuts. Public Works consolidated all aspects of the permitting function for franchise utilities and other qualified contractors resulted in the department keeping records in different locations and in different formats. Two sections within the department issued permits for utility street cuts. Public Works consolidated all aspects of the permitting function for franchise utility companies and qualified contractors under the Transportation Engineering Section. During the audit, we determined a lack of written policies and procedures contributed to difficulties with tracking and record-keeping of utility streets cuts. The department developed policies and procedures, which address: -permit requirements to ensure that street cut activity is permitted -standard guidelines for conducting preliminary, interim, post-closure and warranty inspections -a process for complete and easily

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
		accessible recordkeeping, including copies of permit applications, permits, inspection results, and the location of metal plates	The policies and procedures lack clarity when describing employees' responsibilities for processing permits.	
3	Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: Immediately	The commissioner of public works should re-prioritize the inspectors' workloads to ensure that they are able to complete all required inspections.	In the audit, inspectors completed few, if any, interim inspections for permits issued because the department prioritized requests for service over inspections of permitted utility work. During this follow-up, we performed an unannounced on-site review of five closed cases we haphazardly selected. All cases contained preliminary, interim and closeout inspections.	Implemented
4	Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: October 2011	The commissioner of public works should use all available options, including requiring insurance and bonding, to enforce the right-of-way ordinance.	In the audit, the department failed to provide insurance and bonding documents for many of the franchise utility companies performing work within the public right-of-way as required by city code. During this follow-up, we requested insurance and bonding documentation for 11 telecom and 1 utility company. The Department of Public Works and risk management supplied insurance and bonding documents for the 11 telecom companies selected. However neither public works nor risk management could locate bond documents for Georgia Power, the fourth highest in street cut permits issued during the original audit.	Partially Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
5	Department of Public Works Regulation of Utility Street Cuts April 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: October 2011	The commissioner of public works should ensure all utility street cuts made by the Department of Watershed Management are permitted and inspected as required by city code.	In the audit, we found that the Department of Watershed Management and its contractors performed excavation work in the right-of-way without requesting permits from the Department of Public Works. Currently, the Department of Public Works receives applications and issues permits and inspects excavation work performed by watershed management's contractors. For in-house or emergency repairs, public works monitors watershed management's Hansen work order database and issues permits for metal plates laid by watershed management still does not apply for permits for all of its street cuts and public works cannot verify the completeness of records in the Hansen system. City code requires everyone to apply for permits even in the case of emergency repairs.	As public works has taken measures to permit watershed management's work and has no controlling authority over the department, we issued a new recommendation to the Department of Watershed Management. See recommendation section below.
6	Office of Fleet Services December 2008 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: January 30, 2009	The director of fleet services should enter into formal service level agreements with each department it serves to promote service accountability. The agreements should outline the responsibilities of each party, cost and service expectations, and how performance will be measured. The agreements should stipulate that the department receive receipts of work performed, and have an opportunity to review charges before being posted to their accounts. The agreements should be understood and acknowledged by the appropriate personnel in order to be effective.	In the audit, public works executed a service level agreement with only the Department of Parks and Recreation. The department acknowledged it has yet to implement this recommendation, but states that it is in the process of developing a service level agreement between the Office of Fleet Services and the other units of Department of Public Works.	Not Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
7	Office of Fleet Services December 2008 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: February 28, 2009	The director of fleet services should set up its billing system to capture detailed job coded tasks so the Office of Fleet Services can evaluate its cost effectiveness compared to available industry benchmarks.	During the audit, we determined that lack of detailed job codes was one factor contributing to the Office of Fleet Services' inability to assess its cost effectiveness compared to available industry benchmarks. The department used broad two-digit task codes that lacked the description of work performed within the AssetWorks application.	Implemented
			Since the audit, the department expanded its job task codes to nine-digit, which include sub-elements for detailed information regarding of services provided.	

Atlanta Municipal Court Recommendations

Court staff has not implemented any of the five recommendations we followed up in this report. In the original audit, court staff agreed with three of the recommendations, partially agreed with one of the recommendations, and disagreed with one recommendation.

