



John Keel, CPA
State Auditor

An Audit Report on

Performance Measures at the Department of Transportation

October 2008

Report No. 09-008



An Audit Report on

Performance Measures at the Department of Transportation

SAO Report No. 09-008
October 2008

Overall Conclusion

The Department of Transportation (Department) reported reliable results for six of eight (75 percent) performance measures for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. A result is considered reliable if it is certified or certified with qualification.

Specifically, for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008:

- One key performance measure—Number of Construction Project Preliminary Engineering Plans Completed—was certified with qualification because the Department's supporting documentation lacked sufficient details and there were no documented supervisory reviews.
- Two key performance measures—Dollar Volume of Construction Contracts Awarded in Fiscal Year (in millions) and Number of Projects Awarded—were certified with qualification because these measures were not compiled according to their definitions and there were no documented supervisory reviews.
- One key performance measure—Number of Highway Lane Miles Resurfaced by State Forces—was certified with qualification because the Department's input controls did not ensure that the results entered in the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) matched the numbers on source documents.
- One key performance measure—Administrative and Support Costs as a Percent of Grant Expended—was certified with qualification because there were no documented supervisory reviews.
- One key performance measure—Automobile Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) Administrative and Support Costs as Percentage of Total Expenditures—was inaccurate because there was more than a 5 percent variance between the Department's reported performance in ABEST and the performance measure results that auditors calculated.

Background Information

Entities report results for their key measures to the Legislative Budget Board's budget and evaluation system, which is called the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas, or ABEST.

- Factors prevented certification of one key performance measure—Number of Lane Miles Contracted for Resurfacing—because the Department did not follow the measure definition.
- One key performance measure—Administration and Support Costs as Percent of Expended Funds—was certified.

Table 1 summarizes the certification results from audit testing.

Table 1

Department of Transportation (Agency 601)				
Related Objective or Strategy, Classification	Description of Measure	Fiscal Year	Results Reported in ABEST	Certification Results
A.1.1 Output	Number of Construction Project Preliminary Engineering Plans Completed	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	877 375	Certified with Qualification
A.1.1 Output	Dollar Volume of Construction Contracts Awarded in Fiscal Year (in millions)	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	\$3,694.48 \$1,444.28	Certified with Qualification
A.1.1 Output	Number of Projects Awarded	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	811 357	Certified with Qualification
C.1.1 Output	Number of Lane Miles Contracted for Resurfacing	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	13,197 6,839	Factors Prevented Certification
C.1.2 Output	Number of Highway Lane Miles Resurfaced by State Forces	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	5,984 2,245	Certified with Qualification
D.1.1 Efficiency	Administrative and Support Costs as a Percent of Grant Expended	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	3.23% 2.76%	Certified with Qualification
D.4.1 Efficiency	Automobile Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) Administrative and Support Costs as Percentage of Total Expenditures	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	12.73% 7.13%	Inaccurate
B.1.2 Efficiency	Administration and Support Costs as Percent of Expended Funds	2007 2008 (quarters 1 and 2)	4.40 % 2.85%	Certified

A measure is **Certified** if reported performance is accurate within 5 percent of actual performance and if it appears that controls to ensure accuracy are in place for collecting and reporting performance data.

A measure is **Certified with Qualification** when reported performance appears accurate but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy. A measure is also certified with qualification when controls are strong but source documentation is unavailable for testing. A measure is also certified with qualification if the agency's calculation of performance deviated from the measure definition but caused less than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.

A measure is **Inaccurate** when the actual performance is not within 5 percent of reported performance, or when there is more than a 5 percent error in the sample of documentation tested. A measure is also inaccurate if the agency's calculation deviated from the measure definition and caused more than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.

A **Factors Prevented Certification** designation is used if documentation is unavailable and controls are not adequate to ensure accuracy. This designation also will be used when there is a deviation from the measure definition and the auditor cannot determine the correct performance measure result.

Summary of Management's Response

The Department generally agreed with the recommendations in this report.

Summary of Information Technology Review

Auditors assessed the information technology (IT) controls over the Department's information systems and other automated processes used for performance measure data. Auditors evaluated general IT controls, including logical access, program change management, physical security, and disaster recovery. Auditors also reviewed application controls, including input controls, process controls, and output controls.

