Follow-up Review of Findings & Recommendations from 2014 Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program

Final Report



Internal Operations No. 16-001 December 22, 2015

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
Office of Inspector General

MEMORANDU M

FINAL AUDIT REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

Internal Operations No. 16-001

SUBJECT: Follow-up Review of Findings

and Recommendations from 2014 Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantaged

Business Enterprise Program

FROM: OIG - Helen Lew /S/

TO: CPRO - John Shackelford

DATE: December 22, 2015

This is a follow-up to a report the Office of Inspector General (OIG) issued December 23, 2014, entitled "Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program." Specifically, the objective of the follow-up audit is to determine if the Chief Procurement Officer (CPRO) has adequately addressed the findings and recommendations in OIG's December, 2014 report.

BACKGROUND

The 2014 OIG evaluation determined WMATA management did not know whether the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program was producing results consistent with its objective. This happened because the DBE reports issued to WMATA's executive management and the WMATA Board of Directors (Board) only included information on the attainment of DBE "award" commitments, with status reports reflecting new anticipated "award" target percentages, rather than the actual achievement percentages of the annual DBE goal itself. In addition, WMATA management did not have sufficient information on how well the DBE program was serving its beneficiaries. This happened because there were no program metrics in place for management to effectively monitor DBE performance.

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority OIG made two recommendations to the CPRO in the 2014 report: (1) prepare written reports to WMATA management, the Board, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on the actual DBE program performance results in compliance with the Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations; and (2) partner with the Chief Performance Officer (CPO) to develop performance indicators and measures for a new DBE Dashboard.

The CPRO's Corrective Action Plan, dated January 23, 2015, to the recommendations stated in part: "The DBE reporting metrics will be revised to include actual performance of the most previous completed Federal Fiscal Year – FFY 14. DBE actual performance stats will be included with the monthly DBE goal update. WMATA will continue to provide the FTA the semiannual Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments in accordance with 49 CFR Part 26 Appendix B; Version 6(a). This report does not require the status of goal attainment by fiscal year."

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

We found the CPRO CAP responses to OIG's "Evaluation of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program" report were inaccurate and inadequate. Specifically, (1) the DBE group's Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments submitted to the FTA contained a significant number of errors and (2) the DBE/Small Business Dashboard was not revised to include actual DBE performance metrics. Overall, OIG's corrections worked in favor of WMATA's DBE program. Based on the above results, OIG made two recommendations to the CPRO that will help validate the accuracy of the FTA Report and improve DBE program performance.

We provided a draft of this report to the CPRO for review and comment on November 13, 2015. In the CPRO's December 21, 2015 response to a draft of this report, Management concurred with the recommendations. The complete text of Management's response is included as Attachment 1 to this report.

Finding 1: The DBE's FTA Report Had Significant Number of Errors

In addressing Recommendation 1 of the 2014 report, the DBE group issued *The Uniform Report of DBE Awards/Commitments and Payments* form on June 1, 2015 to the FTA as required. The DBE's FTA report was provided to OIG for review on August 10, 2015. Our audit of the report determined it contained a significant number of errors (A copy of the DBE Manager's FTA Report can be seen in Attachment 2).

In brief, the report submitted to the FTA has 87 cells that require input of data. Our review disclosed that 18, or 20.7 percent of cells were inaccurate. This occurred because (1) the FTA reporting instructions were not followed as directed in Appendix B to 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 26, and (2) the DBE group had an inefficient and ineffective process in place to formally track and record payments made to Prime Contractors and DBE Subcontractors. Specifically, we found the FTA report included unrelated award amounts, erroneous removal of contracts, omission of the last day in the reporting period, omission of payments, miscalculations of data, and calculation errors (A copy of the OIG's Corrected FTA Report can been seen in Attachment 3).

The criteria for completion of the FTA report is found in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26. It provides guidance to recipients of DOT federal financial assistance for the proper completion of the Uniform Report of DBE Awards/Commitments and Payments form. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR state, "Recipients are required to submit this report semi-annually. In addition, recipients of DOT funds are expected to keep accurate data regarding the contracting opportunities available to firms paid for with DOT dollars. Failure to submit contracting data relative to the DBE program will result in noncompliance with Part 26. All dollar values listed on the Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments form should represent the DOT share attributable to the Operating Administration (OA): Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to which this report will be submitted."

The report is used to determine whether WMATA achieved its DBE goal in accordance with 49 CFR Part 26. The method(s) used to meet the goal are paramount to overall compliance and help ensure the DBE program is narrowly tailored to combat discrimination, and its effects, during federally-assisted projects.

OIG obtained a copy of the FTA's Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments form from the CPRO's proposed DBE/Small Business Dashboard located on WMATA's website for the October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015 reporting period. The FTA report included a General Reporting Section and was followed by four sections: Section A, Awards/Commitments Made During This Reporting Period; Section B, Breakdown by Ethnicity & Gender; Section C, Payments on Ongoing Contracts; and Section D, Total Payments on Contracts Completed this Reporting Period.

