PENNDOT – Engineering District 10-0
ISO 9001 Internal Audit Report
(01/13)

Department	Audit Process	Date & Time of Audit
Construction	7.2.2, 7.2.3	8/20/13 8:00 AM

Auditor(s)	Audit Objectives:
1. Nate Adams 2. Mike Curry	Review process to insure compliance and improved effectiveness with ISO 9001: 2008 and organizational requirements.

Name of Auditee(s)	Auditee(s) job Function
1. Paul Koza, P.E.	1. Assistant District Executive - Construction

Item(s) or areas audited
Customer Related Processes, specifically Requirements Related to the Project (7.2.2) and Customer Communication (7.2.3).

Auditee Comments:

-

Plan approved by: (Management Representative)

Tab Boyer, P.E.

PENNDOT – Engineering District 10-0
ISO 9001 Internal Audit Report

Audit Criteria

External requirements (questions)

1. In a Community Action Committee (CAC), who are the committee members? Is the committee comprised of only Department personnel?
2. How does the CAC solicit customer feedback specifically? And, what are the intended outcomes of a CAC?
3. How is customer satisfaction data collected (i.e. phone calls, snail mail, door-to-door?)
4. Who is responsible for responding to customer complaints?

External requirements (answers)

1. A CAC is a process in design for larger projects. The CAC is comprised of people from the community where the project is located such as business owners, emergency response personnel, and adjacent property owners along with the design team.
2. The CAC has regular meetings where minutes are kept and a newsletter may be sent out to local newspapers to keep the community informed. The design team presents several options of design and a voting process can be used to determine what the final product will be. The whole goal is to include the community and also keep the community informed of the project in an effective manner.
3. Projects are selected by the Construction Services Engineer to have surveys sent to property owners in the vicinity of the project. The survey includes general questions about quality and expected outcomes. The surveys are collected and sent to CO where they generate a report which is gone over with staffing at winter school meetings.
4. The lowest delegated Department personnel able to handle complaint should respond first. In instances where the customer is not satisfied by that response the complaint is moved up the chain of command and handled accordingly at each position. For example, if the IIC does not settle the complaint, he/she informs the ACE of the issue and the ACE makes contact with customer.

Internal requirements (questions)

1. Who is the current constructability coordinator for District 10?
2. Who should have the most involvement in the constructability review process from the construction unit? The project ACE or IIC?
3. The process narrative and flow chart mentions a constructability review checklist several times, is this a standard checklist used for each project? If so, where can it be located?
4. Are there any foreseeable changes to this process coming in the future?

Internal requirements (answers)

1. Larry Cernansky. He coordinates all meetings and determines level of reviews.
2. Typically, the ACE represents the construction unit during review meetings. If the IIC is known for the project then the ACE will request they also attend meetings. If the IIC is not known, sometimes IIC's with past experience on like projects are asked to attend review meetings.
3. Yes, Larry Cernansky has the checklist which is standard for each project in District 10. There is some discussion about the Department moving towards a statewide checklist used for each project for conformity between Districts.
4. A possible change that may be coming is that a Constructability Coordinator – Construction will be selected and a new flow chart specifically made for the construction unit to perform reviews along with what is already in place.

PENNDOT – Engineering District 10-0
ISO 9001 Internal Audit Report

Overall Statement of Effectiveness of the Quality Management System

Areas of strength regarding ability to meet requirements- including observed <u>BEST Practices</u>

The process is effective in its stated purposes of obtaining customer feedback and communication. The constructability flow chart is detailed and easy to follow in terms of the process requirements.

Areas to consider for improvement:

None

Specific observed nonconformities (Findings): If Applicable, Follow-up Scheduled:

1. N/A

Observations and auditor comments:

The possible change of having a constructability review process specifically handled by a construction unit representative will be of great value in putting out projects that are designed correctly and constructed on budget.

Statement of overall effectiveness of the system:

The process is satisfactorily effective in fulfilling its state purposes.

Distribution of Audit Report:

- Manager of area audited
- A.D.E. Construction
- ISO Management Representative

Unit Manager Comments Including Follow-Up Action: (if any)

- **N/A**