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
1	Municipal Court Operations March 2011	The court administrator should ensure that case managers enter cases assigned to the public defender into CourtView in order to accurately measure workload.	In the audit, we found inconsistent recording of case assignments, meaning the public defender was unable to accurately track and report workload.	Not Implemented
	Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: April 14, 2011		The court administrator believes that implementing this recommendation would slow case processing time without upgrades to CourtView, which would not be cost effective, in his view. The court administrator plans to request funds for a new system in the fiscal year 2014 budget process.	
2	Municipal Court Operations March 2011 Management Disagreed Expected Implementation Date: None	The chief judge should stagger court session schedules to reduce wait time and the potential for overcrowding.	During the audit, the court operated seven courtrooms; the judicial agencies were funded 21 additional positions in the fiscal year 2011 budget to operate nine courtrooms. We concluded that workload didn't justify the increase. Case workload in the last six months of 2010 – the busiest during our review period – required judges to spend only 28% of their paid time on the bench. We recommended staggering sessions as a way to reduce overcrowding and wait time without the additional expense. The court continues to disagree with this recommendation as an effective mechanism for reducing wait time and addressing overcrowding. Instead the court plans to	Not Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
			secure additional resources to expand its hours of business operations.	
3	Municipal Court Operations March 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: April 14, 2011	The court administrator should work with judges to review and establish meaningful disposition codes to better track case outcomes.	In the audit, we found that several disposition codes overlapped making meaningful analysis, such as tracking case disposition and accurately assessing performance, difficult. The court administrator stated that staff reviewed the 153 disposition codes and concluded they can group the codes into 9 codes. The software provider informed the department that it would take 8 months and \$13,000 to deactivate the unneeded codes. The court administrator believes that this is not a cost-effective purchase due to the age of the system and how cumbersome it is.	Not Implemented
4	Municipal Court Operations March 2011 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: April 14, 2011	The court administrator should develop a process to review data entries in CourtView to ensure information is complete and accurately entered in the system.	In the audit, we found 26% of records contained no courtroom location, 33% of cases analyzed from fiscal years 2008 to 2010 remained open as of August 2010 and case managers had not consistently recorded cases assigned to public defenders. The court administrator stated the court has a quality control team and process for monitoring data entries in CourtView. The unit identifies, monitors, investigates, and arranges resolution of data-related discrepancies in case management	Not Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
			processes. Quality control staff also reviews case files. However, the court administrator provided no evidence of review or monitoring activities as requested. The court administrator also stated that the court is currently testing the mobile eCitation software, which allows law enforcement to electronically transmit citation data directly to the court's case management system.	
5	Municipal Court Operations March 2011 Management Partially Agreed Expected Implementation Date:	The chief judge should review and consider reducing the number of charges that require a court appearance as an alternative way to increase court efficiency and reduce costs.	During the audit, we found that the court allowed 250 out of about 2,800 charges to be paid as fines in lieu of a court appearance. State law requires a court appearance for 11 specific charges, any offense committed by a person under 21, any charge related to a traffic accident, and any other violations as determined by the court. Judges had last reviewed the charges payable in lieu of court appearance in July 2006. The court administrator stated that the chief judge formed a committee to review charges. The committee has since completed its review and submitted recommendations. A decision is yet to be reached on these recommendations. A copy	Not Implemented
			of the review was not provided to us as requested.	

Department of Procurement Recommendations

Procurement staff has implemented four of the six recommendations we followed up in this report. Two of the recommendations are partially implemented.