Numerous errors were found throughout the report during our examination and are detailed below for your review according to each section of the FTA's report by item number. Overall, OIG's corrections worked in favor of WMATA's DBE program. The detail is provided in order to assist the DBE Manager in understanding the basis for the errors and making the necessary corrections. OIG cannot close the recommendation until appropriate attention is given through the correction and resubmittal of the FTA report.

General Reporting Section

The WMATA Board was responsible for adopting and authorizing the release of the annual DBE percentage participation rate and the percentage of race-neutral and race-conscious goals that supported it, for the audit period. On July 22, 2010, the Board had adopted the 19 percent race-conscious¹ measure and 6 percent race-neutral² measure. However, OIG found the subdivided goal percentages entered for race-conscious and race-neutral DBE participation had been changed from those that were adopted by the Board and authorized for release. The goals entered in item 7 of the report was a 13 percent race-conscious measure and a 12 percent race-neutral measure.

According to an FTA letter dated, January 30, 2015, addressed to the former General Manager and DBE Manager, FTA urged WMATA to reduce the use of contract goals "proportionately" when it exceeds the overall goal in two consecutive years. The letter instructed WMATA to submit its adjusted race-neutral/race-conscious breakdown in FY 2015 by February 27, 2015. As a result of the FTA request, the DBE Manager made adjustments to the percentage and sent a letter dated, February 27, 2015, to the FTA Regional Civil Rights Officer with the new subdivided goals as follows: 13 percent to be achieved through race-conscious measures and 12 percent to be achieved through race-neutral measures. FTA reviewed the new percentages and determined it met the DBE requirements through a letter dated, April 22, 2015.

¹ According to DOT regulation 49 CFR Part 26, "race-conscious" is defined as a measure or program that is focused specifically on assisting only minority-owned DBEs, including women-owned DBEs.

² According to DOT regulation 49 CFR Part 26, "race-neutral" is defined as a measure or program that is, or can be, used to assist all small businesses. For the purpose of this part, *race-neutral* includes gender-neutrality.

The DBE Manager advised us the Board had not been notified about FTA's request to adjust the subdivided goals, nor the suggested changes in the goal breakdown. The DBE Manager advised us that the Board would be notified of the changes in the DBE's year-end report.

Section A: Awards/Commitments Made During This Reporting Period

<u>Item 8(A)</u> – The DBE Manager reported \$57,197,630 as the total dollar amount of prime contracts awarded; however, OIG recalculated it to be \$44,353,795. We found that the total dollar amount of prime contracts awarded for the reporting period was misstated. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 8(A) states, "Provide the total dollar amount for all prime contracts assisted with DOT funds and awarded during this reporting period." According to the new awards report from the Office of Procurement and Materials (PRMT), the amount for contract FQ14008 is \$5,870,588. Upon further review of the FQ14008 contract file, there were four option years awarded for a total of \$12,843,835 that the DBE group included in the contract award amount. The contract was awarded on 12/2/2014 and the period of performance on the base year is from 1/7/2015 through 3/6/2016.

OIG contacted the Civil Rights Officer for Oversight and DBE for the Eastern Region from the FTA to obtain guidance on contracts with option years attached to them. In an email dated, September 24, 2015, the Officer stated, "The amount of the option(s) should only be included in the report for the respective year(s)." Since the period of performance on the base year has yet to expire, the option year has not been exercised on the contract and cannot be included in item 8(A). As a result, the total dollar amount of prime contracts awarded for the reporting period was **overstated** by \$12,843,835.

<u>Item 8(I)</u> – The DBE Manager reported 6.49 percent as the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on prime contracts; however, OIG recalculated it to be 8.4 percent. We found that the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on prime contracts was incorrectly calculated. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 8(I) states, "Divide the dollar amount in item 8(C) by the dollar amount in item 8(A) to derive this percentage. Round the percentage to the nearest tenth." Instead, the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on prime contracts was calculated by dividing the dollar amount in item 8(G) by the dollar amount in item 8(A). As a result, the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on prime contracts was **understated** by 1.9 percent.

<u>Item 9(I)</u> – We found that the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on subcontracts was incorrectly calculated. The DBE Manager reported 11.56 percent as the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on subcontracts; however, OIG recalculated it to be 100 percent. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 9(I) state, "Divide the dollar amount in 9(C) by the dollar amount in item 9(A) to derive this percentage. Round percentage to the nearest tenth." Instead, the percentage of total dollars to DBEs was calculated by dividing the amount in item 9(E) by item 8(A). As a result, the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on subcontracts was **understated** by 88.4 percent.

