



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Office of the Inspector General • 7833 Walker Drive, Suite 425 • Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

November 18, 2020

To: Bill Tyler
Director, Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation

Alvin McNeal
Acting Deputy Director, Administration and Development

Bridget Stesney
Division Chief, Park Planning and Development

From: Renee Kenney, CPA, CISA, CIA, CIG
Inspector General

Natalie M. Beckwith, MPA, CFE
Assistant Inspector General

Subject: Follow-Up Review – Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation
Capital Program

The Department of Legislative Services, Office of Legislative Audits' (OLA) issued a performance audit report (Report) on Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) capital program on January 10, 2018. The audit was authorized under Chapter 448 of the Laws of Maryland, 2015. Said Report included 7 findings, each with supporting audit recommendation(s).

The purpose of this follow-up review was to assess DPR's actions taken to resolve each of the findings. The following is the result of the Office of the Inspector General's (OIG) follow-up review:

Finding #	OLA Finding/Recommendation(s)	Status
1	Prince George's County's Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) lacked formal written policies and procedures for capital project management. We recommend that DPR, in consultation with the Prince George's County Planning Board,	Ongoing

Finding #	Finding/Recommendation(s)	Status
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. develop and implement formal written policies and procedures for capital planning and project management, including roles and responsibilities for those involved with planning construction management, project monitoring, and construction closeout; and b. establish performance expectations and reporting mechanisms to monitor the effectiveness of the capital planning and project management operations. 	
2	<p>The annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) documents did not contain certain project information to promote clarity and transparency and may not have met a certain statutory requirement.</p> <p>We recommend M-NCPPC Prince George’s County ensure that its Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. supplementary information, as necessary, to identify individual projects and related funding; b. detailed project descriptions to provide more information on project scope and size; and c. construction schedules that meet the requirements of State law, in accordance with advice from the Office of the Attorney General. 	Completed
3	<p>DPR had not established a comprehensive approach to documenting project activities and costs, including the retention of necessary project and contract documents.</p> <p>We recommended that DPR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. fully utilize the project management software system to establish timelines and monitor individual project progress and costs, and to electronically retain important project and contract documents; b. develop a system user manual containing management’s expectations of how the system and its available capabilities and functionality should be used; and c. use the system’s form building capabilities to standardize information gathering for critical functions, such as inspections. 	Ongoing
4	<p>The duration of the five projects initially tested was long, ranging from 7 years to 12 years. According to DPR, there were lengthy periods where PPD staff levels did not keep pace with increases in its CIP; however, DPR had not developed</p>	Completed

	<p>workload standards to identify staff resource needs, especially during fluctuations in project activity.</p> <p>We recommended that DPR should develop staffing workload standards to determine the necessary resources for properly administering and overseeing projects and that this information be used for strategic planning of project work and deploying staff resources.</p>	
5	<p>Site inspection results were not routinely recorded in the project management system and, in one case, the inspection documentation was not consistently prepared during the entire construction phase.</p> <p>We recommended that DPR specify in its policies and procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the desired frequency of site inspections; b. the information to be recorded for each inspection; c. the method for retaining inspection results, such as within the project management system; and d. the process for supervisory review of inspection results. 	Completed
6	<p>Many contract change orders did not appear to have been approved in a timely manner. DPR also did not consistently prepare documentation of its assessment of contractor proposed change order cost increases or extensions of time for work performance.</p> <p>We recommended that DPR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. describe in its change order policies and procedures the steps to be taken for reviewing change order proposals for reasonableness and the documentation to be maintained to demonstrate that changes to Time of Performance (TOP) and contract costs were deemed appropriate; and b. determine the targeted timeframe for obtaining final change order approvals that also considers the necessity of all currently required levels of approval and helps ensure that approvals occur before the original TOP subject to the change order ends. 	Completed
7	<p>Contractors frequently did not complete their work within the timeframes specified in their contracts and DPR actions to hold contractors accountable were not always evident.</p> <p>We recommended that DPR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. develop formal guidelines regarding the progressive steps to be taken to address untimely contractor work performance; and 	Completed

	b. assess liquidated damages for untimely or non-performance or document why assessment of liquidated damages is not appropriate.	
--	---	--

DPR management provided sufficient information and clarification for us to conclude five of the seven audit findings have been satisfactorily addressed and implemented. Implementation of the two remaining recommendations is ongoing.

