

Major Capital Construction Audit

Good progress, but continued vigilance needed

April 2018



Steve March, Multnomah County Auditor
Fran Davison, senior management auditor
Mark Ulanowicz, principal management auditor



Why we conducted this audit:

- High dollar projects
- Complex construction
- External stakeholders
- Limited experience with high-rise construction
- Two projects going at the same time

What we did:

We focused on cost controls –

- The construction contract
- The project delivery method
- Subcontracting processes
- Pay applications
- Change orders
- The County's internal processes

What we found:

Contracts –

- Were consistent with best practices
- A few areas would benefit from greater clarity

Project delivery method –

- Project design benefitted from contractor input

Subcontracting process –

- The construction environment made it difficult to use competitive bidding as a cost control tool
- Monitoring is needed on some arrangements



What we found:

Pay applications –

- Review not consistent across projects
- Contractors made adjustments

Change orders –

- Review process consistent with best practices
- Follow-up review needed

County internal payment and contracting processes –

- Departments understand project team needs
- Payment process timely
- Contract amendments involve many reviews



Recommendations:

The County would benefit from engaging a specialist construction auditor.

- In order to get the most value out of the County's actual cost reimbursement contracts, a review of project books and records by a specialist construction auditor is required.
- To benefit from future cost-based construction projects, the County should build the expectation that construction audit standards will be applied to any future projects.

Questions?





