

Draft Committee Minutes

Minutes of the Operational Audit Advisory Committee Meeting
September 25, 2006

Committee Members: Patricia Basti, David Crowley, Leslie Ghiz, Alton Knight, David Raasch, and Jim Tarbell

The Operational Audit Advisory Committee held a special meeting concerning the issuance of the Street Sweeping Audit on September 25, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in room 169, City Hall. Audit Committee members, David Crowley, Patricia Basti, Alton Knight, David Raasch and Leslie Ghiz were present. Mr. Jim Tarbell was absent. Also in attendance was City Manager Milton Dohoney, Steve Bailey, Director of Public Services and Kathy Hoehn, Supervising Accountant with Public Services. Mr. David Crowley chaired the meeting. The Internal Audit Manager, Mark Ashworth, served as recording secretary.

Chairperson Crowley called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. He thanked all for attending the special meeting to discuss the Street Sweeping Audit. He asked that everyone introduce himself or herself before getting under way.

After a brief explanation of the meeting by Mr. Crowley, Mr. Ashworth was asked to give an over view of the report.

Mr. Ashworth commented first on the reason for the committee receiving a copy of a draft report. The reason for this release of a draft was due to a public records request made by the Cincinnati Enquirer. Prior to releasing this to the newspaper this was given to all committee members. Mr. Ashworth then answered any questions the committee may have had after reading the audit.

Steve Bailey provided an overview of the street sweeping program and the measures he is taking to correct the problems noted in the audit. It was pointed out that the department agreed with nine recommendations and the other recommendations that were not completely agreed to be not as much a difference but a different approach to address the situation.

Mr. Crowley asked why IAD had not reviewed the contractor. Mr. Ashworth explained that the scope of the audit did not include the contractor. He stated that he did review the terms of the contract and found that the contractor was providing the service as contracted for the amount of money bid. There had been no change orders submitted. The Public Service department has the responsibility to manage and oversees that contract with the private concern. They had no issues with the contractor. For those reasons mentioned IAD did not expand their scope and look at the contractor.

The Committee asked for the 2005 expenditures for the sweeping program. Ms. Kathy Hoehn responded that the amount was \$566,000 (IAD disagrees with that amount). Ms Basti asked for a clarification on the number of curb miles. Mr. Ashworth stated that only two to three curb miles are posted for sweeping daily and the remainder of curb miles are from streets with cars parked etc.

Mr. Alton Knight asked Mr. Bailey about recommendation 9. Recommendation 9 deals with the need for routes. He asked if other cities had routing. Mr. Bailey did not disagree; he stated that most cities use a routing system.

Mr. Bailey wanted to discuss the curb mile versus sweeping mile in relationship to the employee bid. Mr. Bailey wasn't sure if the employee team messed up that part of the bid by confusing the two terms or did they attempt to force their bid numbers into what they knew the City had budgeted for the street sweeping operations. He didn't have the answer and has not been able to find the answer but wanted to offer these two potential reasons for the bid and work provided differing.

Ms Basti commented that she believed that the tone of the executive summary was very negative especially after reading the rest of the report. She recommended that Mr. Ashworth take a look at that in the future to ensure that the tone remains consistent with the contents of the report. Ms. Ghiz disagreed and found the report just stated the facts of what was found. She was sure that Council would not be making any decisions based on the first page. Mr. Ashworth agreed to review future reports with tone in mind when drafting the executive summary.

With no further comments about the street sweeping audit, Mr. Crowley asked about the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Ashworth indicated that the next meeting would have to be moved in order to accommodate the City Manager's schedule. Discussion involved holding the next meeting on the regular date (October 12, 2006) or moving it to October 17th. The committee did not want to move the meeting. With no objections the next meeting was set for October 12, 2006 at 9:30 a.m.

With no additional business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.