

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow-up Preliminary Audit Report**

**Prepared For:**

**Russell M. Pry**  
**Audit Committee**

**Approved by Audit Committee**  
**December 18, 2012**



**Summit County**  
**Internal Audit Department**  
**175 South Main Street**  
**Akron, Ohio 44308**

*Lisa L. Skapura, Director*  
*Meredith Merry, Deputy Director*  
*Lucas Immel, Internal Auditor*  
*Jaime Vedrody, Internal Auditor*

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow up Audit**

**Auditors:**

Lisa Skapura, Director; Meredith Merry, Deputy Director; Lucas Immel and Jaime Vedrody, Internal Auditors.

**Objectives and Methodology:**

To determine if management has implemented their management action plans as stated in the previously issued Preliminary and Follow up Audit reports.

We conducted this follow up audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those 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.

**Scope:**

An overview and evaluation of policies, processes, and procedures implemented by the department/agency because of management actions stated in the management action plans during the Preliminary and Follow up Audit process.

**Testing Procedures:**

The following were the major audit steps performed:

1. Review the final Preliminary report to gain an understanding of IAD issues, recommendations, and subsequent management action plans completed by the audited department/agency.
2. Review the work papers from the Preliminary Audit.
3. Review any departmental/agency response documentation provided to IAD with management action plan responses following the Preliminary Audit.
4. Identify management actions through discussions/interviews with appropriate departmental personnel to gain an understanding of the updates/actions taken.
5. Review applicable support to evaluate management actions.
6. Determine implementation status of management action plans.
7. Complete the first Follow up Audit report noting the status of previously noted management actions.

**Disclaimer:**

We recognize that the Internal Audit Department (IAD) has surplus assets which were disposed of during the period of review, and therefore is unable to audit its own asset disposal and maintain objectivity. Based on this fact, IAD surplus assets are excluded from testing and review.

**Summary:**

Of the eleven issues and the corresponding management action plans noted in the Follow-Up Audit Report, the Summit County Department of Administrative Services fully implemented nine (9) management action plans and partially implemented two (2).

Based on the above noted information, IAD believes that the Department of Administrative Services has made a positive effort towards implementing the management action plans as stated in response to the issues identified in the preliminary audit and no further follow-up is needed.

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow up Audit**

Listed below is a summary of the issues noted in the Follow up Audit Report their status. Each issue number is in reference to the Preliminary Audit report:

**Management Action Plans Previously Implemented During 1<sup>st</sup> Follow-up Audit:**

- **Issue 4-** Upon discussions with the Maintenance Supervisor, Deputy Director of Physical Plants, and the Director of DAS, IAD noted that there are currently no formal written policies and procedures in place for the scrap process in regards to obtaining items from individual departments. IAD was able to obtain a scrap policy for the Physical Plants Department from the Physical Plants Office Manager; however, the policy begins with the accumulation of assets and does not address any procedures for collecting and maintaining the assets.
- **Issue 8-** Upon observation and in accordance with the policies and procedures, IAD noted during testing that four of the six scrap pay-ins from 2007 did not include a weigh-in slip from the scrap dealer. IAD contacted the Maintenance Supervisor regarding this and he confirmed that they do not always receive a weigh-in slip when assets are taken to the scrap yard.
- **Issue 10-** Through testing and discussions with the Deputy Director of Capital Projects, IAD identified that there is currently no written procedure in place to ensure that county assets supplied to contractors are returned upon completion of the contract.
- **Issue 11-** Upon review of the Summit County Department of Animal Control Employee Handbook of Policies and Procedures, there are no cash handling (collecting, receipting, voiding, reconciling, depositing, etc.) procedures in place. IAD obtained the following policies and procedures from the Animal Control Manager:
  - Handling funds throughout the workday
  - Voided Transactions at Animal Control
  - End of the day money preparation for the Fiscal Office
  - Taking funds to the Fiscal Office

Additionally, IAD noted that the Animal Adoption policy contained in the Employee Handbook of Policies and Procedures contained incorrect fees, and there was no policy for Owner Release Animals. 12/7/07, IAD obtained an updated Animal Adoption policy from the Animal Control Manager, containing the correct adoption fees, and an Owner Release Animals policy.

- **Issue 12-** Upon discussion with the Animal Control Manager on 12/7/07, and during testing, IAD noted that there is a lack of segregation of duties between collecting cash, reconciling/preparing the daily deposits, and delivering the deposits to the Fiscal Office. The Secretary, who is able to conduct cash transactions, is also one of the people responsible for preparing the deposit. Additionally, the Deputy Wardens, who can conduct cash transactions, may also prepare the deposit, as well as deliver the deposit to the Fiscal Office.
- **Issue 15-** There is no reconciliation performed at the Animal Control, the Office of Budget and Management, nor the Fiscal Office to ensure timely and accurate collection of municipal billing remittances. Additionally, there is no invoice date printed on the invoices. The billing states that payment is due twenty days from invoice date; however, since there is no invoice date on the billing, it is difficult to determine if the payment is timely.