Overall, the Department's general IT controls and software application controls were adequate. The Department's key controls have certain strengths, but all systems tested had access control weaknesses or lacked documented procedures for updating system information or controlling user access.

Summary of Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

The objectives of the audit were to determine whether the Department:

- Accurately reported selected key performance measures to ABEST.
- Has adequate control systems in place over the collecting, calculating, and reporting of selected key performance measures

The audit scope included eight key performance measures the Department reported for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. Auditors also reviewed the controls over the submission of data used in reporting the performance measures and traced performance measure information to the original source documents when possible.

The audit methodology consisted of selecting eight key performance measures, auditing reported results for accuracy and adherence to measure definitions, evaluating controls over the performance measures' calculation processes and related information systems, and testing of original source documentation.

Contents

Detailed Results

Chapter 1 The Department Should Improve the Reliability of Its Performance Measure Reporting	1
--	---

Chapter 2 The Department's Controls Over Information Technology Systems Are Adequate, But Certain Areas Need Improvement	9
---	---

Appendix

Appendix Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	13
--	----

Detailed Results

Chapter 1

The Department Should Improve the Reliability of Its Performance Measure Reporting

The Department of Transportation (Department) reported reliable results for six of eight (75 percent) performance measures for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. A result is considered reliable if it is certified or certified with qualification.

The Department can improve the reliability of its measures by developing and implementing adequate controls over the collection, calculation, review, and reporting of performance measures. Two important controls on which the Department should focus are:

- Developing and implementing controls that ensure supporting documentation for each reporting period, including updates entered into automated systems, is retained for the fiscal year reported plus three years.
- Conducting management reviews and documenting approvals to ensure that calculations are consistent with each measure's definition and methodology in ABEST.

The Guide to Performance Measure Management (State Auditor's Office Report No. 06-329, August 2006) is a helpful resource for developing procedures for performance measure reporting.

Key Measures

Number of Construction Project Preliminary Engineering Plans Completed

**Results for Fiscal Year 2007 and the First Two Quarters of Fiscal Year 2008:
Certified with Qualification**

Results are certified with qualification when reported performance appears accurate, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy.

This measure was certified with qualification because the reported results were accurate, but auditors identified the following control weaknesses in the calculation of the measure:

- The Department did not have documentation indicating which preliminary engineering plans it included in the results it reported to ABEST. Because of this, there were differences between the Department's source documents (logs) and summary documents; however, those differences (1.15 percent for fiscal year 2007 and 2.18 percent for the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008) were inconsequential in relation to the total year-to-date results reported.

- The Department did not have documentation of supervisory review before it submitted the performance measure results to its ABEST coordinator.

Recommendations

The Department should:

- Document the total number and type (local or statewide) of preliminary engineering plans counted and reported on the source documentation for this performance measure.
- Implement and document a process to review the calculation of this performance measure prior to submission to the ABEST coordinator.

Management's Response

TxDOT concurs with these recommendations to document the number and type of engineering plans on the source document, and to implement and document a process to review the calculation of this measure prior to entering into ABEST.

Dollar Volume of Construction Contracts Awarded in Fiscal Year (in Millions)

**Results for Fiscal Year 2007 and the First Two Quarters of Fiscal Year 2008:
Certified with Qualification**

A measure is certified with qualification if the agency's calculation of performance deviated from the measure definition but caused less than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.

This measure was certified with qualification because the reported results were accurate, but the Department did not compile the measure results according to the measure definition and there was no documented supervisory review of performance measure data. According to the measure definition, all contracts the Texas Transportation Commission awards should be included in the calculation.

The query the Department used to generate performance measure information included updates that had been made to information in the automated system. This resulted in the omission of contracts that the Texas Transportation Commission awarded but were later canceled or were not completed because of contractor default. The Department's procedures did not include reporting the performance measure data that was updated in the automated system. The difference between the Department's reported measure result and the correct performance measure result was less than 1 percent for both periods audited.

In addition, there was no documentation of supervisory review before the performance measure results were submitted to the Department's ABEST coordinator. Documented supervisory review of performance measure data

helps ensure the performance measure is properly collected and accurately calculated and reported.