<u>Item 10(I)</u> – We found that the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on all contracts was incorrectly calculated. The DBE Manager reported 18.05 percent as the percentage of total dollars to DBEs on all contracts; however, OIG recalculated it to be 23.3 percent. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 10(I) states, "Divide the total dollars awarded to DBEs in item 10(C) by the dollar amount in item 8(A) to derive this percentage. Round percentage to the nearest tenth." Instead, the percentage of total dollars on all contracts was calculated by adding the percentages in items 8(I) and 9(I) together. As a result, the percentage of total dollars to DBEs was **understated** by 5.3 percent.

Section B: Breakdown by Ethnicity & Gender

OIG did not find any errors in this section.

Section C: Payments on Ongoing Contracts

OIG asked the Senior DBE and Compliance Specialist to provide a report of all contracts that are currently in progress for the reporting period. The report provided reflected data from October 1, 2014 through March 30, 2015. The Specialist mentioned that she provides a list of contracts she is tracking that had activity during the reporting period to the Technology Support Manager, PRMT. The Technology Support Manager of PRMT extracts all payments made on the contracts from PeopleSoft for the reporting period and sends it back to the Specialist. Then, the Specialist populates a spreadsheet with the information received.

OIG asked the Technology Support Manager, PRMT for the corresponding report, but for the correct reporting period of October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015. With the absence of March 31, 2015 contracting activity on the report, the report given by the Senior DBE and Compliance Specialist was incomplete; therefore, items 18(A – F) were misstated.

Item 18(A) — The Technology Support Manager, PRMT provided OIG a list of 76 ongoing contracts during the reporting period; however, OIG recalculated it to be 77 contracts. According to the Contract Manager's email dated, March 14, 2014, contract FQ12166 was terminated before any work was performed by the DBE Subcontractor; therefore, it is not considered an "ongoing" contract. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 state for Section C, "Submit information on contracts that are currently in progress" and item 18(B) state, "Provide the total number of contracts where work was performed during the reporting period." In addition, contracts FQ14096 and FQ14080 was erroneously omitted from the list. According to the DBE Subcontractor Prompt Payment reports, both DBE Subcontractors performed work and were paid on both contracts; therefore both contracts are considered "ongoing". As a result, the list provided by the Technology Support Manager, PRMT should have been a total of 77 ongoing contracts.

The DBE Manager reported 74 contracts as the total number of prime and subcontracts currently in progress; however, OIG recalculated it to be 77 contracts. The Senior DBE and Compliance Specialist provided OIG a list of 74 ongoing contracts during the reporting period. The Specialist erroneously removed contracts FQ13007 and FQ12188 from the list due to the submission of approved DBE Goal Waiver requests by the Prime Contractors. However, the instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 18(B) states, "Provide the total

number of contracts where work was performed during the reporting period." 'Work performed' includes work done by the Prime Contractor and/or DBE Subcontractor. In addition, contract FQ14096 was erroneously omitted from the list. According to the DBE Subcontractor Prompt Payment report, the DBE Subcontractor performed work and was paid; therefore, the contract is considered "ongoing".

Upon OIG's corrections to the total number of contracts in item 18(A), the total number of ongoing contracts for the reporting period is 77 contracts. As a result, item 18(A) was understated by three contracts.

Item 18(B) – We found that the total dollars paid on prime and subcontracts currently in progress was incorrectly calculated. The DBE Manager reported \$43,460,066.56 as the total dollars paid on prime and subcontracts currently in progress; however, OIG recalculated it to be \$78,911,001. The report provided to OIG by the Senior DBE and Compliance Specialist had total dollars paid to all firms performing work on contracts as \$43,460,066.56. This condition occurred because (1) the last day of the reporting period was omitted from the report, (2) contract FQ14096 was omitted from the report that had a total amount paid to the Prime Contractor of \$375,882 and (3) contract FQ12220 total amount paid to the Prime Contractor was incorrectly recorded as \$856,143.67, instead of \$8,561,432.67. We found the total dollars paid in item 18(B) equated to \$78,911,011. As a result, item 18(B) was understated by \$35,450,934.

<u>Item 18(C)</u> – The DBE Manager reported 67 contracts as the total number of contracts with DBEs; however, OIG recalculated it to be 66 contracts. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 18(C) state, "From the total number of contracts provided in 18(A), provide the total number of contracts that are currently being performed by DBE firms for which payments have been made." There were a total of 11 contracts that did not have any DBE payments made during the reporting period; therefore, the total number of contracts with DBEs equates to 66 contracts [77 total number of contracts — 11 contracts without DBE payments]. As a result, the total number of contracts with DBEs was **overstated** by one contract.

