

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

Department	Audit Process	Date & Time of Audit
Construction Unit	7.5.1 M6	4/29/14 9:00 AM

Auditor(s)	Audit Objectives:
1. Dave Schaffer 2. Katherine Bailly	Review 7.5.1 M6 District Quality Assurance, Hot Mix Asphalt Plant 30 Day Review

Name of Auditee(s)	Auditee(s) job Function
1. Dave Shaffer	1. TCIS, Materials Unit

Item(s) or areas audited
7.5.1 Procedure M6 District Quality Assurance, Hot Mix Asphalt 30 Day Review

Auditee Comments:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dave Shaffer and materials unit making changes to flow chart language. ○ Some questions in audit more applicable to the Initial Plant Review Process. See notes.

<u>Plan approved by: (Management Representative)</u>
Tab Boyer

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

Audit Criteria	
<p><u>External</u> requirements (questions)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have corrections been made as part of our non-conformity review? (See previous audit November 22,2011) 2. What modifications to forms have been made to accommodate WMA? 3. What is an example of a “district specific” review form? 4. How and where are plant deficiencies tracked? 5. How are plants notified of deficiencies and how is this relayed to the Project IIC’s/Managers? 6. How does the district verify that plants outside the district are certified and maintaining records properly? 	
<p><u>External</u> requirements (answers)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. Corrections were made—added WMA to process flow chart. 2. No changes necessary to field forms. WMA was added to flow chart. 3. DQA Plant Inspection List and DQA Review 200 Report modified. 4. In the electronic Plant Book, deficiencies in red. Also on DQA Plant Inspection Sheets. 5. Plants receive copies of forms from question #4. Project IIC’s/Managers not notified unless plant operation is suspended due to deficiencies. 6. Bulletin 41 and also the same forms our district uses are on file at the plant. 	
<p><u>Internal</u> requirements (questions)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are corrective actions verified? 2. What happens in the flowchart if the District Material Manager finds errors in the approval forms? 3. Has the process map (flowchart) been updated since the last review? 4. How does the WMA approval process differ from the HMA approval process? 5. Do plants get reviewed every 30 days as is indicated in this process? 6. What training does the district materials staff receive to be qualified to determine the accuracy of testing? 	
<p><u>Internal</u> requirements (answers)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrective actions and tracked and verified using the DQA Plant Inspection Sheets and DQA Review 200 Report. 2. Flowchart needs modified to remove language “HMA/WMA Plant Inspection Approved” 3. Yes. WMA was added. 4. *Initial Plant Inspection Process* The approval process does not differ between WMA and HMA. 5. Yes, plants are reviewed every 30 days. Deviations are pursued more frequently as needed. Flow chart language will be changed to reflect REVIEW not CERTIFICATION *Initial Plant Inspection Process* 6. NECEPT Level I and II Plant, and PAPA meeting updates 	

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 BEST Practices

1. Plant inspections and deficiencies are well tracked with forms so that any materials inspector coming in knows exactly what needs to be reviewed and what corrective actions need to be taken by the plant to resolve any deficiencies found.

Areas to consider for improvement:

1. Flowchart language for this process needs to be changed in order to reflect that this process is a review of the plant every 30 days and not necessarily used to certify the plants for approval.

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

1. None.

Observations and auditor comments:

1. Materials unit keeps excellent records of all reviews performed and records are kept up to date.
2. Dave showed great organization and produced good examples to verify this process.

Statement of overall effectiveness of the system:

- System is functioning well with no non-conformities found.

Distribution of Audit Report:

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

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



Will follow up process change with R. Polenik if warranted, assigned as CPAR 11-14, due 6-30-14