Recommendations

The Department should:

- Ensure it compiles the reported measure according to the measure definition by including all contracts the Texas Transportation Commission awards (including contracts subsequently canceled) in its calculation of this performance measure.
- Maintain supporting documentation for each reporting period, including supporting documentation for all updates entered into automated systems that affect reporting period totals and data on awarded contracts and dollar amounts.
- Implement and document a process to review the collection, calculation, and reporting of this performance measure prior to submission to the ABEST coordinator.

Management's Response

TxDOT concurs with the recommendations and will implement an updated procedure that will compile data in accordance with the measure definition, maintain the documentation supporting each reporting period, and review the calculation before entering to ABEST.

Number of Projects Awarded

**Results for Fiscal Year 2007
and the First Two Quarters
of Fiscal Year 2008:
Certified with Qualification**

A measure is certified with qualification if the agency's calculation of performance deviated from the measure definition but caused less than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.

This measure was certified with qualification because the reported results were accurate, but the Department did not compile the measure results according to the measure definition. According to the measure definition, all projects awarded by the Texas Transportation Commission should be included.

The query the Department used to generate performance measure information included updates that had been made to information in the automated system. This resulted in the omission of contracts that the Texas Transportation Commission awarded but were later canceled or were not completed because of contractor default. The Department's procedures did not include reporting the performance measure data that

was updated in the automated system. The difference between the Department's reported measure result and the correct performance measure result was less than 3 percent for both periods audited.

In addition, there was no documentation of supervisory review before the performance measure results were submitted to the Department's ABEST coordinator. Documented supervisory review of performance measure data helps ensure the performance measure is properly collected and accurately calculated and reported.

Recommendations

The Department should:

- Ensure it compiles the reported measure according to the measure definition by including all contracts the Texas Transportation Commission awards (including contracts subsequently canceled) in its calculation of this performance measure.
- Maintain supporting documentation for each reporting period, including supporting documentation for all updates entered into automated systems that affect reporting period totals and data on awarded contracts and dollar amounts.
- Implement and document a review process of the performance measure calculation prior to submission to the ABEST coordinator.

Management's Response

TxDOT concurs with the recommendations and will implement an updated procedure that will compile data in accordance with the measure definition, maintain the documentation supporting each reporting period, and review the calculation before entering to ABEST.

Number of Highway Lane Miles Resurfaced by State Forces

This measure was certified with qualification because, although the reported results were accurate, controls over data collection and reporting were not adequate to ensure continued accuracy. The Department's input controls did not ensure that data in the automated system accurately reflected information in source documentation or that changes made to the data used to calculate the performance measure were reported to ABEST.

Ten (38 percent) of the 26 changes that were documented on the

**Results for Fiscal Year 2007 and
the First Two Quarters of Fiscal
Year 2008:
Certified with Qualification**

Results are certified with qualification when reported performance appears accurate but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy.

Department's change tracking spreadsheet were not reflected in the Department's Maintenance Management Information System (MMIS). Additionally, the number of square yards resurfaced on the Department's *Daily Activity Reports* differed from the number of square yards resurfaced that was recorded in MMIS for 2 of 42 (4.76 percent) items tested for fiscal year 2007 and for 1 of 21 (4.76 percent) items tested for the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008.

Recommendations

The Department should:

- Maintain supporting documentation for each reporting period, including supporting documentation for all updates entered into automated systems that affect reporting period totals and data reflected in MMIS.
- Ensure that changes it makes to performance measure data subsequent to reporting are also reported to ABEST, along with an explanation of the reason for the change.

Management's Response

In August of 2008, TxDOT implemented an automated daily audit report that reflects any changes to task numbers in MMIS made by district or division personnel. These reports are filed electronically. This will provide supporting documentation to any updates made to the system after the Daily Activity Report has been entered.

TxDOT is also in the process of replacing the current MMIS application with a new maintenance management system. The new system will have improved auditing functionality and provide an easier error correction process to ensure accuracy of the data. The expected implementation date of the new system is fiscal year 2011.

Administrative and Support Costs as a Percent of Grant Expended

**Results for Fiscal Year 2007 and the First Two Quarters of Fiscal Year 2008:
Certified with Qualification**

Results are certified with qualification when reported performance appears accurate, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy.

This measure was certified with qualification because the reported results were accurate, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy.

The Department does not have documented procedures for review of the data used in the calculation of this measure. As a result, there was no documentation of supervisory review of the performance measure calculations for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. In addition, there were no documented reviews for the data

extracts that the Department used to calculate the measure results for the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. Documented supervisory review of performance measure data helps ensure the performance measure is properly collected and accurately calculated and reported.