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
1	Payroll Tax Compliance April 2006 Management Response Not Required Expected Implementation Date: Not requested	The chief procurement officer and city attorney should create a policy to provide guidance to departments on the proper classification of workers and include this policy in the city's Procurement Manual	In the audit, we found that departments hired individuals without guidance on the proper classifications of workers as either employees or contractors. An incorrect classification could result in violating IRS tax policies. The department has updated the city's Procurement Manual to include guidance of IRS policies for classifications.	Implemented
2	Aviation Grants Management - Federal Recovery Act June 2010 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: September 1, 2010	The chief procurement officer should develop specific contracting procedures for recovery act projects and provide training on specific requirements.	In the previous audit, the audit team found that Aviation did not follow some recovery act provisions specific to project selection and procurement because the projects receiving funding were under way before the city entered into grant agreements with the federal agencies. The department has updated contract document processing guidelines to include adherence to special requirements for federal agencies. Additionally, since the audit, most if not all of the ARRA funded-projects are complete.	Implemented
3	Aviation Grants Management - Federal Recovery Act June 2010	The chief procurement officer should encourage city vendors to promote fraud awareness and provide Integrity Line contact information to their employees.	In the previous audit, the audit team sought to expand fraud awareness and awareness of the Integrity Line to city vendors in relation to the recovery act. The department has included information	Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
	Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: August 1, 2010		regarding fraud awareness and the Integrity Line in contracting documents as of November 2012.	
4	Department of Aviation Hartsfield Jackson Development Program June 2007 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: May 15, 2007	The chief procurement officer and Law department should work together to propose code revision if necessary and to provide guidelines to user agencies on the appropriate use, documentation, and reporting of contingency expenditures.	In the previous audit, the audit team found that the Department of Aviation used miscellaneous modifications to fund contingencies and suggested code changes for contingency expenditures. In December 2009, city council passed an ordinance detailing the chief procurement officer's role in emergency contract modifications and the appropriate use and reporting of contingency expenditures.	Implemented
5	HRMS, Financial and Procurement Applications Round 3 July 2006 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: Not requested	The city should establish a policy for formal procurement contracts requiring suppliers to submit an electronic copy of their proposal along with the paper copy. Having an electronic copy would save the city time by not having to scan hard copies into Oracle.	We attended conference room pilot test sessions during the Oracle implementation that were intended to evaluate system functionality. We made recommendations to strengthen processes that could not be fully automated in Oracle. The Department of Procurement has requested electronic copies for some proposals and plans to make this a standard requirement in fiscal year 2014. We reviewed evidence requesting suppliers to include electronic copies on CD or thumb drive for one request for proposal. We also obtained evidence of submitted bid documents on CD.	Partially Implemented

	Report Title and Date	Recommendation	City Auditor Analysis	Implementation Status
6	Oracle ERP Target Process Blueprint September 2005 Management Agreed Expected Implementation Date: Not requested	The process of notifying users of events and milestones (e.g., insurance premium dates, lease renewal dates, etc.) should be automated outside of Oracle (since it cannot be done in Oracle) to ensure due dates and deadlines are not inadvertently missed.	We reviewed the Oracle ERP Target Process Blueprint document prepared for the Oracle implementation to ensure that the software, process, enhancement, and reporting levels for the ERP project were properly defined. We made recommendations to enhance the controls over the manual procedures created to address gaps identified in the financial module. The department is implementing a notification system with the Contract Logix application, with planned completion in fiscal	Partially Implemented
			year 2014. We reviewed the department's system requirements documents and implementation timeline.	

Attachment B: New and Reassigned Recommendations

1. The commissioner of the Department of Watershed Management should ensure that all of the department's street cuts, including those for emergencies, within the city's right -of-way are properly permitted.

Attachment C: Management Review and Response to Audit Recommendations

Report # 11.09	Report Title	e: Implementation of Audit Recommendations	6/25/2013
Recommendation # 1			Degree of Agreement
 The commissioner of the Department of Watershed Management should ensure that all of the 			Agrees
=	department's street cuts, including those for emergencies, within the city's right -of-way are		
ριορε	properly permitted.		October 2013
			Responsible Person
			R. Wells
Pr	Proposed Action: DWM Office of Linear Infrastructure Operation will coordinate bi-weekly with DPW Office of Engineering Service to ensure all street cuts including emergencies within the City's ROW are permitted properly. In addition, Hanse management reports will be used on a monthly basis to reconcile to ensure all work is captured.		ed properly. In addition, Hansen