IAD also noted, during communications with municipalities in an attempt to collect past due amounts, that the municipalities are not billed consistently each month (i.e., occasions with quarterly billings). This could make it difficult for the Animal Control facility, as well as the municipalities, to accurately track and monitor the monthly charges and payments.

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow up Audit**

- **Issue 17-** Nine out of the twelve personnel files tested, located in the Human Resource Department, did not contain the applicable certifications. IAD was able to obtain the certifications for the nine Animal Control employees upon follow-up with the Animal Control Manager.

**Management Action Plans Fully Implemented During 2<sup>nd</sup> Follow-up Audit:**

- **Issue 1-** During discussions with the Physical Plants Office Manager, IAD was informed that there are no written policies and procedures in place or any employee cross-training of the various job functions performed by the Office Manager. The Physical Plants Office Manager works with the Capital Projects Department as well as Department of Physical Plants – Facilities. This was recognized as an issue during a preliminary interview when the current Physical Plants Office Manager informed IAD that there is currently no one who could perform her various job functions (processing payroll, expenditures, etc).

*Through review of policies and procedures and discussions with various county personnel, IAD confirmed that the Office Manager functions are currently being processed by outside departments.*

- **Issue 2** – The DAS does not have written policies and procedures for the building maintenance function. The department primarily operates based on immediate maintenance needs, work requests, and a system of preventive maintenance. Significant control issues related to operational efficiency and effectiveness are not addressed in this type of informal system. IAD noted the following issues upon follow-up with the Deputy Director of Physical Plants:

- There is no formal process for prioritizing work; assignments are made as requests are received.
- Maintenance Supervisors are given no documented guidance regarding how to monitor labor and materials consumed by their staff. This increases the risk of inefficiencies in the utilization labor and materials.
- The Facilities Management department does not have a process for assigning staff in such a way as to maximize productivity. The department assigns maintenance staff to various buildings around the County (i.e., one maintenance man assigned to the Safety building, one maintenance man assigned to the Court House, etc.).
- There is no formal, written process for preventive maintenance, which could result in shortened useful lives of equipment, more costly repairs, and equipment operating at less than optimum efficiency. The Maintenance Supervisor indicated that preventive maintenance is performed, however, it is not being tracked. IAD recognizes that work is contracted out for the larger County buildings; however, the Physical Plants department is responsible for the preventive maintenance work for the smaller buildings and projects.

*Through review of policies and procedures, IAD confirmed that the above-noted items were included.*

- **Issue 3** - Upon discussion with the Deputy Director of Physical Plants, Maintenance Supervisor, and the Director of Department of Administrative Services, IAD noted that there are no formal written policies and procedures in place for the surplus auction process.

*Through review of policies and procedures, IAD confirmed that the process for surplus auction was included.*

- **Issue 5** - IAD met with the Maintenance Supervisor of Physical Plants and noted the following issues regarding the current work order system:

- DAS currently has a manual work order system in place. The system consists of a Daily Work Sheet and a two part Maintenance/Repair Order slip. The following omissions or inconsistencies of information were noted during testing:

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow up Audit**

- There is a column on the Daily Work Sheet for a Work Order number, and there is box on the Maintenance/Repair Order slip for the same information. Of the items tested, there were Work Order numbers assigned to each request on the Daily Work Sheets, but there were no work order numbers on the Maintenance/Repair Order forms. Based on the fact that the number was missing, there was no way to confirm that the two entries were the same work order request.
  - There were 23 out of 120 instances where a Maintenance/Repair Order slip was prepared with no corresponding line item on the Daily Work Sheet.
  - There were 53 out of 91 instances where entries were made on the Daily Work Sheets with no corresponding Maintenance/Repair Order slip.
  - There were 9 out of 120 instances where Maintenance/Repair Order slips existed but it could not be determined if there was a corresponding line item on the Daily Work Sheet.
  - The Maintenance/Repair Order slips have an area where start time/end time can be entered, but it is not being used.
  - Verification that the work has been completed was not signed off by the requesting department.
- The DAS is unable to track workload statistics, such as number of work requests completed by maintenance staff in a month or year, or the number of requests made by departments in the same time frame.
  - There is no formal process for tracking inventory used on projects.
  - There is no formal scheduling process. Per the Maintenance Supervisor, work is assigned as requests are phoned in or projects are scheduled (i.e., departments are moving, renovations, etc.). If there is little work scheduled, the maintenance staff is assigned to preventative maintenance.

Without complete data from the above mentioned documents, the DAS is unable to determine accurate staffing ratios, employee schedules, personnel performance, productivity analysis, evaluation of projects, or inventory used. Upon discussion with the Deputy Director of Physical Plants, he is currently researching an automated work order systems; however, there are no funds available in the 2008 budget.