Recommendation

The Department should develop and implement procedures for a documented supervisory review of the data extracts and calculations used to determine results for this performance measure.

Management's Response

TxDOT concurs with the recommendation and will develop and implement a procedure for a documented supervisory review. Procedures will be implemented to include a review of the data extracts and calculations regarding this measure.

Automobile Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) Administrative and Support Costs as Percentage of Total Expenditures

Results for Fiscal Year 2007 and the First Two Quarters of Fiscal Year 2008: Inaccurate

A measure is inaccurate when the actual performance is not within 5 percent of reported performance, or when there is more than a 5 percent error in the sample of documentation tested. A measure is also inaccurate if the agency's calculation deviated from the measure definition and caused more than a 5 percent difference between the number reported in ABEST and the correct performance measure result.

This performance measure was inaccurate. The 12.73 percent result that the Department reported for fiscal year 2007 was less than auditors' calculation of 18.97 percent, resulting in the performance measure being underreported by 32.88 percent.

This measure is defined as the percentage that all administrative and support costs represent of the total amount of expenditures in a given fiscal year for the Automobile Theft Prevention Authority (ATPA) of the Department's Vehicle Titles and Registration Division. Auditors determined that the Department's procedures and calculation of the measure did not include all of the expenditures as required by the definition, which made the measure inaccurate.

The results the Department reported for the first quarter of fiscal year 2008 was 59.45 percent, resulting in the performance measure being overreported by 115.18 percent. The Department incorrectly reported results for the first quarter of fiscal year 2008 using preliminary figures for November 2007, instead of actual figures. This error was identified during this audit, and the Department submitted a correction to ABEST.

Auditors also identified other issues that the Department should correct:

- The Department’s procedures for calculating the measure incorrectly state that the measure is calculated by multiplying by 100,000, instead of multiplying by 100, to calculate a percentage.
- The review process for this measure at the division level is not documented. A documented supervisory review of performance measure data helps ensure the performance measure is properly collected and accurately calculated and reported.
- Reported and actual administrative support costs exceeded both the ABEST target of 6.23 percent and the statutory limit of 8.00 percent. Texas Civil Statutes, Article 4413(37), Section 8(b), states that “In any fiscal year, the amount of the administrative expenses for the [Automobile Theft Prevention Authority], including salaries, travel, and marketing expenses, and other overhead expenses may not exceed eight percent of the total expenditures of the [Automobile Theft Prevention Authority].”

Recommendations

The Department should:

- Coordinate with the Legislative Budget Board and the Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning, and Policy to revise the measure’s definition and data source. It also should ensure that the data source includes all related expenses.
- Update its procedures for this measure to reflect the revised ABEST definition, methodology, and data source for this measure.
- Revise its procedures for this measure to include a review of the data after it is calculated at the division level to verify the accuracy of the reported measure results and adherence to the ABEST definition and methodology. This review should be documented.

Management’s Response

TxDOT concurs with the recommendations to revise the LBB definition and will include all related expenses, update our procedures to reflect these revised ABEST definitions and data sources, and implement and document a process to review the calculation of this measure prior to entering into ABEST.

Number of Lane Miles Contracted for Resurfacing

Results for Fiscal Year 2007 and the First Two Quarters of Fiscal Year 2008: Factors Prevented Certification

A factors prevented certification designation is used if documentation is unavailable and controls are not adequate to ensure accuracy. This designation also will be used when there is a deviation from the measure definition and the auditor cannot determine the correct performance measure result.

Factors prevented the certification of this measure. In a 2006 audit, factors also prevented the certification of this measure (see *An Audit Report on Performance Measures at Five State Agencies*, State Auditor's Office Report No. 07-005, December 2006).

The Department did not follow the definition for this measure. The definition refers to resurfacings completed throughout the state by contract; however, the Department reported the lane miles for which it had contracted, rather than actual lane miles completed.

The Department has proposed changes to the measure definition to emphasize that the measure includes contracts awarded but for which work may or may not have been performed during the reporting period.

Recommendation

The Department should coordinate with the Legislative Budget Board and the Governor's Office of Budget, Planning, and Policy to revise the measure.