<u>Item 18(D)</u> – We found that the total payments made to DBE firms was incorrect. The DBE Manager reported \$10,921,677.75 as the total payments made to DBE firms; however, OIG recalculated it to be \$8,967,764. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 18(D) state, "From the total dollar amount paid to all firms in 18(A), provide the total dollar value paid to DBE firms currently performing work during the period". OIG asked the Senior DBE and Compliance Specialist and each DBE Specialist to provide all of the DBE Subcontractor and/or Prime Contractor Prompt Payment Reports for the reporting period. We found that the total payments to DBE Subcontractors in item 18(D) equated to \$8,967,764. As a result, the total payments was **overstated** by \$1,953,914.

<u>Item 18(F)</u> – Upon OIG's correction to the total payments made to DBE Subcontractors in item 18(D), the percentage to DBEs was reduced from 25.13 percent to 11.4 percent. As a result, item 18(F) was **overstated** by 13.7 percent.

Section D: Total Payments on Contracts Completed this Reporting Period

DOT regulations state in 49 CFR Part 26, §26.51(f) that the DBE program is to be "...narrowly focused to overcome the effects of discrimination..." Advising recipients, "If, during the course of any year in which you are using contract goals, you determine that you will exceed your overall goal, you must reduce or eliminate the use of contract goals to the extent necessary to ensure that the use of contract goals does not result in exceeding the overall goal."

The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for Section D state, "This section should provide information only on contracts that are closed during this period." We asked the Senior DBE and Compliance Specialist to provide a report of all contracts closed during the reporting period. To verify DBE participation on each closed contract, OIG requested and reviewed the contract closeout packets for each closed contract from the Office Engineer, Office of Capital Program Delivery (CPDO), which is located in the Department of Transit Infrastructure and Engineering Services (TIES). In addition, OIG reviewed the associated digitized contract files from PeopleSoft for DBE participation. In using both methods, we found that only two out of 13 contracts closed within the reporting period had DBE participation as follows: FQ12219 and FQ7100. This information was found on both the contract agreement and the Performance Evaluation and Contract Closeout (COTR Report) form. Both closed contracts were race-conscious contracts.

<u>Item 19(C)</u> – The DBE Manager reported \$2,587,922 as the DBE participation amount needed to meet the goal in dollars; however; OIG recalculated it to be \$2,487,692. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 19(C) state, "From the total dollar value of prime contracts completed this reporting period in 19(B), provide the total dollar amount of dollars awarded or committed to DBE firms in order to meet contract goals. This applies only to Race-Conscious contracts."

To verify DBE awarded or committed dollars for both contracts, OIG reviewed both the contract closeout packets and associated digitized contract file from PeopleSoft for each contract. According to the Notice of Award letter dated, September 13, 2012, contract FQ12219 was awarded for \$2,755,009. The COTR Report stated that the DBE participation goal on the contract was 26 percent, equating to \$716,302 as awarded or committed DBE dollars [\$2,755,009 x .26]. According to the Notice of Award letter dated, March 18, 2009, contract FQ7100 was awarded for \$11,809,268. The COTR Report stated that the DBE participation goal on the contract was 15 percent, equating to \$1,771,390 as awarded or committed DBE dollars [\$11,809,268 x .15]. In adding both DBE contract dollar values together, item 19(C) equates to \$2,487,692. As a result, item 19(C) was **overstated** by \$100.231.

OIG agrees that the percent to DBEs in item 19(E) is 34 percent, save rounding to the tenth percent as instructed in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26; however, our review of this section of the report showed that the actual performance was based on only two completed³ contracts totaling \$15,160,266.

³ WMATA's Procurement Procedures Manual, August 2015, §18 – Contract Compliance and Administration, 18-18 - Closeout of Contract Files: A completed contract is one where all articles and services have been delivered, all payments have been made, all administrative actions accomplished and completed, and all aspects of contractual performance have been accomplished, terminated or otherwise disposed of by contract modification.

<u>Items 20(A) & 20(B)</u> – The DBE Manager reported six contracts as the total number of closed race-neutral contracts; however, OIG recalculated it to be zero race-neutral contracts in item 20(A), which reduced the total dollar value of closed contracts in item 20(B) to zero dollars. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for items 20(A) and 20(B) state, "These figures should be based on contracts completed using Race Neutral measures". As a result, the number of closed race-neutral contracts was **overstated** by six closed contracts.

<u>Items 21(A) & 21(B)</u> – Upon OIG's corrections to the total number of race-neutral contracts in item 20(A) and to the total dollar value of race-neutral contracts in item 20(B), the total number of contracts completed was **reduced** to two contracts in item 21(A), and the total value of contracts completed was **reduced** to \$15,160,266 in item 21(B).

<u>Item 21(D)</u> – The DBE Manager omitted the total DBE participation dollars, however, OIG calculated it to be \$5,197,010 in item 21(D). As a result, the total DBE participation dollars was **overstated** by the aforementioned dollar amount.