*Through review of the maintenance work order system, IAD confirmed that maintenance work is able to be tracked, distributed, and monitored by supervision and management staff.*

- **Issue 6** - Upon physical observation and during testing, IAD was unable to trace items, by tag number, from the Executive Order to the storage facility, based on the fact that different policies, thresholds, and criteria exist for individual departments/Elected Officials. Because of these differences, IAD was unable to perform accurate and consistent tracking of certain items within the sample. The following is an explanation of IAD's remaining findings:
  - Two of the twenty-five assets that should have been located at the storage facility, were sold at the last auction. The Executive Orders for these assets were dated within the scope; however, since the assets were taken to auction prior to having proper approval, these assets were not located at the warehouse.
  - At the time of testing, per the Maintenance Supervisor, there were eleven of the twenty-five assets with an Executive Order that had not been picked up. Therefore, IAD was unable to trace these assets to the warehouse. The dates on the Executive Orders ranged from 10/2/07 to 1/16/08, IAD's testing was on 3/12/08.
  - IAD could not trace four of the twenty-five assets by description or tag number.

*Through review of policies and procedures and testing, IAD confirmed that assets set for auction are being tracked and were located in the respective location.*

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow up Audit**

- **Issue 7** - Upon physical observation of the storage facility, IAD selected a sample of twenty items that possessed a Summit County inventory tag for testing. IAD was unable to trace, by tag number, eight out of twenty assets from the warehouse to an Executive Order.

*Through review of policies and procedures and testing, IAD confirmed that assets located at the auction storage facility were properly authorized through an Executive Order.*

- **Issue 13** - Eight out of thirty-one deposits made in August 2007 were not in accordance with O.R.C § 9.38, which states, "...deposit the moneys on the business day next following the day of receipt, unless the public office of which that person is a public official adopts a policy permitting a different time period, not to exceed three business days next following the day of receipt..." IAD contacted the Animal Control Manager on 1/2/08 to confirm whether she had such a policy in place for Animal Control. She confirmed that there was not a written policy in place for deposits.

*Through review of policies and procedures and testing, IAD confirmed that monies collected at the Animal Control facility are being timely deposited.*

- **Issue 14** - IAD noted the following issues upon observation and review of the SCAMP database and its manual:
  - There is no user password required for login by employees into the Main Switchboard, allowing no authentication of an employee into the system.
  - Upon observation and discussion with the Animal Control Manager, employees can overwrite fees with each transaction.
  - The database does not have the ability to show the amount received for payment and the amount of change due. Therefore, there is no means for tracking money going in and out of the facility using the current database.

*Through review of the SCAMP database and testing, IAD confirmed that the above-noted issues were corrected and reasonable controls are in place and that fees being collected are in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code.*

- **Issue 18** - Upon review of the Telecommunications department expenditures selected for detailed testing, IAD noted five out of ten expenditures that were not signed as "Approved to Pay." Upon discussion with the Administrative Secretary, if the expenditure were a phone company bill for service, the Telecommunications department would not sign off for payment. IAD noted that the expenditures were phone company bills, ranging from \$914.67 to \$58,391.52.

*Upon review of telecommunications invoices and confirmation from the Telecommunications Manager, IAD confirmed that telecommunications invoices are being reviewed by appropriate personnel.*

**Management Action Plans Partially Implemented During 2<sup>nd</sup> Follow-up:**

- **Issue 9** - Upon physical observation of the storage facility, IAD selected ten scrap assets, which possessed a Summit County inventory tag as a sample for testing. During testing, ten out of the ten assets selected were unable to be traced, by tag number, to the following supporting documentation:
  - Executive Order
  - 2007 and 2008 Disposal Orders log
  - County of Summit Declaration of Surplus Inventory form.

**Summit County Executive Office**  
*Department of Administrative Services*  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Follow up Audit**

*Five (5) 2012 Executive Orders were randomly selected for testing to confirm that supporting documentation exists for the scrap pay-in. No errors were noted; however, IAD was unable to determine the final disposition for three (3) of the five (5) assets selected. Per the Deputy Director of Physical Plants, the disposition of the asset will be noted on the department approved Executive Order.*

- **Issue 16** - Upon review of the Animal Control contracts provided by the Law Department, IAD noted that there were four municipalities with billing activity in 2006 and 2007 that did not have contracts with Animal Control.
  - City of Barberton
  - City of Monroe Falls
  - Village of Reminderville
  - Village of Lakemore

Upon further discussion with the Animal Control Manager, IAD was informed that there are no copies of contracts maintained at the Animal Control facility.

*A 2012 Animal Control pay-in report and municipal billings were compared to the Law Department contract database for current municipality agreements. IAD noted that a current contract did not exist for seven (7) of the sixteen (16) municipalities with billing activity in 2012. On 10/22/12, IAD received confirmation from the Executive Law Department that contracts were drafted for the municipalities and sent out for signatures. As of 11/30/12, IAD received confirmation that either a signed contract or formal notification declining the agreement was received, from two (2) municipalities.*