Management's Response

Measure definition change request was submitted to the Legislative Budget Board on August 21, 2007 in response to the State Auditor's FY 2006 audit findings and recommendations.

The updated/approved measure definition for FY 2010-2011 biennium reflects the changes in August, 2007. The new definition states "This measure calculates the total number of lane miles receiving roadway surface improvements under Contracted Routine Maintenance plus the total number of lane miles let to receive roadway surface improvements under Contracted Preventive Maintenance."

The Department's Controls Over Information Technology Systems Are Adequate, But Certain Areas Need Improvement

The Department's general information technology (IT) controls and software application controls are adequate. The Department's controls have certain strengths, but all systems tested had access control weaknesses or lacked documented procedures for updating system information or controlling user access.

The Department's controls have the following strengths:

- The Department has an appropriate change management structure, and all changes are controlled by the Department's Data and Quality Management Services Branch.
- The Department's documentation describes processing, input, and output controls designed to ensure data accuracy and completeness for most systems tested.
- User IDs were unique for all systems tested.

However, the Department's management of user access should be improved to ensure compliance with Department established policies regarding user access, authorization, and management. Specifically:

- Four users had access to the Financial Information Management System (FIMS), but they were not assigned to the Finance Division, as required by the established access criteria.
- One user was granted access to the Design and Construction Information System (DCIS) without approval from the Office of Primary Responsibility, as required by the DCIS access criteria.
- The Department does not have up-to-date criteria defining the rules for granting access to its Budget Information System (BIS), and it was unable to provide a list of all users with access to BIS and their associated access levels.
- Department policy requires each terminated user's ID to be suspended by the close of business on the user's last workday for normal terminations and immediately for adverse terminations. A review of the Department's management of user access identified that 28 terminated users had active access to systems used for performance measure reporting. Ten terminated users had continued access to MMIS. Six terminated users had continued access to FIMS. Twelve terminated users had continued access to DCIS.

- The Department does not have documented procedures for adding or deleting users from its Decision Support System/Bid Analysis Management System (DSS/BAMS) to ensure that user access is properly managed. However, a review of five users' access to DSS/BAMS indicated that their access was appropriate and that they were current employees.

In addition, the Department does not have written procedures and guidelines for the point at which performance information is first recorded. A lack of documented procedures may result in inaccurate or inconsistent data. The Department also does not have documented procedures for uploading data from the DCIS system into the DSS/BAMS system. Documented procedures help ensure data accuracy and consistency in the event those employees currently downloading the data are unavailable.

Recommendations

The Department should:

- Ensure that users with access to FIMS meet the criteria for access to that system.
- Ensure that users obtain appropriate approvals before being granted access to DCIS.
- Develop up-to-date criteria defining rules for granting access to BIS.
- Suspend terminated users' ID in accordance with Department policy.
- Document its procedures for adding or deleting users from DSS/BAMS.
- Document written procedures and guidelines for the point at which performance information is first recorded.
- Develop and implement documented procedures for uploading data from the DCIS into DSS/BAMS.

Management's Response

Recommendation: Ensure that users with access to FIMS meet the criteria for access to that system.

TxDOT maintains an up-to-date Access Criteria document for the FIMS application. The Access Criteria documents the job functions and the appropriate access levels to perform the job function. TxDOT Security Administrators (SA) are trained to validate each access request against the Access Criteria to ensure proper access is granted. The Finance Division

performs an annual audit of all FIMS access to verify all users have the appropriate access.

TxDOT will enhance the existing compliance monitoring system to perform an additional validation that “Finance Division only” access is only granted to Finance Division employees.

Recommendation: Ensure that users obtain appropriate approvals before being granted access to DCIS.

TxDOT will enhance the existing compliance monitoring system to perform an additional validation that all DCIS profiles requiring an exception have a valid exception on file.

Recommendation: Develop up-to-date criteria defining rules for granting access to BIS.

Access to BIS is granted on an individual basis. When a request is made, a determination is made whether an additional license is necessary or if a transfer of access rights from one person to another is more appropriate. Determination is made based on the position of the person asking for access and how many licenses the office currently holds.

TxDOT will develop and implement a standard set of guidelines for granting BIS access by December 1, 2008.

Recommendation: Suspend terminated users’ id in accordance with Department policy.