<u>Item 21(E)</u> – The DBE Manager omitted the total percent to DBEs, however, OIG calculated it to be 34.3 percent. The instructions in Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 for item 21(E) state, "Divide the total DBE participation dollar value in 21(D) by the total dollar value of contracts completed in 21(B) to derive this percentage. Round to the nearest tenth." As a result, the total percent to DBEs was **understated** by the aforementioned percentage.

Recommendation:

We recommend the CPRO:

1.1 Direct the DBE Manager to put in place a formal process that (1) collects sufficient documentation and (2) validates the accuracy of the information presented in the FTA Report.

<u>Finding 2: The Proposed DBE/Small Business Dashboard Did Not Include</u> Performance Metrics

In addressing Recommendation 2, the DBE group responded to OIG's findings in the Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program final report by proposing a DBE/Small Business Dashboard to track DBE performance. The DBE Dashboard provided to OIG for review on August 10, 2015 included three reports: Small Business and Local Preference Program Monthly Awards Report, Uniform Report, and FFY2014 DBE Payments to Date. The proposed DBE/Small Business Dashboard did not include any performance metrics.

OIG discussed the new "Dashboard" proposed in the June 10, 2015 CAP with the CPRO. The "DBE performance metrics" presented by management were inadequate in that they were informational reports and not actual performance metrics. While those reports are valuable, without the development of actual metrics and performance measures, management will continue the 'status quo'. As a result, we found management's proposed CAP deficient in addressing the OIG's recommendation. During our meeting, the CPRO was in agreement to change the metrics presented in the CAP and asked OIG to meet with the DBE Manager to share examples of potential new metrics that could be used in monitoring program performance.

OIG held a meeting with the DBE Manager on September 28, 2015 to discuss the DBE Dashboard included in their June 10, 2015 CAP. At the CPRO's request, we suggested the following basic metrics that are currently being reported in the FTA's Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments form: (1) monitor the new DBE contract awards/commitment percentage (Item 10(I)) and compare it to the triennial DBE 25 percent goal to assess WMATA's level of commitment to the DBE program; (2) monitor the active/ongoing DBE contract payments (Item 18(F)) to assess how well the program is developing in real time; and (3) track the actual DBE performance attainment through closed contracts (Item 19(F)) to assess how well WMATA does in achieving the triennial 25 percent We also suggested incorporating a metric that will document how many DBE Subcontractors are actually getting work. The utilization percentage rate of DBE Subcontractors would be a good measure of program effectiveness. OIG reported that during FFY 2013 and the first three quarters of FFY 2014, only 9.9 percent and 4.2 percent of the DBE Subcontractors were awarded contracts, respectively. In addition, 77 percent of the DBE award dollars went to just two firms in FFY 2013. This could be improved with the addition of a metric to monitor the participation rate and implementation of goals to improve it.

In response to our meeting with the DBE Manager, an update to the recommendation was received on October 14, 2015. The CPRO offered only one change to the original CAP response. Management added a chart that would track the current DBE monthly participation percentage. However, cumulative tracking and comparison to the triennial goal was not included in the chart. As this was the only metric offered, opportunities for enhancing the DBE program through better reporting and program monitoring will not be attained. Management's proposed CAP as presented will not provide WMATA executive management and the Board with sufficient data to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of overall DBE program performance. OIG cannot close the recommendation until appropriate attention is given through the development of enhanced metrics.

Recommendation:

We recommend the CPRO:

2.1 Direct the DBE Manager to develop performance indicators and measures that will (1) monitor the new DBE contract awards/commitment percentage; (2) monitor the active/ongoing DBE contract payments; (3) track actual DBE performance attainment through closed contracts; and (4) measure program effectiveness through a DBE utilization percentage rate.

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The specific objective of the audit was to determine if the Chief Procurement Officer adequately addressed the findings and recommendations in OIG's December, 2014 report, entitled "Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantage Business Enterprise Program." The scope of the review was Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015. FFY was used because WMATA's annual DBE goal is linked to the FTA's reporting cycle, rather than WMATA's fiscal year. Work was conducted at WMATA headquarters and the DBE offices located at the Material Supply Facility in Landover, Maryland.

Appendix B to 49 CFR Part 26 and the accompanying instructions were reviewed. OIG efforts focused on verifying data reported on the Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments and determining if the data reported to the FTA was accurate and complete. We reviewed reports of DBE activities in order to assess if the information was properly stated. We reviewed contract closeout packets and digitized contract files. All reported numbers were reviewed and support documentation was checked. The results of our review was populated into an electronic version of the Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments and evaluated.

The DBE/Small Business Dashboard provided was reviewed and analyzed. OIG efforts focused on verifying the validity of the DBE Dashboard and determining if the data reported was adequate. OIG held an Exit Conference on October 20, 2015 to discuss the preliminary results with WMATA management.