The two (2) ongoing audit recommendations contain an updated management response and revised expected completion date.

Finding #1: Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) lacked formal written policies and procedures for capital project management.

Status: Ongoing

Original Management Response:

DPR management concurred with the audit finding and recommendations. Management provided the following details in support of the finding:

- Departmental Goals:
 - DPR will establish a total quality management system for all aspects of CIP project management including the timely delivery of projects.
- Departmental Action Plan:
 - DPR will develop and implement formal policies and procedures for:
 - each phase of project management;
 - project roles and responsibilities;
 - project monitoring and supervision;
 - status reporting;
 - project debriefing for lessons learned; and
 - performance expectations.

Follow-Up Testing: The OIG reviewed the newly created Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Project Manual (Manual). Although complete, the Manual has not been incorporated into the Department’s E-Builder Project Management Information System and staff have not received training regarding the new contents.

Updated Management Response: DPR’s next steps will include the following:

- training the team members in the Park Planning and Development Division;
- incorporating the CIP Project Manual into E-Builder; and
- updating employee job functions.

Revised Expected Completion Date: June 2021

Revised Follow-Up Date: August 2021

Finding #3: DPR had not established a comprehensive approach to documenting project activities and costs, including the retention of necessary project and contract documents.

Status: Ongoing

Original Management Response:

DPR management concurred with the audit finding and recommendations. Management provided the following details in support of the finding:

- Departmental Goals:
 - DPR will leverage technology to maximize efficiency and standardize business processes appropriate to:
 - make project recording keeping more efficient and consistent;
 - enhance the monitoring of project management for adherence to policies and procedures; and
 - make status reporting more readily available.
- Departmental Action Plan
 - DPR will fully implement project management software;
 - create a user manual for project management software, which details the standard protocols for system use;
 - develop automated forms for standard project management processes, such as site inspections; and
 - explore integration with the financial system to decrease duplicate data entry and increase efficiency of tracking project budgets.

Follow-Up Testing: The OIG reviewed the scope of work for E-Builder Project Management Information System's professional services Request for Proposal. Although a vendor has been selected, full implementation of the system is scheduled for June 2021.

Updated Management Response: The newly selected vendor commenced work on the project in July 2020. The team has engaged in several work sessions and the full project including a user guide and updated standardized project management forms will be completed by June 2021.

With regard to financial system integration, the existing E-Builder software system has not been integrated with the Commission's financial system. During the most recent upgrade to Infor by the Commission in Spring 2019, it was determined that this work could not be included into the scope of the system upgrade. The Park Planning and Development Division will continue to evaluate this need as the Central Administrative Service's Accounting team considers future upgrades to Infor.

Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation – Capital Program
Follow-up to OLA's Performance Audit

While an integration of Infor and E-Builder would have been convenient for the CIP Project Managers, it would not significantly change the CIP project budget management. The Division is still capable of reviewing and managing project budgets without this integration.

Revised Expected Completion Date: June 2021

Revised Follow-Up Date: August 2021

For your convenience, we have included a copy of the Office of Legislative Services, Office of Legislative Audits original audit report dated January 2018. If we can be of assistance in the future, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Thank you for your assistance in this review.

cc:

Executive Committee

Casey Anderson

Elizabeth Hewlett

Asuntha Chiang-Smith

Audit Committee

Dorothy Bailey

Lori Depies

Partap Verma

Benjamin Williams

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Adrian Gardner

Joseph Zimmerman

Office of Legislative Audits

Gregory A. Hook