TxDOT’s current compliance monitoring system will validate that terminated user accounts are either suspended or terminated. The compliance monitoring system currently reports on a monthly basis. TxDOT will enhance the compliance monitoring system to monitor terminations on a daily basis. This enhancement will alert SAs each day if there is a terminated user with an account that has not been suspended.

Recommendation: Document its procedures for adding or deleting users from DSS/BAMS.

Management agrees with the recommendations and will formalize the procedure for adding and deleting users from DSS/BAMS.

Recommendation: Document written procedures and guidelines for the point at which performance information is first recorded.

The Department will describe the procedures of data entry into the systems in the performance measure manuals, and attach a copy to the system manuals.

Recommendation: Develop and implement documented procedures for uploading data from the DCIS into DSS/BAMS.

The current process for updating information from DCIS into DSS/BAMS will be documented. Management agrees with the recommendations and will formalize the procedure for adding and deleting users from DSS/BAMS. Further, the current process for updating information from DCIS into DSS/BAMS will be documented.

Appendix

Appendix

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Objectives

The objectives of this audit were to determine whether the Department of Transportation (Department):

- Accurately reported selected key performance measures to the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST).
- Has adequate control systems in place over the collecting, calculating, and reporting of selected key performance measures.

Scope

The scope of the audit included eight key performance measures the Department reported for fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. Auditors also reviewed controls over the submission of data used in reporting performance measures and traced performance measure information to the original source documents when possible.

Methodology

Auditors selected eight key performance measures that the Department reported in ABEST in fiscal year 2007 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2008. The Department completed questionnaires related to its performance measurement process to help identify preliminary control information.

Specific tests and procedures included:

- Auditing calculations for accuracy and to ensure that they were consistent with the methodology on which the Department and Legislative Budget Board agreed.
- Analyzing data flow to evaluate whether proper controls were in place.
- Testing a sample of source documents to verify the accuracy of reported performance when possible.
- Conducting high-level review of all information systems that support the performance measure data.
- Assessing performance measure results in one of four categories: Certified, Certified with Qualification, Inaccurate, and Factors Prevented Certification.

Criteria used included the following:

- The *Guide to Performance Measure Management* (State Auditor's Office Report No. 06-329, August 2006).
- ABEST measure definitions.

Project Information

Audit fieldwork was conducted from May 2008 through August 2008. 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 that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The following members of the State Auditor's staff performed the audit:

- Bruce Dempsey, CIA (Project Manager)
- Joseph Mungai, CIA, CISA (Assistant Project Manager)
- Michael Gieringer, MS, CFE
- Ashlee Jones, MAcy, CGAP
- Snehi Basnet, MAcy
- Leslie P. Ashton, CPA (Quality Control Reviewer)
- Verma Elliot, MBA, CGAP, CIA (Audit Manager)

Copies of this report have been distributed to the following:

Legislative Audit Committee

The Honorable David Dewhurst, Lieutenant Governor, Joint Chair
The Honorable Tom Craddick, Speaker of the House, Joint Chair
The Honorable Steve Ogden, Senate Finance Committee
The Honorable Thomas “Tommy” Williams, Member, Texas Senate
The Honorable Warren Chisum, House Appropriations Committee
The Honorable Jim Keffer, House Ways and Means Committee

Office of the Governor

The Honorable Rick Perry, Governor

Department of Transportation

Members of the Texas Transportation Commission

Ms. Deirdre Delisi, Chair

Mr. Ned Holmes, Commissioner

Mr. Ted Houghton, Commissioner

Mr. William Meadows, Commissioner

Mr. Fred Underwood, Commissioner

Mr. Amadeo Saenz, Jr., P.E., Executive Director



This document is not copyrighted. Readers may make additional copies of this report as needed. In addition, most State Auditor's Office reports may be downloaded from our Web site: www.sao.state.tx.us.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this document may also be requested in alternative formats. To do so, contact our report request line at (512) 936-9880 (Voice), (512) 936-9400 (FAX), 1-800-RELAY-TX (TDD), or visit the Robert E. Johnson Building, 1501 North Congress Avenue, Suite 4.224, Austin, Texas 78701.

The State Auditor's Office is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability in employment or in the provision of services, programs, or activities.

To report waste, fraud, or abuse in state government call the SAO Hotline: 1-800-TX-AUDIT.