We conducted this performance 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 the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Corrective actions proposed (resolution phase) and implemented (closure phase) by the affected Departments/Offices will be monitored and tracked through the OIG's Audit Accountability and Resolution Tracking System. Department policy requires that you develop a final corrective action plan (CAP) for our review in the automated system within 30 days of the issuance of this report. The CAP should set forth specific action items and target completion dates necessary to implement final corrective actions on the findings and recommendations contained in this report.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance extended by your staff during the audit. Should you or your staff have any questions, please contact Andrew Clemmons, Assistant Inspector General for Audit on (202) 962-115.

cc: GMGR – P. Wiedefeld CHOS – B. Richardson CPO – A. Burnside COUN – M. Pohl



SUBJECT: Response to the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) Follow-up Review of Findings and Recommendations from 2014 Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantage Business Enterprise Program

DATE: December 21, 2015

FROM: PRMT -

THRU: PRMT – John Shackelford Shack

TO: GMGR/CEO - Paul Wiedefeld

This memo responds to the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) Follow-up Review of Findings and Recommendations from their 2014 Evaluation of WMATA's Disadvantage Business Enterprise Program. The objective of the follow-up review was to determine whether the Chief Procurement Officer (CPRO) had adequately addressed the findings and recommendations in OIG's December 2014 report.

It is noted that the initial review of OIG was titled as a Performance Evaluation, No. 15-002. See attachment 1. The current report is titled Internal Operations Audit No. 16-001. See attachment 2. Notwithstanding, the title of the documents does not change the content nor focus of our feedback.

The OIG evaluation determined WMATA management did not know whether the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program was producing results consistent with its objectives. The OIG opined that the DBE reports issued to WMATA's executive management and the WMATA Board of Directors (Board) only included information on the attainment of DBE "award" commitments, with status reports reflecting new anticipated "award" target percentages, rather than the actual achievement percentages of the annual DBE goal itself. OIG also opined WMATA management did not have sufficient information on how well the DBE program was serving its beneficiaries because there were no program metrics in place for management to effectively monitor DBE performance.

OIG provided two recommendations to the Chief Procurement Officer (CPRO):

(1) prepare written reports to WMATA management, the Board, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on the actual DBE program performance results in compliance with the Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations; and

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (2) collaborate and partner with the Chief Performance Officer (CPO) to develop performance indicators and measures for a new DBE Dashboard.

The CPRO provided a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), dated January 23, 2015, indicating that:

- (1) The DBE reporting metrics will be revised to include actual performance of the most previous completed Federal Fiscal Year FFY 14; and DBE actual performance statistics will be included with the monthly DBE goal update. However, OIG found that the CPRO's CAP responses to OIG's "Evaluation of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program" report were inaccurate and inadequate. Specifically, (1) the DBE group's Uniform Report of DBE Commitments/Awards and Payments submitted to the FTA contained a significant number of errors and (2) the DBE/Small Business Dashboard was not revised to include actual DBE performance metrics. It should be noted that performance metrics are not an FTA requirement.
- (2) The CPRO and CPO would collaboratively develop reporting metrics that would be posted to a common dashboard for publication.

In their updated report of the CPRO corrective actions taken, OIG made two recommendations. PRMT concurs with comment on the OIG recommendations.

Finding 1: The DBE's FTA Report Had a Significant Number of Errors.

OIG stated that 18 of 87 cells of information were incorrect because:

- (1) FTA reporting instructions were not followed; and
- (2) DBE group had an ineffective and insufficient process in place to formally track and record payment made to Prime Contractors and subcontractors. Specifically, the DBE report contained unrelated award amounts, erroneous removal of contracts, omission of data from the last day in the reporting period, omission of payment, miscalculations of data, and calculation errors.

PRMT/DBE Response to Finding 1:

PRMT/DBE concurs with this recommendation and has updated the report. It is noted that the DBE group did follow the FTA instructions for Appendix B at 49 CFR Part 26 and submitted a data element compliant and timely report of the required awards, commitments, and payment form required by the FTA guidance in effect

at the time of the report filing. Recently, the FTA updated its reporting requirement to obtain actual attainment against the goal. We will comply with that requirement, as part of the next scheduled report to FTA, and will provide the correction of inaccurate information in the semi-annual report. FTA concurs with this data correction approach.

OIG stated that the DBE Group did not inform the Metro Board that FTA had requested a change in the race-neutral and race-conscious goals and did not obtain its approval for the changes. The DBE Group followed the instructions mandated by the Board in Resolution 2011-30. See attachment 3. The Board delegated the approval of any DBE goal changes to the General Manager/CEO. The DBE Group submitted this information to the General Manager and obtained his approval in accordance with the cited resolution.

The data calculation errors noted by OIG in items 8(A), 8(I), 9(I) and 10(I), have been corrected and formula adjustments in the data collection process have been updated. Based on the recalculations, DBE has also made adjustments to Section B (breakdown by ethnicity and gender); Section C (payment on ongoing contracts); Section D Items 19(C); 20(A), 20(B) and 21(A), (B), (D) and (E): (total payment on contracts completed this report period).

