

# **City of Albuquerque** Office of Internal Audit

FOLLOW-UP OF THE INSPECTION TAG INVENTORY CONTROLS Report #20-18-102F March 11, 2021

# **INTRODUCTION**

The Office of Internal Audit (OIA) issued Audit No. 18-102, Inspection Tag Inventory Controls on October 24, 2018. OIA has completed a follow-up to determine the corrective actions that the Planning Department (Planning) has taken in response to the report. The report contains one recommendation, which has been implemented and is considered closed as of January 11, 2021.

# **BACKGROUND**

OIA conducted a performance audit on October 24, 2018, to evaluate the effectiveness of the internal controls used by Planning to ensure the accountability, accuracy, and safeguarding of the inventory of inspection approval tags. The audit found that inspection approval tags are not the City of Albuquerque's (City's) official record for successful building code inspection, but rather the City's official record for successfully passing code inspections is maintained in the POSSE Land Management System (POSSE). POSSE is an electronic permitting and inspection database maintained by the Building Safety Division. However, stakeholders have not been informed that there is little to no assurance value with the issued inspection approval tags by the Planning's Building Safety Division is responsible for ensuring construction work within the City with approved plans and building standards.

## **OBJECTIVE**

The objective of this follow-up was to determine whether Planning has taken the corrective actions recommended in OIA's October 24, 2018 audit report on Inspection Tag Inventory Controls. Consistent with Government Auditing Standards, Section 9.08, promulgated by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the purpose of audit reports includes facilitating a follow-up to determine whether appropriate corrective actions have been taken. This field follow-up is a non-audit service. Government Auditing Standards do not cover non-audit services, which are defined as professional services other than audits or attestation engagements. Therefore, Planning is responsible for the substantive outcomes of the work performed during this follow-up and is responsible to be in a position, in fact and appearance, to make an informed judgment on the results of the non-audit service. OIA limited our scope

Follow-Up Inspection Tag Inventory Controls

#20-16-107F

Date: March 11, 2021 to actions taken to address our audit recommendations from the final audit report dated October 24, 2018 through the submission of actions on February 22, 2020.

## <u>METHODOLOGY</u>

To achieve the objective, OIA:

- Obtained documentary evidence from Planning.
- Interviewed Planning staff to understand and verify the status and nature of the corrective actions taken.
- Verified the status of the recommendations that Planning had reported as implemented.

#### <u>RESULTS</u>

One recommendation was addressed in the original audit report, which has been closed. See <u>ATTACHMENT 1</u>

Follow-Up Inspection Tag Inventory Controls

Date: March 11, 2021

#20-16-107F

#### SUBMITTED:

DocuSigned by: Connie Barros-Montoya

Connie Barros-Montoya, Principal Auditor Office of Internal Audit

#### REVIEWED:

DocuSigned by: Sarah Faford-Johnson

Sarah Faford-Johnson, Contract Auditor Office of Internal Audit

#### APPROVED:

Nicole Kelley, Acting City Auditor Office of Internal Audit

#### APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION:

DocuSigned by: Edmund E. Pirca, Esq.

Edmund E. Perea, Chairperson Accountability in Government Oversight Committee

# ATTACHMENT 1

Recommendation	Responsible Agency	Department Response	OIA Conclusion	<u>OIA Use Only</u> Status Determination
Recommendation 1:	Planning Department	The latest draft of the Development     Process Manual removes all language	As of June 8, 2020, the Planning Department updated its <i>Development</i>	□ Open
The Planning Department should:	2 00 00 0000	concerning building construction inspections.	<i>Process Manual</i> (DPM). The DPM responds to the mutual need of both	⊠ Closed □ Contested
Align the City's website,     Development Process		All stake holders, i.e., permit holders, are	private and public sectors to coordinate and clarify complexities of	
Manual, and other applicable regulations		notified of the official inspection record via the revised text on all approval tags.	the development process, which includes:	
with current inspection			Albuquerque/Bernalillo County	
<ul><li>practices.</li><li>Inform all stakeholders of</li></ul>		• All approval tags now have the disclaimer and the URL directing to the official	Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan);	
Planning's current inspection practices and		inspection record website. See examples below.	Integrated Development     Ordinance (IDO); and	
clearly communicate that inspection approval		• The inspection entry data consistency is	<ul> <li>Revised Article 14-16 ROA 1994 (ROA 1994).</li> </ul>	
tags are not the City's official record for the		part of the system's required actions. A drop-down menu limits the results of	The Planning Department updated its	
successful completion for permitted work.		inspections to a specific list.	website to inform stakeholders of the current inspection practices, including	
Revise all inspection		Inspection Approval Survey: Building	instructions for stakeholders planning a	
approval tags to include a disclaimer. This disclaimer		Safety either looked at the websites or called the following jurisdictions in the	new construction, addition or remolding project to apply for building	
will mitigate the risk to the City by informing the		attempt to determine how similar size city's building departments administered	permits at the office or online.	
stakeholders that inspection tags are not the		inspection approval notification: Las Vegas, Nevada; Long Beach, California;	The Planning Department also updated the permit application process through	
official City record and verifications must be		Louisville, Kentucky; Memphis, Tennessee; Mesa, Arizona; Milwaukee, Wisconsin;	ePlan portal, which is the review process that is available to developers,	
validated with the information in POSSE.		Nashville, Tennessee; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Omaha, Nebraska; Portland,	contractors, architects and	
• Consider researching other		Oregon; Raleigh, North Carolina;	homeowners looking to apply for building permits with City of	
cities practices to identify and determine the most		Sacramento, California; Tucson, Arizona; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Virginia Beach, Virginia.	Albuquerque.	

# ATTACHMENT 1

Recommendation	Responsible Agency	Department Response	OIA Conclusion	<u>OIA Use Only</u> Status Determination
		Of those municipalities where an approval process could be determined, there was not a clear "best practice". The various department processes ranged from only issuing approval tags as the official record, to approval tags with the electronic system being the official record, to approval tags with the tags being the official record or a sign off sheet and the inspection was recorded in an electronic system as the unofficial record, to no approval tags being given at all. This led us to the conclusion to continue to provide tags as an official notification and continue to use the electronic permitting and inspection system as the official inspection record.	The Planning Department's Building Safety Division also updated the inspection tag disclaimer informing the stakeholders: "This tag is not official record of inspection. To verify the result of this inspection please visit: http://posse.cabq/pub/lms/loginh/aspx. " The disclaimer directs the stakeholders to the POSSE platform to validate the inspection tag status. According to the Planning Department, the department researched 16 jurisdictions to determine how the jurisdictions administered inspection approval notifications. The results were not clear or could not find best practices due to the varied range of the inspection tags processes. The Planning Department concluded that its current practices are sufficient.	