

DEBRA K. DAVENPORT, CPA AUDITOR GENERAL

STATE OF ARIZONA OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

WILLIAM THOMSON DEPUTY AUDITOR GENERAL

June 3, 2008

The Honorable John Nelson, Chair Joint Legislative Audit Committee

The Honorable Robert Blendu, Vice Chair Joint Legislative Audit Committee

Dear Representative Nelson and Senator Blendu:

Our Office has recently completed a 36-month followup of the Arizona Department of Transportation—A Review of the Oversight and Management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System regarding the implementation status of the 8 audit recommendations (including sub-parts of the recommendations) presented in the performance audit report released in June 2005 (Auditor General Report No. 05-CR1). As the attached grid indicates:

- 7 have been implemented, and
- 1 has been substantially implemented.

Unless otherwise directed by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, this concludes our followup work on the Department's efforts to implement the recommendations from the June 2005 performance audit report.

Sincerely,

Melanie M. Chesney, Director Performance Audit Division

MMC:Acm Attachment

cc: Victor Mendez, Director Arizona Department of Transportation

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System

| | Recommendation | Status of Implementing Recommendation | Additional Explanation |
|----|--|--|------------------------|
| 1. | Continue to improve and implement successful project management practices, both through the completion of the Accelerated Program and in the implementation of new RFS programming, in- cluding the current change order review and ap- proval process. | Implemented at 24 Months | |
| 2. | Develop and implement a memorialization and retention policy for documentation of approved project changes and key project decisions, which enables easy documentation location and review. | | |
| | a. ADOT should consider developing a checklist to keep in the centralized project files that in- dicates all the types of documentation to be included in the file, so that at any point, a project file could reasonably be expected to provide a comprehensive overview of changes to the project and/or other key project decisions throughout the project's de- velopment. | Implemented at 36 Months | |

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System (cont'd)

| Recommendation | Status of Implementing Recommendation | Additional Explanation |
|--|---|--|
| 3. Develop a single database, or a system of coordinated databases, which is capable of generating reports that track, present, and explain the history of a project's incremental and cumulative development including budgeted to actual costs, timeline, and scope changes. Ideally, this system should allow queries and reports for individual projects, whole corridors, and the Accelerated Program (and/or the Proposition 400 program) overall. | Substantially Implemented at 36 Months | According to ADOT staff, ADOT has developed a computerized "Information Data Warehouse," referred to as the Data Mart, to capture Statewide Program Information and records of project con- tracts, financial forms, design reports, and project agreements. This data warehouse can also gener- ate reports. Data Mart also tracks all MAG Re- gional Transportation Plan (RTP) cost estimates throughout the project development process and, according to ADOT staff, Data Mart provides a centralized repository of all RTP cost estimates and is available to ADOT management and staff through their personal computers. In addition, the Field Office Automation System database maintains information on project histo- ry, including estimated budgets, bid amounts, actual costs, and milestone dates. |

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System (cont'd)

| Recommendation | Status of Implementing Recommendation | Additional Explanation |
|---|---|---|
| 3. Develop a single database, or a system of coordinated databases, which is capable of generating reports that track, present, and explain the history of a project's incremental and cumulative development including budgeted to actual costs, timeline, and scope changes. Ideally, this system should allow queries and reports for individual projects, whole corridors, and the Accelerated Program (and/or the Proposition 400 program) overall (concl'd) | Substantially Implemented at 36 Months (concl'd) | However, ADOT is still in the process of getting all RTP Freeway Program data entered into Da- taMart. For example, cost estimate information is not yet entered that would allow queries and re- ports on whole corridors. In addition, ADOT is still working on downloading program and project management information (including cost estimate summaries and expenditure and obliga- tion data) into DataMart. |
| a. Additionally, in the process of establishing a method of retrieving consolidated data, we recommend that ADOT examine opportunities to allocate indirect and/or apply direct project costs currently captured as "system-wide" expenditures for the purposes of Life Cycle Certification Reporting on corridor-specified obligations. | Implemented at 36 Months | |

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System (concl'd)

| Recommendation | Status of Implementing Recommendation | Additional Explanation |
|---|--|------------------------|
| b. We also recommend that ADOT define and track right-of-way acquisition budgets and budget changes to watch for opportunities to increase its ability to anticipate the impact of the right-of-way acquisition process on the overall project budget. | Implemented at 36 Months | |

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System (cont'd)

| | Recommendation | Status of Implementing Recommendation | Additional Explanation |
|---|--|--|------------------------|
| comp all pri posed preser tablisi pariso ness (| ire comparisons of historical budgets and estimated bletion dates — and the memorialized explanations for ior changes to them — when evaluating newly pro- d changes. Proposed changes should also require the ntation of impact on key performance indicators es- hed for the RFS program and other metrics of com- on to enable analysis of cost-efficiency and effective- (e.g. budgeted, estimated, and actual costs per mile milar projects.) | Implemented at 36 Months | |
| that w perfor tunitie examp delive dule, c cent o | e key performance indicators for the RFS program vill help ADOT, MAG, and STB recognize trends of rmance that might trigger greater analysis for oppor- es to improve cost-efficiency and effectiveness. For ple, consider setting and tracking program success at ering projects within 95 percent of the original sche- or having actual project costs come within 10 per- of the first design estimate (plus inflation) — and/or indicators, as proposed by ADOT, MAG, and/or | Implemented at 36 Months | |

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System (concl'd)

| | Recommendation | Status of Implementing Recommendation | Additional Explanation |
|----|---|--|------------------------|
| 6. | Require separate tracking, monitoring, and reporting on the completion, including funding and actual costs, of the Accelerated Program separately of the funding, costs, and timelines for initiatives resulting from the passage of Proposition 400. | Implemented at 12 Months | |