OIG Recommendation 1.

Direct the DBE Manager to put in place a formal process that (1) collects sufficient documentation and (2) validates the accuracy of the information presented in the FTA Report.

Response:

PRMT concurs. PRMT has implemented procedures and the DBE Group has collected and validated the information contained in the FTA reports.

OIG Recommendation 2.

Direct the DBE Manager to develop performance indicators and measures that will (1) monitor the new DBE contract awards/commitment percentage; (2) monitor the active/ongoing DBE contract payments; (3) track actual DBE performance attainment through closed contracts; and (4) measure program effectiveness through a DBE utilization percentage rate.

Response:

PRMT concurs. The proposed Contract Life Cycle Management (CLM) system will have the capacity to track WMATA's supply chain activities and report on procure

to pay metrics which will include planning, sourcing and commitment vs actual payments along with the dates and amounts related to award, receipts, invoices and payments. The CLM system will have automated notifications functionality based on milestones dates and pre-defined workflow for all levels of approvals.

PRMT will continue to work with the Chief Performance Office to develop performance indicators and reporting measures. It is currently collecting the new DBE contract awards and monitoring the active/ongoing DBE contract payments. This data will be submitted, on a monthly basis, to OMBS.

Attachment 2

Original DBE Submission Attachment 1

	M /AWARDS AND DAY	V manina							
		TURNIS .	** Plane sales to	the frameworks should be described as	Aldes and the Avenue				
The bottom of the first property of the bottom of the first of the fir	A 1 1554A	18 IPPs Angelogy	7.00		SOR CHAPTURES.				
editorit.									
Detected thread years to relate to represent purpose thread	10.5			4 Date This Remore Subsessed, June	1.2015				
Plante and address of Recipions	II tel selvin que lous 2 tipo be	104 Brt. 1-Mar 31)	[] Report due Dur (for person April 3-Sept. 200)) I fan woud reput dec Dur.)			
Annual D&E Cont(s)).	Roce Conscious Projection		La Sant Married Branches				Tower of Co		
rds/Commitments this Reporting			113%			112%	CONTRICTOR COM	25%	
AWARDS STORY TO THE SAME BOOK TO									
THIS EXPORTING PERSON (mail collects and substitute constant during the reporting period)	Filial Delizine	Total Rumber	Total to D&Es (dellars)	Total to CEEs (reader)	Total to DEEs /Rore Conscious (declars)	Total to D&Es/Race Constrous (neather)	Total to DEEn/Raco Houtral (dullers)	Total to D\$Es/Race Neutral (souther)	Percentage of total delians to DREs
	\$57 197 630 00	24	52 712 457 00				4 4 5 5 4 5 5 5 5		2 -2-1
Substitutes comment/constrained that period				6	CC C44 453 00	-	3.712.467.00	1	6.49%
TOTAL							4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		11.56%
					130.014.427.00	1X	13 3.717.467.00	LL	18.05%
			Contracts Awarded to DEEs this Period						
	Fotot to DEE Mader pro-	n		Satel to DRE (number)			•		
	Western	Mea	Tetal		Men	Test			
		\$8,721,217	\$9,039,796	1	3	4			
	SO	\$386,746	\$386,746	0	1	 			
Notire American	SO	SO			ĥ	là -			
Acton-Pacific American						 			
					<u> ^</u>	 			
	633.004					1			
						3			
	2450.674	\$9.976.245	IS10.326.919	<u> </u>	16	110			
tents Made this Period				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
(rejon allows of engines occurrent)		Retal Dellars Pald		Tistal Number of Contracts with DBEs	Total Payments to DEE Grass		Total Number of DBE Gree Park		Percent to 086s
Printe and task manifesty contents in progress	74	\$	43,460,066.56	67	ş	10,921,677.75	30	5	25.13%
TOTAL PATRICISTS ON CONTRACTS COMPLETED THE REPORTOR PERIOD	Number of Contracts Complicad		Total Dellar Value of Coot	Parts Completed	DEE Participation Heeded to Meri Goal (Deliar		Total DSE Farbitpones (Bellers)		Percent to Dille
Auto Congrang									
face Heating			13,100,200.00		<u> \$</u>	2,587,922.00	\$	5,197,010.00	34%
	6		\$ 13,355,641.00						
		<u> </u>	\$	28,515,907.00					l
Solutional By:			34 Signature:				25. Phone Humber:		
	Shedomical tributes 1 1 1 Per Chandre (Add Recipros) 1 1 Per Chandre (Add Recipros) Contributes (FTA R	CENTRE REPORT OF DRE COMMITMENTS (AWARDS AND PAY	CEPORNA REPORT OF DRE COMMITMENTS (AWARDS AND PAYEDRES Character (AR Angeles (Control of Control of Contro	CEPORNE SEPORT OF DRE COMMITMENTS/AWARDS AND PAYFORMS Present Profession	Characteristic Committee Committee	Committee Comm			Control Cont

Attachment 3

OIG Corrected Version Attachment 2

***Please refer to the businessines shoet is indentited to joined only seed; Schemited An Ecologistic, Farmer PTA Encaptures; Factori Succi year to which reporting yested (EV); Experting Period Permand address of Auspient: Annual OSS Gostio;	1398 FFV 2015 Disport due June			NE CONSMITMENTS					
AP Hembers (FAA Recipions); Grean Humber (FTA Recipions); Foderal Recal year in which reporting ported (chi; Experting Period Home and address of Recipions;	1398 FFY 2015 Picport due June	DM	② TAI	ariahan 80 Marahan			_		
Number (PTA Recipients): Federal Recal year in which reporting ported (stir): Aspersing Period Jame and address of Recipients	FFY 2015 Peport due hine				•				
Pederal Recol year in which reporting period (city) Reporting Period Rome and address of Receptants	FFY 2015 Peport due hine								
Reporting Period Stome and address of Reciptoric	į	57Y 2015		4. Date This Report S					
	į	1 (for period Oct. 1-	Mar. 31)				FAA annual report	due Dee 1	
Annumi DRI Gosfiti:	WANTA BOD FIRST SE	eet, N.W. Washington					(Classes report		
	Zaco Canacious Proje		19%				OVERALL Goal	23%	
			2211	nitments this Repo		- DK	0.000		
	A		c		ī		G		-
AMANDA/COMMUNICATES MANN COURSE THAT REPORTING PERSON (SHAII conducts and subconstructs constitued during this reporting period)	Total Dullers	Total Municiper	Total to IIII.s (dollars)	Total to DEEs (number)	Total to DBEs /Roce Conscious (deCons)	Total to DBEs/Reco Conscious (number)	Fetal to UREs/Race Neutral (dellars)	Total to DBCs/Raco Neutral (number)	Percentage of total dollars to DBCs
Frime contracts asserted this period	\$44,333,795	24	\$1,712,467				\$3,712,467.00	:	B.4%
Selectarizados amordos/camendos/chip period	\$4,614,452	,	\$8,814,432	,	6,614,452	,			100%
TOTAL			\$10,228,919	10	4,614,652	•	\$3,713,447.00	:	23.3%
		Contracts Asserted to DATe this Bodge						1	
SEEAIDONNI SY STRINGTY & CENTRE	Α		¢		E .		- 67	,	
	Total to DB2 (dollar amount)				Tatal to DEE (America	n	Rane(s) of Perfetoration (MS Come		
	Women	Mgm	Tetal	Women	Man	Fetal		l	
Stack American	\$ 110575	\$ 8231.337	t anna 104				Nettermide Electrical, Absolute Solutions & Accordates, G.W. Peoples, Cardes		
Mepanie Amenepa		121,746	164,746		 		RIA Electrical		
Hathre American									
			9,826		- 1	1			
Non-Millertry		854,455	,		 		Acoro Sepply, L.I.S.		
TOTAL		0.000.000			-	 ;			
			20,010,015	·	•				
				ents Made this Per					
	Α		·	· ·		•	E	•	
PAYMENTS ON UNIQUES CONTRACTS (report activity of Degring contract)	Total Humber of Cantracts	Total Dellars Paid		Tatal Humber of Contracts with DBEs	Yetsi Payments to CDE firms		Total Humber of DES Stone Paid	Percent to OEEs	
Priorie and sele contracts currently in progress	77	\$	78,911,001	"	66 5 0,960,6		36	11.4%	
·			· ·						
RUTAL PAYMEDITS ON CONTRACTS CONSPICTED THE REPORTING PERSON									Percent to DRE
Raco Canacique			\$	11,160,266	5	2,467,692	8 5,197,010		343%
face Meutral									
	•		5				\$ 5,197,819		34,3%
	SISSAEDONAN BY TRENDETY & CENTURE BICK American Bigshik American	A Technology & Chartes A Warren Back American S 316,577 Bashik American S 316,577 Bashik American S 316,577 Bashik American S 316,577 Bashik American Selection Market Selection Mar	A B Total to D03 (delier ame Whemen Men A B Total to D03 (delier ame Whemen Men S 118,575 S 8,721,117 Repair American S 118,575 S 8,721,117 S 11,094 S 11,09	SEARCOWN BY ETRINICETY & CALADICA Total to D02 (defer amount) Wigness Book American S 318,572 S 8,723,217 S 9,019,796 S 318,572 S 9,723,217 S 9,019,796 Book American A 8 WITHIN THE SIMPLE OF STREET	STARTAFTS	STARTONIN BY ETHOLOGY & COURT CONTROL OF TOTAL PROPERTY OF TOTAL P			STARTAND 10